

IN THE INDEPENDENT LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION

AT SUVA

ILSC CASE NO. 005 OF 2025

ILSC CASE NO. 006 OF 2025

ILSC CASE NO. 011 OF 2025

BETWEEN : **THE CHIEF REGISTRAR**

APPLICANT

AND : **JADHAV PRAKASHAN**

RESPONDENT

Counsel : **Ms R Wati and Mr S Nand for the Chief Registrar**
Respondent in Person

Date of Hearing : **30 September 2025**

Date of Decision : **8 October 2025**

Date of Sanction : **24 November 2025**

SANCTION

Introduction

[1] This matter concerns the Respondent, Jadhav Prakashan, who has been found guilty of four counts of Professional Misconduct, contrary to Section 82(1)(a) and Section 108(2) of the Legal Practitioners Act 2009. The misconduct arose from his repeated and willful failures to respond to statutory complaint notices issued by the Chief Registrar in relation to complaints lodged by Urnesh Lata, Sanjay Anand Rai, Sibhod Prasad, and Atesh Ram.

Findings

- [2] The Commission finds that these failures constitutes serious misconduct which undermines the regulatory framework established to protect the public and uphold the reputation of the legal profession in Fiji. Such repeated disregard for statutory notices by the Chief Registrar erodes public confidence and demonstrates the Respondent's unfitness to remain in practice.

Legal Principles

- [3] The Commission reiterates the principles established in *Chief Registrar v Ligabalavu* FJILSC 3, and reaffirmed in *Chief Registrar v Bukarau* FJILSC 2 and *Chief Registrar v Seruvatu* FJILSC 4, that non-compliance with the Chief Registrar's lawful requests raises serious concerns regarding a practitioner's suitability for practice. As cited in *Singh v Chief Registrar* FJCA 141; ABU 58.2013, disregard for the regulator's attempts to protect the public fundamentally undermines the regime established by Parliament.

Determination

- [4] The Respondent was afforded ample opportunity to respond, including extensions granted upon request. He failed and declined to provide any substantive response or credible explanation. His pattern of selective engagement with the regulator, responding only to matters that served his interests, exhibits willful non-compliance. The unverified, unsigned medical documentation is insufficient to provide a reasonable excuse for his sustained lack of response across multiple complaints over more than a year.
- [5] This conduct resulted in:
- Undue delay and prejudice to legitimate complainants.
 - Denial of procedural fairness to the complainants.
 - Undermining of the regulatory framework under the Act.

- Erosion of public confidence in the profession and its regulator.

[6] There are no mitigating factors. Aggravating features include repeated disregard for regulatory authority, failure to respond to four separate complaints, and lack of a credible explanation. The Commission considers the conduct to constitute serious professional misconduct, requiring firm sanction to protect the public, uphold professional standards, and deter future breaches.

Orders

[7] Pursuant to sections 121 and 124 of the Legal Practitioners Act 2009, the following sanctions are imposed:

1. **Suspension**

The Respondent is suspended from holding or applying for a practising certificate until he has:

- Furnished written responses satisfactory to the Chief Registrar regarding all outstanding complaints.
- Paid all fines and costs ordered herein.

2. **Public Reprimand**

The Respondent is publicly reprimanded for his serious and repeated acts of professional misconduct. The reprimand shall be recorded on the Commission's register and notified to the Legal Practitioners Unit.

3. **Fine and Costs**

The Respondent shall pay:

- \$2,000 fine to the Independent Legal Services Commission; and
- \$1,000 costs to the Chief Registrar (Legal Practitioners Unit).

These sums are to be paid within sixty (60) days of this ruling.

4. **Trust Account and Receivership**

The freeze on the Respondent's law firm trust account shall continue. All trust property and client files shall be managed under receivership by an appointee of the Chief Registrar until the Commission is satisfied that all client interests and statutory obligations are protected.

5. **Further Orders for Non-Compliance**

Should the Respondent fail to comply with the requirements regarding written responses or the payment of fines and costs, the Commission may, upon application, consider further sanction including striking the Respondent off the roll of legal practitioners.




.....
Justice Daniel Goundar
COMMISSIONER

Solicitors:

Legal Practitioners Unit for the Applicant

Respondent in Person