Accident victims aideg v schen

BY VICKY WONG

to afford private litigation. ordinary legal aid but too poor who were too rich to qualify for Aid Scheme which was set up under the Supplementary Legal accident victims from four years ago to help those ages has been recovered for Hongkong's "sandwich class" ABOUT \$12.5 million in dam-

a total of 46 cases had been one of these had been won. concluded to date, and all but which administers the scheme, the Legal Aid Department North, an assistant director of According to Mr Tony

cluded so far might seem small compared with the number of years the scheme had been run-The number of cases con-

ning, Mr North said. But this was not unusual in

court, are taken on.

sessed, could be determined. the accident since it took time before the full extent of injulegal process and because pertook cases to move through the ries, on which damages were asally not litigated too soon after sonal injuries cases were gener-

gated now concerned victims tion, Mr North said. the scheme's first year of operawho had applied for aid during Some of the cases being liti-

der the scheme and 155 cases were still pending, while 126 cations had been received unhad been turned down. To date, a total of 366 appli-

cal negligence, which can be ex-tremely difficult to prove in dealing with dental and medisonal injury cases, except those Under the scheme, only per-

> dents. the rest are made by those hurt thirds of the applications which industrial or construction acciin other ways, such as through have been made so far, while tims account for some two-Road traffic accident vic- Viee

of thousands of dollars in law-

yers tees, and court costs, to have cost the scheme hundreds

pared with the normal legal aid criteria of \$2,700 and \$15,000 in disposable capital, comin earnings and assets respeca month or more than \$100,000 able income exceeding \$15,000 applicant cannot have a dispos-To qualify for assistance, an

\$1,000 "application fee" for the cases taken on need only pay a rowed from the Lotteries Fund accident victims who get their was set up with money bor-Under the scheme, which

litigation effort.
Should they lose, the \$1,000

liability even though it may

Should they win, however, a proportion of their damages award is expected to go back n sımılar circumstances can be into the scheme so that others take on the litigation.

helped in the future under the self-financing nature of the

amount of money due after a prohibited by law in England arrangement is accepted prac-tice in the United States, but is tavourable ruling. party seeking damages the ful because the scheme denies the Such a "contingency fee"

fee arrangements are also pro-hibited by law, except in the In Hongkong, contingency

already paid limits their case of sandwich class accident victims.

percentage of the damage healthy with about \$550,000 having been received so far as a awards won. funding appears relatively At present, the scheme's

\$400,000 the scheme borrowed ready been repaid. from the Lotteries Fund has al-And nearly half of the

could plunge the fund deeply lars in court costs. hundreds of thousands of dolinto the red if it had to pay out that the loss of just one big case Mr North noted, however,

still lost, Mr North added. million in costs might be run appealed all the way to the Privy Council in London and up it a complicated case was It is even possible that \$1