



## HONG KONG BAR ASSOCIATION

Secretariat: LG2 Floor, High Court, 38 Queensway, Hong Kong  
 E-mail: info@hkba.org Website: www.hkba.org  
 Telephone: 2869 0210 Fax: 2869 0189

21 June 2019

Mr. Lemuel Woo  
 Clerk to Panel  
 Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services  
 Legislative Council Complex  
 1 Legislative Council Road, Central  
 Hong Kong.

Dear *Lemuel*,

**Consultation Paper on the proposed amendments to the  
 High Court Ordinance (Cap. 4) to facilitate the more efficient handling of cases,  
 Including those relating to non-refoulement claims**

Please find a copy of the Comments of the Hong Kong Bar Association on the subject Consultation Paper dated 21 June 2019 for the AJLS Panel Meeting to be held on 24 June 2019. The same was sent to the Judiciary Administration.

Yours sincerely,

  
 Philip Dykes SC  
 Chairman

### 香港大律師公會

香港金鐘道三十八號高等法院低層二樓

**Chairman 主席：**  
 Mr. Philip J. Dykes, S.C. 戴啟思  
**Vice Chairmen 副主席：**  
 Mr. José-Antonio Maurellet, S.C. 毛樂禮  
 Mr. Edwin W.B. Choy, S.C. 蔡維邦  
**Honorary Secretary & Treasurer  
 名譽秘書及財政：**  
 Mr. Jonathan T.Y. Chang 張天任  
**Deputy Honorary Secretary  
 副名譽秘書：**  
 Ms. Po Wing Kay 布穎琪  
**Administrator 行政幹事：**  
 Ms. Dora Chan 陳少琼

**Council Members 執行委員會委員：**  
 Mr. Lawrence Lok, S.C. 駱應淦  
 Mr. Johannes M.M. Chan, S.C. (Hon) 陳文敏  
 Mr. Stewart K.M. Wong, S.C. 黃繼明  
 Ms. Anita H.K. Yip, S.C. 葉巧琦  
 Mr. Jeremy J. Bartlett, S.C. 包智力  
 Mr. Derek C.L. Chan, S.C. 陳政龍  
 Mr. Erik Sze-Man Shum 沈士文  
 Mr. Andrew Y.S. Mak 麥業成  
 Mr. Bruce C.H. Tse 謝志浩  
 Mr. Jonathan Wong 黃若鋒  
 Ms. Pauline P.L. Leung 梁寶琳

Mr. Robin Gregory D'Souza 蘇諾賢  
 Mr. Randy Shek 石書銘  
 Mr. Jeffrey C.K. Tam 譚俊傑  
 Mr. Lester H.L. Lee 李曉亮  
 Ms. Kim M. Rooney 甘婉玲  
 Mr. Hugh T.T. Kam 金晋亭  
 Ms. Lorraine H.M. Tsang 曾希雯  
 Ms. Fiona Fok Ching Chong 臧蕸澗  
 Ms. Christy Yuen Pui Wong 黃苑蓓

**Hong Kong Bar Association's comments on Consultation paper on proposed amendments to the High Court Ordinance (Cap.4) to facilitate the more efficient handling of cases, including those relating to non-refoulement claims**

1. It is evident that the justification for the amendments to the HCO is based on the surge in case load between in 2017 and 2018 of applications for leave to apply for judicial review and subsequent appeals to the CA and CFA.
2. Whilst it is agreed that it is desirable that cases are handled as expeditiously as possible, the question is whether the proposed amendments are appropriate in the case of non-refoulement claimants and/or necessary, generally.

**Special considerations for non-refoulement cases**

3. Whilst the proposed amendments propose to apply all judicial reviews and not just those concerning non-refoulement claimants, cases involving 'life and limb' must be dealt with according to the 'high standards of fairness' required by law following *Security for Security v Sakthevel Prabakar* [2005] 1 HKLRD 289. This means that any amendments which have the potential to lower the standard of fairness must be closely scrutinised.
4. Whilst it is difficult to specifically criticise each of the proposed amendments for being unfair (or less fair), it must be the case that such streamlining, which is to the benefit of the judiciary will be to the detriment of the litigant - after all, there is a reason why the CA is meant to be composed of three, not two judges.
5. Whilst expedience and good administration may tip the balance in favour for a two-judge bench for general judicial reviews, the judiciary ought to consider whether expedience outweighs the 'high standards of fairness' required in non-refoulement cases and whether such amendments would, accordingly, be in line with *Prabakar*.

**Are the amendments necessary?**

6. According to the Annex to the Consultation Paper, there was a sharp rise in judicial reviews on account of a significant increase in applications for leave to apply for judicial review by non-refoulement claimants in 2017 and 2018 - from 60 applications in 2016 to 2,851 applications in 2018.
7. It is self-evident that such a sudden increase has caused a great deal of pressure on the courts. However, it is not clear whether this is a trend that is set to continue, necessitating amendments to the HCO.
8. Annexed to these comments are the statistics provided by the Immigration Department as to non-refoulement claims<sup>1</sup>. From these figures, it is clear that there was a sharp rise in non-refoulement claims in 2014, leading to the number of outstanding cases reaching a high of 10,922 in 2015.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.immd.gov.hk/eng/facts/enforcement.html>

9. However, this rise was not wholly due to a sudden increase in claims, but rather, due to the introduction of the USM in March 2014, which meant that as well as screening new claims, a large volume of Torture Claims which had already been determined under the Immigration Ordinance had to be re-screened under all applicable grounds other than torture. This caused a significant bottleneck.
10. Between 2015 and 2017/18, this glut of non-refoulement cases moved through the system to be heard by the TCAB/Non-refoulement Petitions Office. It is likely that it was this unusually large cohort of claimants who began to file applications for leave for judicial review in 2017 and 2018 upon the refusal of their appeals to the TCAB/Non-refoulement Petition Office.
11. By 2018, the bottleneck at first-tier was cleared and the number of outstanding non-refoulement cases fell to 546 and as of March 2019, only 275 outstanding cases remain. The real effect of the reduction in non-refoulement claims at first-tier is evident from closure of more than half of the Duty Lawyer CAT Offices and a significant reduction in staffing as well as the end of the Pilot Scheme in 2019.
12. That being the case, whilst the effects of the backlog in 2014/15 may continue to be felt for some time by the courts (and indeed may worsen over short-term as the greatest number of cases were determined in 2017/18), it should be considered whether an extreme measure such as amending the HCO is really necessary when there is every indication that the surge in judicial reviews is not a permanent trend but one that will likely fall back to pre-2017 levels in due course.

### **Are the proposed amendments the only way to deal with the rise in judicial reviews?**

#### *Increase in manpower the obvious solution*

13. When the bottleneck occurred at first-tier, the Security Bureau responded by introducing the Pilot Scheme which expedited the claims through immigration screening. Once the bottleneck hit the TCAB, the response was to significantly increase the number of panel members (some 50 to 100 new adjudicators were appointed). Both these measures, which were essentially an increase in manpower, were effective in expediting cases through the system. Ultimately, the only permanent solution would be to increase judicial manpower.

#### *Quality and transparency of TCAB decisions*

14. The quality of Immigration and TCAB/Non-refoulement Petition Decisions unfortunately add to the court's caseload. Whilst there is much criticism levelled at non-refoulement claimants for abusing the system and purposely creating delay, there has been little discussion on how elementary errors in the decision-making process in the USM have necessitated involvement of the courts in exercising their supervisory jurisdiction in the first place.
15. TCAB decisions are not reported. The lack of transparency creates latitude for improper and unfair decision-making which then creates potential judicial reviews.

#### *Inadequate Legal Aid/Duty Lawyer funding*

16. Where the duty lawyer representing a claimant at first-tier is of the view that there are no grounds of appeal, no funding or legal representation is provided to the claimant for their appeal to the TCAB. With legal representation and cases properly presented and heard at the appeal level, there may be fewer applications for judicial review of TCAB decisions.
17. Likewise, the difficulty in getting Legal Aid for application for leave for judicial review (the refusal rate is over 99%) means that nearly all non-refoulement applicants for leave for judicial review are unrepresented. Inadequately prepared cases create a great deal more work for judges who have to review all the papers and get to grips with the relevant issues without the assistance of counsel and further, unrepresented clients cause delay through failure to understand and comply with court procedures. Increased legal aid funding may increase efficiency substantially.

### **Specific comments on the proposed amendments**

18. In paragraph 6 of the consultation paper, it states, “[I]n the event of a 2-Judge CA not being able to reach an unanimous decision, under the extant section 34B(5) of Cap.4, the applicant could apply to have the case re-argued before a 3 -Judge CA.” In the case of non-refoulement claimants who are often unrepresented and highly unlikely to be fluent English or Chinese speakers, an application to have the case-reargued before three judges is likely to be an obstacle and an automatic right to have the case re-argued before 3 judges would not only be more fair but more efficient.

21 June 2019

Hong Kong Bar Association

## ANNEX

### Torture/Non-refoulement Claim Cases (as at End of March 2019)

Year	Made	Determined	Withdrawn or Taken No Further Action	Outstanding (Cumulative)
before 2005	53	0	4	49
2005	211	1	30	229
2006	528	43	54	660
2007	1 584	82	51	2 111
2008 <sup>[1]</sup>	2 198	179	132	3 998
2009 <sup>[2]</sup>	3 286	0	1 037	6 340 <sup>[3]</sup>
2010	1 809	214	1 186	6 749
2011	1 432	932	802	6 447
2012	1 174	1 575	1 154	4 892
2013	491	1 813	778	2 792
2014	8 851 <sup>[4]</sup>	1 047	978	9 618
2015	5 053	2 339	1 410	10 922
2016	3 838	3 218	1 561	9 981
2017	1 843	4 182	1 743	5 899
2018	1 216	5 467	1 102	546
2019 (Jan-Mar)	281	498	54	275
<b>Total on Torture/ non-refoulement Claims</b>	<b>33 848</b>	<b>21 590</b>	<b>12 076</b>	<b>275</b>

<sup>[1]</sup> The Court of First Instance of the High Court (CFI) held in December 2008 that the Administration should provide legal assistance to a torture claimant during the screening process and provide suitable training for the decision makers. The Immigration Department (ImmD) then suspended all screening works.

<sup>[2]</sup> The Legislative Council passed the Immigration (Amendment) Ordinance 2009 in November 2009, making it an offence for illegal immigrants to take any employment or establish or join in any business. The ImmD implemented the enhanced administrative mechanism in December 2009.

<sup>[3]</sup> This includes 93 reviewed cases.

<sup>[4]</sup> On commencement of the Unified Screening Mechanism (USM) on 3 March 2014, there were 2 501 outstanding torture claims. Separately, 4 198 persons have lodged non-refoulement claims on applicable grounds (other than torture) (in which 2 962 cases were lodged by rejected or withdrawn torture claimants), making a total of 6 699 non-refoulement claims pending determination on commencement of the USM.