

**FORMER HONGKONG SOLICITOR SUED FOR \$HK336,000**

It is said, of the legal profession, just about internationally, too, with, perhaps, certain clear and damnable exceptions in respect of practitioners of certain parts of Asia and the Middle East, that one's word should be one's bond.

Stockbrokers used to make such claims, too, but, sadly, over the past few years, especially, one has seen that class of layman fall tragically from grace in the US, as well as many of those stockbrokers, formerly trading in stocks and shares in the Hongkong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC).

Of course, solicitors and barristers, just like their lay stockbroker brethren, are only human, and, as such, they are prone to the same temptations as other mere mortals, to wit: Greed and avarice; deception; as well as theft.

At least one solicitor, who has been in the HKSAR for quite a number of years, but who does not possess a Practising Certificate, today, allowing him to hang out his shingle, proclaiming that his legal shop is open for business, actually sued his Church – which did not go down too well with the English Council Members, who thought that they had, in their midst, one of the devout Episcopalians.

That former HKSAR solicitor is Mr David Rule Pyott.

Some HKSAR solicitors and barristers, as one may surmise, succumb to temptation, but the vast majority of them, happily, maintain the code to which all civilised men of the world should aspire, that code, personifying the highest standards of honesty and trust.

Over the years, **TARGET** has brought to its subscribers, the names of those members of the legal profession of the HKSAR, who have failed the test of time; and, have fallen from grace in the eyes of their peers, as well as giving the legal profession a rather black eye.

The solicitors' firm of Laurence Pang and Company, [TARGET wrote on March 12, 2003](#), was sued for \$HK143,000 plus costs in respect of rent on its offices, located at The Hongkong Trade Centre – for 3 months.

What surprised **TARGET**, at the time of the issuance of the District Court Writ, naming Laurence Pang and Company as the sole Defendant, was the fact that the monthly rental was just \$HK47,700 – and the firm could not find the wherewithal to meet that commitment.

Then, there was E-Fortune Investments Ltd, which sued Raymond Hung and Company, another HKSAR solicitors' firm, for \$HK8.29 million in respect of gross negligence in that the firm *'failed to exercise all proper skill and care, diligence and competence.'*

Then, there was the case of the solicitors' firm of Oldham, Li and Nei, which was sued on February 26, 2003, by Mr Joachim Wolfgang Starke for \$HK4 million, being money, allegedly, due and owing.

And, of course, there is the continuing saga of the (legal) Family of Swaine, which has the distinction of having accumulated the most number of writs in the HKSAR over the past few years.

## The Pyott Case

Mr [David Rule Pyott](#) was, at one time, a partner of Freshfields, a solicitors' firm with offices in the HKSAR. This firm was held in very high esteem, at one time (it no longer exists in its original form).

Mr David Rule Pyott, readers will recall, last graced the pages of **TARGET** on April 10, 2002, after he had sued St John's Cathedral Council for \$HK44,500 for what was described as fees for legal consultancy work. That claim was made in spite of the fact that ... [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](mailto:editor@targetnewspapers.com) or [targnews@hkstar.com](mailto:targnews@hkstar.com). **TARGET** does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.*