

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05166-9 - English Civil Justice After the Woolf and Jackson Reforms:

A Critical Analysis

John Sorabji

Index

[More information](#)

INDEX

Note: Court cases and documents are in italics.

- access to justice
 Woolf Reforms' overriding objective 216–17
 Woolf Reports 166–7
 Woolf's new theory of justice 165–82, 256–7
- active case management 184–7
 introduction 28, 145–6, 156
 Jackson recommendations 244
 lacking in rigour 230
 post-1999 failures 202–5, 209–11
 rule-compliance 146
 structural changes per Woolf Reforms 184–5
 United States 203–4, 209–11
see also procedural case tracks
- adjective law
 reform per Bentham 80–2
 requirements for redesigning 81–2
- administration of equity 38
- administration of justice, a continuous process 255
- Adoko v Jemal* 172
- adversarial litigation culture as result of RSC 185–6
- amendment of pleadings proposal by Common Law Commission 54–5
- Aon Rusk Services Australia Ltd v Australian National University* 232–4
- APIL
 concern re procedural case tracks 191–3
 response of Woolf Reforms 193–6
- Appeal Court *see* Court of Appeal
- appellate process, equity 42, 58
Arbuthnot Latham Bank Ltd v Trafalgar Holdings Ltd 171
Arrow Nominees Inc & Another v Blackledge & Others 178–80
- Association of Personal Injury Lawyers *see* APIL
- Attorney-General v Cooper* 44–5, 60
- Australia, distributive justice 232–4
- B v B* 125–30, 162n5
- Beachley Property Limited v Edgar* 115, 169–72
- Beeching Report, delays 148–9
- Bentham, Jeremy 75–100
 English legal system critique 75, 78–9, 81
- Bentham's theory of justice 76
 abolition of common law 80
 adjective law reform 80–2
 comparison with traditional theory 96–8
 comparison with Woolf's new theory of justice 164
 concluding analysis 98
 contrasted with RSC's theory of justice 161–2
 effective enforcement of substantive justice 83–4
 evidence presentation 90–1
 felicific calculus 91–3, 95–6, 98, 212, 241
 hierarchical structure 97–8
 problems 94–100, 241, 250

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05166-9 - English Civil Justice After the Woolf and Jackson Reforms:

A Critical Analysis

John Sorabji

Index

[More information](#)

260

INDEX

- Bentham's theory of justice (cont.)
 procedural law policy aims 76
 role of substantive justice 96–7
 substantive law reform 79–80
 unworkable 96
 utilitarian critique 76–9
 utility 97–8
 warning for Woolf Reforms 96, 100
- binary system of civil justice system 14
Birkett v James 69–71
- book overview 1–5, 9, 257–8
- Brooke, LJ 125, 133, *see also Hannigan v Hannigan & Others; Sayers v Clarke-Walker; Thurrock Borough Council v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport & the Regions*
- canon law, origins of equity 40–1
- Cantley Committee 19
- 'cards on the table' approach to litigation 20
- Carswell, Lord 224–5
- case management *see* active case management
- CFA reform 202
- Chancery Court 38
 as Court of Conscience 40–1, 44
 not fit for purpose 32–3
Charlesworth v Relay Road Ltd & Others 173
- civil courts *see* courts
- Civil Justice Review (1988) 19–20, 24
- civil justice system
 binary system 14
 Civil Justice Review (1988) 19–20, 24
- common law formalism 34–8, 47, 68
- complexity problems 12–24, 55, 69–70
- composition 9–10
- consensual denial of substantive justice 186–7
- cost problems 12–24, 69–70, 148–50, 158
- crisis overview 9–30
 critique per Bentham 75, 78–9, 81
- delay problems 12–24, 69–70, 85–6,
see also delays
- early settlement 26
- external questions for reformers 23–4, 26
- functions 11–12
- general processes 11–12
- House of Lords 180–2, 224–5
- internal questions for reformers 23–4
- Jackson Review 201–5
- Judicature Commission 13–14, 18–19, 24
- limited resources 163, 166, 168–9
- party-control/court-control of litigation 151
- post-Woolf 187, 201–5
- proportionate justice
see proportionate justice
- purpose 9–12
- reform failures 12–21, 33, 50, 59
- reforming Commissions from 1820s to 1870s 12–14
- reforms *see* reform
- Rules of the Supreme Court *see* RSC
- structural reforms per Woolf 182–4, 197–9
- substantive justice reappraised 26
- Tildesley* test *see* *Tildesley* test
- vexation 85–6
- civil justice systems, differences in 11
- Civil Procedure Rules *see* CPR
- Civil Procedure (The White Book)* 118, 124, 127–31
- Clarapede & Co v Commercial Union Association* 63
- Cobbold v Greenwich LBC* 226
- code of judicial procedure 81–2
- collective proportionality 167–9, 214
 House of Lords 180–2
 per CPR 1.1(2)(e) & (f) and CPR 3.9 (1)(b) 247–9
 problems 243–4, 246
 solutions 246–53
- Collier v Williams* 237
- Collins v The Vestry of Paddington* 63

- Commissioners of Customs and Excise v Eastwood Care Homes* 124
- Commissions from 1820s to 1870s for civil justice system reform 12–14
- common law
- Bentham's abolition of 80
 - evolution 31–2
 - formalism 34–8, 47, 68
 - link with procedural law 34–8
 - reform of *see* common law reform
 - rule-compliance 34–8, 43–4
 - triumph of equity over 56–68
- Common Law Commission, amendment of pleadings proposal 54–5
- common law courts 14
- not fit for purpose 32–3
- Common Law Procedure Act 1852, s. 222 55, 61, 65
- common law reform 46–56
- 1873 reforms 59–60
 - Hilary Term Rules 50, 53
 - post-1852 55–6
 - pre-1873 reforms 52, 68
 - single form of writ 49, 57
 - see also* reform
- Compagnie Financière du Pacifique v Peruvian Guano Company* 57
- complacency in procedure 69–72, 115, 164
- complete justice
- applied in practice 60–2
 - equity 40–6, 48, 68
 - joinder of issues and parties 54, 57
 - post-1873 56–67
 - Second Common Law Commission 53–6
- complexity problems of civil justice system 12–24, 55, 69–70
- composition of civil justice system 9–10
- conditional fee agreements reform 202
- constitutional purpose of courts 143, 159
- cost minimisation 150–60, 184–5
- cost problems
- civil justice system 12–24, 69–70, 148–50, 158
 - Lownds* test 242–3
 - Lownds* test replaced 251–2
 - Woolf Reports 149–50, 152–5
- cost-benefit analysis
- per Bentham 89
 - per Jackson Review 168–86
- costs
- management and budgeting 251
 - proportionate costs rule per Jackson Reforms 251–3
 - subordinate to utility 86–7, 97–8
 - see also* cost minimisation; cost problems
- Court of Appeal
- case management lacking in rigour 230
 - CPR's overriding objective 119–30
 - post-CPR introduction 230–1
 - post-Jackson introduction 231–2, 234–5
 - post-RSC introduction 230
 - post-*Tildesley* change in approach 173–82, 224–6
 - strict approach consequences 238–9
 - Tildesley* test 64–6, 171–6
 - traditionalist interpretation 203
 - UK Supreme Court support 239
 - see* individual cases
- Court of Conscience 40–1, 44
- courts
- case management *see* active case management
 - constitutional purpose 143, 159
 - duty under CPR 122, 171–2
 - equity 14, 32, *see also* Chancery Court
 - IT 144–5
 - judgment enforcement 83–4
 - litigation management 28
 - new theory of justice challenges 253–4
 - seeking the truth 138–9
 - utility as aim 82, 88
 - 'weakness of will' 209–11
 - see also* common law courts

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05166-9 - English Civil Justice After the Woolf and Jackson Reforms:
A Critical Analysis

John Sorabji

Index

[More information](#)

262

INDEX

- Courts and Legal Services Act 1990 20
- CPR
- court's duty 122, 171–2
 - introduction 117, 230–1
 - r. 1.1(2)(c) 249, 251
 - r. 1.1(2)(e) and (f) 247–9
 - r. 3.9 124, 126–31, 244–6
 - r. 3.9, *Tildesley* test 128
 - r. 3.9(1)(a) 249
 - r. 3.9(1)(b) 247–9
 - r. 44.3(5) 249, 252
 - reform requirements 202
- CPR's overriding objective 108
- Court of Appeal 119–30, 230–1
 - economy and efficiency 113–14, 118–19, 128–9
 - implementation post-1999 117
 - litigants' duty to assist court 123
 - per D. Greenslade 114
 - proportionality 113, 118–19, 128–30, 214
 - revised 214
 - rule 1 102–3, 118, 147–8, 214
 - textbook writers' flawed understanding 117–19
 - three philosophies 130–1
 - to deal with cases justly 113–14, 118
 - traditional 112–17
 - traditionalist interpretation 111–12, 131–4
 - Zuckerman 141–2
- Cropper v Smith* 64, 118
- Daniels v Thompson* 179
- Dehn, Conrad 220
- delays
- Beeching Report 148–9
 - minimisation per Woolf Reforms 158–60, 184–5
 - problem of civil justice system 12–24, 69–70, 85–6
 - Tildesley* test 163
 - utility 86–7, 97–8
 - Woolf Reports 148–9, 152–5
- Department of Transport v Chris Smaller (Transport) Ltd* 129–30
- discovery 152–3
- United States 210
- distributive justice
- Australia 232–4
 - prevailing over individual justice 250
- disutility 84, 86–7
- drafting, substantive law per Bentham 79–80
- early settlement, civil justice system 26
- economy and efficiency
- CPR's overriding objective 113–14, 118–19, 128–9
 - Woolf Reforms 88, 148–50, 157, 198
 - Woolf's new theory of justice 148–50, 213, 256
 - see also* procedural case tracks
- ends of justice
- as utility 82
 - collateral 84–7
 - collateral contrasted with direct 85
 - competition between two ends 89–93
 - direct end 83–5, 89–90
 - positive and negative 82
 - roles of collateral 85–6, 88–9
- enforcement requirement of court judgments 83–4
- equality *see* principle of equality
- equity
- administration 38
 - appellate process 42, 58
 - canon law origins 40–1
 - complete justice 40–6, 48, 68
 - courts 14, 32, *see also* Chancery Court
 - delegation of authority to Lord Chancellor 38
 - evidence procurement 41, 57–8
 - formalism 43–4, 47
 - interrogatory 41
 - petitions 39
 - pre-trial and trial process 38, 58
 - procedural devices absent from common law process 41
 - procedural and substantive law distinct 38–9

- procedure 38–9, 42–6
 procedure approach to be universal 57–8
 rectification mechanism 42, 44
 rule-compliance 42–7, 73
 triumph over common law 56–67
 Evershed Committee 17–19
 Evershed, Sir Raymond 17
 evidence
 Bentham's approach to presentation of 90–1
 expert 154
 procurement in equity 41, 57–8
 witness 153–4
 expert evidence 154
 external questions for reformers 23–4, 26–7

 fairness, substantive justice 125, 130
 Federal Rules of Procedure 210–11
 felicific calculus
 Bentham's theory of justice 91–3, 98, 212, 241, 244
 questions unanswered 95–6
 felicific fallacy, Woolf's new theory of justice 212–13
Ferrand v The Mayor, Alderman and Burgesses of Bradford 45, 60–1, 230
 First Common Law Commission 49, 53
 formalism
 common law 34–8, 47, 55, 67
 equity 43–4, 47
Frydender v France 166
 functions of civil justice system 11–12

Gale v Superdrug Stores Plc 174–5, 223–4
Glass v Surrendran 237
 Gorell Committee 16
 Greenslade, D 114
Grovit v Doctor 171

Hannigan v Hannigan & Others 119–23
 Hanworth Commission 16–17
 Hanycz, C. 192–3

 happiness or pleasure, utility 94–5
Harkness v Bell's Asbestos & Engineering Ltd 66–7
Hashtroodi v Hancock 136, 236–8, 247–8
 Heilbron and Hodge Report 20, 25–7
 hierarchical structure in Bentham's theory of justice 97–8
 High Court of Australia 232–4, 236
 Hilary Term Rules 50, 53, 59, 231
Hoddinott & Others v Persimmon Homes (Wessex) Ltd 238–9
 Hoffmann, Lord 180–2
 Hong Kong Reforms 221–3
 House of Lords
 individual and collective proportionality 180–2
 proportionality ignored 224–5

 implementation, Woolf's new theory of justice 115–17, 229–41, 243–4
Indigo Company v Ogilvy 64–6
 individual justice, subordinate to distributive justice 250
 individual proportionality 167, 169, 214
 embedded in management of claims 251
 House of Lords 180–2
 Jackson Review 168–86
 per CPR 1.1(2)(c), CPR 3.9(1)(a) and CPR 44.3(5) 249
 problems 242–3
 secondary to collective 247
 information technology *see* IT
 internal questions for reformers 23–4
 interrogatory, in equity 41
 Introductory View of the Rationale of Judicial Evidence 91
 irreparable prejudice 126–7
 Issacharoff, S 194–6, 217
 IT
 courts 144–5
 substantive justice 144–5
 Woolf Reforms recommendations 144–5

- Jackson Reforms
 active case management 244
 Court of Appeal's contribution
 231–2, 234–5
 CPR r. 3.9 244–6
 implementation time 231–2
 proportionate costs rule 251–3
 Victorian approach replication
 229–41
- Jackson Review 133
 cost–benefit analysis 168–86
 individual proportionality 168–86
 post-Woolf crisis in civil justice
 201–5
 recommendations 205, 244
- Jackson, Sir Rupert 201–2
- joinder of new parties 54, 57
- JSC BTA Bank v Solodchenko* 226,
 229
- judgment enforcement, need for
 effective 83–4
- Judicature Acts 1873–75 14
- Judicature Commission 102
 civil justice system 13–14, 18–19, 24
 different approach from Woolf 103
- justice
 access to *see* access to justice
 administration a continuous process
 255
 ends of *see* ends of justice
 proportionate per Woolf Reforms
 136–7, 197–9
 utility 82
 wider public interest 215–17
- Kuhn, T. 22–4, 27–8
 scientific revolutions 208
- Kurtz v Spence* 70
- Leeson v Marsden* 237–8
- Legal Aid, Sentencing and Punishment
 of Offenders Act 2012 202
- Letpak v Harris* 171–2
- Lightman J 124
- litigants
 duty to assist court 123
 excessively adversarial culture
 185–6
- principle of equality 166
 proportionate share of resources
 181
- litigation
 management by courts 28
 satellite 70–3, 146
- Longmore LJ 126–30
- Lord Chancellor, delegation of
 authority 38
- Lownds* test 242–3
Lownds test replaced 251–2
Lownds v Home Office 242–3
- Magna Carta (1215) 12, 37, 85
- Mark II overriding objective 214
- maximisation, utility 83–7, 90, 97
- May, Sir Anthony 135, 157
- means and end confusion 48–9
- Middleton Report* 21
- Mill, J.S., utilitarian standard of
 happiness 77
- Millett LJ 115–17, 174–5, 223–4
- minimisation
 cost and delay reforms 150–60,
 184–5
 resource use 168–9
- Moevao v Department of Labour* 255
- Mortgage Corporation v Sandoes*
 114–15
 appeal 115–17, 171
- Moy v Pettman Smith (a firm)* 224–5
- Neuberger J 173–8
- Neuberger, Lord, MR 251–2
- NML Capital Ltd v Argentina* 229
- Nosal v Ukraine* 166
- Nottinghamshire and City of
 Nottingham Fire Authority v
 Gladman Commercial
 Properties* 226–9
- Ontario, RSC's overriding objective
 comparison 109–11, 197–9
- overriding objectives
 CPR *see* CPR's overriding objective
 general 108–11, 162n5, 197
 Mark II 214
 RSC *see* RSC's overriding objective

- Rules of Civil Procedure for the Ontario Superior Court of Justice and Court of Appeal 109, 111
- South Australian Supreme Court Rules 108–9, 111
- US Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 108–11
- Woolf Reforms *see* Woolf Reforms' overriding objective
- overviews
 - of book 1–5, 9, 257–8
 - of crisis in civil justice 9–30
 - of Woolf Reforms 130–4, 255–7
- Peel Commission 16–17
- petitions, equity 39
- pleadings simplified under RSC 59, 62–7, *see also* RSC (1875) Ord 27 r.1
- pleasure or happiness, utility 94–5
- pre-trial and trial process, equity 38
- principle of equality 165–6, 198
 - collective aspect 166–7
 - litigants 166
 - Woolf's new theory of justice 165–82, 256–7
- principle of utility 76
 - application in substantive law reform 79–80
- principles
 - for implementation of Woolf Reforms 115–17
 - Woolf's new theory of justice 102–5, 213
- Principles of Judicial Procedure* 92
- problems
 - Bentham's theory of justice 94–100, 241, 250
 - collective proportionality 243–4, 246
 - complexity in civil justice system 12–24, 55, 69–70
 - delay in civil justice system 12–24, 69–70, 85–6
 - delivery of substantive justice 32–3, 36–8, 68
 - individual proportionality 242–3
 - proportionate justice application 207–54
 - utilitarianism 94–5
 - vexation 85–6
 - Woolf's new theory of justice
 - implementation 207–13, 242
 - see also* cost problems
- procedural case tracks 188
 - allocation criteria 188–9
 - APIL's concern 191–3
 - fast track 188–9
 - multi-track track 188–90
 - overriding objective per Woolf Reforms 195–6
 - small claims track 188–90
- procedural complacency 69–72, 115, 164
- procedural default
 - relief from consequences 72, *see also* RSC Ord.59; *Tildesley* test
 - RSC's theory of justice 212
- procedural justice, substantive justice attainment 220–9, 256
- procedural law
 - confused with substantive law 48–9
 - link to substantive law 34–8
 - policy aims per Bentham 76
 - separation from substantive law 48–53, 57
 - trumped by substantive justice 220–9
- procedural reforms, minimising cost and delay 150–7, 159–60
- procedure
 - devices in equity 41
 - reform always inevitable 21–2
 - role in common law 34–8
 - role in equity 38–9, 42–6
 - processes of a civil justice system 11–12
- proportionality
 - collective *see* collective proportionality
 - CPR's overriding objective 113, 118–19, 128–30, 214
 - ignored by House of Lords 224–5

- proportionality (cont.)
 individual *see* individual
 proportionality
 procedural case tracks 188
 structural 182–4
 substantive justice 168–82
 Supreme Court of Canada 235
 United States 210
 Woolf Reports 167–8, 198
 Woolf’s new theory of justice
 165–82, 213, 242, 257
- proportionality test 175–6
- proportionate costs rule, Jackson
 Reforms 251–3
- proportionate justice
 applications problems 207–54
 education 214
 promotion of 187
 rejection of 211, 220–9
 structural reforms 182–4, 197–9
 Woolf’s new theory of justice 136–7,
 164–5, 169–82, 197–9
- Provisions of Oxford 50
- Ptolemaic astronomy 22, 24
- Purdy v Cambran* 175
- Rastin v British Steel Plc* 148
- Re Coles and Ravenshear* 60
- Re Pritchard (deceased)* 66
- rectification mechanism, equity
 42, 44
- reform
 adjective law 80–2
 applying principle of utility 79–80
 approached on false basis 22–3
 as inevitable 21–2
 failures in civil justice system 12–21,
 33, 50, 59
 internal and external questions
 23–4
 minimising cost and delay 150–7,
 184–5
 structural and procedural 150–7
 structural proportionality in civil
 justice system 182–4
 time and effort requirements for
 204
see also common law reform
- rejectionist approach
 Woolf Reforms 220–9
 Woolf’s new theory of justice 208,
 220–30
- relief from consequences of procedural
 default 72, *see also* RSC Ord.59;
Tildesley test
- resource allocation, substantive justice
 168–9, 180–2
- revolutionary view, Woolf’s new theory
 of justice 208
- RSC
 adversarial litigation culture 185–6
 common law and equity as sources
 14–16, 46–56
 complexity, cost and delay 14–16
 continuity with the past 47–8,
 204–5
 equity’s approach to substantive
 justice adopted 46–56,
 69–70
 introduction 33, 230
 Ord. 27 r. 1 61–7
 Ord. 59 61–4, 66–7
 overriding objectives 60–2, 69, 73,
 109–11, 197–9
 pleadings simplified 59, 62–7,
 see also RSC (1875) Ord 27 r.1
 post-Woolf 204–5
 satellite litigation 70–3, 146
 simpler approach to procedural rules
 14–16, 59
Tildesley test 67, 117
 trial process 58
 triumph of complete justice 56–67
- RSC’s overriding objective 60–2, 69, 73,
 109–11, 197–9
 aim vs. excessive cost and delay 73
 justice prevailing over rule
 compliance 60–2, 69
 Ontario, South Australia and US
 comparison 109–11, 197–9
- RSC’s theory of justice
 contrasted with Bentham’s theory of
 justice 161–2
 endorsed by Court of Appeal 174,
 230
 individualistic form of justice 161–4

- procedural non-compliance 212
- replaced with proportionate justice 136
- substantive justice's privileged status 140
- Woolf Reforms' proposals 150–7
- Woolf Reports 162–3
- Zuckerman 140
- rule-compliance
 - active case management 146
 - common law 34–8, 43–4
 - equity 42–7, 73
- Rules of Civil Procedure for the Ontario Superior Court of Justice and Court of Appeal, overriding objectives 109, 111
- Rules of the Supreme Court *see* RSC
- St Aldwyn Committee 16
- satellite litigation, RSC 70–3, 146
- Savings & Investment Bank Ltd v Fincken* 180
- Sayers v Clarke-Walker* 123–5
- Second Common Law Commission 51–3
 - amendment of pleadings proposal 54–5
 - complete justice 53–6
 - joinder of new parties proposal 54
- Securum Finance Ltd v Ashton* 180
- Smith, Peter J 226–9
- Smith v Barker* 45–6, 60
- South Australia, RSC's overriding objective comparison 109–11, 197–9
- South Australian Supreme Court
 - Rules, overriding objectives 108–9, 111
- Statute of Westminster, second 50
- Steward v North Metropolitan Tramways Company* 64
- structural proportionality 182–4
- structural reforms
 - minimising cost and delay 150–7, 159–60, 184–5
 - proportionate justice 182–4, 197–9
- substantive justice
 - a subordinate aim 75–6, 97–8
 - adoption by the RSC 46–56
 - APIL's concerns 191–3
 - attainment through procedural justice 220–9, 256
 - Bentham's theory of justice 96–7
 - consensual denial of 186–7
 - contrary to Woolf Reforms 115–17, 119
 - effective enforcement per Bentham 83–4
 - fairness 125, 130
 - IT 144–5
 - limited in Woolf's new theory of justice 256–7
 - problems in delivery of 32–3, 36–8, 68
 - procedural case tracks 188
 - proportionality 168–82
 - proportionate justice promotion 187
 - proportionate justice rejection 211, 220–9
 - reappraisal 26
 - resource allocation 168–9, 180–2
 - sacrificed per Woolf Reforms 195–6, 198
 - seeking the truth 138–9
 - structural changes per Woolf Reforms 184–5
 - Tildesley test see Tildesley test*
 - trumping procedural law 220–9
 - United States 209–11
 - utility-maximisation tempered 93
 - Woolf Reforms 137–8, 143–8, 159–60
 - Zuckerman 139–43
- substantive law
 - drafting per Bentham 79–80
 - link to procedural law 34–8
 - not self-executing 80–1
 - redesign requirements 81
 - reform per Bentham 79–80
 - separation from procedural law 48–53, 57
 - utility value 79, 98
- Supreme Court of Canada, individual and collective proportionality 235

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05166-9 - English Civil Justice After the Woolf and Jackson Reforms:

A Critical Analysis

John Sorabji

Index

[More information](#)

268

INDEX

- Sutradhar v Natural Environment Research Council* 180–2, 191
- Swain-Mason & Others v Mills & Reeve LLP* 225–6, 229
- Swift Committee 16
- The White Book* 118, 124, 127–31
- theories of justice
- Bentham *see* Bentham's theory of justice
 - RSC *see* RSC's theory of justice
 - Woolf *see* Woolf's theory of justice
- Thermaware v Linton* 176
- Three Rivers District Council and Others v Governor and Company of the Bank of England (No 3)* 136, 234
- Thurrock Borough Council v Secretary of State for the Environment, Transport & the Regions* 122–3
- Tildesley test 163–4
- Court of Appeal decisions 64–6, 171–6
 - CPR r. 3.9 128
 - delays 163
 - practical means guidance 235–6
 - procedural complacency 69–71, 115, 164
 - repudiated 169–71
 - RSC by 1965 67
 - RSC rules undermined 117
 - securing substantive justice 163–4
 - time to set up 231
- Tildesley v Harper* 62
- traditionalist interpretation
- CPR's overriding objective 111–12, 131–4
 - of Court of Appeal 203
- traditionalists
- education of 214
 - Woolf's new theory of justice 207, 218–20
- trial and pre-trial process, equity 58
- UCB Corporate Services Ltd v Halifax (SW) Ltd (UCB)* 172–3
- UK Supreme Court, support for Court of Appeal 239
- United States
- case management 203–4, 209–11
 - discovery 210
 - proportionality 210
 - RSC's overriding objective
 - comparison 109–11, 197–9
 - substantive justice 209–11
 - US Federal Courts, use of sanctions 209–11
 - US Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, overriding objectives 108–11
 - utilitarian critique, Bentham 76–9
 - utilitarianism 77–8
 - direct 77
 - discretionary and non-discretionary approaches 90
 - indirect 77–8
 - problems with 94–5
 - utility
 - as aim of courts 82, 88
 - as justice 82
 - disutility 84, 86–7
 - in Bentham's theory of justice 97–8
 - in hierarchical structure 97–8
 - maximisation 83–7, 90, 97
 - maximisation tempered 93
 - pleasure/happiness 94–5
 - prevailing over delays 86–7, 97–8
 - principle of *see* principle of utility
 - vexation 86–7, 97–8
 - utility value 79, 98
- vexation 84
- problem of civil justice system 85–6
 - subordinate to utility 86–7, 97–8
- Victorian and post-Jackson authorities compared 229–41
- Vinos v Marks & Spencer Plc* 238
- Waller LJ 176–8, 198
- Ward LJ 178–9
- welfare-hedonism 76
- 'wider public interest', justice 215–17
- Willis v Nicholson* 242–3
- Winn Committee 19
- witness evidence 153–4
- Woods v Chaleff & Ors* 172

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05166-9 - English Civil Justice After the Woolf and Jackson Reforms:
A Critical Analysis

John Sorabji

Index

[More information](#)

INDEX

269

- Woolf, Lord 169–71
- Woolf Reforms 28–30
 - active case management structural changes 184–5
 - APIL's concerns re procedural case tracks 191–3, 195–6
 - continued commitment to substantive justice 144–8, 159–60
 - delays 158–60, 184–5
 - economy and efficiency 88, 148–50, 157, 198
 - implementation through ten principles 115–17
 - implementation time 231
 - international reception 221–3
 - IT recommendations 144–5
 - minimising cost problems 158–60, 184–5
 - overview 130–4, 255–7
 - post-Woolf civil justice review 29–30
 - proportionate justice theory 136–7, 197–9
 - rejectionist approach 220–9
 - substantive justice 137–8, 143–8, 159–60
 - substantive justice misunderstood 115–17, 119
 - success or failure 201–5
 - warning from Bentham's theory of justice 96, 100
 - see also* CPR's overriding objective; Woolf Reforms overriding objective
- Woolf Reforms' overriding objective
 - cost and delay minimisation 150–60, 184–5
 - economy and efficiency 88, 148–50, 157, 198
 - equitable access to justice 216–17
 - procedural case tracks 188
 - specific aims 165
 - substantive justice 137–8, 143–4, 195–6
 - wider public interest 215–17
- Woolf Reports 20, 24, 73–4, 146–7
 - access to justice 166–7
 - cost 149–50, 152–5
 - delays 148–9, 152–5
 - expert evidence 154
 - procedural case tracks 188
 - proportionality 167–8, 198
 - RSC's theory of justice 162–3
 - structural reforms 182–4
 - witness evidence 153–4
- Woolf Review* 27–30
- Woolf's new theory of justice
 - access to justice 165–82, 256–7
 - and Judicature Commissioners' approach 103
 - articulation requirements 234–6
 - challenges for courts 253–4
 - comparison with Bentham's theory of justice 164
 - cost 149–50, 152–5
 - delays 148–9, 152–5
 - economy and efficiency 148–50, 157, 213, 256
 - equality and proportionality 165–82, 256–7
 - expert evidence 154
 - felicific fallacy 212–13
 - implementation 115–17, 229–41, 243–4
 - implementation problems 207–13, 242
 - introduction 101–5, 107–12, 161–5, 256
 - IT recommendations 144–5
 - lack of understanding 207–8, 214
 - post-1999 case management failures 202–5, 209–11
 - principles 102–5, 213
 - proportionality 165–82, 213, 242, 257
 - proportionate justice 136–7, 164–5, 169–82, 197–9
 - recognition and rejection 208
 - rejectionist approach 208, 220–30
 - revolutionary view 208
 - substantive justice 115–17, 119
 - absent as overriding objective 137–9, 143–4
 - as continued commitment 144–8, 159–60
 - limited 256–7

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05166-9 - English Civil Justice After the Woolf and Jackson Reforms:

A Critical Analysis

John Sorabji

Index

[More information](#)

270

INDEX

- Woolf's new theory of justice (cont.)
 traditionalist view 207, 218–20,
 229–30
 two interpretations 105
 witness evidence 153–4
- Worldwide Corporation Limited v GPT Ltd* 176–8, 226
- Zander, Michael 201–5
- Zuckerman, A.
- analysis of Woolf Reforms'
 overriding objective 138, 142
 court's 'weakness of will' 209–11
 CPR's overriding objective 141–2
 discovery 152
 revised CPR r. 3.9 246–7
 RSC's theory of justice flawed
 140
 substantive justice 139–43
 traditional theory 142–3