

More on judicial review transfer

Colin Yeo — 19 December 2013 — [Leave a comment](#)

Following on from two recent posts on this subject ([Judicial review in the Upper Tribunal, Do not lodge Upper Tribunal judicial reviews by post if urgent](#)), there has been *another* warning about the transfer of judicial reviews into the Upper Tribunal. A claim that includes an element of unlawful detention must remain in the High Court according to the Lord Chief Justice's [Practice Direction](#) on transfers. In the case of *R (on the application of Ashraf) v Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2013] EWHC 4028 (Admin) Cranston J goes on the war path:

It seems to me that to lodge a challenge to removal in the Administrative Court, including a ground going to the lawfulness of detention, when there is no obvious distinct merit in that aspect, could well constitute an abuse of process by the lawyers engaged in the case.

Just why Mr Justice Cranston thinks that immigration lawyers would deliberately include a meritless ground of a claim in order to appear in the High Court rather than the Upper Tribunal is a bit of a mystery.

Mr Justice Cranston

He goes on specifically to threaten [Hamid-style](#) proceedings and/or costs sanctions against any such lawyers. Note that the lawyers involved in this case are not sanctioned and their conduct not criticised, despite some very grumpy final words from the judge. Indeed, it was Declan himself who flagged this up with me for the attention of Free Movement readers.

Speaking from an advocate's point of view, it seems that *Hamid*-style Star Chamber proceedings are now going far beyond sanction for deliberately misleading the court or deliberately lodging late injunction applications. Some judges are using them as a cudgel to threaten representatives for reasons that are, frankly, rather questionable.

In this case the judge's threats were based on a disagreement about the legal merits of one aspect of the case. Funding had been granted some time previously for the unlawful detention challenge and many claimant lawyers would say there was an obviously arguable case that detention was unlawful based on the independent medical report and the other facts of the case. Home Office policy is not to detain victims of torture where there is independent evidence of torture and there was independent evidence in this case.

Further, some of the findings and the old, outdated case law relied on in the judgment are potentially open to criticism. The age old allegation that a doctor is a mere scribe for the patient resurfaces, for example. This is based on no evidence, misunderstands the role of the doctor and utterly devalues clinical method and opinion. In the intervening years the immigration tribunal has moved on from such a blinkered, arguably arrogant, approach so it is a shame to see it dredged up in the High Court.

It looks like we can expect Mr Justice Cranston or others to haul some other immigration lawyers over the coals in the near future. How many of us will be left willing to accept instructions for injunction applications? Is that the point of these hearings? Or are these threats becoming so routine and absurd that they risk losing their effect?

Related posts:



[Do not lodge Upper Tribunal judicial reviews by post if urgent](#)



[Judicial review in the Upper Tribunal](#)



[R \(Ignaoua\) v Secretary of State for the Home Department](#)

Share this:

 Facebook 2
  Twitter 8
  LinkedIn 1
  Google
  Email

Google+

Colin Yeo  Követés 0

In [Judicial review, Procedure](#)

Colin Yeo

 Posts
  Website
  Twitter
  Facebook
  Google+

A barrister specialising in UK immigration law at [Garden Court Chambers](#) in London, I have been practising in immigration law for 13 years. I am passionate about immigration law and founded and edit the [Free Movement](#) immigration law blog.

Subscribe to new blog posts by email

Email Address

Subscribe

◀ [Dignity has no nationality:...](#)

No Comments

Be the first to start the conversation.

Leave a comment

Enter your comment here...

Search...

The Free Movement immigration law blog is written by members of the immigration team at Garden Court Chambers in London, ranked as top tier in both [Chambers and Partners](#) and [The Legal 500](#). The editor is [Colin Yeo](#).

Recent

Comments



More on judicial review transfer

19 December 2013



Dignity has no nationality: Our Day 2013

18 December 2013



Incompetence, neglect and failure to show due diligence

18 December 2013

On email

Subscribe to new blog post alerts:

On The Forum

New grounds of appeal during S.3D Leave by [Shahid Aslam](#)

Elderly dependent success on appeal by [Kitty Falls](#)

Child Registration by [Sonya King](#)

Regulation 9 EEA – Surinder Singh by [Sumera Ashraf](#)

When did the right to retained right of residence come into force by [Visa Legal](#)

On Twitter

Tweets



Bail Inm Det
@BIDdetention

22 children entered immigration detention in Nov 2013

Retweeted by [Colin Yeo](#)

Expand



Colin Yeo
@ColinYeo1

VERY dark humour on the Syrian resettlement non-act

Show Media



Colin Yeo
@ColinYeo1

Any suggestions on things to ban that are already ban

Expand



Rob Ford (England)
@robfordmancs

On Facebook



Free Movement

Like

483 people like Free Movement.



Facebook social plugin

On this blog



On other blogs

Asad Khan immigration blog

BritCits

JCWI blog

Life Without Papers

NCADC blog

Nearly Legal

Pink Tape

Strasbourg Observers

UK Constitutional Law Group

UK Human Rights Blog

UK Supreme Court Blog

From the archives

Detention unlawful when Secretary of State fuffs around

One of the more pernicious aspects of the so-called automatic deportation provisions in the UK Borders Act 2007 is the... [Read more...](#)

By [Greg Ó Ceallaigh](#) | Published on 9 December 2013

Judicial review in the Upper Tribunal

Since 17 October 2011, some immigration judicial reviews have been heard in the Upper Tribunal. Until now this was confined... [Read more...](#)

By [Colin Yeo](#) | Published on 12 December 2013

Disclaimer

The information and commentary on this blog is provided free of charge for information purposes only. The information and commentary does not, and is not intended to, amount to legal advice to any person.

Views expressed in blog posts are those of the author only, not Garden Court Chambers as a whole.

About the blog

The Free Movement blog was founded by Colin Yeo in 2007. Colin continues to edit the blog and other members of the immigration team at Garden Court Chambers also contribute. [More about the blog](#)

Login

Username

Password

Remember Me

Log In

[Lost Password?](#)

 Facebook

 Twitter

 Google +

 LinkedIn

[Sitemap](#) [Cookie Policy](#) [Comment Policy](#) [Privacy Policy](#)

© 2013 Colin Yeo