

The matter in dispute arises out of the use of Block Fees and inclusive fees in the one account of expenses.

The defender was found liable for the pursuer's expenses as is indicated in Lord Mayfield's Interlocutor of 8 th October 1981. The Account of Expenses lodged by the Pursuer (No. 16 of Process) contains Block Fees egg. "Trstructic fee" and inclusive fees taken from the Act of Sederunt dated 9 th November and 6th December 1979 e.g. "Fee For ali work up to the swearing of Affidavits" and "Fee for all work from weaning of Affidavits to obtaining Extract".

Under date May 27 290. there is catered "Fee for settlement by Joint Minute" 545 . This is a Birch Fec taken from the Table of Fees under Rule 347 If the whole account had be: made up of the inclusive fees allowed under the said Act of Sederuat in tic opinion of the Auditor the charge of $£ 45$ would not have been allowed as these ices are inclusive of all work done.

It seems to the Auditor to be unfair on the client to take advantage of , a means to obtain grater fees by a use of a mixture of fees as in this account He has accordingly taxed of: we Sentiment fee of $\mathrm{E}_{4} 5$. It is a matter for comment" that no block fee i. provided for Affidavits in Part II of the Table Now Blocks and detailed foes may not both be used in the same account which makes it difficult for soliubrs to make up a mixed fee account and be paid for additional work not cored by the inclusive fees where the block and inclusive fees are mixed.

However in this account ane agents have taken fees whin are inclusive of all work done from taking animations to decree. Therefore in the opinion of the Auditor they hare Ama pad ob the wort done in connection with the serchern framing inema:ions oo decree.

## action

To RBSPECT WHEREOF

EDINBURGH, 8th Februäry 196,2




