HIGH COURT OF JUSTICIARY (at PERTH)

THE LEGAL AID (Scotland) (Criminal Proceedings)

SCHEME 1964

SS

Accused: - tried 4/5th August 1981

Charge: Robbery

Result: 5 years imprisonment

EDINBURGH, 3rd February 1982. The Auditor taxes the fees due to Counsel as undernoted for his whole trouble at the sum of SIX HUNDRED AND THIRTEEN POUNDS (£613) to which Value Added Tax falls to be added £91.95 together SEVEN HUNDRED AND FOUR POUNDS 95 (£704.95).



AUDITOR OF HIGH COURT OF JUSTICIARY

Note referred to:-

R.L. Martin, Advocate

15/6/81 Perth High Court

17/6/81 Perth High Court

4/8/81 Perth HIgh Court

Trial 2 days

Note re appeal

£115.00

340.00

23.00

£613.00

Agents:- Malcolm Jack & Matheson, Cowdenbeath

Auditor's Fee £19.50 VAT at 15% 2.93

£22.42

PARLIAMENT HOUSE **FACULTY SERVICES LIMITED EDINBURGH** EH1 1RF NOTIFICATION N FEE 031-226 5071 Telex: 727856 F.S. REF. M425/SI812358/01 MALCOLM, JACK & MATHESON, DATE OF ISSUE WALMER HOUSE, 27/07/81 EAST PORT: DUNFERMLINE, FIFE SOLICITORS REF. CUNHH KY12 7JH. M425 SOL. LEGAL AID CODE Please quote Faculty Services Ref. on all correspondence H.M.A. V CASE CLIENT L.A. CERT NO. ADVOCATER.L. MARTIN. ADVOCATE CODE VAT REG. NO. MOI 272 2516 72 Item Date Details Item Amount b ATTENDANCE AT PERTH HIGH COURT 15/06/81 WAITING DAY - NO OTHER WORK UNDERTAKEN 115,00 17/06/81 FULL DAY 170,00 THE CONRT OF SECTIONS 15.00 The tax date for this supply is the date of payment - not the date of issue. A copy of this note must be returned with any payment or challenge.

MEMO

to: From:

Dated: 7th January, 1982

H.M.A. v.

The only dispute in this case is in respect of Mr. R.L. Martin's attendance waiting at Perth High Court on the 17th June, for which he has claimed a full day's fee i.e. £170.00. The Solicitors confirm in their letter of the 5th November, that on the 17th June, Mr. Martin and the Solicitor attended Perth High Court and it was not until the late afternoon that the Crown, for their own reasons, intimated that the case would not call on that particular circuit. It would appear therefore that Mr. Martin's attendance at Court on the 17th June was merely waiting time and adopting the normal practice of the Auditor of the Court of Session, his daily fee should be restricted to two-thirds the normal Trial fee. I don't think that you should have any difficulty with the Auditor, but should he, for some unknown reason, allow Mr. Martin's fees in full, do not ask the Auditor for a Note.