

**Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services**

**List of follow-up actions**  
**(Position as at 19 February 2004)**

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
1. Performance of Bailiff service	27 January 2003	<p>The Judiciary Administration has been requested to -</p> <p>(a) provide the number of attempts made in executing court orders, the number of summonses and legal documents served, and the number of attempts made in serving these documents by Bailiffs;</p> <p>(b) provide a breakdown of court orders, by categories, which fall within and outside the respective waiting time for execution; and</p> <p>(c) provide the guidelines for Bailiffs and the various measures to enhance the Bailiff service in due course.</p>	Written response from the Judiciary Administration was issued to the Panel vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1342/03-04(01) on 13 February 2004.
2. Implications of cost saving proposals of the Judiciary on the system of administration of justice	24 February 2003	<p>The Judiciary Administration has been requested to -</p> <p>(a) provide a comparison of the existing staffing structure of the Judiciary's Accounts Office, the Court Language Section and Typing Services with the proposed rationalised structures;</p> <p>(b) explain the duties and responsibilities of the translator posts proposed to be deleted;</p>	Written response from the Judiciary Administration was issued to the Panel vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1342/03-04(01) on 13 February 2004.

Subject	Date of meeting	Follow-up actions required	Administration's response
		<p>(c) provide information on the number of judges vis-à-vis temporary judges;</p> <p>(d) respond to the view that the ranking of the Judiciary Administrator should be reviewed having regard to the existing level of responsibilities of the post;</p> <p>(e) explain the measures to take forward any modernisation programme of the Judiciary and the resource implications of such programme; and</p> <p>(f) explain whether the introduction of any improvement measures would be hampered by the existing financial constraints.</p>	
3. Transcript fees	23 June 2003	The Judiciary Administration has been requested to respond in writing to the questions raised by members relating to the criteria for charging of transcript fees and the impact of the high transcript fees on court users, in particular the appellants.	Response awaited. The Judiciary Administration has been reminded to provide a written response as soon as possible.
4. Budgetary arrangements for the Judiciary	24 November 2003	<p>The Administration has been requested to -</p> <p>(a) provide a breakdown of the components of Programme area (1) under Head 80 of the Judiciary's Estimates;</p> <p>(b) provide a list of the existing judiciary fees and charges and the rate of cost-recovery; and</p>	Written response from the Administration was issued to the Panel vide LC Paper No. CB(2)1288/03-04(01) on 10 February 2004.

<b>Subject</b>	<b>Date of meeting</b>	<b>Follow-up actions required</b>	<b>Administration's response</b>
		(c) explain the methodology used for calculating the judiciary fees and charges.	

Council Business Division 2  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
19 February 2004