

IN THE MATTER OF ABDUL QAYYUM BUTT (registered foreign lawyer)  
AND SELLIAH VEERAVAGU, solicitor

- AND -

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974

---

Mr A H Isaacs (in the chair)  
Mr R J C Potter  
Mr M C Baughan

Date of Hearing: 20th September 2004

---

## **FINDINGS**

of the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal  
Constituted under the Solicitors Act 1974

---

An application was duly made on behalf of The Law Society by Geoffrey Williams of Queen's Counsel, solicitor of 2a Churchill Way, Cardiff, CF10 2DW on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2003 that Abdul Qayyum Butt (a registered foreign lawyer) of 63a Kingsley Road, Hounslow, Middlesex, TW3 1QB and Selliah Veeravagu, solicitor of 24 Fernlea Road, Mitcham, Surrey, CR4 2HE might be required to answer the allegations contained in the statement which accompanied the application and that such Orders might be made as the Tribunal should think right.

On 17<sup>th</sup> December 2003 the Applicant made a supplementary statement containing further allegations against Mr Butt.

The allegations set out below are those contained in the original and supplementary statements. The allegations against Mr Butt were that he had been guilty of conduct unbecoming a registered foreign lawyer in each of the following respects namely that he had:

- a) appeared before Magistrates as Advocate when he had no right of audience;
- b) breached Rule 1(E) of the Solicitors Practice Rules 1990 with respect to his standard of work.

The allegations against the Respondents, Mr Butt and Mr Veeravagu were that they had been guilty of conduct unbecoming a registered foreign lawyer and a solicitor respectively in each of the following respects namely that they had:

- c) breached the terms of the Solicitors Publicity Code 1990 in their use of professional stationery;
- d) failed to comply with the terms of Rule 13 of the Solicitors Practice Rules 1990 (and as amended) with respect to their failure to ensure adequate and requisite supervision of the firm A Q Butt & Co;
- e) held themselves out as being in partnership when SV was not discharging the responsibilities arising from partnership.

Supplementary allegations against Mr Butt alone were that he had been guilty of conduct unbecoming a registered foreign lawyer in each of the following respects namely that he had:

- f) further failed to comply with the terms of Rule 13 of the Solicitors Practice Rules 1990 (and as amended) with respect to his failure to ensure adequate and requisite supervision of the firm A Q Butt & Co;
- g) made misleading statements in correspondence to the OSS;
- h) failed to pay clients' funds into a client bank account contrary to Rule 3 of the Solicitors Accounts Rules 1991 and since 1<sup>st</sup> May 2000 contrary to Rule 15(1) of the Solicitors Accounts Rules 1998;
- i) failed to deliver Accountant's Reports notwithstanding the terms of Section 34 of the Solicitors Act 1974 and the Rules made thereunder;
- j) failed to comply with the Solicitors Indemnity Rules 2001.

The application was heard at the Court Room, 3rd Floor, Gate House, 1 Farringdon Street, London, EC4M 7NS when Geoffrey Williams appeared as the Applicant and the Respondent appeared in person.

The evidence before the Tribunal included the unsworn evidence of Mr Butt and "Particular of Grounds" submitted by Mr Veeravagu, such document being undated but received in the Tribunal's office on 26<sup>th</sup> August 2003. Both Respondents denied the allegations made against each of them.

On 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> September the Tribunal heard four cases in which Mr Veeravagu was the Respondent, this case is one of them. The Tribunal made its Order in respect of Mr Veeravagu when it had heard all four cases, the other three being 8857, 8859 and 8860 of 2003.

The Tribunal made the following Order against Mr Veeravagu in respect of all four cases in which he was the Respondent.

The Tribunal Order that the Respondent, Selliah Veeravagu of Fernlea Road, Mitcham, Surrey, solicitor, be Struck Off the Roll of Solicitors and they further Order that he do pay with regard to case no. 8857, 10%; with regard to case no. 8858, 25%; with regard to case no. 8859, 100% and with regard to case no. 8860, 75% of the respective costs of and incidental to these applications and enquiries to be subject to a detailed assessment unless agreed between the parties to include the costs of the Investigation Accountant of the Law Society.

At the conclusion of this case the Tribunal Ordered that the Respondent, Abdul Qayyum Butt of Hounslow Avenue, Middlesex (formerly of 36a Kingsway Road, Hounslow Middlesex, TW3 1QB), registered foreign lawyer, be Struck Off the Register of Foreign Lawyers and that he pay 75% of the costs of and incidental to this application and enquiry to be subject to a detailed assessment unless agreed between the parties.

#### History of the Respondents

1. Mr Butt was a registered foreign lawyer. He was born on 6<sup>th</sup> June 1936 and registered as a foreign lawyer in May of 1996.
2. Mr Veeravagu was born in 1946 and admitted as a solicitor in 1991.
3. At all times material to the application Mr Butt carried on practice in partnership under the style of A Q Butt & Co at 63a Kingsley Road, Hounslow, Middlesex, TW3 1QB.
4. At all times material to the application Mr Veeravagu carried on practice as a solicitor as follows:
  - (a) on his own account and in partnership under the style of Veera & Co at 24 Fernlea Road, Mitcham, Surrey, CR4 2HE;
  - (b) in partnership with the Respondent Mr Butt as set out in paragraph 3 above.
  - (c) in partnership under the style of Chambers & Co;
  - (d) in partnership under the style of Bokhari & Co;
  - (e) in partnership under the style of Tooting Law Chambers.

#### The Applicant's case

5. On 26<sup>th</sup> November 1998 Mr Butt appeared as Advocate in child care proceedings in the Brentford Magistrates Court. He was not permitted so to do as the status of Registered Foreign Lawyer does not confer any right of audience or the right to conduct litigation.
6. A complaint about this was made both by a firm of solicitors acting for the child's guardian ad litem and by the Magistrate's Clerk.
7. The litigation was conducted on behalf of a vulnerable lady, a mother who was contesting the making of an interim care order. There had been serious deficiencies in

her representation. Counsel instructed on behalf of the child considered that Mr Butt did not appear to have any significant knowledge or understanding of the relevant legislation and his conduct of the proceedings was unusual. A statement had been required from the child's mother (Mr Butt's client) which was filed late at about 5.00 pm on the day before the substantive hearing. Another witness statement was filed at the hearing. The statement did not address issues raised in the psychiatrist's report, the guardian ad litem's report or comment on the care plan. Counsel had not been fully and properly instructed at the hearing. The attendance of a witness, whom the other side wished to cross-examine, had not been arranged nor had the attendance of an interpreter for the mother (Mr Butt's client) – although this was arranged at short notice in the course of the first morning of the hearing. Mr Butt gave advice to the child's older brother without recognising that there may well have been a conflict of interest between the mother and the older brother, who was of age and might have been in a position to make his own application concerning the child.

8. Mr Butt dispatched an unqualified person to attend court on 8<sup>th</sup> July 1999.
9. The Respondent's professional notepaper was as follows:

At the head of the page:

A.Q. BUTT & CO  
SOLICITORS & OATH COMMISSIONERS

- SELLIAH VEERAVAGU LL.B. SOLICITOR 47 Hounslow Avenue Hounslow
- ABDUL QAYYUM BUTT M.A.LL.B R.F.L Middlesex. TW3 2DZ

At the foot of the page:

---

EXPERTS IN IMMIGRATION, WELFARE CRIMINAL, MATRIMONIAL AND CIVIL LITIGATION  
OFFICE: TEL 0181 8982262 FAX: 0181 8934808 or in Emergency 0958 310197 (Mobile)

10. The Respondent's firm, AQ Butt & Co, was required to be supervised in accordance with Rule 13 of the Solicitors Practice Rules 1990 (and from 23<sup>rd</sup> December 1999 as amended). Compliance with the Rule depended upon adequate supervision being exercised by Mr Veeravagu.
11. In the letter of 4<sup>th</sup> May 2000 from Veera & Co to the Office for the Supervision of Solicitors, Mr Veeravagu said he clearly explained the provisions [of Rule 13] to Mr Butt that the practice was not to exercise or assume responsibility for any right of audience or right to conduct litigation. In connection with his supervision of the practice Mr Veeravagu said:
 

"I used to visit two to three times a week and sometimes I do not visit for two to three weeks but whenever necessary I attend the office."
12. In his letter to the OSS dated 14<sup>th</sup> June 2000 Mr Veeravagu said:

"[Mr Butt] acted on his own accord and attended the Magistrates and conducted litigation."

He went on to say that "Mr Butt alone was responsible for that".

13. Mr Veeravagu went on to say that he did not consider that the abbreviation "RFL" would serve to mislead anyone.
14. In his letter to the OSS dated 2<sup>nd</sup> February 2001, Mr Veeravagu said:
 

"Now I entirely accept that my interest in no less than four firms is not in accordance with The Law Society directives and advice. So from now on I propose to devote myself entirely to Chambers Solicitors and to Bokharj & Co Solicitors".
15. Mr B of the OSS had attended at the offices of A Q Butt & Co on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2000. Following his visit, the OSS made enquiries as a result of which it was established that Mr Butt and Mr Veeravagu had never shared fee income nor had Mr Veeravagu been a signatory on A Q Butt & Co's bank accounts. On the telephone Mr Veeravagu had confirmed to Mr B that it was "a question of convenience" for his name to appear on A.Q. Butt & Co's letterhead. Mr Ashgar who Mr Butt claimed had succeeded Mr Veeravagu as "supervising" solicitor in correspondence with the OSS denied that he was a partner in Mr Butt's firm though his name appeared on its letterhead.
16. Subsequent to Mr Veeravagu's departure from A Q Butt & Co in or about June 2000 the OSS made enquiries as to the firm's supervisory arrangements.
17. With his response of 14<sup>th</sup> February 2002 to the enquiry of the OSS Mr Butt enclosed a chronology in the following form:

#### Chronology

01.09.96	A Q Butt & Co S Veeravagu solicitor as partner Supervision solicitor Mohammad Asghar
01.01.00 - 05.05.00	Veeravagu as a partner me as Principal
05.05.00	Asghar removed but Veeravagu continued
22.06.00	S M M Bazeer replaced Veeravague
22.02.01	Bazeer left Kapila replaced him
13.02.01	Kapila started work
13.09.01	Kapila left removed as directed by OSS
14.09.01	M A Mansoor joined
05.10.01	Mr A Mansoor removed as directed by OSS
05.10.01	S Ruparalia took over
23.10.01	We paid £555 for Sonita [Ruparalia] pervious (sic)
04.01.02	year fee
16.01.02	Closed solicitors firm removed her name Working as a consultants

18. Mr Butt had earlier instructed Messrs Radcliffes to represent him and by a letter dated 31<sup>st</sup> October 2001 they had supplied the OSS with the following details of the history of the practice of A Q Butt & Co:

"Dear Sir,

A Q Butt – Disciplinary Proceedings

1. As you are aware, this firm has been instructed in the last few days by Mr Butt in respect of the decision to refer his conduct to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal. This is Mr Butt's appeal against that decision.
2. Our understanding is that there were various allegations which have been made against him. These can be summarised as follows:
  - 2.1 Mr Butt has allegedly breached his status as a registered foreign lawyer;
  - 2.2 Mr Butt has allegedly breached the publicity code;
  - 2.3 Mr Butt has allegedly acted in a situation where a conflict of interest existed;
  - 2.4 Mr Butt allegedly sent an unqualified person to conduct a final direction hearing;
  - 2.5 Mr Butt falsely represented himself in publicity to be an expert in welfare, immigration, matrimonial and criminal law;

Please confirm that allegations at paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 have indeed been withdrawn.

Background

3. A Q Butt was formed on 1 September 2001.
  - 3.1 Mr Butt was registered as a registered foreign lawyer on 1<sup>st</sup> May 1996;
  - 3.2 On the formation of A Q Butt & Co the partners in the firm were Mr Veeravagu and Mr Butt;
  - 3.3 The make-up of the partnership since formation is set out in the schedule below:

<u>Date</u>	<u>Name of Partner</u>	<u>Date ceased to be a Partner</u>	<u>Date The Law Society informed</u>
01.09.96	Mr Butt		Same day or prior
01.09.96	Mr Veeravagu	21.06.2000	Same date or prior
21.06.00	Mr Bazeer	22.02.2001	Same day or prior
13.02.01	GM Kapila	13.09.01	Same day or prior
13.09.01	Mansoor	05.10.01	
05.10.01	S Ruparalia		
13.09.01	Mansoor	05.10.01	

4. In addition to the partners, A Q Butt & Co has from time to time employed various fee earners including assistants and paralegals. A schedule setting out the employee history of non-partners is set out below:

<u>Name of Fee Earner</u>	<u>Qualifications</u>	<u>Status</u>
Mr Butt	Pakistani qualified advocate Registered Foreign Lawyer in UK	The Principal
Mr Asghar	Solicitor (partner for a few days only)	Was Supervising Solicitor
Mr Majid	LLB	Was an Outdoor Clerk
Miss Mirza	LLB LPC	Legal Assistant
Mrs Butt		Office Administrator
Miss S Butt		Was a Legal Assistant
Mr Babar Butt		Paralegal/IT
Miss Fouzia Butt		Secretary
Mr Yasar	LLB	Outdoor Clerk
Mr Iqbal	LLB	Outdoor Clerk
Mr Mian	LLB	Outdoor Clerk

5. Relationship with Mr Asghar

It is common ground that Mr Asghar was invited to be a partner in the firm and agreed to such an appointment. A few days later he changed his mind. He has since then never been a partner in the practice. He has however been a supervising solicitor from time to time (see above). It is our understanding that when Mr Butt approached Mr Asghar to work with him, it was Mr Butt's hope and aspiration that Mr Asghar would wish to be a partner in his firm. However Mr Asghar later changed his mind and decided to be the supervising solicitor and Mr Veeravagu was reappointed as a partner.

Mr Butt's Status as a Registered Foreign Lawyer

6. Mr Butt has been a registered foreign lawyer since 1996. Mr Butt is aware of the limits that his status places upon him. It is, we understand

alleged that on 26 November 1998 Mr Butt represented a client in front of lay magistrates. As you are aware, Mr Butt did inform Counsel outside the court room that he was a registered foreign lawyer and held a practising certificate. He had, at the time, been expecting Counsel (Khuda Bakhsa) to attend the hearing on his client's behalf. Counsel's message that he would be unable to attend was not passed to Mr Butt in advance of the hearing...."

19. The Applicant said that the evidence was clear that:
- (a) Mr Mansoor was not involved at all at A Q Butt & Co. For the three week period when Mr Butt asserted Mr Mansoor had joined and when he left (14<sup>th</sup> September 2001 and 5<sup>th</sup> October 2001) Mr Butt was running the practice alone.
  - (b) Ms S Ruparelia (a solicitor) was not Mr Butt's partner from 5<sup>th</sup> October 2001. Since 5<sup>th</sup> October 2001 the date upon which Mr Butt asserted that Ms Ruparelia became a partner, he ran the firm alone until he ceased to practise in or about January 2002.
  - (c) Mr Butt undertook the representation of appellants to the Immigration Appeal Authority and the Immigration Appeal Tribunal.
  - (d) Mr Butt had received surety monies on behalf of clients and that no annual Accountant's Reports were filed with The Law Society in respect of the firm.
  - (e) Mr Butt had not obtained Professional Indemnity Insurance cover for the firm by the date when he should to have made an application for cover from the Assigned Risks Pool – Rule 8 of the Solicitors Indemnity Rules 2001. No such application was made until 9<sup>th</sup> October 2001.

### **The Submissions of the Applicant**

- 24. With regard to Mr Butt's appearance as an advocate in child care proceedings, he had accepted that he did so appear. Before so doing he should have made his status absolutely plain to the court. He failed to make that status plain despite enquiry being made of him.
- 25. In acting as he did in the case in question Mr Butt failed in his obligation to provide a proper standard of work to his client. That included his despatch of an unqualified member of staff to the Magistrates Court on 8<sup>th</sup> July 1999.
- 26. Mr Butt's conduct was exacerbated by the fact that Mr Butt described himself as an expert in matrimonial matters. Any claim to expertise can be made only if it can be justified. The Tribunal was referred to paragraph 2 (b) of the Solicitors Publicity Code 1990 which specifically applied to registered foreign lawyers. The Respondent possessed no such expertise. Indeed if the Respondent had had such expertise then the complaints would not have arisen.



27. Mr Butt asserted that it was not improper to claim expertise as he had access to experts in the field. Any solicitor or registered foreign lawyer has access to experts and that was not enough to justify a claim to expertise being made.
28. With regard to the letterhead of A Q Butt & Co, the firm was described as "Solicitors and Oath Commissioners". The Respondent was described as "RFL". That abbreviation was prohibited by paragraph 6 of the Solicitors Publicity Code 1990. It was accepted that that breach was ultimately rectified.
29. Mr Butt was not able to perform the role of "solicitor qualified to supervise" at A Q Butt & Co as the practice exercised rights of audience and conducted litigation. The Tribunal was reminded of the provisions of Rule 13(5)(j)(ii) which was as follows:

"A registered foreign lawyer who is a principal in the practice may fulfil the role of a "solicitor qualified to supervise" for the purpose of paragraph (3) of the rule or note (k)(ii)(C) below provided that:

  - (A) no right of audience or right to conduct litigation is exercised or supervised from that office; and
  - (B) the Registered Foreign Lawyer has practised as a lawyer for at least 36 months within the last ten years;
  - (C) he or she has completed the training specified under note (d)(ii) above.
30. It was apparent that Mr Veeravagu did not provide any adequate supervision; nor did Mr Ashgar, Mr Bazeer, Mr Kopila, Mr Mansoor or Ms Rupalalia.
31. The relationship of Mr Butt and Mr Veeravagu was described as a partnership but it was not a partnership in the proper sense of the word. While Mr Veeravagu was held out as a partner he only attended at the office of A Q Butt & Co from time to time, he was also engaged with several other practices. He was not a signatory on any partnership bank account, there was no fee sharing and the arrangements between Mr Butt and Mr Veeravagu was entered into purely for the sake of convenience. In such circumstances Mr Veeravagu could not possibly discharged his supervisory duties at the firm.
32. As a partner, or at least as a solicitor held out as such, Mr Veeravagu was responsible in conduct for the breaches of the Publicity Code demonstrated by the description "Solicitors and Oath Commissioners" and where Mr Butt was described by the initials "RFL".
33. Mr Butt's assertions in correspondence addressed to the Office for the Supervision of Solicitors with regard to his being in partnership with Mr Mansoor and subsequently with Ms Rupalalia were not true and were misleading.

34. In holding surety monies Mr Butt was required to hold those monies in a client account designated as such and to file annual Accountant's Reports with The Law Society and otherwise to comply fully with the Solicitors Accounts Rules.
35. Mr Butt had been late in making application indemnity cover from the Assigned Risks Pool. He had put that right and it was accepted that the lateness of his application had been reflected in the large premium payable.

### **The Submissions of Mr Butt**

36. Mr Butt said on the occasion when he had appeared before the Magistrates he had not appeared as an Advocate for his clients but as a representative of his firm. Counsel had not turned up and it had been his intention to explain the position to the court.
37. With regard to his standard of work in that case the client had been particularly difficult and had insisted upon being represented by Mr Butt's firm. If he had not agreed to represent her then she would have been without representation. Mr Butt accepted that he was not experienced in such work but he did have access to those who had such experience.
38. Mr Butt believed it was perfectly in order to describe himself on his firm's letterhead as "RFL". He had subsequently come to accept that he should probably be described as "registered foreign lawyer" and the professional stationery had been changed.
39. Mr Butt considered that his firm was properly supervised in accordance with the provisions of Practice Rule 13. He said that that he did not conduct litigation but represented appellants in immigration matters.
40. Mr Butt said he and Mr Veeravagu were partners.
41. Mr Veeravagu confirmed that the chronology which he had supplied showing the dates when various solicitors were involved in his firm was correct. He had never practised without having a solicitor/partner/supervisor. He had taken considerable steps to ensure that that was the case including putting advertisements in The Law Society's Gazette. His explanations of the state of affairs at his firm from time to time were not misleading.
42. Mr Butt said that he did not hold clients' money. He did not take payments on account of costs but rather undertook his work on a fixed fee basis. He accepted that he did hold surety monies. Because he did not hold clients' money he was not required to have a client account, comply with the Solicitors Accounts Rules, or deliver annual Accountant's Reports. Mr Butt said he had never touched one penny of clients' money. Mr Butt also said that he had delivered to The Law Society Accountant's Reports relating to the practice accounts.
43. Mr Butt said that he had obtained indemnity cover from the Assigned Risk Pool which had cost him a very great deal of money.

### **The Submissions of Mr Veeravagu**

44. The Tribunal sets out the "Particulars of Grounds" submitted by Mr Veeravagu and received in the Tribunal's office on 26<sup>th</sup> August 2003:
- "1. c. The Respondent denies the allegation that he breached the terms of the solicitor publicity code in his use of professional stationery. The letterhead was sent to the Law Society first (letter to the OSS dated 4<sup>th</sup> May 2000).
- d. The Respondent denies the allegation that he failed to comply with the terms of Rule 13 of the Solicitors Practice Rules. Mr Butt was the principal of the firm and he was "a solicitor qualified to supervise" (para 2 of Rule 13). He was supervising the firm of A Q Butt & Co.
- e. The Respondent was a partner at the firm and he accepts the responsibility as a partner. Mr Butt was responsible for supervision of the firm and if he breached the rules of professional conduct without my knowledge, he was personally responsible.
- 2-18 No comment
19. The Respondent denies the allegation that the practice exercised rights of audience and conducted litigation. The Law Society originally granted permission to Mr Butt to form the multinational practice subject to the condition that the firm cannot exercise rights of audience and cannot conduct litigation.
20. The Respondent accepts that he has not supervised the firm.
21. The Respondent accepts the responsibility as a partner of the firm. During the period in which I was a partner at A Q Butt & Co I was not engaged with any other practices except my own practice.
22. The Respondent denies that he was responsible in conduct for the breaches of the publicity code committed by virtue of the use of the firm's professional stationery. The letterhead in dispute has been submitted to The Law Society before the firm started to use the stationery and The Law Society raised no objection as to the format."

### **The Tribunal's Findings of Fact**

The Tribunal found as facts:

- (a) that Mr Butt had appeared as an advocate though as a registered foreign lawyer he was not entitled to do so;
- (b) that in relation to the child care proceedings the standard of work of his firm (of which he was effectively sole principal) fell far short of a proper standard;

- (c) that Mr Butt's stationery was misleading and breached the Solicitor's Publicity Code 1990;
- (d) that there was no or no effective supervision of Mr Butt's practice at times when such supervision was required by Practice Rule 13;
- (e) that Mr Veeravagu was not properly to be described as being in partnership with Mr Butt;
- (f) that none of Mr Ashgar, Mr Bazeer, Mr Kapila, Mr Mansoor or Ms Ruparelia could properly be described as partners of Mr Butt nor did any of them perform any effective role as supervising solicitor;
- (g) that Mr Butt's explanations of the position were insufficiently full and frank to avoid The Law Society being misled;
- (h) that Mr Butt had received client funds which should have been paid into client account with a consequent failure to have Accountant's Reports prepared and delivered in accordance with Section 34 of the Solicitors Act 1974;
- (i) that Mr Butt failed to comply with the Solicitors Indemnity Rules 2001 by neglecting to apply in time for cover from the Assigned Risks Pool.

### **The Decision of the Tribunal**

- 45. The Tribunal found all of the allegations against each of the Respondents to have been substantiated. It appeared to the Tribunal that Mr Butt was of the opinion that if superficially he appeared to comply with the Practice Rules that was good enough. He did not appear to understand that apparent compliance when there was no actual compliance was in itself a dishonest approach. At the hearing, at which Mr Butt represented himself, he appeared in a number of respects not to understand the matters which had been alleged against him. In particular the Tribunal noticed his insistence that he had never taken one penny of clients' money. That had never been alleged against him. What had been alleged was that he had not complied with the Solicitors Accounts Rules and in particular had not opened a client account in which to hold client monies.
- 46. The Tribunal was troubled that the matters alleged against Mr Butt reflected his failure to grasp the obligations and duties which those who practice as registered foreign lawyers had placed upon them. The Tribunal concluded that in order to protect the public and good reputation of the solicitors' profession and indeed that of registered foreign lawyers, it was right that Mr Butt's name should be removed from the Register of Foreign Lawyers.
- 47. The matters alleged against Mr Veeravagu were heard over two days when three other matters involving Mr Veeravagu were considered by the same Division of the Tribunal. At the conclusion of all of those matters the Tribunal decided that Mr Veeravagu similarly had flagrantly breached the Rules and Regulations relating to solicitors and registered foreign lawyers and it was right for the protection of the

public and the good name of the solicitors' profession that he should be struck off the Roll.

48. With regard to this case, No. 8858 of 2003, the Tribunal ordered that Mr Butt should pay 75 per cent of the costs of and incidental to the application and enquiry, to include the costs of the Investigation Accountant of The Law Society, to be subject to a detailed assessment unless agreed between the parties. In respect this case it was ordered that Mr Veeravagu should pay 25 per cent of the costs of and incidental to the application and enquiry, to include the costs of The Law Society's Investigation Accountant, to be subject to a detailed assessment unless agreed between the parties.

DATED this 12<sup>th</sup> day of November 2004

on behalf of the Tribunal

A H Isaacs  
Chairman