AUDITOR OF COURT SHERIFFDOM OF GLASGOW AND STRATHKELVIN

DX 551025 GLASGOW LP 5 GLASGOW 2

T McCAFFERTY AUDITOR OF COURT 1 CARLTON PLACE **GLASGOW G5 9DA** Tel/Fax 0141-418-5241

RECEIVED

1 3 JUN 2005

My Ref:

TMc/JM

Your Ref: JDH/

Head of Legal Services (Technical) Legal Services Department Scottish Legal Aid Board 44 Drumsheugh Gardens Edinburgh EH3 7SW

RECEIVED ACCOUNTS REGISTERATION לטטל אטע ס ר

9th June 2005

Dear Mr Haggarty

DF

EDWARD TARGOWSKI, QC FACULTY SERVICES REF FR020068 and DO020157 LEGAL AID REF CH2074169202 and 2060103602

I enclose herewith my Note on the above together with copies of the Faculty Services invoices as taxed by me attached thereto. If clarification on any point is required please telephone.

I have copied the Note and invoices to Mr Targowski. I have also explained that not all of the Audit Fee is recoverable and that you will adjust this in settling with him. Finally, I enclose my own Audit Fee invoice. If this cannot be settled by 7th July please refrain from paying until after 25th July as I will be on holiday between those dates.

Yours sincerely

Yours sincerely

T. McCAFFERTY S.L.A. AUDITOR OF COURT SHERIFFDOM OF GLASGOW AND STRATHKELVIN

The Scottish Legal Aid Board DXED 555250	VAT Reg. No. 62	VAT Reg. No. 624 0878 39		
Edinburgh-30	VAT Invoice No:	05/412		
	Date:	9th June 2005		
	Ref.			

To Professional Charges relative to:	FEES	VAT
Edward Targowski Q.C.		
Го Audit Fee	£8,096.00	£1,416.80
Γο Charging Fee		£0.00
	£8,096.00	£1,416.80
	TOTAL	£9,512.80

SHERIFFDOM OF GLASGOW AND STRATHKELVIN AT GLASGOW

Note by the Auditor of Court, Glasgow Sheriff Court in the Taxation of Fees of Edward Targowski Q.C on Joint Remit of the Scottish Legal Aid Board and Edward Targowski Q.C.

This taxation which took place before me on 21st March 2005 arose out of a dispute between the Scottish Legal Aid Board (The Board) and Edward Targowski Q.C relative to the fees claimed by Mr Targowski in representing Jennifer Dorward in a Social Work Referral in relation to Baby

The case involved an allegation by the Reporter that the child had been the subject of an assault which resulted in him suffering subdural haemorrhages within the skull. The remit to me is in terms of Regulation 12 of the Civil Legal Aid (Scotland) (Fees) Regulations 1989 (S.1. 1989 No 1490). In terms of Regulations 9 & 10 of the Regulations Counsel may be allowed such fees as are reasonable for conducting the Proceedings in a proper manner as between Solicitor and Client, third party paying and Counsel's Fees in the Sheriff Court shall be 90% of the amount of fees that would have been allowed in a taxation if the work had not been legal aid work. At the taxation the Board was represented by Mr Edward Targowski Q.C, attended personally.

Prior to the taxation Mr Targowski had provided me with a Note to assist me in considering the appropriateness of the fees claimed. At the taxation produced a Note of behalf of the Board together with a schedule detailing the fees claimed taken from the invoices issued by Faculty Services Limited. At the outset I pointed out that this schedule omitted a Court Proof Day on 28th March 2003 which has been charged at £2,500 the same as the other Proof Days. The total Fees being taxed by me therefore amount to £172,250 plus v.a.t contained within ten invoices which are attached to this Note and show the sums being "taxed off" where appropriate.

The Board in their Note referred me to, amongst others, the under noted taxations involving Counsel's Fees

Hamilton Sheriff Court - 10th July 2001
 Edinburgh Sheriff Court - 15th November 2001
 Glasgow Sheriff Court - 26th September 2002
 Glasgow Sheriff Court - 6th February 2003
 Linlithgow Sheriff Court - 26th January 2005

All of the foregoing taxations relate to Fees of Junior Counsel.

Mr Targowski referred to the case of Guo Circa 2000 - 2001 where I understand the Board settled Senior Counsel's Fees at £2,000 per day without the need for taxation. I also understand that in the case Senior and Junior were sanctioned. In the case presently before me the sanction of Junior Counsel had been refused by the Board. Mr Targowski also referred me to a recent taxation in Stirling Sheriff Court where the Auditor had allowed Senior Counsel (Mr Targowski) a daily rate

of £2,500. Again in this case Senior and Junior had been sanctioned.

The Board's objections I believe come under the following headings:

1. Trial days all of which are charged at £2,500 per day

 Consultations charged at Fees ranging from £750 to £4000. In addition on four trial days further fees had been charged for consultations which took place on these days.

3. Commitment days claimed where a nine day proof did not run its full course (it had

been set down for fifteen days) two commitment days claimed.

4. Notional diet/Advising day Objection to daily rate charged.

5. Preparation of written submissions. Sixteen days claimed with no detail of how much time spent on this work.

The Sheriff's note in the case before me extends to 83 pages containing 37 findings in fact with the hearing extending to 39 days of evidence including 2 days of submissions. There were 15 Medical experts and although not all were called to give evidence all were sanctioned by the Board. The Sheriff allowed the solicitors an uplift of 35% in their fees, to reflect the complexity. The Fees claimed cover the period from 26th June 2002 (Consultation with Client and Solicitor) to 3rd February 2004 (Attendance at Glasgow Sheriff Court - Advising).

I am fully conversant with the various cases referred to in the Board's note and have given consideration to the two cases referred to by Mr Targowski. It would seem to me that the present case is not dissimilar to the Case (Hamilton) where children were allegedly suffering from non-accidental injuries including subdural case involved 48 days of Proof including 5 days of haemorrhages. The The case before me involved 39 days of Proof including 2 days of submissions. case involved Counsel from June 1999 to March 2000 (9 submissions. The months) with the Hearing during the period Oct/Nov 1999 to March 2000 (6 months). The case before me involved Counsel from June 2002 to February 2004 (1 year 8 months) with the Hearing during the period November 2002 to July 2003 (10 months). The present case therefore lasted longer with the Hearing spread over a longer period. This does not make the case more complex or suggest that Fees to Counsel should be at a higher level. However, it does demonstrate that there is a three year gap in the commencement of the cases June 1999/June 2002 and almost four years in the conclusion March 2000 to 2004. Fees payable to Counsel, Senior and Junior must Having given due consideration to all obviously increase during this period. submissions and the Notes by my fellow Auditors provided by both Mr Targowski, considering this case on its merits and exercising my own discretion and knowledge as an Auditor I have determined the Fees applicable under the headings in dispute as follows:

Trial Days

Mr Targowski contended that this had been the most complex case he ever had to deal with and that the refusal to sanction Junior Counsel meant that all preparatory work such as reading and drafting of submissions required to be carried out by him at Senior rates. In addition he required to be engaged in exceptionally complicated preparation to enable him to understand the radiological evidence, including computer and ultra sound imaging. Research was required to be carried out into the complex causation of subdural haemorrhages, natural and inflicted, and their timing. He required to obtain Medical articles to help in the comprehension of the Medical evidence. Accordingly Mr Targowski was of the opinion that the daily rate charged £2,500 was fair reflecting the complexity of the case and the fact he had no Junior.

Whilst the Board accept that Senior Counsel's fees were settled at £2,000 per day in the case they contend that settlement was made at a time when Auditors' decisions tended to vary and that having regard to the taxations earlier referred to in respect of Junior then an appropriate rate for Senior would be £1,800 - £2000.

I require to fix a reasonable fee in respect of the conduct of the proceedings by Counsel and in that regard what I consider an appropriate "daily rate" for the preparation and conduct of the case. Considering all submissions to me and in particular in which Senior was allowed a daily rate of £2,500 where Junior was also sanctioned, I am of the view that the appropriate rate in this case would be £2,400. Under deduction of 10% earlier referred to this gives a daily rate of £2160. It is further in my view that in a case of such complexity this daily rate would encompass all preparation as in any lengthy case preparation must be regarded as ongoing. However, in this case submissions were made on 5th & 6th January 2004 and Counsel has claimed 16 days preparation of written submissions between 29th October 2003 and 20th December 2003. The question of this preparation I will deal with later.

Where a Court day is shown to be less than 2 hours I have restricted the foregoing daily rate by half. This also applies to the three Pre-Proof Diets 29th October 2002 and 11th and 12th November 2002. These Diets lasted 2 hours, 1 hour 30 minutes and 40 minutes respectively. Accordingly the appropriate rate would be £1,200. Under deduction of 10% earlier referred to this gives a daily rate of £1,080.

Consultations

The number of Consultations claimed is undoubtedly out of the ordinary. There are 20 Consultations over a period of 18 days and covering 16 Fee charges. The consultations range in time from 25 minutes to 2 hours and as certain expert witnesses were based in England as well as Consultations in Glasgow and Edinburgh Counsel required to travel to Nottingham (twice), Birmingham, Bristol, Oxford and Liverpool (twice).

In general I am of the view that meetings between Counsel and his instructing Solicitors or with a party other than the client or an expert witness is not a consultation but is considered to form part of the preparation included within the daily rate. Consultations on a court day are subsumed within the daily rate and are not separately chargeable. However where it is clear that a consultation took place in the evening I have on this occasion allowed a charge. The claims for Consultations I have therefore allowed as follows:

Between 26th June 2002 and 10th October 2002 6 consultations all Glasgow have been charged at a total of £9,000 ranging from £1,000 to £2,500. Although I understand these consultations to have lasted at times varying from 25 minutes to 2 hours the Fee allowable requires to recognise an element of preparation and travel to and from the consultation. I consider a Fee of £800 to be appropriate for each of the consultations held on 18th July, 9th August, 15th August and 20th September. As the consultations held on 26th June and 10th October 2002 lasted 30 minutes and 25 minutes respectively I have restricted these Fees to £400. Applying the deduction of 10% earlier referred to gives Fees of £720 and £360.

From 4th November to 7th November 2002 5 consultations Nottingham (twice) Birmingham, Bristol and Oxford have been charged at £7,000. Being over a four day period I am of the opinion that £6,000 would be appropriate to include Travel, Subsistence and Preparation and in view of the Locations involved these are fixed at what I consider to be a premium rate. Under deduction of 10% earlier referred to this gives a Fee of £5,400.

11th November 2002 consultation in Glasgow with 30 minutes. In view of this being a Court Day and a Fee having already been allowed I have "taxed off" this Fee in its entirety.

13th November 2002 consultation with I I hour 45 minutes. Although this is a Court Day I understand this consultation took place in the evening and in these circumstances I consider a fee of £500 to be appropriate. Under deduction of 10% earlier referred to this gives a Fee of £450.

15th November 2002 consultation with least and Alder Hay Hospital Liverpool. I consider a fee of £1,500 to be appropriate and again being a premium rate. Under deduction of 10% earlier referred to this gives a fee of £1,350.

20th November 2002 consultation with Dr Maroo, Edinburgh 1 hour 30 minutes. Again although this is a Court day I understand this consultation took place in the evening and in these circumstances I consider a Fee of £500 to be appropriate. Under deduction of 10% earlier referred to this gives a Fee of £450.

10th March 2003 consultation Glasgow 1 hour 45 minutes. To reflect this consultation involved three expert witnesses I consider a fee of £1,000 to be appropriate. Under deduction of 10% earlier referred to this gives a Fee of £900.

13th March 2003 consultation Liverpool. I consider a fee of £1,500 to be appropriate and again being a premium rate. Under deduction of 10% earlier referred to this gives a Fee of £1,350.

26th March 2003 Pre evidence consultation with In view of this being a Court Day and a Fee having already been allowed I have "taxed off" this Fee in its entirety.

30th June 2003 and 10th July 2003. Two consultations on Glasgow with Solicitor and Client. No detail available. I consider a fee of £750 on each day to be appropriate. Under deduction of 10% earlier referred to this gives a Fee of £675 for each consultation

Commitment Days.

2 Commitment days charged July 2003. The continued hearing was set down for 15 days commencing 2nd July 2003. It concluded on 15th July the ninth day. Counsel has charged an additional two days at £2,000 each day. Although there can be an argument for a commitment day or days where a Sheriff Court Proof does not proceed I am of the view that in a case of this length where there are a substantial number of Court Days together with Consultations a commitment Fee is inappropriate and I have therefore "taxed off" this Fee.

Notional Diet/Advising Days

19th August 2003 and 3rd February 2004 Notional Diet I hour. As with Trial days I have allowed these days at £1,200. Under deduction of 10% earlier referred to this gives a Fee of £1,080 each day.

Preparation of Written Submissions and Submission Days

16 days claimed for preparation of written submissions. In general preparation in such a lengthy case must be regarded as ongoing and therefore the daily rate reflects preparation. However I believe it is accepted by the Board that this is an exceptional case and that additional work would have been required in the preparation of written submissions as requested by the Sheriff. Whilst this is without doubt the greatest number of days for the preparation of submissions I have encountered in my experience as an Auditor I do not doubt that this time will have been expended by Mr Targowski. The time taken may reflect the fact the Junior Counsel was not sanctioned in this case although that was not suggested by Mr Targowski. Undoubtedly where Senior and Junior are sanctioned Senior will have the benefit of Junior Counsel's notes taken during the course of any hearing. Indeed where Senior and Junior are sanctioned I would expect Junior to prepare written submissions which would obviously be charged at a lesser daily rate than Senior. Senior Counsel's charge thereafter, if any, would be to peruse Junior Counsel's submissions prior to the actual hearing. It will therefore prove more time consuming for Senior Counsel to prepare submissions where he does not have the benefit of Junior Counsel's notes. Nevertheless I do not feel I could sustain the number of days claimed. From the information before me and considering there were 37 Trial days and allowing for the review of the evidence from this time I consider that 10 days would be appropriate and have accordingly "taxed off" days. Mr Targowski has charged £1,750 for each of the 16 days claimed compared to £2,500 charged for each Court Day. In previous taxations I have allowed Fees for preparation of submissions at Two Thirds of the Fee allowed for a Court Day. I see no requirement to amend this practice. The appropriate daily rate for the preparation of Written Submissions is therefore £1,600 (two-thirds of £2,400). Under deduction of 10% earlier referred to this gives a daily rate of £1,440 which I have allowed for 10 days. The two submission days I will deal with as Trial Days allowing £2,400. Under deduction of 10% this gives a daily rate of £2,160 for each day.

Finally, under this heading I will deal with the Fee charged for 17th March 2003 when although the date was set down for a hearing it did not proceed and a Fee of £500 was charged for preparatory work undertaken. Earlier, whilst dealing with Trial days I have expressed my view on preparation in such a case being ongoing and that the daily rate encompassing preparation. Although the Proof hearing did not proceed on 17th March it did continue the next day 18th March. Accordingly any preparation for the 17th has not been lost but allowed in the daily rate for the 18th. In view of this I have "taxed off" this Fee in its entirety.

In conclusion I have shown on the various Invoices issued by Faculty Services Limited on behalf of Mr Targowski the foregoing abatements. I have also incorporated my own Fee thereon, allowing recovery of my Fee on the total Fees allowed as opposed to the Fees charged by Counsel. I therefore tax the disputed Fees due to Edward Targowski Q.C at a total of £135,634.95 (One hundred and Thirty Five Thousand Six hundred and Thirty Four Pounds and Ninety Five pence) all as detailed on the invoices issued by Faculty Services Limited which are docquetted and attached hereto.

AUDITOR OF COURT

SHERIFFDOM OF GLASGOW AND STRATHKELVIN

9th JUNE 2005

SCOTTISH LEGAL AID BOARD

HAYS BOX No. GW333 GLASGOW

PER FLEMING & REID

SOLICITORS

180 HOPE STREET

GLASGOW

G2 2UE



TO1

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

TAXED DEF

CONSULTATION - CLIENT AND COUNSEL -26-06-2002 18-07-2002 GLASGOW CONSULTATION - CLIENT AND COUNSEL --280.00 GLASGOW CONSULTATION - ROYAL HOSPITAL FOR SICK 09-08-2002 CHILDREN GLASGOW WITH -782-20 15-08-2002 CONSULTANT IN PEDIATRIC NEUROLOGY (REPORTERS CONSULTATION -WITNESS) -1780.00

-3,480.00 Continued...

16-01-2003

F136/D0020157/1

IAIN M.FLEMING

IAIN M FLEMING

1 of 5 325212

2089 1 CRIMINAL LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE

> CH/ /20601036/02 17-05-2002

> > 271 9428 40

1000.00

1000.00

1500.00

1500.00

1000.00

*** LEGAL AID ***

PER FLEMING & REID SOLICITORS 180 HOPE STREET GLASGOW

G2 2UE

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

TAXED OF -3480.00

20-09-2002

- ROYAL CONSULTATION -

HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN - GLASGOW

-780.00

(REPORTERS WITNESS) GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT

(REPORTERS CONSULTATION -

04-11-2002 WITNESS)

CONSULTATION - NOTINGHAM

CONSULTATION - BIRMINGHAM -

-600.co CONSULTATION - BRISTOL -

-6340.00 Continued...

*** LEGAL AID ***

16-01-2003

F136/D0020157/1

IAIN M.FLEMING

IAIN M FLEMING

2 of 5 325212

2089 1 CRIMINAL LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE

> CH/ /20601036/02 17-05-2002

> > 271 9428 40

1500.00

2500.00

1500.00

PER FLEMING & REID SOLICITORS 180 HOPE STREET GLASGOW G2 2UE

T01

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

Continued...

*** LEGAL AID ***

16-01-2003

F136/D0020157/1

IAIN M.FLEMING

IAIN M FLEMING

325212 3 of 5

2089 1

CRIMINAL LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE

CH/ /20601036/02 17-05-2002

271 9428 40

4000.00 2500.00

1500.00 -2500.00 2500.00

1500.00

PER FLEMING & REID SOLICITORS 180 HOPE STREET GLASGOW G2 2UE

16-01-2003

F136/D0020157/1

IAIN M.FLEMING

IAIN M FLEMING

325212 4 of 5

CRIMINAL LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE

CH/ /20601036/02 17-05-2002

271 9428 40

TO1

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

13,410.00

15-11-2002

CONSULTATION - ALDER HEY HOSPITAL FOR

-650.00

SICK CHILDREN LIVERPOOL - PROFESSOR

18 ±112002 00 19-11-2002 00 20-11-2002 00 20-11-2002 00

GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT

EDINBURGH HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN -

EVENING CONSULTATION DR

- 1050.00 21-11-2002 - 340.00

GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT

Continued... -16,470.00

*** LEGAL AID ***

2000.00

2500.00 2500.00

2500.00

1500.00

PER FLEMING & REID SOLICITORS 180 HOPE STREET GLASGOW G2 2UE

TO1

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

18Xes off -16470-00

GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT

16-01-2003

F136/D0020157/1

IAIN M.FLEMING

IAIN M FLEMING

325212 5 of 5

2089 1 CRIMINAL LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE

> CH/ /20601036/02 17-05-2002

> > 271 9428 40

2500.00 2500.00 2500.00 2500.00 2500.00

-19,590.00

*** LEGAL AID ***

60000.00

- 3,428-25

12018.25

17.50

10000 HIN

70500.00

PER FLEMING & REID SOLICITORS 180 HOPE STREET GLASGOW G2 2UE

T01

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

TANKOD Off

03-03-2003 - 06.03.03 - PROOF GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT
- 2,440.00 3 + £2,60

21-03-2003

F136/D0020157/3

IAIN M.FLEMING

IAIN M FLEMING

325212 1 of 1

2089 1 CRIMINAL LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE

> CH/ /20601036/02 17-05-2002

> > 271 9428 40

10000.00

-2,440.00 -427.00

*** LEGAL AID ***

10000.00

17.50

1750.00

SCOTTISH LEGAL AID BOARD

HAYS BOX No. GW333 GLASGOW

PER FLEMING & REID

SOLICITORS

180 HOPE STREET

GLASGOW

G2 2UE

20-03-2003

F136/D0020157/2

IAIN M.FLEMING

IAIN M FLEMING

325212 1 of 1

2089 1

CRIMINAL LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE

CH/ /20601036/02

17-05-2002

CENT CHANGE IN

T01

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

271 9428 40

TAXED OF

MANDON		
10-03-2003	CONSULTATION -	
	CONSULTANT PAEDIATRIC URO - RADIOLOGIST	1500.00
010000	CONSULTATION -	750.00
-2/00.00	CONSULTATION -	
	PAEDIATRIC RATIOLOGIST)	750.00
- 171-0000	AND 12-03-2003: GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT LA LAIGH LATE OF A LOSS	5000.00
		1500.00
- () () -()	GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT \ at £\080	2500.00
-1490.00		
-5430.00	*** LEGAL AID ***	12000.00
-950-25	17.50	2100.00
-6380.2	,	14100.00
- 67 90. A.		

CRIMINAL L/AID (AUTO.SANCTION) HAYS BOX No. GW333 GLASGOW

PER FLEMING & REID

SOLICITORS

180 HOPE STREET

GLASGOW

G2 2UE

24-03-2003

F136/FR020068/2

PAUL REID

LOUISE ARROL PR/LMA/FAQ

1 of 1

CHILDREN HEARING REFERAL RE

TO1

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

CRIMINAL L/AID (AUTO.SANCTION)

CH/2074169202

21-05-2002

271 9428 40

TAXED OF

17-03-2003

PROOF DID NOT SIT - ALTHOUGH THIS DATE

WAS ORIGINALLY SET DOWN FOR HEARING -

-600.20

PREPARATORY WORK UNDERTAKEN

-2,440.00

- 21.03.03 - PROOF GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT - 4 DAYS 3 2 2060

500.00

10000.00

*** LEGAL AID ***

10500.00

-2940.00 -514.50 -3,454.60

17.50

1837.50 12337.50 CRIMINAL L/AID (AUTO.SANCTION) HAYS BOX No. GW333 GLASGOW

PER FLEMING & REID

SOLICITORS

180 HOPE STREET

GLASGOW

G2 2UE

CHILDREN HEARING REFERAL

TO1

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

TAXED off

- 24-03-2003 - 2440.00 26-03-2003

TO 27-03-2003 PROOF GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT - 4 DAYS

PRE EVIDENCE CONSULTATION WITH

RE-EXAMINATION OF MRI SCANS SO FURTHER INFORMATION NOT GIVEN AT PREVIOUS CONSULTATION IN SHEFFIELD, WITNESS CALLED BY REPORTER IN HIS PROOF AFTER

*** LEGAL AID ***

-750.00

WITNESS INTIMATED BY OURSELVES.

-3,190.00

- 558as -3,748.as

28-03-2003

F136/FR020068/3

PAUL REID

LOUISE ARROL PR/LMA/FAQ

1 of 1

CRIMINAL L/AID (AUTO.SANCTION)

CH/2074169202 21-05-2002

271 9428 40

10000.00

750.00

10750.00

17.50 1881.25

CRIMINAL L/AID (AUTO.SANCTION)

HAYS BOX No. GW333 GLASGOW

ER FLEMING & REID

SOLICITORS

180 HOPE STREET

GLASGOW

G2 2UE



T01

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

TAXED SEF

- 1420.00

PROOF - GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT

02-04-2003

F136/FR020068/4

PAUL REID

LOUISE ARROL PR/LMA/FAQ

1 of 1

CRIMINAL L/AID (AUTO.SANCTION)

CH/2074169202 21-05-2002

271 9428 40

2500.00

-1420.00 248.50 -1,668.50

*** LEGAL AID ***

2500.00

17.50

437.50

SCOTTISH LEGAL AID BOARD

HAYS BOX No. GW333 GLASGOW

PER FLEMING & REID

SOLICITORS

180 HOPE STREET

GLASGOW

G2 2UE



TO1

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

IPXZO OFF

30-06-2003

CONSULTATION - GLASGOW.

-07)07-2003 COURT.

TO 04-07-2003: PROOF GLASGOW SHERIFF
COURT. TO 09-07-2003: PROOF GLASGOW SHERIFF
COURT. 3 A FOLLO COURT. 3 A FOLLOW COURT. 3 A FOLLOW CONSULTATION - GLASGOW.

10-02-2003 CONSULTATION - GLASGOW.

11-07-2003 PROOF - GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT.

AND 15-07-2003: PROOF GLASGOW SHERIFF

COURT. 2 A FOLLOW

THIS PROOF WAS INSTRUCTED FOR 15 DAYS

-5870.00 Continued ...

*** LEGAL AID ***

18-07-2003

F136/D0020157/4

IAIN M.FLEMING

IAIN M FLEMING

325212 1 of 2

2089 1

CRIMINAL LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE

CH/ /20601036/02 17-05-2002

271 9428 40

1000.00

7500.00

7500.00

1000.00

2500.00

PER FLEMING & REID

SOLICITORS 180 HOPE STREET GLASGOW G2 2UE

TO1

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

BUT ONLY SAT ON 9 THEREFORE ADDITIONAL 2 DAYS CHARGED AS COMMITMENT TO THOSE INSTRUCTED. THESE HAVE BEEN CHARGED AT EDINBURGH RATE AS COUNSEL DID NOT TRAVEL

- 4000.00 TO GLASGOW.

18-07-2003

F136/D0020157/4

IAIN M.FLEMING

IAIN M FLEMING

2 of 2 325212

2089 1 CRIMINAL LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE

> CH/ /20601036/02 17-05-2002

> > 271 9428 40

4000.00

- 9,870.20 - 1,727-25 - 11,597-25

*** LEGAL AID ***

28500.00

17.50

4987.50

DED ELEMIN

PER FLEMING & REID

SOLICITORS

180 HOPE STREET

GLASGOW

G2 2UE

TOI

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

TEXED OFF

19-08-2003

NOTIONAL DIET - GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT - DISCHARGING PROOF DATES SET DOWN FOR

- 1420.00

SEPTEMBER

21-08-2003

F136/D0020157/5

IAIN M.FLEMING

IAIN M FLEMING

325212 1 of 1

2089 1

CRIMINAL LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE

CH/ /20601036/02 17-05-2002

271 9428 40

2500.00

-1420.00 -248.50 -1,668.50

*** LEGAL AID ***

2500.00

17.50

437.50

CRIMINAL L/AID (AUTO.SANCTION) HAYS BOX No. GW333 GLASGOW

PER FLEMING & REID SOLICITORS 180 HOPE STREET GLASGOW G2 2UE

08-01-2004

F136/FR020068/6

PAUL REID

LOUISE ARROL PR/LMA/FAQ

1 of 1

CRIMINAL L/AID (AUTO.SANCTION)

CH/2074169202 21-05-2002

271 9428 40

TO1

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

PREPARATION OF SUBMISSIONS OCTOBER 29TH, 30TH, NOVEMBER 4TH, 10TH, 11TH, 12TH, 14TH, 19TH, 20TH, 21ST DECEMBER 9TH, 10TH, 11TH, 12TH, 13TH & 20TH 16 COURT DAYS AT 1750

-13600.00

- 680.00

& 06/01/2004 - SUBMISSIONS FOR GLASOW SHERIFF 2 £ £2,60

28000.00

5000.00

*** LEGAL AID ***

33000.00

-14,280.00 -2499.00 -16,779-00

17.50

38775.00

CRIMINAL L/AID (AUTO.SANCTION) HAYS BOX No. GW333 GLASGOW

PER FLEMING & REID SOLICITORS 180 HOPE STREET GLASGOW G2 2UE

T01

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

1. LED OH

- 1+20.00

ATTENDANCE AT GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT

-1420.00 -1,668.50

05-02-2004

F136/FR020068/7

PAUL REID

LOUISE ARROL PR/LMA/FAQ

1 of 1

CRIMINAL L/AID (AUTO.SANCTION)

CH/2074169202 21-05-2002

271 9428 40

2500.00

*** LEGAL AID ***

2500.00

17.50

437.50

SCHEDULE OF FEES DUE TO EDWARD TARGOWSKI Q.C. FACULTY SORVICES REF. DO ODDISTAND FRODOOLS DORWARD / FRAME

TAXED = H		INC. U.A.T
- 23.018.25 INVOICE DATED	16-1-2003 _	£ 70,500.00
•	g1.3,2003	11,750.00
- 6,380. DE INVOICE DATED	ECOE. E.05	14,100.00
- 3454.50 INJOICE DATED	24.3, 2003	12,337.50
- 3,748-25 INVOICE DATED	28.3-2003	12,631-25
- 1668.50 INJOICE DATED	2.4.2003	2,937-50
- 11,597.25 INVOICE DATED	18.7.2003	33,487-50
- 1668.50 INVOICE DATED	21-8.2003	2937.50
- 16,77900 INVOICE DETERD	B-1-9004	38,775.00
- 1,668.50 invoice DATED	5.2.2004	2,937.50
-72850.00		£ 202,393.75
TAXO	ם סגל ואנר אשעי	A 72850.00
	(129543-75
AUDITORS	FOE WELL JAT. 39	<u>51280</u>
	WHEREOF	05-11-50
F 9 JUN 2005	p111.116000 -0	135,634-95

GLASGOW

I HAVE EXAMINED THE DETAILED TEMPS OF CHARGE RELATING TO THE FOREGOING ACCOUNT AND AIR OF THE OPINION THAT IT IS FAIRLY AND REASONABLY GHARGE. Thirty File Mouroand Six bundred and Minty Form lounds and Ninty File pence (\$135,634-95) T.M. Callet

> SHERIFFDOM OF GLASGOW AND STRATI WELVE