

The Law Society of British Columbia
In the matter of the *Legal Profession Act*, SBC 1998, c.9
and a proceeding pursuant to s. 39 concerning

Raghbir Singh Basi

Respondent

Decision of the Benchers

Hearing date: October 1, 2004

Panel: Ralston S. Alexander, QC, Chair, Gavin Hume, QC, Terence La Liberte, QC

Counsel for the Law Society: Jean Whittow, QC

Appearing on his own behalf: Raghbir S. Basi

[1] This Panel convened on September 8, 2004 pursuant to Section 39 of the *Legal Profession Act* and Rule 4-17 of the Law Society Rules to determine whether Mr. Basi should be suspended or have conditions placed on his practise pending a final disposition of a citation that was authorized by the Discipline Committee.

[2] At the conclusion of that hearing, in oral reasons, we placed certain conditions on Mr. Basi. Written reasons were issued on September 14, 2004.

[3] We have considered the evidence provided today, and the submissions of counsel and Mr. Basi. In the result, we make the following order.

[4] This is a continuation of a proceeding ordered pursuant to the provisions of Rule 4-17 of the Rules of the Law Society. At the initial proceeding of this matter, this Panel ordered that the Respondent provide a substantive response to a letter dated May 19, 2004 which he had received from Mr. Jim Dent of Law Society staff and that that letter be provided by the Respondent to the Law Society by the close of business on September 20, 2004. There was at that time an express acknowledgement provided by the Respondent that that was more than enough time within which to respond to the Law Society's letter.

[5] We find today, as a matter of fact, that the substantive response to the Law Society was not provided within the prescribed time frame.

[6] We find further, that in any event, when the response was provided, it was a materially deficient response and that that deficiency has not been corrected.

[7] We therefore find, on a balance of probabilities, and as provided in Law Society Rule 4-17(1)(a), that the continued practice of this Respondent will be dangerous or harmful to the public or his clients, and we accordingly order that he be suspended from the practice of law effective immediately, with such suspension to be effective until the disposition of the citation authorized by the Discipline Committee on September 2, 2004.

[8] We remain seized of this matter.

