

IN THE HIGH COURT OF FIJI
WESTERN DIVISION AT LAUTOKA
CIVIL JURISDICTION

CIVIL ACTION No. HBC 106 OF 2016

BETWEEN : **SHAVEENA KUMARI** of Jinnu Road, Lautoka, Domestic Duties.
PLAINTIFF/RESPONDENT

AND : **IFTIKAR IQBAL AHMED KHAN** of Lautoka, Barrister & Solicitor,
operating as **IQBAL KHAN AND ASSOCIATES**, Barristers and
Solicitors, Lautoka.
1ST DEFENDANT/1ST APPLICANT

AND : **MUSTAFA NEWAZ KHAN** of Lautoka, Businessman as the Trustee of
the **ESTATE OF SHAH NEWAZ KHAN** of Lautoka, Senior Law Clerk
to **IQBAL KHAN & ASSOCIATES**, Barristers and Solicitors, Lautoka,
by virtue of the probate.
2ND DEFENDANT/2ND APPLICANT

Appearances : Mr R. Kumar for the defendants/applicants
Ms S. Ravai for the plaintiff/respondent
Date of Hearing : 17 September 2018
Date of Ruling : 30 November 2018

R U L I N G

[On stay pending appeal]

Introduction

[01] This is an application for a stay pending appeal.

[02] By a joint application filed 4 June 2018, the first defendant and the second defendant (I will call them for the purpose of this application '*the applicants*') seek an interim stay on execution of the judgment delivered on 3 April 2018 ('*my judgment*') pending the hearing or determination of the matter and/or until the determination of appellant's appeal in Fiji Court of Appeal ('*the application*').

- [03] The application is supported by the affidavit of Mr Iqbal Khan (the first defendant) who is a solicitor practising in Fiji. He says in his affidavit that: I am the applicant/first defendant in this case and am authorised by the second defendant to make and swear this affidavit on his behalf. The affidavit is sworn on 4 June 2018.
- [04] The original second defendant, Shah Newaz Khan had passed away before the judgment was delivered. On 22 May 2018, his son, Mustaffa Newaz Khan was substituted as the Trustee of the Estate of Shah Newaz Khan in place of the second defendant for the purpose of execution of the judgment. An amended notice and grounds of appeal has been filed in the Court of Appeal on 30 May 2018.
- [05] The plaintiff/respondent (*'the respondent'*) opposes the application. She filed her affidavit in response to the affidavit in support of notice of motion for stay of execution pending appeal.
- [06] The application is made pursuant to section 20 (1) (e) of the Fiji Court of Appeal (Amendment) Act of 1998, which states:
- "20 (1) A Judge of the court may exercise the following powers of the court-*
- ...
- (e) to stay execution or make interim order to prevent prejudice to the claims of any party pending an appeal;..."*
- [07] At the hearing, I have had the benefit of hearing oral arguments from counsel on both sides on stay pending an appeal. Only the applicants filed written submission. The respondent did not file any written submission.

Background

- [08] The background facts are briefly as follows: Mr Iqbal Khan is a solicitor operating IQBAL KHAN AND ASSOCIATES. Mr Shah Newaz Khan was a senior law clerk to Mr Iqbal Khan. Ms Shaveena Kumari, the plaintiff initiated proceedings against both of them (the defendants) for the recovery of \$37,000.00, general and pecuniary damages and costs. Her claim is based on fraud in that she alleged that: a) dishonestly obtaining the sum of \$37,000.00 as purchase price

against the agreed purchase price of \$12,000.00, b) dishonestly attempting to convert the monies paid by the plaintiff to the defendants as a loan to Jai Singh, c) Continuing to demand and receive monies from the plaintiff with the full knowledge that the said Prema Wati Nath had aborted the Sale and Purchase Agreement, dishonestly convincing the plaintiff that the Sales and Purchase Agreement was afoot when in fact it was not so, d) deliberately and dishonestly misleading the plaintiff whilst acting as the plaintiff's legal advisor in the matter of the Sale and Purchase of the said Housing Authority Lease and e) the defendant falsely made misrepresentation to the plaintiff to obtain the sum of \$37,000.00 from the plaintiff, false misrepresentation in that she alleged that: a) falsely stating to the plaintiff that the sale price had increased from \$12,000, b) falsely stating to the plaintiff that the transfer process was alive when in fact it was not so, c) continuing to demand and receive monies from the plaintiff in the face of an aborted Sale and Purchase Agreement; and negligence and professional misconduct in that she alleged that: a) acting for both the plaintiff and the Vendor and/or her nominee the said Jai Singh without proper and/or adequate advisement to the plaintiff, b) failing to advise the plaintiff to seek independent legal advice in the first instance when acting for the Vendor and/or her nominee, c) failing to explain any of the documents proffered to the plaintiff in a language capable of being understood by the plaintiff, d) failing to process the transfer of the plaintiff with due diligence, e) continuing to demand of the plaintiff and receive purchase monies in the face of an aborted transfer, f) failing to issue trust account receipts in respect of monies paid by the plaintiff towards the transfer, g) dishonestly attempting to convert trust monies paid by the plaintiff into an unauthorized loan to Jai Singh, h) failing to advise the plaintiff of the true status of the transfer and demanding and receiving monies from the plaintiff nonetheless and i) conducting themselves with deception and dishonest in discharging their duties as a legal practitioner towards the plaintiff.

[09] The defendants denied the allegations as false.

[10] At the trial, plaintiff called 5 witnesses and produced 26 documents in support of her claim. For defence, only original second defendant (Shah Newaz Khan) gave evidence and produced one document namely Writ of Summons filed in the Magistrate's Court, Order dated 21/11/12. JDS dated 2/7/13.

[11] Mr Iqbal Khan, the first defendant opted not to give evidence.

[12] Upon analysing the evidence, the court delivered the following judgment:

1. The defendants jointly and severally refund the sum of \$37,000.00 to the plaintiff.
2. The defendants jointly and severally pay general damages in the sum of \$20,000.00 and punitive damages in the sum of \$30,000.00, totalling \$50,000.00 to the Plaintiff.
3. The defendants jointly and severally pay costs on an indemnity (full solicitor-client) basis to be assessed before the Master, if not agreed.

Grounds of Appeal

[13] The applicants appeal the judgment on the following grounds:

1. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J's conduct during the trial which was positively and actively obstructing the 1st Defendant in doing his work as a Counsel and further Ajmeer J's conduct was abrupt, tensed, rude, arrogant, discourteous, belittling and bullying the Defendants and as such his conduct lead to an unfair trial and as such there was a substantial miscarriage of justice.*
2. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact in not allowing the 1st Defendant to defend the 2nd Defendant contrary to rule of natural justice and Constitutional Rights to Counsel.*
3. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact in not giving or refusing the 1st Defendant to defend the 2nd Defendant as he was required by law that reasons must be given for rulings for the information of all the parties concerned and as such there was a substantial miscarriage of justice.*
4. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact by not allowing the 2nd Defendant to be defended by the 1st Defendant was denied a fair trial and as such there was a substantial miscarriage of justice.*
5. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact in not granting the 2nd Defendant couple of hours to arrange for another counsel after he was denied representation by the 1st Defendant and such refusal caused an unfair trial and a substantial miscarriage of justice.*
6. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact in not allowing the 1st Defendant to cross-examine the plaintiff and her witness, matters which involved the 2nd defendant and impacted the 1st Defendant the refusal to do so denied the 1st defendant and the 2nd defendant a fair trial.*

7. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact in not taking into consideration the plaintiff's statement of claim and the evidence that was adduced by the plaintiff were contrary to the plaintiff's statement of claim and/or was never pleaded in Plaintiff's Statement of Claim.*
8. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact in finding that the 1st Defendant was liable whereas the evidence of the plaintiff was to the effect that she had no dealings with the 1st Defendant and as such there was no evidence against the 1st Defendant.*
9. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact in finding the 1st Defendant vicariously liable which was contrary to law based on the evidence before the court.*
10. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J's findings that both the defendants forged the documents in question when there was no evidence of forgery by 1st and 2nd Defendants. There was no independent evidence of handwriting expert or other evidence pointing towards the defendants and as such there has been a substantial miscarriage of justice.*
11. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact in not taking into consideration that there were serious conflicts of evidence between the plaintiff and her witness and on balance of probabilities he ought to have found the plaintiff's case not proved against the 1st and 2nd Defendants.*
12. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact not taking into serious consideration the civil claim by the Plaintiff against one J. Singh in a Lautoka Magistrates Court Civil Action No. 97 of 2012 whereby J. Singh agreed owing to the Plaintiff the sum of \$38,000.00 the same amount that was claimed by the Plaintiff against the Defendants in this Honorable Court which proved on balance of probabilities that J. Singh owed monies to the Plaintiff and not the Defendants and on this material the plaintiff's action ought to have been dismissed contrary to the laws of estoppel.*
13. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact by excessively interfering with both the Appellant's cross-examination of the Plaintiff and her witnesses which led to the Appellant's/Defendant's not having a fair trial and hence a substantial miscarriage of justice.*
14. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact by not allowing the 1st Defendant to cross-examine the 2nd defendant and his witnesses. That after the 2nd Defendant had given evidence in Chief the trial judge directed the Plaintiff's Counsel to cross examine the 2nd Defendant and not asking the 1st Defendant to cross examine the 2nd defendant.*
15. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact when he wrote the judgment in open court whilst the counsels were waiting for almost 5 minutes on 3rd of April 2018 did so without taking into consideration the entire evidence in the trial and as such there was a substantial miscarriage of justice.*

PARTICULARS

- D) *after hearing the Plaintiff's and Defendant's case adjourned the matter to 15th of November 2017 for judgment when the 2nd Defendant passed away and the matter was further adjourned to February 2018 and on this date the judgment was not ready and further adjourned to 3rd of April 2018. On 3rd of April 2018 the trial judge did not have a written judgment but wrote the judgment hurriedly in Court and later read the judgment. The said judgment did not contain what was pronounced in court on 3rd of April 2018 but later contained in a written judgment some 3 days later.*
16. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact when he heard the evidence of the Plaintiff's and Defendant's on the 31st day of July 2017 and gave judgment on 3rd of April 2018 could not have remembered or recollect the demeanour of all the witnesses after they had given evidence some 9 months ago and hence finding the demeanour of witness as a fact what they had said some 9 months ago caused a substantial miscarriage of justice.*
 17. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact when on the 15th of November 2017 the 2nd Defendant passed away and it was encumbered on the court that the Plaintiff substitute the 2nd defendant after the Probate was granted and pronouncing judgment against the deceased was wrong in law and the judgment should be declared null and void.*
 18. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law in pronouncing judgment which was ambiguous and contrary to Plaintiff's statement of claim and evidence before the court caused a substantial miscarriage of justice.*
 19. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact when he concluded in his conclusion that "For the reasons set out above, I having been satisfied that the plaintiff has proved her case sufficiently, conclude that the defendants had acted for both the vendor and purchaser in a conflicting situation and thereby committed a professional misconduct. The defendants had devised a plan to extract monies from the plaintiff on the forged documents, which is another professional misconduct" when there was no evidence of such professional misconduct by either defendants.*
 20. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J's drawing of conclusion that both the defendants were liable was irrational and not soundly based on legal principles and as such there was a substantial miscarriage of justice.*
 21. *That the Trial Judge Ajmeer J's findings against the defendants were contrary to documentary evidence tendered in court and in the circumstances his findings were travesty of justice.*
 22. *That the Learned Trial Judge's findings against the Appellants/Original Defendants were contrary to the evidence and not taking into serious consideration the evidence of the 2nd Defendant and his witnesses.*

23. *That the Appellant reserves the right to add further grounds of appeal upon receipt of Court Record.*

Grounds for stay of execution

[14] The applicants set out in their affidavit in support (affidavit of Mr Iqbal Khan) the following grounds for seeking stay pending appeal:

1. *That I am the applicant/first defendant in this case and am authorized by the second defendant to make and swear this affidavit on his behalf.*
2. *That I deposed to the facts herein as within my own knowledge that acquired by me in the course of negotiating with the respondents and or their agents or servants save and except where stated to be on information, belief and where to stated, I verily believe to be true.*
3. *That on the 3rd day of April, 2018 my matter was called before his Lordship Justice Mr M.H. Mohamed Ajmeer and after the trial following orders were made:-*
 1. *The defendants jointly and severally refund the sum of \$37,000.00 to the plaintiff.*
 2. *The defendants jointly and severally pay general damages in the sum of \$20,000.00 and punitive damages in the sum of \$30,000.00, totally \$50,000.00 to the Plaintiff.*
 3. *The defendants jointly and severally pay costs on an indemnity (full solicitor-client) basis to be assessed before the Master, if not agreed.*
4. *That I crave leave to refer to the Amended Grounds of Appeal, a copy of which is annexed hereto and marked "IIAK1" and say that to the best of my knowledge, information and belief the contents thereof are true and correct in all respects.*
5. *That I am informed and verily believe that I have good prospect of success on the said appeal.*
6. *That the amended grounds of appeal advanced by me in this application are substantive and show arguable legal issues.*

7. *That I verily believe that I have a good prospects of success in my Appeal and that His Lordship Mr Mohamed Ajmeer erred in law and in fact in making orders against me and he also erred in law and in fact in not considering the rules of the natural justice.*
8. *That I verily believe that the Trial Judge Ajmeer J's drawing of conclusion that both the defendants' were liable was irrational and not soundly based on legal principles and as such there was a substantial miscarriage of justice.*
9. *That I verily believe that my Appeal would be successful and I humbly request this Honourable Court for the following Orders that:-*
 - (a) *The orders made by His Lordship Mr. M.H. Mohamed Ajmeer on the 3rd day of April, 2018 be stayed.*
10. *That I have acted diligently in prosecuting my proposed appeal.*
11. *That my appeal will be rendered nugatory if stay is not granted.*
12. *That my proposed grounds of appeal have raised questions of general importance.*
13. *That the plaintiff will not be prejudiced by the stay and there is nothing to show that the plaintiff will be prejudiced by the stay.*
14. *That I have been informed by Senior Counsels and verily believe that the grounds of Appeal raise some very important questions of law and facts that needs to be addressed by the Fiji Court of Appeal.*
15. *That the plaintiff has taken out a bankruptcy proceeding against me and if stay of execution is not granted then my assets will be liquidated by the Official Receiver.*
16. *That I am a principal of the law firm Iqbal Khan & Associates and if the assets are liquidated then I will lose all my clients which no amount of damages can replace.*
17. *That I am a Fiji citizen and I do not hold citizenship of any other country. I have properties in Fiji worth over \$200,000.00 and I will be able to settle any judgment sum that has been ordered by the Court.*

18. *That I am informed and verily believe that the second defendant as the Trustee of the Estate of Shah Newaz Khan has properties worth over \$200,000.00 and he will be able to settle any judgment sum that has been ordered by the Court.*
19. *That the balance of convenience and the protection of the status quo is in our favour as we will be prejudiced if stay is not granted.*

Grounds of Objection

[15] The respondent in her affidavit states her grounds of objection for stay:

“ ...

2. *That I am advised by my solicitors that the defendants Grounds of Appeal is without any merit whatsoever.*
3. *That I am greatly prejudiced by being denied the fruits of a successful litigation.*
4. *That I am sixty three years old, a widow and quite sickly now and I have no source of income whatsoever.*
5. *That before service of the bankruptcy notice and the bankruptcy petition my solicitors wrote to the first defendant to settle the Bill of Costs.*
6. *That there being no response to the said letter, my solicitors then wrote to the first defendant on 18 April 2018 and the first defendant responded with his letter dated 21 April 2018.*
7. *That the first defendant failed to respond further and I instructed my solicitors to proceed to recovery process.*
8. *That the first defendant has been properly served as appears from the supporting affidavit.*
9. *That the first defendant has not provided any details of his so called assets and I ask this Honourable Court to Order the defendants to disclose details of their assets with documentary evidence.*

10. That I also ask this Honourable Court to order the first defendant to deposit the Judgment sum in court pending his application for stay.

...”

The Law

[16] The Court of Appeal Rules 1949, as amended (‘CAR’) (in part) provides:

“34 (1) Except so far as the court below or the Court of Appeal may otherwise direct-

(a) an appeal shall not operate as a stay of execution or of proceedings under the decision of the court below;

(b) no immediate act or proceeding shall be invalidated by an appeal.” [Emphasis supplied]

[17] The CAR, R 26 (3), states:

“(3) Wherever under these Rules an application may be made either to the court below or to the Court of Appeal it shall be made in the first instance to the court below.”

The governing principles

[18] The governing principles applicable in an application for stay pending appeal include: (a) Whether, if no stay is granted, the applicant’s right of appeal will be rendered nugatory, (b) Whether the successful party will be injuriously affected by the stay, (c) The *bona fides* of the applicants as to the prosecution of the appeal, (d) The effect on third parties, (e) The novelty and importance of questions involved, (f) The public interest in the proceeding, (g) the overall balance of convenience and the status quo (see *Natural Waters of Viti Ltd v Crystal Clear Mineral Water (Fiji) Ltd* [2005] FJCA 13; ABU0011.2004S (18 March 2005).

[19] The court must ask the following questions when considering an application for stay of execution pending appeal:

(a) If a stay is refused, what are the risks of the appeal being stifled?

(b) If a stay is granted and the appeal fails, what are the risks that the respondent will be unable to enforce the judgment?

(c) *If a stay is refused and the appeal succeeds, and the judgment is enforced in the meantime, what are the risks of the appellant being able to recover what has been paid to the respondent?*

(See *Hammond Suddard Solicitors v Agrichem International Holdings Ltd* [2001] EWCA Civ 1915, LTL 18/12/2001)

Discussion

- [20] The basic rule is that a litigant is entitled to enjoy the fruits of its success (*BMW AG v Commissioners of HM Revenue and Customs* [2008] EWCA Civ 1028, LTL 7/10/2008).
- [21] The respondent has obtained a judgment after a full trial where the court had considered the evidence adduced by both sides. The court did not believe the evidence given by the second original defendant.
- [22] In order to obtain a stay the defendant must establish that they have sufficiently exceptional circumstances as stated in *Ward v Chandra* [2011] FJSC 8; CBV0010 (20 April 2011).
- [23] Basically, the applicants seek stay of execution of a monetary judgment delivered against them.
- [24] Chiefly, the grounds urged by the applicants for seeking stay pending appeal are as follows:
1. *I have acted diligently in prosecuting my proposed appeal.*
 2. *My appeal will be rendered nugatory if stay is not granted.*
 3. *My proposed grounds of appeal have raised questions of general importance.*
 4. *The plaintiff will not be prejudiced by the stay and there is nothing to show that the plaintiff will be prejudiced by the stay.*
- [25] Mr Iqbal Khan, the first defendant although he claims that he has authority to swear an affidavit on behalf of the second defendant, he has primarily sworn the affidavit on his own behalf. It will be noted that he states in his affidavit 'I' and 'My'.

Bankruptcy

- [26] Another ground for stay pending appeal is the bankruptcy application filed by the respondent against the first defendant. With regards to the bankruptcy application, Mr Iqbal Khan deposes:

"That the plaintiff has taken out a bankruptcy proceeding against me and if stay of execution is not granted then my assets will be liquidated by the Official Receiver."

- [27] Since the Magistrate has stayed the bankruptcy proceedings in view of the appeal against the judgment, the bankruptcy ground relied upon for stay of execution has become redundant. Therefore, I will not consider this issue in this application.

The bona fides of the applicants as to the prosecution of the appeal.

- [28] This ground was not in dispute. The first applicant states that he has acted diligently in prosecuting my proposed appeal. It is not clear whether the second applicant has acted diligently in prosecuting the appeal. However, I do not intend to discuss this point any further.

Proposed grounds of appeal have raised questions of general importance

- [29] Each of the findings of the court has been converted into grounds of appeal. The dispute was between the respondent (plaintiff) and the applicants (defendants). No questions of law raised by the applicants at the trial.
- [30] Only question of law raised in the appeal is vicarious liability. Ground 9 is that *the* Trial Judge Ajmeer J erred in law and in fact in finding the first Defendant vicariously liable which was contrary to law based on the evidence before the court.
- [31] It is an admitted fact that the impugned sale and purchase agreement was executed by Messrs Iqbal Khan & Associates. On the evidence, the court found that the owner's signature that appears on the sale and purchase agreement was a forged one.

[32] The original second defendant (Shah Newaz Khan) was receiving money based on the sale and purchase agreement. Mr Shah Newaz Khan was the senior legal clerk to Messrs Iqbal Khan Associates.

[33] There was no evidence that the sale and purchase agreement and subsequent transactions arising from that agreement happened without the knowledge and approval of Mr Iqbal Khan. On that basis, the court held that Mr Iqbal Khan was vicariously liable for the action of his employee. Mr Iqbal Khan has gone to the extent of defending his employee, the second defendant. Now, Mr Iqbal Khan has filed grounds of appeal on behalf of the second defendant.

Appeal will be rendered nugatory if stay is not granted

[34] The applicants submit that their appeal will be rendered nugatory if stay is not granted. They further submit that the plaintiff will not be prejudiced by the stay and there is nothing to show that the plaintiff will be prejudiced by the stay.

[35] Stay of execution pending appeal relates to a monetary judgment. Having this in my mind, I ask myself the question that: If a stay is granted and the appeal fails, what are the risks that the respondent will be unable to enforce the judgment?

[36] The first applicant, Mr Iqbal Khan says that: *'I am a Fiji citizen and I do not hold citizenship of any other country. I have properties in Fiji worth over \$200,000.00 and I will be able to settle any judgment sum that has been ordered by the Court.* Likewise, the second respondent, Mr Mustaffa Newaz Khan (on his behalf Mr Iqbal Khan deposes in the affidavit) says that: *'I am informed and verily believe that the second defendant as the Trustee of the Estate of Shah Newaz Khan has properties worth over \$200,000.00 and he will be able to settle any judgment sum that has been ordered by the Court.*

[37] Both the applicants say that they have properties in Fiji worth over \$200,000.00 and will be able to settle any judgment sum that has been ordered by the court.

[38] The judgment orders the applicants jointly and severally pay a sum of \$87,000.00 (refund of \$37,000.00 + general damages:\$20,000.00 + punitive damages:30,000.00) with costs which is to be assessed on solicitor-client indemnity basis.

[39] The applicants do not provide details of the property. They do not even say what kind of property they have which is worth over \$200,000.00 and where it is

situated. When asked for details of the property, they said they not bound to provide details of the property in this proceedings. It appears that the applicants had deliberately refused to provide the details of the property that would be available for settlement of the judgment sum if the appeal fails. In the circumstances, I am satisfied that there is a risk that the respondent will be unable to enforce the judgment if a stay is granted and the appeal fails.

[40] The next question I ask myself is that: *If a stay is refused and the appeal succeeds, and the judgment is enforced in the meantime, what are the risks of the appellant being able to recover what has been paid to the respondent?*

[41] The respondent in her affidavit states that: *'I am sixty three years old, a widow and quite sickly now and I have no source of income whatsoever.'*

[42] It is obvious that the respondent has no source of income. Therefore, there is a risk of the applicants being able to recover what has been paid to the respondent if a stay is refused and the appeal succeeds.

[43] With the view to balancing the risk involved around this case, I am prepared to grant a stay pending appeal on the condition that the applicants shall deposit the judgment sum of \$87,000.00 into court within one month of the date of this ruling. If the applicants fail to comply with the condition as ordered, the respondent will be free to enforce the judgment. There will be no order as to costs.

The outcome

1. Stay of execution of the judgment dated 3 April 2018 pending appeal is granted on the condition that the applicants shall deposit the judgment sum of \$87,000.00 into court within one month of the date of this ruling.
2. If the applicants fail to comply with the condition as ordered (under order 1 above), the respondent will be free to enforce the judgment.

3. There will be no order as to costs.

M.H. Mohamed Ajmeer
..... 30/10/18

M.H. Mohamed Ajmeer

JUDGE

At Lautoka
30 October 2018

Solicitors:

For applicants: M/s Iqbal Khan & Associates, Barristers & Solicitors

For respondent: M/s Fazilat Shah Legal, Barristers & Solicitors

