## HUGO DIAMANA LALO (representing himself and the descendants of Veko and Ugara tribes) -V-. LEVI LOKOHO (representing himself and the descendants of Doko and Talise Land holding Group), M.S.L. IMPORT AND EXPORT COMPANY LIMITED AND THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL

HIGH COURT OF SOLOMON ISLANDS (KABUI, J.).

Civil Case No. 225 of 2002

Date of Hearing: $23^{rd}$  July 2003Date of Ruling: $30^{th}$  July 2003

Mr B. Upwe for the Applicant Mr C. Hapa for the Respondent

## <u>RULING</u>

<u>Kabui, J.</u> This is an application by the 1<sup>st</sup> Defendant filed on 26<sup>th</sup> May 2003 seeking leave for the release of royalties in the A & A Legal Services Trust Account to the 1<sup>st</sup> Defendant. The Applicant also applies for costs to be met by the Plaintiff.

## The Background.

Certain royalty monies had been paid into the Trust Account of A & A Legal Services. The Isabel Local Court had determined on 16<sup>th</sup> January 2003 that the parties in the dispute were one. The Plaintiff filed Notices of Discontinuance on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2003 in accordance with the terms of the consent order filed on 3<sup>rd</sup> March 2003. The application was the follow-up to the notices of discontinuance filed by the Plaintiff.

## The decision of the Court.

There is I think a misunderstanding of the terms of the consent order by the former Solicitor for the Plaintiff. Paragraph 3 of the consent order clearly states that the notices of discontinuance were to do with the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Defendants only and not to include the 1<sup>st</sup> Defendant. The Plaintiff's action would still stand in relation to the 1<sup>st</sup> Defendant. The letter dated 14<sup>th</sup> April 2003, addressed to the Registrar of the High Court in response to his letter dated 24<sup>th</sup> March 2003, querying the correctness of the Notice of Discontinuance filed on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2003 by the former Solicitor for the Plaintiff, had overstated the correct position. The correct position is that the Plaintiff has not withdrawn his action against the 1<sup>st</sup> Defendant. It is therefore rather premature to conclude that the action against the 1<sup>st</sup> Defendant has been withdrawn. That is not the case. This is why the Plaintiff has instructed a new Solicitor to oppose this application. Whilst it is not disputed that the Isabel Local Court had determined the parties to be one, that decision is being appealed and cross-appealed by both parties. The outcome of the two appeals is being awaited. It is therefore premature to release the royalties to the 1<sup>st</sup> Defendant whilst the dispute is awaiting the determination of the Isabel Customary Land Appeal Court. I will not grant the application being sought by the 1<sup>st</sup> Defendant. The application is refused. The parties will meet their own costs.