

documents necessary to support their case. This is also evident from prayer 6 of the Notice of Motion in the main application. It is therefore premature to conclude under these circumstances that by refraining from disclosing their defence to the charge in this application as it now stands, the Bobroffs are playing possum.

[69] The Bobroffs have also made it clear in the papers before this Court that in the event the Court decides to take over the disciplinary processes from the Law Society, they must then be given an opportunity to file their defence properly to the complaint against them.

[70] The allegation that the Law Society allows the Bobroffs to play possum has no merit. There is no provision in the Act which empowers or obligates the Law Society to prescribe to an attorney facing a Disciplinary Enquiry as to how he/she must plead his/her case. As with the other complaints, this attack is premature. The Bobroffs have pleaded not guilty to the charges in the Enquiry³¹ and they have indicated their preparedness to state their case should the proceedings be conducted in this Court. Such Enquiry could not proceed mainly because the Grahams themselves twice requested that the Disciplinary Enquiry be postponed.

³¹ On 13 June 2013.