



IN THE GRAND COURT OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS

CAUSE NO. ATT 121 of 2022 (DDJ)

IN THE MATTER OF THE LEGAL PRACTITIONERS ACT (2022 REVISION)

AND IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION FOR THE LIMITED ADMISSION OF JEREMY EDWARD GOLDRING QC AS AN ATTORNEY-AT-LAW OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS IN GRAND COURT FINANCIAL SERVICES DIVISION CAUSE NO: 74 of 2022 (DDJ)

Appearances: Mark Dowds of Carey Olsen for the Applicant
Jeremy Edward Goldring QC

Before: The Hon. Justice David Doyle

Heard: 8 August 2022

**Ex tempore
Judgment delivered:** 8 August 2022

**Transcript
of ex tempore Judgment
circulated:** 15 August 2022

**Transcript
of ex tempore
Judgment approved:** 15 August 2022



HEADNOTE

Determination of Limited Admission Application – plea to local attorneys to file such applications in good time and to specify the grounds of the application in the application

JUDGMENT

Introduction

1. I shall now deliver a judgment in respect of ATT 121 of 2022. I have considered the application for limited admission of Jeremy Edward Goldring QC in respect of FSD 74 of 2022 (DDJ) (the “Application”) and I have considered the affidavits in support of the Application. As I have tried to make plain in the past applications for limited admission are not mere formalities or rubber-stamping exercises. Proper respect must be given to the local jurisdiction and the strict requirements that must be satisfied before such an application can be considered and, if appropriate, granted. Moreover they should be made on a timely basis otherwise great inconvenience is caused to court administration and other matters are potentially adversely impacted upon. I make another plea to the local attorneys to file these applications in good time.

Summary

2. For the reasons which I will state in this judgment I have decided to grant the Application.

The relevant law and procedure

3. No skeleton argument or authorities were provided to me in respect of the Application. In respect of the relevant law and procedure I have however considered my judgment in *Limited Admission of David Stewart Mumford QC* (9 March 2022), section 4 of the Legal Practitioners Act (2022 Revision) (“Section 4”) and the Practice Direction 4 of 2012 (“Practice Direction”). In *Mumford* I endeavoured to review the relevant law and



procedure and I do not set it all out again in this short judgment but I have full regard to it.

Determination of the Application

4. Having considered the relevant law and procedure and the facts of this case I now turn to the determination of the Application presently before me.
5. I am satisfied in the circumstances of the Application presently before me that the requirements of Section 4 and the Practice Direction have been duly complied with, although the application was left very late in the day.
6. The grounds of the Application were not specified in the Application itself or in the supporting documentation. In *Mumford* (9 March 2022) at paragraph 9(4) (d) I stated:

“For future reference and from my perspective the concise grounds of the application for limited admission should ideally be set out in the application itself and the detail can be provided in the supporting affidavits and, depending on the circumstances of the case, the relevant pleadings exhibited or at least a summary of them provided ...”

The attorney for the applicant this morning has outlined the grounds as follows:

- (1) high value of the matter;
- (2) complex points of law; and
- (3) desirability and efficiency of one leading counsel for all dissenters and the avoidance of potential conflicts.

7. Paragraph 6(d) of the Practice Direction provides that “unless the Judge hearing the Application is already very familiar with the specified suit or matter concerned [the attorney’s affidavit should contain] a sufficiently detailed summary thereof to enable the Judge to exercise his discretion in all the circumstances as to whether or not to admit the Applicant for the purposes of appearing, acting or advising in that specified suit or matter.” Fortunately in this particular case I had an opportunity over the weekend to read into the matter because certain applications are before the court this Thursday.
8. I have considered the various relevant factors including the nature and complexity of the case. There can be no doubt in respect of the applicant QC’s qualifications, good character, professional conduct, expertise and experience. The applicant QC has obtained a work permit. I note also that the local attorneys will remain involved and that the case will primarily be conducted from the Cayman Islands. I note that the clients wish to be advised and represented by the applicant QC alongside local attorneys.
9. I am satisfied that it is appropriate in the circumstances of this case to exercise my discretion in favour of granting the Application and I grant it for the brief reasons contained in this judgment.
10. The applicant QC is to sign the register of admitted attorneys as soon as is practicable and I note the undertaking at paragraph 12 of the applicant QC’s affidavit sworn earlier today. The applicant QC, of course, is required to comply with all the professional duties and obligations and be subject to the professional discipline of a generally admitted attorney at law and as an officer of this court.

THE HON. JUSTICE DAVID DOYLE
JUDGE OF THE GRAND COURT