

**CONCERNING**

An application for review pursuant to section 193 of the Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006

**AND**

**CONCERNING**

a determination of the Auckland Standards Committee

**BETWEEN**

**MR UQ**

Applicant

**AND**

**MR OI**

Respondent

**The names and identifying details of the parties in this decision have been changed**

**Decision as to Jurisdiction**

[1] On [2012] the Auckland Standards Committee (Standards Committee) issued two determinations declining to take any further action on complaints by the Applicant against two lawyers. One was the above Respondent.

[2] On [2013] the Applicant filed an application for review of each of the determinations.

[3] Counsel for the Respondent contends that the Standards Committee decision was made available to the Applicant via email on [2012] (that is, the same day that the decision was made), and further contends that the Applicant's application for review was not lodged within the 30 working day timeframe required under s 198 of the Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006 (the Act). The Applicant does not deny that this is so.

[4] As a matter of jurisdiction this office has no discretion to accept review applications that are outside of the statutory time limit. Section 198 of the Act requires an application for Review to be lodged “within 30 working days after a copy or notice of the determination...” is “served on, given to, or otherwise brought to the attention of, the applicant for review.” A preliminary question of jurisdiction arises in respect of the review application, namely whether the review application has been filed within the statutory time period.

[5] In this case the Standards Committee decision was made available to the Applicant via email on [2012] (that is, on the same day the decision was made). The first question is whether the email from the Law Society dated [2012] meets the service or notice requirements set out by section 198 of the Act as amended. In this day and age I have no doubt that communication by way of email is now a well established means of communication, and that by this means the Applicant received notice of the determination made by the Committee sufficient to satisfy s 198.

[6] The next question is whether the review application was filed within 30 working days of [2012].

[7] “Working day” is not defined in the Act. It is therefore necessary to refer to the Interpretation Act 1999, whereby section 29 provides:

**Working day** means a day of the week other than—

- (a) A Saturday, a Sunday, Waitangi Day, Good Friday, Easter Monday, Anzac Day, the Sovereign's Birthday, and Labour Day; and
- (b) A day in the period commencing with 25 December in a year and ending with 2 January in the following year; and
- (c) If 1 January falls on a Friday, the following Monday; and
- (d) If 1 January falls on a Saturday or a Sunday, the following Monday and Tuesday:

[8] Applying the above, the 30 days that can be counted after the Committee's decision [2012] means that a review application ought to have been filed no later than [x January 2013]. The application was in fact filed on [xx January 2013]. By my calculations it was filed two days after the latest date for filing.

[9] In these circumstances I do not need to consider the amendment to s 198 which creates a 'deeming' provision where the actual date of delivery of a decision cannot be ascertained with any degree of certainty. That is not the case here. I conclude that the review application is out of time, and is therefore outside the jurisdiction of this office to consider it.

**DATED** this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of April 2013

---

Hanneke Bouchier  
**Legal Complaints Review Officer**

In accordance with s.213 of the Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006 copies of this decision are to be provided to:

Mr UQ as the Applicant  
Mr OI as the Respondent  
Counsel for the Respondent  
The Auckland Standards Committee  
The New Zealand Law Society