

# 立法會 *Legislative Council*

LC Paper No. CB(4)787/19-20

Ref : CB4/PL/AJLS

## **Report of the Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services for submission to the Legislative Council**

### **Purpose**

This report gives an account of the major work of the Panel on Administration of Justice and Legal Services ("the Panel") during the 2019-2020 Legislative Council ("LegCo") session. It will be tabled at the Council meeting of 15 July 2020 in accordance with Rule 77(14) of the Rules of Procedure of the Council.

### **The Panel**

2. The Panel was formed by a resolution passed by the Council on 8 July 1998 and as amended on 20 December 2000, 9 October 2002, 11 July 2007 and 2 July 2008 for the purpose of monitoring and examining policy matters relating to the administration of justice and legal services. The terms of reference of the Panel are in **Appendix I**.

3. The Panel comprises 37 members, with Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun and Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang elected as Chairman and Deputy Chairman respectively. The membership of the Panel is in **Appendix II**.

### **Major work**

#### Issues and public work projects relating to the Judiciary

##### *General adjournment of court proceedings*

4. Owing to the outbreak of the coronavirus disease-2019 ("COVID-19") in Hong Kong, all hearings of the courts/tribunals scheduled for early 2020

were adjourned except urgent and essential hearings/matters. Some members expressed concerns about the possible impacts of the general adjournment of court proceedings during the General Adjourned Period ("GAP") and requested the Judiciary Administration ("Jud Adm") to discuss this with members at the Panel meeting in February 2020. However, as that Panel meeting was rescheduled to a later date on consideration of the latest situation of COVID-19, Jud Adm was requested to provide a written response to the Panel.

5. In its letter on 24 February 2020, Jud Adm informed members of the details of the various measures that the Judiciary had been and would be taking to address and alleviate the impact of GAP on the operation of the judicial system. These measures included the enhanced measures for urgent and essential businesses, communication with stakeholders and the public, preventive measures at court premises, on-going reviews and updates, and the preparation for resumption of proceedings and re-opening of court registries/offices. Subsequently, Jud Adm issued seven more letters to update members on matters relating to GAP (which ended on 3 May 2020), and discussed this subject with members at the Panel meeting on 27 April 2020.

6. At the meeting, some members expressed concerns that the general adjournment of court proceedings during GAP had inevitably affected the access to justice for parties and applicants in relevant proceedings. In response, Jud Adm explained that the Judiciary was keenly aware that GAP had affected court users and stakeholders to varying extent and had been taking proactive steps to mitigate its impact, and had made special arrangements for handling all urgent and essential court hearings and business promptly.

7. Some members also expressed concern about the impact on caseload accumulated during GAP and considered that, in order to alleviate the impact of the aftermath of GAP, the Judiciary should consider temporary measures to relieve the shortage in judicial manpower, including the appointment of more Deputy Judges, to deal with the heavy caseload. There was also a suggestion to allocate additional resources to the Judiciary so that the courts might operate on a round-the-clock basis to alleviate the impact on caseload.

8. In response, Jud Adm advised that within the constraint of reduced capacity because of the need to maintain social distancing, the courts had been handling as much court business as efficiently and safely as possible during GAP. The Judiciary had also been redeploying or engaging temporary registry staff to help clear the backlog of cases filed with the registries as expeditiously as possible.

9. Some members considered that the Judiciary should learn a lesson from the outbreak of COVID-2019 and, in the long run, expedite its implementation of information technology application projects to enable the electronic transmission of documents among parties to the proceedings and the conduct of hearings by telephone or video link. The Judiciary was urged to formulate appropriate measures as soon as practicable to reduce the impacts of court closures necessitated by infectious disease outbreaks in future.

10. Jud Adm responded that under its Information Technology Strategy Plan, the Judiciary had been proactively developing by phases an integrated court case management system across all levels of courts to enable an electronic mode for handling court-related documents and payments. The Court Proceedings (Electronic Technology) Bill seeking to provide the necessary legal basis for implementing the above system had been introduced into LegCo in early January 2020. Jud Adm supplemented that, pending passage of the Bill, the Judiciary had been exploring and introducing administrative measures within the confines of its information technology security policy and practices to enable the handling of certain documents by electronic means.

#### *2019-2020 Judicial Service Pay Adjustment*

11. At its meeting on 27 April 2020, the Panel was briefed on the judicial service pay adjustment for 2019-2020. Members noted that the Acting Chief Executive in Council had, on the recommendation of the Standing Committee on Judicial Salaries and Conditions of Service, decided that the pay for Judges and Judicial Officers ("JJOs") for 2019-2020 should be increased by 5.63%. The Panel supported the Administration's submission of the funding proposal to the Finance Committee ("FC") for consideration.

12. Some members enquired about the effectiveness of the upward pay adjustments in attracting new blood and the grooming and retention of existing talents. In response, the Administration advised that the annual salary review for JJOs was only one of the measures in recruiting and retaining talents. Apart from that, a Benchmark Study would in principle be conducted every five years to check whether judicial pay was kept broadly in line with the movements of legal sector earning over time, with its frequency subject to periodic review.

13. The Administration further advised that on recruitment of JJOs, a total of 128 judicial appointments were made in a total of 15 open recruitment exercises for various judicial ranks conducted between 2011 and 2019, and a new round of recruitment exercise would be launched in the second half of 2020. As regards the extension of the statutory retirement ages for JJOs, the

Judicial Officers (Extension of Retirement Age) (Amendment) Bill 2019 for the implementation of the new retirement ages and related arrangements had been passed by LegCo in late 2019. It was believed that the above measures would help the Judiciary in recruiting and retaining talents in the Judiciary.

*Additional courtrooms and associated facilities at lower ground fourth floor in the High Court Building*

14. At the Panel meeting on 25 May 2020, Jud Adm and the Administration briefed members on the major works project for the construction of additional courtrooms and associated facilities on the lower ground fourth floor of the High Court Building ("HCB") ("the Project") to meet operational needs of the courts. The Panel indicated support for the Project to be submitted to the Public Works Subcommittee for consideration and endorsement.

15. In response to some members' concerns about the impact of the Project not being able to be submitted to FC for approval within the current legislative session, the Administration advised that the planned timetable of the Project would be inevitably affected. Jud Adm further explained that there was an imminent need to construct additional courtrooms and associated facilities in the existing HCB to meet operational needs of the High Court in the interim whilst, to meet the long-term accommodation needs of the High Court, the Judiciary planned to construct a new HCB with improved court facilities at Site 5 of the new Central Harbourfront.

16. In response to a member's enquiry about the estimated annual recurrent expenditure arising from the Project, Jud Adm advised that the estimated annual recurrent expenditure arising from the Project was \$1.7 million, which included the repair and maintenance costs of electrical and mechanical facilities, information technology facilities, and digital sound recording systems, etc.

17. Members noted that in order to release the space required for construction of the additional courtrooms and associated facilities in the Project, the High Court Library had to be relocated to the first floor of the High Block, Queensway Government Offices. In this regard, some members expressed concern that this would cause inconvenience to library users. Jud Adm advised that the new location for the High Court Library was in close proximity to HCB and it was believed that the relocation of the High Court Library would not have significant effect on the existing level of services provided to library users.

18. Noting the increasing popularity of searching information online, some members suggested that the Judiciary might consider digitizing certain legal reference books and research materials kept by the High Court Library. It would not only enhance the service provided by the High Court Library, but also further overcome the space and physical constraints encountered by the High Court in the long run. Jud Adm advised that members' views would be taken into account when formulating long-term plan for meeting the accommodation needs of the High Court.

19. Apart from the Project proposed, some members suggested that in order to further alleviate the problem of shortage of courtrooms and associated facilities in the High Court and, by learning the lessons from the impact of the outbreak of COVID-2019, the Judiciary should explore more unconventional modes for handling court businesses of the High Court, say hearings by video conferencing. In response, Jud Adm advised that they would maintain close communication with all relevant stakeholders, court users and the public and listen to their feedback in devising necessary measures and planning for the way forward.

*Mechanism for handling complaints against judicial conduct*

20. At the Panel meeting on 25 May 2020, Jud Adm briefed members on the latest progress of implementation of the improvement measures on the mechanism for handling complaints against judicial conduct ("the mechanism") which were made by the Judiciary following its review of the mechanism in 2016. Members were last informed of the progress through an information paper in March 2018.

21. Members noted that the mechanism had been operating smoothly. They were also informed of the latest progress and the complaint statistics in relation to enhancing the administrative support with the setting up of the Secretariat for Complaints against Judicial Conduct; measures to facilitate the users; court leaders to consult senior/expert judges in handling complaints as necessary; and enhancing transparency.

22. Some members raised concerns relating to a statement made by the Chief Justice ("CJ") on 25 May 2020 ("the statement") regarding the Reasons for Sentence delivered by a District Judge on a recent case. CJ was of the view that the Reasons for Sentence had caused controversy in that there was a risk that some members of the public could take the view that the principles he mentioned in the statement might have been compromised in that a wrong perception was given. These members noted that the District Judge concerned would not for the time being deal with any cases involving a similar political

context, and expressed concerns whether the decision amounted to a punishment for the District Judge concerned and whether the same yardstick would be applied to other JJOs who expressed political views in their judgments.

23. Some other members noted that there had been public complaints, which were copied to them for attention, lodged against JJOs allegedly speaking anonymously in media interviews, signing public petition and being members of political parties. These members pointed out that whilst such conduct clearly went against the principles as mentioned by CJ in the statement, i.e. JJOs must refrain from unnecessarily expressing in public (including in their judgments) any views on matters that were controversial in society or might come before the courts for adjudication, little was heard about the outcome of such complaints. They questioned whether these complaints against judicial conduct would be handled in a fair and consistent manner similar to complaints regarding non-political cases.

24. In response, Jud Adm stressed that it had nothing to add to the statement and it was not appropriate for Jud Adm to comment on individual cases. It also stressed that the principle of judicial independence involved the independence of each judge at any level of our courts to adjudicate according to law without any interference and, therefore, complaints against judicial decisions or decisions made under statutes such as the Legal Aid Ordinance (Cap. 91) would not be handled under the mechanism. Anyone who felt aggrieved by these decisions of JJOs could only appeal (where available) through the existing legal procedures.

25. Jud Adm also drew members' attention to the Guide to Judicial Conduct ("the Guide") which had provided guidelines governing the circumstances where judges would be disqualified from hearing certain cases due to actual, presumed or apparent bias. Some members considered that the Guide issued in 2004 should be brought up-to-date.

26. Some members noted that, along with the increase in cases relating to the social events in 2019, there was a corresponding rise in the number of complaints made against JJOs handling such cases. They were concerned that some of these complaints might be unfounded or frivolous in nature, and about the measures which would be taken by the Judiciary to protect JJOs from unreasonable criticisms. Jud Adm responded that the Judiciary had always followed the mechanism in a fair and impartial manner. Every complaint lodged against JJO regarding his/her conduct, with the information required under the mechanism provided, would be duly processed and considered step by step.

The Law Reform Commission of Hong Kong

*Implementation of the recommendations made by the Law Reform Commission of Hong Kong*

27. At the Panel meeting on 22 June 2020, the Secretary for Justice ("SJ"), in her capacity as the ex-officio chairman of the Law Reform Commission of Hong Kong ("LRC"), briefed members on the progress of implementation of the recommendations made by LRC by the relevant government bureaux and departments.

28. Members were in general concerned about the long time taken for LRC to consider for reform those aspects of the laws of Hong Kong referred to it by SJ or CJ. It took years for a sub-committee appointed by LRC to study the subject referred to it by LRC before making recommendations for public consultation. It then took year(s) for LRC to finalize the report on the relevant law reform proposals having regard to the views collected in the consultation exercise(s).

29. Some members suggested that the Administration should enhance the manpower resources of LRC, such as engaging more full-time members to support its work. In response, LRC advised that the Administration had kept on reviewing its manpower resources from time to time, and would submit staffing proposals to FC for approval if necessary. For example, in 2019, the Establishment Subcommittee's endorsement had been sought for the creation of one permanent post of Deputy Principal Government Counsel (DL2) in the LRC Secretariat to strengthen the legal support provided to LRC to expedite its work in making and implementing recommendations on reform of the law, which was pending the approval of FC.

30. Some members also expressed concern that the Administration had spent long time to consider the recommendations made in various LRC reports. They urged the Administration to expeditiously implement LRC's recommendations on various reports, such as the reports on "Privacy and Media Intrusion", "Civil Liability for Invasion of Privacy", "Substitute Decision-making and Advance Directives in Relation to Medical Treatment", "Criteria for Service as Jurors" and "Voyeurism and Non-consensual Upskirt-photography".

31. In response, LRC referred to the set of guidelines issued by the Director of Administration in October 2011 ("DoA's guidelines") by which bureaux and departments having policy responsibility over any LRC report were required to provide at least an interim response within six months of publication of the report, and a detailed public response within 12 months of its publication.

32. According to DoA's guidelines, bureaux and departments were required to give full consideration to LRC's recommendations and provide a detailed public response setting out which recommendations they accepted, rejected or intended to implement in modified form, the implementation of LRC's recommendations would be monitored by LRC.

*Report of the Law Reform Commission of Hong Kong on "Review of Substantive Sexual Offences"*

33. The Review of Sexual Offences Sub-committee ("the Sub-committee") of LRC was appointed in 2006 to review the law relating to sexual and related offences in Hong Kong ("the review"). Over the years, the Sub-committee had issued three consultation papers on the three parts of its overall review of substantive sexual offences, which was the major part of the Sub-committee's study under its terms of reference.

34. A total of 71 preliminary recommendations were made in the three consultation papers and responses were received from members of the public. Between December 2012 and July 2018, the Panel had held six meetings to consider and listen to the views of deputations on the three consultation papers. At the Panel meeting on 22 June 2020, LRC briefed members on its report on "Review of Substantive Sexual Offences" ("the Report") which was issued in December 2019 and had been circulated to all LegCo Members. The Report discussed the responses received to the three consultation papers and set out LRC's analysis and final recommendations.

35. The Panel members expressed support to the Report in general, welcoming LRC's adoption of the mainstream views collected in the past consultations, including the call for clearer definitions for sexual offences and increased protection for vulnerable persons such as minors and mentally incapacitated persons.

36. Some members queried whether the proposed abolition of certain offences, such as indecent conduct towards a child under 16, would undermine the protection for minors. In response, LRC said that as a number of existing offences proposed to be replaced by new ones would broaden the protection coverage, those offences mentioned by members could be abolished.

37. Some members expressed concerns regarding the overall approach taken by the Sub-committee and LRC in the review, pointing out that the 14-year duration was considered too long. They questioned the effectiveness of breaking down the review into four parts with multiple consultation papers and reports issued. In response, LRC said that a comprehensive approach was

required for this review since it was an exercise covering a large number of offences in different areas.

38. While acknowledging the efforts made by LRC, some members raised concerns on whether the Administration would implement the numerous recommendations as a priority. In response, LRC pointed out that its report on "Voyeurism and Non-consensual Upskirt-photography" was published in April 2019 ahead of the remaining work of the Sub-committee in order to address the pressing need for the new offences recommended in that report, and the Security Bureau had already planned to discuss this report with the relevant Panel of LegCo. As regards other recommendations in the Report, LRC said that it was for the Administration to decide whether and when the recommendations were to be implemented.

39. The Hong Kong Bar Association invited to attend the meeting had expressed support for LRC's recommendations, on the grounds that they would bring into line some of the current sexual offences which did not conform to the equality requirement under Article 25 of the Basic Law. In addition to supporting the gender-neutral approach in sexual offences, the Hong Kong Bar Association also called on the Administration to consider extending the offence of incest to cover step parents and adoptive parents, and to extend the proposed new offence of trespass with intent to commit a sexual offence to cover a person who formed such intent after entering premises.

### Policy initiatives of the Department of Justice

#### *Vision 2030 for Rule of Law*

40. At the Panel meeting on 27 April 2020, members were briefed on Vision 2030 for Rule of Law, which was one of the major policy initiatives under the Department of Justice ("DoJ")'s purview in the Chief Executive's 2019 Policy Address.

41. "Vision 2030 for Rule of Law" was a 10-year initiative which was DoJ's commitment to building and maintaining a fair and rule-based society underpinned by the rule of law through collaboration with stakeholders towards sustainable development for all. Some members questioned DoJ's ability to promote its work in this area. They pointed out that the rule of law in Hong Kong had been deteriorating with public's confidence in the rule of law diminishing due to a lack of check and balance against the usage of power by the authorities.

*Proposed application of the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region*

42. On 2 March 2020, the Administration issued a public consultation paper to seek the public's views and comments on whether the the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods ("CISG") should be applied to Hong Kong, and if so, its implementation in Hong Kong. At its meeting on 25 May 2020, the Panel was briefed on the consultation paper.

43. Some members queried why CISG was not applicable to Hong Kong in the past while many of its trading partners had already been the Contracting States of CISG. In response, the Administration explained that prior to 1 July 1997, CISG was not applied to Hong Kong because the United Kingdom was not a Contracting State while the status quo had remained after the reunification.

44. Some members were concerned about how CISG would benefit Hong Kong, in particular to members of the legal profession. In reply, the Administration pointed out that almost all major trading partners of Hong Kong including Mainland China, the USA and Japan were Contracting Parties to CISG, while Hong Kong had participated in the Belt and Road Initiative ("BRI"). Given that the aim of CISG was to reduce legal barriers that could diminish or hamper the free flow of trade between economies, thereby increasing efficiency and driving economic growth, the Administration believed that CISG could assist in driving Hong Kong's Gross Domestic Product and trade growth. It would also help prevent Hong Kong businesses from being subject to unfamiliar foreign laws when entering into cross-boundary transactions with the BRI members or other new trading partners.

45. The Administration further advised that the application of CISG to Hong Kong and implementing it in Hong Kong law might benefit the legal profession by increasing the opportunities of Hong Kong lawyers in drafting the CISG contracts and documents enhancing their competence in handling and managing CISG-related disputes.

46. Some members noted the effect that the various differences between the CISG and existing Hong Kong law might have on the application of CISG to Hong Kong and enquired how this would be overcome. In reply, the Administration advised that if it was decided that CISG was to be applied to Hong Kong, it would seek such application under Article 153 of the Basic Law and its implementation in Hong Kong law by way of enacting a new stand-alone Ordinance.

47. Some members enquired whether a Hong Kong party could opt out of CISG if it was applied to Hong Kong, and about the potential conflicts between CISG and the Sales of Goods Ordinance (Cap. 26). In reply, the Administration pointed out that the flexibility of CISG allowed for the parties to derogate from certain provisions of CISG or exclude it entirely. Furthermore, CISG was relatively more pro-contract in the sense that its policy was to keep the contract alive, even in the event of breach, rather than allow for easy termination, which suggested that CISG was economically more efficient. The Administration further advised that, based on its analysis, it could see no fundamental difference between CISG and Hong Kong law making it impossible for the application of CISG to Hong Kong.

#### Conduct of civil servants in the Department of Justice

48. Some members expressed concerns regarding a prosecutor in DoJ who had published a book to explain people's right under arrest to young children, and considered that it might undermine public's confidence in the impartiality of prosecutors. They questioned about the mechanism for approving the application of outside work from DoJ's staff, and the mechanism to prevent conflicts of interests. A member also pointed out that a group of DoJ's staff had, in an anonymous open letter, alleged that SJ had been politically biased when making prosecution decisions in cases relating to protesters in the recent social events. She considered that there was a need for DoJ to supervise its staff's conduct.

49. In response, the Administration advised that while it would not comment on individual cases, the conduct of civil servants were governed by the Basic Law and the Civil Service Code which required them to remain impartial and politically neutral. The Administration also reiterated that all prosecutorial decisions would be made in an objective manner based on the law, evidence and the Prosecution Code.

#### Basic Law related issues

##### *Article 22 of the Basic Law*

50. In relation to a press statement issued by the Constitutional and Mainland Affairs Bureau that the Liaison Office of the Central People's Government ("the CPG") in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR") ("LOCPG") was not set up in accordance with Article 22(2) of the Basic Law, some members sought an explanation from the Administration about this position.

51. By referring to the Constitution of the People's Republic of China, the Basic Law, historical background on the setting up of LOCPG in HKSAR and the State Council's decision, the Administration explained that as LOCPG was an office representing the CPG in HKSAR and not an office set up by departments of the Central Government, Article 22(2) of the Basic Law ("BL") was not applicable to LOCPG. However, all offices set up in HKSAR by the Central Government and their personnel, including LOCPG shall act in accordance with the principle of "one country, two systems", strictly abide by the Basic Law and the laws of HKSAR, and discharge their duties in accordance with the laws.

52. In response to some members' enquiry on whether LOCPG shall abide by BL 22(1) and not to interfere in the affairs which HKSAR administered on its own, the Administration advised that LOCPG was authorized by the CPG to handle issues relating to Hong Kong. It was entrusted with the authority and responsibility to represent the CPG to express views and exercise supervisory power on major issues such as those concerning the relationship between the CPG and SAR, the accurate implementation of the Basic Law, the proper operation of the political system and the well-being of the community as a whole. Discharging such duties did not constitute any interference with the affairs which the HKSAR administered on its own in accordance with the Basic Law.

#### *Basic Law education*

53. Some members expressed their views that the Basic Law education in Hong Kong should be stepped up in light of a lack of understanding of the Basic Law and the relationship between the Central Government and the HKSAR Government among the general public and in schools, and also among civil servants. They considered that a better understanding of the Basic Law would also help reduce the antagonism held by some people in Hong Kong against the Mainland.

54. A member pointed out that some people held an incorrect notion that any interpretation of the Basic Law by the National People's Congress Standing Committee ("NPCSC") would undermine the rule of law, while in fact this power of NPCSC should be seen as an integral part of the constitutional design.

55. In response, the Administration advised that that there had been on-going promotion of the Basic Law, both in schools and in the community, and through multiple channels including animated publicity materials on DoJ's website (i.e. Studio DoJ), other publications and training courses.

### Other issues

56. During the session, the Panel had also considered the Administration's proposed framework for cooperation with the Mainland in corporate insolvency matters.

57. The Panel was also consulted on the following staffing proposals in the Judiciary and supported submission of the proposals to the Establishment Subcommittee and FC:

- (a) creation of one judicial post of Justice of Appeal of the Court of Appeal of the High Court (JSPS 17) to cope with the increased workload of the Court of Appeal of the High Court arising from, inter alia, the upsurge of civil appeals in relation to non-refoulement claims cases filed with the Court of Appeal of the High Court; and
- (b) creation of one Principal Executive Officer post (D1) to rationalize the existing manpower of the Accommodation Section so as to provide on-going and long-term strategic and management support to Jud Adm on accommodation and court security matters.

### **Meetings held**

58. From October 2019 to June 2020, the Panel held a total of eight meetings.

Council Business Division 4  
Legislative Council Secretariat  
8 July 2020

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

**Terms of Reference**

1. To monitor and examine, consistent with maintaining the independence of the Judiciary and the rule of law, policy matters relating to the administration of justice and legal services, including the effectiveness of their implementation by relevant officials and departments.
2. To provide a forum for the exchange and dissemination of views on the above policy matters.
3. To receive briefings and to formulate views on any major legislative or financial proposals in respect of the above policy areas prior to their formal introduction to the Council or Finance Committee.
4. To monitor and examine, to the extent it considers necessary, the above policy matters referred to it by a member of the Panel or by the House Committee.
5. To make reports to the Council or to the House Committee as required by the Rules of Procedure.

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

**Membership list for the 2019-2020 session**

<b>Chairman</b>	Dr Hon Priscilla LEUNG Mei-fun, SBS, JP
<b>Deputy Chairman</b>	Hon Dennis KWOK Wing-hang
<b>Members</b>	Hon James TO Kun-sun Hon Abraham SHEK Lai-him, GBS, JP Prof Hon Joseph LEE Kok-long, SBS, JP Hon WONG Ting-kwong, GBS, JP Hon CHAN Kin-por, GBS, JP Hon WONG Kwok-kin, SBS, JP Hon Mrs Regina IP LAU Suk-yee, GBS, JP Hon Paul TSE Wai-chun, JP Hon Claudia MO Hon Steven HO Chun-yin, BBS Hon WU Chi-wai, MH Hon Charles Peter MOK, JP Hon CHAN Chi-chuen Hon LEUNG Che-cheung, SBS, MH, JP Dr Hon KWOK Ka-ki Hon KWOK Wai-keung, JP Dr Hon Fernando CHEUNG Chiu-hung Hon IP Kin-yuen Hon Elizabeth QUAT, BBS, JP Hon Martin LIAO Cheung-kong, GBS, JP Hon POON Siu-ping, BBS, MH Dr Hon CHIANG Lai-wan, SBS, JP Hon CHUNG Kwok-pan Hon Alvin YEUNG Hon CHU Hoi-dick Hon Jimmy NG Wing-ka, BBS, JP Dr Hon Junius HO Kwan-yiu, JP Hon Holden CHOW Ho-ding Hon YUNG Hoi-yan, JP Hon Tanya CHAN Hon CHEUNG Kwok-kwan, JP

Hon HUI Chi-fung  
Hon LAU Kwok-fan, MH  
Hon KWONG Chun-yu  
Hon Jeremy TAM Man-ho

(Total : 37 members)

**Clerk** Mr Lemuel WOO

**Legal Adviser** Mr YICK Wing-kin

\* Changes in membership are set out in Annex to Appendix II.

## **Annex to Appendix II**

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

#### **Changes in membership**

<b>Member</b>	<b>Relevant date</b>
Hon Gary FAN Kwok-wai	Up to 16 December 2019
Hon AU Nok-hin	Up to 16 December 2019
Hon Tommy CHEUNG Yu-yan, GBS, JP	Up to 20 January 2020
Dr Hon Helena WONG Pik-wan	Up to 20 January 2020
Hon LAM Cheuk-ting	Up to 20 January 2020
Hon Jeffrey LAM Kin-fung, GBS, JP	Up to 21 January 2020
Hon SHIU Ka-chun	Up to 21 January 2020
Hon YIU Si-wing, BBS	Up to 25 February 2020
Hon CHAN Han-pan, BBS, JP	Up to 17 March 2020
Hon CHAN Chun-ying, JP	Up to 17 March 2020
Ir Dr Hon LO Wai-kwok, SBS, MH, JP	Up to 19 March 2020
Hon Wilson OR Chong-shing, MH	Up to 19 March 2020
Hon Christopher CHEUNG Wah-fung, SBS, JP	Up to 12 May 2020