

Enhanced Legal Reference System

Purpose

This note sets out the enhancements made to the Legal Reference System of the Judiciary website in June 2022 for your general information.

The enhancements

2. As part of the Judiciary's ongoing efforts to improve our website having regard to the prevailing circumstances, the Judiciary has recently launched some enhancements to the Legal Reference System to make the searching of judgments more user friendly. In gist, more searching options and hyperlinks to cases cited in judgments with neutral citation numbers are added. Please refer to **Annex** for details. A hyperlink to the Legal Reference System is attached below for easy reference:

<https://legalref.judiciary.hk/lrs/common/ju/judgment.jsp>

3. We hope the enhancements would facilitate court users in getting the required information and will continue with our efforts in making refinements as and when necessary.

Enquiries

4. Enquiries about the enhancements may be addressed to Mr Barry Lee, Chief Judicial Clerk at 2886 6572.

Judiciary Administration
June 2022

Key New Features of the Legal Reference System

1. **Interface** – The new interface provides sleeker menus and bigger default fonts.

2. **Quick search** - It becomes a multi-value search box. In addition to case number and neutral citation number, court users may now search using this phrase, party name, and any of these words. Please use symbols " " and () @party as appropriate.



3. **Advanced search** – Court users may now search using more than four parameters. The parameters are abridged and re-ordered.

Advanced Search[\[Print\]](#)

Search for results using one or more of the following options:

this phrase	▼	
this phrase	▼	
Parties of Judgment	▼	
Coram of Judgment	▼	
Neutral Citation Number of Judgment	▼	
Case Number of Judgment	▼	
Representation	▼	
Date of Judgment	▼	

☒ **Stemming** (e.g. find "taxes" if your search word is "tax")

On appeal from : ▼ ▼

Database(s):

Judgments

Reasons for Verdict

Reasons for Sentence

Practice Directions

select all

CTRL + click to select multiple databases

Go!

New search

- [Judgments](#)
- [Search Form](#)
- [Search Help](#)

4. Hyperlinks of cases cited within a judgment - This is applicable to cases with neutral citation numbers. Court users can get access to the judgments of the cases cited by clicking the neutral citation numbers.

5. No printing of the HTML version of judgments - The print function has been removed to avoid inadvertent non-compliance with paragraph 6 of Practice Direction 5.5, which specifies that the unreported judgment should be provided in the original Word-format instead of the online format.

Home [Go to Word](#) ⓘ For PD 5.5 [6] printing

6. A recent judgment of this Court on whether indemnity costs ought to be awarded is the judgment on relief and costs handed down on 6 September 2019 in *Leung Chun Kwong v Secretary for the Civil Service* [\[2019\] HKCFA 34](#). The reasons which the successful appellant put forward as to why indemnity costs in his favour would be appropriate are set out in para 14 of that judgment. They were that the proceedings involved the public interest; that the conduct of the respondents was unreasonable; that their cases were wholly unmeritorious; and that he will be out of pocket because of the substantial contribution which he was required to make in order to obtain legal aid for the proceedings. In declining to award that appellant indemnity costs and awarding him costs to be taxed on the usual basis, this Court said as follows (at para 15):

“Whilst we have some sympathy for the appellant because of the extent to which he will be out of pocket despite winning this litigation, we are satisfied that this is not an appropriate case for indemnity taxation of the appellant’s costs. We do not consider the behaviour of the respondents in making the challenged decisions and thereafter in contesting the judicial review proceedings, then pursuing the appeal to the Court of Appeal and thereafter resisting the appeal to this Court was so unreasonable and without merit as to be deserving of a costs sanction usually reserved for those cases in which there has been something improper or inappropriate or wholly unreasonable in the administrative decisions under challenge or in the conduct of the proceedings.”