

Table of Contents

<i>Foreword</i>	v
<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xi
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xxi
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xlvi
<i>Table of International Treaties and Conventions</i>	li
1. Introduction	1
I. The Structure of the Argument	7
Part 1: A Tort-Based Approach to Damages for Human Rights Breaches	
2. The Tort Framework	13
I. Setting the Scene: Vindication, Damages and Torts Theory	14
A. The Concept of Vindication in the Law of Torts	14
i. Rights and Interests.....	15
ii. Vindication and Other Functions	17
B. Damages.....	21
C. Torts Theory.....	23
II. Distinguishing Vindicatory and Compensatory Torts.....	25
A. Vindicatory Torts: Torts Actionable Per Se.....	25
i. Prerequisites to Actionability.....	26
ii. Strictness of Liability.....	27
iii. Onus	30
iv. Defences.....	31
v. Other Features	32
B. Compensatory Torts: Negligence	32
i. The Gist: Actionable Loss	33
ii. Fault	35
iii. Causation.....	36
iv. Duty of Care	39
v. Onus and Defences.....	40
vi. Rights-Based, Vindicatory Theories of Negligence	41
C. Torts Which Combine Vindication and Compensation: Private Nuisance	45

III.	Vindication and Damages.....	46
A.	Range of Damages	47
B.	Compensatory Damages and Vindication.....	50
C.	Compensatory Damages within Torts	
	Actionable Per Se	53
	i. Overview	54
	ii. Normative Damage Inherent in the Interference.....	58
	iii. The Supreme Court Decision in <i>Lumba</i> : Deviation from Orthodoxy	61
	iv. Recovery and Assessment of Damages for Normative Damage.....	67
	v. Consequential Losses	70
	vi. Other Features of Damages within Torts Actionable Per Se	72
IV.	Conclusions.....	73
3.	A Tort-Based Approach to Human Rights Damages	76
I.	A Tort-Based Approach as a Matter of Principle	76
A.	Common Aims of Protection and Vindication: Background.....	77
B.	Common Aims of Protection and Vindication: Significant Doctrinal Features.....	82
	i. Standing.....	83
	ii. Actionable Per Se	83
	iii. Strict Liability	83
	iv. Defences	85
	v. Substantive Questions for the Judiciary	87
	vi. Remedies	87
	vii. Procedure.....	88
	viii. Miscellaneous	89
C.	Common Functions, the Implications for Damages, and the Prevailing Approach to Human Rights Damages	89
D.	Are Positive Obligations Distinguishable?	97
E.	Common Functions, Common Interests and Coherence	104
F.	What Tort Can Offer.....	113
II.	The Tort-Based Approach: Core Features	116
A.	Non-Compensatory Damages	116
	i. Nominal Damages	117
	ii. User and Gain-Based Measures.....	117
	iii. Exemplary Damages	122
	iv. Vindictory Damages.....	125

B.	Compensatory Damages.....	129
i.	Non-Pecuniary Damage and Loss	130
ii.	Flexibility in Methodology	134
iii.	Pecuniary Loss.....	135
iv.	Recoverable Heads Not Limited to those Recognised at Common Law.....	136
III.	The Relationship Between Human Rights Damages and Other Judicial Remedies	140
A.	Monetary Remedies	140
i.	General.....	140
ii.	Disciplining the Current Approach to Concurrent Liability Under the HRA: Case Study on Nuisance and Article 8	142
B.	Specific Relief.....	146
i.	Situations where Specific Relief shall be Sufficient Remedy	146
ii.	Situations where Specific Relief is Granted to Prevent a Wrong.....	147
iii.	Situations where Specific Relief and Damages are Both Required	148
iv.	Situations where Specific Relief is of No Relevance	149
v.	Situations where Damages may be Awarded in Lieu of Injunctive Relief.....	150
vi.	Specific Relief of Primary Importance in Human Rights Law?.....	152
IV.	The Tort-Based Approach and the Provisions of the HRA.....	153
A.	Decision to Award Damages	153
B.	Quantum and Range of Damages.....	157
V.	Flawed Tort-Based Approaches: The United States Constitutional Tort Jurisprudence	159

Part 2: Human Rights Damages and the Public Law–Private Law Distinction

4.	The Public Law–Private Law Distinction	167
	SECTION 1. THE PUBLIC LAW–PRIVATE LAW DISTINCTION AS A TOOL FOR LEGAL DEVELOPMENT	171
I.	Lack of an Anchor.....	171
II.	Choppy Seas: The Implications of ‘Publicness’	179
III.	Oceans or Seas of Doctrine? The Pluralistic Nature of Public Law Doctrine.....	184
IV.	Pulling Into Port: Conclusion	187

SECTION 2. THE PUBLIC LAW-PRIVATE LAW DISTINCTION AND HUMAN RIGHTS DAMAGES.....	189
I. Protection of the Public and Human Rights Damages: The Approach in <i>Anufrijeva</i>	189
A. The Public Interest Theory of Public Law.....	190
B. The Public Interest Theory and Human Rights Damages	193
C. Understanding the Public Interest Theory as a Product of Its Time.....	198
II. Individual Rights and the Public Interest Theory of Public Law	199
A. Individual Rights versus Public Duties, Individual Interests versus Public Interests.....	200
B. Rights versus Public Duties: The Role of the Court	209
C. Public Law and Private Law: The Procedural Dimension	212
III. Conclusion: Slaying Chimaera	218
IV. Is the Public Interest Approach the Only ‘Public Law’ Approach?	220

**Part 3: Alternative Approaches to Damages for
Human Rights Breaches**

Introduction	228
I. The Case Law Under the Act	229
II. Context: No Other Remedy	233
5. Human Rights Damages and ‘Just Satisfaction’: The ‘Mirror’ Approach.....	235
SECTION 1. THE TERMS OF THE HRA.....	238
I. Principles or Practice?.....	241
A. Quantum.....	244
II. A Section 2(1) Analogy?	245
III. The ‘Ordinary’ Approach	250
SECTION 2. THE SUPRANATIONAL DIMENSION	252
I. Supranational versus Domestic Context	252
A. No Strasbourg Imperative	252
B. The Subsidiary Role of the European Court of Human Rights	254
C. The Conceptual Nature of Convention Rights: International Law versus Domestic Law.....	258
D. The Supranational Context	261
E. The English Courts’ (Lack of) Consideration of the Distinctiveness of Supranational Context	263
F. Compliance with Convention Requirements	266

II. Problematic Jurisprudences: Supranational and Municipal	268
A. The Supranational Jurisprudence	269
B. Limited Guidance.....	275
C. Emergence of a Problematic Domestic Jurisprudence	279
i. Problems of Reasoning	280
ii. Problems of Broad Discretion: Subjective Concerns and Inconsistency	286
iii. Quantum	288
iv. Incoherence	290
D. Supplementing Strasbourg.....	292
SECTION 3. THE METHODOLOGY OF THE MIRROR APPROACH.....	297
I. A Problematic Method	297
II. Quantum.....	301
III. Inconsistent Method and the Risk of Skewed Interpretation	303
IV. '[O]ne Damn Thing after Another'	307
SECTION 4. THE FUTURE OF THE MIRROR APPROACH POST-FAULKNER	310
I. Delphic Dicta	310
II. Beginnings of a Liberalisation of Approach?	313
III. A British Bill of Rights?	319
SECTION 5. OVERVIEW	321
6. Interest-Balancing Approaches.....	324
SECTION 1: DOCTRINAL ANALYSIS OF THE INTEREST-BALANCING APPROACH.....	326
I. The Interest-Balancing Approach and the Terms of the HRA	326
II. The Interest-Balancing Approach and Convention Requirements	330
A. Requirements of Article 13 (and Articles 34 and 35(1))	331
B. Substantive Rights and Remedies	334
C. Absolute Nature of Article 13	335
D. Proportionality.....	336
III. The Interest-Balancing Approach and Fundamental Principles of English Law	337
A. <i>Ubi Ius, Ibi Remedium</i>	337
B. The Principle of Equality.....	340

SECTION 2: NORMATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE INTEREST-BALANCING APPROACH.....	342
I. Concerns that may Justify an Interest-Balancing Approach	343
II. The Importance of Remediating Rights-Violations	345
III. Prejudice to the Public Interest: Only in Public Law?.....	353
IV. Is the Interest-Balancing Approach Necessary?	355
V. Public Interest Factors: A Critical Analysis	361
A. Depletion of Resources Available to Benefit the Wider Community	363
i. The Importance of a Robust, Evidence-Based Approach.....	367
ii. Constitutional, Institutional and Practical Concerns	370
iii. Financial Impact in Other Parts of Public Law.....	372
B. Moral Status of the Victim	375
C. Pragmatic Political Concerns.....	380
D. Chilling Effects.....	382
i. An Empirical Void	382
ii. Empirical Evidence and Difficulties of Prediction	383
iii. Limitations of Courts	389
E. Floodgates and ‘Litigation Culture’	390
F. Leaving the Political Branches to Respond: Is it Realistic?	397
i. Case Studies.....	399
VI. Rule-of-Law and Other Concerns Raised by the Discretionary Nature of the Interest-Balancing Approach	405
VII. Refining the Interest-Balancing Approach.....	409
A. Individual versus Public: Avoiding a False Dichotomy.....	409
B. Starting-Point, Structure and Weighting of Factors	418
SECTION 3. CONCLUSIONS	423
7. Other Methods of Limiting Human Rights Damages.....	426
I. Degree of Loss Under Article 41, ECHR	427
II. EU Law, <i>Francovich</i> Liability and the ‘Sufficiently Serious’ Criterion	433
A. The <i>Francovich</i> Criteria	434

B.	Should the <i>Francovich</i> Criteria Govern Human Rights Damages?	435
i.	Different Interests	435
ii.	A Marginal Remedy	437
iii.	Range of Institutions Potentially Liable	438
iv.	Different Contexts: EU Law versus Domestic Human Rights Law	438
C.	Conclusion	445
III.	Immunities from Suit in US Constitutional Tort Law.....	446
A.	The Importance of Context	447
i.	Constitutional Concerns	448
ii.	Widespread Governmental and Official Immunities	451
iii.	Relevant Defendant	456
iv.	Instrumentalist Conception of Liability	458
B.	The Qualified Immunity Doctrine	460
i.	The 'Clearly Established' Element.....	460
ii.	The 'Objective Reasonableness' Element	463
iii.	Avoidance of Substantive Constitutional Issues.....	466
C.	Conclusion	468
8.	Conclusion	470
	<i>Index</i>	477