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Models of Judicial Review: Dispute Resolution v. Application of the Law

- EU, Roman Law “Application of the Law” - Actio popularis
- Canada: Moderated Standing
- Why is PIS more associated with Constitutional, not Admin law?
Myth #1: It All started with the *Charter*

- From municipal law to constitutional law (*Thorson*, 1975) and back to administrative law (*Finlay*, 1986)
- Right to litigate “in the stead” of the municipality
- Problem: origins allow much wider relief: *MacIlreith v Hart* (1908)
Myth #2: Courts are Overrun by Public Interest Litigants

• “The idle and whimsical plaintiff, a dilettante who litigates for a lark, is a specter which haunts the legal literature, not the courtroom” *Canada v. Downtown Eastside* (2012) para 28, Prof K.E. Scott.

• PI Litigants still must demonstrate “serious issue”, “genuine interest” & “reasonable means”. Why?

• Who is in the best position to prove elements? Reverse onus: NZ Law Comm.
Myth #3: Constitutional Standing is about “Ultimate Rightness”

• Admin law PIS would therefore be more technical and weaker

• Yet “the three factors should not be viewed as items on a checklist or as technical requirements. Instead, the factors should be seen as interrelated considerations to be weighed cumulatively, not individually, and in light of their purposes.” Downtown Eastside, para 36.

• Quality v. Nature of the Arguments
Difficulty #1: Public Interest Issues are Complex

- Individual v. Decisions of General Application
- *(Finlay, 1986 – Oldman River, 1992)*
- The respondents “have the capacity to undertake this litigation. The Society is a well-organized association with considerable expertise” *Downtown Eastside*, para 74.
Difficulty #2: Time is *Not* on Your Side

- Ongoing v. Instantaneous Obligations (30 - 90 days)
- “The precipitation of premature applications on incomplete evidence is hardly desirable.”
  Time limits in judicial review applications should not provoke a litigant “into ill-advised hyperactivity.”

Difficulty #3: Substance Dictates Standing and Timing

• “It depends on the nature of the issues raised and whether the court has sufficient material before it” Finlay para 16.

• LeBlanc et al. v. Moncton (City) et al., 2013 NBQB 236.
Conclusion

• PIS poses greater problems when directed at administrative decisions of general application.
• PI litigation is still perceived as an “attack” on government.
• “Imagine a culture where an argument is viewed [not as war but] as a dance, the participants are seen as performers, and the goal is to perform in a balanced and aesthetically pleasing way.” Lakoff, *Metaphores we Live By*. 