

MR CHRISTOPHER PAUL ERVING IS SUED BY THE LAW SOCIETY**Is This The Final Chapter In The Saga ?**

The Council of The Law Society of Hongkong has sued Solicitor Christopher Paul Erving () in the High Court of The Hongkong Special Administrative Region (HKSAR) of the People's Republic of China (PRC).

Miscellaneous Proceedings Action, Number 2402 of 2014, was filed at the tail end of the last week of September.

TARGET () is proscribed from having access to the Statement of Claim, attached to this Miscellaneous Proceedings Action, but it is not too difficult to deduce the gist of The Council's case against Mr [Christopher Paul Erving](#) who will be forced to defend himself with regard to the allegations, contained therein, assuming that he determines so to do.

As **TARGET** wrote on September 11, 2014 (Please refer to **TARGET** Intelligence Report, Volume XVI, Number 172) in respect of another HKSAR, High Court Action, the case of Mr Neill Denis Patrick v. Mr Christopher Paul Erving, whereby the Plaintiff was seeking \$HK1,529,000, the final sentence of that exclusive report was:

'One must assume that the next episode in this long-running saga, which is now about 20 years old, will be a determination by The Law Society of Hongkong.'

In an earlier HKSAR, High Court Action, when Mr William Allan, an HKSAR barrister, sued Ng and Company (a firm) (the First Defendant) and Mr Christopher Paul Erving (the Second Defendant), a Partner of Ng and Company, at the time, Mr Justice Anthony To, in his written Judgment in the case, stated that Mr Christopher Paul Erving had perpetrated '*perjury and fraud on the Court by its own officer*'.

At the conclusion of Mr Justice Anthony To's lengthy Judgement, he stated:

'Accordingly, I make an award of exemplary damages in the amount of \$2,140,000 together with interest in favour of the Plaintiff (Mr William Allan) against the 1st and 2nd Defendants jointly and severally (Mr Christopher Paul Erving and Erving Brettell, respectively). The Defendants shall pay interest at judgment rate on the capital sum of \$1,390,000 (i.e. \$1,190,000 + \$200,000) with effect from 28 October 1994 and on the capital sum of \$750,000 with effect from 29 November 1995 until payment. The Defendants shall pay the Plaintiff's costs in this action on indemnity basis, to be taxed if not agreed. The Plaintiff's own costs shall be taxed in accordance with Legal Aid Regulations.

'In addition, I give direction to the Law Society to commence disciplinary proceedings against the 2nd Defendant and to consider removing him from the roll of solicitors. The punishment might appear heavy for a first time and one off misconduct, but nothing less would have been adequate for misconduct of such a gravity involving perjury and fraud on the Court by its own officer. And after all, by some fortuitous events, he had the punishment suspended by 16 years already.

'Lastly, I thank counsel for their well researched arguments as to the law and for their detailed analysis of the facts which they unearthed after 16 years. Both counsel were under tremendous pressure because of the seriousness of the case. They discharged their unenviable burden with outstanding competence and uncompromising vigour. I apologise for the time taken in deliberation.'

At ... [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. **TARGET** does not guarantee to publish readers' views, but reserves the right so to do subject to the laws of libel.*