

QUEENSLAND CIVIL AND ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL

CITATION: *Legal Services Commissioner v Scott* [2025] QCAT 334

PARTIES: **LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSIONER**
(applicant)

v

LIAM SHANE SCOTT
(respondent)

APPLICATION NO/S: OCR297-23

MATTER TYPE: Occupational regulation matters

DELIVERED ON: 5 September 2025

HEARING DATE: 13 December 2024

HEARD AT: Brisbane

DECISION OF: Justice Mellifont, President

Assisted by:

Ms Petrina Macpherson, Practitioner Panel Member

Ms Patrice McKay, Lay Panel Member

ORDERS:

- 1. The respondent's conduct subject of the discipline application is characterised as professional misconduct.**
- 2. Pursuant to s 456(2)(a) of the *Legal Profession Act 2007* (Qld), it is recommended the respondent's name is removed from the local roll.**
- 3. The respondent pay the applicant's costs of and incidental to the discipline application, such costs to be agreed or assessed on the standard basis on the Supreme Court Scale under the *Uniform Civil Procedure Rules 1999* (Qld).**

CATCHWORDS:

PROFESSIONS AND TRADES – LAWYERS – COMPLAINTS AND DISCIPLINE – PROFESSIONAL MISCONDUCT AND UNSATISFACTORY PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT – CRIMINAL OFFENCES – where the respondent was convicted of 15 serious offences – where the serious offences involved child exploitation material and the recording of the genitalia of others in breach of their privacy – where the respondent pleaded guilty and was sentenced to two years' imprisonment, suspended after four months – where the applicant filed a discipline application in the Tribunal – where the parties reached an agreement as to characterisation and sanction – where the Tribunal is required to determine the appropriate

characterisation and sanction – whether the respondent’s conduct should be characterised as professional misconduct – whether the Tribunal should recommend the respondent’s name be removed from the local roll

Criminal Code (Cth) s 474.19, s 474.22

Criminal Code (Qld) s 228D, s 227A(2), s 228B(1)

Legal Profession Act 2007 (Qld) s 5, s 9, s 418, s 419, s 420(1)(c)(i), s 456(2), s 462(1)

Allinson v General Council of Medical Education and Registration [1894] 1 QB 750

Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner v Morcom [2016] SASFC 121

Legal Practitioners Conduct Board v Power [2013] SASFC 118

Queensland v Legal Services Commissioner & Anor; Legal Services Commissioner v Shand [2018] QCA 66

Legal Services Commissioner v Ferguson [2021] QCAT 205

Legal Services Commissioner v Madden (No 2) [2008] QCA 301

Watts v Legal Services Commissioner [2016] QCA 224

APPEARANCES &
REPRESENTATION:

This matter was heard and determined on the papers pursuant to s 32 of the *Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009* (Qld)

REASONS FOR DECISION

Background

- [1] In May 2022, Mr Liam Shane Scott (‘Mr Scott’) was convicted of 15 criminal offences. Those offences included the making of child exploitation material (‘CEM’), possessing CEM and recording multiple adults’ ‘genital region’ in breach of their privacy.
- [2] The offending conduct occurred over a span of more than five years, between 26 March 2015 and 14 September 2020, while Mr Scott was an Australian lawyer. Amongst other conduct, Mr Scott installed spy cameras in rooms within his home to record individuals, including his partner’s female relative who was between 13 to 14 years old at the time of the offences. He pleaded guilty to a number of State and Commonwealth offences in respect of this conduct in the District Court at Toowoomba on 3 May 2022 before her Honour Judge McGinness. He was sentenced to various concurrent terms of imprisonment, the highest of which was two years, suspended after four months. He was also placed on two years’ probation.
- [3] On 6 February 2023, the Legal Services Commission wrote to Mr Scott advising him that the Commission was aware of the offending and the plea of guilty, having received information as a result of a newspaper article published in the Toowoomba Chronicle. The Commission requested that he provide submissions about the alleged conduct.

- [4] On 18 February 2023, Mr Scott provided submissions to the Commission confirming that he had pleaded guilty to the offences in the District Court and had been sentenced. He admitted that he had engaged in conduct that constitutes professional misconduct under the *Legal Profession Act 2007* (Qld) ('LPA'). Mr Scott expressly stated that he accepts and admits that the Tribunal should find that his conduct be characterised as professional misconduct and requested that the matter be dealt with by the Tribunal on the papers.
- [5] On 4 December 2023, the Legal Services Commissioner filed a discipline application against the Mr Scott which contains one charge:
- On various dates between 26 March 2015 and 14 September 2020, the Respondent engaged in conduct for which he was convicted of serious offences involving the possession and production of child exploitation material, using a carriage service to access child pornography and child abuse material, and recording in breach of privacy.
- [6] On 17 April 2024, Mr Scott filed his response to the disciplinary application, admitting to the alleged conduct, and stating that he had thereby engaged in professional misconduct of a nature that is likely to a material degree to bring the legal profession into disrepute. Further, he admitted the alleged conduct demonstrates that he is not a fit and proper person to remain on the roll of persons admitted to the legal profession.
- [7] Mr Scott accepts and admits the conduct the subject of the charge. The parties jointly submit that:
- (a) the alleged conduct should be characterised as professional misconduct; and
 - (b) if the Tribunal is satisfied that the Mr Scott has engaged in professional misconduct, that an order be made pursuant to s 456(2)(a) of the *LPA* recommending that the name of the Mr Scott be removed from the local roll.
- [8] Mr Scott has, by his admissions in his response to the Commission's letter and by his response to the disciplinary application, demonstrated the earliest possible acknowledgement of wrongdoing and insight into the nature of his offending. He has cooperated with the Tribunal to the greatest extent possible seeking to have the matter disposed of without contest, and on the papers, from the outset.

The Facts

Respondent

- [9] Mr Scott is 50 years old and was admitted to the legal profession in Queensland on 8 July 1996. He has not held a practising certificate in Queensland since 30 June 2010.
- [10] At the time of the alleged conduct, being between 26 March 2015 and 14 September 2020, Mr Scott was employed as a law lecturer at the University of Southern Queensland in Toowoomba.
- [11] At all material times, Mr Scott was an Australian lawyer as defined by s 5(1) of the *LPA* and a local lawyer pursuant to s 5(2).

Charge – Engaged in conduct for which there was conviction of a serious offence

- [12] On 14 September 2020, the Queensland Police Service ('QPS') executed a search warrant at Mr Scott's residence in Upper Flagstone in the state of Queensland. During

the execution of the search warrant, the QPS seized Mr Scott's electronic devices and discovered hidden cameras in the guest bathroom of the Mr Scott's residence. They also found evidence that a camera was previously hidden in Mr Scott's guest bedroom.

[13] In the course of reviewing the material, the QPS found the following on Mr Scott's mobile phone:

- (a) 88 CEM 'category 2' images depicting female children aged between 12 to 14 years old, which show the breasts and/or genitalia of the children depicted; and
- (b) images showing naked, half-naked, and clothed people from within the guest bathroom and guest bedroom of Mr Scott's residence, which were captured using hidden cameras.

[14] The QPS also analysed Mr Scott's computer and internal hard drive which revealed:

- (a) browser history revealing 188 matches for the search term 'Lolitas'. Almost all these searches also included the file name 'LS Studios', being a common genre of CEM depicting real girls aged approximately 10 to 14 years old;
- (b) 315 files tagged as 'LS studios' files, which had subsequently been deleted;
- (c) over 14,000 'LS Model' or similar photographs had been downloaded by the defendant, which had subsequently been deleted; and
- (d) 35 cached images depicting people being recorded in either a bedroom or bathroom, most of which the QPS recognised as having been recorded within Mr Scott's residence, which had subsequently been deleted.

[15] On 22 April 2021, Mr Scott voluntarily attended the Toowoomba Police Station in Queensland where he was arrested. He was ultimately charged with the following offences:

- (a) one count of possessing CEM in contravention of s 228D of the *Criminal Code* (Qld) ('*Qld Code*');
- (b) one count of using a carriage service to access child pornography material in contravention of s 474.19(1)(a)(i), (aa), (b) of the *Criminal Code* (Cth) ('*Commonwealth Code*');
- (c) one count of using a carriage service to access child abuse material in contravention of s 474.22(1) (a)(i), (aa), (b) of the *Commonwealth Code*;
- (d) 11 counts of recording in breach of privacy (genital or anal region) in contravention of s 227A(2) of the *Qld Code*; and
- (e) one count of making child exploitation material in contravention of s 228B(1) of the *Qld Code*.

(together (a) – (e) are referred to as 'Serious Offences').

[16] On 3 May 2022, Mr Scott was arraigned in the District Court at Toowoomba and convicted on his own plea of guilty of the offences. The learned sentencing Judge stated the following:

By way of summary, on the 14th of September 2020, police executed a search warrant at your home to search for child exploitation material. They seized your electronic devices which were analysed. They located 88 child exploitation

category 2 images, and also evidence that you had accessed such material over a period of time as outlined in the indictment. You had subsequently deleted the files that you had previously accessed. Police also located some spy cameras you had installed in the guest bathroom at your home, and further evidence that one had previously been installed in the guest bedroom.

Analysis of your devices revealed photographs of 12 identifiable victims' genitals and/or breast area. The victims included house guests, extended family members and colleagues, aged between 15 and 43. For example, there was an image of [a significant person in your life] and images which could be traced to some of [their] friends. Most seriously were photographs of your partner's [relative] who was aged approximately ... 13 to 14 at the time. Those images, some of those were recorded in their home by a portable recorder that you had taken when you visited. You were arrested and charged, and you exercised your right of silence; although I accept that during the police search, you did cooperate fully with them. I have two victim statements that have been tendered from your former partner and also from [their relative]. It is clear from those statements that they have suffered devastating and ongoing adverse impact, and I have regard to the material therein.

I also have read and have regard to a large amount of material that has been tendered on your behalf. First, there is Ms Addison forensic pathologist's pre-sentence assessment, also the treatment summary report from psychologist Ms Landers. She confirms that you have engaged consistently and positively with therapy sessions focused on sexual offending. You have been attending regularly since the 28th of September 2020. As a result of your commitment during those sessions, she considers that you have significantly increased your insight, that you are remorseful. You have shown shame and guilt as a result of your offending, and she has assessed you as a low-risk of reoffending.

Ms Landers, as I say, she assessed you for the purposes of providing a forensic report. Ms Addison, she considers that you do have a number of protective factors, and she has assessed you as being at a moderate risk of reoffending, without further counselling. I believe it is appropriate to make sure that you receive that as part of the sentence I impose. Ms Landers also has concerns for your safety and wellbeing in a custodial setting, having regard to a number of factors personal to you. A number of references have also been provided. They are very supportive of you. They speak highly of your many positive qualities and your contribution over the years within the Toowoomba community. I also note the significant adverse consequences that you have suffered in relation to your career as outlined by those letters of support, and they also indicate that they have witnessed you demonstrating shame and remorse due to your offending.

Mr Scott, I do have regard to your early pleas of guilty which show a cooperation with the administration of justice, and your lack of criminal history or any subsequent indication of offending. You are a person who has exhibited traits of otherwise good character and community work over the years. As I have already indicated, I do accept that you have suffered significant consequences. This has been a significant fall from grace for you. You had achieved a lot over the years through your profession which you will no longer be able to do in the future. I also have regard to your positive steps for a significant period of time to engage in counselling to rehabilitate.

Of course, as you are aware, there are a number of serious features to your offending, the child exploitation material that you possessed is serious. Possession of such images does not support a market that involves serious

exploitation of material. The recordings of unsuspecting women within your home and the child within her own home are particularly serious offences as well. These people were entitled to feel safe when they visited you and your partner, and the child in particular was entitled to feel safe in her own home. Her parents had welcomed you there and they trusted you, and you abused their trust.

General and personal deterrence and the need for denunciation are particularly relevant in sentencing you today, as, of course, are the principles of rehabilitation. I have had regard to the comparable decisions that have been referred to by the Prosecution and Defence. In relation to counts 2 and 3, which are Commonwealth offences, I have regard to the matters set out in section 16A of the Crimes Act. In relation to count 1 and count 15, I have regard to the matters set out in section 9 of the Penalties and Sentences Act, including those matters in subsections (4) and (6), where it is indicated that a term of imprisonment must be imposed unless there are exceptional circumstances.

Those serious features of your offending in total have led me to the conclusion that although there are a number of factors positive to you, that exceptional circumstances do not exist. I also have regard to section 17A of the Crimes Act, and have reached the conclusion that a sentence of imprisonment is the only appropriate sentence to impose. I am required to state my reasons, and they are based primarily on the objective serious nature of the offences, having regard to the comparable decisions to which I have been referred.¹

- [17] With respect to the State offences, Mr Scott was sentenced to various concurrent terms of imprisonment, the highest of which was two years' imprisonment, suspended after four months. Mr Scott was also ordered to perform probation for two years. With respect to the Commonwealth offences, Mr Scott was sentenced to 18 months on each offence, concurrently, to be released after four months on a two year good behaviour recognisance in the sum of \$1,000.00.

Legislative Framework

- [18] Pursuant to s 456(1) of the *LPA*, if the Tribunal is satisfied that Mr Scott has engaged in unsatisfactory professional conduct or professional misconduct, the Tribunal may make any order it deems fit.
- [19] It is therefore necessary for the Tribunal to first decide whether Mr Scott's conduct constitutes either unsatisfactory professional conduct or professional misconduct before an order under s 456 of the *LPA* can be made.

Meaning of unsatisfactory professional conduct and professional misconduct

- [20] Section 418 of the *LPA* provides:

Unsatisfactory professional conduct includes conduct of an Australian legal practitioner happening in connection with the practice of law that falls short of the standard of competence and diligence that a member of the public is entitled to expect of a reasonably competent Australian legal practitioner.

¹ Transcript of Proceedings, *R v Liam Shane Scott* (District Court, 20/22, Judge McGinness, 3 May 2022) 2-3.

[21] Section 419 of the *LPA* provides:

- (1) **Professional misconduct** includes –
 - (a) unsatisfactory professional conduct of an Australian legal practitioner, if the conduct involves a substantial or consistent failure to reach or maintain a reasonable standard of competence and diligence; and
 - (b) conduct of an Australian legal practitioner, whether happening in connection with the practice of law or happening otherwise than in connection with the practice of law that would, if established, justify a finding that the practitioner is not a fit and proper person to engage in legal practice.
- (2) For a finding that an Australian legal practitioner is not a fit and proper person to engage in legal practice as mentioned in subsection (1), regard may be had to the suitability matters that would be considered if the practitioner were an applicant for admission or for the grant or renewal of a local practising certificate.

[22] Suitability matters are described in s 9(1) of the *LPA* and include:

- (a) whether the person is currently of good fame and character;
- ...
- (e) whether the person is or has been convicted of an offence in Australia ... and if so:
 - (i) the nature of the offence; and
 - (ii) how long ago the offence was committed; and
 - (iii) the person's age when the offence was committed.

[23] Section 420(1)(c)(i) of the *LPA* provides that conduct for which there is a conviction for a serious offence, is conduct capable of constituting unsatisfactory professional conduct or professional misconduct.

[24] 'Serious offence' is defined as an offence, whether committed in or outside of Queensland, that is an indictable offence against the law of the Commonwealth or any jurisdiction, whether or not the offence is or may be dealt with summarily.²

[25] The offences committed by Mr Scott pursuant to s 3(3) of the *Qld Code* are indictable offences and are therefore serious offences as defined in the *LPA*. Pursuant to s 420(1)(c)(i) of the *LPA*, it follows that the conduct in relation to the charge is capable of constituting professional misconduct or unsatisfactory professional conduct.

[26] Professional misconduct was described in *Allinson v General Council of Medical Education and Registration* [1894] 1 QB 750, 763 ('*Allinson*') as requiring proof of conduct which 'would be reasonably regarded as disgraceful or dishonourable by his professional brethren of good repute and competency'. The Tribunal applied the test in *Legal Services Commissioner v Ferguson* [2021] QCAT 205 ('*Ferguson*'). It was a case where the practitioner, Mr Ferguson, was also charged and convicted of possessing CEM and using a carriage service to transmit child pornography. The

² *Legal Profession Act*, sch 2, definition of 'serious offence' para (a) ('*LPA*').

Tribunal applied *Allinson* in finding that the conduct of Mr Ferguson was professional misconduct stating:

...there can be no doubt that the conduct for which the Respondent was convicted would be reasonably regarded as disgraceful or dishonourable by other members of the profession of good repute and competency.

It was, therefore, conduct which would justify a finding that, at the time of the conduct, the Respondent was not a fit and proper person to engage in legal practice.

The Tribunal finds that the Respondent engaged in professional misconduct.³

Characterisation of the Conduct – Professional Misconduct

[27] In sentencing Mr Scott, the learned sentencing Judge of the District Court stated:

The child exploitation material that you possessed is serious. Possession of such images does support a market that involves serious exploitation of material. The 25 recordings of unsuspecting women within your home and the child within her own home are particularly serious offences as well. These people were entitled to feel safe when they visited you and your partner, and the child, in particular, was entitled to feel safe in her own home. Her parents had welcomed you there and they trusted you, and you abused their trust.⁴

[28] An Australian lawyer who is placed in a position of trust and abuses that position by engaging in criminal offences involving children, justifies a finding that the practitioner is not a fit and proper person to engage in legal practice. It follows that such conduct is correctly characterised as professional misconduct for the purposes of s 419(1)(b) of the *LPA*.

[29] The present case involves not only a conviction for possessing CEM, but also convictions for:

- (a) one count of making CEM;
- (b) two counts of using a carriage service to access CEM; and
- (c) 11 counts of recording in breach of privacy.

[30] Mr Scott's conduct involved a premeditated plan to use his position of trust to create CEM.

Sanction

[31] In considering whether an order recommending the name of a practitioner be removed from the local roll should be made, the Tribunal must consider whether the practitioner is a fit and proper person at the time of the hearing⁵ and whether 'the probability is that the practitioner is permanently unfit to practice'.⁶

[32] It is well established that the purpose of making disciplinary orders pursuant to s 456 of the *LPA* is not to punish Mr Scott, but to protect the public.⁷ Such orders protect

³ *Legal Services Commissioner v Ferguson* [2021] QCAT 205, [15]-[17] ('*Ferguson*').

⁴ Transcript of Proceedings, *R v Liam Shane Scott* (District Court, 20/22, Judge McGinness, 3 May 2022) 3.

⁵ *Legal Services Commissioner v Madden (No 2)* [2008] QCA 301, [132] ('*Madden*').

⁶ *Watts v Legal Services Commissioner* [2016] QCA 224, [46] ('*Watts*').

⁷ *Madden*, [122].

the public by preserving the ‘good standing of the legal profession and of the Roll as the Court’s endorsement of the fitness of those enrolled’.⁸

[33] As stated by McMurdo JA (with whom Morrison JA and Brown J agreed):

The community needs to have confidence that only fit and proper persons are able to practise as lawyers and if that standing, and thereby that confidence, is diminished, the effectiveness of the legal profession, in the service of clients, the courts, and the public is prejudiced. The Court’s Roll of practitioners is an endorsement of the fitness of those who are enrolled.⁹

[34] Unsurprisingly, several other cases concerning the type of offending committed by Mr Scott have resulted in findings that the practitioner is not a fit and proper person to practise.

[35] In *Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner v Morcom* [2016] SASCFC 121 (*‘Morcom’*), the respondent solicitor was convicted of six counts of possessing child pornography and one count of possessing an unlicensed firearm, coupled with breaching a suspended sentence bond, a supervised bail agreement and an undertaking not to practise. The various offences led the Full Court to find that the solicitor was not a fit and proper person to remain on the roll of practitioners.

[36] The solicitor’s offending in *Morcom* concerned numerous offences. Specifically, in relation to the child pornography and firearm offences, the Court stated that:

The child pornography and firearm charges are both offences of a nature that carry such a stigma, and reveal such defects of character, that they tend to undermine the ability of the Practitioner to command the necessary respect of clients and other members of the legal profession. Allowing practitioners with convictions of this nature to continue to practise also carries a risk of damaging the reputation and standing of the legal profession in the public eye. As observed earlier, maintenance of public confidence and trust in the legal profession is important to the effective functioning of the profession.¹⁰

[37] In *Legal Practitioners Conduct Board v Power* [2013] SASCFC 118 (*‘Power’*), the practitioner involved was removed from the local roll as a result of conduct and convictions involving the indecent filming of persons (including minors) and the possession of child pornography.

[38] The facts in *Power* and the present case have various similarities:

- (a) In both cases the respondents were convicted of 15 offences spanning over several years. They involved the possession of CEM and the indecent filming of both adults and children without their knowledge.
- (b) The offending in both cases were not isolated instances or lapses of judgment. Rather, the conduct required some degree of sophistication and premeditation.
- (c) Both cases involved the respondents installing hidden cameras in their homes and recoding guests who attended their homes without their knowledge.

⁸ *Attorney-General of the State of Queensland v Legal Services Commissioner & Anor; Legal Services Commissioner v Shand* [2018] QCA 66, [58] (*‘Shand’*).

⁹ *Shand*, [55].

¹⁰ *Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner v Morcom* [2016] SASCFC 121, [105].

- (d) In *Power*, the practitioner was sentenced to 15 months' imprisonment with a non-parole period of four months. Mr Scott, in the present case, was sentenced to two years' imprisonment, suspended after serving four months.
- (e) Part of the offending occurred in circumstances where the respondents were placed in a position of trust, and they abused that trust.

[39] In *Power*, the Full Court carefully considered whether removal from the local roll was appropriate having regard to the mitigating circumstances at hand. Removal from the roll was ultimately ordered despite the Court accepting that the practitioner was genuinely remorseful, demonstrated insight into his conduct, had taken positive steps towards rehabilitation, addressed the conflict between his religious beliefs and his sexuality, and was unlikely to reoffend.¹¹

[40] The Court highlighted that the offences disclosed such defects of character that if left to remain on the roll, would plainly bring the profession into disrepute:

By allowing a practitioner to remain on the Roll of Practitioners, this court holds the practitioner out as a fit and proper person to practice. The offences disclose character defects that affect the practitioner's capacity and fitness to be a practitioner. They involved a serious breach of the law. They are of a kind that damage a practitioner's ability to maintain a relationship of trust and confidence with other members of the profession and with clients. The public could not have complete confidence in a person with such serious and recent convictions. To continue to hold the practitioner out as a fit and proper person to remain a member of the profession would bring the profession into disrepute.¹²

[41] The Court concluded that to sufficiently protect the public and maintain the public's confidence in the legal profession and the administration of justice, the practitioner's name should be removed from the local roll.¹³

[42] Not all convictions for child pornography offences will result in removal from the local roll. In *Ferguson* (which involved convictions for possessing CEM and using a carriage service to transmit child pornography), the Tribunal ordered that Mr Ferguson be publicly reprimanded, suspended from practice for three years and that he continue to attend psychiatric consultations over a period of time.¹⁴

[43] The Tribunal does not consider that a suspension, like that ordered in *Ferguson*, is appropriate here. Whilst Mr Scott has shown shame, remorse, insight and engaged in treatment, the Tribunal is of the view that the nature of the offending committed by Mr Scott is to demonstrate such character flaws that a suspension is not sufficient. The offending was over many years, with a degree of sophistication and premeditation and abuse of trust. The offending resulted in fifteen recorded convictions and attracted actual terms of imprisonment.

[44] In this case, suspension from practising would not be an appropriate sanction to sufficiently protect the public and the profession's standing. The offending carries 'such a stigma, and [reveals] such defects of character' (to use the words of Kourakis CJ, Blue and Doyle JJ in *Morcom*) that it is not likely Mr Scott will ever to be of an

¹¹ *Legal Practitioners Conduct Board v Power* [2013] SASFC 118, [33] ('*Power*').

¹² *Power* [2013] SASFC 118, [39].

¹³ *Power* [2013] SASFC 118, [40].

¹⁴ *Ferguson*, [46].

appropriate character to resume practise. To endorse him as a fit and proper person to remain a member of the profession would bring the profession into disrepute.

- [45] The Tribunal finds that that the allegations against Mr Scott have been made out on the balance of probabilities, and that:
- (a) the respondent's conduct in respect of the charge should be characterised as professional misconduct; and
 - (b) an order should be made, pursuant to s 456(2)(a) of the *LPA*, recommending that the name of the respondent be removed from the local roll.

Costs

- [46] Section 462(1) of the *LPA* states:

A disciplinary body must make an order requiring a person whom it has found to have engaged in prescribed conduct to pay costs, including costs of the commissioner and the complainant, unless the disciplinary body is satisfied exceptional circumstances exist.

- [47] There are no exceptional circumstances in this case justifying an order departing from s 462(1) of the *LPA*.
- [48] The Tribunal orders that Mr Scott pay the Legal Services Commissioner's costs of and incidental to the discipline application, such costs to be agreed or assessed on the standard basis on the Supreme Court scale under the *Uniform Civil Procedure Rules 1999* (Qld).