



THE REPORT

CITY OF WESTMINSTER AND HOLBORN LAW SOCIETY NEWS

NO.40 JANUARY/FEBRUARY 2006

THE PRESIDENT'S COLUMN

CHARLES FRASER



Happy New Year!

2006 promises to be an even more interesting year than 2005, although for me 2005 was quite a momentous year personally, as well as professionally.

The consultation paper on the future of the Law Society will be out by the time you read this edition of The Report. It is, as the Law Society keeps saying, your opportunity to "Have your Say". "It's your Law Society" after all. So, I would urge you to respond. The paper may not give you an opportunity to say all that you want to, in which case add what you would like to add to the comments section, or alternatively write to us, and we can then include it in our own response if appropriate. Consultation papers do not always ask the questions that those being consulted want to be asked. There is no harm in giving your opinions on all aspects that concern you; to repeat the slogan, "It's your Law Society".

You should also have received your invitation to our annual dinner on 7 March. This year's dinner promises to be a wonderful event, with the Right Honourable David Mellor QC as our guest speaker. I hope that you will be able to come. Tickets are selling like the proverbial hot cakes, I understand, so book now to avoid disappointment.

Without wishing to pre-empt a decision by the officers and main committee regarding the Wig & Pen Prize, I want to raise the issue as

early as possible this year. When I was elected president I said that we carry out a huge amount of pro bono work within the boundaries of the City of Westminster and Holborn, and for the most part this goes unnoticed. I want to repeat today what I said in October. I intend to do so again, once the prize is officially launched. We need to be proud about the work that is carried out pro bono, and I would like to encourage all those solicitors who qualify, to enter the Wig & Pen competition. What one person may consider a very modest contribution to pro bono activities may in fact be a prize-winning effort! I want to see more candidates from the City of Westminster and Holborn. Those of you who carry out or oversee pro bono work will not be able to win the prize if you do not enter the competition. It is as simple as that. The calibre of applicants is indeed very high, but I refuse to accept that candidates from our Society are not of as high calibre as those who work in the City of London. Do not be put off by what other candidates may have done. I know that some firms in the City of London use the Wig & Pen prize when marketing their firms. The winner this year will also be able to do so, and I hope that the winner will be from our Society. Although the prize has not yet been launched, please start thinking about it. The rules were published in the last issue of The Report (December

2005), which can also be viewed on our website.

Lastly, I would like to mention that the YSG is organising a Gala Ball on 4 February to be held at the Savoy, entitled "A night at the Oscars". Tickets are available through their website, or by email business@ysg.org, or by phone 01727 896 088.

I think that I have already said enough for this issue, but I would like to take this opportunity to wish you all a very happy, successful and prosperous New Year.

DIARY 2006

FEBRUARY

- 22 Committee meeting
- 27 Lecture - Employment Tribunals

MARCH

- 7 ANNUAL DINNER
- 20 Lecture - Planning Law Update
- 22 Committee meeting

APRIL

- 24 Lecture - Money Laundering Update
- 26 Committee meeting

MAY

- 22 Lecture - The Finance Bill
- 31 Committee meeting

JUNE

- 14 LEGAL CHARITIES GARDEN PARTY
- 19 Lecture - Stamp Duty Land Tax Update
- 28 Committee meeting

JULY

- 10 Lecture - Trusts and Probate
- 19 Committee meeting

CONTENTS

PRESIDENT'S COLUMN _____	1
COUNCIL MEMBER'S REPORT _____	3
LAW SOCIETY CONSULTATION ON SERVICES _____	3
REVENUE COMMITTEE _____	4
BRUSSELS VISIT _____	5
CHRISTMAS QUIZ – WINNER AND ANSWERS _____	5
OBITUARY _____	5
STEPHEN RAYNER AWARD _____	6
WIG & PEN _____	6
SUB COMMITTEE LIST _____	7
ANNUAL DINNER FORM _____	7
ALEXANDER FORBES _____	8
CWHS LECTURES _____	8

The City of Westminster and Holborn Law Society

A company limited by guarantee
registered in England and Wales
number 5467334

Registered office:
25 Rotherwick Road
London NW11 7DG
Telephone/Fax: 020 8209 1039
www.cwhls.org.uk

Editor

Rosemary Lester
6 Westhorpe Road
Putney
London SW15 1QH

Editorial Board

Timothy Drabble
Andrew Hill
Charles Fraser
Elizabeth Beesley

Published by

The City of Westminster and
Holborn Law Society

Printed by

Hunts Printing
12A Station Field Industrial
Estate, Kidlington
Oxford OX5 1JD
Telephone 01865 853633
print@hunts.co.uk
www.hunts.co.uk

All rights reserved, reproduction
in whole or part without written
permission from the Publisher is
not permitted. Photographic
material and manuscripts are
supplied at owners risk, neither
the company nor its agents accept
any liability for loss or damage.

The views expressed in The
Report are not necessarily those
of the Society, Editor or Editorial
Board. No responsibility is
accepted for any advertisement or
advertising material inserted in
The Report.


Help & Support
SOLICITORS SUPPORT NETWORK

0800 328 4203

Tax Deductibility of Subscriptions paid to The City of Westminster and Holborn Law Society

Members in salaried posts are able to deduct the amount of their
subscriptions to the Society to arrive at their taxable income. The two former
Societies, City of Westminster and Holborn, were both approved under Section
201 (c) of the Income and Corporation Taxes Act 1988. I have been attempting
for a long time to have the amalgamated Society (in both unincorporated and
incorporated form) entered on the register. I have at last succeeded in
obtaining this. The reference that should be quoted is 951/C1314WW.

Timothy Drabble (Honorary Treasurer)

The deadline for all copy for the
March edition of THE REPORT,
is **Friday, 24 February 2006**

Copy to be sent to The Editor at:
6 Westhorpe Road, London SW15 1QH
rlester@lesting.fsnet.co.uk

Contributions to be sent by email

President: Charles Fraser, Fraser & Fraser, 39 Hatton Garden, EC1N 8EH
020 7832 1400 charles@lostkin.co.uk

Vice President: Sara Chandler, The College of Law, Legal Advice Centre, 14 Store Street, London WC1E 7DE
020 7291 1290 sara.chandler@lawcol.co.uk

Junior Vice President: Michael Gillman, Bishop & Sewell, 46 Bedford Square, London WC1B 3DP
020 7631 4141 Fax: 020 7636 5369

Hon Treasurer: Timothy Drabble, Okehurst, Billingshurst, West Sussex, RH14 9HS
01403 782535 drabtim@okehurst.co.uk

Hon Secretary: Peter Adams, 5 Osten Mews, Emperors Gate, London SW7 4HW
020 7370 7450 Adamspg@aol.com

Deputy Hon Secretary: Jonathan Cornthwaite, Wedlake Bell, 52 Bedford Row, WC1R 4LR
020 7395 3000 jcornthwaite@wedlakebell.co.uk

Editor: Rosemary Lester, 6 Westhorpe Road, Putney, SW15 1QH
020 8788 7023 rlester@lesting.fsnet.co.uk

Administrator: Elizabeth Beesley, 25 Rotherwick Road, NW11 7DG
020 8209 1039 admin@cwhls.org.uk

COUNCIL MEMBERS REPORT

SHORT OF CASH IN THE NEW YEAR?

THE LAW SOCIETY HAS YOUR MONEY!

SUE NELSON



The December Council meeting usually approves the budget for the coming year. Once the budget is approved, the setting of the PC fee at the following July's meeting follows as night follows day. The voting patterns demonstrate that many Council members do not realise this and approve the budget with hardly a murmur and then refuse to support the PC fee increase 6 months later! Last year's budget was a horror and came to the December 2004 Council meeting with grave words about 'reviewing in February'. Regrettably, Council approved that budget but the spending had been planned and took place against the 'approved budget'. The February review turned into a meaningless exercise. We now know that the December 2004 budget/July 2005 PC fee has been yet another very considerable overcollection. Perhaps as much as £1 in every £20 might have been left in the practitioner's pockets.

This year there was another attempt to send the budget to Council 'for approval' but this failed, as the Transition Programme at Chancery Lane creates a need for urgent and thoroughgoing review of all activities and expenditure. This left the Council, therefore, 'noting the budget' with a thorough review to be included in time for the budget to be approved by Council in February. What we 'noted' was that it looks like we will need to raise about £100 million through the PC fee in 2006 unless we make some serious changes. £100 million budget means a PC fee of about £1,000 again.

The two new Boards – Consumer Complaints and Regulation – have been established with an obligation to ensure that they provide 'value for money'. I look forward to seeing an end to the insatiable

appetite for money demonstrated by our activities in Leamington Spa. The Legal Services Ombudswoman expresses no concern about the level at which we fund complaints handling. Our own (now retired and appointed to the Regulation Board) Independent Complaints Commissioner, Sir Stephen Lander, has identified many areas for improvement in systems and yet, once again, the budget allocation for that Directorate is underspent. This is regrettable.

Elsewhere, looking to a more commercially sensitive Law Society, the cost of particular activities has been identified for the first time. How much does the library cost the profession? What is the true cost of the international committee? How much does the regional office network cost each PC holder? Once the cost is known we will be in a better position to determine which of these activities we wish to retain as is. In many cases it is a matter of looking at new ways of undertaking these activities but in some cases at a reduced level or perhaps not at all. Out of a total staff number of 1475 (it was 831 in 1999), we have 11 full time equivalents working in the Equality and Diversity Unit and 114 in the Information and Communications Directorate. Is this necessary/desirable/sustainable?

How much we eventually need to raise will be calculated only after much more careful scrutiny of another draft budget by the Main Board (now merged with the Finance and Resource Board and re-badged, Sellafield-like, as the Corporate Governance Board (CGB)). In February, Council is going to have to make some serious decisions, hopefully with a well-reasoned paper from the CGB. Council members will need to get

to grips with the papers and the figures as demonstrably we have not been getting it right in the past – unless you are happy for the Society to over collect/under spend.

The only other item of interest was a silly debate re-designing the Consultation Paper (which still hasn't been sent out as I write this on 12 January) about the 'New Law Society'. I consider this exercise to be verging on the pointless, and a costly and time wasting exercise. The paper is now so anodyne as to be likely to produce useless information. You really can't reinvent yourself on the basis of responses to a consultation paper and that is why we have pollsters doing some more focused work for us with the profession. The Society has a Council of 100 all of whom have constituents and should have – and do have in the case of your Council members – mechanisms for establishing what the profession thinks of the current Law Society and what they would want and maybe be willing to pay for from any re-designed Law Society. To spend four months designing a consultation exercise, six weeks making the changes debated on 7 December, launch the consultation on 19 January, wait three months to get the results back and, finally, six weeks more to digest the results is just another way of saying – 'Let's start re-designing the Law Society in the autumn or winter of 2006'. The decisions on the 2006 budget – see above – due to be made in February will have significant impact on the re-design of the Law Society and, in my view, we do not have the luxury of wasting the 2005/6 Council years as proposed.

LAW SOCIETY CONSULTATION ON SERVICES

In its media update of 9 January, the Law Society asks the profession to participate in this important consultation (launched on 19 January). A response should take ten or fifteen minutes.

The questionnaire is online at the Law Society website and the consultation runs until 21 April.

REVENUE COMMITTEE

JEREMY DE SOUZA



The Pre-Budget Report contained a number of complex measures and embryo measures. One of the former, on the sale of property lessor companies, took effect immediately. But a fundamental difficulty in the clauses published on 5 December was pointed out and an “addendum” had to be published on 19 December!

After consulting colleagues on the Land Law and Conveyancing Committee, this Committee will be making substantive responses to the following consultations, and the texts of these are likely to be available on the Society’s website by the time you receive this:

- proposed amendment to the VAT nominee definition;
- rewrite of VAT Act, Schedule 10 (principally the option to tax rules);
- proposed planning-gain supplement; and
- draft Real Estate Investment Trusts legislation.

Tax Scheme Reporting

For solicitors generally, the most important development is the announcement that, from 1 April, all income tax, corporation tax and capital gains tax “schemes” will be subject to the Finance Act 2004 disclosure regime. At the moment, there is no proposal to extend this to inheritance tax, but such an extension may well be but a matter of time.

The extension last summer to stamp duty land tax is still creating difficulties and, at the time of writing, HMRC had not yet agreed to the publication of the Law Society’s White List.

With “avoidance” seen as including anything which reduces or defers tax as against another possible transaction, the question has arisen (but not yet been answered) in the context of SDLT as to whether the “obvious” has to be disclosed when the village idiot might well have adopted another means of achieving the same commercial end. The same problem is likely to arise in relation to property sales and CGT/s.776.

Allied to this development is the paring down of the s.741 defences to Taxes Act 1988, s.739 income tax charges on those causing income to accrue to non-resident entities. It will now be necessary to disclose the professional advice given at the time.

Other developments

- SDLT has now been agreed as not payable where the only substantial asset in a deceased’s estate is the home and a sole residuary legatee pays the

inheritance tax in order to avoid having to sell it;

- SDLT has been stated not to be payable on the statutory indemnity for landlord’s professional fees under the enfranchisement legislation;
- Where a new farm tenant has agreed to hand his single farm payment entitlement over to the landlord on vacation, the initial (and provisional) value of that element of the “consideration” may be taken to be nil – in the event of this happening, a s.80 charge will, however, arise;
- VAT zero-rating is available for the construction of certain types of residential accommodation. Problems have, however, been experienced with the exclusion of that which is “similar to” a hospital, in relation to which tribunals have tended to get immersed in the various health service definitions. Fortunately, the Vice-Chancellor of the High Court has cut the Gordian Knot by ignoring this side show in *HMRC v. Fenwood Developments Ltd* [2005] EWHC 2954 (Ch).
- Although the taxpayers lodged an appeal against the Lands Tribunal’s Decision in *Antrobus* [see the December issue], this was withdrawn a few days later. Although I do not know whether this is the reason, on past performance I would have expected HMRC to have made them an offer they could not refuse in order to achieve this. It is difficult to predict the official line on “farmhouse” qualification for agricultural property relief in the light of the clear divergence between the interpretation adopted by the Lands Tribunal and that previously laid down in a number of Special Commissioners’ and Court of Appeal cases. With the retirement (and initial non-replacement) of Mr Peter Twiddy, it may, furthermore, be some time before practitioners can divine to what extent official practice on Inheritance Tax Act 1984, s.115(2) – as opposed to (3) – is being changed.
- To general surprise, HMRC are not to appeal in *Judge (PRs of Walden) v. HMRC*, SpC.506. As had been the case in *IRC v. Eversden (Exors of Greenstock)*, [2002] STC 1109, their submissions had been formulated in such a way as to steer clear of pleading SP.10/79. The question must therefore be posed as to whether it would be reasonable to infer that they do not fancy their chances of this being upheld in Court?
- There has been a respite for the taxpayers in the “Arctic Systems” saga, *Jones v. Garnett* [2005] EWCA Civ 1553.

It is too soon to tell whether HMRC will abandon ship, but if they do not, they need to explain how their version of the law can produce certainty in a joint venture situation. A situation cannot exist in which both spouses are liable with HMRC having the right of choice as to the party to be assessed (quite apart from this being contrary to the underlying principle of self-assessment).

- The noise from the life assurance industry has been such that members can hardly be unaware of the Government’s “U” turn on SIPP home ownership. There are, however, times when the naive need to be protected from their own stupidity. More materially, do not lose sight of the fact that exactly how inheritance tax is to be applied to new-style pension funds remains to be revealed in the March Budget.

Changing tack in Luxembourg

Members may recall the *Lindman* case, C-42/02, in November 2003, under which a Finnish taxpayer was successful in calling in aid the European Treaty’s inter-state commerce provisions in order to avoid paying tax on a Swedish lottery win. In 2005, there have been signs of a change in the ECJ’s approach.

- In *D*, C-376/03, the Advocate General’s view that a German taxpayer should be allowed to adopt the more favourable terms of the Belgo-Dutch treaty and claim exemption from Dutch wealth tax was not adopted. It should follow that the “most favoured taxpayer” UK Claims Litigation Group are unlikely to be successful.
- And although *Marks & Spencer*, C-446/03, has been publicised as a win for that company, recovering its £30m in full is to be dependent upon proving that, inter alia, each subsidiary’s losses could not have been passed on to a purchaser of its shares. The UK’s group relief restrictions are only invalid to the extent to which it is not possible to use or carry forward the losses locally. It must therefore be open to doubt whether many members of the “group loss” UK Claims Litigation Group will be able to draw any comfort from the ECJ’s judgment.

The end result is likely to be a good one for UK taxpayers generally. The “billions” at risk in these suits will go some way towards replacing the reduction in our “rebate” which the Prime Minister had to concede in December.

THE BRUSSELS STUDY TRIP

DAVID MORGAN

I sometimes wonder how many of us are aware of the full impact that the EU has on our law – and no, I am not about to fulminate against the excesses of our Brussels Bureaucrats. There seems little doubt that our Government is not averse to trying to introduce controversial legislation through the European route, nor to gold-plating EU directives and seeking to lay the blame at the European Commission's door. I note that over 9,000 suspicious transactions have been reported by solicitors under money laundering legislation in this country last year while only 15 were made by German lawyers during the same period.

How do I know this? Well, I have just returned from a visit to the European Institutions, organised by Morag Goldfinch, our Greater London Regional Manager, in conjunction with Andrew Laidlaw, at the Law Society's Brussels office. This office monitors EU legislation on behalf of the profession and liaises with the relevant specialist committees. For firms that do not have their own office in Brussels, it can provide an invaluable resource, not only in the form of physical facilities, such as "hot desks" but also by way of contacts with key personnel in the European Institutions and the diplomatic missions such as UKrep (UK's permanent representative to the EU). Even for those firms with offices in Brussels, the Law Society office can play a useful role



in providing contacts in the European Institutions and lobbying where appropriate.

The visit was planned and driven by Jeffrey Forrest, immediate Past President of CWLS, and the programme included presentations by the European Commission's Legal Service, the Council of Ministers, UKrep, the European Parliament and the CCBE (the European umbrella organisation for the national bars and law societies in the EU). There were also talks given by the Law Society personnel on the work carried out by them and the back up they give to solicitors. A lot of this work goes largely unseen and unreported but it was clear to me that, without their input, we would all suffer.

In particular, Michael Renouf, who is the Law Society's Council Member responsible

for EU matters and who practises in Brussels, gave a very useful insight into how EU law can be used "creatively", even in those fields where you might feel it has no application, to assist clients not merely in interpreting national law but also in enforcing their rights.

It is quite clear that, whatever one may think of the political effects of our EU treaties, practitioners ignore the legal impact of EU law at their peril. While we tend to think of EU directives in terms of regulation, we need to remember that they can give our clients useful rights, not only in commercial transactions but also in family matters and criminal prosecutions. There can be advantages in thinking outside the box and it may well be to clients' benefit to consult with one of our EU specialists if you are uncertain.

CHRISTMAS QUIZ 2005

Thank you to all who entered the literary quiz (December issue of *The Report*). Congratulations to **Alun Jones** of Lawrence Graham LLP, whose name was first out of the hat of correct entries and who therefore wins the prize.

The questions and answers are:

- A. "To begin at the beginning": Dylan Thomas, *Under Milk Wood*.
- B. "It is a truth universally acknowledged": Jane Austen, *Pride and Prejudice*.
- C. "No man is an island entire of itself": John Donne, *Meditation XVII* (also cited as *Devotions Upon Emergent Occasions*).
- D. "There was no possibility of taking a walk that day": Charlotte Bronte, *Jane Eyre*.
- E. "England has been in a dreadful state for some weeks. Lord Coodle would go out, Sir Thomas Doodle wouldn't come in": Charles Dickens, *Bleak House*.
- F. "It was the best of times, it was the worst of times": Charles Dickens, *A Tale of Two Cities*.
- G. "What we call the beginning is often the end. And to make an end is to make a beginning": T.S.Eliot, *Four Quartets* (also cited as *Little Gidding*).

ANTHONY TROWER

A G TROWER, erstwhile senior partner of Trower Still & Keeling and a Founder Member of Holborn Law Society, died recently aged 84. We send our sympathy to his widow and family and his many colleagues and friends in Holborn.

INTERLEGES PRESENTS... THE STEPHEN RAYNER AWARD

Interleges (www.interleges.com), the international association of independent law firms, has resolved to dedicate an award to the memory of its co-founder Stephen A. Rayner of London. Interleges hopes that the award will become an established annual event relative to international commercial law and international dispute resolution. The award will be granted to the author of the best essay on the subject matter selected by a specialised jury and is open to undergraduate law students and law trainees who graduated after 1 January 2004.

THE STEPHEN RAYNER AWARD 2006

Interleges believes in the benefits of international trade in the framework of the rule of law. International commercial law and WTO law are

both considered important despite their very different roles.

The subject matter:

LEX MERCATORIA AND WORLD TRADE ORGANISATION LAW IN RELATION TO INTERNATIONAL COMMERCIAL CONTRACTS.

Word limit: **5000 words**

Prize: **US\$ 4,000.00**

Plus an invitation to attend the final dinner of the Interleges Annual General Meeting in Zurich (FIFA Club Sonnenberg, Saturday 27 May 2006), all expenses paid.

Deadline: **31 March 2006**

Please visit our web-site (www.interleges.com) for **Entry Specifications and Guidance Notes for Applicants.**

For many years, Stephen Rayner was a moving spirit on the Committee of Holborn Law Society and subsequently on the Committee of CWHS. In recent years, he was the Chairman of the International Committee and it is fitting that his memory should be honoured by Interleges, the International Association of Independent Law Firms, which has established an award in his name. It is hoped that the Stephen Rayner Award will become an annual event relative to international commercial law and international dispute resolution. The award will be granted to the author of the best essay on the subject matter elected by a specialised jury and is open to undergraduate law students and law trainees who graduated after 1 January 2004.

WIG & PEN PRIZES 2006

NIGEL MAYHEW

Applications are invited for the annual Wig and Pen prizes for pro bono legal work by young solicitors. The closing date for nominations is expected to be a date in April, will be announced as soon as possible. Nomination packs will be available from www.ysg.org.uk

Applications for the Wig and Pen prizes are invited from individuals who have been nominated for the Young Solicitors' Group Pro Bono Award and have been admitted as solicitors for less than 5 years. There is also a requirement that a candidate must either be a member of CWHS or the City of London Law Society or work as a solicitor within the catchment area of either Law Society.

The award of a prize is made to a candidate who has made a significant contribution to the quality of justice in their communities and in helping to

ensure the legal system is open and available to all. In particular, the judges will take into account -

- (a) the length of time involved in giving free legal advice or representation to people who have otherwise failed to obtain access to justice;
- (b) the candidate's involvement in setting up new or innovative projects providing free legal services to people who would otherwise fail to obtain access to justice;
- (c) the significance of the candidate's service to their clients and their community; and
- (d) the extent to which the candidate's contribution was made in his or her own time outside that person's normal employment.

Two prizes may be awarded. The first prize consists of a silver ink stand and

quill pen to be held by the winner for one year and a cash sum of £1,000 which is paid to the approved charity or project of the winner's choice. A second prize may be awarded to a candidate who is not in receipt of the first prize and, at the closing date for entries, does not work within the local Law Society catchment area of the first prize winner. The second prize consists of a cash sum of £500 to be paid to the approved charity or project of the winner's choice.

The winner of the Wig and Pen prize in 2005 was Miss Mahnaz Malik, then a litigation Solicitor at Simmons & Simmons. She won the prize for her work on the British Pakistan Law Council and the "Children in prison" project in Pakistan.

This year's prize will be awarded at a ceremony in June 2006 at the Law Society.

SUB COMMITTEES

OFFICERS

Chairman – Ms Sara J M Chandler
Sara.chandler@lawcol.co.uk
The College of Law, Legal Advice
Centre, 14 Store Street, London
WC1E 7DE
Tel: 020 7291 1290
Fax: 020 7291 1348

EDUCATION AND TRAINING

Chairman – Michael J Gillman
mg@bishopandsewell.co.uk
Bishop & Sewell, 46 Bedford Square,
London WC1B 3DP
Tel: 020 7631 4141
Fax: 020 7636 5369
DX 278 Chancery Lane

Organiser of lecture programme –
Nigel Mayhew
Nigel.mayhew@dft.gsi.gov.uk
D F T, Room 1/03D Great Minster
House, 76 Marsham Street, SW1P 4DR
Tel: 020 7944 6760
Fax: 020 7944 2226

INTERNATIONAL

Chairman – David Morgan
Davidtmorgan21@hotmail.com
David T Morgan, 9 Gray's Inn Square,
London WC1R 5JF

Tel: 020 7404 2646
Fax: 020 7404 2890
DX 128 Chancery Lane

LAND LAW AND CONVEYANCING

Chairman – Adam Maberly
maberlys@hotmail.com
58 Albert Drive, London SW19 6LD
Tel: 020 8788 1645

LAW REFORM

Chairman – Arthur Weir
absweir@compuserve.com
30 Maidensgrove, Near Stonor,
Henley-on-Thames, Oxon RG9 6EX
Tel & Fax: 01491 638 943

LITIGATION – CIVIL

Chairman – Miss Joanna Kennedy
joanna.kennedy@collyerbristow.com
Collyer-Bristow, 4 Bedford Row,
London WC1R 4DF
Tel: 020 7242 7363
Fax: 020 7405 0555
DX 163 Chancery Lane

PARLIAMENTARY AND PLANNING

Chairman – Mark Challis
Markchallis@bdb-law.co.uk
Bircham Dyson Bell, 50 Broadway,
London SW1H 0BL

Tel: 020 7170 0323
Fax: 020 7222 3480
DX 2317 Victoria

PROFESSIONAL MATTERS

Chairman – Julian Aylmer
julian.aylmer@rpc.co.uk
Reynolds Porter Chamberlain,
Chichester House, 278/282 High Holborn,
London WC1V 7HA
Tel: 020 7242 2877
Fax: 020 7242 1431
DX 81 Chancery Lane

REVENUE

Chairman – Jeremy de Souza
Jeremy.de-souza@wandb.co.uk
White & Bowker, 19 St Peter Street,
Winchester, Hants SO23 8BU
Tel: 01962 844 440
Fax: 01962 842 300
DX 2506 Winchester

TRAINEE AND YOUNG SOLICITORS GROUP

Chairman – Miss Roisin Upcraft
ru@hunters-solicitors.co.uk
Hunters, 9 New Square, Lincoln's Inn,
London WC2A 3QN
Tel: 020 7412 0050
Fax: 020 7412 0049

THE ANNUAL DINNER

of
The City of Westminster and Holborn Law Society
Tuesday, 7 March 2006 6.45 for 7.30 pm
in Middle Temple Hall

The highlight of the Society's year is its annual dinner. This year we are again holding the dinner in Middle Temple Hall. The principal speaker will be the Right Honourable David Mellor, QC.

The price for the evening is £70 per person and this includes drinks at the reception beforehand and three course meal with wine and port or brandy. After dinner drinks will be available from a cash bar. The dress code is black tie.

Come and bring your colleagues, clients, spouses and friends! Apply for your tickets now.

ANNUAL DINNER: TUESDAY, 7th MARCH 2006

Please return to: Mrs E J Beesley, 25 Rotherwick Road, NW11 7DG (DX 33801 Golders Green)

Please send me tickets @ £70 per ticket: a cheque for £ is enclosed payable to CWHLS

Name:

Name of firm:

Address:

..... DX

Dietary requirements:

Seating requirements (if any)

DELEGATION

There is a fine line between delegating and dumping work. Delegation, if done properly, is an effective business tool in that the person most suitably qualified is allocated the work, thereby reducing the risk of a claim arising, whereas dumping work on a fee earner without any thought as to suitability greatly increases the chance of a claim.

In too many firms inadequate thought is given to the process of delegation. It should be an integral part of the client acquisition process. Having established that you wish to take the work on, the firm needs to be certain that it has suitably qualified personnel to do it. After all, it is stated in the Guide to the Professional Conduct of Solicitors that firms should not take a matter on unless they have sufficient skill, expertise and time to do it.

Work may be delegated either for the reasons set out above, or for training purposes. If the latter, then there will have to be a greater degree of supervision on the part of the firm. It is therefore important that there is some degree of structure attached to the delegation process in a firm. Delegation

should not be used as an excuse to get rid of a troublesome or difficult file. There needs to be greater finesse to the delegation process other than that the person to whom the file has been given has not got much work to do!

A suggested procedure is:

- A formal process which is the same across the whole firm
- Only a nominated individual may delegate a file (such as the department head, or a partner)
- Nobody other than the nominated individual may delegate a file (so as to avoid "sub delegation")
- Responsibility for the file rests with the person who delegates it
- When a file is delegated, all relevant information is brought to the attention of the fee earner who receives it, including critical time limits, unusual risks attaching to the matter, and what needs to be done and by when

- If delegation occurs during the retainer, make sure the client is told immediately who is dealing with the matter and, if appropriate, why there has been a personnel change
- Agree that status reports as to progress and any other relevant factors are sent to the delegator at regular intervals
- A central record is maintained of delegated work, which is monitored
- That work is delegated only to persons:
 - With the appropriate experience and skill levels
 - Who have sufficient time
 - Who will be able to see the matter through (i.e. are not planning to be absent from the office for an extended period).

This column was prepared by Alexander Forbes Professions, a Division of Alexander Forbes Risk Services Limited, which is authorised and regulated by the Financial Services Authority. A Lloyd's broker.

CWHLS LECTURES

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE SOCIETY'S LECTURES THIS YEAR WILL BE HELD ON MONDAYS IN THE OFFICES OF NABARRO NATHANSON, LACON HOUSE, 84 THEOBALD'S ROAD, WC1X 8RW

27 February	THE NEW EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL AND DISPUTES RESOLUTION RULES – THE FIRST FIFTEEN MONTHS	Simon Auerbach
20 March	PLANNING LAW: AN AGE OF UNCERTAINTY?	Martin Edwards
24 April	MONEY LAUNDERING UPDATE	Louise Delahunty
22 May	THE FINANCE BILL	Christopher Sokol
19 June	STAMP DUTY LAND TAX UPDATE	Patrick Cannon
10 July	TRUST AND PROBATE UPDATE	Victoria Cook

These lectures will be held at the offices of **Nabarro Nathanson** at Lacon House, 84 Theobald's Road, WC1X 8RW. They begin at 6.15 pm with a drink available from 6.00 pm. One hour of CPD is available (ref: JC/CWHLS) – please give your roll number when attending.

TO: Mrs E J Beesley, CWHLS, 25 Rotherwick Road, London NW11 7DG

DX 33801 Golders Green

Please send tickets for the following lectures: £20 per ticket for members and £30 per ticket for non members

	Member	Non member
Developments in intellectual property law in the last 12 months	_____	_____
Employment Tribunals	_____	_____
Planning Law Update	_____	_____
Money Laundering Update	_____	_____
The Finance Bill	_____	_____
Stamp Duty Land Tax	_____	_____
Trust and Probate Update	_____	_____

I enclose a cheque for £ _____ payable to the City of Westminster and Holborn Law Society

Name	Name of Firm

Address	

DX	

Signature	Date
_____	_____