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"invaluable . to the armoury of all . a compulsory addition to the library of every immigration judge and practitioner." The President of the Upper Tribunal Immigration and Asylum Chamber, Mr Justice McCloskey. The system of appeals and judicial review in immigration has received a radical overhaul in recent years. The Immigration Appeals and Remedies Handbook is a practical and user-friendly text dealing with all aspects of immigration appeals, and with administrative and judicial review. The book is written in the style of a user-friendly Handbook and features check lists and bullet points for ease of understanding. It covers: -The new appeals system currently entering force in stages from October 2014, with most migrants being dealt with under a radically different structure than that previously in place from April 2015; -The wholly new Procedure Rules for the First-tier Tribunal Immigration and Asylum Chamber, with radical new features as to the awarding of costs and featuring judicial limitations on the withdrawing of immigration decisions and varying of the grounds for refusal; -The case law on natural justice, rules of evidence, one stop notices, vulnerable witnesses and children; -Judicial review in the Upper Tribunal Immigration and Asylum Chamber; -The new system of Administrative Review under the Immigration Rules; -Identifying challenges based on points of law and preparing and presenting appeals in the Upper Tribunal Immigration and Asylum Chamber; -Appeals under the EEA Regulations and to the Special Immigration Appeals Commission; -Onwards appeals to the Court of Appeal.

This volume examines the implementation of the Return Directive from the perspective of judicial dialogue. While the role of judges has been widely addressed in European asylum law and EU law more generally, their role in EU return policy has hitherto remained under explored. This volume addresses the interaction and dialogue between domestic judiciaries and European courts in the implementation of European return policy. The book brings together leading authors from various backgrounds, including legal scholars, judges and practitioners. This allows the collection to offer theoretical and practical perspectives on important questions regarding the regulation of irregular migration in Europe, such as: what constitutes inadequate implementation of the Directive and under which conditions can judicial dialogue solve it? How can judges ensure that the right balance is struck between effective return procedures and fundamental rights? Why do we see different patterns of judicial dialogue in the Member States when it comes to particular questions of return policy, for example regarding the use of detention? These questions are more timely than ever given the shifting public discourse on immigration and the growing political backlash against immigration courts. This book will be essential reading for all scholars and practitioners in the fields of immigration law and policy, EU law and public law.

Civil and political rights

Key chapters, written by leading experts across the field, engage with important...
ongoing debates in the field of EU administrative law, focusing on areas of topical interest such as financial markets, the growing security state and problematic common asylum procedures. In doing so, they provide a summary of what we know, don’t know and ought to know about EU administrative law. Examining the control functions of administrative law and the machinery for accountability, this Research Handbook eloquently challenges areas of authoritarian governance, such as the Eurozone and security state, where control and accountability are weak and tackles the seemingly insoluble question of citizen ‘voice’ and access to policy-making. This book analyses how the system of immigration judicial reviews works in practice, as an area which has, for decades, constituted the majority of judicial review cases and is politically controversial. Drawing upon extensive empirical research and unprecedented research access, it explores who brings judicial review challenges against immigration decisions and why, the type of immigration decisions that are challenged, how cases proceed through the judicial review process, how cases are settled out of court, and how judicial review interacts with other legal and non-legal remedies. It also examines the quality of immigration judicial review claims and the quality of the initial administrative decisions being challenged. Through developing a novel account of the operation of the immigration judicial review system in practice and the lived experience of it by judges, representatives, and claimants, this book adds a significant new perspective to the wider understanding of judicial review. The Refugees Act 130 of 1998 enabled South Africa to treat asylum seekers in a humanitarian and dignified manner. However, more than 20 years into democracy, the refugee status determination system, which is the responsibility of the Department of Home Affairs (DHA) is overburdened with asylum applications. The core criticism against the DHA is its failure to finalize asylum application within 180 days. The key attraction of South Africa’s asylum regime is its non-encampment policy, which bestows on an asylum seeker the right to work or study pending the outcome of the asylum application. This mini-dissertation will not focus on challenges that asylum seekers and refugees may encounter when asserting a specific entitlement. The aim is instead to highlight red flags which will assist any interested party to have a basic understanding of what refugee status determination in South Africa entails. Although refugee status determination is an administrative process, South African courts have laid down jurisprudence confirming the following: (i) At the moment a foreigner expresses an intention to apply for asylum, he or she must be afforded the opportunity to do so; (ii) Illegal entry into the state do not bar application for asylum; (iii) Equality before the law affords asylum seekers suspected of being illegal the right to appear before a competent court within 48 hours of arrest; and (iv) Asylum seekers must apply for immigration permits from abroad. Differently put, an asylum seeker may not apply for a change in status, pending adjudication of an asylum claim in South Africa. To deter illegal migration to South Africa, the DHA has done the following: (a) It unilaterally closed the Cape Town and Port Elizabeth Refugee Reception Offices (RRO’s); (b) It established a Border Management Agency to dispense with adjudication of asylum applications at a border post or point of entry; (c) It granted special dispensation work permits to asylum seekers from Southern African Development Community (SADC) countries. Refugee status determination and dissecting a persecution claim may be perceived as two different enquiries. The latter enquiry is often the subject matter of statutory tribunals and courts during judicial review proceedings. This study explains the key functions of roleplayers, their different processes and inherent functions under the umbrella of refugee status determination. It is recommended that attorneys and non-governmental organisations be allowed to actively participate, from the inception stage, in South Africa’s refugee status determination process. This will minimise the life-cycle of an asylum claim which often ends in judicial review proceedings. This forces the DHA to be accountable, transparent and to reflect on its commitment to treat asylum seekers, refugees and foreigners in good faith and dignity. Immigration detention is considered by many states to be a necessary tool in the execution of immigration policy. Despite the apparently key role it plays in immigration enforcement, the law on immigration detention is often vague, especially in relation to determining the circumstances under which prolonged detention remains lawful. As a result, the courts are frequently called upon to adjudicate these matters, with scant legal tools at their disposal. Though there have been some significant judgments on the legality of detention at the constitutional level, the extent to which these judgments have had an impact at the lower end of the judiciary is unclear. Indeed, it is the lower courts which are tasked with judging the legality of detention through habeas corpus or judicial review proceedings. This
book examines the way this has occurred in the lower courts of two jurisdictions, the UK and the US, and contrasts this practice not only in those jurisdictions, but with judgments rendered by the Court of Justice of the European Union, a constitutional court at the other end of the judicial spectrum whose judgments are applied by courts and tribunals in the EU Member States. Although these three jurisdictions use similar tests to evaluate the legality of detention, case outcomes significantly differ. Many factors contribute to this divergence, but key among them is the role that fundamental rights protection plays in each jurisdiction. Through a forensic evaluation of 191 judgments, this book compares the laws on detention in the UK, US and EU, and makes recommendations to these jurisdictions for improvement. This judicial analysis is the product of a project between IARLJ-Europe and EASO and it forms part of the EASO professional development series for members of courts and tribunals. The analysis is primarily intended for use by members of courts and tribunals of EU Member States concerned with hearing appeals or conducting reviews of decisions on applications for international protection. It aims to provide a judicial analysis on asylum procedures and non-refoulement as primarily dealt with under the Asylum Procedures Directive 2013/32/EU (APD (recast)). It is intended to be of use both to those with little or no prior experience of adjudication in the field of international protection within the framework of the CEAS as well as to those who are experienced or specialist judges in the field. As such, it aims to be a useful point of reference for all members of courts and tribunals concerned with issues related to asylum procedures and non-refoulement. The structure, format and content have, therefore, been developed with this broad audience in mind. Moreover, it is hoped that it will contribute to ‘horizontal judicial dialogue’. "The author addresses the question of taking into account vulnerability in the European law on asylum by devoting special attention to the European Directive of 27 January 2003 on reception conditions for asylum seekers and to recast proposals of the text presented by the European Commission. She analyzes the issue from a new point of view and from different perspectives - legal and practical, European and national. Her approach is multidisciplinary so the study at the origin of her book brought together lawyers, psychologists, social workers, specialists on the reception of asylum seekers, NGO representatives, member states or members of the academic circle. As part of the establishment of a Common European Asylum System by 2012, the review of the proposed amendments to legal instruments other than the reception conditions directive (mainly the asylum procedures directive and the Dublin Regulation) highlight the will of European institutions to give greater protection to vulnerable persons. The legal review of these proposals and recast texts to the reception conditions Directive, as well as the position of some Member States, show that conceptualization and implementation of this increased consideration for vulnerability in European law on asylum are still uncertain and under construction. In order to improve both conceptualization and implementation recommendations for law and practice are advocated." --Publisher.Judicial review allows individuals, businesses and others to ask the court to consider whether, for example, a government department has gone beyond its powers, a local authority has followed a lawful process or an arms-length body has come to a rational decision. As such, it is a crucial check to ensure lawful public administration. The expansion of judicial review has, in the government's view, led to abuse of the system. The earlier consultation "Judicial Review: Proposals for Reform" (ISBN 9780101851527), introduced changes to the time for bringing planning or procurement challenges and offered a way for courts to filter out unmeritorious challenges. This follow-up review seeks further reform in areas such as: the courts' approach to cases which rely on minor procedural defects; rebalancing financial incentives; speeding up appeals to the Supreme Court in a small number of nationally significant cases and planning challenges. Also this paper looks at the potential reform as to who can bring judicial review and whether alternative mechanisms exist to resolve disputes. The paper also includes a proposal in relation to the payment of legal aid providers in judicial review cases. This paper sets out the Government's proposals for the reform of Judicial Review. Judicial Review is a critical check on the power of the State, providing an effective mechanism for challenging the decisions of public bodies to ensure that they are lawful. The Government is concerned that the Judicial Review process may in some cases be open to abuse, such as delaying tactics, which add to the costs of public services. This paper sets out reform on three key areas: (i) The time limits within which Judicial Review proceedings must be brought; (ii) The procedure for applying for permission to bring Judicial Review proceedings; (iii) The fees charged in Judicial Review proceedings. The European Convention on Human Rights and European Union law provide an increasingly important framework
for the protection of the rights of foreigners. European Union legislation relating to asylum, borders and immigration is developing fast. There is an impressive body of case law by the European Court of Human Rights relating in particular to Articles 3, 5, 8 and 13 of the ECHR. The Court of Justice of the European Union is increasingly asked to pronounce itself on the interpretation of European Union law provisions in this field. This handbook presents this European Union legislation and the body of case law by the two European courts in an accessible way. It is intended for legal practitioners, judges, prosecutors, immigration officials and nongovernmental organisations, in the EU and Council of Europe Member States. Adequate and fair asylum procedures are a precondition for the effective exercise of rights granted to asylum applicants, in particular the prohibition of refoulement. In 1999 the EU Member States decided to work towards a Common European Asylum System. In this context the Procedures Directive was adopted in 2005 and recast in 2013. This directive provides for important procedural guarantees for asylum applicants, but also leaves much discretion to the EU Member States to design their own asylum procedures. This book examines the meaning of the EU right to an effective remedy in terms of the legality and interpretation of the Procedures Directive in regard to several key aspects of asylum procedure: the right to remain on the territory of the Member State, the right to be heard, the standard and burden of proof and evidentiary assessment, judicial review and the use of secret evidence. This book explores what international and EU law require from the national asylum judge with regard to the required intensity of the judicial scrutiny to be applied, and with regard to evidentiary issues, such as the standard and burden of proof, the assessment of credibility, the required level of individualisation, the admission and evaluation of evidence, opportunities for presenting evidence and time limits for submitting evidence. To that end, an analysis is made of the provisions on national (judicial) proceedings contained in the Refugee Convention, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, the UN Convention against Torture, the European Convention on Human Rights, the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU and a number of secondary EU law instruments, such as the EU Qualification Directive and the EU Asylum Procedures Directive, with a particular focus on issues of evidence and judicial scrutiny. An examination of the emergence of the legal regime in the United Kingdom addressing refugees and asylum seekers. Thirty-third report of Session 2010-12 : Drawing special attention to, Veterinary Medicines Regulations 2011 (S. I. 2011/2159); Tribunal Procedure (Upper Tribunal) (Amendment) Rules 2011 (S. I. 2011/2343); Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber) (The New Asylum Model, introduced by the Home Office in 2006 to achieve faster conclusions to asylum applications, has strengthened aspects of the asylum process. The case ownership approach, in which a single individual manages an application from start to finish, has created a strong incentive to conclude cases and applications are being concluded more quickly, and there are also signs that the quality of decision-making is improving. But the new process is not yet working to its optimum efficiency and effectiveness. The UK Border Agency has done well to improve its handling of the casework. There was a rise in the proportion of cases being dealt with within six months, peaking above the target of 40 per cent in December 2007. The backlog of decisions to be made has however more than doubled in over a year, to 8,700 in the second quarter of 2008. At the point of application, the full screening interview is not taking place in a quarter of cases, so that key information about claims could be being missed. A separate process has been established to clear, by 2011, the backlog of 'legacy cases', unresolved before the introduction of the New Asylum Model, which is put at some 335,000 cases. The Agency has made inroads but the target looks challenging. Few removals of failed applicants are being achieved, hampered by a lack of detention space and problems obtaining emergency travel documents. Throughout the second half of 2007, the gap between unfounded applications and removals increased. The Agency missed its 'tipping point' objective, which is to remove more failed asylum applicants than the number who make new unfounded applications. Unfounded applications exceeded removals by over 20 per cent. FIRST PRIZE WINNER OF THE SLS BIRKS PRIZE FOR OUTSTANDING LEGAL SCHOLARSHIP 2011 How are we to assess and evaluate the quality of the tribunal systems that do the day-to-day work of adjudicating upon the disputes individuals have with government? This book examines how the idea of adjudicative quality works in practice by presenting a detailed case-study of the tribunal system responsible for determining appeals lodged by foreign nationals who claim that they will be at risk of persecution or ill-treatment on return to their country of origin. Over recent years, the asylum appeal process has become a major area of judicial decision-making and the most frequently restructured tribunal system. Asylum
adjudication is also one of the most difficult areas of decision-making in the modern legal system. Integrating empirical research with legal analysis, this book provides an in-depth study of the development and operation of this tribunal system and of asylum decision-making. The book examines how this particular appeal process seeks to mediate the tension between the competing values under which it operates. There are chapters examining the organisation of the tribunal system, its procedures, the nature of fact-finding in asylum cases and the operation of onward rights of challenge. An examination as to how the tensions inherent in the idea of administrative justice are manifested in the context of a tribunal system responsible for making potentially life or death decisions, this book fills a gap in the literature and will be of value to those interested in administrative law and asylum adjudication. The essays that comprise this collection focus on the impact and future developments of judicial review in a number of social welfare situations that include homelessness, housing benefit, immigration and social security, to name but a few. Vertical Judicial Dialogues in Asylum Cases attempts to answer the question what international and EU law require from the national asylum judge with regard to the intensity of judicial scrutiny and issues of evidence. This title explores the procedural and substantive principles of administration law. It uses case studies and comparative studies of procedural fairness and propriety in courts to find the similarities and differences among various legal systems. Along with several European countries, it also covers Latin America and China. The central concern of this book is to find answers to fundamental questions about the British asylum system and how it operates. Based on ethnographic research over a two-year period, the work follows and analyses numerous asylum appeals through the British courts. It draws on myriad interviews with individuals and a thorough examination of many state and non-state organizations to understand how the system works. While the organization of the book reflects the formal asylum process, a focus on specific legal appeals reveals the ‘political’ factors at play as different institutions and actors seek to influence judicial decision-making and overturn/uphold official asylum policy. The final chapter draws on the author’s ethnographic findings of the UK’s ‘asylum field’ to re-examine research on the Refugee Determination System in the US, Canada and Australia which has narrowly focused on judicial decision-making. It argues that analysis of Refugee Determination Systems must be situated and studied as part of a wider, political, semi-autonomous ‘asylum field’ which needs to be better understood. Providing an in-depth ethnographic study of a national asylum system and of immigration law and practice, the book will be an invaluable resource for academics, researchers and policy-makers in the UK and beyond working in this highly topical area. This book offers a new interpretation of judicial review in England and Wales as being concerned with the advancement of justice and good governance, as opposed to being concerned primarily with ultra vires or common law constitutionalism. It is developed both from examining the functions and values that ought to be served by judicial review, and from analysis of empirical 'social' facts about judicial review primarily as experienced in the Administrative Court. Based on ground-up case law analysis it constructs a new taxonomy on the grounds of judicial review: mistake, procedural impropriety, ordinary common law statutory interpretation, discretionary impropriety, relevant/irrelevant considerations, breach of an ECHR protected right or equality duty, and constitutional allocation of powers, constitutional rights, or other complex constitutional principles. It explains each of these grounds, what academic and judicial support there might be for them outside case law analysis, and their similarities and differences when viewed against popular existing taxonomies. It concludes that Administrative Court judges are engaged in ordinary common law statutory interpretation in approximately half of all cases, and that where discretionary judgement is involved on the part of the initial decision-maker, judges do indeed consider their task to be one of determining whether the challenged decision was justified by reasoning of adequate quality. It finds that judges apply ordinary common law principles of statutory interpretation with historical pedigrees, including assessing the initial decision-maker's reasoning with reference to statutory purpose, and sifting relevant from irrelevant considerations, including moral considerations. The result is a ground-breaking reassessment of the grounds of judicial review in England and Wales and the practice of the Administrative Court. Welfare entitlements for legal and illegal immigrants - Impact of the new legislation on migrant farmworkers - Due process and other constitutional issues - Asylum procedures - New grounds for exclusion and deportation - Naturalization - Future Perspectives. Through the Refugee Act of 1980, the United States offers the prospect of safety to people who flee to America to escape rape, torture, and even
death in their native countries. In order to be granted asylum, however, an applicant must prove to
an asylum officer or immigration judge that she has a well-founded fear of persecution in her
homeland. The chance of winning asylum should have little if anything to do with the personality of
the official to whom a case is randomly assigned, but in a ground-breaking and shocking study, Jaya
Ramji-Nogales, Andrew I. Schoenholtz, and Philip G. Schrag learned that life-or-death asylum
decisions are too frequently influenced by random factors relating to the decision makers. In many
cases, the most important moment in an asylum case is the instant in which a clerk randomly
assigns the application to an adjudicator. The system, in its current state, is like a game of chance.
Refugee Roulette is the first analysis of decisions at all four levels of the asylum adjudication
process: the Department of Homeland Security, the immigration courts, the Board of Immigration
Appeals, and the United States Courts of Appeals. The data reveal tremendous disparities in asylum
approval rates, even when different adjudicators in the same office each considered large numbers
of applications from nationals of the same country. After providing a thorough empirical analysis, the
authors make recommendations for future reform. Original essays by eight scholars and policy
makers then discuss the authors’ research and recommendations Contributors: Bruce Einhorn,
Steven Legomsky, Audrey Macklin, M. Margaret McKeown, Allegra McLeod, Carrie Menkel-Meadow,
Margaret Taylor, and Robert Thomas.Covering all of the substantive grounds on which a claim may
be brought, this definitive new work provides unrivalled analysis and guidance on the law of judicial
review. Written by three experienced practitioners, Judicial Review: Principles and Procedure
includes chapters on the most common grounds for bringing a claim, such as procedural fairness and
irrationality, but also covers emerging grounds such as delay on the part of public bodies and error
of fact. In addition, the authors provide a separate, detailed treatment of areas such as
administrative policies and the public sector equality duty. Each element of this complex area of law
is carefully broken down to ensure that answers are always easy to find and, where the law is in
doubt, the dispute is concisely stated and the view most likely to be preferred by the courts is
expressed. The book analyses in detail the issues that are likely to arise in practice, with thorough
and up-to-date reference to case law throughout. It incorporates the jurisprudence arising out of the
Human Rights Act 1998, providing practitioners with a complete yet practical treatment of each
relevant topic. The book contains comprehensive coverage of procedural matters in each stage of a
claim, from pre-action to costs, and includes a chapter on European Union law from Marie Demetriou
QC of Brick Court Chambers, providing a uniquely full treatment of all the issues which might be
encountered in practice. Refugees and asylum-seekers are high up on many people's political
agenda. Even so, there is a remarkable lack of information. Who are these asylum-seekers? Aren't
they almost all "bogus"? How do western immigration authorities decide whether or not they are
genuine? Is the UN convention on Refugees out of date and in need of renegotiation? This book
brings insider knowledge to the study of asylum in Britain today. It is based on visits to places where
asylum seekers are detained, on working with lawyers representing asylum-seekers and on a close
knowledge of many of the refugee organisations. It argues passionately that Britain shall not throw
away, through ignorance and misunderstanding, a reputation for providing a place of safety for the
persecuted, and the chance of welcoming people who have much to contribute to national life and
culture.'Asylum remains a hugely important area of law, deeply affecting the lives of very many
people: the nation's approach to it is a touchstone of our humanity.' – from the foreword to the second
edition by The Rt Hon The Lord Brown of Eaton-under Haywood. This is the leading
practitioner textbook dealing solely with the law and practice pertaining to all aspects of asylum in
the UK. It is a decade since the last edition published, since when much has happened in this area,
with the most significant being Brexit. The third edition will be the first post-Brexit refugee
practitioner work. The new legal regime should be clearer by early 2021, either because a new
regime of Rules and Regulations is in place, or because the first judicial decisions on the new
constitutional arrangements and the treatment of EU Retained Law are giving insight. The third
dition covers: - Credibility assessment: UNHCR and Beyond Proof, language analysis, family tracing,
assessing belief and sexuality - Assessing risk: assurances, shifting burdens of proof and duties of
enquiry, the relevance of inability to return - Persecution: conscientious objection, future expression
of fundamental rights - Developments in the understanding of vulnerability: the interaction of
refugee law with trafficking, statelessness and gender preference issues - Exclusion for wrongdoing,
for access to rights akin to nationality, and for non-UNHCR protection - Cessation of status: family
members, change of circumstances, and relevance of internal relocation - Third country cases: returns under and beyond Dublin 3, third country returns post-Brexit - Procedures - asylum claims in detention, delays in determining claims, family reunion

International law provides states with a common definition of a "refugee" as well as guidelines outlining how asylum claims should be decided. Yet even across nations with many commonalities, the processes of determining refugee status look strikingly different. This book compares the refugee status determination (RSD) regimes of three popular asylum seeker destinations: the United States, Canada, and Australia. Though they exhibit similarly high levels of political resistance to accepting asylum seekers, refugees access three very different systems—none of which are totally restrictive or expansive—once across their borders. These differences are significant both in terms of asylum seekers' experience of the process and in terms of their likelihood of being designated as refugees. Based on a multi-method analysis of all three countries, including a year of fieldwork with in-depth interviews of policy-makers and asylum-seeker advocates, observations of refugee status determination hearings, and a large-scale case analysis, Rebecca Hamlin finds that cross-national differences have less to do with political debates over admission and border control policy than with how insulated administrative decision-making is from either political interference or judicial review. Administrative justice is conceptualized and organized differently in every state, and so states vary in how they draw the line between refugee and non-refugee. Provides an in-depth overview of ADR before covering in detail the principles, processes, and enforcement options involved. This fully revised third edition integrates a range of important new case law and specifically locates ADR within an increasingly digital landscape.
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