AUDITOR OF COURT

## SHERIFFDOM OF GLASGOW

AND STRATHKELVIN

## DX 551025 GLASGOW

LP 5 GLASGOW 2

## T McCAFFERTY AUDITOR OF COURT

1 CARLTON PLACE<br>GLASGOW G5 9DA<br>Tel/Fax 0141-418-5241



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 Amdit 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 $7^{\text {th }}$ July please refrain from paying until after $22^{\text {th }}$ July as $I$ ndyll be op holiday between those dates.

Yours sincerely

T. McCAFFERTY S.L.A.

AUDITOR OF COURT
SHERIFFDOM OF GLASGOW
AND STRATHKELVIN

| The Scottish Legal Aid Board | VAT Reg. No. 624087839 |
| :--- | :--- |
| DXED 555250 |  |
| Edinburgh-30 | VAT Invoice No: $05 / 412$ |
|  | Date: |
| Ref. | 9th June 2005 |


| To.Professional Charges relative to: | FEES | VAT |  |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Edward Targowski Q.C. |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| To Audit Fee | $£ 8,096.00$ | $£ 1,416.80$ |  |
| To Charging Fee | $£ 8,00$ |  |  |

# 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 $21^{\text {st }}$ 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 $28^{\text {th }}$ 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

1.     - Hamilton Sheriff Court - $10^{\text {th }}$ July 2001
2. Edinburgh Sheriff Court $-15^{\text {th }}$ November 2001
3. Glasgow Sheriff Court $-26^{\text {th }}$ September 2002
4. 
5. 

 - Glasgow Sheriff Court - $6^{\text {th }}$ February 2003 Linlithgow Sheriff Court - $26^{\text {th }}$ 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
2. 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 $26^{\text {th }}$ June 2002 (Consultation with Client and Solicitor) to $3^{\text {rd }}$ 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 haemorrhages. The $\square$ case involved 48 days of Proof including 5 days of submissions. The case before me involved 39 days of Proof including 2 days of submissions. The case involved Counsel from June 1999 to March 2000 (9 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 obviously increase during this period. Having given due consideration to all submissions and the Notes by my fellow Auditors provided by both $\square$ and 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 $\quad$ 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 $5^{\text {th }} \& 6^{\text {th }}$ January 2004 and Counsel has claimed 16 days preparation of written submissions between $29^{\text {th }}$ October 2003 and $20^{\text {th }}$ 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 $29^{\text {th }}$ October 2002 and $11^{\text {th }}$ and $12^{\text {th }}$ 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 $26^{\text {th }}$ June 2002 and $10^{\text {th }}$ October 20026 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 $18^{\text {th }}$ July, $9^{\text {th }}$ August, $15^{\text {th }}$ August and $20^{\text {th }}$ September. As the consultations held on $26^{\text {th }}$ June and $10^{\text {th }}$ 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 $4^{\text {th }}$ November to $7^{\text {th }}$ November 20025 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 $£ 5,400$.
$11^{\text {th }}$ November 2002 consultation in Glasgow with $\square 30$ 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.
$13^{\text {th }}$ November 2002 consultation with 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 $£ 450$.
$15^{\text {th }}$ November 2002 consultation with 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 $£ 1,350$.
$20^{\text {th }}$ 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 $£ 450$.
$10^{\text {th }}$ 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 $£ 900$.
$13^{\text {th }}$ 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 $£ 1,350$.
$26^{\text {th }}$ 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.
$30^{\text {th }}$ June 2003 and $10^{\text {th }}$ 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 $2^{\text {nd }}$ July 2003. It concluded on $15^{\text {th }}$ 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

$19^{\text {th }}$ August 2003 and $3^{\text {rd }}$ 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" 6 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 $17^{\text {th }}$ 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 $17^{\text {th }}$ March it did continue the next day $18^{\text {th }}$ March. Accordingly any preparation for the $17^{\text {th }}$ has not been lost but allowed in the daily rate for the $18^{\text {th }}$. 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.
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16-01-2003

F136/D0020157/1

IAIN M.FLEMING

IAIN M FLEMING
$325212 \quad 1$ of 5

20891
CRIMINAL LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE
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## pexeo off

26-06-2002
-64.as
18-07-2002.
$-280.0$
09-08-2002
$-780 \cdot 00$
$-1,780.00$
$-3,480 \cdot 00$

CONSULTATION - CLIENT AND COUNSEL -
GLASGOW
1000.00

CONSULTATION - CLIENT AND COUNSEL -
GLASGOW
1000.00

CONSULTATION - ROYAL HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN GLASGOW WITH
CONSULTANT IN PEDIATRIC NEUROLOGY 1500.00

CONSULTATION - (REPORTERS
WITNESS)
1500.00
1000.00
*** LEGAL AID ***
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T01 E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

TRXRD ofs
$-3480.00$
$20-09-2002$
-780.00
$2940-200200$
$10-10-2002$
-1.040 .00
$04-11-2002$
$\sim 600.00$
$05-11-2002$
$-6,340.00$
CONSULTATION -
 HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN - GLASGOW ROYAL

| (REPORTERS WITNESS) | 1500.00 |
| :--- | ---: |
| GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT | 2500.00 |
| CONSULTATION - (REPORTERS |  |
| WITNESS) | 1500.00 |
| CONSULTATION - NOTINGHAM |  |
| CONSULTATION - BIRMINGHAM - | 3000.00 |
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20891
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TAXIOS oft
$-6,340.00$

4000.00

$-1,500.00$
12-11-2002. 00
GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT
CONSULTATION - - REPORTERS
WITNESS 1500.00
GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT
2500.00

GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT
2500.00

CONSULTATION - YORKHILL HOSPITAL - DR
$-1050.00$
14-1 1 -2002 GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT
1500.00

- $340-00$
$-13,410-000^{\text {continued... }}$
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CRIMINAL LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE
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## TAXCOD off

$-13,410.00$

| 15-11-2002 | CONSULTATION - ALDER HEY hospital for |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | SICK CHILDREN LIVERPOOL - PROFESSOR |  |
| $-650.00$ |  | 2000.00 |
| $18=1$ | GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT | 2500.00 |
| 19-11-2002 | GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT | 2500.00 |
| $20-140.00$ | GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT | 2500.00 |
| $20=11-2082 \cdot 00$ | EDINBURGH HOSPITAL FOR SICK CHILDREN - |  |
|  | EVENING CONSULTATION DR |  |
| 1 |  | 1500.00 |
| $\begin{gathered} 21-\frac{11-2002}{3} 0.00 \\ -00 \end{gathered}$ | GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT | 2500.00 |
| $-16470 . \Delta \Delta$ | Continued. . . |  |

SCOTTISH LEGAL AID BOARD
HAYs BOX No, GW333 GLASGOW

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


T01 E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

## ipxen off

$-16,470.00$


| $-19,590.00$ | $* * *$ LEGAL AID *** | 60000.00 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $-3,428 \cdot 25$ | 17.50 | 10500.00 |
| $-23,018 \cdot 25$ | 70500.00 |  |
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PER FLEMING \& REID
SOLICITORS
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GLASGOW
G2 2UE

T01
E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

## TAXAD off



03-03-2003 - 06.03.03 - PROOF GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT
10000.00

CRIMINAL LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE

CH/ /20601036/02
17-05-2002

271942840

SCOTTISH LEGAL AID BOARD
HAYS BOX NO. GW333 GLASGOW
PER FLEMING \& REID
SOLICITORS
180 HOPE STREET
GLASGOW
G2 2UE
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20891
CRIMINAL LEGAL AID CERTIFICATE
CH/ /20601036/02
17-05-2002

T01
E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

271942840

## TexED off

10-03-2003
$-2100.00$

| CONSULTATION - |
| :--- |
| CONSULTANT PAEDIATRIC URO - RADIOLOGIST <br> CONSULTATION - <br> CONSULTATION - <br> PAEDIATRIC RATIOLOGIST) <br> AND 12-03-2003: GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT <br> CONSULTATION (LIVERPOOL - <br> CONSULTANT NUERO - SURGEON) <br> GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT |

$-54.30 .00 \quad * * *$ Legad aid ***
12000.00
$-950.25$
$17.50 \quad 2100.00$
$-6,380.25$
14100.00

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

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

CHILDREN HEARING REFERAL RE

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

271942840
24-03-2003

F136/FR020068/2

PAUL REID

LOUISE ARROL PR/LMA/FAQ

1 of 1

CRIMINAL L/AID (AUTO, SANCTION)

## $\mathrm{CH} / 2074169202$

21-05-2002

## Taxten off

17-03-2003
$-500.00$
PROOF DID NOT SIT - ALTHOUGH THIS DATE WAS ORIGINALLY SET DOWN FOR HEARING -
PREPARATORY WORK UNDERTAKEN
500.00

18-03-2003
$-2,440.00$

- 21.03 .03 - PROOF GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT
- 4 dxys 3 at 三2160 lat A1,080

CRIMINAL L/AID (AUTO. SANCTION)

HAYS BOX No. GW333 GLASGOW

```
PER FLEMING \& REID
```

SOLICITORS
180 HOPE STREET
GLASGOW
G2 2UE

CHILDREN HEARING REFERAL

E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.

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

271942840

## Thexen off

$-2440.00$
$-750.00$

TO 27-03-2003 PROOF GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT - 4 DAYs 3 \% 2160 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 WITNESS INTIMATED BY OURSELVES.
750.00
$-3,190.00$ *** LEGAL AID *** 10750.00
$17.50 \quad 1881.25$
12631.25

CRIMINAL L/AID (AUTO. SANCTION)
02-04-2003
HAYS BOX No. GW333 GLASGOW


SOLICITORS
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T01
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TAXEO DEF
$-1428-03-2003$ PROOF - GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT
$-1420.00$
*** LEGAL AID ***
248.50
$-1,668.50$

F136/FR020068/4

PAUL REID

LOUISE ARROL PR/LMA/FAQ

1 of 1

CRIMINAL L/AID (AUTO, SANCTION)

CH/2074169202
21-05-2002

271942840
2500.00
17.50
437.50
2937.50

SCOTTISH LEGAL AID BOARD
HAYS BOX No. GW333 GLASGOW

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


TO1

## IPAXOD off

$-{ }_{02-07-2003}^{3040} 5$
consultation - glasgow.
TO 04-07-2003: proof g ghasgow sheriff

- 2100.00

07!07-2003
Court. a at f $2,6 \infty$
1000.00

TO 09-07-2003: PROOF GLASGOW SHERIFF
$-\log 0 \cdot 0 \Delta_{10-07}$ COURT. 3 at $\frac{f 1 b 0}{}$
consultation - glasgow.
proof - glasgow sheriff court.
11420.00

AND 15-07-2003: PROOF GLASGOW SHERIFF

- 680.0 0 court. 2 at It216o
this proof was instructed for 15 days
-5870.00 continued...

SCOTTISH LEGAL AID BOARD
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F136/D0020157/4
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## Taxon off

$-5870.00$
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

- H.000.00 to ginscon.
4000.00


SCOTTISH LEGAL AID BOARD
HAYS BOX NO, GW333 GLASGOW
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## pexten off

> 19-08-2003
> NOTIONAL DIET - GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT DISCHARGING PROOF DATES SET DOWN FOR - H20. DA SEPTEMBER
2500.00
$-1420.00$
*** LEGAL AID ***
2500.00
$-248.50$
17.50

437,50
$-1,668$. 50
2937.50

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.

08-01-2004

F136/FR020068/6

PAUL REID

LOUISE ARROL PR/LMA/FAQ

$$
1 \text { of } 1
$$

CRIMINAL L/AID (AUTO, SANCTION)
CH/2074169202
21-05-2002

271942840

## Taxem

PREPARATION OF SUBMISSIONS OCTOBER 29TH, 30 TH, NOVEMBER $4 \mathrm{TH}, 10 \mathrm{TH}, 11 \mathrm{TH}, 12 \mathrm{TH}$, $14 \mathrm{TH}, 19 \mathrm{TH}, 20 \mathrm{TH}, 21 \mathrm{ST}$ DECEMBER 9 TH , $10 \mathrm{TH}, 11 \mathrm{TH}, 12 \mathrm{TH}, 13 \mathrm{TH} \& 20 \mathrm{TH} 16$ COURT

## $-13600.00$ <br> 05-01-2004

 DAYS AT 175028000.00

- 680.00
\& 06/01/2004 - SUBMISSIONS FOR GLASOW
sherifr a at f21bo
5000.00
$\begin{array}{lll}-14280 \cdot 00 & * * * \text { LEGAL AID *** } & 33000.00 \\ -2499 \cdot c 0 & 17.50 & 5775.00 \\ -16,779 \cdot 00 & 38775.00\end{array}$

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

TEER FLLEMING \& REID
SOLICITORS
180 HOPE STREET
GLASGOW
G2 2UE


T01
E.G.M. TARGOWSKI Q.C.
' . 2 XRD of
-1 - 1 03-02-2004 ATTENDANCE AT GLASGOW SHERIFF COURT

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

271942840
2500.00
17.50
437.50
2937.50

SCHËdulé of fors Dué to EDWARD Targonski Q.L. fAcultt SRdLCES REF. DO 020157 AND FR020068

DORWARD / FRAME

Tax.20 off

- 23.018.25 INJorcer dased 1b-1.200.3
- 2,867.00 NJorć Danto al.3.2003
- b,380.25 INJOLE DATED
- 3.454.50 indoick Derned
- 37,78.25 INJOLCS DATED
- $1.668 \cdot 50$ lNJoIce DeIteo
- 11,597.2S INJOICS DATED
- 16b8.So invoile Derted al-8.2003
- 16,779.00 injover Detrad
- 1,668.50 iNJorké Dermen
5.2.2004
indorer Totan INc. U.a.t
f $70,500.00$ 11,750.0.0 $14,100.00$ $12,3.37$. So 12,631-25 $2,937.50$ 33,487-50 2,937.50 $38,775 \cdot 00$

$$
f \frac{2,937.50}{202,393.75}
$$

TaXer off INEL. V.A.K.

$$
72,850 \cdot 00
$$

AUAKORS FDE INELL. Jeit. $99,51 a .80$

$$
\frac{10,850 \cdot \infty}{129,543-7.5}
$$

Wh Reot

$$
\frac{6,091-20}{135,634-95}
$$

BLASQOM ....


 Af The suve Onshundred and Thisty Fide Thownand Six bundred and Tinirty Four poundo and Ninioty Fije pence (f135,634-95)
T.Mr cappetha


[^0]:    T. MCCalferthy SHERIFFDOM OFGLASGOW AND STRATHKELVIN $9^{\text {th }}$ JUNE 2005

