

# Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	vii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xi
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xvii
1 Introduction	1
I. The Relevant Scenarios	3
II. Definitional Difficulties	7
III. The Original Legal Entrenchment of the Doctrine and the Underlying Rationale	10
IV. The Possibility of General Principles and Interpretational Methodology	14
V. The Purposive Nature of The Separation of Powers Doctrine	29
VI. The Problem of Definition and the Formalist Approach	37
VII. Core Branch Functions?	40
2 Legislative Interference in the Pending Case Scenario: The Foundation of Principle and the Australian Position	57
I. Introduction	57
II. The Australian Constitutional Position and the Early Australian Constitutional Scholars	57
III. Early Development of Principle by the High Court	65
IV. The Foundation of a Discrete Set of Principles Governing the Pending Case Scenario: <i>Liyanage v R</i>	67
V. Consolidation of Principle Post- <i>Liyanage</i>	74
VI. The Direction Rule at the Crossroads: <i>Nicholas v The Queen</i>	90
VII. The Uncertain Status of the Direction Principle in Australia	113
3 Legislative Interference with Judicial Functions: The Jurisprudence of the United States, Evaluation of Principle, and Towards Resolution	117
I. Introduction	117
II. The Emergence of the Changed Law Rule and the Direction Principle in the United States	121
III. <i>Klein</i> and Its Uncertain Meaning	124
IV. Hart's Thesis and the United States Foundation of the Direction Principle	131
V. The Decline of the Direction Rule: The <i>Robertson</i> Case	135
VI. <i>Robertson's</i> Uncertain Legacy: <i>Plaut v Spendthrift Farm Inc</i>	145

## x Contents

VII.	<i>Klein</i> Qualified, Overruled or Misinterpreted? <i>Miller v French</i>	152
VIII.	The <i>Schiavo</i> Litigation	162
IX.	Further Confirmation of the Direction Principle	168
X.	General Conclusions on the Separation of Powers and the Pending Case Scenario	170
XI.	Towards a Resolution	174
XII.	A Reformulated Direction Principle	177
XIII.	Speculative Propositions	180
XIV.	Conclusion	186
4	The Separation of Powers and Final Judgments: Defining the Principle Limiting Legislative Revision of Final Judgments	191
I.	Introduction and Definition of Final Judgment	191
II.	Reflections on Finality Where the Separation Doctrine is Not Entrenched	195
III.	A Middle Case: India	202
IV.	Early Australian Commentary on the Constitutional Protection of Final Judgments	206
V.	The Current Australian Position	210
VI.	Qualifications	212
VII.	A Reinforcement of Australian Jurisprudence: The Irish Position on Final Judgments	215
VIII.	The United States Supreme Court and Final Judgments	217
IX.	The <i>Wheeling Bridge</i> Qualification	222
X.	The Development and Consolidation of Principle by the United States Supreme Court	224
XI.	The Inviolability Principle Tested: <i>Miller v French</i>	236
XII.	Conclusion	245
5	Qualifications to the Inviolability of Final Judgments and Final Summation	247
I.	Introduction	247
II.	The <i>Wheeling Bridge</i> Qualification, the Regulation of Public Rights and 'Conditional' Final Judgments	249
III.	The Waiver Qualification	251
IV.	Conclusions on the Final Case Scenario	267
6	Protections Afforded Decisional Independence in Jurisdictions without an Entrenched Separation of Powers	271
I.	Introduction	271
II.	The United Kingdom and the Separation of Powers	272
III.	The European Convention on Human Rights	288
IV.	The United Kingdom, the ECHR and the Human Rights Act 1998.	302
V.	Canons of Statutory Interpretation	306
7	Conclusion	311
	<i>Index</i>	321