

LITIGANTS BEWARE !
BARRISTERS MAY LEAVE YOU HIGH AND DRY

It appears that a former, leading barrister of the Hongkong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC) has done a runner.

He is the 72-year-old, Mr Geoffrey Watson, who, according to The Hongkong Bar Association, occupies offices at Cosmos Building, Number 8-11, Lan Kwai Fong, Central, Room 604.

However, according to a receptionist at this office, Mr Watson only used the chambers for his correspondence; and, he has not been seen *'for a long time'*.

The Chambers are shared by Mr Peter C.K. Chan, according to The Bar List, published in March, this year.

According to a receptionist, speaking in Chinese at the shared chambers of Messrs Watson and Chan: *'A number of people have been calling up here, looking for Mr Watson.'*

'He has not paid for his share of the rent (in the chambers) for the past year.'

Mr Watson, known in the profession as being a very clever advocate, on occasions, is being actively sought by The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation Ltd – because this bank alleges that Mr Watson owes it about \$HK180,000.

The bank is alleging that Mr Watson and The Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation Ltd entered into an agreement which, in essence, renewed Mr Watson's existing banking facilities for another year, those facilities, being in the amount of \$HK170,000.

As at May 17, 2001, Mr Watson was said to have been in arrears in the sum of \$HK179,131.75 and has not responded to a bank letter of demand, dated May 25, 2001.

The bank would like to get back

Recently, there have been a number of complaints about one particular barrister, who, only one month ago, left the territory.

The barrister, a Crown Counsel (QC) of the *'old school'*, was in the habit of stating that a barrister works best when he gets paid, up front.

On one occasion, he had a prospective client, followed to his office by an Assistant Solicitor in order to obtain a cheque in the amount of \$HK80,000 from the client's company.

While barristers are supposed to be instructed by solicitor, it was the barrister, who demanded, at conference, in front of his Junior, that the prospective client pay his Retainer Fee, posthaste ... [CLICK TO ORDER FULL ARTICLE](#)

***While TARGET makes every attempt to ensure accuracy of all data published,
TARGET cannot be held responsible for any errors and/or omissions.***

If readers feel that they would like to voice their opinions about that which they have read in TARGET, please feel free to e-mail your views to editor@targetnewspapers.com or targnews@hkstar.com. TARGET does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.