

ADMINISTRATIVE JUSTICE AND ASYLUM APPEALS

A STUDY OF TRIBUNAL ADJUDICATION



Robert Thomas

Administrative Justice and Asylum Appeals

A Study of Tribunal Adjudication

ROBERT THOMAS



• H A R T •
PUBLISHING

OXFORD AND PORTLAND, OREGON

2011

Published in the United Kingdom by Hart Publishing Ltd
16C Worcester Place, Oxford, OX1 2JW
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: <http://www.isbs.com>

© Robert Thomas 2011

Robert Thomas has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988,
to be identified as the author 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 means, 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 Ltd at the address above.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data Available

ISBN: 978-1-84113-936-4

Typeset by Hope Services, Abingdon
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

ADMINISTRATIVE JUSTICE AND ASYLUM APPEALS

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.

PREFACE

This book is the product of an empirical legal research project into the procedure and determination of asylum appeals by the responsible administrative tribunal, the Asylum and Immigration Tribunal (AIT). In undertaking this project I have become indebted in a number of ways. First, the project would not have been possible without the generous financial assistance of the Nuffield Foundation (AJU/00124/G), for which I am extremely grateful. In particular, I would wish to thank Sharon Witherspoon, the Deputy Director of the Foundation, for her enthusiasm, assistance, and support. Secondly, the research grant enabled me to benefit from an excellent research associate, Dr Rute Caldeira, who ably demonstrated her commitment, efficiency, tirelessness, and good humour in undertaking with me the legwork of the empirical research and the analysis. I would also like to thank Rute for our extremely useful, though often inconclusive, discussions over asylum appeals. Thirdly, I would not have been able to undertake the research project without the agreement of the AIT, the Ministry of Justice, and the United Kingdom Border Agency which granted access to undertake the research, in particular, to have access to tribunal determinations which would otherwise had been unavailable and to conduct interviews. I am particularly grateful to Mark Ockelton, Deputy President of the then AIT for his receptiveness, assistance, and guidance when I first approached him with the idea of undertaking empirical research into asylum appeals. Fourthly, thanks also go to the School of Law, University of Manchester for affording me study leave to work on the project.

For some years, I have had an interest in the operation and functioning of administrative appeal systems and in the working of the asylum appellate jurisdiction in particular. This interest has several sources. First, there has, over recent years, been much academic and other debate over administrative justice which has accompanied various reforms to the administrative justice system and the tribunals system in particular. Much of this debate has been supported by institutions such as the Nuffield Foundation, the Economic and Social Research Council, and the Administrative Justice and Tribunals Council.¹ A second source of my interest stemmed from the particular difficulties of organising an effective appellate process for those individuals refused asylum. No other tribunal system has been as frequently reformed as the asylum appeal process. When the Government proposed in 2004 to reform the appeals process, I acted as a specialist adviser to a Parliamentary select committee.² The most notable aspect of this

¹ See, eg, M Adler, *Administrative Justice in Context* (Oxford, Hart Publishing, 2010).

² House of Commons Constitutional Affairs Committee, *Asylum and Immigration Appeals* (2003–04 HC 211).

set of reforms had been the controversial proposal to enact an ouster clause in order to immunise the tribunal's decisions from challenge in the higher courts. This aroused widespread opposition and focused attention directly upon the appeals process. After the Government backed down and the dust had settled, this interest quickly dissipated. Nonetheless, my own interest remained. Following the establishment of the AIT in 2005, I wanted to examine in detail how the tribunal was working in practice. I also wanted to demonstrate to my fellow administrative lawyers that tribunals are not, as often assumed, peripheral to their discipline, but are instead central to understanding the complex and dynamic relationship between governmental and legal processes. A third source of my interest has arisen from the particular challenge of investigating and researching asylum appeals. After all, most other large-scale tribunal jurisdictions have been the subject of academic study. However, the immigration and asylum appeals system—now the second largest—had, for one reason or another, either often eluded or been overlooked by the few administrative law scholars interested in administrative tribunals. Finally, as I examined the appeals process in more detail, I became interested in and perplexed by the nature of asylum decision-making and its peculiarly difficult demands.

The principal objective of the book is to examine the effectiveness and quality of tribunal adjudication through a case-study of the asylum appeals process. The book is, then, a study of a specific, and slightly unusual, adjudication system, in one geographical setting, over one period of time. It is not, therefore, claimed that the specific findings and analysis presented here on asylum appeals are generally applicable. The book does, though, offer a general way of thinking of about adjudicative quality. In this respect, the book might shed some broader light upon the role and function of administrative tribunals and the difficulties and problems that arise when we seek to assess and evaluate their work.

The study of immigration and asylum appeals, the legal rules, and their administration can be a challenging endeavour at the best of times, partly because of the incessant outpouring of judicial decision-making—tribunal determinations and court judgments—as well as policy and legislative changes, and new rules and regulations. Indeed, during the progress of the empirical component of the research project, there was a consultation on a further restructuring of the immigration and asylum appeals system to transfer the AIT into the new, two-tier tribunal system, the First-tier Tribunal and the Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber). This transfer occurred in early 2010 and represents an important change to the organisation of the tribunal, particularly as regards onward appeals against initial tribunal decisions and the role of the higher courts in the decision-making process. The transfer is certainly an important reform, but it does not radically affect the handling of initial appeals; even less, does it alter the nature of the decision-making task involved in determining asylum appeals. The transfer does not, therefore, represent a wholesale reform of the tribunal, but another step in its evolution. For this reason, the analysis presented in this book remains valid and is not undermined by the transfer. Despite this structural change, I have, however,

referred to the tribunal as the AIT at various sections throughout the book, where it has been appropriate to do so; for the most part, I have referred to it simply as the Tribunal.

In addition to keeping up with constant legal and policy developments, the empirical project involved the collection of masses of empirical data about the appeals process. The empirical component of the research involved three principal forms of data collection: the observation of appeal hearings; analysis of tribunal determinations; and interviews with participants in the appeals process. Some of the chapters draw upon this data, but it is neither possible nor desirable to present all of it. The book, therefore, draws selectively upon the data collected to illustrate how the asylum appeals process functions and to support the analysis presented here.

It is commonplace to note that people are more likely to come into contact with the legal system by appearing before a tribunal than a court of law. The task of observing tribunals at work and watching them operate in practice brings home their prosaic character as they discharge their quotidian task of delivering justice to people. Asylum appeals are, though, distinctive because of the nature of the issues involved. Appellants often give personal evidence of a kind that does not feature as regularly in other legal proceedings. The consequences of wrong decisions can have drastic consequences and the decisional task is highly challenging. As this book seeks to argue, decisional accuracy is one of the key values informing an adjudication system, but also one of the most imponderable. In the asylum context, it is virtually impossible to pin down something as elusive as decisional accuracy. Having observed around 200 or so asylum appeals, and having had access to the same documentary evidence as the judge, and heard the same oral evidence as the judge, I cannot really claim to be any the wiser as to whether the decisions were right or wrong. From personal experience, it seemed to me that, in a handful of cases, the decision reached was questionable—either because asylum might have been either wrongfully refused or granted—but whenever I felt this, it just seemed to be my own subjective point of view and that I was certainly in no better position to decide. In most of the appeals that I observed, the decision reached seemed to me to be within the bounds of what was reasonable and that some decision one way or the other was required—otherwise the adjudication process would fail in its primary mission: to adjudicate.

In undertaking this project, I have been fortunate enough to have received considerable assistance from a number of different institutions and people. The empirical component of this project involved immersion in the world of asylum appeals and I was able to speak with people holding positions at all levels within this world. Immigration Judges, Senior Immigration Judges, representatives, Home Office presenting officers and caseworkers, medical and country expert witnesses, tribunal interpreters, and Tribunal Service staff all generously spared their time to speak about their work and to provide the kind of insights that cannot be gleaned either from observing appeal hearings or reading appeal determinations. I am grateful to them.

Thanks also go to my academic colleagues at Manchester and elsewhere who provided guidance, assistance, and encouragement during the project. In particular, I would like to thank Charles Blake, Tom Gibbons, Andrew Sanders, and Hugo Storey. At an early stage of the project, I received valuable assistance from Alex Hermon, Jo Shaw, and Maurice Sunkin. I would also like to thank Sarah Craig, Richard Rawlings, Genevra Richardson, Neville Harris, and William Lucy for their comments on drafts. Thanks also go to Richard Hart and his team at Hart Publishing. Of course, despite the assistance provided to me, I assume sole responsibility for the book's shortcomings.

Earlier versions of some of the chapters have been presented in a number of academic conferences and seminars and I have benefited from the comments received. An early version of chapter seven was presented at a conference on the best practices for refugee status determination hosted by Monash University at its conference centre in Prato, Italy in 2008. A revised version of the conference paper appeared as 'Consistency in Asylum Adjudication: Country Guidance and the Asylum Process in the United Kingdom' (2008) 20 *International Journal of Refugee Law* 489. A different and extended version is included here. I have also drawn upon a chapter, 'Refugee Roulette—a UK Perspective' in J Ramji-Nogales, AI Schoenholtz, and PG Schrag (eds), *Refugee Roulette: Disparities in Asylum Adjudication and Proposals for Reform* (New York, New York University Press, 2009), that offered a UK perspective on empirical research by Ramji-Nogales, Schoenholtz, and Schrag which revealed striking disparities in asylum adjudication in the United States. An amalgamation of chapters five and six was presented at a conference on asylum and refugees hosted by the Centre of African Studies, SOAS, University of London in 2009. Presentations based on other parts of the book have been given to the Administrative Justice and Tribunals Council, the Nuffield Foundation, and the Sussex Centre for Migration, University of Sussex. Furthermore, together with the Nuffield Foundation and the International Association of Refugee Law Judges, I organised a roundtable discussion on the topic of country guidance in asylum decision-making systems in the UK and elsewhere, which took place in the summer of 2009, from which I learnt much.

Finally, I need to thank my family: my wife, Nicola, and our children, Penelope, Rosamund, Constanza, Edward, and Gwendolyn, for their support and forbearance.

Robert Thomas
Hartford
May 2010

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	v
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xi
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xxv
1 Administrative Justice, Quality and Asylum Adjudication	1
Quality and Administrative Justice	3
Asylum Adjudication	16
Research Methods	28
The Plan of the Book	31
2 Asylum Decision-Making and its Organisation	33
The Asylum Decision Problem	34
Organising Decision-Making	50
The Tribunal's Jurisdiction and Organisation	61
Conclusion	65
3 Costs, Accuracy and Decision Processes	67
Considering Costs	69
The Appeal Decision Process	77
The Timeliness of Decision-Making	94
Conclusion	99
4 Appeal Hearings	101
The Pre-Hearing Stage	101
Substantive Hearings	107
Immigration Judge Questioning and the Absence of Representation	119
Closing the Hearing and Decision-Writing Targets	128
Conclusion	131
5 Credibility	134
The Credibility Problem	134
Assessing Credibility	140
Hard Cases	159
Weighing it all up	161
Conclusion	165

Contents

6 Country Information	167
The Problem of Country Information	168
Using Country Information	175
Country Information and the Appeals Process	180
Country Expert Evidence	182
Conclusion	194
7 Country Guidance	196
The Country Guidance Concept	197
Managing Country Guidance	202
Assessing Country Information and Producing Guidance	206
Binding Factual Precedent or Authoritative Guidance?	214
Using Country Guidance	217
Appraising Country Guidance	220
Conclusion	234
8 Onward Rights of Challenge	236
The Benefits and Costs of Onward Challenges	237
Organising Onward Challenges: An Excursus	240
The Value of Onward Challenges	259
Tribunals, Courts and Decision-Making Quality	271
Conclusion	278
9 Conclusion	280
Evaluating Adjudicative Quality	281
Reconsidering Asylum Adjudication	287
<i>Bibliography</i>	295
<i>Index</i>	309

TABLE OF CASES

AUSTRALIA

<i>NABD v Minister for Immigration and Multicultural and Indigenous Affairs</i> (2005) 216 ALR 1 (Australian High Court)	212
---	-----

EUROPEAN COURT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

<i>Abdulaziz, Cabales and Balkandali v United Kingdom</i> (1985) 7 EHRR 471.....	36
<i>Bensaid v United Kingdom</i> (2001) 33 EHRR 10	70
<i>Chahal v United Kingdom</i> (1996) 23 EHRR 413	36
<i>D v United Kingdom</i> (1997) 24 EHRR 423	36, 70
<i>N v United Kingdom</i> (2008) 47 EHRR 39	36
<i>NA v United Kingdom</i> (2009) 48 EHRR 15	171, 213
<i>Said v Netherlands</i> (2006) 43 EHRR 248	172

REPUBLIC OF IRELAND

<i>Nyembo v Refugee Appeals Tribunal</i> [2007] IESC 25 (Supreme Court of Ireland)	138
---	-----

UNITED KINGDOM

Court Judgments

<i>AA and LK v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] 2 All ER 160 (CA)	224
<i>AA (Uganda) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 579	276
<i>AA (Zimbabwe) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 149	224, 227, 254
<i>Abdi, Ashori, Madani, Mighty and Lumba v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] EWHC Admin 3166	256
<i>AG (Somalia) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 1342	258

<i>AH (Sudan), IG (Sudan), and NM (Sudan) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] Imm AR 584 (CA)	207
<i>AH (Sudan) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] UKHL 49; [2008] 1 AC 678	30, 190, 227, 275
<i>AJ (Cameroon) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 373	263
<i>Able (UK) Ltd v HM Revenue and Customs</i> [2007] EWCA 1207	274
<i>Ali (DM) v Immigration Appeal Tribunal</i> [1973] Imm AR 33 (CA)	18, 229, 254
<i>Al-Mehdawi v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [1990] 1 AC 876 (HL)	115
<i>Ariaya v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 48; [2006] Imm AR 347	215
<i>Arshad v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2001] EWCA Civ 587	241
<i>AS & DD (Libya) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 289	275
<i>BA (Nigeria) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2009] UKSC 7	254
<i>Batayav v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2003] EWCA Civ 1489	206
<i>Benkaddouri v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2004] INLR 1 (CA)	57
<i>BK (Democratic Republic of Congo) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 1322	227, 275
<i>CA v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2004] EWCA Civ 1165; [2004] Imm AR 640	37, 169, 273
<i>Chikwamba v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] UKHL 40; [2008] 1 WLR 1420	53
<i>CM (Kenya) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 312	186
<i>Cooke v Secretary of State for Social Security</i> [2001] EWCA Civ 734; [2002] 3 All ER 279	274, 276
<i>Detamu v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 604	264
<i>DK (Serbia) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 1747; [2007] Imm AR 411	244
<i>E and R v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2004] EWCA Civ 49; [2004] QB 1044	264
<i>EB (Kosovo) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] UKHL 41	97
<i>Edwards v Bairstow</i> [1956] AC 14 (HL)	274, 275
<i>EM (Lebanon) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] UKHL 64	36
<i>Entry Clearance Officer, Mumbai v NH (India)</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 1330	276
<i>FK (Kenya) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 119	189, 227

<i>FM (Iran) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 1540.....	263
<i>FP (Iran) and MB (Libya) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 13; [2007] Imm AR 450.....	80, 103
<i>GH (Afghanistan) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2005] EWCA Civ 1603	84, 264
<i>Ghebru v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 1043.....	248
<i>Gheisari v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 1854.....	38
<i>Haile v Immigration Appeal Tribunal</i> [2001] EWCA Civ 663; [2002] INLR 283	115
<i>HF (Algeria) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 445.....	108, 138, 245
<i>Hinchy v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions</i> [2005] UKHL 16; [2005] 1 WLR 967.....	274
<i>HK v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 1037	38, 84, 148, 262
<i>HS (Zimbabwe) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 915	224
<i>Huang v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] UKHL 11; [2007] 2 AC 176	36, 97
<i>IA (Somalia) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 323; [2007] Imm AR 685	215, 264
<i>Indrakumar v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2004] Imm AR 76 (CA)	134, 241
<i>J v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2005] EWCA Civ 629; [2005] Imm AR 409.....	36, 70
<i>JC (China) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2009] EWCA Civ 81.....	227
<i>JT (Cameroon) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 878; [2009] 1 WLR 1411	57, 158
<i>K v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] Imm AR 161 (CA)	186
<i>Karanakaran v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2000] 3 All ER 449 (CA)	43, 45, 48, 63, 189
<i>KH (Sudan) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 887.....	215
<i>Koci v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2003] EWCA Civ 1507	212
<i>Koller v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2001] EWCA Civ 1267.....	274
<i>Macharia v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [1999] EWCA Civ 3001.....	181
<i>Manzeke v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [1997] EWCA Civ 1888; [1997] Imm AR 524	199

<i>Maqsood v the Special Adjudicator and the Secretary of State</i> [2001] EWHC Admin 1003; [2002] Imm AR 268	115
<i>MH (Iraq) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 852 [17] (Laws LJ)	170
<i>Mibanga v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2005] EWCA Civ 367	146, 154
<i>Miftari v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2005] EWCA Civ 481	200
<i>MK (Burma) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 187	122
<i>Montgomerie & Co Ltd v Wallace-James</i> [1904] AC 73 (HL)	82
<i>Murkarkar v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 1045	244
<i>Muuse v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2010] EWCA Civ 453	256
<i>N v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2005] UKHL 31; [2005] 2 AC 296	36
<i>Napp Pharmaceutical Holdings Ltd v Director General of Fair Trading</i> [2002] EWCA Civ 796; [2002] 4 All ER 376	274
<i>NT (Togo) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 1431	158
<i>OD (Ivory Coast) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 1299	92, 217, 275
<i>Otshudi v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2004] EWCA Civ 893	138
<i>P and M v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2004] EWCA Civ 1640; [2005] Imm AR 84	241
<i>Re Poyser and Mills' Arbitration</i> [1964] 2 QB 467 (QB)	92
<i>R (A) v London Borough of Croydon</i> [2009] UKSC 8	160
<i>R (AK (Sri Lanka) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2009] EWCA Civ 447	254
<i>R ((AM) (Cameroon)) v Asylum and Immigration Tribunal and the Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 100	245
<i>R (B) v London Borough of Merton</i> [2003] EWCA Admin 1689	160
<i>R (BAPIO Action Ltd) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 1139	232
<i>R (Benda) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2002] Imm AR 314 (HC)	239
<i>R (Boafo) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2002] EWCA Civ 44; [2002] 1 WLR 1919	237, 256
<i>R (Cart, U, and XC) v Upper Tribunal and Special Immigration Appeals Commission</i> [2010] EWHC Civ 859	251, 253
<i>R (Casey) v Restormel Borough Council</i> [2007] EWHC Admin 2554	245
<i>R (Degirmenci) v Immigration Appeal Tribunal</i> [2003] EWHC Admin 324	157
<i>R (Es Eldin) v Immigration Appeal Tribunal</i> (Court of Appeal, 29.11.2000, unreported) (CA)	189

<i>R ((F) (Mongolia)) v Asylum and Immigration Tribunal</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 769; [2007] 1 WLR 2523	245
<i>R (FH; K; A; V; H; SW; HH; AM; SI & ZW) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] EWHC Admin 1571	256
<i>R (Frezghi) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2009] EWHC Admin 335	113
<i>R (G and M) v Immigration Appeal Tribunal</i> [2004] EWCA Civ 1731; [2005] 1 WLR 1445	245
<i>R (Husan) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2005] EWHC Admin 189	232
<i>R v Immigration Appeal Tribunal and Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Shah</i> [1997] Imm AR 145 (HC)	48
<i>R v Immigration Appeal Tribunal, ex parte K</i> [1999] EWCA Civ 2066	174
<i>R v Immigration Appeal Tribunal, ex parte S</i> [1998] Imm AR 252	80
<i>R (Iran) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2005] EWCA Civ 982; [2005] INLR 633	92, 134, 200, 262
<i>R (Jackson) v Attorney-General</i> [2006] 1 AC 262 (HL)	242
<i>R (Javed) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2001] EWCA Civ 789; [2001] Imm AR 529	232
<i>R (Jenner) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2010] EWHC Admin 132	256
<i>R (Karas and Miladinovic) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWHC Admin 747	254, 256
<i>R (Katshunga) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWHC Admin 1208	253
<i>R (Lutete and Others) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] EWHC Admin 2331	200
<i>R (Madan and Kapoor) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 770; [2008] 1 All ER 973	226, 256
<i>R (Martin) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWHC Admin 799	253
<i>R (N) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2009] EWHC Admin 873	255
<i>R (Pharis) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2004] EWCA Civ 654, [2004] 3 All ER 310	239
<i>R v Preston Supplementary Benefits Appeal Tribunal</i> [1975] 1 WLR 625 (CA)	274
<i>R (R) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2005] EWHC Admin 520	115
<i>R (Saribal) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2002] EWHC Admin 1542; [2002] INLR 596	237, 256
<i>R (S) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWHC Admin 1111; [2006] EWCA Civ 1157; [2006] INLR 575	255
<i>R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Anufrijeva</i> [2003] UKHL 36; [2004] 1 AC 604	53

<i>R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Bugdaycay</i> [1986] Imm AR 8 (CA); [1987] AC 514 (HL).....	18
<i>R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Deniz Mersin</i> [2000] INLR 511 (QB).....	255
<i>R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Onibiyo</i> [1996] QB 768 (CA)	254
<i>R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Phansopkar</i> [1976] QB 606.....	255
<i>R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Robinson</i> [1998] QB 929 (CA)	263
<i>R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Thangarasa and Yogathas</i> [2002] UKHL 36; [2003] 1 AC 920	229
<i>R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Yousaf and Jamil</i> [2000] 3 All ER 649 (CA)	82
<i>R (SK) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] EWHC Admin 98.....	256
<i>R v Special Adjudicator, ex parte Demeter</i> [2000] Imm AR 424 (HC)	84
<i>R v Special Adjudicator, ex parte Ullah</i> [2004] UKHL 26; [2004] 2 AC 323.....	36
<i>R (Thangeswarajah) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] EWHC Admin 3288.....	213
<i>R (Wani) v Secretary of State for the Home Department and the Asylum and Immigration Tribunal</i> [2005] EWHC Admin 2815; [2005] Imm AR 125 (HC)	246
<i>R (YH) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2010] EWCA Civ 116	254
<i>R (Yogachandran) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWHC Admin 392.....	253
<i>S & Others v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2002] EWCA Civ 539; [2002] INLR 416	199
<i>SA (Somalia) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 1302.....	154
<i>SA (Sri Lanka) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 614.....	263
<i>SA (Syria) and IA (Syria) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 1390	174
<i>Saad, Diriye and Osorio v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2001] EWCA Civ 2008 [2002] Imm AR 471.....	44
<i>Saleem v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2000] EWCA Civ 186; [2000] Imm AR 529 (CA)	103
<i>Sandralingham and Ravichandran v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [1995] EWCA Civ 16; [1996] Imm AR 97 (CA).....	63
<i>Save Britain's Heritage v Secretary of State for the Environment</i> [1991] 1 WLR 153 (HL)	92
<i>Secretary of State for the Home Department v Akaeke</i> [2005] EWCA Civ 947; [2005] Imm AR 701	57, 274

<i>Secretary of State for the Home Department v S</i> [2007] EWCA Civ 346	97
<i>Secretary of State for the Home Department v TB (Jamaica)</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 977	256
<i>Secretary of State for the Home Department v Thirukumar</i> [1989] Imm AR 402 (CA)	18
<i>Shirazi v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2003] EWCA Civ 1562; [2004] 2 All ER 602	84, 198
<i>SK v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2003] EWCA Civ 841	208
<i>Sivakumaran v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [1988] AC 958 (HL)	42
<i>South Bucks District Council v Porter</i> [2004] UKHL 33; [2004] 4 All ER 775	92, 261
<i>SS (Iran) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 310	263
<i>Subesh, Suthan, Nagulananthan and Vanniyaingam v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2004] EWCA Civ 56; [2004] Imm AR 112	82, 123, 134, 190, 226, 241
<i>Virjon B v Special Adjudicator</i> [2002] EWHC Admin 1469	154
<i>VNM v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 47	269
<i>WM (DRC) v Secretary of State for the Home Department; Secretary of State for the Home Department v AR (Afghanistan)</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 1495; [2007] Imm AR 337	254
<i>Y v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2006] EWCA Civ 1223	148
<i>YB (Eritrea) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2008] EWCA Civ 360	265
<i>Yuill v Yuill</i> [1945] 1 All ER 183 (CA)	119
<i>ZL and VL v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2003] EWCA Civ 25; [2003] Imm AR 330	229
<i>ZT (Kosovo) v Secretary of State for the Home Department</i> [2009] UKHL 6; [2009] 1 WLR 348	254

Tribunal Determinations

<i>A v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Turkey)</i> [2003] UKIAT00061	145
<i>AA (No 1) v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Involuntary returns to Zimbabwe)</i> Zimbabwe CG [2005] UKAIT00144	180, 207, 224
<i>AA (No 2) v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Risk for involuntary returnees)</i> Zimbabwe CG [2006] UKAIT00061	224
<i>AA v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Expert evidence, assessment)</i> Somalia [2004] UKIAT00221	187
<i>AA v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Language diagnosis: use of interpreters)</i> Somalia [2008] UKAIT00029	112