

**MR CHRISTOPHER PAUL ERVING IS SUED, ONCE AGAIN****Will The Law Society of Hongkong Take Action ?**

Mr Christopher Paul Erving (), a solicitor, practising in the Hongkong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC), has been sued in the HKSAR High Court by a Mr Neill Denis Patrick.

Mr Neill Denis Patrick, the Plaintiff, is seeking from Mr Christopher Paul Erving, the Defendant, the sum of \$HK1,529,000 plus interest, damages and costs.

The Indorsement of Claim, attached to Writ of Summons, Number 1725 of 2014, states only:

- '1. The Plaintiff's claim is for an aggregate sum of HK\$1,529,000 being money payable by the Defendant to the Plaintiff being money had and received by the Defendant to the use of the Plaintiff since in or around 2001 and damages;*
- '2. Alternative to Paragraph 1 above, the Plaintiff's claim is for an aggregate sum of HK\$1,529,000 and damages for wrongfully failing and/or refusing to return to the Plaintiff since around 2008 compensation and costs of HK\$1,529,000 that the Defendant received as solicitor for and on behalf of the Plaintiff pursuant to the Employees Compensation Ordinance in breach of contract and/or fiduciary duty; and*
- '3. Interest and costs'*

Mr Christopher Paul Erving, according to the database of **TOLFIN** (), the Computerised, Online Financial Intelligence Service and Web-Based, Credit-Checking Provider, is, presently, a Consultant of the legal firm of Chong and Yen ().

He used to be the Sole Proprietor of the legal firm of Messrs Erving Brettell () and, also, at one time, he was a Partner in the legal firm of Ng and Company.

Mr Christopher Paul Erving holds the distinction of pilloried by Mr Justice Anthony To in his Judgment in respect of the Case of William Allan (an HKSAR barrister) (the Plaintiff) and Messrs Ng and Company (a firm) (the First Defendant) and Christopher Erving (a Partner in the firm of Ng and Company) (the Second Defendant).

Mr Justice Anthony To, in his concluding remarks in respect of this Action, stated, among other things, that Mr Christopher Paul Erving had perpetrated *'perjury and fraud on the Court by its own officer.'*

The Introduction of the Judgment of Mr Justice Anthony To states:

- '1. This is an action by the Plaintiff (Mr William Allan) against the solicitors who, after having been requested to act for him and having obtained confidential information relating to his case, and/or even agreeing to act for him, turned around to act for his opponent in the same set of proceedings whilst being in possession of such confidential information. The proceedings in question were the matrimonial proceedings in FCMC*

*No 2766/1994 between the Plaintiff who is a barrister in criminal practice and his wife (the “Wife”) who is a medical practitioner. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Defendant (“Erving”) is the solicitor to whom such confidential information was allegedly imparted. The 1<sup>st</sup> Defendant was the firm of solicitors of which Erving was a partner. Essentially, the Plaintiff’s claim is for exemplary damages for Erving’s breach of duty of confidence for which the 1<sup>st</sup> Defendant would also be vicariously liable.*

- ‘2. *A Statement of Claim was filed and served together with the Writ on 28 October 1994. The ...* [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). **TARGET** does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.*