

SUPREME COURT OF QUEENSLAND

CITATION: *Barristers' Board v Pratt* [2002] QCA 532

PARTIES: **BARRISTERS' BOARD**
(applicant)
v
NORRIS HARRY PRATT
(respondent)

FILE NO/S: Appeal No 10612 of 2002

DIVISION: Court of Appeal

PROCEEDING: Miscellaneous Application - Civil

DELIVERED
EXTEMPORE ON: 5 December 2002

DELIVERED AT: Brisbane

HEARING DATE: 5 December 2002

JUDGES: de Jersey CJ, Helman and Philippides JJ
Judgment of the Court

ORDER: **Order that the name of the respondent be removed from the Roll of Barristers.**

CATCHWORDS: PROFESSIONS AND TRADES – LAWYERS –
REMOVAL OF NAME FROM ROLL – application for
removal of respondent from Barristers' Roll on grounds that
he had pleaded guilty to 12 child sexual offences –
consideration of duties and necessary attributes of barristers

COUNSEL: R Trotter for the applicant

SOLICITORS: Hemming & Hart for the applicant

THE CHIEF JUSTICE: The Barristers' Board has applied for an order that the name of the respondent Norris Harry Pratt be removed from the roll of barristers. Mr Pratt does not oppose, indeed consents to, such an order.

On 18 December 2001, the respondent pleaded guilty to 12 offences committed over the period 31 December 1991 to 1 January 1993. They included carnal knowledge by anal intercourse, indecent dealing with a male under the age of 16

years, wilful exposure of a child under 16 years and taking an indecent photograph of a male under 16 years. The respondent was sentenced to an effective term of two and a-half years' imprisonment.

The respondent has previously practised as a barrister and served as a judicial officer in Papua New Guinea, and as a Crown Prosecutor in the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions in Queensland.

Personal offending of such gravity carried on over a substantial period is inimical to the high standard of respect for the law, integrity, trustworthiness and common decency expected of members of the Bar both by the Courts of law and the public. It is intolerable to think that the Court would hold out as fit to practise as a barrister a person who has shown such blatant disrespect for the law he is ethically and otherwise obliged to uphold. No response, short of striking off, should be made in this situation.

There will accordingly be an order that the name of the respondent be removed from the roll of barristers and, in so saying, I express the view of the Court with the concurrence of my colleagues.
