

For information**Legislative Council's Panel on Public Service****Follow-up actions required arising from the meeting on 20 April 2009****Administration's response on
Disciplinary mechanism and related procedures for
disciplined services and civilian grades**

The number of applications for legal representation received from civil servants subject to disciplinary proceedings under the relevant disciplined service legislation (“DSL”) since the handing down of a judgment by the Court of Final Appeal (“CFA”) in March 2009¹ and the number of applications approved, with breakdown by disciplined services departments, are appended in the following table -

Department	Applications for legal representation during disciplinary proceedings conducted under the DSL	
	No. of applications received*	No. of applications approved*
Hong Kong Police Force	1	Under consideration
Correctional Services Department	1	
Fire Services Department	1	
Customs & Excise Department	0	NA
Government Flying Service	0	NA
Immigration Department	0	NA
Total	3	0

* Figures as at 6.5.2009

Civil Service Bureau
May 2009

¹ This refers to the ruling in the case of *Lam Siu Po v Commissioner of Police (FACV No.9 of 2008)*, in which the CFA ruled on 26.3.2009 that the relevant provisions under the Police (Discipline) Regulations (Cap. 232A) which prohibited a barrister or solicitor from representing a defaulter and conducting the defence on his behalf during disciplinary proceedings was unconstitutional, null and void.