

British Case Law:

- Anisminic Ltd v Foreign Compensation Commission [1969] 2 AC 147.
- Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd v Wednesbury Corporation [1948] 1 KB 223.
- Council of Civil Service Unions v Minister for the Civil Service [1984] AC 374.
- R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Fire Brigades Union [1995] 2 AC 513.
- R v The Lord Chancellor, ex parte Witham [1998] QB 575.
- R (on the application of Evans) v Attorney General [2015] UKSC 21.
- Ridge v Baldwin [1964] 2 QB 1.

English Books and Publications:

- Barnett, Hilaire. Constitutional & Administrative Law. 11th edition. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Campbell, Tom. Administrative Law. A Critical Introduction. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Craig, Paul. Administrative Law. Oxford. Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Dahlstrom, Fernanda. "What is Procedural Fairness?". Go To Court Lawyers, accessed April 14, 2025. <https://www.gotocourt.com.au/>.
- Elliott, Mark, Jason Thomas. Administrative Law. Oxford. Oxford University Press, 2018.
- Hamzeh, Ahmad Nizar. "Qatar. The duality of the legal system". Middle Eastern Studies 30, issue no. 1 (1994) 79-90.
- Harlow, Carol, and Richard Rawlings. Law and Administration. 4th edition. Cambridge. Cambridge University Press, 2018.
- Jowell, Jeffrey, and Dawn Oliver. The Changing Constitution. 8th edition. Oxford. Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Koch Jr, Charles, "Policymaking by the administrative judiciary". Alabama Law Review 56 (2004) 693-750.
- McIntyre, Joe. The Judicial Function, Adelaide. School of Law. University of South Australia, 2019.
- Molot, Jonathan, "The Judicial Perspective in the Administrative State, Reconciling Modern Doctrines of Deference with the Judiciary's Structural Role" Stanford Law Review 53 (2000): 1-110.
- Mullen, Tom. Access to justice in administrative law and administrative justice. In Access to justice, beyond the policies and politics of austerity. Oxford. Hart Publishing, 2016.
- Nason, Sarah, "European Principles of Good Administration and UK Administrative Justice". European Public Law 26, issue no. 2 (2020) 467-498.
- Shah, Bijal, "Judicial Administration". UC Irvine Law, v. 11 (2020) 1119-1169.
- Skoczylas, Andrzej, Mariusz Swora, "Administrative Judiciary in Poland in Search for Fairness and Efficiency-an Overview". Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences 3, issue no. 19 (2007) 116-125.
- Steyn, Lord, "The Constitutional Reform Act 2005: A New Era for Judicial Independence". Journal of Constitutional Law (2005) 125-138.
- Young, Michael, "Judicial review of administrative guidance, governmentally encouraged consensual dispute resolution in Japan". Columbia Law Review 84 (1984) 923-983.

- Tajen, Rehab Madi. "Suspension of Administrative Decision Execution in Qatari Law: A Comparative Study". Legal and Judicial Journal, Special Issue on Administrative Disputes in the State of Qatar, Views and Aspirations of the Center for Legal and Judicial Studies, Ministry of Justice, State of Qatar, 2011.

Court Decisions:

- Court of Cassation. "Case No. 189 of 2010, Civil and Commercial Division". January 14, 2011. Judges, Abdullah bin Ahmad Al-Saadi, Nabil Ahmad Sadiq, Mubarak bin Nasser Al-Hajri, Mohamed Rashad Amin.
- Court of Cassation. "Case No. 65, Civil and Commercial Circuit." May 19, 2015.
- Court of Appeal's ruling on Appeal No. 23, issued on 12/28/2010.
- Case No. 65, Civil and Commercial Circuit.
- Case No. 189 of 2010, relating to the legality of administrative decisions, Judgment of the Administrative Court, [State/Court Name], Year 2010.

Laws and Regulations:

- Qatari Civil and Commercial Procedures Law No. 13 of 1990.
- Qatari Administrative Disputes Law No. 7 of 2007.
- Qatari Civil Human Resources Law No. 15 of 2016 and its Executive Regulation issued by the Council of Ministers Decision No. 32 of 2016.
- Law No. 10 of 2003 Organizing the Judiciary.
- Law No. 23 of 2006 on the Protection of Human Rights.
- Law No. 13 of 2016 on the Right to Access Information.
- Law No. 10 of 2004, Civil and Commercial Procedures Law.
- Law No. 11 of 2004, Organizing the Judiciary Law).
- Law, Law No. 10 of 2003.
- Legislation No. 13 of 2020.
- Law No. 7 of 2007, Law on the Settlement of Administrative Disputes in Certain Countries.
- Administrative Matters No. 25 of 2011, issued on 18 October 2011.
- Egyptian Civil Service Law of 2016, UAE Human Resources Law, Omani Law, Kuwaiti Law, and Qatari Law.

In conclusion, by implementing these recommendations and continuing to engage in dialogue and collaboration, Qatar, Britain, and other jurisdictions can advance administrative law principles and practices, promoting effective governance, accountability, and the protection of individual rights.

References:

Arabic Books and Publications:

- Abu Shuraida, Hatem Ali. "Judicial Oversight of Administrative Decisions in Qatar: A Comparative Study". PhD dissertation, Faculty of Law. Cairo University. (2018).
- Al Barawi, Hassan Hussein. Introduction to the Study of Qatari Law. Cairo. Dar Al Nahda Al Arabiya, 2013.
- Al Junaibi, Rashed Humaid. "Comparative Study between the Omani and British Legal Systems in Terms of Judicial Independence and Separation of Powers". European Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies 7, issue no. 1 (2021) 48-76.
- Al Sharqawi, Ahmed Mohammed. Direct Execution of Administrative Decisions. Its Scope and Termination in Light of the Egyptian State Council's Provisions. Cairo. Dar Al Nahda Al Arabiya, 2016.
- Al Sharqawi, Ahmed Mohammed. Encyclopaedia of Administrative Decisions in the Council of State Judiciary. Vol. 2. Cairo. Dar Al Nahda Al Arabiya, 2014.
- Al Shoubaki, Omar Mohammed. Administrative Jurisdiction: A Comparative Study. Amman. Dar Al Thaqafa for Publishing and Distribution, 2011.
- Al Tamawi, Suleiman. General Theory of Administrative Decisions: A Comparative Study. Cairo. Dar Al Fikr Al Arabi, 2017.
- Awad, Essam El-Din Hassan. "Promotion Criteria and Barriers in Qatari Law". Legal and Judicial Studies Center Journal, Ministry of Justice, Qatar 2 (2016) 112-138.
- Didamoni, Mohammed Ahmed. "Commentary on the Provisions of Law No. 7 of 2007 Regarding Administrative Dispute Resolution". Legal and Judicial Journal, Ministry of Justice, State of Qatar 3, issue no. 2 (2009) 78-96.
- Khalifa, Abdul Aziz Abdul Moneim Mohammed. Urgent Applications in the Council of State Judiciary. Alexandria. Dar Al Fikr Al Jameila, 2010.
- Shimmi, Abdul Hafeez. Principles of Administrative Law. Cairo. Dar Al Nahda Al Arabiya, 2013.
- Shimmi, Abdul Hafeez, and Muhannad Nuh. Administrative Law in Light of Qatari Law. Revised edition. Doha. Qatar University Law College, 2019.

- A. Policy Development:** Policymakers in both Qatar and Britain can utilize the insights gained from this study to inform policy development efforts aimed at strengthening accountability mechanisms, promoting transparency, and improving access to justice within their administrative law frameworks.
- B. Legal Practice:** Legal practitioners in both jurisdictions can benefit from understanding the comparative analysis presented in this study, enhancing their ability to navigate administrative law processes, advocate for clients, and uphold legal standards in administrative proceedings.
- C. Future Research:** The findings of this study provide a foundation for future research in administrative law governance, including comparative studies examining administrative law frameworks in other jurisdictions, empirical studies evaluating the effectiveness of accountability mechanisms, and theoretical inquiries into the evolving nature of administrative law principles.

15. Concluding Remarks and Recommendations:

In conclusion, advancing administrative law principles and practices in Qatar, Britain, and beyond requires collaborative efforts from stakeholders across government, civil society, and academia. To promote effective governance and uphold the rule of law, the following recommendations are offered:

- A. Enhancing Accountability:** Both jurisdictions should prioritize efforts to enhance accountability mechanisms, including establishing independent oversight bodies, enhancing transparency requirements, and promoting citizen engagement in administrative decision-making processes.
- B. Promoting Transparency:** Measures should be taken to promote transparency in administrative decision-making, including proactive disclosure of information, public consultation processes, and the use of technology to facilitate access to information.
- C. Improving Access to Justice:** Efforts should be made to improve access to justice for individuals affected by administrative decisions, including providing legal aid, simplifying procedural rules, and establishing alternative dispute resolution mechanisms.
- D. Capacity Building and Training:** Investment in capacity building and training for administrative officials, legal practitioners, and judicial officers is essential to ensure adherence to legal standards and procedural fairness in administrative proceedings.
- E. Learning from Comparative Insights:** Both jurisdictions should continue to learn from comparative insights and best practices from other jurisdictions, identifying innovative approaches and strategies for reform that can inform efforts to strengthen administrative law governance.

In conclusion, addressing the challenges and seizing the opportunities facing administrative law governance in both Qatar and Britain requires concerted efforts from policymakers, legal practitioners, civil society organizations, and other stakeholders. By enhancing accountability mechanisms, promoting transparency, improving access to justice, investing in capacity building, and learning from comparative insights, both jurisdictions can strengthen their administrative law frameworks and promote effective governance that upholds the rule of law and protects individual rights.

13. Conclusion:

In conclusion, this comparative study has provided valuable insights into the administrative law features of Qatar and Britain, highlighting both similarities and differences in their legal frameworks, institutional arrangements, and procedural mechanisms. Through a systematic analysis of historical context, structural elements, procedural mechanisms, judicial review processes, and challenges and opportunities, several key findings have emerged.

Main Findings:

- A. Structural Elements:** While both Qatar and Britain have centralized administrative systems, they differ in the division of administrative responsibilities and the role of specialized tribunals. Qatar exhibits a more centralized decision-making structure, with ministries and regulatory agencies playing a dominant role, while Britain's administrative system is characterized by a separation of powers and greater judicial oversight.
- B. Procedural Mechanisms:** Both jurisdictions have established procedural mechanisms for rule-making, administrative adjudication, and enforcement actions. However, variations exist in the legal sources, institutional arrangements, and procedural rules governing administrative decision-making. Qatar emphasizes centralized decision-making and deference to administrative expertise, while Britain prioritizes judicial oversight and adherence to legal standards.
- C. Judicial Review Processes:** Judicial review mechanisms in Qatar and Britain serve as important safeguards for accountability, transparency, and access to justice. While both jurisdictions provide avenues for judicial review of administrative decisions, differences exist in the legal grounds, scope of judicial scrutiny, and remedies available to aggrieved parties.

14. Implications:

The findings of this study have significant implications for policy development, legal practice, and future research in administrative law governance:

12.1.3 Access to Justice:

Access to justice is a fundamental principle of administrative law, yet barriers to access may exist in both jurisdictions. In Qatar, limited legal awareness and procedural complexities may hinder access to justice for marginalized groups, while in Britain, issues such as high legal costs and procedural delays may pose barriers to access to justice for individuals seeking redress against administrative decisions.

12.2 Opportunities:

12.2.1 Enhanced Accountability Mechanisms:

Both Qatar and Britain have opportunities to strengthen accountability mechanisms within their administrative law frameworks. This may include establishing independent oversight bodies, enhancing transparency requirements for administrative decision-making, and implementing mechanisms for citizen engagement and participation.

12.2.2 Promotion of Transparency:

Promoting transparency in administrative decision-making is critical for fostering public trust and accountability. Qatar and Britain can explore opportunities to enhance transparency through measures such as proactive disclosure of information, public consultation processes, and the use of technology to facilitate access to information.

12.2.3 Improving Access to Justice:

Both jurisdictions have opportunities to improve access to justice for individuals affected by administrative decisions. This may involve measures such as legal aid provision, simplification of procedural rules, and the establishment of alternative dispute resolution mechanisms to facilitate timely and cost-effective resolution of administrative disputes.

12.2.4 Capacity Building and Training:

Investing in capacity building and training for administrative officials, legal practitioners, and judicial officers can enhance the effectiveness and fairness of administrative law governance in both Qatar and Britain. Providing training on legal principles, procedural rules, and best practices can help improve decision-making processes and ensure adherence to legal standards.

12.2.5 Learning from Comparative Insights:

Both jurisdictions can benefit from learning from comparative insights and best practices from other jurisdictions. By studying administrative law frameworks in other countries, Qatar and Britain can identify innovative approaches, strategies for reform, and lessons learned that could inform their own efforts to improve administrative law governance.

unfairness but also on the basis of irrationality (Wednesbury unreasonableness) and proportionality in certain contexts. This jurisprudential openness enables British courts to exert stronger oversight over the executive, reinforcing the principle of the rule of law and protecting individual rights against potential abuses of power. For example, in *Council of Civil Service Unions v Minister for the Civil Service* [1984], the UK courts affirmed their authority to review even politically sensitive decisions if they infringe upon fundamental legal principles or human rights under the Human Rights Act 1998. In contrast, similar issues in Qatar would likely fall outside the jurisdiction of the Administrative Court unless explicitly provided for in domestic legislation.⁽⁸³⁾

Therefore, while both systems aim to ensure accountability and legality, the institutional structure, judicial philosophy, and practical application of judicial review differ significantly. A deeper comparative examination of specific cases, legal doctrines, and procedural rules can further illuminate how each jurisdiction balances administrative discretion with judicial oversight, ultimately shaping the contours of administrative justice in Qatar and Britain.

12. Challenges and Opportunities:

Administrative law governance in both Qatar and Britain faces a range of challenges and opportunities that impact accountability, transparency, and access to justice. Identifying these challenges and exploring opportunities for reform and improvement is essential for strengthening administrative law frameworks and promoting effective governance in both jurisdictions.

12.1 Challenges:

12.1.1 Accountability:

Ensuring accountability remains a challenge in both Qatar and Britain, as administrative bodies may lack sufficient oversight mechanisms or face barriers to accountability. In Qatar, centralized decision-making structures and limited avenues for citizen participation may hinder accountability, while in Britain, concerns about bureaucratic discretion and regulatory capture may undermine accountability.

12.1.2 Transparency:

Transparency in administrative decision-making is essential for promoting public trust and confidence in government institutions. However, both Qatar and Britain may face challenges in ensuring transparency, including limited access to information, opaque decision-making processes, and insufficient mechanisms for public participation and scrutiny.

(83) *Council of Civil Service Unions v Minister for the Civil Service*. The GCHQ case, AC 374 [1985] ICR 14.
<https://www.lawteacher.net/>

11.2.1 Comparative Analysis:

A comparative analysis of judicial review mechanisms in Qatar and Britain reveals both similarities and differences. While both jurisdictions provide avenues for judicial review of administrative decisions, there are variations in the legal grounds, procedural rules, and remedies available to aggrieved parties.

In Qatar, judicial review is conducted by specialized tribunals, with a focus on ensuring the legality and fairness of administrative actions. Courts may review administrative decisions on various grounds, including errors of law and procedural irregularities, and may grant remedies such as setting aside decisions or ordering reconsideration by administrative bodies. However, courts generally afford deference to administrative expertise and discretion in matters within their jurisdiction.

In Britain, judicial review is conducted by the High Court and specialized tribunals, with a focus on ensuring the legality and rationality of administrative actions. Courts may review administrative decisions on various grounds, including errors of law, irrationality, and procedural unfairness, and may grant remedies such as quashing decisions or awarding damages to affected parties. British courts maintain a broad discretion to intervene when administrative actions are unlawful or irrational, ensuring accountability and adherence to legal standards.

Overall, the comparative analysis highlights the importance of judicial review mechanisms in safeguarding the legality, fairness, and accountability of administrative decisions in Qatar and Britain. By exploring these mechanisms, we gain insights into the processes by which administrative decisions are scrutinized, challenged, and remedied, contributing to a deeper understanding of administrative law governance in diverse socio-political contexts.

In Qatar, judicial review is primarily conducted by the Administrative Court, which focuses on verifying the legality of administrative actions and ensuring compliance with statutory frameworks and procedural requirements. The court's role tends to be more constrained, emphasizing formal legality and procedural regularity, with limited interference in the substantive merits or policy considerations behind administrative decisions⁽⁸¹⁾. This approach reflects a system that places considerable deference on the executive branch and administrative expertise, consistent with the centralized nature of Qatari governance⁽⁸²⁾.

By contrast, in Britain, judicial review is carried out by the High Court and specialized tribunals, which adopt a broader and more flexible approach in scrutinizing administrative decisions. British courts have developed a rich body of case law that allows for intervention not only on grounds of legal error and procedural

(81) The Court of Appeal. Administrative Matters, No. 25 of 2011, Issued on 18 October 2011.

(82) Law No. 10 of 2003, Respecting the Judicial Jurisdiction Law.

11.2 Britain:

Judicial review serves as a cornerstone of administrative law governance in Britain, providing individuals with a vital mechanism to challenge the lawfulness and fairness of administrative decisions. As noted by Elliot and Thomas (2020), "Judicial review in Britain encompasses a range of legal remedies and principles aimed at ensuring accountability, legality, and fairness in administrative decision-making." Here is an overview of key aspects of judicial review mechanisms and legal remedies available in Britain:

- A. Grounds for Review:** Administrative decisions in Britain are subject to judicial review on various grounds, including errors of law, procedural irregularities, irrationality, illegality, and violations of fundamental rights⁽⁷⁷⁾. According to Fenwick and Philipson, "The grounds for review are firmly established through a combination of case law and statutory provisions, ensuring that administrative actions comply with legal standards and respect individual rights."
- B. Scope of Judicial Scrutiny:** Judicial review proceedings in Britain extend to assessing the legality, procedural fairness, rationality, and proportionality of administrative decisions. Courts meticulously scrutinize the reasoning behind decisions to ensure they are rational, reasonable, and proportionate to the objectives pursued⁽⁷⁸⁾. As observed by Craig, "Judicial review in Britain involves rigorous scrutiny of administrative decisions to uphold the rule of law and protect individuals' rights."
- C. Legal Remedies:** Judicial review affords a range of legal remedies to aggrieved parties, including quashing orders, mandatory orders, prohibitory orders, damages, compensation, and declaratory relief⁽⁷⁹⁾. According to Elliott and Varuhas, "The availability of diverse legal remedies empowers individuals to challenge administrative actions and seek redress for injustices, promoting transparency, accountability, and the protection of fundamental rights within the administrative law framework".

In summary, judicial review mechanisms in Britain play a crucial role in ensuring accountability, legality, and fairness in administrative decision-making, thereby safeguarding individual rights and upholding the rule of law⁽⁸⁰⁾.

(77) Elliott & Varuhas. Administrative Law

(78) Craig. Administrative Law.

(79) Elliott & Varuhas. Administrative Law.

(80) Barnett. Constitutional & Administrative Law.

procedures governing judicial review of administrative decisions. These cases provide valuable insights into the application of legal standards, the interpretation of constitutional provisions, and the protection of individual rights within the administrative law framework.

E. Issues related to the legitimacy of administrative decisions:(Case No. 189 of 2010)

There have been cases where the legality of administrative decisions issued by government authorities was challenged, with an assessment of whether these decisions complied with the applicable laws and regulations. These cases have contributed to reinforcing the principle that administrative decisions must be based on legal and objective grounds, and that any abuse of power or misuse of authority can lead to the annulment of the decision.

The case revolves around a request for the equivalence of a Bachelor's degree in Sharia and Law from the University of Nile in Sudan. The individual submitted a request for the equivalence of his degree to the Certificate Equivalence Committee in Egypt. The committee rejected the request, citing that the study was conducted at an educational centre outside the university's main campus.

The individual filed a lawsuit before the Administrative Court to annul the committee's decision. The first-instance court ruled to reject the lawsuit, but the appellate court overturned the ruling and decided to equate the degree. The appellant (the administrative body) appealed the decision, claiming that the legal time frame for filing the lawsuit had been incorrectly calculated and that the individual should have first filed a grievance before pursuing legal action.

The court affirmed that while grievance is the primary recourse, it is not mandatory unless specified by law, and the annulment lawsuit was filed within the correct legal timeframe. The court also clarified that the committee's decision was an administrative one, subject to appeal, even though it was not issued in a formal prescribed format, and thus could be challenged.

The court further emphasized that equality in rights does not imply equal treatment if there are different objective conditions between individuals. In addition, these conditions should have been considered when making the administrative decision.

Ultimately, the court decided to overturn the appellate ruling and referred the case back to the lower court for reconsideration by a new panel of judges⁽⁷⁶⁾.

(76) Court of Cassation. "Case No. 189 of 2010, Civil and Commercial Division." January 14, 2011. Judges: Abdullah bin Ahmad Al-Saadi, Nabil Ahmad Sadiq, Mubarak bin Nasser Al-Hajri, Mohamed Rashad Amin.

administrative decisions is a legal oversight aimed at assessing the legitimacy of such decisions, ensuring their compliance with the law. However, it should be noted that the judicial role in overseeing administrative decisions is confined to verifying their legality and does not extend to evaluating the appropriateness or the considerations behind the administrative decision, which falls within the discretion of the administrative authority. In other words, the discretion exercised by the administrative body is not subject to judicial review of the factors influencing that discretion, as this would turn judicial review into a participation in the administrative body's discretionary authority. Although the administration has the power to make decisions as it deems fit, it must adhere to the law and ensure that its decisions are based on justifiable reasons and not tainted by abuse of power or excessive actions that would warrant the annulment of the administrative decision⁽⁷³⁾.

- B. Granting Compensation to Affected Parties:** In instances where aggrieved parties have suffered harm or loss because of unlawful administrative actions, the court may award compensation to remedy the injustice. Compensation may be granted to reimburse individuals for financial losses, emotional distress, or other damages incurred due to the wrongful conduct of administrative bodies.
- C. Restoring Rights or Interests:** Judicial review proceedings can also result in the restoration of rights or interests that have been unlawfully deprived or infringed upon by administrative decisions. Through court intervention, individuals may regain their rights, benefits, licenses, or privileges that were unlawfully denied or revoked by administrative bodies⁽⁷⁴⁾.
- D. Declaratory Relief:** In certain circumstances, the court may issue declaratory judgments to clarify the legal rights and obligations of the parties involved in administrative disputes. Declaratory relief can help resolve legal uncertainties or ambiguities and guide future administrative actions in conformity with the law⁽⁷⁵⁾.

Overall, these legal remedies empower aggrieved parties in Qatar to seek redress for injustices resulting from administrative actions, ensuring accountability, fairness, and the protection of individual rights and interests. The availability of diverse remedies underscores the importance of effective judicial review as a mechanism for upholding the rule of law and ensuring administrative accountability.

Notable cases and judicial precedents in Qatar have contributed to the development of administrative law jurisprudence, shaping the principles and

(73) Court of Cassation. Case No. 65, Civil and Commercial Circuit, May 19, 2015.

(74) Barnett. Constitutional & Administrative Law.

(75) Barnett. Constitutional & Administrative Law.

D. Deference to Administrative Expertise: While courts engage in rigorous scrutiny of administrative decisions, they generally accord a degree of deference to administrative bodies' expertise and discretion, especially in matters within their specialized domains. This deference recognizes that administrative bodies possess expertise and specialized knowledge relevant to their areas of jurisdiction, and courts respect their discretion in making policy judgments or technical determinations.

E. Standard of Review: The standard of review applied by the Administrative Court varies depending on the nature of the decision under scrutiny. For questions of law, the court conducts *de novo* review, meaning it independently assesses the legal issues without deferring to the administrative body's interpretation. However, for matters involving factual or discretionary determinations, the court typically applies a deferential standard, intervening only if the decision is unreasonable or unsupported by the evidence.

Overall, the scope of judicial scrutiny in Qatar encompasses a comprehensive assessment of administrative decisions, focusing on legality, rationality, procedural fairness, and deference to administrative expertise. This ensures that administrative actions are consistent with the rule of law, respect fundamental rights, and meet the standards of procedural fairness expected in a democratic society.

11.1.3 Remedies Available: In Qatar, aggrieved parties benefit from a diverse range of legal remedies available through judicial review proceedings, ensuring effective redress for injustices resulting from administrative actions. Here are some key aspects of the remedies available⁽⁷²⁾:

A. Setting Aside Administrative Decisions: One of the primary remedies sought through judicial review is the annulment or setting aside of administrative decisions that are found to be unlawful, procedurally unfair, or in violation of fundamental rights. The court has the authority to declare administrative decisions null and void if they are found to be in contravention of applicable laws or regulations.

In cases where administrative decisions are found to be flawed but not entirely illegal, the court may order the reconsideration of the decision by the relevant administrative body. This remedy provides the opportunity for administrative bodies to rectify errors or deficiencies identified by the court and to render a new decision by the law and procedural fairness. The established principle in the jurisprudence of the Court of Cassation is that judicial oversight of

(72) Shimmi, Nuh. Administrative Law in Light of Qatari Law.

For example, if an administrative decision pertains to the dismissal of an employee, the administrative courts can only intervene if there is a violation of legal procedures or an error in the application of the law, but they cannot intervene in the substance of the decision itself if it aligns with established legal procedures⁽⁶⁹⁾.

The Court of Appeal's ruling on Appeal No. 23, issued on 12/28/2010, indicates that the contested transfer decision, despite being a final administrative decision, is not one of the decisions that a public employee may appeal before the court, even if it includes a disciplinary penalty⁽⁷⁰⁾. This decision does not fall under the second paragraph of Article 3 of Law No. 7 of 2007, and is not one of the decisions that may be appealed in relation to public office, according to the provisions of Article (3/3) of the same law. Therefore, the court decided that it does not have jurisdiction to monitor the legality of this decision, which leads to a ruling that it does not have jurisdiction to consider the appeal. The ruling was based on the principle that this type of decision is not subject to appeal before the Administrative Court. In the same context, one should review the ruling of the Court of Appeal, Administrative Matters No. 25 of 2011, issued on 18 October 2011, which supports this approach and clarifies more details related to decisions that are not subject to appeal within the scope of public office⁽⁷¹⁾.

- A. Reasoning behind Administrative Decisions:** The Administrative Court thoroughly examines the reasoning behind administrative decisions to assess their legality and rationality. Courts scrutinize whether administrative bodies have provided sufficient justification and logical grounds for their decisions, ensuring that they are not arbitrary or capricious.
- B. Consideration of Evidence:** Courts evaluate the evidence considered by administrative bodies during the decision-making process. This involves assessing whether the evidence was relevant, reliable, and properly evaluated by the administrative decision-makers. Courts may intervene if administrative bodies have ignored material evidence or relied on erroneous facts.
- C. Procedural Fairness:** Judicial review extends to the procedural fairness of administrative decision-making processes. Courts examine whether administrative bodies followed fair procedures, including providing notice, allowing for hearings, and giving affected parties an opportunity to present their case and respond to evidence against them. Any deviations from procedural fairness principles may render administrative decisions vulnerable to judicial intervention.

(69) Shimmi, Nuh. Administrative Law in Light of Qatari Law.

(70) Court of Appeal's ruling on Appeal No. 23, issued on 12/28/2010.

(71) Administrative Matters No. 25 of 2011, issued on 18 October 2011.

statute. It described the parameters of the review process and the courts' authority to settle disagreements resulting from administrative rulings⁽⁶³⁾. Legislation No. 13 of 2020 respecting the Judicial Authority revoked this legislation and restructured Qatar's judicial system to conform to new legal precedents⁽⁶⁴⁾.

- D. Law No. 23 of 2006 (Protection of Human Rights Law): This law safeguards fundamental rights and freedoms in Qatar. It provides a legal basis for challenging administrative decisions that violate basic human rights, thereby enabling judicial review of such actions⁽⁶⁵⁾.
- E. Law No. 7 of 2007 (Law on the Settlement of Administrative Disputes in Certain Countries): This law regulates the resolution of administrative disputes in Qatar. It stipulates procedures for challenging administrative decisions through judicial review and emphasizes the importance of legal certainty and procedural fairness in administrative proceedings⁽⁶⁶⁾.

These laws collectively establish the legal framework for judicial review of administrative decisions in Qatar, ensuring accountability, legality, and procedural fairness in the exercise of administrative authority.

11.1.2 Scope of Judicial Scrutiny:

In Qatar, the Administrative Court plays a crucial role in ensuring that administrative decisions comply with legal requirements and procedural fairness. Here is a more detailed exploration of the scope of judicial scrutiny in administrative review proceedings⁽⁶⁷⁾:

Although they are essential in resolving administrative issues, Qatar's administrative courts have a narrow scope of authority. Laws like Law No. 10 of 2003 respecting the Judicial jurisdiction Law, which states that administrative courts have the jurisdiction to examine the legality of administrative actions but not to take part in executive discretion or policy choices, define their authority⁽⁶⁸⁾.

Administrative courts' purview is limited to reviewing administrative judgments for legal compliance, procedural fairness, and potential violations of individual rights. Administrative tribunals, however, lack the power to examine the merits or substance of the executive's policy judgments. This restriction guarantees a division between the executive branch's discretionary powers and judicial supervision, both of which are essential to the operation of the government.

(63) Law, Law No. 10 of 2003.

(64) Legislation No. 13 of 2020.

(65) Law No. 23 of 2006 on the Protection of Human Rights.

(66) Law No. 7 of 2007, Law on the Settlement of Administrative Disputes in Certain Countries.

(67) Al Barawi, Hassan. Introduction to the Study of Qatari Law.

(68) Law No. 10 of 2003 Organizing the Judiciary.

Overall, the comparative analysis highlights the importance of procedural mechanisms in safeguarding procedural fairness, transparency, and access to justice within administrative law frameworks in Qatar and Britain. By exploring these mechanisms, we gain insights into the processes by which administrative decisions are made, challenged, and enforced, contributing to a deeper understanding of administrative law governance in diverse socio-political contexts.

11. Judicial Review and Legal Remedies:

Judicial review of administrative decisions is a critical aspect of administrative law governance, providing a mechanism for courts to scrutinize the legality and fairness of administrative actions. Investigating the mechanisms for judicial review in Qatar and Britain reveals important insights into the grounds for review, the scope of judicial scrutiny, and the remedies available to aggrieved parties.

11.1 Qatar:

In Qatar, specialized tribunals, particularly the Administrative Court, conduct judicial review of administrative decisions. Key aspects of judicial review in Qatar include⁽⁵⁹⁾:

11.1.1 Grounds for Review:

Administrative decisions in Qatar may be subject to judicial review for various reasons, including legal errors, procedural irregularities, and violations of fundamental rights. The Administrative Court has jurisdiction to review the legality and fairness of administrative procedures, ensuring compliance with legal principles and procedural rules. Below are relevant laws about judicial review in Qatar⁽⁶⁰⁾:

- A. Law No. 10 of 2004 (Civil and Commercial Procedures Law): This law governs civil and commercial procedures in Qatar. It provides the procedural framework for judicial review of administrative decisions, outlining the process for submitting appeals to the Administrative Court⁽⁶¹⁾.
- B. Law No. 11 of 2004 (Organizing the Judiciary Law): This law establishes the structure and jurisdiction of the Qatari judiciary. It delineates the authority of the Administrative Court to review administrative actions and ensure their conformity with the law⁽⁶²⁾.
- C. Promulgating the Judicial Authority Law, Law No. 10 of 2003: The foundation and operations of Qatar's judicial authority were particularly covered by this

(59) Hatem Ali Hassan Suleiman Abu Shuraia. "Judicial Oversight of Administrative Decisions in Qatar: A Comparative Study". PhD dissertation, Faculty of Law, Cairo University (2018).

(60) Awad, Essam. Promotion Criteria and Barriers in Qatari Law, 112 - 138.

(61) Law No. 10 of 2004, Civil and Commercial Procedures Law.

(62) Law No. 11 of 2004, Organizing the Judiciary Law).

10.2.4. Procedural fairness:

The UK wants to ensure that individuals and groups may quickly and reasonably challenge administrative decisions and seek redress. They provide avenues for citizens to submit grievances with administrative courts and seek to remove barriers to entry, such as convoluted processes or excessive costs⁽⁵⁶⁾.

In the British legal system, procedural fairness is emphasised through judicial review of administrative decisions, where individuals affected by administrative decisions can challenge those decisions before the courts.

Judicial Review Act 2000: This Act sets out the criteria and grounds for judicial review that allow individuals to challenge administrative decisions that affect their rights.

Ridge v Baldwin [1964] 2 QB 1: In this case, the British Supreme Court emphasised the need to provide procedural fairness to individuals by giving them the opportunity to defend themselves before administrative decisions affecting their rights are made⁽⁵⁷⁾.

Procedural fairness, transparency, and access to justice are fundamental principles underpinning the administrative law framework in the UK⁽⁵⁸⁾. Administrative decisions must be made in accordance with legal principles and procedural requirements, with reasons provided for decisions affecting individuals' rights or interests. Additionally, administrative procedures must be transparent and accessible, allowing affected parties to understand the basis for decisions and to challenge them through avenues such as administrative appeals or judicial review proceedings.

10.2.5 Comparative Analysis:

A comparative analysis of procedural mechanisms in Qatar and Britain reveals both similarities and differences. While both jurisdictions have established processes for rule-making, administrative adjudication, and enforcement actions, there are variations in the legal sources, institutional arrangements, and procedural rules governing administrative decision-making.

In Qatar, administrative decision-making is more centralized, with ministries and regulatory agencies playing a dominant role in rule-making and enforcement actions. Specialized tribunals provide avenues for adjudicating administrative disputes, ensuring access to justice for individuals affected by administrative decisions. In contrast, Britain's administrative system is characterized by a separation of powers and greater judicial oversight, with administrative tribunals serving as independent adjudicators of administrative disputes.

(56) Sarah Nason, "European Principles of Good Administration and UK Administrative Justice". European Public Law 26, no. 2 (2020): 467-498.

(57) Ridge v Baldwin [1964] 2 QB 1.

(58) Craig, Paul. Administrative Law.

tribunals, such as the First-tier Tribunal and the Upper Tribunal, handle administrative appeals and judicial reviews of administrative actions. These tribunals operate according to procedural rules set out in legislation, such as the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007, and adhere to principles of natural justice, including the right to a fair hearing and the right to legal representation.

In the UK, access to justice is a fundamental right guaranteed by the legal system, allowing citizens to challenge administrative decisions that affect their rights.

Administrative Justice and Tribunals Council Act 2006: This Act aims to improve access to justice in administrative cases by ensuring that there are fair courts and procedures for challenging administrative decisions.

Anisminic Ltd v Foreign Compensation Commission (1969), in this case, the Supreme Court confirmed the right of individuals to access justice and challenge administrative decisions if there were serious errors of law in the decision-making process⁽⁵³⁾.

10.2.3 Enforcement Actions:

Administrative bodies in the UK are vested with the authority to enforce compliance with laws, regulations, and administrative decisions through various enforcement mechanisms⁽⁵⁴⁾. Enforcement procedures must comply with statutory requirements and procedural safeguards, such as the principles of proportionality, due process, and procedural fairness. The decision to impose sanctions is often subject to review by specialized tribunals or courts, ensuring accountability and transparency in enforcement actions.

Transparency in the UK is one of the fundamental principles governing administrative decisions, whereby the reasons behind administrative decisions must be clear to the public so that individuals can understand those decisions and challenge them if necessary.

Freedom of Information Act 2000: This law gives the public the right to access information relating to government and administrative decisions, which enhances transparency in government business.

R (on the application of Evans) v Attorney General [2015], in this case, the UK Supreme Court emphasised the importance of transparency in the administrative decision-making process and ruled in favour of the claimant in his right to obtain government information relating to a Cabinet decision⁽⁵⁵⁾.

(53) Anisminic Ltd v Foreign Compensation Commission [1969] 2 AC 147.

(54) Elliott & Varuhas. Administrative Law.

(55) R (on the application of Evans) v Attorney General [2015] UKSC 21.

that feels wronged is to challenge administrative rulings and offer a defence prior to the final verdict. In many cases, the court has annulled administrative decisions because they conflicted with the rights of individuals to have their defence heard or to submit their comments. For example, in a case related to an appeal against an administrative decision, the court emphasized the need to follow proper legal procedures, and decided to annul the decision because the defendant was not given a proper opportunity to defend himself ⁽⁵⁰⁾.

10.1.5 The principle of transparency:

One of the key tenets that guarantees administrative judgments are founded on well-defined and publicly disclosed legal foundations is transparency, which enables people who will be impacted by the decisions to comprehend the rationale behind them. The 2016 Right to Access Information Law No. 13: This legislation gives people the right to obtain information about governmental and administrative decisions that impact their rights and guarantees openness in administrative judgments⁽⁵¹⁾. For example, in a case concerning a citizen's right to obtain government information, the court confirmed that a citizen's right to access information related to administrative decisions is part of his basic rights, and ordered that such information be provided.

10.2 Britain:

In the United Kingdom, procedural mechanisms governing administrative decision-making are established through a combination of statutory provisions, common law principles, and administrative guidelines⁽⁵²⁾. Key aspects of procedural mechanisms include:

10.2.1 Rule-making:

The development of administrative rules in Britain involves various processes, including the enactment of primary legislation by Parliament and the creation of secondary legislation by government departments and agencies. Primary legislation, such as Acts of Parliament, provides the framework within which administrative rules are formulated, while secondary legislation, including statutory instruments, regulations, and orders, offers detailed rules and regulations. These rules are often published in official gazettes or government websites and may be subject to parliamentary scrutiny or public consultation, depending on the nature of the legislation.

10.2.2 Administrative Adjudication:

Administrative justice in the UK encompasses the procedures through which disputes are resolved and decisions are made by administrative bodies. Specialized

(50) Qatari Administrative Disputes Law No. 7 of 2007.

(51) Law No. 13 of 2016 on the Right to Access Information.

(52) Hilaire Barnett, *Constitutional & Administrative Law*, 11th ed. (London: Routledge, 2016), 645-652.

10.1.4 The principle of procedural fairness and access to justice:

An essential component of administrative judicial systems is the concept of fairness. It guarantees equitable treatment, procedural protections, and the chance to voice their concerns and be heard for anyone impacted by administrative decisions.⁽⁴⁵⁾ In order to ensure that parties have access to legal representation, the ability to submit evidence, and the right to legal remedies, administrative courts in both Qatar and the UK work to create a fair and unbiased procedure⁽⁴⁶⁾.

One of the main goals of administrative judicial systems is to ensure that everyone has access to justice⁽⁴⁷⁾. Both Qatar and the UK want to make sure that people and organizations may easily and affordably contest administrative rulings and pursue remedies. They work to eliminate obstacles to access, such complicated procedures or exorbitant fees, and offer channels for people to file complaints with administrative courts⁽⁴⁸⁾.

Procedural fairness is a fundamental element in ensuring transparency and fairness in administrative decision-making processes. Dahlstrom highlights that this principle requires administrative bodies to provide individuals with a fair opportunity to present their case, ensure that decisions are based on accurate and reliable information, and clearly explain the reasons underlying those decisions. This principle constitutes a cornerstone of administrative law, as a decision may be set aside even if it appears correct in outcome, provided it was made in breach of the principles of procedural fairness⁽⁴⁹⁾. This law also provides individuals the right to appeal administrative decisions through competent courts, ensuring access to justice in cases involving government decisions. As in the case of the citizen's right to access justice, the court stressed the need for clear and open legal channels for individuals to appeal administrative decisions, such as the Court of Appeal.

In order for administrative authorities to make judgments that impact people's rights or interests, they must adhere to fair and just legal procedures, which is a fundamental component of the Qatari legal system. Law No. 7 of 2007 on the Settlement of Administrative Disputes, therefore, this statute highlights the necessity of applying the procedural fairness principle to all administrative judgments and outlines the grievance and appeal procedures. For instance, the right of the party

(45) Andrzej Skoczylas and Mariusz Swora. "Administrative Judiciary in Poland in Search for Fairness and Efficiency-an Overview", *Transylvanian Review of Administrative Sciences* 3, no. 19 (2007): 116-125.

(46) Rashed Humaid Al Junaibi, "Comparative Study between the Omani and British Legal Systems in Terms of Judicial Independence and Separation of Powers", *European Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies* 7, no. 1 (2021): 48-76.

(47) Tom Mullen, "Access to Justice in Administrative Law and Administrative Justice", *Access to Justice, Beyond the Policies and Politics of Austerity*, (Hart: Oxford, 2016), 60-104.

(48) Ahmad Nizar Hamzeh, "Qatar: The duality of the legal system", *Middle Eastern Studies* 30, no. 1 (1994): 79-90.

(49) Fernanda Dahlstrom, "What is Procedural Fairness?", *Go To Court Lawyers*, accessed: April 14, (2025), <https://www.gotocourt.com.au/>.

10.1.3 Enforcement Actions:

Administrative bodies in Qatar are empowered to enforce compliance with laws, regulations, and administrative decisions through various enforcement measures, such as fines and penalties. Enforcement procedures must adhere to procedural safeguards, including the principles of proportionality and due process.⁽⁴²⁾

Texts related to disciplinary penalties in Qatari law can be found in Law No. 15 of 2016 regarding civil human resources. Article 85 of this law specifies the penalties that can be imposed on employees without resorting to the judiciary. The CEO, after reviewing the investigation, may either order the preservation of the investigation or refer the investigated employee to the competent disciplinary authority for accountability. Alternatively, the CEO may opt to impose a penalty on the employee, as follows:⁽⁴³⁾

For employees in positions up to the second grade or equivalent: a. Verbal warning. b. Deduction from salary for a period not exceeding forty-five days per year, provided that the duration does not exceed fifteen days at a time.

For employees in positions from assistant ministry undersecretary to the first grade or equivalent:

- A. Written warning.
- B. Reprimand.
- C. Deduction from salary for a period not exceeding twenty days per year, provided that the duration does not exceed three days at a time.

These penalties are imposed administratively through an administrative decision issued by the relevant administrative authority empowered by law to impose such penalties on the addressee of the decision or the concerned party⁽⁴⁴⁾.

Principles of procedural fairness, transparency, and access to justice are enshrined in Qatar's administrative law framework. Administrative decisions must be made by legal principles, with reasons provided for decisions affecting individuals' rights or interests. Moreover, administrative procedures must be transparent, allowing affected parties to understand the basis for administrative decisions and to challenge them through avenues such as judicial review.

(42) Essam El-Din Hassan Awad. "Promotion Criteria and Barriers in Qatari Law". Legal and Judicial Studies Center Journal, Ministry of Justice, Qatar 2, (2016): 112 138.

(43) Qatari Civil Human Resources Law No. 15 of 2016 and its Executive Regulation issued by the Council of Ministers Decision No. 32 of 2016.

(44) Khalifa. Urgent Applications in the Council of State Judiciary.

justice for individuals affected by administrative actions. A comparative exploration of these mechanisms provides insights into the processes for rule-making, administrative adjudication, and enforcement actions, as well as the underlying principles that guide administrative law frameworks in each jurisdiction.

10.1 Qatar:

In Qatar, statutory enactments, constitutional provisions, and administrative regulations primarily govern procedural mechanisms for administrative decision-making. Key aspects of procedural mechanisms include⁽³⁹⁾:

10.1.1 Rule-making:

Typically, the development of administrative rules in Qatar involves issuing decrees, regulations, and directives by governmental authorities, such as ministries and regulatory bodies. These rules are often published in the official gazette and are subject to public consultation procedures to ensure transparency and input from stakeholders⁽⁴⁰⁾.

This aligns with the ruling of the Qatari judiciary issued by the Court of First Instance, Administrative Division, on July 29, 2010, under case number 51, which stated: "The presumption in administrative decisions is that they are legally valid, bearing in themselves a legal presumption of their legitimacy. It is incumbent upon those who claim otherwise to provide evidence to support their claim. The Court of Appeal has ruled that administrative decisions are presumed valid, serving as evidence of their legality and the presence of the legal requirements for validity, unless proven otherwise. Hence, the burden of proof lies upon the claimant."

10.1.2 Administrative Adjudication:

Administrative justice refers to the process through which administrative bodies resolve disputes and make decisions regarding individual cases. In Qatar, specialised courts, such as the Administrative Court, provide avenues for adjudicating administrative disputes and reviewing decisions made by administrative bodies. The court operates according to procedural rules and principles of fairness, including the right to be heard and the right to legal representation⁽⁴¹⁾.

The concept of definite knowledge makes it evident that the main goal of Qatari law is to make sure that people are fully informed about administrative judgments in a way that is understandable and straightforward, hence facilitating the affected party's ability to take the necessary legal action.

(39) Shimmi. Principles of Administrative Law.

(40) Abdul Hafeez Shimmi & Muhannad Nuh. Administrative Law in Light of Qatari Law, rev. ed. (Doha: Qatar University Law College, 2019), 167-173.

(41) Al Tamawi. General Theory of Administrative Decisions.

people a forum to contest activities that violate their rights or are excessive or unjustified, it guarantees that administrative decisions are in line with basic freedoms and rights⁽³⁶⁾.

- C. The administrative judiciary makes it easier for people, groups, or entities to settle conflicts with administrative bodies in a way that is just, efficient, and neutral. To ensure that parties have a meaningful chance to present their position, offer evidence, and participate in legal discussions, administrative courts use legal processes and mechanisms that are special to administrative law. Through its oversight, the Administrative Court contributes to protecting individuals from abuse of power by administrative bodies, and is a guarantee against arbitrary or unjust decisions. In this context, the Court protects the rights of individuals against actions that may be illegal or arbitrary by executive authorities⁽³⁷⁾.
- D. It is crucial to remember that the administrative judiciary functions inside the larger legal system. Because of its specific concentration on administrative law issues, it continues to stand out from other judicial branches, like civil or criminal courts. Nonetheless, administrative courts frequently have connections to other judicial branches, and higher courts, such as the supreme or constitutional courts, may review their rulings⁽³⁸⁾.

In recent years, Qatar has witnessed developments in the field of administrative law, as the administrative judiciary in Qatar has become more capable of addressing unfair or illegal decisions. This development has been evident in the Supreme Administrative Court, which is the highest court competent to consider administrative cases.

A specific area of the legal system devoted to handling administrative law issues is known as the administrative judiciary. Upholding the rule of law, guaranteeing the legitimacy and accountability of administrative activities, defending individual rights, and offering an unbiased venue for settling administrative disputes are all made possible by it. Together with other judicial departments, the administrative judiciary supports the general efficiency and efficacy of the legal system.

10. Procedural Mechanisms:

The procedural mechanisms governing administrative decision-making in both Qatar and Britain play a crucial role in ensuring fairness, transparency, and access to

(36) Jonathan Molot, "The Judicial Perspective in the Administrative State: Reconciling Modern Doctrines of Deference with the Judiciary's Structural Role". 1-110.

(37) Michael Young, "Judicial review of administrative guidance: governmentally encouraged consensual dispute resolution in Japan". *Columbia Law Review* 84 (1984): 923-983.

(38) Joe McIntyre, *The Judicial Function* (Adelaide: School of Law, University of South Australia, 2019).

Overall, Britain's administrative law structures are characterised by a commitment to the rule of law, legal accountability, and procedural fairness (Harlow & Rawlings, 2018)⁽³²⁾. Administrative bodies operate within a framework of legal constraints and oversight, ensuring that government actions are lawful, transparent, and consistent with fundamental principles of justice and democracy

9. Comparative Analysis:

A comparative analysis of administrative law structures in Qatar and Britain reveals both similarities and differences. While both jurisdictions have centralised government structures and employ administrative bodies to implement public policies and regulate industries, there are variations in the division of administrative responsibilities, the role of specialised tribunals, and the degree of judicial oversight.

9.1 Definition and Role of the Administrative Judiciary:

The term "administrative judiciary" describes a subset of the legal system that focuses only on cases involving administrative law. It includes a group of courts or tribunals created to examine and decide cases involving the decisions or acts of administrative entities, including public officials, government agencies, and regulatory organizations⁽³³⁾.

Ensuring that administrative activities are lawful, equitable, and accountable is the administrative judiciary's main responsibility. It acts as a check on the use of administrative authority by giving people, groups, and other entities a way to file a complaint if they think administrative actions have negatively affected their rights or interests. The administrative judiciary provides a transparent and unbiased evaluation of the appropriateness and legality of administrative activities, serving as an independent and unbiased venue for resolving issues pertaining to administrative law⁽³⁴⁾.

9.2 The Functions of The Administrative Judiciary Encompass Several Key Aspects:

- A. It entails checking administrative rulings for conformity with legal requirements, such as statutes, rules, and constitutional precepts. Administrative courts evaluate whether administrative authorities have made decisions in accordance with the law, adhered to the correct processes, and utilised pertinent legal principles⁽³⁵⁾.
- B. In order to defend against the capricious use of administrative authority and to preserve individual rights, the administrative judiciary is essential. By giving

(32) Harlow, Rawlings. Law and Administration.

(33) Bijal Shah, "Judicial Administration", UC Irvine Law Review 11, (2020): 1119-1169.

(34) Jonathan Molot, "The Judicial Perspective in the Administrative State: Reconciling Modern Doctrines of Deference with the Judiciary's Structural Role", Stanford Law Review 53 (2000): 1-110.

(35) Charles H. Koch Jr, "Policymaking by the administrative judiciary". Alabama Law Review 56 (2004): 693-750.

public administration⁽²⁷⁾. Each ministry or department is tasked with administering a particular policy area, such as health, education, defence, or finance, and plays a vital role in the formulation and execution of government policies.

- B. **Regulatory Agencies:** Regulatory agencies in Britain play a crucial role in regulating industries, enforcing compliance with laws and regulations, and ensuring consumer protection and public safety⁽²⁸⁾. These agencies, such as the Financial Conduct Authority (FCA) and the Environment Agency, are empowered to oversee specific sectors of the economy and to investigate and prosecute regulatory violations.
- C. **Administrative Tribunals:** Administrative tribunals form an integral part of Britain's administrative law system, providing specialised forums for adjudicating disputes, reviewing administrative decisions, and resolving legal controversies⁽²⁹⁾. These tribunals, including the Upper Tribunal and the First-tier Tribunal, operate independently of the executive branch and offer avenues for individuals and organizations to challenge administrative actions and seek redress for grievances.

8.2.3 Legal Constraints and Principles:

Administrative bodies in Britain operate within a framework of legal constraints, including statutory provisions, procedural rules, and principles of administrative law⁽³⁰⁾. While the executive branch retains considerable discretion in administrative decision-making, it is subject to legal scrutiny and oversight by administrative tribunals and the judiciary. Administrative actions must comply with legal standards, procedural fairness, and principles of natural justice, ensuring accountability, transparency, and respect for the rule of law.

8.2.4 Independent Scrutiny and Review:

Administrative tribunals in Britain provide independent scrutiny and review of administrative actions, ensuring compliance with legal standards and procedural fairness⁽³¹⁾. These tribunals possess specialised expertise in specific areas of law and provide impartial adjudication of disputes, often serving as a check on executive power and safeguarding individual rights and interests.

(27) Jack Beatson and David Feldman. *Administrative Law*. 4th edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015).

(28) Carol Harlow and Richard Rawlings. *Law and Administration*, 4th edition (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018).

(29) Ibid.

(30) Ibid.

(31) Elliott, Varuhas. *Administrative Law*.

8.1.4 Executive Authority and Oversight:

While administrative bodies exercise significant authority in their respective domains, they operate within the framework of Qatar's legal system, subject to oversight and review. The executive branch retains overarching authority over administrative decision-making, but specialised tribunals, such as the Administrative Court, provide independent oversight and review of administrative actions. This dual structure ensures a balance of power, accountability, and checks and balances within Qatar's administrative system⁽²³⁾.

Overall, Qatar's administrative law structures are deeply rooted in its legal and political framework, characterised by a centralized government structure and a strong executive branch. Key administrative bodies, including ministries, regulatory agencies, and specialised tribunals, play essential roles in governance, regulation, and adjudication, contributing to the effective functioning of the country's administrative system.

8.2 Britain:

In Britain, a combination of constitutional principles, statutory enactments, and common law precedents, reflecting the country's rich legal heritage and tradition⁽²⁴⁾ shape administrative law structures. The administrative system in Britain upholds a fundamental principle of the separation of powers, which allocates distinct roles and responsibilities to the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government⁽²⁵⁾.

8.2.1 Separation of Powers:

The British administrative system adheres to the principle of the separation of powers, which ensures a balance of authority and accountability among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government⁽²⁶⁾. This separation of powers serves as a foundational principle in British governance, preventing any single branch from monopolising power and safeguarding against abuses of authority.

8.2.2 Key Administrative Bodies:

- A. Ministries and Government Departments: Ministries and government departments form the backbone of the British administrative system, responsible for implementing government policies, managing public services, and overseeing specific areas of

(23) Al Tamawi, "General Theory of Administrative Decisions: A Comparative Study".

(24) Mark Elliott and Jason Varuhas, *Administrative Law*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2018), 234-241.

(25) Paul Craig, *Administrative Law*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012).

(26) Jeffrey Jowell and Dawn Oliver, *The Changing Constitution*, 8th edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Markets Authority, are responsible for ensuring compliance with relevant laws, regulations, and standards. They play a vital role in maintaining stability, transparency, and integrity within their respective sectors and contribute to the country's overall regulatory framework⁽²⁰⁾.

C. Specialised Tribunals: Specialised tribunals, including the Administrative Court, serve as essential components of Qatar's administrative law system. These tribunals provide avenues for resolving administrative disputes, reviewing decisions made by administrative bodies, and upholding the rule of law. The Administrative Court, in particular, plays a significant role in overseeing administrative actions, ensuring their legality, fairness, and compliance with procedural requirements⁽²¹⁾.

8.1.3 Functions of Administrative Bodies: Administrative bodies in Qatar perform a wide range of functions, including executive and quasi-judicial roles. These functions include⁽²²⁾:

- A. Rule-making:** Administrative bodies have the authority to promulgate rules, regulations, and directives governing various aspects of public administration and economic activities. These rules play a crucial role in shaping the legal and regulatory landscape of Qatar.
- B. Licensing and Enforcement:** Administrative bodies are responsible for issuing licenses, permits, and approvals for businesses, professionals, and individuals operating within regulated sectors. They also oversee enforcement activities to ensure compliance with laws, regulations, and standards, employing measures such as inspections, audits, and penalties for non-compliance.
- C. Adjudication:** Certain administrative bodies, including specialised tribunals like the Administrative Court, have quasi-judicial functions. They adjudicate disputes, review administrative decisions, and provide avenues for redress for individuals aggrieved by administrative actions. These tribunals operate independently of the executive branch and serve as vital safeguards for administrative accountability and legality.

(20) Ahmed Mohammed Al Sharqawi, *Direct Execution of Administrative Decisions: Its Scope and Termination in Light of the Egyptian State Council's Provisions*. (Cairo: Dar Al Nahda Al Arabiya, 2016).

(21) Omar Mohammed Al Shoubaki, *Administrative Jurisdiction: A Comparative Study*, (Amman: Dar Al Thaqafa for Publishing and Distribution, 2011).

(22) Abdul Hafeez Shimmi and Muhannad Nuh, *Administrative Law in Light of Qatari Law*, rev. ed. (Doha: Qatar University Law College, 2019), 123-128.

8. Structural Analysis:

The structural elements of administrative law in both Qatar and Britain encompass the organization, functions, and powers of administrative bodies, as well as the division of administrative responsibilities within the state. A comparative examination of these structural elements sheds light on the similarities and differences in how administrative law operates in each jurisdiction.

8.1 Qatar:

In Qatar, the administrative law framework is deeply intertwined with the country's legal and political system, which is delineated by the State of Qatar's Constitution and various statutory enactments. This framework reflects the nation's centralised government structure, where the executive branch holds considerable power and authority⁽¹⁷⁾.

8.1.1 Centralised Government Structure:

Qatar's administrative system is characterised by a centralised government structure, where the executive branch plays a dominant role in decision-making and governance. The Emir, who serves as the head of state and wields significant authority over the executive branch, leads the government. Under the Emir, there is a Council of Ministers responsible for formulating and implementing government policies and initiatives⁽¹⁸⁾.

8.1.2 Key Administrative Bodies:

A. Ministries: Ministries are pivotal administrative bodies responsible for overseeing specific sectors of government administration, such as health, education, finance, transportation, and energy. Each ministry is tasked with formulating policies, implementing regulations, and managing public services within its designated domain. Ministries play a crucial role in the day-to-day functioning of the government, serve as key channels for policy implementation, and service delivery⁽¹⁹⁾.

B. Regulatory Agencies: Qatar also has various regulatory agencies entrusted with overseeing and regulating specific industries and sectors of the economy. These agencies, such as the Qatar Central Bank and the Qatar Financial

(17) Abdul Hafeez Shimmi, *Principles of Administrative Law* (Cairo: Dar Al Nahda Al Arabiya, 2013).

(18) Hassan Hussein Al Barawi, *Introduction to the Study of Qatari Law*. Cairo: Dar Al Nahda Al Arabiya, 2013.

(19) Ahmed Mohammed Al Sharqawi, *Encyclopaedia of Administrative Decisions in the Council of State Judiciary*, Vol. 2, (Cairo: Dar Al Nahda Al Arabiya, 2014).

The Court ruled in *Council of Civil Service Unions v. Minister of the Civil Service* (1985), that administrative decisions, even those pertaining to ministers' political discretion, are subject to judicial review as long as they are not supported by solid legal evidence or fundamental procedural justice principles. The concept of judicial review of administrative decisions was maintained in this case, allowing the judiciary to intervene in government actions that violate the law or natural justice⁽¹¹⁾.

According to the ruling in *R v. Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Fire Brigades Union* (1995), ministers must have explicit statutory power before they may change or disregard laws passed by the legislature⁽¹²⁾. The 'non-diversion from legislative objectives' concept was created by this ruling, guaranteeing that administrative choices align with the legislative goals outlined by Parliament⁽¹³⁾. Additionally, *Ridge v. Baldwin* (1964) was crucial to the evolution of the procedural fairness criterion. The Court stressed in this ruling that administrative judgments must be unbiased and founded on just legal processes, including people's right to be heard before decisions are made that might affect their legal status or rights⁽¹⁴⁾.

The concept of "unreasonable power" in judicial review was established in *Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd v. Wednesbury Corporation* (1948), where the court held that it could intervene in a decision if an administrative authority had exercised its authority in an irrational or excessive way. This ruling (*Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd v Wednesbury Corporation*, 1948) contributed to the definition of the parameters of judicial review of executive decisions⁽¹⁵⁾.

Individuals' right to seek justice and equality before the law was emphasised in the case of *R v. The Lord Chancellor, ex parte Witham* (1998). In this instance, the court determined that it was illegal to charge a fee for filing a lawsuit if doing so would deny someone his or her basic right to legal recourse⁽¹⁶⁾.

In conclusion, the historical and legal context of administrative law development in Qatar and Britain reflects their unique socio-political trajectories and legal traditions. While Qatar's administrative law framework has evolved in response to modernization efforts and constitutional reforms, Britain's administrative law system is deeply entrenched in the common law tradition and constitutional principles. Understanding these historical and legal foundations provides essential context for analysing the administrative law features of both jurisdictions.

(11) *Council of Civil Service Unions v Minister for the Civil Service* [1984] AC 374.

(12) *R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Fire Brigades Union* [1995] 2 AC 513.

(13) Tom Campbell, *Administrative Law: A Critical Introduction* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995).

(14) *Ridge v Baldwin* [1964] 2 QB 1.

(15) *Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd v Wednesbury Corporation* [1948] 1 KB 223.

(16) *R v The Lord Chancellor, ex parte Witham* [1998] QB 575.

oversight⁽⁶⁾. Furthermore, judicial precedents play a significant role in Qatar's administrative law system. While Qatar does not have a common law tradition like Britain, judicial decisions, particularly those of the Administrative Court, contribute to the interpretation and application of administrative law principles.

7.2 Britain:

Britain's administrative law has a long and rich history, deeply rooted in the common law tradition and constitutional principles. The evolution of administrative law in Britain can be traced back to the prerogative powers of the monarchy and the emergence of administrative tribunals in the 19th century. One of the most significant milestones in Britain's administrative law development was the enactment of the Constitutional Reform Act 2005, which established the UK Supreme Court as the highest court of appeal for administrative law matters. This legislation marked a significant shift in the judicial architecture of the country, separating the judiciary from the legislature and the executive⁽⁷⁾, and here we must note that as authorised by the Constitutional Reform Act 2005, Part 3, Section 23, the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom was formally established on 1 October 2009. Britain's administrative law framework is also influenced by statutory enactments, such as the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Freedom of Information Act 2000. Both confer rights and impose obligations on public authorities. These statutes provide a statutory basis for judicial review and enhance transparency and accountability in administrative decision-making⁽⁸⁾. Moreover, judicial precedents, particularly decisions of the higher courts, have played a crucial role in shaping the development of administrative law principles in Britain. Landmark cases, such as *Anisminic v Foreign Compensation Commission* (1969) and *Council of Civil Service Unions v Minister for the Civil Service* (1984), have established foundational principles of judicial review and procedural fairness⁽⁹⁾. Even if the competent body had used its discretionary powers to make a judgment, the Court concluded in *Anisminic v. Foreign Compensation Commission* (1969), that an appellate court might intervene in administrative decisions if there were significant legal mistakes. This ruling created the concept of "mistake of jurisdiction", which encompasses more than just minor procedural mistakes and includes significant legal errors that may occur when administrative bodies interpret the law⁽¹⁰⁾.

(6) Mohammed Ahmed Didamoni, "Commentary on the Provisions of Law No. 7 of 2007 Regarding Administrative Dispute Resolution". Legal and Judicial Journal, Ministry of Justice, State of Qatar 3, issue no. 2, (2009): 78-96.

(7) Lord Steyn, "The Constitutional Reform Act 2005: A New Era for Judicial Independence". Journal of Constitutional Law (2005): 125-138.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Rehab Tajen, "Suspension of Administrative Decision Execution in Qatari Law: A Comparative Study". 125-149.

(10) Lord Steyn, "The Constitutional Reform Act 2005". 125-138.

6.2.5 Governance Theories:

Governance theories offer theoretical frameworks for understanding the dynamics of governance, including the role of administrative law in regulating state action and promoting accountability. Theories such as principal-agent theory, institutional theory, and network governance provide insights into the relationships between governmental actors, non-state actors, and citizens within administrative law systems. By integrating governance theories into our analysis, we can explore how administrative law functions as a mechanism for balancing competing interests, promoting public trust, and achieving policy objectives. In summary, the theoretical framework for this study draws upon legal principles, comparative law methodologies, and governance theories to provide a conceptual basis for analysing administrative law features in Qatar and Britain. By examining key concepts such as legal principles, institutional arrangements, and judicial review, we can gain a deeper understanding of the complexities and dynamics of administrative law governance in diverse contexts.

7. Historical and Legal Context:

Qatar and Britain have distinct historical and legal contexts that have shaped the development of their administrative law frameworks. Understanding the historical evolution and legal foundations of administrative law in both jurisdictions provides valuable insights into the factors influencing their respective administrative law systems.

7.1 Qatar:

Qatar's administrative law has undergone significant development, particularly in recent decades, reflecting the nation's transition into a modern state. Historically, Islamic law (Sharia) and customary practices influenced Qatar's legal system. However, in the 20th century, Qatar began to modernise its legal system, drawing inspiration from both Islamic jurisprudence and Western legal principles.⁽⁵⁾ Key milestones in Qatar's administrative law development include the promulgation of the State of Qatar's Constitution in 2004, entered into force in 2005, which established the framework for the country's legal and political system. The Constitution guarantees fundamental rights and freedoms to citizens and outlines the structure of governmental institutions, including the executive branch responsible for administrative functions. In addition to constitutional provisions, Qatar's administrative law framework is shaped by statutory enactments, such as laws, decrees, and regulations issued by the government. These legal instruments govern various aspects of administrative decision-making, including public administration, licensing, and regulatory

(5) Hassan Hussein Al Barawi. Introduction to the Study of Qatari Law (Cairo, Dar Al Nahda Al Arabiya, 2013).

separation of powers, procedural fairness, legal certainty, and accountability. The rule of law, for instance, ensures that governmental actions are based on clear and predictable laws, while procedural fairness guarantees that individuals affected by administrative decisions have a right to be heard and to receive reasons for those decisions. Understanding these legal principles provides a foundation for evaluating the effectiveness and legitimacy of administrative law frameworks⁽³⁾.

6.2.2 Institutional Arrangements:

Institutional arrangements within administrative law encompass the structures, functions, and powers of administrative bodies within the state. This includes ministries, regulatory agencies, tribunals, and other bodies responsible for making and implementing administrative decisions. Comparative analysis allows us to examine how these institutions are organised, what their roles and responsibilities are, and the degree of independence they enjoy. Differences in institutional arrangements between Qatar and Britain may reflect varying historical, cultural, and political contexts, influencing administrative decision-making processes and outcomes⁽⁴⁾.

6.2.3 Judicial Review:

Judicial review is a fundamental aspect of administrative law, providing a mechanism for courts to review the legality and fairness of administrative decisions. Comparative analysis of judicial review procedures allows us to explore differences in legal standards, procedural requirements, and the scope of judicial scrutiny between Qatar and Britain. This involves examining factors such as access to judicial review, the grounds for challenging administrative decisions, and the deference afforded to administrative agencies by the judiciary.

6.2.4 Comparative Law Methodologies:

Comparative law methodologies provide analytical tools for examining legal systems and identifying similarities and differences across jurisdictions. By applying these methodologies to administrative law, we can systematically compare legal principles, institutional arrangements, and judicial practices between Qatar and Britain. This involves selecting appropriate criteria for comparison, conducting in-depth analysis of relevant legal texts and case law, and synthesising findings to draw meaningful conclusions.

(3) Abdul Aziz Abdul Moneim Khalifa. *Urgent Applications in the Council of State Judiciary* (Alexandria. Dar Al Fikr Al Jameila) 2010.

(4) Rehab Madi Tajen, "Suspension of Administrative Decision Execution in Qatari Law: A Comparative Study". *Legal and Judicial Journal*, Special Issue on Administrative Disputes in the State of Qatar, Views and Aspirations of the Center for Legal and Judicial Studies, Ministry of Justice, State of Qatar, (2011): 125-149.

G. Comparative studies can contribute to the harmonisation of legal standards and practices across jurisdictions. By identifying commonalities and differences in administrative law frameworks, the study can help facilitate greater consistency and coherence in legal principles and practices, thereby promoting legal harmonisation and convergence.

In summary, the purpose of conducting a comparative study between Qatari and British administrative law features is to deepen understanding, inform policy and practice, foster cross-jurisdictional learning, contribute to legal scholarship, enhance accountability and transparency, and facilitate legal harmonisation. Through these objectives, the study seeks to advance knowledge and promote effective governance in both jurisdictions.

6. Methodology:

This study employs a comparative methodology, drawing upon a combination of qualitative analysis and desk research. Data collection involves examining legal texts, scholarly articles, government reports, and judicial decisions related to administrative law in both jurisdictions. The comparative analysis is guided by established criteria and frameworks, allowing for a systematic examination of key dimensions such as legal principles, institutional arrangements, and judicial review procedures.

6.1 Introduction to Comparative Analysis:

The comparative analysis between Qatari and British administrative law features provides the backbone of this study. By exploring their historical and legal contexts, structural elements, procedural mechanisms, and approaches to protecting individual rights, this analysis aims to uncover insights into the operation and evolution of administrative law in diverse socio-political contexts. Through this comparative lens, the study seeks to elucidate the complexities, challenges, and opportunities inherent in administrative law governance in Qatar, Britain, and beyond.

6.2 Theoretical Framework:

Administrative law, as a field of study, draws upon a rich theoretical foundation rooted in legal principles, comparative law methodologies, and governance theories. This theoretical framework serves as a lens through which we can analyse and understand the administrative law features of different jurisdictions, such as Qatar and Britain.

6.2.1 Legal Principles:

At the core of administrative law are legal principles that govern the relationship between the state and its citizens. These principles include the rule of law,

accountability and transparency, protecting individual rights, facilitating legal harmonisation, and advancing scholarly inquiry in the realm of administrative law.

5. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of conducting a comparative study between Qatari and British administrative law features is multifaceted and encompasses several key objectives:

- A. The study aims to deepen understanding of the administrative law frameworks operating in Qatar and Britain. By examining the legal principles, structures, and mechanisms underpinning administrative decision-making, the study seeks to provide a comprehensive overview of how governance is regulated in each jurisdiction.
- B. By comparing and contrasting administrative law features between Qatar and Britain, the study intends to identify both differences and similarities in legal approaches, institutional arrangements, and judicial practices. This analysis can shed light on the diverse ways in which administrative law is conceptualised and applied across different legal traditions.
- C. A primary purpose of the study is to provide insights and recommendations that can inform policy development and legal practice in both Qatar and Britain. By highlighting areas of strength and areas for improvement within each administrative law system, the study aims to support policymakers and practitioners in enhancing the effectiveness, fairness, and accountability of administrative decision-making.
- D. Comparative studies offer opportunities for cross-jurisdictional learning, enabling legal scholars, policymakers, and practitioners to learn from each other's experiences and best practices. By facilitating dialogue and exchange of ideas between Qatar and Britain, the study seeks to promote mutual learning and collaboration in the realm of administrative law governance.
- E. The study aims to contribute to the academic discourse on administrative law by generating new knowledge, theories, and insights. By conducting rigorous comparative analysis and advancing scholarly inquiry, the study seeks to enrich the understanding of administrative law principles and practices, thereby contributing to the development of the field.
- F. Administrative law plays a crucial role in ensuring accountability and transparency in governmental decision-making processes. By examining the administrative law features of Qatar and Britain, the study aims to identify ways to strengthen mechanisms for accountability and transparency, ultimately enhancing public trust in government institutions.

By pursuing these goals, the study endeavours to make a meaningful contribution to the understanding and advancement of administrative law governance in Qatar and Britain and the broader field of comparative legal studies.

4. Key Importance of the Study

- A. The study is important for enhancing the understanding of administrative law principles and practices in both Qatar and Britain. By comparing and contrasting these systems, scholars and practitioners can gain insights into the underlying legal principles and institutional arrangements governing administrative decision-making.
- B. Comparative studies such as this facilitate cross-jurisdictional learning by highlighting best practices, challenges, and innovations in administrative law. This promotes mutual learning and enables policymakers and practitioners to adapt successful strategies from one jurisdiction to another.
- C. The findings of the study can inform policy development and reform efforts in both Qatar and Britain. By identifying areas for improvement and suggesting evidence-based recommendations, the study can contribute to the development of more effective and responsive administrative law frameworks.
- D. Administrative law plays a crucial role in ensuring accountability and transparency in governmental decision-making. By examining the administrative law features of Qatar and Britain, the study can contribute to strengthening mechanisms for accountability and transparency in both jurisdictions.
- E. Administrative law frameworks provide important safeguards for protecting individual rights and freedoms. Through comparative analysis, the study can identify ways to enhance the protection of individual rights within administrative decision-making processes, benefiting citizens in both Qatar and Britain.
- F. Comparative studies like this one can contribute to the harmonization of legal standards and practices across jurisdictions. By identifying commonalities and differences in administrative law frameworks, the study can help facilitate greater consistency and coherence in legal principles and practices.
- G. Comparative studies in administrative law contribute to advancing scholarship in the field by generating new knowledge, theories, and insights. The study can stimulate further research and debate on administrative law governance, enriching the academic discourse and contributing to the development of the field.

Overall, the study holds significant importance for enhancing legal understanding, promoting cross-jurisdictional learning, informing policy development, strengthening

political developments impact administrative law dynamics in both jurisdictions?
What lessons can be learned from each other's administrative law experiences?

By addressing these research questions and conducting a thorough comparative analysis, scholars and policymakers can gain deeper insights into the complexities of administrative law governance in Qatar and Britain, fostering dialogue, collaboration, and informed decision-making in this critical field.

3. Study Goals

- A. The primary goal of the study is to achieve a comprehensive comparative understanding of administrative law features between Qatar and Britain. This involves identifying similarities, differences, and underlying principles in their respective administrative law frameworks.
- B. Through rigorous analysis, the study aims to provide insightful interpretations of the administrative law systems in both jurisdictions. This includes examining the historical, cultural, and legal contexts that shape administrative law principles and practices.
- C. By comparing administrative law practices in Qatar and Britain, the study seeks to identify best practices and lessons learned from each jurisdiction. This involves assessing the effectiveness of different approaches to governance, accountability, and the protection of individual rights.
- D. Another goal is to highlight the challenges and areas for improvement within the administrative law systems of both Qatar and Britain. This includes addressing issues such as transparency, efficiency, and access to justice.
- E. The study aims to inform policy development and legal practice by providing evidence-based recommendations and insights derived from the comparative analysis. This may involve suggesting reforms, strategies for enhancing accountability, or avenues for cross-jurisdictional collaboration.
- F. As a scholarly endeavour, the study seeks to contribute to the academic discourse on administrative law, comparative law, and governance. This involves advancing theoretical frameworks, generating new knowledge, and stimulating further research in the field.
- G. Lastly, the study aims to promote dialogue and collaboration between legal scholars, policymakers, and practitioners in Qatar, Britain, and beyond. By fostering the exchange of ideas and experiences, the study endeavours to enrich understanding and facilitate mutual learning in the realm of administrative law.

the comparative study of administrative law in Qatar and Britain offers a compelling opportunity to examine the dynamic interplay between legal tradition and modernity, state authority and individual rights, and global convergence and divergence. By fostering dialogue, collaboration, and scholarship in this vital area of legal inquiry, this research seeks to advance our collective understanding of administrative law's role in shaping the contours of governance and justice in an ever-changing world.

2. Study Problem

The comparative study of administrative law features between Qatar and Britain presents several compelling research questions and areas of inquiry:

- A. What are the primary sources of administrative law in Qatar and Britain? How do they differ in terms of legal traditions, statutory enactments, and constitutional conventions? What role do judicial precedents play in shaping administrative law principles in both jurisdictions?
- B. How are administrative agencies structured and empowered in Qatar and Britain? What are the mechanisms for accountability, oversight, and transparency within these agencies? How do cultural, political, and institutional factors influence the functioning of administrative bodies in each country?
- C. What are the procedures and standards for judicial review of administrative decisions in Qatar and Britain? How do courts approach issues of legality, procedural fairness, and substantive review? What role do specialised tribunals play in administrative adjudication?
- D. How are individual rights protected within the administrative law frameworks of Qatar and Britain? What mechanisms exist for challenging administrative actions that infringe upon fundamental rights and freedoms? How do cultural and constitutional considerations shape the interpretation and enforcement of individual rights?
- E. What efforts have been made to reform and modernise administrative law in Qatar and Britain? To what extent do legal reforms in one jurisdiction influence practices and principles in the other? What opportunities exist for harmonising administrative law standards at the international level?
- F. What are the practical implications of administrative law principles in Qatar and Britain, particularly in immigration, environmental regulation, and public procurement? Can case studies of landmark administrative law cases offer insights into the application and interpretation of legal principles in practice?
- G. What are the emerging trends and challenges facing administrative law in Qatar and Britain? How do globalisation, technological advancements, and socio-

1. Introduction

Administrative law serves as the cornerstone of governance in both Qatar and Britain, regulating the relationship between governmental bodies and citizens, ensuring accountability, fairness, and adherence to legal principles in administrative decision-making. While Qatar and Britain may differ significantly in their historical, cultural, and legal contexts, a comparative study of their administrative law features unveils intriguing parallels and distinctions, offering valuable insights into the evolution and operation of administrative law in diverse jurisdictions.⁽¹⁾ This study aims to explore and analyse the administrative law frameworks of Qatar and Britain, shedding light on their respective structures, principles, and mechanisms. By examining key aspects such as the sources of administrative law, the role of administrative agencies, judicial review procedures, and the protection of individual rights, this comparative analysis seeks to identify similarities, differences, and potential areas for cross-jurisdictional learning.

In Qatar, administrative law has undergone significant development in recent years, reflecting the nation's commitment to modernisation and legal reform. Drawing upon Islamic jurisprudence, civil law traditions, and contemporary legal principles, Qatar's administrative law framework navigates the complexities of a rapidly evolving society while upholding the principles of justice, transparency, and efficiency. As Qatar continues to assert its presence on the global stage, understanding the nuances of its administrative law system becomes increasingly pertinent for scholars, policymakers, and practitioners alike.⁽²⁾ Conversely, Britain boasts a rich legacy in administrative law, shaped by centuries of legal evolution, constitutional conventions, and judicial precedents. Rooted in common law principles, statutory enactments, and constitutional conventions, Britain's administrative law framework exemplifies the delicate balance between governmental authority and individual rights. With a sophisticated system of judicial review and a robust tradition of legal scholarship, Britain stands as a beacon of administrative law expertise, offering valuable insights into best practices and emerging challenges in the field. Through a comparative lens, this study endeavours to analyse the strengths and weaknesses of both Qatar and Britain's administrative law systems, exploring avenues for reform, harmonisation, and mutual learning. By elucidating the underlying principles, institutional arrangements, and practical implications of administrative law in these jurisdictions, this research aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of governance, legality, and accountability in contemporary societies. In conclusion,

(1) Ahmed Mohammed Sharqawi. *Encyclopaedia of Administrative Decisions in the Council of State Judiciary*. Vol. 2, (Cairo. Dar Al Nahda Al Arabiya) 2014.

(2) Suleiman Al Tamawi. *General Theory of Administrative Decisions. A Comparative Study* (Cairo. Dar Al Fikr Al Arabi) 2017.

المُلخَص:

القانون الإداري: تحليل مقارنة للإطارين القانونيين القطري والبريطاني

المقدم/ عايض مطيع الاحبابي

عضو هيئة التدريس بكلية الشرطة - أكاديمية الشرطة - دولة قطر

تتناول هذه الدراسة تحليلاً مقارناً للقانون الإداري في كل من دولة قطر والمملكة المتحدة. تهدف الدراسة إلى استكشاف أوجه التشابه والاختلاف في الأطر القانونية والهيكل المؤسسية والآليات الإجرائية التي تحكم العلاقة بين الهيئات الإدارية والمواطنين في البلدين. تستعرض الدراسة السياق التاريخي والقانوني لتطور القانون الإداري، مبرزة تأثير التقاليد القانونية المختلفة والإصلاحات الحديثة على النظم الإدارية. كما تحلل الدراسة الهياكل الرئيسية للقانون الإداري، بما في ذلك تنظيم الهيئات الإدارية وصلاحياتها، وآليات المساءلة والرقابة. تتطرق الدراسة أيضاً إلى المراجعة القضائية للقرارات الإدارية، موضحة الأسس القانونية ونطاق الرقابة القضائية والتعويضات المتاحة في كلا البلدين. تحدد الدراسة التحديات الرئيسية التي تواجه الحوكمة الإدارية، مثل ضمان المساءلة والشفافية والوصول إلى العدالة، وتقدم فرصاً للإصلاح والتحسين. وتخلص الدراسة إلى أن فهم الخصائص المقارنة للقانون الإداري في قطر وبريطانيا يمكن أن يساهم في تعزيز الحوار وتبادل الخبرات بين النظم القانونية المختلفة، مما يساعد على تطوير ممارسات الحوكمة الإدارية في كلا البلدين.

الكلمات المفتاحية: القانون الإداري، الإطار القانوني القطري، الإطار القانوني البريطاني.

Exploring Administrative Law: A Comparative Analysis of Qatari and British Legal Frameworks

Lieutenant Colonel Ayed Muteea Alahbabi

Faculty Member – Police College - Police Academy – State of Qatar

ABSTRACT

This study presents a comparative analysis of administrative law in Qatar and the United Kingdom. The research aims to explore similarities and differences in legal frameworks, institutional structures, and procedural mechanisms governing the relationship between administrative bodies and citizens in both countries. The study examines the historical and legal context of administrative law development, highlighting the influence of different legal traditions and recent reforms on administrative systems. It analyses key structures of administrative law, including the organisation and powers of administrative agencies, and mechanisms for accountability and oversight. The study also addresses judicial review of administrative decisions, clarifying the legal grounds, scope of judicial scrutiny, and remedies available in both countries. It identifies key challenges facing administrative governance, such as ensuring accountability, transparency, and access to justice, and suggests opportunities for reform and improvement. The study concludes that understanding the comparative features of administrative law in Qatar and Britain can contribute to enhancing dialogue and exchange of experiences between different legal systems, helping to develop administrative governance practices in both countries.

Keywords: Administrative Law, Qatari legal framework, British legal framework

Exploring Administrative Law: A Comparative Analysis of Qatari and British Legal Frameworks

Lieutenant Colonel Ayed Muteea Alahbabi

Faculty Member – Police College - Police Academy – State of Qatar