

**DECISION OF THE DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE
OF THE GENERAL LEGAL COUNCIL**

COMPLAINT NO. 85/2003

BETWEEN	ENID ABRAHAMS	THE COMPLAINT
AND	MICHAEL WILLIAMS	THE ATTORNEY
PANEL	MRS. LEILA PARKER-ROBINSON	
	MISS BERYL ENNIS	
	MR. JEROME LEE	

Hearing dates June 11, 2005 and December 2, 2006

JUDGEMENT:-

This is a complaint by Mrs. Enid Abrahams against Mr. Michael Williams, Attorney-at-Law who practises in Kingston and has his office at 64 East Street in the city and parish of Kingston during the relevant time. The Attorney did not appear in person neither was he represented on the 1st or 2nd days of the hearing.

The formal complaint was that the attorney had not dealt with her business with due expedition and acted with deplorable negligence in the performance of his duties. The complainant in her statement of the facts also alleged that she had been overcharged.

The panel satisfied itself on both occasions that the Attorney was properly served and in addition prior to the second hearing date was satisfied that the notes of the hearing on the first day were sent him.

The facts that are relevant are as follows:

1. That the complainant's husband while walking on the correct side of the public road was hit down by a Motor Truck owned by the National Water Commission. This was in 1987. He died on the spot.
2. That all her efforts to receive some compensation from that public body proved futile so she eventually sought the services of the Attorney at Law Mr.. Michael Williams
3. She paid the Attorney \$800.00 a reasonable sum then.
4. Subsequently the Attorney advised her of an offer of settlement of \$25,000.00 by the Water Commission which she rejected as being too small.
5. The Attorney did nothing further although he promised the Complainant so to do.
6. In breach of canon IV(r) of the Legal Profession (Canons of Professional Ethics) Rules the Attorney has not dealt with his client's business with all due expedition.
7. The panel found that in breach of Canon IV (s) of the Legal Profession (Canons of Professional Ethics) Rules the Attorney has acted with inexcusable neglect.

It is noted that the statutory period to bring such an action before the Courts has long expired and as a result it is now unlikely that any claim on behalf of the Complainant against the Water Commission could succeed. The Complainant has therefore suffered a real loss as a result of the delay.

The panel therefore and unanimously came to the decision that the complaint of Mrs. Abrahams against the Attorney was proved and made the following order.

1. The Attorney, Michael Williams, to make a payment of the sum of \$100,000.00 to the Complainant pursuant to Section 12(4) (c) of the Legal Profession Act; and
2. to pay the further amount of \$10,000.00 as costs in the matter.

Dated the 21st day of April 2007


.....
Mrs. Leila Parker Robinson


.....
Miss Beryl Ennis


.....
Mr. Jerome Lee