# **Demo session**

ATLANTIS THE PALMLIMITED v DSA ARCHITECTS INTERNATIONAL

Exported on: Oct 17, 2024 By MIPL @

eTabella



Powered by eTabella.com

Between		
	Attantis the Palm Ltd.	
		Claimant
	- and -	
	Architects International	
		Respondent
-	- before -	
	Demo session	
	Thursday, 17 Oct 2024	

# **Annotations**



# Highlights

Page	Source text	Note	Issues
1	two points. First, to remind the parties that I would like		Unassigned
1	bundles have in c		Unassigned
1	MR JONES: It's a very good quest		Unassigned

1 11:00:00	PROCEEDINGS
2 11:00:00	(11.00 am)
3 11:00:03	HIS HONOUR: Thank you. {R17} Before we begin, can I just mention
4 11:00:06	two points.
5 11:00:07	First, to remind the parties that I would like
6 11:00:09	a copy of the chronology cross-referenced to the
7 11:00:12	bundles.
8 11:00:13	Also, I would like just a little help as to how the
9 11:00:15	bundles have been put together. They are certainly not
10 11:00:18	in chronological order; what order are they in?
11 11:00:19	MR JONES: It's a very good question, the sort of question
12 11:00:21	that I
13 11:00:24	HIS HONOUR: The rules require a chronological bundle, and
14 11:00:25	it is quite difficult thinking – well, I would like to
15 11:00:27	see the letter to which that document is an answer, and
16 11:00:30	then you have to, by pure chance, go about four bundles
17 11:00:31	further on, which slightly (Pause)
18 11:00:33	But they have just been divided up with tabs.
19 11:00:36	MR JONES: I mean, one option is the parties assist you by
20 11:00:37	producing an agreed bundle hopefully when we have
21 11:00:39	done our written closings.
22 11:00:42	HIS HONOUR: I would be grateful. There was always a risk
23 11:00:43	anyway of seeing the document in two different places.
24 11:00:45	MR JONES: We'll secure that for you.
25 11:00:48	Could I ask your Honour, please, to take up the list

1 11:00:49	
2 11:00:51	of issues. It can be found in bundle B at tab 2.
3 11:00:54	In tab 3, there are two sets of lists of issues.
4 11:00:55	There's a case memorandum list of issues from the
5 11:00:57	HIS HONOUR: The parties weren't able to agree on the list
6 11:01:00	of issues?
7 11:01:01	MR JONES: That's right, yes. Slightly
8 11:01:03	HIS HONOUR: It's not unknown, Mr Jones.
9 11:01:06	MR JONES: The bank and the first defendant were able to
10 11:01:07	agree on what they thought were the list of issues.
11 11:01:09	HIS HONOUR: Of course. That goes without saying.
12 11:01:12	MR JONES: My learned friend took you to these yesterday in
13 11:01:13	relation to his submissions about the issue estoppel,
14 11:01:15	and made the point that the July 2003 dishonest
15 11:01:18	statement was not an issue.
16 11:01:19	I mean, that's absolutely right, because I'll
17 11:01:21	develop that's actually a point in our favour, but
18 11:01:24	perhaps, first of all, we could turn to page 19.
19 11:01:25	HIS HONOUR: Yes.
20 11:01:27	MR JONES: This is within the claimant's list of issues,
21 11:01:30	just to see how narrowly focused the misrepresentation
22 11:01:31	issue in the 2001 trial was.
23 11:01:33	One can see that summarised at paragraph 8, and then
24 11:01:36	in the subparagraphs which go over the page.
25 11:01:37	It's very clear, just looking at what those issues

1 11:01:39	are, in terms of the representations made.
2 11:01:42	
3 11:01:43	Starting at subparagraph 16.1.1:
4 11:01:45	"The claimant's capital would be protected and they
5 11:01:48	would not lose money
6 11:01:49	16.1.2 There was only a negligible chance the
7 11:01:51	claimant's capital would fail to appreciate"
8 11:01:54	HIS HONOUR: Yes.
9 11:01:55	MR JONES: These are all pre-contractual representations.
10 11:01:57	They are very much focused at the early stage.
11 11:02:00	If one turns to the list of issues by the parties,
12 11:02:01	one can see at page 11, and then forward to page 18, for
13 11:02:03	example, in relation to the misrepresentation claim,
14 11:02:06	they are all focused on, again, pre-contractual
15 11:02:07	representations which have been relied on in the
16 11:02:09	re-amended particulars of claim. I think my learned
17 11:02:12	friend took you to those.
18 11:02:13	Unless you would like me to, I don't propose to take
19 11:02:15	you back to the claimant's re-amended particulars
20 11:02:18	of claim.
21 11:02:19	HIS HONOUR: It's the protection point.
22 11:02:21	MR TOMASON: Protection, exactly. It's all about what was
23 11:02:24	said to induce the claimant to enter into these
24 11:02:25	products.
25 11:02:27	Again, I'll develop this further, but this is the

1	11:02:30	only focus of attention in terms of agency at that
2	11:02:31	point again, subject to what happens.
3	11:02:33	
4	11:02:36	In terms of tomorrow, having discussed it with my
5	11:02:37	learned friend, we are, I think, of the view that if we
6	11:02:39	were to start again at 9.30, we would hope to get
7	11:02:42	finished bylunch.
8	11:02:43	I have checked myschedule for Thursday. I can move
9	11:02:45	things, if needs be.
10	11:02:48	The difficulty I face is, unfortunately, with my
11	11:02:49	solicitors. Mr Marke can be here for a little bit on
12	11:02:51	Thursday morning, but my associate cannot.
13	11:02:54	So I would be flying solo if I were to appear past
14	11:02:55	about 11.30 on Thursday.
15	11:02:57	I understand that there are some difficulties also
16	11:03:00	with Thursday from the defendant's side, albeit those
17	11:03:01	can be resolved.
18	11:03:03	So I think the lawyers' preference would be fairly
19	11:03:06	focused submissions tomorrow morning and try and get
20	11:03:07	through them by lunch.
21	11:03:09	HIS HONOUR: I think we should make the decision now.
22	11:03:12	In light of what you have said, I think the decision
23	11:03:13	should be that we will finish tomorrow, one way or
24	11:03:15	the other.
25	11:03:18	If, for some reason, something trickles over, it can

1 11:03:19	be dealt with in writing, even though that is
2 11:03:21	undesirable and to be avoided if at all possible. But
3 11:03:24	we will not consider continuing on Thursday.
4 11:03:25	