

# FAX - CONFIDENTIAL

18 September 2003

To	Ms Lisa McLean
Organisation	Piper Smith & Basham
Fax	020 7630 6976
From	Noëlle Rawé (Jefferson House)
Subject	Fax to MRJ re. 20C order application
Number of pages	Page 1 of 8

Dear Ms McLean,

Thank you for your draft letter to MRJ.

To help you with the second and third paragraph, I'll relate the sequence of what was said:

- 1 Mr Staddon said I wished to prevent the Applicant's costs from being charged on the service charge (I don't remember the exact wording, but this is the gist of it)
- 2 The other side Counsel replied that I had not made an application
- 3 The Chair, Mrs Goulden, said that I could do this at a later stage
- 4 I think that at this stage (might have been before) Mr Staddon cited various previous LVT cases in support of my request. These were argued by the other side's Counsel
- 5 The other side's Counsel said "My client will not charge Ms K-Dit-Rawé for the costs, but intends to charge other residents"
- 6 At this point Mrs Goulden said: "Oh, I don't know. I am not sure about this. I'll have to check". There was a recess. After the recess she declared: "This will require another day of hearing". She then turned to Mr Staddon and said: "How does your client feel about this?". Mr Staddon replied: "I will have to discuss with my client"

This was the end of it.

In case this is relevant: In a letter dated 7 April 2003 to MRJ, Oliver Fisher wrote: "We write to confirm that at the next hearing of this matter our Counsel will be making an Application for an Order under Section 20 ( c) of the Act in relation to the costs. In particular, that the legal costs incurred on behalf of your clients should not be added to the service charge."

Thank you for your assistance Ms McLean

Best regards

Noëlle Rawé

MEMORY TRANSMISSION REPORT

PAGE : 001  
 TIME : 18-09-03 15:23  
 TEL NUMBER: 020 [REDACTED] [REDACTED]  
 NAME : [REDACTED] FX866

FILE NUMBER : 128  
 DATE : 18-09 15:19  
 TO : 902076306976  
 DOCUMENT PAGES : 001  
 START TIME : 18-09 15:19  
 END TIME : 18-09 15:23  
 SENT PAGES : 001  
 STATUS : OK

FILE NUMBER : 128

\*\*\* SUCCESSFUL TX NOTICE \*\*\*

FAX - CONFIDENTIAL

18 September 2003

To	Ms Lisa McLean
Organisation	Piper Smith & Basham
Fax	020 7630 6976
From	Noelle Rawé (Jefferson House) Ref: LM.R360/1
Subject	Fax to MRJ re. 20C order application
Number of pages	Page 1 of 1

Dear Ms McLean,

Thank you for your draft letter to MRJ.

To help you with the second and third paragraph, I'll relate the sequence of what was said:

- 1 Mr Staddon said I wished to prevent the Applicant's costs from being charged on the service charge (I don't remember the exact wording, but this is the gist of it)
- 2 The other side Counsel replied that I had not made an application
- 3 The Chair, Mrs Goulden, said that I could do this at a later stage
- 4 I think that at this stage (might have been before) Mr Staddon cited various previous LVT cases in support of my request. These were argued by the other side's Counsel
- 5 The other side's Counsel said "My client will not charge Ms K-Dit-Rawé for the costs, but intends to charge other residents"
- 6 At this point Mrs Goulden said: "Oh, I don't know. I am not sure about this. I'll have to check". There was a recess. After the recess she declared: "This will require another day of hearing". She then turned to Mr Staddon and said: "How does your client feel about this?". Mr Staddon replied: "I will have to discuss with my client"

This was the end of it.

In case this is relevant: In a letter dated 7 April 2003 to MRJ, Oliver Fisher wrote: "We write to confirm that at the next hearing of this matter our Counsel will be making an Application for an Order under Section 20 (c) of the Act in relation to the costs. In particular, that the legal costs incurred on behalf of your clients should not be added to the service charge."

Thank you for your assistance Ms McLean

Best regards



Noelle Rawé