

## **Before the High Court**

### **Instructions to Authors**

- (1) This section of the *Review* publishes relatively short pieces on cases or issues pending before the High Court, in time for those pieces appear before oral argument in the case takes place. The Editorial Committee will review cases shortly after special leave is given by the High Court to consider whether treatment in “Before the High Court” is appropriate. Cases suitable to treatment in “Before the High Court” are those that raise major or novel issues of principle.
- (2) Before the High Court pieces should wherever possible draw on comparative jurisprudence (for example, in North America or Europe) on the issue faced by the Court. It is not intended that the piece engage in detailed discussion of factual issues, except to the extent that these activate questions of principle.
- (3) In order to achieve the purposes of “Before the High Court”, it is essential to have pieces prepared rather rapidly, and to adhere to deadlines. If the *Review* can assist potential authors in achieving this, it will be happy to do so.
- (4) The length of the item is strictly constrained by the overall size limit for each issue of the *Review*, as established in the contract with the publishers. Items should not exceed 5000 words in length. The Committee reserves the right, in consultation with the author, to edit each contribution so as to keep it within that length limit.
- (5) The Editorial Committee reviews cases given special leave, and normally solicits comment from an academic with expertise in the relevant area. However, suggestions and contributions are welcome. If you know of cases which are likely to come before the Court and which would deserve treatment, please contact us as soon as possible.

*Last updated 16 November 2006*