CO/2629/97
------------

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION CROWN OFFICE LIST

<sup>°</sup>A

B

C

D

Ε

F

G

Η

Royal Courts of Justice The Strand London WC2A 2LL

Tuesday, 1st December 1998

Before:

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE TURNER

## REGINA

- v -

## THE CRIMINAL INJURIES COMPENSATION BOARD Respondent

Ex parte ENVER BAYRAM Applicant

(Computer Aided Transcript of the Palantype Notes of Smith Bernal Reporting Limited 180 Fleet Street, London EC4A 2HG Tel: 0171 831 3183 Official Shorthand Writers to the Court)

MISS A ROBINSON (instructed by Treasury Solicitors, Queen Anne's Chambers, 28 Broadway, London SW1H 9JS) appeared on behalf of the Respondent.

MR I WRIGHT (instructed by Ormerod Heap & Marshall, Green Dragon House, 64-70 High Street, Croydon CR0 9XN) appeared on behalf of the Applicant.

> JUDGMENT (As Approved)

> > 1

Smith Bernal

**Official Court Reporters** 

## JUDGMENT

MR JUSTICE TURNER: On 13th December 1995 the applicant was notified of a final award by the Criminal Injuries Compensation Board. On 10th January an increased award was made, which the applicant accepted on 15th January.

It is the applicant's present position that he was at all material times unaware of his right to call for an oral hearing on his claim by the Board.

On 8th April 1996 the applicant expressed dissatisfaction with the award which he had accepted. He was notified on 29th April that the only circumstance in which the Board could re-open a matter where a final award had been made and accepted was if there had been a serious change in his medical condition.

The Board sought further evidence, which gradually came into being, so that on 26th February 1997 the Board refused to re-open the matter on the predictable grounds that there had been no serious change in the applicant's condition. It had never been his case that such an event had happened.

On 23rd May 1997, by letter from his solicitors, the applicant invited the Board to re-open the matter on the grounds that the award was too low. At that stage no application was made on the basis that the Board was being invited to reconsider the time for the applicant's request for an oral hearing and there was no reference to the fact, now accepted, that the applicant was unaware of the right

2

Smith Bernal

Official Court Reporters

H

G

۰A

B

С

D

E

 $(\cdot)$ 

 $\mathbf{F}$ 

to apply for an oral hearing at any material time.

"A

B

С

D

Ε

F

G

Η

The decision which the applicant seeks to challenge on this application is the decision of the Board of 4th June 1997 not to grant the applicant an oral hearing. Unfortunately the correspondence which would show the precise request which was made to the Board in respect of the oral hearing is not available, either from the applicant's solicitors or from the Treasury solicitors representing the interests of the Board. What is available is the Board's letter, dated 4th June 1997, which, unless it was written in bad faith -- which I simply do not accept, and it has not been suggested -- is inconsistent with any request having been made to the Board for an extension of time within which the application for an oral hearing should have been made.

It now emerges that underpinning the applicant's present application is the fact, as I have previously mentioned, that he claims at all material times to have been unaware of his right to have requested an oral hearing in respect of the proposed final award. It is now manifestly too late for the applicant to make that request.

I come to this conclusion with the utmost feeling of regret in that the applicant on the material which I have read so far, and of course I have not heard the other side on the merits, may justly feel that he has been hard done by. In part this may arise from his decision to attempt to understand the intricacies of the scheme without the benefit of legal advice, to which, of course, under the

Official Court Reporters

3

Smith Bernal

scheme, as it was, he would not have been entitled to recover any costs had he sought it.

For these reasons this application must be refused. MR WRIGHT: My Lord, yes, the applicant has had\_benefit of legal

aid to make this application. MR JUSTICE TURNER: Legal aid taxation.

A

B

С

D

E

( )

F

G

 $\mathbf{H}$ 

Smith Bernal

4

Official Court Reporters