

**JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS COMMISSION: A COMPARISON BETWEEN THE
JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS COMMISSION IN MALAYSIA AND THE JUDICIAL
APPOINTMENTS COMMISSION IN UNITED KINGDOM**

By

Ahmad Danial Bin Mohd Azlan (2009223716)

Luqman Bin Mazlan (2009654352)

Mohd Irzan Iswatt Bin Mohd Noor (2009411306)

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Bachelor in Legal Studies (Hons)

Universiti Teknologi MARA

Faculty of Law

DECEMBER 2011

The students/authors confirm that the work submitted is their own and that appropriate

Credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Assalamualaikum W.B.T first and foremost praised to ALLAH S.W.T for giving us strength to complete this thesis paper in time we would like to express our deepest appreciation to, Puan Norita Binti Azmi, our supervisor who has guided us non-stop in completing this research paper project. She has continuously giving us support and encourages us with regards to this paper project. Without her supervision and consistent help, this research project paper would not have been possible to complete in due time.

Furthermore, we would like to show our deepest gratitude to Dato' Syed Ahmad Helmi Bin Syed Dahlan, the Judge of Court of Appeal, who has help us in providing sufficient information regarding this topic. His views and opinions have provided us a better understanding and a clearer view with regard to this topic.

Besides that, we also like to thank Cik Norizan Binti Yaakub, a Bar Council Member and Senior Partner of Norizan and Associates for giving us guidance and advice to this topic. Her opinion and suggestion from a practitioner point of view is deeply appreciated in completing this paper project.

Not to mention, we owe our deepest gratitude to Encik Wan Khairil Anwar Bin Wan Muhammad, the Deputy Secretary of Judicial Appointments Commission for giving his precious time in allowing us to interview him for this project paper. His information, opinion, and suggestion are deeply appreciated and we are grateful that his information has helped us in completing this project paper.

Lastly, we would like to thank our college mate and family in completing from the very beginning. This research has been carried out by a team comprises of Ahmad Danial Bin Mohd Azlan, Luqman Bin Mazlan, and Mohd Irzan Iswatt Bin Mohd Noor. This project has been contributed equally and fairly between us.

ABSTRACT

This project paper has been conducted in relation of the Judicial Appointments Commission. For the purpose of our research, we have compared the two Acts which are the Judicial Appointments Act in Malaysia and also the Constitutional Reform Act in United Kingdom. This is because both models have different structures and functions as to having the exclusive rights towards judicial independence. In upholding the independence of Judiciary, we have done a comparison between these two countries, Malaysia and United Kingdom. This is important for the purpose of our paper project, in order to review the loopholes of structures and functions of Judicial Appointments Commission in Malaysia. This is because the setting up of this body defeats the purpose of having exclusive rights of judicial independence as there is still an infringement of power by the Executive solely by the Prime Minister. Furthermore, in order to provide a better form and structures of Judicial Appointments Commission, this project paper will provide a reasonable suggestions and rational recommendations on the loopholes discovered from the comparative study between the two bodies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgement	ii
Abstract	iii
Contents	iv

TOPIC	PAGE
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
1.0 Introduction on Judicial Appointment Commission	1
1.1 Background	3
1.2 Literature Review	4
1.3 Research Question	8
1.4 Objective of the Research	8
1.5 Significance of the Research	9
1.6 Scope and Limitation of the Research	9
1.7 Research Methodology	10
1.8 Conclusion	10
CHAPTER 2: THE JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS COMMISSION OF MALAYSIA	11
2.0 Introduction on the Judicial Appointments Commission of Malaysia	11
2.1 Appointment and Dismissal of Judges	14
2.2 The Prime Minister of Malaysia	18
2.3 Findings	19
2.3.1 First Respondent	19
2.3.2 Second Respondent	21
2.3.3 Third Respondent	23
2.4 Conclusion	26

CHAPTER 3: THE JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS COMMISSION IN UNITED KINGDOM	27
3.0 Introduction on the Constitutional Reform Act of United Kingdom	27
3.1 Clarity in the Law	28
3.2 Transparency	31
3.3 Ombudsman	33
3.4 The Lord Chancellor	34
3.5 Costly and Lengthy Process	38
3.6 Conclusion	39
CHAPTER 4: COMPARISON BETWEEN THE JUDICIAL APPOINTMENTS COMMISSION ACT AND THE CONSTITUTIONAL REFORM ACT	40
4.0 Introduction	40
4.1 The Big Picture of Both Acts	40
4.2 Members of the Commission	41
4.3 The Selection Process and Methods of Appointment	43
4.4 Ombudsman	44
4.5 The Drawbacks	45
4.5.1 Funding and Allowances	45
4.5.2 Prime Minister and the Lord Chancellor	46
4.6 Conclusion	46
CHAPTER 5: RECOMMENDATIONS AND CONCLUSION	48
5.0 Introduction	48
5.1 Members of the Commission	48
5.2 Dismissal	49
5.3 Amending the Act	50
5.4 Appointments	50
5.5 Funding	51
5.6 Ombudsman	52
5.7 Conclusion	53
REFERENCES	54
APPENDICES	56