



Park, Patricia. (2003). Editorial. *Mountbatten Journal of Legal Studies*, December 2003, 7 (1 & 2), pp. 3-4

Downloaded from <http://ssudl.solent.ac.uk/981/>

Usage Guidelines

Please refer to usage guidelines at <http://ssudl.solent.ac.uk/policies.html> or alternatively contact ir.admin@solent.ac.uk.

EDITORIAL

This issue introduces a new section to the Journal in addition to a new Editorial Board and a new and extended Advisory Board.

We are particularly fortunate to have advice from Dr Mike Biles, The Ombudsman for England and Bettina Rigg, Partner at Bond Pearce Law Firm as practitioners on the new Editorial Board. This will support the academic expertise of Dr Benjamin Andoh, Nick Curwen and Simon Parsons from the School of Law. The Advisory Board has been extended to include academics from other jurisdictions to better advise on the growing international submissions to the journal. These include Goran Husslar from the University of Orebro in Sweden and Dr Thomas Shomerus from the University of Luneburg in Germany.

In response to short submissions from authors who wish to make a point on some topical legal issue the new Editorial Board decided to introduce a separate section for 'Legal Comment'. The first comment is by Alec Samuels who was moved to write about the decision in *Wainwright v Home Office* with regard to the invasion of privacy. The second introduces some thoughts from Brazil on the recent Arbitration Law and the difficulties of general acceptance of alternative dispute resolution in Brazil. This will be extended into a full paper for the next issue of the journal. This section is primarily for authors to state their thoughts on issues of the moment prior to developing full articles for publication, or just to make a personal comment on some legal point, which is of interest.

The first of the articles is a consideration of the position of pedlars and the inexorable drive by local authorities to 'tidy up' locations by driving out such colourful characters from our market streets. The response by some is to no longer pedal their wares in the local streets of our market towns but to travel wider distances across cyberspace where even the restrictive activities of local authorities cannot reach.

The second article considers the issue estoppel and the 1989 Children Act proceedings. It would appear that these two instruments are incompatible inasmuch as the concept of issue estoppel requires a conclusion to the issue whereas under the Children Act there is a

requirement for some flexibility. The approach of Hale J has resolved this conundrum to a certain extent but this has left further problems for practitioners in the area.

Article three visits a controversial area with regard to the seclusion of psychiatric patients. This is a sadly neglected area from the legal perspective and this article gives an over-view of the legal concepts and some of the problems of this 'measure of last resort'.

The final article in this issue addresses the conflicts between world trade dispute resolution and environmental issues. A number of cases, which have been before both the panel and the Appellate Body of the WTO are analysed with the conclusion that the rules are interpreted restrictively with little consideration of the environmental instruments which increasing numbers of states are enacting into their domestic law.

Professor Patricia Park