LEGAL PRACTICE COMMITTEE OF QUEENSLAND

OFFICE: NUMBER: **Brisbane** 01/2014

Applicant:

LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSIONER

AND

Respondent:

STEPHEN THOMAS MURRAY DRING

ORDER

Before:

P M Schmidt (Chair), B Houlihan (Solicitor member)

L Lynch (Lay member)

Date:

17 November 2016

Basis for Judgement:

Discipline Application filed on 20 January, 2014

THE ORDER, FINDINGS AND REASONS OF THE COMMITTEE:

The Respondent was born on 24 November 1962 and is currently 53 years of age. He is an Australian Legal Practitioner within the meaning of section 6(1) of the *Legal Profession Act* 2007, having been admitted to practice on 29 January 1996.

The charge against the Respondent is that between 16 November 2011 and 3 April 2012, the Respondent breached a condition of his practising certificate, in contravention of section 58 of the *Legal Profession Act* 2007.

Between 1 September 2009 and 2 February 2012, the Respondent was retained as a consultant for Colville Johnston Lawyers: ('the firm') by way of an arrangement between the firm and the Respondent as to the basis upon which he could perform legal work and the allocation of fee charged.

Telephone: (07) 3406 7737 Facsimile: (07) 3406 7749

2

At all material times, the Respondent was the holder of an unrestricted employee

practising certificate which did not entitle him to practise as a principal or sole

practitioner in private practice.

Between 16 November 2011 and 7 February 2012, the Respondent acted for a client

as a sole practitioner and not as a consultant of the firm.

Between 1 December 2011 and 3 April 2012, the Respondent acted for a client as a

sole practitioner and not as a consultant of the firm.

The Respondent admits the charge.

The Committee finds the conduct complained of amounts to unsatisfactory

professional conduct and finds the Respondent guilty of unsatisfactory professional

conduct.

In considering penalty, the Committee is mindful of the objective of protection of the

public and the maintenance of proper professional standards by way of both personal

and general deterrence. It has taken into account the following mitigating factors:

1. The Respondent has not had any other disciplinary proceedings brought

against him prior to or since the conduct which is the subject of the charge;

The Respondent has cooperated with the Commission;

3. The Respondent has expressed remorse for his conduct;

4. The events which are the subject of the charge occurred in excess of 4 and half

Management Course, obtained a principal practising certificate and has gained

further experience in the requirements and responsibilities of running a legal

years ago, during which time the Respondent has completed the Practice

practice.

5. The Respondent's personal financial and health circumstances.

ORDER

The Committee orders:

1. The Respondent is publically reprimanded.

2. The Respondent is ordered to pay a fine of \$1,000 payable within 3 months of

today's date.

3. The Respondent is ordered to pay the Applicant's costs, if agreed between the

parties within 30 days of agreement, or failing agreement, to be assessed and

payable within 30 days of the date of Assessor's Certificate.

Notice of Intention to Seek Compensation Order was filed on 17 February, 2014. The

Complainant seeks a Compensation Order pursuant to section 464 of the Legal

Profession Act 2007. The Committee does not consider the Respondent satisfies the

meaning of law practice as prescribed by section 464(d) and, furthermore, does not

consider that the alleged losses flow from the conduct which is the subject of the

charge as required by section 465(1) (a).

In the alternative, the Complainant seeks a Compensation order pursuant to Section

456(1) and 456(4) of the Legal Profession Act 2007(Qld). In respect of the application

of the general power under these provisions, the Committee adopts the position taken

in Legal Services Commissioner- v- Jiear [2012] QCAT 221 SC and Legal Services

Commissioner v Kellahan [2012] QCAT 263. In any event, there are unresolved

issues between the Complainant and the Respondent as to the terms of their

arrangement and that is not a matter for the Committee to determine. The alleged

losses may be pursued in another jurisdiction if the complainant wishes. Accordingly,

the Committee does not exercise its discretion to make a Compensation order.

We direct that this order be placed on the Committee's website.

Chairperson

18 November, 2016.

Telephone: (07) 3406 7737 Facsimile: (07) 3406 7749