

**DECISION OF THE
DISCIPLINARY COMMITTEE OF THE GENERAL LEGAL COUNCIL**

COMPLAINT NO. 177 of 2024

**IN THE MATTER OF ALLISON JOANNA BECKFORD v
ANTONEITA A. HALL, an Attorney-at-Law.
AND
IN THE MATTER OF THE LEGAL PROFESSION ACT,
1971**

PANEL: Ms. Tana'ania Small, KC - Chairperson
Mr. Kevin O. Powell, KC
Ms. Delrose Campbell

APPEARANCES: Ms. Allison Joanna Beckford

HEARING: October 4, 2025, November 8, 2025 and November 22, 2025

Introduction

1. Allison Joanna Beckford ("the Complainant") makes this complaint by Form of Application Against an Attorney-at-Law dated November 9, 2024 and Form of Affidavit by Applicant sworn to by her on the same date. The Complainant has alleged herself aggrieved by an act of professional misconduct committed by attorney-at-law, Antoneita A. Hall ("the Attorney").
2. The Complainant's ground of complaint is that the Attorney is in breach of Canon VI(d) which states that **"...an Attorney shall not give a professional undertaking which he cannot fulfil and shall fulfil every such undertaking which he gives."**
3. Before considering the substantive complaint, the Panel notes that the Attorney did not participate in the matter. Despite being served with notice of the hearing for October 4, 2025, the Attorney did not attend the hearing, send a representative or an apology for absence. The Complainant was present and ready to proceed. The Panel therefore proceeded with the hearing in the

absence of the Attorney pursuant to Rule 8 of the Fourth Schedule to the Legal Professional Act entitled Legal Profession (Disciplinary Proceedings) Rules.

4. The Panel decided it would take the Complainant's evidence and adjourn for the notes of the evidence to be sent to the Attorney giving her an opportunity to respond and/or make herself and/or her counsel attend the next hearing to cross-examine the Complainant, give evidence or make submissions. Having taken the Complainant's evidence on October 8, 2025 notice of the next hearing date and the notes of his evidence were sent to the Attorney on November 3, 2025.
5. When the Panel reconvened on November 8, 2025 the Attorney did not attend, was not represented and did not send an apology.

The Factual Background

6. The Complainant's evidence can be shortly stated.
7. In February 2024 the Complainant purchased from the Attorney a property in Norwood, St. James registered at Volume 1305 Folio 621 of the Register Book of Titles ("the Property").
8. As a part of that transaction the Attorney issued a letter dated February 13, 2024 on her professional letterhead to a mortgage documentation officer at the National Commercial Bank. The caption to the letter read: **"Proposed Sale/Purchase of Part of Norwood Pen and Paradise Pen, Saint James- Strata Lot 3 – Lots 49 & 65 – Volume 1305 Folio 621 – Antoneita Hall to Allison Beckford."**
9. The letter stated: **"I, Antoneita Hall, hereby give my professional undertaking to pay all outstanding maintenance fees associated with the unit at captioned up to date of possession."**
10. Despite this undertaking, the Attorney did not pay the outstanding maintenance and on August 8, 2024 the Complainant was informed by the management

company that based on the account balance they were “required to initiate the power of sale application.” In October 2024 the Complainant wrote to the Attorney reminding her of the professional undertaking she had given “regarding the outstanding balance of \$369764.24...”

11. In March 2025 the Complainant’s brother exchanged WhatsApp messages with the Attorney in which the Attorney informed her to “send me the bill”. Later that month three payments totaling \$349,221.00 were made by the Attorney. However, there remained a balance of \$20,543.24 payable pursuant to the Attorney’s undertaking. As at the date on which the Complainant gave her evidence, there was no further payment by the Attorney.

Discussion

12. The Complainant's complaint is that the Attorney failed to fulfil his professional undertaking. The seriousness of failing to fulfil a professional undertaking is not in doubt. **Sylvester Morris v General Legal Council, ex parte Alpart Credit Union**¹ is a decision of the Court of Appeal which considered an appeal against a finding by the Disciplinary Committee that an attorney was guilty of professional misconduct for failing to fulfil his professional undertaking.
13. The Panel takes into account that in order to find the Attorney guilty of professional misconduct it must be satisfied on the evidence beyond all reasonable doubt - see **Wilton Campbell v David Hamlet (as Executrix of Simon Alexander Privy Council Appeal No. 7 of 2001)**.
14. The Panel would make two observations at the outset.
15. First, while the undertaking was not given to the Complainant, as the purchaser of the Property and the person who would be prejudiced by the Attorney’s failure to fulfil her undertaking, the Complainant is person aggrieved. Second, while the undertaking did not state a date by or period within which the payment

¹ (1985) 22 JLR 1

would be made, the Panel finds that it should be interpreted to mean that it would be made within a reasonable time.

16. Having considered all the evidence before it the Panel makes the following findings of fact.
17. On a plain reading of the Attorney's letter of February 13, 2024 the Attorney gave her professional undertaking to pay the outstanding maintenance on the Property. This amounted to \$369,764.24. This payment should have been made within a reasonable time. Even assuming that the Attorney was only made aware of the amount payable in March 2025, as at the date of the hearing of this complaint, some 8 months later, the Attorney had not fulfilled her professional undertaking. There remained an outstanding balance of \$20,543.28.

Conclusion

18. In all circumstances, the Panel finds that the Attorney did not honour her professional undertaking given in her letter dated February 13, 2024 and is guilty of misconduct in a professional respect.
19. In accordance with the procedure recommended by the Court of Appeal in Owen Clunie v General Legal Council SCCA No. 03 of 2013, the Panel directs that a date be fixed to give the Attorney an opportunity to be heard in mitigation before a sanction is imposed.

Dated the 22nd day of November 2025



TANA'ANIA SMALL



KEVIN O. POWELL



DELROSE CAMPBELL