

BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT AND LAND USE APPEAL TRIBUNAL

Cause No. : ELAT 995/15

In the matter of:

GEORGES CHEN FEE AH YAN

&

BRUNO SAVRIMOOTOO

Appellants

v.

THE DISTRICT COUNCIL OF GRAND PORT

Respondent

Ruling:

Attorney for the Appellant has moved to withdraw on the ground that his clients are not following his instructions, more particularly on the issue of the counsel who would appear for the Appellants.

Although the Appellants have no objection for the Attorney to withdraw, we observe the following:

1. The reason for withdrawing is not simply that the Appellants are not following instructions but those instructions relate to the choice of counsel who will conduct the case.
2. This does not go to the root of the case, and, as such, to the instructions given to Attorney.
3. Bearing in mind that:
 - (i) the duties of Attorney are first and foremost to the Tribunal
 - (ii) the stage where this case has reached
 - (iii) the potential prejudice that the co-Respondent states will be caused in case of further delay, this Tribunal does not grant the motion of Attorney to withdraw, the more so that at no point has counsel Mooneepillay withdrawn from this case. His letter dated 14th July received only this

morning refers to counsel Munisamy to replace him on the dates earmarked for continuation.

In the circumstances, the motion is set aside.

Delivered by:

Mrs. Vedalini Bhadain, Chairperson,

Prof (Dr) Toolseeram Ramjeawon, Assessor.

Mr. Pravin Manna, Assessor

Date: 14/7/16