

FORM 1

CERTIFICATE OF DETERMINATION OF COSTS
Legal Profession Act 2004 (the Act), Sections 367(1) and 368

ASSESSMENT OF LAW PRACTICE AND CLIENT COSTS
(APPLICATION BY CLIENT)

COSTS ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT NUMBER: 2009/4981

COSTS APPLICANT: MOHAMMED TARIQ

COSTS RESPONDENT: KEDDIES INSURANCE LAW SPECIALISTS PTY LTD
ABN 97 119 864 881

1. THE APPLICATION IS DETERMINED BY SUBSTITUTING FOR THE DISPUTED COSTS, AS A FAIR AND REASONABLE AMOUNT OF COSTS TO BE PAID TO THE COSTS RESPONDENT THE SUM OF: FORTY EIGHT THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED AND FOURTEEN DOLLARS NINETY EIGHT CENTS (\$48,514.98)

Note 1 Credit is to be given by the Costs Respondent to the Costs Applicant for the sum of EIGHTY FIVE THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND SIXTY ONE DOLLARS FORTY SEVEN CENTS (\$85,761.47) paid on account.

\$93,870.07

Note 2 The amount paid on account exceeds the substituted amount by the sum of THIRTY SEVEN THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY SIX DOLLARS FORTY NINE CENTS (\$37,246.49) which is to be repaid by the Practitioner (s.368(4) of the Act).

Note 3 Interest is not payable on the amount of costs assessed.

2. THE COSTS RESPONDENT IS TO PAY TO THE COSTS APPLICANT THE SUM OF THIRTY SEVEN THOUSAND TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY SIX DOLLARS FORTY NINE CENTS (\$37,246.49).

A statement of reasons accompanies and forms part of this determination.

To: Costs Applicant: Mohammed Tariq
c/o Brydens Law Office
Solicitors
DX 5029 LIVERPOOL

To: Costs Respondent: Keddies Insurance Law Specialists Pty Ltd
DX 11571
SYDNEY DOWNTOWN
(Ref: PJS)

ISSUED ON: 23 July 2009

COSTS ASSESSOR

M.W. Robinson
Barrister-at-Law
10th Floor, Selborne Chambers
174 Phillip Street
Sydney NSW 2000
DX 375 SYDNEY



.....
COSTS ASSESSOR

SENT ON:

20 AUG 2009



.....
MANAGER COSTS ASSESSMENT

This Certificate is, on the filing of the Certificate in the office or registry of a court having jurisdiction to order the payment of that amount of money and with no further action, taken to be a judgment of that court for the amount of unpaid costs (Section 368(5) of the Act). The rate of interest payable (if applicable) in respect of that amount of costs is the rate of interest prescribed by paragraph 110A of Legal Profession Regulation 2005.

FORM 3

CERTIFICATE AS TO DETERMINATION OF COSTS OF COSTS ASSESSMENT
Legal Profession Act 2004 (the Act), Section 369(5)

ASSESSMENT OF LAW PRACTICE AND CLIENT COSTS
(APPLICATION BY CLIENT)

COSTS ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT NUMBER: 2009/4981

COSTS APPLICANT: MOHAMMED TARIQ

COSTS RESPONDENT: KEDDIES INSURANCE LAW SPECIALISTS PTY LTD
ABN 97 119 864 881

1. THE APPLICATION WAS DETERMINED AND A CERTIFICATE OF DETERMINATION OF COSTS WAS ISSUED ON 23 JULY 2009
2. THE COSTS OF THE COSTS ASSESSMENT (SECTION 369 OF THE ACT) TO BE PAID BY THE COSTS RESPONDENT ARE IN THE SUM OF NINE THOUSAND AND FIFTY FOUR DOLLARS THIRTY SIX CENTS (\$9,054.36)

Note 1 The amount of NINE THOUSAND AND FIFTY FOUR DOLLARS THIRTY SIX CENTS (\$9,054.36) includes the sum of FOUR HUNDRED AND FIFTY FIVE DOLLARS ELEVEN CENTS (\$455.11) being the fee postponed for the application (s.367(2) of the Act).

Note 2 Costs incurred by the client are determined at FIVE THOUSAND FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS (\$5,500) inclusive of GST and are included herein.

Note 3 The amount of NINE THOUSAND AND FIFTY FOUR DOLLARS THIRTY SIX CENTS (\$9,054.36) includes the costs of the Costs Assessor paid by the Costs Applicant/Costs Respondent to the Manager, Costs Assessment to obtain the release of the Certificate of Determination of Costs and this Certificate (Section 369(8) of the Act).



A statement of reasons accompanies and forms part of this determination.

To: Costs Applicant: Mohammed Tariq
c/o Brydens Law Office
Solicitors
DX 5029 LIVERPOOL

To: Costs Respondent: Keddies Insurance Law Specialists Pty Ltd
DX 11571
SYDNEY DOWNTOWN
(Ref: PJS)

ISSUED ON: 23 July 2009

COSTS ASSESSOR

M.W. Robinson
Barrister-at-Law
10th Floor, Selborne Chambers
174 Phillip Street
Sydney NSW 2000
DX 375 SYDNEY



.....
COSTS ASSESSOR

SENT ON: 20 AUG 2009



.....
MANAGER COSTS ASSESSMENT

This Certificate is, on the filing of the Certificate in the office or registry of a court having jurisdiction to order the payment of that amount of money and with no further action, taken to be a judgment of that court for the amount of unpaid costs (Section 369(7) of the Act).

FORM 8

REASONS FOR DETERMINATION

*Legal Profession Act 2004, Section 370
Legal Profession Regulation 2005, Reg 128*

**ASSESSMENT OF LAW PRACTICE AND CLIENT COSTS
(APPLICATION BY CLIENT)**

COSTS ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT NUMBER: 2009/4981

COSTS APPLICANT: MOHAMMED TARIQ

**COSTS RESPONDENT: KEDDIES INSURANCE LAW SPECIALISTS PTY LTD
ABN 97 119 864 881**

Date of application for assessment: 30 March 2009

Date application referred to Costs Assessor: 26 May 2009

This is an application for assessment by a Client (Mohammed) of costs payable in respect of a damages claim for personal injuries brought on his behalf by the Respondent Practitioner (Keddies).

The Practitioner also acted for the Applicant's daughter, Ambreen and wife, Khalida, which are the subject of concurrent costs assessments numbers 2009/4963 and 2009/4979. The matters have been assessed concurrently, since they all have similar, if not identical, features.

Mohammed's claim was for personal injuries, and could be said to have been complicated by a pre-existing sequelae from a prior head injury; the wife and daughter having modest claims for compensation arising out of Mohammed's condition.

My reasons in each case are to be taken as being applicable to all three cases.

The material upon which the assessment has been conducted in each case has been the Application filed by the Applicant's solicitors, together with objections on behalf of the Applicant; the Respondent's Notice of Specific Replies and Concessions, in each case dated 20 May 2009; and the Applicant's Replies to those Replies and Concessions (undated but received under cover of letter dated 26 June 2009 from the Applicant's solicitor).

Further time was granted to Keddies to provide further responses in each case dated 20 July 2009, which were carefully considered.

In the case of Mohammed, I was forwarded correspondence dated 25 May 2009 from Keddies to the Manager, Costs Assessment, dated 25 May 2009, attaching a further Amended Reconciliation Statement dated 20 June 2008, and further correspondence from Keddies to me dated 24 June in each matter set out what the Costs Respondent claimed to be the amount in dispute in each matter (which I accepted) and the total costs claimed in each bill of costs, inclusive of GST, which I also accepted, as well as the totals for professional costs and disbursements in the bills, inclusive of GST.

I accepted the background outlined in the General Objections to Costs filed in each case. From this, it is apparent that on 11 January 2007 Mohammed was involved in a motor accident when he was injured. On 2 February 2007 he instructed Keddies to act for him in a claim for damages. They did so. However, it was not until about 12 April 2007 that he signed a costs agreement.

In the meantime, on about 21 March 2007, the NRMA Insurance, which acted for the Defendant in the claim (which had been commenced) admitted liability. Thereafter, Mohammed's claim was simply a matter for proof of damages, although Keddies point out in further responses that they have never conceded this.

On about 23 July 2007 the Respondent took instructions to bring Compensation to Relatives claims for the wife Khalida and the daughter, Ambreen, for nervous shock.

It was not until about 30 November 2007 that Keddies provided costs agreements and disclosure documents to Khalida and Ambreen, some four months after having taken instructions from them, and having commenced proceedings on their behalf.

All three matters were resolved at the Informal Settlement Conference on 21 February 2008.

In the case of Mohammed, the agreement by NRMA Insurance was to pay him an amount of \$400,000 to cover all paybacks, and out-of-pocket and treatment expenses and included legal costs. From that sum, Keddies deducted \$85,761.47 for costs and disbursements. As it turns out, the doubt in my mind as to whether that amount did include disbursements has become irrelevant, since I consider that it was grossly in excess of the amount of costs and disbursements to which they were reasonably entitled for the work done.

On 21 February 2008 Ambreen's matter settled for \$75,000 inclusive of costs, and Keddies deducted \$17,390.39 for costs and disbursements.

At the same conference on 21 February 2008, Khalida's matter settled for \$45,000 inclusive of costs and Keddies deducted \$15,146.30 for costs and disbursements. Whether or not each of these amounts included disbursements is similarly irrelevant, since I have concluded that those amounts were, in each case, grossly in excess of what Keddies were reasonably entitled to deduct.

Costs Agreements and Disclosure

By s.309 *Legal Profession Act 2004*, a law practice must disclose to a client in accordance with Division 3 of the Act, the basis on which legal costs will be calculated. By s.311(1), disclosure must be made in writing before, or as soon as practicable after, the law practice is retained in the matter. There are exceptions to the requirements imposed on the practitioner by s.311, which are set out in s.312. None of them apply here.

The effect of failure to disclose is set out in s.317, and may be summarised as follows:

- (1) The payment of legal costs is postponed until they are assessed.
- (2) No proceedings may be brought for recovery until the costs have been assessed.
- (3) An agreement entered into in breach of the provision may be the subject of an application by the Client to have it set aside.

- (4) The costs on assessment may be reduced by an amount proportionate to the seriousness of the failure to disclose.

By s.369(3) LPA, where there has been a failure to disclose, the Client may apply to have the agreement set aside under s.328 LPA 2004. This has been done in each of the subject applications.

I have considered the costs agreements in each case, together with the disclosure document therewith provided.

Under s.328(2), I have considered in each case the matters to be considered and I have concluded that, as submitted by the Applicant in each case, the costs agreements should be set aside. In doing so, I have acted on the conclusion that I have drawn, that the hourly rates were grossly excessive for a straightforward personal injuries matter, particularly in respect of the senior practitioner's claims (at \$490). I have also had particular regard to the fact that in each case the law practice failed to make adequate disclosure in writing. Keddie's submission that they delayed providing a costs agreement because of the Applicant's mental state (in the case of Mohammed) flies in the face of the Respondent's clear duty to do so as soon as practicable after it had been retained.

I am therefore satisfied that in each case the agreement does not comply in a material respect with the disclosure requirements of Division 3 LPA and in the exercise of my powers under s.328 LPA, I set each agreement aside. In each case I am satisfied that, had I not set aside the agreement, I should not apply its terms: s.361(1)(c) LPA.

The effect of this is that I am required to assess the bills without regard to the hourly rates, and to allow an amount in each case that is fair and reasonable in the circumstances.

In my approach to assessment of each bill I have accepted the Applicant's submission that the maximum hourly rate for solicitors should be \$350, and I have reduced the claims for junior solicitors to \$280 and clerks and paralegals \$60 to \$200 per hour, depending on the work involved.

In particular, I have concluded from a close examination of the bills, particularly the bill in relation to Mohammed, that Keddie in each case has practised systematic duplication and overcharging which, in my opinion, is deliberate and has in many cases led to the charging of costs that are grossly excessive.

Each assessment has been conducted in accordance with the criteria set out in s.363 of the *Legal Profession Act 2004*.

I have, in each case, set out a schedule of professional costs and disbursements reduced, which will explain the extent to which I considered that the items in the bill exceeded that which was fair and reasonable in all the circumstances.

In each case I have not reduced items to which no objection was made.

However, to provide some examples in relation to the Mohammed bill where I considered that charging was grossly excessive, I refer to the following items:

Items 184-189: the claims total \$1,519, concessions made by the Practitioner total \$588 (i.e. more than one third of the claim), and a fair and reasonable amount for the work was determined at \$525.

Items 205-207: refer to claims for dealing with an NRMA cheque for \$227.55. The total claims

are \$245, the Respondent conceded \$196, and a reasonable allowance was \$35.

See also, items 217-221, where the claim totals \$931, concessions total \$539, and the reasonable allowance is \$70.

Possibly the most gross example of overcharging arises out two simple phone calls made to counsel and the NRMA representative on 18 February 2008, which could reasonably have been done by a clerk. At items 835-836 of the bill of Mohammed, \$196 is claimed, at items 98 and 99 in the bill of Ambreen the same amount is claimed, and at items 88 and 89 of the bill of Khalida the same amount is claimed, making a total of \$588 for work that, in my opinion, should have been done by a clerk charging \$20 for 12 minutes work.

Similar examples can be discerned from the schedule of costs reduced, which I set out as follows:

In the bill of Mohammed Tariq:

The following items were reduced by the amounts indicated:

Items 1-12 by \$1,315, items 14-19 by \$952, item 20 by \$147, item 21 by \$60, item 26 by \$20, item 27 by \$40, item 28 by \$80, item 29 by \$81, item 30 by \$56, item 31 by \$28, item 32 by \$63, item 33 by \$63, item 34 by \$40, item 35 by \$84, item 36 by \$28, item 37 by \$46, item 38 by \$56, item 40 by \$28, item 41 by \$28, item 44 by \$28, items 45-46 by \$42, item 48 by \$28, items 50-52 by \$224, items 53-54 by \$420, items 55-56 by \$161, items 57-58 by \$45, items 59-60 by \$110, item 61 by \$98, item 62 by \$63, item 63 by \$135, items 64-65 by \$161, item 66 by \$112, items 67-68 by \$161, items 69-70 by \$161, item 71 by \$224, item 72 by \$245, item 73 by \$43, item 74 by \$120, items 75-76 by \$273, items 78-79 by \$65, items 80-81 by \$161, items 82-83 by \$210, items 85-94 by \$609, items 95-96 by \$40, items 97-98 by \$273, item 100 by \$70, item 101 by \$196, items 102-103 by \$60, items 106-107 by \$210, item 108 by \$20, item 109 by \$20, items 111-112 by \$238, items 113-115 by \$284, items 116-117 by \$84, items 118-119 by \$203, item 120 by \$30, item 121-124 by \$222, item 125 by \$20, items 126-129 by \$119, items 130-144 by \$973, items 145-147 by \$100, items 148-149 by \$380, items 150-151 by \$238, item 152 by \$28, items 153-154 by \$63, item 155 by \$42, item 156 by \$63, item 157 by \$98, item 158 by \$63, item 159 by \$98, item 160 by \$30, items 161-163 by \$224, items 164-166 by \$90, item 167 by \$18, items 168-169 by \$112, item 170 by \$63, item 171 by \$98, item 172 by \$63, item 173 by \$98, item 174 by \$119, item 175 by \$196, item 178 by \$56, items 179-180 by \$154, items 181-183 by \$273, items 184-189 by \$994, item 190 by \$126, item 191 by \$98, items 192-193 by \$70, item 194 by \$70, items 195-196 by \$40, item 197 by \$56, item 198 by \$28, item 199 by \$20, item 200 by \$40, item 202 by \$40, item 203 by \$28, item 204 by \$98, items 205-207 by \$210, item 208 by \$63, item 209 by \$98, item 210 by \$20, item 212 by \$63, item 213 by \$56, items 214-215 by \$126, items 216-221 by \$861, items 222-225 by \$56, items 228-229 by \$60, items 230-231 by \$161, item 232 by \$20, items 233-235 by \$60, item 237 by \$40, items 239-241 by \$140, items 242-243 by \$20, item 244 by \$20, items 245-246 by \$875, items 247-249 by \$36, items 250-253 by \$732, items 254-259 by \$230, items 260-262 by \$148, items 264-265 by \$112, item 266 by \$77, item 267 by \$58, item 268 by \$56, item 270 by \$28, item 271 by \$280, items 272-273 by \$840, items 274-279 by \$230, items 281-282 by \$28, item 283 by \$84, items 285-286 by \$126, items 287-288 by \$60, item 289 by \$20, item 290 by \$20, item 291 by \$20, items 292-293 by \$20, items 294-295 by \$80, item 296 by \$63, items 298-300 by \$280, items 301-302 by \$161, item 303 by \$63, item 304 by \$112, item 305 by \$63, item 306 by \$70, item 307 by \$40, items 308-309 by \$80, items 310-311 by \$100, item 312 by \$30, items 313-314 by \$42, items 315-316 by \$40, items 317-326 by \$511, items 327-340 by \$728, items 343-345 by \$70, items 346-347 by \$56, items 348-358 by \$973, items 359-360 by \$72, items 361-

362 by \$20, items 363-364 by \$56, items 365-367 by \$308, item 368 by \$63, item 369 by \$63, items 370-372 by \$224, items 373-374 by \$56, items 375-377 by \$217, items 378-379 by \$112, items 381-382 by \$60, item 383 by \$40, item 387 by \$28, item 388 by \$20, items 389-390 by \$30, item 391 by \$14, item 393 by \$14, items 394-395 by \$40, items 396-397 by \$20, item 398 by \$14, item 399 by \$49, items 400-402 by \$371, items 403-404 by \$112, item 405 by \$49, item 408 by \$40, item 409 by \$98, item 410 by \$20, item 411 by \$30, items 412-413 by \$60, items 417-419 by \$168, items 420-422 by \$914, items 423-431 by \$679, item 432 by \$10, items 433-437 by \$230, item 438 by \$14, item 440 by \$28, item 441 by \$245, items 442-446 by \$171.50, items 447-448 by \$112, items 449-450 by \$63, items 451-453 by \$210, item 454 by \$98, item 460 by \$98, items 461-463 by \$322, items 464-466 by \$511, item 467-468 by \$196, items 471-472 by \$56, items 473-487 by \$483, items 488-489 by \$161, item 491 by \$28, items 493-495 by \$42, item 497 by \$28, item 498 by \$162, item 499 by \$28, item 500 by \$63, items 501-503 by \$266, items 504-506 by \$70, item 507 by \$20, items 508-510 by \$210, item 511 by \$63, item 512 by \$98, items 513-514 by \$196, items 519-523 by \$98, items 524-528 by \$168, item 529 by \$20, items 530-543 by \$210, item 546 by \$20, item 547 by \$20, item 548 by \$20, item 550 by \$20, items 551-553 by \$651, items 560-562 by \$40, items 563-566 by \$126, items 568-571 by \$560, item 572 by \$56, item 573 by \$56, items 575-576 by \$120, items 577-586 by \$140, items 590-594 by \$238, items 602-604 by \$70, item 605 by \$36.67, items 606-607 by \$70, item 608 by \$20, items 609-611 by \$56, item 612 by \$98, items 613-614 by \$80, items 616-617 by \$20, item 619 by \$28, items 620-624 by \$385, item 625 by \$63, items 626-628 by \$175, items 629-631 by \$371, items 632-633 by \$28, item 634 by \$147, item 635 by \$42, item 636 by \$78, item 637 by \$78, item 638 by \$20, items 639-640 by \$40, item 641 by \$78, items 642-644 by \$70, item 645 by \$63, items 647-653 by \$140, items 654-655 by \$161, items 658-659 by \$63, item 660 by \$63, items 661-662 by \$42, items 663-665 by \$504, items 666-668 by \$80, item 669 by \$56, item 670 by \$40, item 671 by \$40, items 672-673 by \$161, items 674-675 by \$80, item 676 by \$70, item 677 by \$70, item 678 by \$14, items 679-681 by \$651, items 682-684 by \$84, items 685-686 by \$40, item 687 by \$63, item 688 by \$64, items 689-690 by \$126, items 691-692 by \$28, items 694-696 by \$175, items 697-698 by \$126, item 699 by \$20, items 700-704 by \$154, items 705-707 by \$48, items 708-722 by \$609, items 725-727 by \$70, item 728 by \$70, items 730-735 by \$238, items 736-742 by \$125, item 743 by \$28, item 745 by \$735, items 749-750 by \$42, items 752-753 by \$126, item 756 by \$56, items 757-761 by \$140, items 766-769 by \$140, items 770-771 by \$28, items 772-773 by \$60, item 774 by \$56, item 775 by \$88, item 776 by \$78, item 777 by \$14, items 779-780 by \$28, items 782-783 by \$28, items 786-787 by \$56, items 789-793 by \$114, items 797-801 by \$98, item 803 by \$38.49, items 807-810 by \$70, items 811-812 by \$40, items 813-822 by \$252, item 824 by \$70, items 825-828 by \$84, items 829-830 by \$156, item 831 by \$14, item 834 by \$14, items 835-836 by \$189.33, item 837 by \$28, item 838 by \$86.33, items 839-864 by \$392, item 867 by \$14, items 868-870 by \$140, items 871-872 by \$161, item 874 by \$46, items 875-876 by \$56, items 877-879 by \$220, item 880 by \$140, items 881-883 by \$262.50, item 884 by \$49, items 885-886 by \$249.67, item 887 by \$70, item 888 by \$63, item 889 by \$28, items 892-894 by \$42, items 895-898 by \$70, items 900-902 by \$245.

Examination of the reductions set out above will explain the extent to which I accepted the submissions of the parties.

I noted the numerous concessions made by Keddies in their submissions. However, in very few cases were concessions adequate to reduce the costs claimed to an amount that was fair and reasonable. In many cases the concessions made it apparent that Keddies must have, in presenting the bills to the three clients, been aware that they had made grossly excessive claims for the work performed.

In its Notice of Specific Replies and Concessions, Keddies in each case made claims for additional attendances that had not been previously billed to the Costs Applicant. Paragraph 78 of its submissions

(page 15) states:

“The Costs Respondent submits that these additional costs totalling \$7,123.96 (inclusive of GST) (in the bill of Mohammed Tariq) should be taken into account when assessing both the concessions and the reasonableness of the costs claimed. The Costs Respondent for ease of finalising the matter, submits that these additional costs should be deducted from the costs conceded below.”

I noted that the additional costs in each case appeared to be for work that may have been distinct from that which is claimed in the particular bill. In further responses Keddies state that the work was simply omitted from the original bill. No explanation is given.

The Costs Respondent has not applied to withdraw its bill and substitute another bill in any of the subject cases. Whether or not it can do so where costs have been paid in full (as in each of these cases), I take the view that the new claims have no credibility, and should not be allowed. I have considered each of them and I do not consider, in the circumstances, any of the claims to be fair and reasonable. None therefore have been included.

Disbursements

I have reduced the amounts claimed for disbursements by \$984.19. The following detail is provided:

Item 906 reduced by \$62.35 (insufficient detail), item 907 reduced by \$660 inclusive of GST (to allow approximately one half), item 908 reduced by \$99 (insufficient detail), item 909 reduced by \$110 (insufficient detail) and 910 reduced by \$52.84 (office overhead).

Summary of Assessment

Mohammed Tariq

I accept (per Keddies' letter to me dated 24 June 2009) that the amount in dispute is \$45,510.96.

I also accept that the totals in the bill inclusive of GST are \$91,377.44 for professional costs and \$10,011.47 disbursements.

My reductions, inclusive of GST, from each are \$51,889.74 and \$984.19, respectively.

The total amount of costs for providing legal services determined to be fair and reasonable are therefore: \$39,487.70, inclusive of GST.

The total amount of disbursements determined to be fair and reasonable is \$9,027.28.

The total assessment of fair and reasonable costs and disbursements \$48,514.98.

It is conceded that the Respondent has been paid \$85,761.47.

The Respondent therefore owes the Applicant the amount of \$37,246.49.

As to costs of the costs assessment, these must be paid by the Costs Respondent. In Mohammed's case, they are made up as follows:

Postponed filing fee, being 1% of amount in dispute	\$ 455.11
Costs Respondent's costs of assessment (20 hrs x \$275 incl GST)	5,500.00
Costs of the Costs Assessor (inclusive of GST)	<u>3,099.25</u>
Total	<u>\$9,054.36</u>

Certificates are issued accordingly.

In each case, having concluded that I consider that the legal costs charged by the Costs Respondent are grossly excessive, I am bound by the provisions of s.393(1) LPA 2004, to refer the matter to the Commissioner for Legal Services to consider whether disciplinary action should be taken against the Costs Respondent. Accordingly, I have, in each case, referred a copy of Certificates and Reasons to the Commissioner for Legal Services.

Issued on: 23 July 2009



M.W. ROBINSON
Costs Assessor