

ANOTHER LEGAL EAGLE HAS LANDED ... WITH A PLOP

The legal profession of the Hongkong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC) has been mauled, over and over again, during the past few years.

One, really, does not know, from one day to another, whether or not a certain barrister/solicitor will be in business the day following one, leaving a cash deposit with such a professional.

TARGET knows of one example of this situation, happening only about one year ago, when a thought-to-be leading barrister, a Queen's Counsel, demanded, in advance, a cash retainer of about \$HK500,000.

Then, this once-famous, HKSAR barrister left for England, claiming that he was ill and that he could no longer work for the client who had invested this not-inconsiderable sum of money with him.

He gave just one day's notice of his intention to quit the HKSAR.

At the time of his engagement, he is quoted as telling his former client: *'One works best when one gets paid in advance.'*

He demanded a cheque in the full amount before commencing any work.

Recently, TARGET has published the situation with regard to Barristers John Joseph Edward Swaine and Graham Anthony Harris (Please see [TARGET Intelligence Report, Volume IV, Number 84 of Wednesday, May 8](#)) and, now, along has come the matter of another well-known solicitors' firm: Richard Tai and Company.

(TARGET is not suggesting, for one minute, that Barristers John Joseph Edward Swaine and/or Graham Anthony Harris should be tarred with the same brush as Mr Desmond Keane, Q.C.)

Richard Tai and Company, of Shun Tak Centre, Central Hongkong, has just been sued for about \$HK148,000 by Pacific Ltd, the corporate landlord of Flat D, on the Second Floor of Kennedy Court, Number 7A, Shiu Fai Terrace, Numbers 134-136, Kennedy Road, Hongkong.

This is a residential flat in a rather, well-to-do area of the HKSAR.

Pacific Ltd is alleging that it has been owed rent on the flat for the past 4 months.

It was only in December, last year, that this solicitors' firm was sued for \$HK240,000 by the corporate landlord of its Shun Tak Centre offices: Shun Tak Centre Ltd.

In September 2001, Edith Y. W. Tang, a Law Costs Draftsman, sued Richard Tai and Company for \$HK137,929, being services, allegedly rendered to the firm.

According to the 2001 Directory of Solicitors Firms in the HKSAR, Richard Tai and Company had an Establishment of 3 working Partners and 4 Assistant Solicitors.

-- E N D --

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.

 [Site Meter](#)