

General Legal Council office High Court of Belize Regent Street, Belize City Belize C.A

May 15th, 2025

Miss Trienia Young Registrar Supreme Court of Belize Treasury Lane Belize City Belize

Dear Madam Registrar,

Re: Complaint 5 of 2019- Donald Patchett v Audrey Matura

We write in relation to the captioned matter.

In accordance with section 17 (2) of the Legal Profession Act Cap 320 Revised Edition 2020, the General Legal Council hereby submits the enclosed decision issued in Complaint 5 of 2019- Donald Patchett v Audrey Matura.

Thank you for your kind attention to this matter.

Yours faithfully,

Kimberly Wallace

Secretary

General Legal Council

Encl: Sanction Decision of Complaint 5 of 2019

Contact us: Tel: (501) 227-0818/614-5157; Email: secretarybelizeglc@gmail.com

GENERAL LEGAL COUNCIL

IN THE MATTER OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION ACT

Complaint No. 5 of 2019

BETWEEN:

DONALD PATCHETT

COMPLAINANT

and

AUDREY MATURA

ATTORNEY-AT-LAW

PANEL:

Mr. Justice Rajiv Goonetilleke (Chair)
Mrs. Magali Marin-Young SC
Mrs. Cheryl-Lynn Vidal SC
Ms. Samantha Matute
Mr. Adler Waight

Hearing: Written Submissions Only

Submissions filed April 25th, 2025

DECISION ON SANCTIONS

Introduction

- This is the General Legal Council's (Council or GLC) decision on the sanctions, if any, to be levied against Ms. Audrey Matura (Ms. Matura) for the breach of Rule 28 of the Legal Profession (Code of Conduct) Rules (Rules).
- On April 11th, 2025, the Council delivered its decision dismissing most of the complaints made by Mr. Donald Patchett against Ms. Matura (Ms. Matura). However, the Council found that Ms. Matura breached Rule 28.
- 3. In summary, the Council found that Ms. Matura had inadvertently overlooked several of Mr. Patchett's email as Mr. Patchett's emails were sent to an email address that Ms. Matura did not have access to. As a consequence of that finding, the Council found that Ms. Matura breached Rule 28.
- 4. The Council gave Ms. Matura an opportunity to address it before imposing sanctions, if any, in this matter¹.
- 5. On April 25th, 2025, Ms. Matura submitted helpful submissions that the Council has considered in full. The Council records its appreciation for the way Ms. Matura and her counsel have generally conducted these proceedings.

Statutory Framework

- 6. The Council is empowered to issue a host of sanctions against an Attorney-at-Law².
- 7. The GLC is further guided by section 85 of the Rules. That section makes plain that a breach of the Rules is a derogation from the high standards of conduct expected from an attorney and a matter that may lead to findings of professional misconduct.

Purpose of Sanctions

- 8. The overriding aim of levying sanctions is to maintain the reputation of the legal profession.3
- Sanctions may also contain punitive elements meant to punish the offending attorney and or deter others from repeating such conduct.

¹ Section 16(2) of the Legal Profession Act

² Ibid.

³ Bolton v Law Society [1994] 1 WLR 512 at paragraph 15

10. These matters weighed heavily upon the Council when coming to its decision in this matter.

Mitigation/Submissions Made

- 11. The Council will summarize the main thrust of Ms. Matura's submissions.
- 12. Ms. Matura's counsel submitted that Ms. Matura's action would not engage of any considerations for issuing sanctions and that no sanctions should be issued.
- 13. Counsel also submitted that Mr. Patchett had direct access to Ms. Matura's email and failed to avail himself of it to the effect that Mr. Patchett bears some fault for the breakdown in communication. It was also submitted that Mr. Patchett's requests for information/communication were not "reasonably...required by...[him]" as Mr. Patchett would have been aware that he did not put Ms. Matura in funds to lodge the transfers.
- 14. Counsel also argued that Complaint No. 2 of 2020 English & Anor. v Chebat was distinguishable, and that Ms. Matura had only recently begun her private practice.

Considerations - Seriousness of Breach

15. The Council has considered that Ms. Matura's conduct was not dishonest in any way. The Council finds that the emails did not come to Ms. Matura's attention and that there was no intention on her part to ignore Mr. Patchett or to shirk her duties including the additional work, which were beyond the original retainer.

The Sanction

- 16. The Council agrees with Ms. Matura's counsel's primary point viz. that Ms. Matura's breach of Rule 28 does not engage any of the considerations for issuing sanctions.
- 17. The Council finds that no loss was caused by the breakdown of communication and that Ms. Matura's inadvertence in 2018 is not likely to be repeated.
- 18. Ms. Matura was not carrying out further services for Mr. Patchett and there was nothing Ms. Matura could have done until Mr. Patchett put her into funds to lodge the transfer documents.
- 19. The Council weighed whether a reprimand would be necessary but, after long reflection, has considered that it would not be appropriate in this instance.

- 20. Ms. Matura had recently begun her practice, and she had no further work to carry out.
- 21. Ms. Matura is not the subject of any previous disciplinary decisions and or sanctions.
- 22. That said, Ms. Matura's argument that Mr. Patchett was to be blamed for the breakdown of communication did not find favor with the Council. Ms. Matura had Mr. Patchett's email and could have also reached out to Mr. Patchett.
- 23. As to the other points raised, the Council did not find it necessary or helpful to rule on those issues.

Order

24. Drawing on the above, the Council has decided that it will issue no sanctions against Ms. Matura.

Dated the 30 of April 2025

By the General Legal Council

Mr. Justiee Rajiv Goonetilleke

Chairman

Magali Marin-Young SC

Member

Cheryl-Lynn Vidal SC

Member

Samantha Matute

Member

Adler Waight Member