

MODERN STUDIES IN PROPERTY LAW: VOLUME 7

This book contains a collection of peer-reviewed papers presented at the ninth biennial Modern Studies in Property Law conference held at the University of Southampton in March 2012. It is the seventh volume to be published under the name of the conference. The conference and its published proceedings have become an established forum for property lawyers from around the world to showcase current research in the discipline. This collection reflects both the breadth of modern research in property law and its international dimensions. Incorporating a keynote address by Lord Walker of Gestingthorpe, retired Justice of the Supreme Court, on 'The Saga of Strasbourg and Social Housing', a number of chapters reveal the burgeoning influence of human rights in property law. Other contributions illustrate an enduring need to question and explore fundamental concepts of the subject alongside new and emerging areas of study. Collectively the chapters demonstrate the importance and relevance of property research in addressing a wide range of contemporary issues.

Previous volumes in this series:

Modern Studies in Property Law: Volume 1

Edited by Elizabeth Cooke

Modern Studies in Property Law: Volume 2

Edited by Elizabeth Cooke

Modern Studies in Property Law: Volume 3

Edited by Elizabeth Cooke

Modern Studies in Property Law: Volume 4

Edited by Elizabeth Cooke

Modern Studies in Property Law: Volume 5

Edited by Martin Dixon

Modern Studies in Property Law: Volume 6

Edited by Susan Bright

Modern Studies in Property Law

Volume 7

Edited by
Nicholas Hopkins



• H A R T •
PUBLISHING

OXFORD AND PORTLAND, OREGON
2013

Hart Publishing
16C Worcester Place Oxford OX1 2JW
United Kingdom
Telephone: +44 (0)1865-517530
Fax: +44 (0)1865-510710
E-mail: mail@hartpub.co.uk
Website: <http://www.hartpub.co.uk>

Published in North America (US and Canada) by
Hart Publishing
c/o International Specialized Book Services
920 NE 58th Avenue, Suite 300
Portland, OR 97213-3786
USA
Tel: +1 (503) 287-3093 or toll-free: +1 (800) 944-6190
Fax: +1 (503) 280-8832
E-mail: orders@isbs.com
Website: www.isbs.com

© The editor and contributors severally 2013

The editor and contributors have asserted their right under the Copyright,
Designs and Patents Act 1988, to be identified as the authors of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval
system, or transmitted, in any form or by any mean, without the prior permission of Hart
Publishing, or as expressly permitted by law or under the terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographic rights organisation. Enquiries concerning reproduction which may not be
covered by the above should be addressed to Hart Publishing at the address above.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data Available

ISBN: 978-1-84946-321-8

Typeset by Compuscript Ltd, Shannon
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ International Ltd, Padstow



Preface

This volume contains refereed papers from the ninth Biennial Modern Studies in Property Law Conference that took place at the University of Southampton in March 2012. The conference series has its origins in the Centre for Property Law at the University of Reading, which held its first conference in 1996. These conferences gave rise to the book *Modern Studies in Property Law*, the volumes of which have, since 2001, been the medium for refereed publication of the conference proceedings. The conferences provide a snapshot of debates and developments in property law research for an international audience of speakers, delegates and readers of the proceedings. Collectively, they provide a representation of recurring and emerging themes in property jurisprudence. It is a testament to the vitality of the research in the field that the inaugural Postgraduate Research Student stream of the conference that took place on the final day in Southampton attracted speakers from the UK, Asia and South Africa.

This published volume opens with the text of the keynote address given by Lord Walker of Gestingthorpe. In his speech, 'The Saga of Strasbourg and Social Housing', Lord Walker reviews the case law on social housing and Article 8 of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) and the 'clash of the Titans' between the English domestic courts and the European Court of Human Rights. He describes the saga as 'the most important concluded struggle, so far, between our courts and Strasbourg'. The remaining chapters in Part I of this collection, 'Property and Housing', focus on what is perhaps the most socially, politically and practically significant use of property; its use as a home. In Chapter 2, Susan Bright, Nicholas Hopkins and Nicholas Macklam continue the theme of human rights and social housing in the specific context of English shared ownership schemes. The authors consider how human rights and domestic public law can be used to protect those who 'own part' but risk 'losing all' as a result of the legal model used to deliver this form of low-cost home ownership. In Chapter 3, Warren Barr considers the impact of the Big Society initiative for charities involved in social housing provision. He suggests that despite the shared rhetoric of the Big Society and charitable providers of social housing, the initiative has ultimately provided more of a challenge than an opportunity. Part I concludes with an analysis of the regulation of private residential tenancies in Ireland by Áine Ryall. Written against the background of an increased demand for private residential housing as the 'dream' of home ownership has ended for many in the global economic crisis, Ryall examines the Residential Tenancies Act 2004. Against the background of proposed reform of the Act, she argues that the legislation is in urgent need of substantial amendment.

The contributions in Part II are themed around 'Challenging Perceptions of Property and Trusts'. In Chapter 5, Adam Hofri-Winogradow examines the phenomenon of 'shapeless trusts': those arising through legislation which does not require title to the trust assets to vest in the trustees. His focus is on two jurisdictions; Israel, whose shapeless trust is set to come to an end, and China. By setting

the ‘old’ alongside the ‘new’, he suggests that shapeless trusts do have their use, particularly in making trusts more accessible outside the Anglo-Saxon legal tradition. In Chapter 6, Leslie Turano-Taylor challenges the assumptions that underpin the decision in *Hammersmith and Fulham LBC v Alexander-David* and the statutory regime that imposes a trust on the grant of a legal lease to a minor. She highlights the practical and theoretical difficulties caused by the trust against the substantively different relationship between a landlord and tenant and a trustee and beneficiary. In Chapter 7, Magdalena Habdas takes us to condominium schemes in Poland and examines the competence of the ‘community of owners’ in respect of common parts. Common parts remain the focus for Sarah Blandy in Chapter 8. Drawing on empirical research undertaken in ‘cohousing’ developments, she challenges the perception of property as being confined to externally imposed ‘rights’ and argues that recognition should be given to a property regime that emerges from the ‘lived experience’ of residents. Underlying both of these chapters is the difficulty presented to property law by any move away from individual, private property. In Chapter 9, written by Sue Farran, the division between private and public property is seen to have become increasingly blurred as people go ‘back to the land’. Tracing a growth in collective use of land, Farran questions whether the property law ‘menu’ (the *numerus clausus*) needs to be reviewed to reflect a move away from individualism.

Part III of the collection, ‘Intersections between Private Property, the Public and the State’, picks up on the themes emerging from Part II. The preceding chapters by Habdas, Blandy and Farran have taken us away from the idea of property rights as individual rights to collective rights and uses of land. In Chapter 10 by John Page, which opens Part III, we move from collective ownership to public property. Page seeks to help fill the gap in the lack of theoretical understanding of such property. Janet Ulph’s contribution in Chapter 11 then considers the sometimes controversial issue of the sale and transfer of items in museum collections. She argues that the guidance provided by law is inadequate, but that the gap should be filled by ethical principles. A theme thus recurs between Parts II and III as to the limits of property law, which appears an inadequate expression for the values and interests in issue beyond wholly ‘private’ rights.

In Chapter 12, Frankie McCarthy poses the challenging question of whether terrorists are entitled to peaceful enjoyment of their possessions. She considers whether anti-terrorist finance measures, designed to stop the flow of money to fund terrorist activities, would and should be found compatible with Article 1 of Protocol 1 of the ECHR. Part III concludes with two chapters focused on property and planning. In Chapter 13, Rachael Walsh explores planning law to cast light on the relationship between property and participation. She argues that the major role afforded to participation in the English planning system is evidence of the increasing ‘democratisation’ of property. In Chapter 14, Peter Williams considers the rise of property and development rights in Australia and the implications for urban planning policy and law.

The final part of the collection, Part IV, is entitled ‘The Nature, Content and Acquisition of Property’ and opens with a contribution by Simon Gardner in Chapter 15. Gardner’s audio-visual keynote address presented at the conference is not one that could translate to writing. Instead, Gardner uses his contribution to this collection to provide an appraisal of the theory of ‘persistent rights’ developed

principally by Ben McFarlane. It is particularly appropriate for Gardner to choose this collection to do so, as one of the key texts of the theory is published in the previous volume of *Modern Studies in Property Law*. Gardner rejects the theory, but not without praise for its ambition. Chapters 16 and 17 address the ‘content’ of property. In Chapter 16, Simon Douglas raises the question of whether a freeholder has ‘a right to use’ land. He concludes that while a freeholder has ‘liberties to use’ land, it remains unclear to what extent these liberties impose duties on others. In Chapter 17, Scott Grattan focuses attention on the right to alienate. Locating his discussion in the broader inquiry of the relationship between property and rights, Grattan considers different contexts in which the right to alienate is absent *ab initio* or has been removed. The final two chapters are each concerned with the ‘acquisition’ of property. In Chapter 18, written by Robin Hickey, the original acquisition of title to personal property by theft is examined. Hickey questions the use of standard actions for interference with goods in situations of ‘wrongful’ possession and argues that rather than recognising a relative title, in some instances the objects of the law may be better served by the imposition of a personal right. In Chapter 19, written by Emma Waring, the ‘acquisition’ has taken the form of compulsory purchase, but for private purposes. Waring places current concerns with private takings in the US and the UK in their historical context. She argues for the need for modern private takings to be ‘scrutinised carefully and used sparingly’ to ensure that their benefits do not come at the expense of the stability of the property regime.

Collectively, the contributions to this volume demonstrate the breadth, depth and variety of modern property scholarship. One of the great benefits of the *Modern Studies in Property Law* series is the ability to bring together a rich diversity of research at an international gathering. The conference owes this to the vision of Professor Lizzie Cooke and her colleagues at the University of Reading and, in no small part, to Richard Hart for his ongoing commitment to the series. On a personal level, I would like to thank my fellow members of the series’ Editorial Board for entrusting the ninth conference to me. I am extremely grateful to the keynote speakers, Lord Walker of Gestingthorpe and Professor Simon Gardner, and to the Rt Hon Sir Terence Etherton, who addressed the conference at its dinner. At Southampton, special thanks are due to my colleagues Emma Laurie and Sarah Nield for their continuous support and involvement in the organisation of the conference. To preserve the integrity of the process, Emma and Sarah also arranged for Chapter 2, on which I am co-author, to be refereed. It would not have been possible to hold the event at Southampton without the backing of Professor Natalie Lee as Head of School, whose support was wholehearted and enthusiastic. Finally, the practical administrative burden of organisation was handled with the utmost efficiency by Jo Hazell.

As this book goes to press, we look forward to the tenth *Modern Studies in Property Law* conference that will take place at the University of Liverpool in 2014.

Nicholas Hopkins
Professor of Law, University of Southampton
January 2013

Table of Contents

<i>Preface</i>	v
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xi
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xxv

PART I: PROPERTY AND HOUSING

1. The Saga of Strasbourg and Social Housing.....	3
<i>Lord Walker of Gestingthorpe</i>	
2. Owning Part but Losing All: Using Human Rights to Protect Home Ownership	15
<i>Susan Bright, Nicholas Hopkins and Nicholas Macklam</i>	
3. The Big Society and Social Housing: Never the Twain Shall Meet?.....	39
<i>Warren Barr</i>	
4. Regulating Residential Tenancies in Ireland: Rights, Responsibilities and Enforcement	59
<i>Áine Ryall</i>	

PART II: CHALLENGING PERCEPTIONS OF PROPERTY AND TRUSTS

5. Shapeless Trusts and Settlor Title Retention: An Asian Morality Play	85
<i>Adam S Hofri-Winogradow</i>	
6. Misplaced Trust: First Principles and the Conveyance of Legal Leases to Minors	107
<i>Leslie Turano-Taylor</i>	
7. The Community of Owners' Regulation of Common Property in Polish Condominium Schemes.....	127
<i>Magdalena Haddas</i>	
8. Collective Property: Owning and Sharing Residential Space	151
<i>Sarah Blandy</i>	
9. Earth under the Nails: The Extraordinary Return to the Land.....	173
<i>Sue Farran</i>	

**PART III: INTERSECTIONS BETWEEN PRIVATE
PROPERTY, THE PUBLIC AND THE STATE**

10. Towards an Understanding of Public Property.....	195
<i>John Page</i>	
11. The Sale of Items in Museum Collections	217
<i>Janet Ulph</i>	
12. Property as a Human Right: Another Casualty of the ‘War on Terror’?	243
<i>Frankie McCarthy</i>	
13. The Evolving Relationship between Property and Participation in English Planning Law	263
<i>Rachael Walsh</i>	
14. The Rise of Property Rights: Implications for Urban Planning, Environmental Protection and Biodiversity Conservation in Australia.....	291
<i>Peter Williams</i>	

**PART IV: THE NATURE, CONTENT AND ACQUISITION
OF PROPERTY**

15. ‘Persistent Rights’ Appraised.....	321
<i>Simon Gardner</i>	
16. The Content of a Freehold: A ‘Right to Use’ Land?.....	359
<i>Simon Douglas</i>	
17. Property and Alienation: Rights, Obligations, Restraints.....	379
<i>Scott Grattan</i>	
18. Possession Taken by Theft and the Original Acquisition of Personal Property Rights	401
<i>Robin Hickey</i>	
19. The Prevalence of Private Takings.....	419
<i>Emma JL Waring</i>	
<i>Index</i>	439

Table of Cases

United Kingdom

A v HM Treasury [2010] UKSC 2, [2010] 2 AC 534	246, 248–50, 256
A v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2004] UKHL 56, [2005] 2 AC 68	3
Abernethy v Hutchinson (1825) 1 H & Tw 28.....	341
AG Spalding v AW Gamage Ltd (1915) 32 RPC 273 (HL).....	341
Aliakmon, The see Leigh & Sillavan Ltd v Aliakmon Shipping Co Ltd	
Allen v Flood [1898] AC 1	366
Anchor Brewhouse Developments Ltd v Berkley House (Docklands Developments) Ltd [1987] 2 EGLR 1973	368
Anchor Brewhouse Developments Ltd v Jury's Hotel Management (UK) Ltd (2001) 82 P & CR 286	385
Anglian Water Services v Crawshaw Robbins & Co [2001] BLR 173	374–75
Armitage v Wadsworth (1815) 1 Madd 189.....	339
Armory v Delamirie (1722) 1 Stra 505.....	401, 411–13
Armstrong DLW GmbH v Winnington Networks Ltd [2012] EWHC 10 (Ch), [2012] 3 All ER 425.....	170, 333, 350
Arnold v Jefferson (1697) 1 Ld Raym 275	411
Ashby v Tolhurst [1937] 2 KB 242.....	402
Asher v Whitlock (1865–66) LR 1 QB 1	401
Ashton v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2010] EWCA Civ 600, [2011] 1 P & CR 5	271, 274
Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd v Wednesbury Corp [1948] 1 KB 223	32, 53, 302, 435
Aston Cantlow Parochial Church Council v Wallbank [2003] UKHL 37, [2004] 1 AC 546.....	5, 27, 436
Astor's Settlement Trusts, re [1952] Ch 534	347
Attorney General for Hong Kong v Reid [1994] 1 AC 324 (PC)	329
Attorney General v Blake [2001] 1 AC 268 (HL)	341
Attorney General v Observer Ltd [1990] 1 AC 109 (HL)	341
Attorney General v Trustees of the British Museum (Commission for Looted Art in Europe intervening) [2005] EWHC 1089 (Ch), [2005] Ch 397	224
Attorney General's Reference (No 2 of 2001), re [2003] UKHL 68, [2004] 2 AC 72	3
Austerbery v Oldham Corporation [1885] Ch D 750.....	155
Ayerst v CK (Construction) Ltd [1976] AC 167	114
Bank Mellat v HM Treasury [2010] EWHC 1332 (QB), [2010] Lloyd's Rep FC 504; [2011] EWCA Civ 1, [2011] HRLR 13.....	249–50
Barclay v Barclay [1970] 2 QB 677 (CA)	338
Barclays Bank Ltd v Quistclose Investments Ltd [1970] AC 567 (HL)	347
Barrett v Morgan [2000] 2 AC 264 (HL)	122
Batchelor v Marlow [2001] EWCA Civ 1051, [2003] 1 WLR 764.....	330
BCCI v Akindele [2001] Ch 437 (CA).....	230
Beer v Ward (1821) Jac 194	339

xii *Table of Cases*

Belfast Corporation v OD Cars Ltd [1960] AC 490.....	264, 269–70
Berkley v Poulett [1977] 1 EGLR 86 (CA)	111
Bettison v Langton [2001] UKHL 24, [2002] 1 AC 27.....	163
Betts v Metropolitan Police District Receiver and Carter Paterson & Co Ltd [1932] 2 KB 595.....	406
Bexley LBC v Secretary of State for the Environment; Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment [2001] EWHC 323 (Admin).....	279
Birmingham Development Co Ltd v Tyler [2008] EWCA Civ 859	373–75
Bishopsgate Investment Management Ltd v Maxwell (No 2) [1994] 1 All ER 261 (CA).....	232
Boardman v Phipps [1967] 2 AC 46 (HL)	232, 342
Bowes, re [1896] 1 Ch 507.....	347
Bradford v Pickles [1895] AC 587 (HL)	363
Bridlington Relay v Yorkshire Electricity Board [1965] Ch 436	375
Brinks v Abu-Saleh (No 3) [1996] CLC 133.....	232
Britain v Rossiter (1879) 11 QBD 123 (CA).....	336
Bruton v London & Quadrant Housing Trust [2000] 1 AC 406 (HL).....	51, 185
Buckley v Gross (1863) 3 B & S 566.....	404–5, 408, 417
Bull v Bull [1955] 1 QB 234 (CA)	338
Burgess v Burgess (1853) 3 De GM & G 896.....	341
Burgess v Wheate (1759) 1 Eden 177.....	347
Burmah Oil v Lord Advocate [1965] AC 75.....	260
Bushell v Secretary of State [1986] AC 75 (HL)	278
Buxton v Minister of Housing [1961] 1 QB 278	269
Cadder v HM Advocate [2010] UKSC 43, [2010] 1 WLR 2601	3
Caldy Manor Estate Ltd v Farrell [1974] 1 WLR 1303 (CA)	394–96
Campbell v MGN Ltd [2004] UKHL 22, [2004] 2 AC 457.....	361
Canterbury City Council v Colley [1993] AC 401.....	270
Cattle v Stockton Waterworks Co (1875) 10 QB 453	338
Centaploy Ltd v Matlodge Ltd [1974] Ch 1.....	124
Chappell v Somers & Blake [2003] EWHC 1644 (Ch), [2004] Ch 19.....	348
Chaudhary v Yavuz [2011] EWCA Civ 1314, [2013] Ch 249	115, 118
Chesterfield BC v Bailey [2011] EW Misc 18 (CC).....	30
Chesterfield Properties plc v Secretary of State for the Environment (1997) 76 P & CR 117	279, 435
Christopher Shepherd v Scottish Ministers (unreported, 1 May 2001) (Court of Session).....	251, 256
City of London Building Society v Flegg [1988] AC 54 (HL)	118
Clark v University of Lincolnshire and Humberside [2000] 1 WLR 1988	31
Club Cruise Entertainment and Travelling Services Europe BV v Department for Transport [2008] EWHC 2794 (Comm), [2009] 1 Lloyd's Rep 201.....	377
Coatsworth v Johnson (1886) 54 LT 520 (CA)	340
Coco v AN Clark (Engineers) Ltd [1968] FSR 415.....	341
Coggs v Bernard (1703) 2 Ld Raym 909.....	402
Coleen Properties v Minister for Housing and Local Government [1971] 1 All ER 1049.....	279
Cooper v Wandsworth Board of Works (1863) 14 CB (NS) 180	269
Costello v Chief Constable of Derbyshire [2001] EWCA Civ 381, [2001] 1 WLR 1437 (CA).....	401–10, 416, 418
Council of Civil Service Unions v Minister for the Civil Service [1985] AC 374.....	30–31

CPS v D [2006] EWHC 2738 (Admin).....	259
Crabb v Arun DC [1976] Ch 179 (CA)	115
Crawley BC v Ure [1996] QB 13 (CA)	121
Crawshay v Thompson (1842) 4 Man & G 357	341
Crow v Tyrrell (1818) 3 Madd 179.....	339
Darlington BC v Wiltshier Northern Ltd [1995] 1 WLR 68, 73 (CA)	348
Davies v Benyon-Harris (1931) 47 TLR 424	111
Davies v Crawley BC [2001] EWHC 854 (Admin).....	279–80
De Freitas v Permanent Secretary of Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries, Lands and Housing [1999] 1 AC 69 (HL)	23
De Rothschild v Secretary of State for Transport (1989) 57 P & CR 330.....	278
Delaney v TP Smith Ltd [1946] KB 393 (CA).....	340
Delius, re [1957] Ch 299.....	234
Denley's Trust Deed, re [1969] 1 Ch 373	347
Di Palma v Victoria Square Property Co Ltd [1984] Ch 346	29
Doe d Warner v Browne (1807) 8 East 165, 103 ER 105	124
Doherty v Birmingham City Council [2008] UKHL 57, [2009] 1 AC 367.....	10–12, 32
Donoghue v Stevenson [1932] AC 562 (HL)	337
Dormer v Fortescue (1741) 2 Atk 282.....	339
Duchess of Argyll v Duke of Argyll [1967] Ch 302	341
Ellenborough Park, re [1956] Ch 131 (CA).....	330
Elliott (1840) 7 M & W 306.....	404, 411–12
Elliott v Southwark LBC [1976] 1 WLR 499	280
Ellis and Ruislip-Northwood Urban Council, re [1920] 1 KB 343	269
Ellis v Loftus (1874) LR 10 CP 10	367
England v Cowley (1872–73) LR 8 Ex 126.....	377
Fairmount Investments v Secretary of State for the Environment [1976] 2 All ER 865.....	278
France Fenwick and Co Ltd v The King [1927] 1 KB 458.....	265, 269
Friends Provident Life and Pensions Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment [2001] EWHC 820 (Admin)	279–80
Gandy v Jubber (1865) 5 B & S 15, 122 ER 911	124
Gernes v Smyth (1499–1500) CP 40/948 m 303	328
Ghaidan v Godin-Mendoza [2004] UKHL 30, [2004] 2 AC 557	13
Gillette UK Ltd v Edenwest Ltd [1994] RPC 279	341–42
Goodman v Mayor of Saltash (1892) 7 App Cas 633.....	189
Gough v Chief Constable of the West Midlands [2004] EWCA Civ 206	403, 407
Government of Mauritius v Union Flacq Sugar Estates Co Ltd [1992] 1 WLR 903	270
Grape Bay Ltd v Attorney General of Bermuda [2000] 1 WLR 574 (PC)	27, 264, 269–70
Gray v Taylor [1998] 1 WLR 1093	51
Gregory v Piper (1829) 9 Bar & Cress 591, 109 ER 220.....	367
Guppys (Bridport) Ltd v Brookling (1984) 14 HLR 1	373–75, 377
Halsey v Esso Petroleum Co Ltd [1961] 1 WLR 683.....	368
Hammersmith and Fulham LBC v Alexander-David [2009] EWCA Civ 259, [2010] 2 WLR 1126	107–8, 112, 116, 119–23, 125–26
Hammersmith and Fulham LBC v Monk [1992] 1 AC 478 (HL)	121, 123, 125
Hanchett-Stamford v Attorney General [2008] EWHC 330 (Ch), [2009] Ch 173.....	184
Hanily v Minister for Local Government [1952] 2 QB 444.....	273
Harries v Church Commissioners [1992] 1 WLR 1241	236
Harrow LBC v Qazi [2003] UKHL 43, [2004] 1 AC 983.....	6–7, 10–12
Haywood v Brunswick Permanent Benefit Building Society (1881) 8 QBD 403 (CA)	331–32

Hewett v Court (1982) 149 CLR 639	112
Hibbert v McKiernan [1948] 2 KB 142	405
HM Advocate v McSalley [2000] JC 485	258–59
HM Treasury v Ahmed see A v HM Treasury	
Holburne, re (1885) 53 LT 212	234
Holmes v Westminster CC [2011] EWHC 2857 (QB)	55
Hopkins v Hopkins (1739) West temp Hard 606	347
Hounslow LBC v Powell [2011] UKSC 8, [2011] 2 AC 186	4, 11–13, 20–23, 25, 30–32, 54
Huang v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2007] UKHL 11, [2007] 2 AC 167	3, 23
Hunter v Canary Wharf Ltd [1997] AC 655 (HL)	345, 375
Hurst v Picture Theatres Ltd [1915] 1 KB 1 (CA)	340
Hussein v Mehman [1992] 2 EGLR 87	125
IDC Group Ltd v Clark (1992) 65 P & CR 179 (CA)	324
Industrial Properties (Barton Hill) Ltd v Associated Electrical Industries Ltd [1977] QB 580 (CA)	340
Inglewood Pulp and Paper Co v New Brunswick Electric Power Commission [1928] AC 492	278
Ingram v Inland Revenue Commissioners [2000] 1 AC 293 (HL)	122
Irving v National Provincial Bank Ltd [1962] 2 QB 73	405
Isaack v Clark (1614) 2 Bulst 306	411
Item Software (UK) Ltd v Fassihi [2004] EWCA Civ 1244, [2005] 2 BCLC 91	236
Jaggard v Sawyer [1995] 2 All ER 189	385
Jeffries v Great Western Railway Co (1856) E & B 802	401, 404–5, 411–16, 418
Jennings v Crown Prosecution Service [2008] UKHL 29, [2008] 1 AC 1046	257
Jones v Chappell (1875) LR 20 Eq 539	124
Jones v Jones (1817) 3 Mer 161	339
Jones v Ruth [2011] EWCA Civ 804, [2012] 1 WLR 1495	385
Kay v Lambeth LBC [2006] UKHL 10, [2006] 2 AC 465	8–12, 31–32
Keech v Sandford (1726) Cas temp King 61, [1558–1774] All ER Rep 230 (LC)	232
Keppel v Wheeler [1927] 1 KB 577 (CA)	235
Keppell v Bailey (1834) 2 My & K 517, 39 ER 1042	113, 331, 334
Khar v Delbounty Ltd (1998) 75 P & CR 232	17
Kinane v Mackie-Konteh [2005] EWCA Civ 45, [2005] WTLR 345	115–16
Kingston upon Thames RLBC v Prince [1999] 1 FLR 593 (CA)	114, 121
Knight v Knight (1840) 3 Beav 148, 49 ER 58	91
Kynoch v Rowlands [1912] 1 Ch 527	367
La Compagnie Sucrière de Bel Ombre Ltd v Government of Mauritius [1995] 3 LRC 494 (PC)	270
Lace v Chantler [1944] KB 368 (CA)	124
Lambe v Eames (1871) 6 Ch App 597 (CA in Ch)	347
Lavery v Pursell (1888) 39 Ch D 508	336
Law Society v Isaac & Isaac International [2010] EWHC 1670 (Ch), [2011] WTLR 425	230
Lawrence v Obee (1815) 1 Sta 22, 171 ER 389	367
Laws v Florinplace Ltd [1981] 1 All ER 659	375
Leeds CC v Price see Kay v Lambeth LBC	
Leigh & Silavan Ltd v Aliakmon Shipping Co Ltd (The Aliakmon) [1986] AC 785	329, 337–38, 349
Linden Gardens Trust Ltd v Lenestra Sludge Disposals Ltd [1994] 1 AC 85 (HL)	379, 395–96, 398

Liverpool City Council v Doran [2009] EWCA Civ 146, [2009] 1 WLR 2365	32
Lloyd's v Harper (1880) 16 Ch D 290 (CA)	348
London & North Western Railway Co v Evans [1893] 1 Ch 16	278
London & South Western Railway Co v Gomm (1882) 20 Ch D 562 (CA)	330, 342, 345–46
Lough v First Secretary of State [2004] EWCA Civ 905, [2004] 1 WLR 2557	276, 280
Lyon v Daily Telegraph Ltd [1943] KB 746	362
Lysaght v Edwards (1875–76) LR 2 Ch D 499	109–111, 119
Malkins Nominees Ltd v Société Financière Mirelis SA [2004] EWHC 2631 (Ch)	348
Manchester Airport plc v Dutton [2000] QB 133 (CA)	338
Manchester City Council v Pinnock [2011] UKSC 6, [2010] 3 WLR 1441	9, 11–14, 20–22, 25, 30–32, 54
Mayor of London v Hall [2010] EWCA Civ 817, [2011] 1 WLR 504	338
MCC Proceeds Inc v Lehman Bros International (Europe) [1998] 4 All ER 675 (CA)	329, 349
McIntosh v Lord Advocate [2001] UKPC D 1, [2003] 1 AC 1078	258–59, 262
McManus v Cooke (1887) 35 Ch D 681	336
McPhail v Doulton [1971] AC 424 (HL)	347
Mexfield Housing Co-operative Ltd v Beresford [2011] UKSC 52, [2012] 1 AC 955	124–25, 171
Millington v Fox (1838) 3 My & Cr 338	341
Milroyd v Lord (1862) 4 De GF & J 264, 45 ER 1184	91
Moncrieff v Jamieson [2007] UKHL 42, [2007] 1 WLR 2620	330
Morison v Moat (1851) 9 Hare 241; affirmed (1852) 21 LJ Ch 248 (CA in Ch)	341
National Carriers Ltd v Panalpina (Northern) Ltd [1981] AC 1965 (HL)	125
National Provincial Bank Ltd v Ainsworth [1965] AC 1175 (HL)	169, 379
Newman LBC v Ria [2004] EWCA Civ 41	121–22
Newnham v Stevenson (1851) 10 CB 713	413
Nisbet and Potts' Contract, re [1905] 1 Ch 391 (Ch D); [1906] 1 Ch 386 (CA)	330, 346
Norris v Government of USA [2010] UKSC 9, [2010] 2 AC 287	3
OBG Ltd v Allan [2007] UKHL 21, [2008] 1 AC 1	335, 366
Ofulue v Bossert [2008] EWCA Civ 7, [2009] Ch 1	27
Oxley v James (1844) 13 M & W 209, 153 ER 87	124
P & A Swift Investments v Combined English Stores Group plc [1988] UKHL 3, [1989] AC 632	164
Pan Atlantic Insurance Co Ltd v Pine Top Insurance Co Ltd [1988] 2 Lloyd's Rep 505 (QBD); affirmed [1989] 1 Lloyd's Rep 568 (CA)	348
Parker v British Airways Board [1982] QB 1004	406, 414
Pascoe v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2006] EWHC 2356 (Admin), [2007] 1 WLR 885	279–80, 285
Pascoe v Turner [1979] 1 WLR 431 (CA)	115
Pear v Secretary of State for Transport, Local Government and the Regions [2003] EWCA Civ 295	279–80
Pemberton v Pemberton (1805) 13 Ves 290	339
Pennycook v Shaws (EAL) Ltd [2004] EWCA Civ 1000, [2004] Ch 296	27
Pepper v Hart [1993] AC 593	5
Perera v Vandiyar [1953] 1 WLR 672 (CA)	371, 373
Peter Pan Manufacturing Corp v Corsets Silhouette Ltd [1964] 1 WLR 96	341
Phillips v Peace [2004] EWHC 1380 (Fam), [2005] 2 FLR 1212	111
Phipps v Pears [1965] 1 QB 76 (CA)	330
Pincke v Thornycroft (1785) 4 Bro PC 92 (HL)	339
Pinion, re [1965] Ch 85 (CA)	234

Polly Peck International plc v Nadir (No 2) [1992] 4 All ER 769 (CA).....	329
Polo Woods Foundation v Shelton-Agar [2009] EWHC 1361 (Ch), [2010] 1 All ER 539.....	330
Poplar Housing and Regeneration Community Association Ltd v Donoghue [2002] QB 48	4, 7, 12
Powell v Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government [2007] EWHC 2051 (Admin).....	278
Prest v Secretary of State for Wales (1982) 81 LGR 193.....	278
Pride (D) & Partners (a firm) v Institute for Animal Health [2009] EWHC 685 (QB).....	371–72, 374–77
Prince Albert v Strange (1849) 1 Mac & G 25	341
Prudential Assurance Ltd v London Residuary Board [1992] AC 386 (HL)	124
Pulteney v Warren (1801) 6 Ves 73	339
Quinn v Leathem [1901] AC 495.....	370
R (Adlard) v Secretary of State for the Environment [2002] EWCA Civ 735, [2002] 1 WLR 2515	274
R (Alconbury) v Secretary of State for the Environment [2001] UKHL 23, [2003] 2 AC 295	6, 285, 289
R (Assets Recovery Agency) v Ashton, Belton v Assets Recovery Agency [2005] NIQB 58	258
R (Beer (t/a Hammer Trout Farm)) v Hampshire Farmers Market Ltd [2003] EWCA Civ 1056, [2004] 1 WLR 233	436
R (Burnley BC) v First Secretary of State [2006] EWHC 798 (Admin)	280
R (Clays Lane Housing Co-operative Ltd) v The Housing Corporation [2004] EWCA Civ 1658, [2005] 1 WLR 2229	280
R (Countryside Alliance) v Attorney General [2007] UKHL 52, [2008] 1 AC 719.....	24
R (Cummins) v Camden LBC [2001] EWHC 116 (Admin).....	279–80
R (Gavin) v Haringey LBC [2003] EWHC 2591 (Admin), [2004] 1 PLR 61	274
R (Greenfield) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2005] UKHL 14, [2005] 1 WLR 673	36–37
R (Kelly) v Hounslow LBC [2010] EWHC 1256 (Admin).....	274
R (Lewis) v Redcar and Cleveland BC [2010] UKSC 11; [2010] 2 AC 70	169
R (Lord Chancellor) v Chief Land Registrar [2005] EWHC 1706 (Admin) [37], [2006] QB 795	278
R (Majed) v Camden LBC [2009] EWCA Civ 1029.....	273–74
R (McIntyre) v Gentoo Group Ltd [2010] EWHC 5 (Admin)	53
R (McLellan) v Bracknell Forest BC [2001] EWCA Civ 1510, [2002] QB 1129.....	5, 12
R (Morgan) v Dyfed Powys Magistrates' Court [2003] EWHC 1568 (Admin).....	403
R (Mortell) v Secretary of State for Community and Local Government [2009] EWCA Civ 1274	279–81, 285
R (Nadarajah) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2005] EWCA Civ 1363.....	33
R (Quila) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2011] UKSC 45, [2012] 1 AC 261.....	3
R (Rose Malster) v Ipswich BC [2001] EWHC 711 (Admin).....	279–80
R (Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd) v Wolverhampton City Council [2010] UKSC 20, [2011] 1 AC 437	426–30, 434–35
R (Ullah) v Special Adjudicator [2004] UKHL 26, [2004] 2 AC 323.....	12
R (Vetterlein) v Hampshire CC [2001] EWHC 560 (Admin).....	274, 279–80
R (Weaver) v London Quadrant Housing Trust [2008] EWHC 1377 (Admin), [2009] 1 All ER 17; affirmed [2009] EWCA Civ 587, [2010] 1 WLR 363.....	19, 31, 33, 53–54, 436

R v Benjafield [2002] UKHL 2, [2003] 1 AC 1099.....	258
R v Disciplinary Committee of the Jockey Club, ex p Aga Khan [1993] 1 WLR 909	436
R v Doncaster MBC, ex p Braim (1989) 57 P & CR 1	189
R v Jia Jin He 2004 WL 3089191	258
R v Lincolnshire CC, ex p Atkinson (1995) 8 Admin LR 529	9
R v May (Raymond George) [2008] UKHL 28, [2008] 1 AC 1028.....	252, 259
R v Panel on Takeovers and Mergers, ex p Datafin plc [1987] QB 815	436
R v Rezvi [2002] UKHL 1, [2003] 1 AC 1099	258
R v Roston [2003] EWCA Crim 2206	406
R v Servite Houses and Wandsworth LBC, ex p Goldsmith (2000) 3 CCLR 325	
R v Shabir [2009] 1 Cr App R(S) 84	259
R v Somerset CC, ex p Fewings [1995] 3 All ER 20	189
R v Tower Hamlets LBC, ex p Von Goetz [1999] QB 1019 (CA)	108, 120, 125
R v Wear Valley DC, ex p Binks [1985] 2 All ER 699	189
Rackham v Jesup (1772) 3 Wilson KB 332	412
Rapier v London Tramway Corp [1893] 2 Ch 588 (CA).....	368
Reading v The King [1949] 2 KB 232 (CA).....	87
Reynolds v Clarke (1724) 1 Str 634, 93 ER 747	369
Rhone v Stephens [1994] 2 AC 310 (HL).....	155, 332
Richardson v Midland Heart Ltd [2008] L & TR 31	13, 17–18, 21, 23, 33, 37
Rightside Properties Ltd v Gray [1975] Ch 72	336
Rose v Watson (1864) 10 HL Cas 672	109
Royal Choral Society v Inland Revenue Commissioners [1943] 2 All ER 101 (CA)	234
Royal Society's Charitable Trusts, re [1956] Ch 87	224
Ruma Begum v Tower Hamlets LBC [2003] UKHL 5, [2003] 2 AC 430.....	6, 13
Rye v Rye [1962] AC 496 (HL).....	121–22
Saltman Engineering Co Ltd v Campbell Engineering Co Ltd (1948) 65 RPC 203 (CA)	341
Saunders v Vautier (1841) 4 Beav 115, 115 ER 282; affirmed Cr & Ph 240, 41 ER 482.....	93, 122, 347
Seager v Copydex Ltd (No 1) [1967] 1 WLR 923 (CA).....	341
Seager v Copydex Ltd (No 2) [1969] 1 WLR 809 (CA).....	341
Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs v Meier [2009] UKSC 11, [2009] 1 WLR 2780	338
Secretary of State for the Home Department v AF (No 3) [2009] UKHL 28, [2010] 2 AC 269	3, 13
Sheldrake v DPP [2004] 1 AC 264	3
Shell UK Ltd v Total UK Ltd [2010] EWCA Civ 180, [2011] QB 86.....	337–38, 348–49
Shipwrecked Fishermen and Mariners' Royal Benevolent Society, re [1959] Ch 220.....	224
Singer Machine Manufacturers v Wilson (1877) 3 App Cas 376 (HL)	341
Singer Manufacturing Co v Hermann Loog (1882) 8 App Cas 15 (HL)	341
Sirdefield v Price (1827) 2 Y & J 73	339
Solomon v Metropolitan Police Commissioner [1982] Crim LR 606	403, 405
South Bucks DC v Porter [2003] UKHL 26, [2003] 2 AC 558	6
Southend-on-Sea v Armour (unreported, 12 March 2012) (CC); affirmed (unreported, 18 October 2012) (QB)	30
Southern Depot Co Ltd v British Railways Board [1990] 2 EGLR 39	17
Southwark LBC v Hyacienth (unreported, 22 December 2011) (CC).....	30
Sovmots Investments Ltd v Secretary of State for the Environment [1979] AC 144 (HL).....	278

Spencer's Case [1583] 5 Co Rep 16a	164, 345
Spense, re [1938] Ch 96	234
St Andrews Allotment Association, re [1969] 1 WLR 229	184
St Helen's Smelting Co v Tipping (1865) 11 HL Cas 642, 11 ER 1483	368
Star Energy Weald Ltd v Bocardo SA [2010] UKSC 35, [2011] 1 AC 380	368
Star Industrial Co Ltd v Yap Kwee Kor [1976] FSR 256 (PC)	342
Starglade Properties Ltd v Nash [2009] EWHC 148 (Ch)	230
Stickney v Keeble [1915] AC 386	336
Street v Mountford [1985] AC 809 (HL)	324, 338
Strickland v Strickland (1842) 6 Beav 77	339
Stringer v Ministry of Housing and Local Government [1970] 1 WLR 1281	281
Sutherland's Trustee v Verschoyle 1967 SLT 106 (Court of Session)	234
Sutton v Buck (1810) 2 Taunt 302	411–12
Swain v Ayres (1888) 21 QBD 289 (CA)	345
Swift v Dairywise Farms Ltd [2000] 1 WLR 1177	170
Tapling v Jones (1865) 11 HLC 290, 11 ER 1344	363, 374
Thompson-Schwab v Costaki [1956] 1 WLR 335	375
Thomson v Park [1944] KB 408	169
Thorner v Major [2009] UKHL 18, [2009] 1 WLR 776	33
Tinsley v Milligan [1994] 1 AC 340	407, 409–10
Tulk v Moxhay (1848) 2 Ph 774 (Ch)	330
Turner v Secretary of State for the Environment (1973) 28 P & CR 123	271
Twinsectra Ltd v Yardley [2002] UKHL 12, [2002] 2 AC 164	347
United Scientific Holdings Ltd v Burnley BC [1978] AC 904 (HL)	125
Vandepitte v Preferred Accident Insurance Corp of New York [1933] AC 70 (PC)	349
Vaughan v Menlove (1837) 3 Bing NC 468, 132 ER 490	368
Virdi v Chana [2008] EWHC 2901 (Ch)	330
Wall v Bright (1820) 1 Jac & W 494, 37 ER 456	109
Walsh v Lonsdale (1881) Ch D 9 (CA)	109–11, 114, 123
Wandsworth LBC v Winder [1985] AC 461	9, 31
Webb v Chief Constable of Merseyside Police [2000] QB 427 (CA)	403, 408–9
Webb v Fox (1797) 7 TR 391	411–12
Wedgwood Museum Trust Ltd (in administration), In the matter of [2011] EWHC 3782 (Ch)	232
Westdeutsche Landesbank Girozentrale v Islington LBC [1996] AC 669 (HL)	113
Westerhall Farms v Scottish Ministers (unreported, 25 April 2001) (Court of Session)	251, 256
Western Counties Railway Co v Windsor and Annapolis Railway Co (1881–82) LR 7 App Cas 178	278
Westminster Bank Ltd v Minister of Housing and Local Government [1971] AC 508	270
Wilbraham v Snow (1670) 1 Mod 30	411, 413
William & Glyn's Bank Ltd v Boland [1981] AC 487 (HL)	118
Williams v Holland (1833) 10 Bing 112, 131 ER 848	369
Wilson v First County Trust Ltd (No 2) [2003] UKHL 40, [2004] 1 AC 816	5, 28
Wilson v Secretary of State for the Environment [1973] 1 WLR 1083	271
Winkfield, The [1902] P 42	401, 413
Woodar Investment Development Ltd v Wimpey Construction UK Ltd [1980] 1 WLR 277 (HL)	348
Yaxley v Gotts [2000] Ch 162 (CA)	116
YL v Birmingham City Council [2007] UKHL 27, [2008] 1 AC 95	436

ZH (Tanzania) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2011] UKSC 4, [2011] 2 AC 166	3
--	---

Australia

Austin v Sheldon [1974] 2 NSWLR 661.....	111
Baker v Cumberland CC (1956) 1 LGRA 321.....	295
Bingham v Cumberland CC (1954) 20 LGR 1	295
Bondi Beach Astra Retirement Village Pty Ltd v Gora [2010] NSWSC 81	394, 397–98
Brisbane City Council v Attorney General (Qld) [1978] 3 Qd R 299	207
Commonwealth v New South Wales (1915) 20 CLR 54.....	297
Commonwealth v Tasmania (1983) 158 CLR 1 (HCA).....	296
Elton v Cavill (No 2) (1994) 34 NSWLR 289	396–97
Fejo v Commonwealth (1999) 195 CLR 96	382
Field v Sullivan [1923] VLR 70	405, 416
Georgiadis v Australian and Overseas Telecommunications Corp (1994) 179 CLR 297.....	392–94
Hall v Busst (1960) 104 CLR 206.....	379, 396
LJP Investments Pty Ltd v Howard Chia Investments Pty Ltd (1989) 24 NSWLR 490.....	385
Mabo v Queensland (No 2) (1992) 175 CLR 1.....	390–91
MacKay, re (1972) 20 FLR 174	396
Meriton Apartments Pty Ltd v Minister for Urban Affairs and Planning (2000) 107 LGERA 363.....	301
Moraitis Fresh Packaging (NSW) Pty Ltd v Fresh Express (Australia) Pty Ltd (2008) 14 BPR 26,339.....	396–97
Newcrest Mining (WA) Ltd v Commonwealth (1997) 147 ALR 42 (HCA).....	296
Noon v Bondi Beach Astra Retirement Village Pty Ltd (2010) 15 BPR 28,221.....	396
Owners of Strata Plan 5290 v CGS & Co Pty Ltd (2011) 281 ALR 575.....	396
Perre v Apand [1999] HCA 36, (1999) 198 CLR 180	370–71
PG Magennis Pty Ltd v Commonwealth (1949) 80 CLR 382.....	297
R v Toohey, ex p Meneling Station Pty Ltd (1982) 158 CLR 327.....	393
Randwick Municipal Council v Rutledge (1959) 33 ALJR 367 (HC).....	197
Reuthlinger v MacDonald [1976] 1 NSWLR 88	396–97
Smith v ANL Ltd (2000) 204 CLR 493.....	392
Southlink Holdings Pty Ltd v Morerand Pty Ltd [2010] VSC 214.....	396–97
Stow v Mineral Holdings (Australia) Pty Ltd (1977) 51 ALJR 672	196, 205
Vercorp Pty Ltd v Lin [2007] 2 Qd R 180.....	396–97
Western Australia v Ward (2002) 213 CLR 1.....	382–83
Wik Peoples v Queensland (1996) 187 CLR 1	382
Wilson v Anderson (2002) 213 CLR 401	382
Wollondilly Shire Council v Picton Power Lines Pty Ltd (1994) 33 NSWLR 551.....	396–97
Yanner v Eaton (1999) 201 CLR 351 (HC).....	196, 204, 382

Canada

Bird v Fort Frances [1949] 2 DLR 791.....	405
Delgamuukw v British Columbia [1997] 3 SCR 1010	391

China (People's Republic)

Beijing Haidian Science & Technology Development Co Ltd v Shenzhen Xinhua Jinyuan Touzi Fazhan Youxian Gongsi (First Instance Civil Cases, Chongqing High People's Court, 19 March 2007)	86, 95, 101
--	-------------

Ireland

Al-Sadik KH Jaly v Phyllis O'Donnell (TR323/DR11/2010) (Tenancy Tribunal).....	74
Bond v Hopkins (1802) 1 Sch & Lef 413	339
Canty v Private Residential Tenancies Board [2007] IEHC 243; [2008] IESC 24.....	63, 68, 77, 79
Cosgrave (Vincent) v Marek Swiderski and Ryszard Molenda (TR34/DR1549/2011) (Tenancy Tribunal).....	74
Ironside (John) v Michael Allen (TR62/DR1045/2008) (Tenancy Tribunal)	74
Landlord X v Edmund Monaghan (TR49/DR1509/2009) (Tenancy Tribunal)	74
O'Donnell v Lane (TR55/DR368/2010) (Tenancy Tribunal)	80
Private Residential Tenancies Board v Her Honour Judge Linnane [2010] IEHC 476	65
Trayer (Avril) v Patrick O'Neill (TR50/DR1206/2009) (Tenancy Tribunal).....	74

Israel

Assessing Officer for Large Factories v Kiryat Nordau Development Co Ltd (Civil Appeal 414/87) 46(5) PD 387 (1992).....	94
Attorney General v Moshe Lishitzki (Civil Appeal 4660/94) 55(1) PD 88 (1999)	94
Ayalon Insurance Corp Ltd v Executor of the Late Chaya Ofelger (Civil Appeal 8068/01) 59(2) PD 349 (2005).....	94
Ben Gurion University of the Negev v Beer-Sheva Municipality (48/88) District Court Decisions 353 (1992(3)).....	94
El Al v Balas (12844/86) District Court Decisions 45 (1989(1))	94
Endowment Trustees of the Sephardi Community in the Holy City of Sephad and Meiron v Kamus (Civil Appeal 6406/03) (16 June 2005, published online).....	95
Estate of the Late Edward Aridor v Petah-Tikva Municipality (Civil Appeal 5964/03) 60(4) PD 437 (2006)	94
Estate of the Late Mrs. Liberman v Junger (Civil Appeal 410/87) 45(3) PD 749 (1991).....	94
Gorban v Tshuva Yitzchak Association for Solving the Housing Shortage (Civil Appeal 1631/02) (31 July 2003, published online)	95
Hoffmann v The Official Receiver-Jerusalem District (4044/07) (24 June 2009, published online)	95–96, 101
Josephina Rutenberg Reis v Estate of Hanna Eberman (Civil Appeal 34/88) 44(1) PD 278 (1990).....	94
Mediterranean Car Agency Ltd v CD Chayut (Civil Appeal 654/82) Adv 39(3) PD 80 (1985).....	94, 96
Michael Beril v Ran Bar Lev (Civil Appeal 369/84) (June 1988, published online).....	94
Orit (Shechter) Ford v Chaim Shechter (Civil Appeal 371/89) 46(1) PD 149 (1992)	96
'Ramatayim', a Cooperative, Ltd v Popular Housing Ltd (688/87) District Court Decisions 510 (1988(2))	94
Wallace v Gat (Civil Appeal 3829/91) 48(1) PD 808 (1994)	94
Weinstein v Fuchs (5715/95) PD 54(5) 792 (2000).....	91

Ya'acov Amster, Receiver v Marsha Tauber Tov (Civil Appeal 5955/09) (19 July 2011, published online).....	95
Yanxin Co Ltd v Huabao Trust and Investment Co Ltd, Shanghai High People's Court, 16 March 2005, Decision No 226 of 2004	101
Yigal Arnon v Shlomo Pyotrkovski (548/06) (1 March 2009, published online).....	95
Zayman v Komeran (Civil Appeal 9225/01) (13 December 2006, published online)	94, 100–1

New Zealand

Gibbs v New Plymouth DC [2006] NZHC 231	208
Lowther v Kim [2003] 1 NZLR 327	112

Poland

Supreme Court

28 September 1963, III CZP 33/62, OSNCP 1964/2/22	138
12 September 1973, III CRN 188/73, OSNC 1974/11/183	138
6 March 1997, I CZ 7/97, OSNC 8/97/111	138
2 December 1998, I CKN 903/97, OSNC 1999/6/113	134
13 April 1999, II CKN 259/98	141
26 May 2000, I CZ 66/00, LEX no 51345	138
29 October 2002, III CZP 47/02, OSNC 2003/7–8/93	141
3 October 2003, III CZP 65/03, OSNC 2004/12/189	134
23 November 2004, III CZP 48/04, OSNC 2005/9/153	130
10 December 2004, III CK 55/04, OSNC 2005/12/212	130
20 October 2005, IV CK 65/05, LEX no 176343	141
28 February 2006, III CZP 5/06, OSNC 2007/1/6	130
19 June 2007, III CZP 59/07, OSNC 2008/7–8/81	143
29 November 2007, III CZP 94/07, LEX no 319929	138
21 December 2007, III CZP 65/07, OSNC 2008/7–8/69	130
8 October 2008, V CSK 143/08, LEX no 485919	130
3 April 2009, II CSK 600/08, LEX no 500188	144
29 June 2010, III CSK 325/09, LEX no 602266	139
21 July 2010, III CSK 23/10; LEX no 677759	141
30 June 2011, III CSK 271/10, LEX no 898253	143
30 June 2011, III CSK 272/10, LEX no 1096041	143

Court of Appeal (Warsaw)

8 September 2010, VI ACa 76/10, LEX no 785514	146
---	-----

Singapore

British Malayan Trustees Ltd v Sibdo Realty Pte Ltd (in liquidation) [1999] 1 SLR 623	112
---	-----

South Africa

John Nitschke Nominees Pty Ltd v Hahndorf Golf Club Inc (2004) 88 SASR 109	396–97
--	--------

United States

Berman v Parker, 348 US 26 (1954)	431
Chesapeake Stone Co v Moreland, 104 SW 762 (Ky 1907).....	424
Chicago, B & QR Co v Chicago, 166 US 226 (1897).....	430
Hawaii Housing Authority v Midkiff, 467 US 229 (1984)	431
Head v Amoskeag Manufacturing Co, 113 US 9 (1885)	424
Kelo v City of New London, 268 Conn 1 (2004); (2005) 545 US 469	430–32, 434–36
Lucas v South Carolina Coastal Council, 505 US 1003 (1992)	281
Martin v Reynolds Metals Co, 221 Or 86, 342 P2d 790 (1959)	369
National Audubon Society v Superior Court, 33 Cal. 3d 419, 658 P 2d 3.....	207
Norwood v Horney, 110 Ohio St 3d 353	436
Old Dominion Co v United States, 269 US 55 (1925)	435
Potlatch Lumber Co v Peterson, 12 Idaho 769 (1906).....	423
Props of the Charles River Bridge v Props of the Warren Bridge, 36 US 420 (1837).....	433
Riggs v Palmer, 115 NY 506 (1889).....	403
State ex rel Thornton v Hay, 462 P 2d 671 (1969).....	201
Stop the Beach Renourishment v Florida Department of Environmental Protection, 130 S Ct 2592 (2010)	212
United States v Carolene Products Co (1938) 304 US 144	288
United States v Craft, 535 US 274 (2002)	356
Wayne County v Hathcock, 471 Mich 445 (2004)	436

European Commission and Court of Human Rights

Allgemeine Gold- und Silberscheideanstalt v United Kingdom (1986) 9 EHRR 1.....	251
Beyeler v Italy (2001) 33 EHRR 52.....	26
Bosphorus Hava Yollari Turzim ve Ticaret Anonim Sirketi v Ireland (2006) 42 EHRR 1.....	245
Broniowski v Poland (2005) 40 EHRR 21	26
Brumarescu v Romania (2001) 33 EHRR 36	36–38
Buckley v United Kingdom (1996) 23 EHRR 101	4
Butler v United Kingdom (App No 41661/98) (unreported, 27 June 2002)	256
Connors v United Kingdom (2004) 40 EHRR 9.....	7–10, 12–13, 29
Dixon v United Kingdom (App No 3468/10) (unreported).....	36
Družstevní Záložna Píra v Czech Republic (App No 72034/01) (unreported, 24 July 2008)	252
Gillow v United Kingdom (1986) 11 EHRR 335.....	24
Gladysheva v Russia [2012] HLR 19	26, 29, 35, 37
Golder v United Kingdom (1979–80) 1 EHRR 524.....	27
Hentrich v France (1994) 18 EHRR 440.....	252, 254
Iatridis v Greece (2000) 30 EHRR 97	252
Islamic Republic of Iran Shipping Lines v Turkey (2008) 47 EHRR 24.....	252
James v United Kingdom (1984) 6 EHRR CD 475 (Comm); (1986) 8 EHRR 123.....	28–29, 252
Jokela v Finland (2003) 37 EHRR 26	28
Kawaja v United Kingdom (unreported, 13 December 2011) (GC)	3
Kay v United Kingdom (2012) 54 EHRR 30	11, 21
Kryvitska and Kryvitskyy v Ukraine (App No 30856/03) (unreported)	22
Lithgow v United Kingdom (1986) 8 EHRR 329	25

Marckx v Belgium (1979) 2 EHRR 330	24
McCann v United Kingdom (2008) 47 EHRR 913.....	10
Mellacher v Austria (1990) 12 EHRR 391	26
Niemietz v Germany (1993) 16 EHRR 97.....	24
O'Halloran v United Kingdom (2008) 46 EHRR 397	3
Papamichalopoulos v Greece (1996) 21 EHRR 439	36
Phillips v United Kingdom (App No 41087/98) (unreported, 5 July 2001).....	258
Pine Valley Developments v Ireland (1991) 14 EHRR 319	26
Pye (JA) (Oxford) Ltd v United Kingdom (2008) 46 EHRR 45	26–27
Riela v Italy (App No 52439/99) (unreported, 4 September 2001)	251
Russian Conservative Party of Entrepreneurs v Russia (2008) 46 EHRR 39	252
Spacek v Czech Republic (2000) 30 EHRR 1010	254
Sporrong and Lonnroth v Sweden (1983) 5 EHRR 35	25, 251
Stretch v United Kingdom (2004) 38 EHRR 12	24, 28
Vasilescu v Romania (1999) 28 EHRR 241.....	252
Welch v United Kingdom (1995) 20 EHRR 247.....	258
Zehentner v Austria (2011) 52 EHRR 22.....	28

European Court of Justice

Booker Aquaculture v Secretary of State for Scotland (Case C–20/00) [2003] 3 CMLR 6.....	251, 256
Hassan v Council of the European Union (Case C–399/06 P); Ayadi v Council of the European Union (Case C–403/06 P) [2010] 2 CMLR 18.....	246
Kadi v Council of the European Union (Case C–402/05) (Kadi I); Al Barakaat International Foundation v Council of the European Union (Case C–415/05 P) [2009] 1 AC 1225	245–46, 258
Mollendorf (Case C–117/06) [2008] 1 CMLR 11	255
R (M) v HM Treasury (Case C–340/08) [2010] 3 CMLR 31	255

European Court of First Instance

Kadi v European Commission (Case T–85/09) (Kadi II) [2011] All ER (EC) 165	246–47, 249–50, 256, 262
Organisation de Modjahedines du Peuple d'Iran (OMPI) v Council of the European Union (Case T–228/02) [2007] All ER (EC) 447 (CFI)	245
Othman v Council of the European Union (Case T–318/01) [2009] All ER (EC) 873	246

Table of Legislation

United Kingdom

Acquisition of Lands Act 1981.....	277–78
s 11.....	277
s 12.....	277
s 13.....	277
s 14.....	277
s 15.....	277
s 23.....	277–79
s 24.....	278
s 25.....	278
Agricultural Land (Utilisation) Act 1931.....	177
Agricultural Tenancies Act 1995	184
Allotments Act 1887	176
Allotments Act 1890	176
Allotments Act 1922	177
s 1(1)(a).....	177
Allotments Act 1925	177
s 8.....	177
Allotments Act 1950	177
s 10.....	178
s 12.....	178
Al-Qaida and Taliban (Asset-Freezing) Regulations 2010, SI 2010/1197.....	249
Al-Qaida and Taliban (United Nations Measures) Order 2006, SI 2006/2952	247
art 3(1)(b).....	248
Anti-terrorism, Crime and Security Act 2001	247–50, 254
pt 3.....	248
s 1.....	247
s 4.....	247, 253
s 5.....	247
sch 2	248
British Library Act 1972	
sch, para 11(4).....	224
British Museum Act 1963	223–24
s 3.....	223
(4).....	223
s 4.....	223
s 5(1)	223, 231
(2).....	225
(3).....	235
s 8.....	223, 225
(3).....	223, 231
s 9.....	223
(1).....	223

Bubble Act 1720	421
Charities Act 2006	185
Charities Act 2011	41
s 2.....	41
s 3.....	41, 43
(2)(a).....	43
s 4.....	41, 43
(3).....	43
s 273.....	231
s 274.....	231
Charities and Trustee Investment (Scotland) Act 2005	185–86
Civil Evidence Act 1968	
s 14.....	361
Civil Procedure Rules	
pt 54.....	31
Commonhold and Leasehold Reform Act 2002	170
Commons Act 2006	169, 173
Commons Registration Act 1965	169
Consumer Credit Act 1974	5
Contracts (Rights of Third Parties) Act 1999	348
Co-operative and Community Benefit Societies and Credit Unions Act 2010	187
Counter-terrorism Act 2008.....	248
s 62.....	248
sch 7.....	248–49
para 9	248
para 13	248
Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000	173, 189, 198
Criminal Justice Act 1988	257
Drug Trafficking Act 1994	257
Electricity Act 1989	
sch 4, para 7.....	270
Equality Act 2010.....	53
Equality Act 2012	
s 5.....	53
s 6.....	53
Financial Restrictions (Iran) Order 2009, SI 2009/2725	249
Flexible Tenancies (Review Procedures) Regulations 2012, SI 2012/695	52
Government of Ireland Act 1920	
s 5(1)	270
Government of Wales Act 2006	
sch 11, para 30.....	223
Highways Act 1980	
s 28(1)	270
Holocaust (Return of Cultural Objects) Act 2009	225
Housing Act 1980	
s 89.....	12–13, 30
Housing Act 1985.....	16, 21, 50
s 82A.....	11
Housing Act 1988.....	38, 50
s 1.....	16
s 5.....	16

s 21(4)	4
sch 1, para 3A(b)	16
sch 2, ground 8	16–18, 20, 22–23, 33–34, 37
Housing Act 1996	
Pt 7	20
s 51	37
s 127	5
(2)	12–14
s 128	5
s 129	5
s 143D	11
(2)	12–14
s 143E	11
s 143F	11
s 193	108
(2)	112
sch 2	37
para 7(1)	37
para 7(2)(a)	37
Housing Act 1998	43
Housing Act 2004	
ss 212–15	69
Housing and Regeneration Act 2008	
s 68	19
(1)(b)	42
s 69	42
(b)	42
(c)	42
s 70	19
s 79(2)	187
s 112	42
Housing and Regeneration Act 2008 (Consequential Provisions) Order 2010,	
SI 2010/866	41
Housing, Town Planning, etc Act 1909	263, 268–69
Human Rights Act 1998	
s 3	3–4, 7, 36, 248, 279, 287
s 4	4, 9, 12–14, 20, 436
s 6	30
(1)	31, 436
(2)(b)	53, 436
(3)(a)	9–10, 12–13
(b)	436
(5)	19, 53, 436
s 7	19
(1)(b)	9
s 8	8
(3)	36
(4)	37
(4)	37
Imperial War Museum Act 1920	
s 2	224
(1)	224

Judicature Act 1873	
s 25(7)	336
Judicature Acts 1873–75	325, 335, 339, 341
Industrial and Provident Societies Act 1965–2002	183
Land Reform (Scotland) Act 2003	173
Land Registration Act 1925	26
Land Registration Act 2002	26, 350
s 27(1)	109
s 33	114
(a)(i)	114
s 116	113
sch 1	114
sch 3	114
Land Settlement (Facilities) Act 1919	176–77
Landlord and Tenant Act 1954	27
s 43	184
Landlord and Tenant Act 1985	170
Landlord and Tenant Act 1987	170
Landsbanki Freezing Order 2008, SI 2008/2668	253
Law of Property Act 1925	108, 169
s 1	155
(6)	107–8, 111
s 2(2)–(3)	118
s 19(1)	108
s 27(1)	118
s 34	110, 155
s 36	110
s 41	336
s 52	109
s 62	119
s 146	177
s 193	173
s 205(1)(ii)	112
Law of Property (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1989	
ss 1–2	109
s 2	109, 336
Leasehold Reform, Housing and Urban Development Act 1993	170
Limitation Act 1980	
s 2	407
s 3(1)	407
s 4(1)	406
(2)	407
s 21(1)	94
Local Government Act 1972	177
s 123(2A)	173
Local Government Act 1992	177
Local Government (Wales) Act 1994	177
Local Government and Housing Act 1989	
s 104	120
Local Government, Planning and Land Act 1980	177

Localism Act 2011	37, 40, 45, 51–52, 55–56, 271, 273–76, 285–86
pt 7	50
chap 2	13
s 88	276
s 89	276
s 91	276
s 95	276
s 99	276
ss 150–53	51
s 151(1)	51
s 154	52
ss 154–55	51
s 164	52
s 178	43
Marine and Coastal Access Act 2009	189
Metropolitan Police Act 1839	
s 29	404
Mobile Homes Act 1983	7, 10
Museums and Galleries Act 1992	223–25
s 4(3)	224
(4)	224–25
(5)	224–25
(6)	224
s 5(1)	224
(2)	224
s 6	223–24, 231
(7)	235
sch 5, pt I	223
Museum of London Act 1965	
s 5(2)	224
s 6	224
National Heritage Act 1983	
s 6(3)	224–25
s 7	224
s 14(3)	224–25
s 15	224
s 19	224
s 20(3)	224–25
s 27(2)	224–25
s 28	224
National Maritime Museum Act 1934	
s 2(3)	224
National Parks Access to the Countryside Act 1949	173
Planning and Compensation Act 1991	270
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004	
s 18	273
s 20	273
s 38A	275
(2)	275
s 113	274

Planning and Housing Act (Northern Ireland) 1931	
s 10(2)	270
Police (Property) Act 1897	
s 1	404, 408, 417
Prevention of Terrorism Act 1989	247
Proceeds of Crime Act 2002	257–58
s 6	257
s 7	257
s 9	257
s 10	257
s 11	257
ss 48–51	257
s 75	257
s 76(2)	257
(3)	257
(4)–(7)	257
sch 2	257
Public Authorities Protection Act 1893	406
Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964	232
s 12	226
s 15	226
sch 2	226, 235
Representation of the People Act 1928	265
Sale of Goods Act 1979	233
s 12	231
Senior Courts Act 1981	
s 31	31
(4)	34
Settled Land Act 1882	108, 347
s 6(1)	108
Settled Land Act 1925	108, 347
s 26(6)	108
s 27(1)	108
Smallholdings and Allotments Act 1908	177
s 23(1)	177
s 61	178
Smallholdings and Allotments Act 1926	177
Statute of Frauds 1677	
s 4	336
Statute of Uses	347
Supreme Court of Judicature Act see Judicature Act	
Telecommunications Act 1984	
sch 2, para 4	270
para 7	270
Tenancy Deposit Schemes Regulations (Northern Ireland) 2012, SI 2012/373	69
Tenancy Deposit Schemes (Scotland) Regulations 2011, SI 2011/176	69
Terrorism Act 2000	247–48
Terrorism (United Nations Measures) Order 2006, SI 2006/2657	247–48
Terrorist Asset-Freezing Act 2010	248
Theft Act 1968	
s 24	405

Torts (Interference with Goods) Act 1977	
s 3.....	401
Town and Country Planning Act 1909.....	294
Town and Country Planning Act 1919.....	294
Town and Country Planning Act 1925.....	294
Town and Country Planning Act 1932.....	269, 294
Town and Country Planning Act 1947.....	270, 310
Town and Country Planning Act 1990.....	426
s 3.....	275
s 55.....	364
s 57.....	364
s 61E	275
(5).....	275
(6).....	275
s 61F(5)	275
s 61G.....	275
s 61W.....	273
s 78.....	273–74
s 174.....	273
s 226.....	277, 427, 429, 435
(1)(a).....	427
(1A)	427
(4).....	427, 435
(8).....	427
s 233.....	429
s 288.....	273–74
sch 4B.....	275
para 7	275
para 9	275
para 10(2).....	275
para 15	275
sch 4C	275
Town and Country Planning (Development Management Procedure) Order 2010, SI 2010/2184	
reg 13.....	274
reg 28.....	273
Trustee Act 1925	
s 68(17)	90
Trustee Act 2000.....	233
s 1.....	237
sch 1	237
Trusts of Land and Appointment of Trustees Act 1996	
s 1(2)(a).....	109–10
s 2(6)	108
s 3.....	118
s 6(2)	122
s 12.....	338
sch 1	109, 111–12, 116, 125–26
para 1	107–8, 122
(1)	108, 111–12, 121
(b).....	120

(3)	108
United Nations Act 1946	
s 1	248
Variation of Trusts Act 1958	347
War Damage Act 1965	260

Australia

Commonwealth of Australia Constitution Act 1900 see Constitution	
Constitution	
s 51	296
(xxxi)	295–97, 392–94
Conservation Trust Act 1972 (Vic)	
s 3	313
Conveyancing Act 1919 (NSW)	
s 77A	199
Crown Lands Act 1989 (NSW)	208
s 77A	198
s 77B	198
s 88D	199
s 88E	199
Environmental Planning and Assessment Act 1979 (NSW)	292, 301–3, 312–13, 316–17
s 26(1)(c)	303
s 27	303
s 93F	313
Environmental Planning and Assessment Amendment Act 1999 (NSW)	302
Environmental Planning and Assessment (Affordable Housing) Act 2000 (NSW)	302
Environmental Planning and Assessment (Infrastructure and Other Planning Reform) Act 2005 (NSW)	302
Inclosed Lands Protection Land Act 1901 (NSW)	211
Land Acquisition (Just Terms Compensation) Act 1991 (NSW)	297, 303
pt 2, Division 3	303
Land Development Contribution Management Act 1970 (NSW)	299
Land (Planning and Environment) Act 1991 (ACT)	299
Local Government Act 1919 (NSW)	295, 299
pt XIIA	295
s 342AC(1)	295
National Parks and Wildlife Act 1974 (NSW)	303, 313
pt 4, Division 4	313
s 69C(1)(a)	199
National Parks and Wildlife Conservation Act 1975 (Cth)	296
Nature Conservation Trust Act 2001 (NSW)	200, 314
s 7(1)(a)–(d)	314
s 11(2)(a)	314
s 12(2)(a)	314
s 30	314
(1)	200
s 37	200
Residential Tenancies Act 2010 (NSW)	69
Standard Instrument (Local Environmental Plans) Order 2006 (NSW)	302

Threatened Species Conservation Act 1995 (NSW)	312
Threatened Species Conservation Amendment (Biodiversity Banking) Act 2006 (NSW)	306
Threatened Species Legislation Amendment Act 2004 (NSW)	306
World Heritage Properties Conservation Act 1983 (Cth)	296

British Virgin Islands

Virgin Islands Special Trusts Act 2003	85
--	----

Canada

Civil Code (Quebec)	89
---------------------------	----

China (People's Republic)

Trust Act 2001	85–90, 92–93, 95, 101–4
s 2	86, 92
s 15	87–88
s 16	87
s 20	87
s 21	87
s 40	87–88
s 51	87
s 52	88

European Union

Reg (EC) 2580/2001	244
Reg (EC) 881/2002	244–46, 255
Art 1	255
Art 2a	255
Reg (EC) 1190/2008	246

France

Civil Code	
Arts 2011–31	85
Law no 2007–211, 19 February 2007	85

Guernsey

Trusts (Guernsey) Law 2007	
s 15(1)	105

Hungary

Law no 120/2009 on Civil Code	
ss 5:583–95	85

Ireland

Adoption Acts 1952–1998	67
Civil Legal Aid Act 1995	
s 27(2)(b)	71
Constitution	59
Deasy's Act see Landlord and Tenant Law Amendment Act Ireland 1860	
Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1992	
s 6	65
Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 2009	
s 84	76
Housing (Rent Books) Regulations 1993, SI 1993/146	64
Housing (Standards for Rented Houses) Regulations 2008, SI 2008/534	64
Landlord and Tenant Law Amendment Act Ireland 1860	64
Landlord and Tenant Law (Amendment) Act 1980	
pt II	65
Residential Tenancies Act 2004	60–82
pt 1	64
pt 2	65–66
pt 3	66
pt 4	64–68, 77–80
pt 5	64, 67–68, 77
pt 6	68, 70, 72
pt 7	64, 73
pt 8	63–64
pt 9	64
s 3	60
(2)	65
(3)	65
s 4(1)	65
s 5(3)	71
(4)	71
s 12	65–66
(1)	60
(d)	60
s 14	66
s 15	66
s 16	65–66
(a)	77
s 17	64
(1)	65
s 18(1)	66
(2)	66
(3)	66
s 20(3)	66
s 24(1)	66
s 28(3)	67
s 33	77
s 34	67–68, 77–78
s 35(4)	67
s 41(2)	67

s 57(b)	67, 77
s 59	67, 80
s 60	67
s 62	68, 79
(1)(d)	79
s 65(4)	67
s 66	68
s 67	68
(3)	77–78
s 68	68
s 70	78
s 72	64
s 83(2)	73
(3)	73
s 86	79
(1)(c)	77
s 93	79
s 98(1)	78
s 102	60
s 106(2)	71
s 109	68
s 115	72, 79
(3)	72
(a)	79
(c)(i)	79
s 117	72
s 119(1)	79
s 123(4)	63
s 124(1)	74
s 126	74
s 134	79
(1)	73
s 135	60
s 136	79
s 147A	60
s 152	81
s 159(1)	64
(3)	60
s 182	64
(1)	68
s 189	64, 72
s 190	64
s 192	65
s 193(a)	64
(d)	64
s 195(4)	64
(5)	64
sch	64
Residential Tenancies Act 2004 (Commencement) Order 2004, SI 2004/505	64
Residential Tenancies Act 2004 (Commencement) (No 2) Order 2004, SI 2004/750	64
Residential Tenancies (Amendment) Act 2009	60

Israel

Land Act 1969 (5729–1969)	99
s 161.....	99
Regulation of Investment Advice, Marketing and Management Act 1995 (5755–1995)	
ss 11–27C.....	104
Succession Act 1965 (5725–1965).....	97
s 3.....	97
s 8(b)	97
s 42(a)	97
(b).....	97
(d).....	97
s 65A.....	97
s 84.....	97
s 86.....	97
Trust Act 1979 (5739–1979).....	90–102
s 1.....	90, 92–93
s 2.....	91
s 3(b)	100
s 17.....	93
(a)	91
ss 17–24	91
s 18(a)	92
(b).....	92
s 19.....	92
s 20.....	93
s 21.....	91
s 22.....	91
s 23.....	92
(a)	93

Jersey

Trusts (Jersey) Law	
s 9A.....	105

Luxembourg

Law of 27 July 2003	101
---------------------------	-----

New Zealand

Bill of Rights 1990	3
Conservation Act 1987	200
Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust Act 1977.....	200
Reserves Act 1977.....	200, 208
s 17.....	208
s 18.....	208

s 19.....	208
s 26.....	208
s 26A.....	208
Residential Tenancies Amendment Act 2010.....	69
Trespass Act 1980.....	211

Poland

Civil Code (Act of 23 April 1964).....	129–33, 135–46
Art 5.....	139
Art 33.....	129–30
§ 1.....	129
§ 2.....	129, 131
Art 58.....	133, 139
Art 140.....	145
Art 144.....	146
Art 199.....	137–38
Art 201.....	138
Art 206.....	135–37
Art 221.....	135, 140
Art 285.....	142
§ 1.....	140, 142
§ 2.....	140
Art 291.....	141
Art 294.....	141
Art 295.....	141
Art 359.....	146
Art 384.....	144
Art 415.....	146
Art 471.....	146
Arts 481–82.....	146
Art 683.....	144
Commercial Companies Code (Act of 15 September 2000).....	131
Art 25.....	131
Art 37.....	131
Decree on Real Rights 1946.....	141
Law on Unit Ownership 1994 (Act of 24 June 1994).....	127–39
Art 1, s 2.....	135
Art 2, s2.....	128
s 4.....	143
Art 3, s 2.....	134
Art 6.....	128–30
Art 8, s 2.....	132
Art 12, s 1.....	134–37
Art 13, s 1.....	144
Art 16.....	146–47, 149
Art 17.....	129, 131
Art 18, s 1.....	132
s 2.....	132
s 2a.....	132

xxxviii *Table of Legislation*

Art 22, s 1	138
s 2	138
Art 23, s 2	138
Art 25, s 1	139
s 3, pt 4	139

San Marino

Law no 43, 1 March 2010	85
-------------------------------	----

South Africa

Trust Property Control Act 57 of 1998	
s 1	89

United States

Constitution	
Fifth Amendment	287–88, 419
Fourteenth Amendment	288
Investment Advisers Act 1940, 15 USC	
s 80b–1 to 21	104
Lands Clauses Consolidation Act 1845	425
Mill Acts	420, 423–25
National Park Act 1966	208
Uniform Power of Attorney Act 2006	
s 119	102
s 120	102

Uruguay

Law no 17.703	85
---------------------	----

International Treaties and Conventions

Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict 1954	
Preamble	219
European Convention on Human Rights 1950	3, 248, 261–62, 279–80, 429, 436
Art 5	3
Art 6	3, 27, 244, 279
Art 8	3–10, 13, 18, 20–25, 28–30, 34–38, 54, 249, 279, 341, 351
(1)	34
(2)	4, 7
(4)	34
Arts 8–11	29, 32
Art 14	7
Art 41	34–36

First Protocol.....	261
Art 1	13, 18, 24–29, 32, 34–38, 189, 243, 245–62, 279, 287, 419, 429
Hague Convention on the Law Applicable to Trusts and on their Recognition 1985	85–86, 89–90, 92, 356
Art 2.....	86, 92
United Nations Convention on the Means of Prohibiting and Preventing the Illicit Import, Export and Transfer of Ownership of Cultural Property 1970.....	219
Art 5(e).....	219

Part I

Property and Housing

The Saga of Strasbourg and Social Housing

LORD WALKER OF GESTINGTHORPE*

WHEN THE HUMAN Rights Act 1998 was enacted, the Lord Chancellor's Department predicted that the Act would cause a wave of litigation for about three years, but that the wave would then subside and the waters would be calm again. This prediction may have been based on the experience in New Zealand, which enacted its Bill of Rights in 1990. But as we all know, it has not worked out like that. There was indeed a wave of litigation, but in the twelfth year since the Act came into force, the waters are far from calm and the Act is still—indeed more than ever—the subject of acute political controversy.

The four most contentious areas have been the impact of the Act on criminal justice, on anti-terrorist legislation, on immigration law and on the law of social housing. The first of these topics is concerned with fair trial rights under Article 6 of the European Convention on Human Rights, including issues as to the reverse burden of proof,¹ trial within a reasonable time,² hearsay evidence³ and the right of access to a lawyer while in police custody.⁴ The second topic, engaging rights to personal liberty and fair trial under Articles 5 and 6, is the contentious litigation over detention without trial of foreign national suspects, followed by the control order regime.⁵ The third topic is concerned with the right to respect for family life under Article 8,⁶ which has had a huge influence on decisions about the deportation of failed asylum-seekers and other immigrants, and led last November to an unusually candid exchange of views between the Home Secretary and the Secretary of State for Justice.

The fourth topic, social housing, is my subject today. Part of its particular interest and difficulty is that it raises issues on both Article 6 and Article 8. Article 6

* Retired Justice of the Supreme Court.

¹ *Sheldrake v DPP* [2004] 1 AC 264; *O'Halloran v United Kingdom* (2008) 46 EHRR 397.

² *Re Attorney General's Reference (No 2 of 2001)* [2004] 2 AC 72.

³ *Kawaja v United Kingdom*, Grand Chamber, 13 December 2011.

⁴ *Cadder v HM Advocate* [2010] 1 WLR 2601.

⁵ *A v Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2005] 2 AC 68; *Secretary of State for the Home Department v AF (No 3)* [2010] 2 AC 269.

⁶ *Huang v Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2007] 2 AC 167; *ZH (Tanzania) v Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2011] 2 AC 166; *R (Quila) v Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2011] UKSC 45, [2012] 1 AC 261; (extradition) *Norris v Govt of USA* [2010] 2 AC 287.

gives everyone the right to have his civil rights and obligations determined by an independent and impartial tribunal. This has raised issues where decisions as to the management of the community's stock of social housing are in effect divided between housing authorities (which may be impartial but are not independent) and a district judge faced with a long list of summary applications for possession. At the same time, Article 8 raises the issue of how (if at all) a housing authority's obligation to show respect for its tenant's home adds to its general obligation to manage its housing stock for the benefit of the community. These are the issues that have led to something of a stand-off between the Strasbourg Court and our highest tribunal, ending (at any rate for the present) a year ago with the decision of the Supreme Court in *Powell*.⁷

There was nothing confrontational about the earliest cases on the impact of the Human Rights Act on social housing. Twelve years ago, the Strasbourg jurisprudence on the subject was much sparser than it is today, although it was already well established⁸ that in Article 8 'home' (or in other European languages, 'domicile', 'domicilio' or 'Wohnung') is an autonomous concept that has very little to do with different forms of ownership or tenure under the property laws of different states. One of the first housing cases to reach the Court of Appeal, in April 2001, was concerned with possession proceedings commenced soon after the coming into force of the Act. In the *Poplar Housing Association* case,⁹ the Court of Appeal held that the association was (for the relevant purposes) a public authority and that Article 8 was engaged, but that the eviction of an assured shorthold tenant was justifiable under Article 8(2), despite the mandatory terms of section 21(4) of the Housing Act 1988. The court held that section 21(4), which effectively deprived the county court of any discretion to refuse a possession order, was not incompatible with Article 8, and rejected the argument that it should be creatively construed under section 3 of the Human Rights Act by reading in the requirement that the court considered it reasonable to order possession.

To my mind, the judgment of the Court of Appeal showed, at what was a very early stage in our jurisprudence on the Human Rights Act, an impressive grasp of the new problems that it poses. In a key passage, the Court emphasised not the housing authority's proprietary title, but its function in carrying out Parliament's enacted policy for allocation of the limited stock of social housing:

The Court has to pay considerable attention to the fact that Parliament intended when enacting section 21(4) of the 1988 Act to give preference to the needs of those dependent on social housing *as a whole* over those in the position of the defendant. The economic and other implications of any policy in this area are extremely complex and far-reaching. This is an area where, in our judgment, the courts must treat the decisions of Parliament as to what is in the public interest with particular deference. The limited role given to the court under section 21(4) is a legislative policy decision ... the Human Rights Act 1998 does not require the courts to disregard the decisions of Parliament ... when deciding whether there has been a breach of the Convention.¹⁰

⁷ *Hounslow LBC v Powell* [2011] 2 AC 186.

⁸ *Buckley v United Kingdom* (1996) 23 EHRR 101 [63].

⁹ *Poplar Housing and Regeneration Community Association Ltd v Donoghue* [2002] QB 48.

¹⁰ *Ibid* [69].

I feel able to commend this judgment without any fear of appearing condescending, since at the time I was in the Court of Appeal and was a party to one of its least successful early decisions on the Act, *Aston Cantlow*.¹¹ This was the case about chancel repairs, in which the House of Lords held that we had fallen into error on just about every point in the case. But our misguidedness was not quite so complete as that of another constitution of the Court of Appeal in *Wilson v First County Trust Ltd (No 2)*.¹² This was an appeal from the county court in a small consumer credit case in which the Court of Appeal of its own motion raised an incompatibility issue and proceeded to make a declaration of incompatibility. This was appealed to the House of Lords by the Secretary of State for Trade and Industry (the original parties having lost any appetite for the fight) and argued on behalf of interveners including the Attorney General on behalf of the Speaker of the House of Commons (on *Pepper v Hart*¹³ implications) and numerous trade bodies. As in *Aston Cantlow*, the House of Lords allowed the appeal on numerous grounds. I mention the case not simply as a diversion but because, in the context of incompatibility, Lord Nicholls made some general remarks about it being open to Parliament to lay down clear general rules, which the court is bound to follow, even if this produces individual hard cases. Lord Nicholls said:

Considered overall, this course may well be a proportionate response in practice to a perceived social problem. Parliament may consider the response should be a uniform solution across the board. A tailor-made response, fitting the facts of each case as decided in an application to the Court, may not be appropriate.¹⁴

One way of putting the Strasbourg Court's message on our social housing legislation—to which I now return—is that this 'one size fits all' attitude may be good enough for a trader doing business under the Consumer Credit Act 1974, but that it is not good enough for a public sector tenant with an Article 8 right to respect for his or her home.

Another early Court of Appeal case explored the other aspect: that of the housing authority as decision-maker. In the *McLellan* case¹⁵ heard in October 2001, a tenant with an introductory tenancy of a flat in Bracknell sought judicial review of the borough council's decision to serve on her notice of proceedings for possession. In such a case, the county court had no discretion to refuse a possession order, provided that the proper procedure had been followed. This was the effect of sections 127 and 128 of the Housing Act 1996, and any review under section 129 was conducted by the housing authority itself, not by the county court. The court's only discretion was, in a case of exceptional hardship, to extend the 14-day period for giving up possession to six weeks. This procedure was challenged as contrary to Article 6 on the ground that it amounted to the determination of the tenant's civil rights otherwise than by an independent and impartial tribunal.

¹¹ *Aston Cantlow Parochial Church Council v Wallbank* [2002] Ch 51; [2004] 1 AC 546.

¹² *Wilson v First County Trust Ltd (No 2)* [2004] 1 AC 816.

¹³ *Pepper v Hart* [1993] AC 593.

¹⁴ *Ibid* [74].

¹⁵ *R (McLellan) v Bracknell Forest Borough Council* [2002] QB 1129.

The Court of Appeal rejected this challenge. It followed the decision of the House of Lords in the *Alconbury* case.¹⁶ These two decisions, together with that of the House of Lords in *Ruma Begum*¹⁷ early in 2003, mark the beginning of the slow and uncertain unfreezing of the rigidity of the judicial review process where human rights are concerned. In *Alconbury*, Lord Slynn said of proportionality:

I consider that even without reference to the Human Rights Act 1998 the time has come to recognise that this principle is part of English administrative law, not only when judges are dealing with Community Acts but also when they are dealing with Acts subject to domestic law. Trying to keep the *Wednesbury* principle and proportionality in separate compartments seems to me to be unnecessary and confusing.¹⁸

Lord Hoffmann, both in *Alconbury* and in *Ruma Begum*, was less inclined to favour a general extension of judicial review principles to include proportionality. He preferred a nuanced approach (reflecting Strasbourg's margin of appreciation) to the nature of the particular administrative decision subject to review and the character of the particular decision-maker.

These themes—whether it is compatible with the Human Rights Act for the court's discretion to be restricted to vanishing point and whether the possibility of resort to judicial review of the housing authority's decision is a sufficient answer—dominate the leading cases to which I now turn. But to complete the preliminaries, it is appropriate to refer to one other early case, which is the decision of the House of Lords in the *South Bucks* case.¹⁹ It was heard with two other appeals, all of them planning cases concerned with unauthorised development by gipsy communities, and the significance of Article 8 in that context. The point actually decided was a fairly limited one, relating to the width of the court's discretion²⁰ to grant an injunction in aid of an enforcement notice issued by a local planning authority. But the speeches contain a recognition of the complexities of these problems. Lord Bingham²¹ quoted a saying of the late Václav Havel that 'the Gypsies are a litmus test not of democracy but of civil society'. Gypsies feature in three of the leading cases.

The first social housing appeal to go to the House of Lords was *Qazi*.²² Mr Qazi and his wife had a secure tenancy of a two-bedroom council house in Harrow Weald. In 1998, there were matrimonial troubles and his wife moved out with their daughter. A few months later, she gave notice to the council, effectively terminating the joint tenancy. Mr Qazi applied for a new tenancy, but it was not granted because the accommodation was more than a single man needed. The council claimed possession in March 2000. At a preliminary hearing in June 2000, Mr Qazi told the Court that he was living with his new wife and her child. By November 2000, she was pregnant and by the trial in June 2001, there were two adults and two children living in the house. The recorder held that as Mr Qazi had no legal or equitable

¹⁶ *R (Alconbury Developments Ltd) v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport and the Regions* [2003] 2 AC 295.

¹⁷ *Ruma Begum v Tower Hamlets LBC* [2003] 2 AC 430.

¹⁸ *R (Alconbury Developments Ltd)* (n 16) [51].

¹⁹ *South Bucks DC v Porter* [2003] 2 AC 558.

²⁰ Town and Country Planning Act 1990, s 187B.

²¹ *South Bucks DC v Porter* [2003] 2 AC 558 [31].

²² *Harrow LBC v Qazi* [2004] 1 AC 983.

rights in the house, it could not be his home. In December 2001, the Court of Appeal allowed the appeal and remitted the case to the county court to consider whether the landlord's interference with Mr Qazi's Article 8 rights was justified under Article 8(2).

Harrow appealed on two main grounds. The first, that the house was not Mr Qazi's home, was unanimously rejected. But the House of Lords was deeply divided as to whether a public sector landlord with an immediate right to possession could be required to justify its claim by a balancing exercise under Article 8(2). Lord Bingham and Lord Steyn were firmly of the view that Article 8 was engaged and justification under Article 8(2) was required. Lord Bingham emphasised:

The Strasbourg authorities have adopted a very pragmatic and realistic approach to the issue of justification. Counsel were agreed that even if the argument for Mr Qazi were accepted, the occasions on which a court would be justified in declining to make a possession order would be highly exceptional.²³

These words 'highly exceptional' were to be revisited more than once. Later cases have recognised that they cannot be a principle on which to decide cases, but only a prediction as to how many cases will be decided in a particular way—and as a prediction, they have not proved to be particularly reliable.

Lord Hope, Lord Scott and Lord Millett took a very different view. A public sector landlord with an immediate, unqualified right to possession under English property law could not be required to justify the enforcement of that right. Lord Scott was characteristically forthright:

There is no case in which a balance has been struck between the tenant's interests and the landlord's rights. In every case the landlord's success has been automatic. And so it must be unless Article 8 is to be allowed to diminish or detract from the landlord's contractual and proprietary rights.²⁴

All three law lords in the majority stressed the potency of the landlord's proprietary rights under English law, rather than relying, as the Court of Appeal had in the *Poplar Housing Association* case, on the carefully differentiated system of tenure (shorthold, secure, introductory and demoted) that had emerged from almost a century of housing legislation.

In May 2004, the Strasbourg Court gave judgment in *Connors*.²⁵ This case concerned the eviction of a gypsy family from a gypsy caravan site owned and run by Leeds City Council. This occurred in August 2000, before the Human Rights Act came into force. The Strasbourg Court held unanimously that the UK was in breach of Article 8 and did not find it necessary to decide on a separate complaint about discrimination under Article 14. But the fact that it was a gypsy family that was evicted from a caravan site specially provided for gipsies was important. Because of an exception in the Mobile Homes Act 1983, licences to occupy plots on these sites had only four weeks' security of tenure. This exception was defended by the UK government on the ground that it was in the public interest for local authorities to

²³ Ibid [25].

²⁴ Ibid [146].

²⁵ *Connors v United Kingdom* [2004] 40 EHRR 189.

have special flexibility in the management of gipsy caravan sites. But the Strasbourg Court did not accept this as sufficient justification.

However the judgment also contains some important general observations as to the inadequacy of the UK model of judicial review for the resolution of factual disputes. In the *Connors* case, Leeds City Council had indicated in correspondence and in witness statements that Mr Connors and his extended family were anti-social troublemakers, but at the court hearing, the council simply relied on the notice to quit without those allegations being supported by evidence. This is a real dilemma in many of these cases. In practice, housing authorities are slow to evict their tenants, even when there are substantial arrears of rent, because they know that eviction may well lead to other more difficult and more expensive problems in other parts of the social security system. But they may feel bound to evict tenants whose seriously anti-social conduct makes life intolerable for their neighbours. The burden of proving anti-social behaviour is a much heavier one (especially if neighbours are intimidated from giving evidence) than simply giving notice to quit in a case where the county court has little or no discretion about making a possession order.

That is one general point that we can take from *Connors*. The other is that in this, as in the later Strasbourg cases in this area, the Chamber included the UK judge, Sir Nicolas Bratza. It is easy to detect his hand in the full and clear judgment, which shows a real understanding of the problems as seen from the domestic side. I believe that there has been a real dialogue—difficult but salutary—between London and Strasbourg on this issue, and Bratza, recently elected as President of the Strasbourg Court, can take much of the credit for this. I add that I must declare an interest in the matter, since over 40 years ago he was my first pupil in chambers in Lincoln's Inn.

Nearly two years after *Connors*, the problem was reconsidered by seven law lords in *Kay and Price*.²⁶ In *Kay*, the appellants were seven individuals who had believed that they had secure tenancies granted by a housing trust, but found (as a result of a notice given to the trust by Lambeth) that they were in the position of trespassers. They might be thought to have had much more in the way of merits than the Maloney family, the effective appellants in *Price*, who had unlawfully sited their caravans on part of a recreation ground belonging to Leeds City Council and had been in occupation for only two days when proceedings were commenced against them.

The House of Lords was unanimous in concluding that both appeals should be dismissed, but there was an important split, four to three, as to the reasons. The majority (led by Lord Bingham) held that in all these cases, Article 8 is engaged and may be relied on to resist an order for possession in the county court, even though it would require—the same form of words again²⁷—‘highly exceptional circumstances before Article 8 would avail the occupiers’. Neither appeal met this requirement: *Price* obviously failed, and in *Kay* the appellants had not pleaded or put forward evidence in support of any special claim.

The tenant's right to raise an Article 8 defence was supported, in Lord Bingham's view,²⁸ by the express terms of section 7(1)(b) of the Human Rights Act. It was also

²⁶ *Kay v Lambeth BC, Leeds CC v Price* [2006] 2 AC 465.

²⁷ *Ibid* [36].

²⁸ *Ibid* [36].

supported by the decision of the House of Lords, made over 20 years earlier, in the *Winder* case.²⁹ In that case, Wandsworth Borough Council, which in the days of Mrs Thatcher claimed to be one of the most efficient local authorities in the country, raised some of its tenants' rents by half within a year—an increase of about 35 per cent followed by 13 per cent on top of that a year later. Mr Winder, a secure tenant of a council flat, refused to pay the increase. When he was sued for arrears of rent and possession, he defended the claim on the ground that the rent increases were unreasonable and thus unlawful. The House of Lords unanimously and forthrightly rejected the council's argument that it was an abuse of process for Mr Winder to raise this defence in the county court rather than by way of judicial review.

The majority, led by Lord Hope and Lord Scott, considered that *Qazi* should not be departed from. *Connors* was treated as a special case. Lord Hope countered Lord Bingham's reliance on section 7 by referring to section 6(2)(b) of the Human Rights Act.³⁰ This provision disapplies a public authority's duty not to act incompatibly with Convention rights where some provision of primary legislation is itself incompatible and 'the authority was acting so as to give effect to or enforce those provisions'. The precise scope of section 6(2)(b) has still not been fully resolved, but in *Pinnock*,³¹ the unanimous judgment of the nine-strong Supreme Court did not accept Lord Hope's view.

Lord Hope went on³² to set out what he called 'gateways' as the only circumstances in which the county court could refrain from making a possession order, where the statutory requirements were satisfied and the court had no statutory discretion. These were: (a) by applying section 3 of the Human Rights Act, if possible, to avoid incompatibility, or alternatively transferring the case to the High Court, which has the power to make a declaration of incompatibility; or (b) by considering (on the *Winder* principle) any seriously arguable issue as to what Lord Hope called 'an improper exercise of its powers at common law'.

The most moderate majority speech (which is not of course to suggest that the others were immoderate) was that of Lady Hale, who observed:

My Lords, I myself do not think that the purpose of Article 8 was to oblige a social landlord to continue to supply housing to a person who has no right in domestic law to continue to be supplied with that housing, assuming that the general balance struck by domestic law was not amenable to attack and that the authority's decision to invoke that law was not open to judicial review on conventional grounds. It should not be forgotten that in an appropriate case, the range of considerations which any public authority should take into account in deciding whether to invoke its powers can be very wide.³³

She then referred to some well-known observations of Sedley LJ³⁴ about local authorities taking account of 'considerations of common humanity, none of which can properly be ignored when dealing with one of the most fundamental human needs, the need for shelter with at least a modicum of security'. Here Lady Hale was

²⁹ *Wandsworth LBC v Winder* [1985] AC 461.

³⁰ *Kay; Price* (n 26) [86].

³¹ *Manchester City Council v Pinnock* [2010] 3 WLR 1441 [93]–[103].

³² *Ibid* [110], a paragraph which has been the subject of much discussion and controversy.

³³ *Ibid* [190].

³⁴ *R v Lincolnshire CC, ex p Atkinson* (1995) 8 Admin LR 529, 534.

saying, in effect, that Article 8 did not add anything to a local authority's existing public responsibilities.

Qazi had not been considered by the Strasbourg Court in *Connors* (perhaps, Lord Bingham suggested in *Kay*,³⁵ because the reasoning of the majority did not support the case that the UK government wished to put forward), but both *Qazi* and *Kay* were considered by the Strasbourg Court in *McCann*,³⁶ in which judgment was given in March 2008 (by then *Kay* was itself on its way to Strasbourg).

McCann resembled *Qazi* in that a married couple had been secure tenants of a council house. In 2001, after incidents of domestic violence, Mrs McCann moved out with the children and they were rehoused by Birmingham City Council. At the landlord's suggestion, Mrs McCann gave notice to quit, terminating the tenancy of the former home, where her husband was still living. Following the House of Lords' decision in *Qazi*, the Court of Appeal dismissed Mr McCann's appeal from the county court. An application for judicial review also failed and Mr McCann was evicted. The Strasbourg Court's evaluation was very clear:

It is, for present purposes, immaterial whether or not Mrs McCann understood or intended the effects of the notice to quit. Under the summary procedure available to a landlord where one joint tenant serves notice to quit the appellant was dispossessed of his home without any possibility to have the proportionality of the measure determined by an independent tribunal. It follows that, because of the lack of procedural safeguards, there has been a violation of Article 8.³⁷

The next step in the saga (for me it seems like retracing a *via dolorosa*) is the decision of the House of Lords in *Doherty*.³⁸ This was another case concerning gipsies, the essential facts of which were similar to those in *Connors*, except that Mr Doherty and his family were not said to be troublemakers. The appeal was argued in March 2008, before the Strasbourg Court's decision in *McCann*, but the speeches (delivered at the end of July 2008) took account of that decision. There were five law lords sitting, so there was no real possibility of the House departing from *Kay*. But there was some hope of a degree of clarification, especially as Carnwarth LJ had made clear (when *Doherty* was in the Court of Appeal)³⁹ what that Court thought about the number, length and opacity of the speeches in *Kay*.

The speeches in *Doherty* may be said to have provided clarification 'up to a point, Lord Copper'. Lord Hope⁴⁰ set out to explain and modify the 'gateways' that he had expounded (with the concurrence of the majority) in *Kay*. Lord Mance and I both expressed regret at the restriction of gateway (b) to 'traditional' or 'conventional' grounds of judicial review, especially as the thinking behind it seemed to be based on a questionable view of the scope of section 6(2)(b) of the Human Rights Act. This led into a further question as to whether the exception of gipsy caravan sites from protection under the Mobile Homes Act 1983 meant that Birmingham City

³⁵ *Kay*; *Price* (n 26) [23].

³⁶ *McCann v United Kingdom* (2008) 47 EHRR 913.

³⁷ *Ibid* [55].

³⁸ *Doherty v Birmingham City Council* [2009] 1 AC 367.

³⁹ *Doherty* [2007] LGR 165 (CA).

⁴⁰ *Doherty* (n 38) [36]–[55].

Council was relying on a common law rather than a statutory right. If I may venture to quote from my own opinion on this point:

At common law, a landlord is entitled to possession of the demised premises if the tenant's lease or tenancy has expired or been validly terminated, and similarly a fortiori if there was only a licence. To that extent the first defendant and the Secretary of State are correct in saying that the city council was, in seeking possession, relying on a common law right. That is part of the picture, but it is far from the whole picture, and in my opinion it would be unrealistic, and productive of error, not to look at the whole picture. The fact is that the city council's common law right was surrounded on all sides by statutory infrastructure, like a patch of grass in the middle of a motorway junction.⁴¹

The last important case is *Pinnock*,⁴² decided by a nine-strong Supreme Court in November 2010. It is, in domestic terms, the most important case of all, since *Qazi*, *Kay* and *Doherty* were all departed from. Other recent developments—the Strasbourg Court's decision in *Kay*⁴³ six weeks before *Pinnock*, and *Powell*⁴⁴ in the Supreme Court in February 2011—are little more than footnotes. *Pinnock* was remarkable not only for departing from three recent decisions of the House of Lords, but also for the fact that the Supreme Court gave a single unanimous judgment delivered by Lord Neuberger MR. The judgment recorded, correctly, that all members of the court had contributed to it. But it is unmistakably the work of Lord Neuberger, who produced a judgment (if I may say so) combining comprehensiveness with clarity, and showing sensitivity both to the Strasbourg jurisprudence and to the social problems that are the staple fare of social landlords and county court judges.

The judgment deals with four issues of increasing specificity. The facts are considered in detail at the end of the judgment. It is sufficient to say that Mr Pinnock was the long-term secure tenant of a council house occupied by himself and his female partner, and—sporadically and at different times—by some or all of his adult or teenage children. Mr Pinnock was a pensioner and was not himself accused of anti-social behaviour, but his partner and his children were found to have been guilty of very serious anti-social behaviour. Lord Neuberger described it as a 'history of crime, nuisance and harassment ... extraordinary in its extent and persistence'.⁴⁵

In March 2005, Manchester City Council applied for possession or alternatively a demotion order under section 82A of the Housing Act 1985 (as inserted by the Anti-social Behaviour Act 2003). Neither order could be made unless the judge was satisfied that it was reasonable to do so. In June 2007, after a six-day hearing, the judge declined to make an order for possession, but made a demotion order. It seems to have had little effect on the behaviour of the tenant's family, and within the year before the order would have lapsed, the Council gave notice to terminate the tenancy. Mr Pinnock exercised his right to require a review, but the notice was upheld by the review panel. In these circumstances, under sections 143D, 143E and 143F of

⁴¹ Ibid [100].

⁴² *Pinnock* (n 31).

⁴³ *Kay v United Kingdom* (2012) EHRR 30, noted in [2011] *European Human Rights Law Review* 105.

⁴⁴ *Hounslow LBC v Powell (No 1)* [2011] 2 AC 104.

⁴⁵ *Pinnock* (n 31) [162].