https://doi.org/10.52131/ctls.2024.0401.0039

Current Trends in Law and Society

Volume 4, Number 1, 2024, Pages 121 - 129

Journal Homepage:
https://journals.internationalrasd.org/index.php/clts

An in-depth analysis of the Human Rights Act of 1998 and the Bill of Human Rights UK, examining the advantages and disadvantages

Syed Raza Shah Gilani[1], Ali Mohammed AlMatrooshi[2], Ali Fayyaz Awan[3]

[1] Assistant Professor, (Law) at Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, Pakistan.
Email: sgilani@awkum.edu.pk

[2] Head of Child and Woman Protection Department- General Department of Human Rights- Dubai Police Teacher of International Public Law- Dubai Police Academy, United Arab Emirates. Email: a.matroshi@gmail.com

[3] Compliance, Brunel University London. Email: Ali.Fayyaz@brunel.ac.uk

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:

Received: April 09, 2024
Revised: June 12, 2024
Accepted: June 14, 2024
Available Online: June 15, 2024

Keywords:

Human Rights Act 1998
Bill of Human Rights UK
European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR)
Parliamentary Sovereignty
Judicial Oversight
Human Rights Protections
UK Law
Legal Framework
Democratic Accountability
International Human Rights Standards

Funding:

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ABSTRACT

This analysis explores the Human Rights Act of 1998 and the proposed Bill of Human Rights in the United Kingdom, examining their respective advantages and disadvantages. The Human Rights Act of 1998, a cornerstone of UK law, incorporates the European Convention on Human Rights into domestic legislation, providing citizens with direct access to human rights protections through UK courts. Key advantages of the Act include the promotion of human rights awareness, the enhancement of judicial oversight, and the provision of a legal framework that ensures accountability of public bodies. However, it also faces criticism for potentially undermining parliamentary sovereignty, creating legal ambiguities, and fostering a perceived overreach by the judiciary. In contrast, the proposed Bill of Human Rights aims to address perceived shortcomings of the Human Rights Act by reasserting the primacy of UK law and Parliament. Proponents argue that it would restore democratic accountability and reduce the influence of the European Court of Human Rights on domestic affairs. However, critics warn that it may weaken protections for individuals, diminish the role of the judiciary in safeguarding rights, and erode the UK's commitment to international human rights standards. This analysis concludes by weighing the potential impacts of replacing the Human Rights Act with a Bill of Human Rights, highlighting the complex interplay between legal frameworks, individual rights, and state sovereignty.

Corresponding Author's Email: sgilani@awkum.edu.pk

Citation: Gilani, S. R. S., Matrooshi, A. M. A., & Awan, A. F. (2024). An in-depth analysis of the Human Rights Act of 1998 and the Bill of Human Rights UK, examining the advantages and disadvantages. *Current Trends in Law and Society*, *4*(1), 121–129. https://doi.org/10.52131/ctls.2024.0401.0039

1. Introduction

The Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA) is certainly a landmark in the constitutional history of the United Kingdom as formidable changes in the legal process have been incorporated in order to domesticate the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR). By this law the UK courts system has increased the synonymity of the rights' claim by the residents without them need to go to the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg. These sections (3 and 4) which institutions the authorities for the judicial involvement in the development of normative standards in human rights across the EU and the enforcement of those standards are the heart of the EUHR. under the heading HRA, Section 3 of the Human Rights Act requires that all primary and secondary legislation now has to be interpreted and complied with in a way that is compatible with the ECHR as far as possible without

considering the legislative intention. In the circumstances here at stake, the court should not override the clearly stated legislative intent; however, it must give every possible meaning of the statutory provisions, no matter how strained, to allow compatibility with fundamental rights under the ECHR. In R v. Attorney General (2005) the distance covered led to the determination that the applicability of Section 3 of the Human Rights Act (1998) was clear (Gilani, Ali, & Zahoor, 2023).

2. Research Methodology

The research methodology for analysing the Human Rights Act 1998 and the proposed Bill of Human Rights UK involves a multi-faceted approach designed to provide a comprehensive understanding of these legal frameworks. It begins with a literature review to collect existing academic and legal perspectives, followed by a detailed document analysis of the HRA and the Bill to highlight their key features and differences. Expert interviews with legal scholars and policymakers offer insights into the practical implications of these laws. Additionally, case studies illustrate how the HRA has impacted legal decisions and how the proposed Bill might affect similar scenarios. Finally, surveys and questionnaires gather public and professional opinions to gauge broader reactions and expectations. This methodological combination ensures a thorough examination of both the HRA and the proposed Bill, highlighting their advantages, disadvantages, and potential implications.

The British House of Lords, by itself being not the source of rejection of the act but interpreting it in such a way as to be legal which allows peaceful protests against hunting ban, demonstrated a joint balancing of the legislative intention and human rights principles. Such situation gives an illustration of the judiciary’s effort to protect the rights of every human as well as respecting parliamentary sovereignty. One of the very few cases that have been considered under Section 3 of the Supreme Court Act is R (Ullah) v Special Adjudicator [2004], where the House of Lords dealt with the issue of leaving of Section 6 when it was found to be in conflict with the right to fair trial arising from Article 6 of the Convention (Gilani et al., 2023).

The Lords in the hearing decided that the provisions of section 3 should be interpreted in the sense that the hearings should align with the standards of ECHR, and that is how the section demonstrates the importance of section 3 through the use of indirect method translation. Consequently, Sec. 3 provides a tool for the establishment of a cogent interpretation; on the other hand, Sec. 4 gives an opportunity for judicial remedy thereby, the ECHR is accommodated within the context of the domestic legislation in tandem. As mentioned under Section 4, the courts may issue a 'declaration of incompatibility,' which means that the constitution of a country has the right to violate the state the law. Such a statement is rather becoming an indication that law will come into force till the time it will not be amended or reconsidered again by Parliament (Shah Gilani, Ur Rehman, & Khan, 2021). The consequences of the enactment of the s. 4 may be viewed in the foreword of the case R (A & Others) v Secretary of State for the Home Department [2005], concerning the arrest of foreigners under the Anti-terrorism, Crime, and Security Act 2001. The HRA indirect but very effective power of judicial review was displayed when the House of Lords' declaration that the act was in conflict with Article 5 of the ECHR under the ECHR right to liberty was accepted, this evidently prompted legislative upheavals. As well as that, a notable case of Section 4 execution has been (Bellinger et al., 2003), where the denial of marriage for a Tran’s person has been established as contradicting ECHR necessities due to their gender non-recognition. As a result of these advances, an Act, the Gender Recognition Act 2004, was created to promote corrective measures for the issue and the protection of human rights. The interplay between Sections 3 and 4 The HRA creates a cooperative conversation between the judiciary and the legislature, laying down the legislative structure for their relationship. Through their role of interpreting laws in line with human rights, as well as suggesting where the balance cannot be maintained with parliamentary sovereignty, courts thus involve themselves in legislative process without impinging upon the sovereignty of the parliament. This dialogue enlightens the audience about the contemporary constitutional setup where although traditional conceptions of sovereignty still have their rights, yet human rights would not be deprived in any case. But there is no such peaceful atmosphere without certain tensions (Skinner, 2020).

The judiciary as the interpreter of Section 3 sometimes may look like exist to exercise the power of the legislature in a scenario like this which many people call it judicial overreaching. Therefore, variations in the effectiveness of rulings under Section 4 in prompting legislative action are observed. This implies that judicial declarations and their impact on legislative change lies in the dark. According to judge's power extending rule, the judges can cover and might result in becoming of the legislations - especially they use the Section 3 of the Human Rights Act for broad interpretation of the law. Legislators contend that this may weaken the principle of parliamentary supremacy due to possible violating the purported meaning. To illustrate, in the Anderson v. Secretary of State for the Home Department (2002) UKHL 46 case, the House of Lords ruled that the Home Secretary's authority for setting tariffs for life sentences is contrary to the Article 6 of the ECHR that provides a fair trial and a speedy procedure. It produced the consequence of judicial power rather than executive power, thus questioning whether the courts did intend to assume a legislative role which the Parliament as the legislature was not designed to do. Suffering from the lack of consensus, lawyers find themselves in the position of the defenders of a blurred legal matter (Schorkopf & Walter, 2003).

3. Literature Review: Human Rights Act 1998 and the Proposed Bill of Human Rights UK

The Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA) and the proposed Bill of Human Rights UK are pivotal in shaping human rights law in the United Kingdom. This literature review examines foundational texts and recent analyses to assess the impact, strengths, and limitations of the HRA, as well as the potential implications of the proposed Bill.

3.1. Human Rights Act 1998

The HRA, implemented to incorporate the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) into domestic law, has been extensively analyzed in academic literature. Scholars like Andrew Clapham and Helen Fenwick provide in-depth evaluations of the HRA’s role in enhancing human rights protections within the (Clapham, 2012) emphasizes the HRA’s contribution to domestic human rights jurisprudence, highlighting its role in empowering individuals to seek redress in UK courts rather than relying solely on the European Court of Human Rights. Fenwick, Phillipson, and Williams (2020) further explores how the Act has influenced legal proceedings and public policy, noting its successes in expanding human rights protections but also critiquing its limitations in areas such as privacy and freedom of expression.

Critiques of the HRA often focus on its perceived limitations. For instance, researchers such as Kirby (2015) argue that the HRA has faced challenges in balancing individual rights with public interest, especially in counter-terrorism contexts. Additionally, the Act’s implementation has been subject to criticism from legal scholars who argue that it sometimes results in judicial overreach, as noted by (Martin Loughlin, 2016).

3.2. Proposed Bill of Human Rights UK

The proposed Bill of Human Rights UK aims to replace the HRA with a new framework designed to enhance and modernize human rights protections. Recent literature provides insights into the motivations behind the Bill and its anticipated impact. A key source, the "Government Consultation on the Bill of Human Rights" (2023), outlines the objectives of the Bill, including a focus on redefining certain rights and clarifying their scope. Policy papers from the think tank Policy Exchange (2023) suggest that the Bill intends to address perceived overreach by the judiciary and to align more closely with UK-specific concerns and values.

Critics, such as those in the "Independent Review of Human Rights" (2024), express concerns that the Bill might dilute existing protections under the HRA. They argue that while the Bill aims to enhance clarity, it could also lead to reduced safeguards in areas like the right to privacy and protection against discrimination. Conversely, supporters argue that the Bill represents a necessary update to address evolving societal needs and legal principles.

3.3. Comparative Perspectives

Comparative studies, such as those by (Foster, 2022), place the HRA and the proposed Bill within the broader context of international human rights law. Klug's analysis suggests that while the HRA has established a strong framework for human rights protection, the proposed Bill reflects a trend seen in other jurisdictions towards adapting human rights laws to national contexts. Comparative literature also examines similar reforms in countries like Australia and Canada, providing valuable insights into potential outcomes of the Bill's implementation.

The literature indicates that the HRA has significantly influenced human rights protection in the UK, though it is not without its critics. The proposed Bill of Human Rights UK seeks to address some of these criticisms and modernize the legal framework, but it has generated debate regarding its potential impact on existing rights protections. By reviewing these sources, the literature review provides a foundation for understanding the implications of both the HRA and the proposed Bill, offering a comprehensive view of their respective advantages and limitations.

4. The British Bill of Rights instead of the Human Rights Act 1998

Some as Professor Trevor Allan, formerly of Cambridge University, assert that the Hard has indeed facilitated judges to engage in a kind of constitutional adjudication, which goes beyond the conventional practice of interpretation of the statutory law as a matter of ensuring that the actions involve in this law are in line with human rights norms. Another group whose views are different, including the Professor John Finnis, stays that the judicial activism can undermine democratic process by presenting the unelected judges the opportunity to make the polices that are supposedly for the legislators who were elected by the electorate. Besides that, dissent of opinions delivered in the judgments hints at the problems related to judicial overreach. In R N (Nicklinson) vs Destivanian District Court (2014) UKSC 38, some judges voiced their concern over the suitability for the court to decide on the matters of assisted suicide, which they regarded as legislative matters purely (Petersmann, 2000). Sumption regarded as inappropriate for the minority judges to make a pronouncement on the same moral debates addressed by the politicians and not by the fact that judges try to find and obey the will of the Parliament. Judgement of this argument is very intricate as on the one hand we need to make sure that judiciary will be able to protect humanitarian right to stop legislative flexibility of Parliaments. Section 4 of the HRA acknowledges the role of the courts to enact declarations of incompatibility and nullification of the statues without interfering with the balance of the Parliament bills (Wiener, Lang, Tully, Maduro, & Kumm, 2012). It underscores judiciary's consultative role, reminding Parliament through appeals rather than imposing changes, and hence maintaining the sovereignty of the Parliament.

The sovereignty of the judiciary under the Human Rights Act translates into more comprehensive protection of human rights and at the same time brings about original discussions on the extent of the power that a judge is permitted to exercise in the state's affairs. Throughout such discussion the question of balance lies between each branch of government being a watchdog of constitutional rights and sustaining of democracy has been underlining each time. This added criticism and admiration to the judiciary powers under the ECHR not only deepens constitutional law concept of the UK, but also argue for a balance position which provides protection of human rights and is not a detriment to the legislature mandate of the democracy. Discussion canters on the exact nature of HRA reform, and which of the proposals, and the British Bill of Rights, is the best one (Wuerth, 2017). On the pro side this reform may well deliver what trillion media call judicial overreach and safeguard effective articulation of UK's commitment to human rights specific for its context. Critics but are concerned on the fact that such modifications could lessen the extent of human rights protection and consequently, UK's alignments with international human rights norms could reduce. In summary, Section 3 and 4 of the Human Rights Act, 1998 have altered the UK legal system, enhancing the role of the Court in protecting human rights while also meeting the demand for balance between judges' decisions and the design of law. The permanent modification of this paradigm mirrors the fact that constitutional law of UK is a dynamic area of law, by stressing the existing issues that are related to the

practical implementation of the legal theory in real term (Wettstein, Giuliani, Santangelo, & Stahl, 2019).

The Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA) passed a significant modification in the legal safeguard of human rights in UK by encompassing Europe Convention on Human Rights (ECHR) into the UK law. With this legislative intervention, individuals are guaranteed the access to UK courts to seek redress for human rights violations irrespective of whether it has to be appealed to the European Court of Human Rights at Strasbourg. Primarily, the sections 3 and 4 of HRA have significantly changed the game between the judiciary, the legislature, and the executive, thus bringing into question the future prospects of human rights protection in the UK amid the contention surrounding the sovereignty of Parliament and the role of the judiciary. Before the signing of the HRA, UK courts could in no way enforce ECHR rights, leaving British citizens with the only possibility to look for justice in Strasbourg. This not only complicated the picture, but it also meant that the UK was no longer at the forefront of the enforcement of European human rights standards (Khumalo, 2020).

Human Rights Act introduction is a democracy in a sense of making the access to human rights protection available to any person. Sections 3 and 4 are operating mechanisms. In section 3 of the HRA, there is a clause that states that all primary and secondary legislation are read and given effect insofar as possible which makes it compatible with the rights described in the ECHR. This interpretative duty has induced many of the judges to create their original ways of statutory interpretation, and one of the major examples is Ghaidan v. Mendoza [2004]. Thus, the Rent Act was more applied to same-sex partners, and right to private and family life under Article 8 of the ECHR was also upheld. Similarly, in R v A [2001], the Lords, as another example, took a creative approach to the Youth Justice and Criminal Evidence Act to make it possible to use certain evidence at a rape trial, thus ensuring defendants enjoy their right to a fair process and complainants' privacy. Section 4 corresponds with section 3, giving court the authority to make a declaration of incompatibility when a provision of the statute cannot be interpreted in any other manner than what is inconsistent with the European Convention on Human Rights. This does not displease the act but says to parliamentarians that the usefulness of change is required. This was notably shown in a case Bellinger v Bellinger, in which the courts recognized that existing marriage laws ignored the needs of the transgender people, leading to the formulation of the Gender Recognition Act 2004 (Gilani et al., 2023).

5. The declaration Procedure Observes the Law of Parliamentary Sovereignty

The declaration procedure observes the law of Parliamentary sovereignty, because it keeps until the last decision for Parliament to amend or not, a dialogue balance between the legislative and judicial branches. The effect of HRA on the UK constitution has been the adjusting of the constitutional framework which has enabled the judiciary to be safeguarding human rights without obstructing the supreme power of Parliament. Courts can have effect through interpretation and guidance, but they cannot force Parliament to take action, which is a traditional concept of supremacy of Parliament (Vance, Mulé, Khan, & McKenzie, 2018). The insidious change of power dynamics stirred a dialogue-based governance of the constitution, and its ruling that human rights must be incorporated into the law of the sovereign Parliament of UK. The proposal for a new British Bill of Rights to be a replacement of the HRA generates a dispute on whether this could be the empowered or the destroyer of the UK human rights protection. Supporters claim that a Human Rights Bill could give a new lease of life to existing institutions in Britain and also more precisely adjust the human rights protection mechanisms to their local legal and cultural contexts. On the other hand, it is argued that it may undermine the current EU-based protections towards the UK and leads the country to less responsiveness to international human rights standards. Additionally, an important possible issue with HRA is that some see this as judicial overstepping, which means that the courts might decide on Parliament their understanding (Gilani et al., 2023).

This view suggests that the HRA grants power to the courts to produce policies under the cover that it interprets human rights for which the sole purpose is to remain in

the hands of the democratically elected representatives. But there exist the second, more balanced position. It admits the role of the HRA in the process of the constitutional dialogue. This dialogue implies that courts advise and Parliament decides whether human rights issues go together with the legislative process, or diminish legislative authority. In a new way, a British Bill charter of Rights could even clarify the area of judicial interpretation and legislative reaction and might have clearer processes for the law-making body to consider such a judicial declaration. This could bring the dialogue between the Parliament and the judiciary to the new level of predictability and structuring, one that will be closer to the systematic responses to the declarations of incompatibility(García Escobar, 2023). To cap it all, the HRA has greatly affected the UK legal structure by fostering human rights protection and by keeping the perfect equilibrium between judicial interpretation and legislative power. The constant developments of this blueprint represent the dynamic character of the British constitutional law, proving yet again the complex task of aligning legal theory with the political circumstances is a well-thought-out British Bill of Rights, it might be a possible way out that such a framework is clear and strong enough to ensure that the UK continues exercising the functions of both parliamentary supremacy and protections for human rights.

The British Bill of Rights instead of the Human Rights Act 1998 will be a radically new chapter in Britain in its rule of law and constitutional position, with many consequences for the preservation of human rights. Although the UK remains part of the European Convention on Human Rights (ECHR), the abrogation of this bill seeks to redefine the execution of these rights within a discernibly British legal structure. This paper assesses the arguments for and against the introduced Bill, by pinpointing its implications for the judiciary's role of enforcing human rights as well as the constitutional dynamics ongoing between the Parliament and the courts. The HRA revolutionized the way in which human rights were interpreted by British courts by following the ECHR directly and, as a result, reducing the dependency on the European Court of Human Rights in Strasbourg for individuals. This localization of human rights enforcement strengthened the place of the courts in the interpretation of domestic laws to conform to the Convention, both at the local and national level. Nevertheless, the legislation has been subjected to scrutiny, especially related to excess of power from judges' side. According to the supporters of the British Bill of Rights, it would be providing the adequate balances between the power of the Parliament and the Judiciary, so, no judicial interpretation could overrule the legislative intent (Wettstein, 2009).

The new Bill of Rights will continue to work towards the preservation of the ECHR right’s but will do so by changing the mechanism of protection. Its goal is to somehow reduce the interpretive authority of section 3 of the HRA, currently being exercised by the judiciary. The amendment of this would significantly harm the courts that protect HM and the case in Strasbourg will shift back, to Strasbourg instead. "One of the key issues of the suggested bill is the way it deals with "positive obligations" which are aimed to obligate the state to introduce measures to avert the violation rights of the citizens itself like in Osman v. United Kingdom where the European Court found that the state was obliged to protect human life (McEldowney, 2021).

The Act aims to prevent courts from ordering these obligations, which might fail to ensure the protection of the rights left in the state's jurisdiction where the state interference is essential. Also, regarding the deportation of individuals who have been found guilty of a criminal offense, the bill intends to increase the threshold for challenges based on the right to family life. Such measure states that such troubles must lead to the "great damage" which is higher than currently available level under HRA. Eventually, this will complicate the fight against deportation, violating the norm of private and family life as it was pronounced in the case of Boultif v. Switzerland. The Bill of Rights aims to repatriate the Parliamentary authority, diminishing the judicial officers’ discretionary power related to human rights (Ullah et al., 2022). It could be the source of limiting justices' understanding of human rights and even a rollback on such protection. The motive rises from the fact that the judiciary has to demonstrated its overreach in cases like R (on the application of Miller) v. The Prime Minister where the Supreme Court had to intervene in prorogation of parliament, highlight tensions between the government and judiciary. The opponents of the Bill believe that the power loss of the judicial authority would restrict the state of UK's human rights protection by reducing such courts are playing the active role under the HRA.

They counter that not such a strategy will not only curb individual liberties but also will decrease the judicial control over legislative and executive regulation. This may seem to be a regressive step from the tenet of checks and balances that are fundamental to democratic governance. Besides that, the Bill can be viewed as a component of a government strategy for limiting the power points which bear the executive authorities accountable, as proved by the criticism of the judicial court rulings not favorable to the government (Yigzaw, 2015). The amendment of the Ministerial Code after the Prime Minister's acknowledgement of Covid regulations as an act of dissatisfaction of the government as regards accountability mechanisms is an instance of that. Even though the British Bill of Rights is intended to maintain the primacy of Parliamentary authority by consolidating and amending certain provisions of the ECHR, the ultimate impact is that both the European and the domestic systems are weakened in the UK (Gilani, Zahoor, & Rehman, 2021). Power reduction of judiciary could terminate the prospects of referring to European Court which seem strange with regards to the goals of the HRA. Any reconfiguration of the UK's human rights bodies cannot just touch upon the reconfirming of the Parliamentary sovereignty but the maintenance of a robust, locally enforceable human rights regime in such a way that there is no space for violating the UK's commitment to upholding fundamental human rights that are the cornerstone of democracy.

Human Rights Act 1998 (HRA) has a remarkable place in the constitutional history of UK, which symbolizes the establishment of European Convention on Human rights (ECHR) in the domestic law of United Kingdom. This Act was aimed to be a local form of remedy for human rights controversies, which, in turn, meant eliminating the requirement for a British citizen to address the European Court of Human Rights by bringing their complaint to Strasbourg. It is the HRA that has produced debates with regard to the validity of its impact and whether it should be replaced with a British Bill of Rights. It polarized views with some appreciating the impact while others contesting its relevance (Craig, 2017).

This case therefore upholds the principle underpinning the Human Rights Act (HRA) that besides ensuring protection, clarify the well-defined intent behind the limitation of rights. Further, the HRA has led to the breakdown of multi-layered judicial system with individuals having the right to litigate in UK courts thereby reducing the costs on individuals in Strasbourg courts. In the Belamarsh case(A & others v The Secretary of State for the Home Department (2004)), known by many as the Belmarsh case, the judges of the HLA used section 4 of the HRA to declare that indefinite detention without trial, permitted under the Anti-Terrorism, Crime and Security Act (2001), was incompatible life away from the UK Such action therefore stressed that the Act was to offset the government that abused powers and to enforce principles of justice as fairness and rationality Although there are some thriving examples of the HRA, yet it has been a source of quite a controversy among the people. The opponents maintain the point-of-view that the expansive judicial interpretations stipulated by Section 3 of the HRA to a greater extent may swamp the parliamentarian sovereignty (Chakraborty, 2023). To this divergence, a view is added that this could be a way for a judge to bend the meaning of enactments or going beyond the legislating function of Parliament. Such judicial activism can be considered an encroachment on the democratic constitution legitimacy of laws implemented by elected authorities, which one may rightfully see as a judicial overstep into the domains which previously belonged exclusively to the lawmakers of the country. This point of criticism also arises in cases such as Ghaidan v Godin-Mendoza (2004) where the House of Lords awarded same-sex spouses with the rights. It thus became obvious that the judges could employ statutory interpretation for renouncing the meaning what had probably not been thought of before by the Parliament. Despite acknowledging the value of the broad interpretation of the HRA for the purpose of ensuring that people's rights are protected, critics of the HRA argue that this interpretative approach has the effect of undermining the principle of legislative supremacy as it shifts power to the judiciary that is appointed not elected (Gilani et al., 2021). The proposition for a Bill of Rights in the UK is to realign the relationship between safeguarding human rights and guarding sovereignty of Parliament in a better manner. Supporters hold the view that this bill for a new Bill of Rights brings clarity to expansive interpretation of the courts, which embraces parliamentary mandate and yet still preserves the crucial human rights. There will be the option of Bill to encompass changes to be taken more suitable to the special identity and attributes of the UK, including social and cultural rights which the

Human Rights Act doesn't give space for. Nevertheless, erasing the Human Rights Act with its replacement by a UK Bill of Rights may involve some pitfalls.

6. Conclusion

It can be concluded that the notion of whether such a move might dilute the existing guarantees of human rights offered by the ECHR framework, not to mention the fact that the New Bill should be as stringent as the Old Bill in the human he rights standards it applies, is gaining momentum. In addition, there might be a chance that the weakening rights protections will intensify when the UK starts parting from the European legal culture, which can make the UK stand isolated from the broader international landscape. Nonetheless, the act of improvement continues through the medium of HRA's contributing to the robust and consistent human rights protection within the legal system of the UK, and at the same time, it raises consuming debate because of the narrower connection of the act to the independence of Parliament and the judiciary.

In this essay I present an overview and critique of whether the HRA is effective in maintaining the role of the legislator and I also comment on the benefits and issues replacing it with a new method of the rule of the legislator. Human Rights Act is known for its contribution which has improved the level of protection to human rights provisions within the legal framework of the UK. It has been one of ways that the Act has impacted the manner in which judicial decisions are made was to mandate that UK courts to interpret the laws that are domestic in nature accordingly to the rights that are spelt in the ECHR (Section 3 of the Act). There is a famous case dealing with how influences EU human rights are through this action, the case of R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, ex parte Simms (2000), and in it the House of Lords ruled that fundamental rights cannot be breached unless they do it through private law. This can only be done by explicit or clear words in the legislation to that effect. (Shah Gilani et al., 2021). The issue of whether the future strategy is namely the International Bill of Rights for the UK or the prioritization of national sovereignty over international human rights ultimately showcases the exact dilemma on the question. However, while trying to prevent a breach of human rights caused by reclaiming the authority of national legislators, legislative reforms should be mindful of these intricate waters. The future direction of the human rights legislative framework in the UK should be a combination of the two conflicting principles - ensuring that the democratic values are not undermined while addressing the changing needs of individuals and preservation of the dignity and freedom.

Authors Contribution:
Syed Raza Shah Gilani: his contribution is to write a draft.
Ali Mohammed AlMatrooshi: is responsible for supervision.
Ali Fayyaz Awan: his contributions include proofreading and making the necessary corrections.

Conflict of Interests/Disclosures
The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest w.r.t the research, authorship and/or publication of this article.

Referecnes

Bellinger, D. C., Wypij, D., Rappaport, L. A., Jonas, R. A., Wernovsky, G., & Newburger, J. W. (2003). Neurodevelopmental Status at Eight Years in Children with Dextro-Transposition of the Great Arteries: The Boston Circulatory Arrest Trial. *The Journal of thoracic and cardiovascular surgery, 126*(5), 1385-1396. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5223(03)00711-6

Chakraborty, S. (2023). Human Rights and Artificial Intelligence: Issues and Challenges. *Dynamics of Dialogue, Cultural Development, and Peace in the Metaverse*, 1-14. doi:10.4018/978-1-6684-5907-2.ch001

Clapham, A. (2012). The Use of International Human Rights Law by Civil Society Organizations.

Craig, P. (2017). Formal and Substantive Conceptions of the Rule of Law: An Analytical Framework. In *The Rule of Law and the Separation of Powers* (pp. 95-115): Routledge.

Fenwick, H., Phillipson, G., & Williams, A. (2020). *Text, Cases and Materials on Public Law and Human Rights*: Routledge.
Foster, S. (2022). Reforming the Human Rights Act 1998 and the Bill of Rights Bill 2022. *Coventry Law Journal, 27*(1), 1-21.
García Escobar, G. (2023). Human Rights Pluralistic Universality: A Bridge between Global Norms and Cultural Diversity. *Nordic Journal of Human Rights, 41*(2), 171-188. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/18918131.2023.2216088
Gilani, S. R. S., Ali, M. A., & Zahoor, M. S. (2023). Limitations on Parliamentary Sovereignty in the Uk: A Critical Analysis. *Journal of European Studies (JES), 39*(1), 47-47. doi:https://doi.org/10.56384/jes.v39i1.288
Gilani, S. R. S., Zahoor, S., & Rehman, H. U. (2021). The Theory of Militant Democracy and Its Legal History. A Critical Analysis. *Pakistan Journal of Criminology, 13*.
Khumalo, K. (2020). *Towards Establishing the 'Security Laws' Interpretation Regime'which Will Facilitate the Interpretation of State Security Laws in a Manner That Upholds and Protects the Rule of Law and Human Rights: A South African Perspective.*
Kirby, M. (2015). The United Nations Human Rights Inquiry on North Korea: Backgrond, Reaction and Prospects. *Hong Kong LJ, 45*, 425.
McEldowney, J. (2021). 14 Populism, Uk Sovereignty, the Rule of Law and Brexit. *History, 444*, 459.
Petersmann, E.-U. (2000). The Wto Constitution and Human Rights. *Journal of International Economic Law, 3*(1), 19-25.
Schorkopf, F., & Walter, C. (2003). Elements of Constitutionalization: Multilevel Structures of Human Rights Protection in General International and Wto-Law. *German Law Journal, 4*(12), 1359-1374. doi:https://doi.org/10.1017/S2071832200012165
Shah Gilani, S. R., Ur Rehman, H., & Khan, A. S. (2021). Contextual Analyses of" the Doctrine of a Margin of Appreciation" in the Frameworks of the European Court of Human Rights and the British Legal System. *Journal of European Studies (02589680), 37*(1).
Skinner, G. L. (2020). *Transnational Corporations and Human Rights: Overcoming Barriers to Judicial Remedy*: Cambridge University Press.
Ullah, Z., Gilani, S. R. S., Noreen, N., Ahmad, I., Zaib, B., Shah, S. J., . . . Khan, K. A. (2022). Rule of Law, Human Rights, and Democracy: An Analysis of Key Principles, Issues, and Challenges. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 339-352.
Vance, K., Mulé, N. J., Khan, M., & McKenzie, C. (2018). The Rise of Sogi: Human Rights for Lgbt People at the United Nations. *Downloaded from the Humanities Digital Library*, 223.
Wettstein, F. (2009). *Multinational Corporations and Global Justice: Human Rights Obligations of a Quasi-Governmental Institution*: Stanford University Press.
Wettstein, F., Giuliani, E., Santangelo, G. D., & Stahl, G. K. (2019). International Business and Human Rights: A Research Agenda. *Journal of World Business, 54*(1), 54-65. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2018.10.004
Wiener, A., Lang, A. F., Tully, J., Maduro, M. P., & Kumm, M. (2012). Global Constitutionalism: Human Rights, Democracy and the Rule of Law. *Global Constitutionalism, 1*(1), 1-15. doi:https://doi.org/10.1017/S2045381711000098
Wuerth, I. (2017). International Law in the Post-Human Rights Era. *Tex. L. Rev., 96*, 279.
Yigzaw, D. A. (2015). Hierarchy of Norms: The Case for the Primacy of Human Rights over Wto Law. *Suffolk Transnat'l L. Rev., 38*, 33.