

STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL SALARIES AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE

Report on Judicial Remuneration Review 2010

June 2010

司法人員薪俸及服務條件常務委員會
Standing Committee on Judicial Salaries and Conditions of Service

28 June 2010

The Honourable Donald Tsang, GBM
The Chief Executive
Hong Kong Special Administrative Region
People's Republic of China
Government House
Hong Kong

Dear Sir,

On behalf of the Standing Committee on Judicial Salaries and Conditions of Service, I have the honour to submit our report containing our findings and recommendation in the Judicial Remuneration Review 2010, which is conducted in accordance with the mechanism and methodology for the determination of judicial remuneration approved by the Chief Executive-in-Council in May 2008.

Yours sincerely,



(Christopher CHENG Wai-chee)
Chairman
Standing Committee
on Judicial Salaries and Conditions of Service

STANDING COMMITTEE ON JUDICIAL SALARIES AND CONDITIONS OF SERVICE

Report on Judicial Remuneration Review 2010

June 2010

Contents

Chapter		Page
1	Introduction	1
2	Mechanism for Judicial Remuneration Review	4
3	Judicial Remuneration Review 2010 – Annual Review	6
4	Conclusion and Recommendation	16

Acknowledgements

Appendix

- A Terms of Reference of the Standing Committee on Judicial Salaries and Conditions of Service
- B Membership of the Standing Committee on Judicial Salaries and Conditions of Service
- C Judicial Service Pay Scale
- D Levels of Court and Judicial Ranks
- E Caseloads in Different Levels of Court between 2007 and 2009

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 This Report sets out the findings and recommendation of the Standing Committee on Judicial Salaries and Conditions of Service (the Judicial Committee) in the Judicial Remuneration Review 2010. The Review was conducted in accordance with the mechanism for the determination of judicial remuneration as approved by the Chief Executive-in-Council in 2008.

The Judicial Committee

1.2 The Judicial Committee is an independent advisory body appointed by the Chief Executive to advise and make recommendations on matters concerning the salary and conditions of service of Judges and Judicial Officers (JJOs)¹. It was first established in December 1987 in recognition of the independent status of the Judiciary and the need for the pay and conditions of service of JJOs to be dealt with separately from those of the civil service.

1.3 In May 2008, the Chief Executive-in-Council accepted all the major recommendations of the Judicial Committee's Report on the Study on the Appropriate Institutional Structure, Mechanism and Methodology for the Determination of Judicial Remuneration in Hong Kong in 2005² (the 2005 Report). With the approval of the Chief Executive, the Judicial Committee's terms of reference and membership

¹ Judges refer to officers in the grades of Chief Justice, Court of Final Appeal; Judge, Court of Final Appeal; Judge of the High Court; and Judge of the District Court. Judicial Officers refer to officers in the grades of Registrar, High Court; Registrar, District Court; Member, Lands Tribunal; Magistrate; Presiding Officer, Labour Tribunal; Adjudicator, Small Claims Tribunal; Coroner; and Special Magistrate.

² The 2005 Report can be found in the website http://www.jsscs.gov.hk/en/publications/reports_jscs.htm.

were expanded. Its terms of reference and membership are at **Appendix A** and **Appendix B** respectively.

Judicial Independence

1.4 The Judicial Committee continues to premise its deliberations on the need to uphold the principle of judicial independence. It enables the court to adjudicate cases in a fair and impartial manner by ascertaining the facts objectively and applying the law properly. In discharging its functions, the Committee has to ensure that judicial remuneration is sufficient to attract and retain talent in the Judiciary, in order to maintain an independent and effective judicial system which upholds the rule of law and commands confidence within and outside Hong Kong. The need to maintain an independent Judiciary of the highest integrity is of utmost importance.

Judicial Remuneration

1.5 In recognition of the independence and uniqueness of the Judiciary, JJOs are remunerated according to an independent salary scale known as the Judicial Service Pay Scale (JSPS) (**Appendix C**). Judicial salaries are subject to regular reviews that are distinct from that carried out in respect of the civil service, with the Judicial Committee rendering advice to the Chief Executive on matters concerning judicial remuneration.

Judicial Remuneration Review 2010

1.6 In conducting the Review in 2010, the Committee has invited the Judiciary and the Administration to provide relevant data and views pertaining to the basket of factors. The Committee then exercises its best judgement in analysing and balancing all relevant considerations in formulating its recommendation. Having considered

all relevant factors, the Judicial Committee **recommends** that judicial salaries should remain unchanged in 2010-11.

Chapter 2

Mechanism for Judicial Remuneration Review

Mechanism

2.1 The mechanism for Judicial Remuneration Review, as approved by the Chief Executive-in-Council in May 2008, comprises two components: a regular benchmark study and an annual salary review.

Benchmark Study

2.2 The Judicial Committee reaffirms its view that a benchmark study on the level of earnings of private sector and public sector legal practitioners should be conducted on a regular basis, in order to ascertain their earning levels, monitor such trends and review judicial salaries where appropriate.

2.3 The Judicial Committee conducted a pilot study on earnings of private sector legal practitioners in Hong Kong in the last quarter of 2005. Through the pilot study, the Committee has confirmed the feasibility of such benchmark study and noted the then relativities between judicial salaries and earnings of private legal practitioners. The Committee decided last year that a benchmark study should in principle be conducted every five years, with its frequency subject to periodic review. The Committee will revisit the timing for the next benchmark study in the latter part of 2010.

Annual Review

2.4 The Committee has agreed that an annual review on judicial remuneration should be conducted, including in the year when a benchmark study is carried out. This will enable the Committee to take a holistic view on the year-on-year changes in relation to the basket of

factors, in conjunction with the findings of the regular benchmark study. During the review, the Committee will consider whether and, if so, how judicial pay should be adjusted.

Balanced Approach

2.5 Consistent with its recommendations in the 2005 Report as approved by the Chief Executive-in-Council, the Committee adopts a balanced approach in reviewing judicial remuneration by taking into account a basket of factors. The basket of factors include the following –

- (a) the responsibility, working conditions and workload of judges vis-à-vis those of lawyers in private practice;
- (b) recruitment and retention in the Judiciary;
- (c) the retirement age and retirement benefits of JJOs;
- (d) the benefits and allowances enjoyed by JJOs;
- (e) prohibition against return to private practice in Hong Kong;
- (f) public sector pay as a reference;
- (g) private sector pay levels and trends;
- (h) cost of living adjustments; and
- (i) the general economic situation in Hong Kong.

2.6 In addition to the above, the Committee also agrees to take into account the following factors suggested by the Administration –

- (a) overseas remuneration arrangements;
- (b) unique features of judicial service – such as the security of tenure, the prestigious status and high esteem of judicial offices; and
- (c) the budgetary situation of the Government – which is a relevant factor for consideration in adjusting civil service pay.

Chapter 3

Judicial Remuneration Review 2010 – Annual Review

The Annual Review

3.1 This is the second year for the Judicial Committee to conduct the annual review of judicial salary in accordance with the mechanism for Judicial Remuneration Review as set out in Chapter 2. In conducting the Review, instead of applying a mechanical formula, the Committee has continued to adopt a balanced approach taking into account the basket of factors and the views of the Judiciary.

Responsibility, Working Conditions and Workload

3.2 On the basis of the latest information provided by the Judiciary, the Committee has not observed any major change in the responsibility and working conditions of JJOs. Members of the Judiciary continue to discharge their functions in maintaining an independent and effective judicial system to uphold the rule of law and safeguard the rights and freedoms of the individual. The levels of court and the respective judicial ranks remain the same as set out in **Appendix D**.

3.3 As regards workload, the total caseloads of the Judiciary as a whole have remained steady in the past few years. In 2009, there was a noticeable increase in the criminal and civil caseloads in the Court of First Instance (CFI) of the High Court and the criminal caseload in the District Court. On the other hand, there was a marked reduction in the number of cases at the Obscene Articles Tribunal. Details are shown in **Appendix E**.

3.4 The Judicial Committee maintains the view that the nature of judicial work is unique. The responsibility and working conditions of JJOs are different from those of legal practitioners in the private sector, rendering any direct comparison between the two inappropriate.

Recruitment and Retention

3.5 In 2009, the Judiciary launched a series of open recruitment exercises to recruit CFI Judges, District Judges and Permanent Magistrates. As of 31 March 2010, a total of 35 judicial appointments have been announced, comprising 10 CFI Judges, 12 District Judges and 13 Permanent Magistrates. The Committee notes that the successful recruitment of a substantial number of JJOs has greatly enhanced the judicial manpower position. The establishment and strength of JJOs as at 31 March 2010 are in **Table 1** below –

Table 1: Establishment and strength of JJOs

Levels of Court	As at 31 March 2010		Net change in strength over 31 March 2009
	Establishment	Strength	
Court of Final Appeal ³	4	4 (4)*	0
High Court ⁴	53	45 (39)	+6
District Court ⁵	39	36 (31)	+5
Magistrates' Courts and Specialised Tribunals/Court ⁵	93	76 (79)	–3
Total	189	161 (153)	+8

* Figures in brackets denote position as at 31 March 2009.

3.6 According to the Judiciary and as suggested by the above statistics, it has not encountered any undue recruitment and retention problem in recent years. Meanwhile, the Judiciary has continued to

³ The figures exclude one Permanent Judge post created for Non-Permanent Judge (NPJ) of the Court of Final Appeal (CFA). In practice, an NPJ is invited to sit in the CFA as required in accordance with the Hong Kong CFA Ordinance, Cap. 484.

⁴ For Senior Deputy Registrar and Deputy Registrar vacancies in the Masters' Office of the High Court, the functions are now carried out by some District Judges and some Magistrates who are appointed as temporary Deputy Registrars.

⁵ For judicial offices in the Masters' Office of the District Court and at the Labour Tribunal, Small Claims Tribunal and the Coroner's Court, the functions are carried out by Principal Magistrates or Magistrates under the cross-posting policy. The cross-posting policy provides greater flexibility in the posting of judicial officers between various courts to serve operational needs.

engage temporary judicial resources to help relieve workload, including internal/external deputy and temporary or acting JJOs. With the filling of vacancies by recruitment, the number of external deputy/temporary JJOs has been reduced at almost all levels of court, from a total of 28 as at 31 March 2009 to 20 as at 31 March 2010.

Retirement

3.7 The statutory normal retirement age for JJOs is 60 or 65, depending on the level of court. Beyond that, extension of service may be approved up to the age of 70 or 71, depending on the level of court and subject to consideration on a case-by-case basis. For retirement benefits, JJOs are either entitled to pension governed by the Pension Benefits (Judicial Officers) Ordinance (Cap. 401), or provident fund governed by the Mandatory Provident Fund Schemes Ordinance (Cap. 485) according to their terms of appointment.

3.8 Retirement is the main source of wastage among JJOs. The anticipated retirement will peak at 10 (or 6.2% of current strength) in 2011-12 and go down to 4 (or 2.5% of current strength) in 2012-13. The Committee notes that the Judiciary has successfully recruited a substantial number of JJOs in the 2009 recruitment exercises, and will continue to keep under review the judicial manpower situation and consider selection exercises in accordance with established policies to fill judicial vacancies as appropriate. One of the challenges for the Judiciary is to continue to attract new blood and to groom and retain existing talent.

Benefits and Allowances

3.9 JJOs are entitled to a range of benefits and allowances in addition to salary. The scope of their benefits and allowances is largely similar to that available in the civil service, with some adaptations having regard to the unique characteristics of the judicial service.

3.10 The Committee notes that there has been no change to the package of fringe benefits and allowances for JJOs in the past year, except that the rates of Leave Passage Allowance⁶ have been revised following similar revisions in the civil service, and the rates of Judicial Dress Allowance⁷ have been revised following the Administration's approval of the Judicial Committee's recommendation on a proposal from the Judiciary. The Judiciary has not proposed any further changes to the benefits and allowances for JJOs.

3.11 The existing package of benefits is an integral part of judicial remuneration, and is an important component that has helped attract capable private legal practitioners to join the bench. The Committee will continue to keep the situation under review.

Unique Features of the Judicial Service

Prohibition against Return to Private Practice

3.12 The Judiciary is unique in many aspects. A prominent feature is the prohibition against return to private practice. Judges at the District Court level and above must give an undertaking not to practise in future as barristers or solicitors in Hong Kong without the permission of the Chief Executive. The Chief Justice and Judges of the Court of Final Appeal are prohibited by statute from practising as barristers or solicitors in Hong Kong while holding office or at any time after ceasing to hold office. On the other hand, judges enjoy security of tenure⁸ and high esteem, which may be seen as attractions for private practitioners joining the bench. The Committee notes that these are all

⁶ Leave Passage Allowance is an allowance to reimburse eligible officers (and their eligible family members, where applicable) their travel-related expenses, e.g. air fares, accommodation and car hire and related expenses.

⁷ Judicial Dress Allowance is an allowance to reimburse JJOs on a "once-and-for-all" basis the cost of purchasing their required judicial attire.

⁸ Any removal from office is subject to detailed statutory procedures, and the removal of the most senior Judges (i.e. the Chief Justice, Judges of the Court of Final Appeal and the Chief Judge of the High Court) has to be endorsed by the Legislative Council and reported to the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress for the record.

long established arrangements and nothing has been changed during the annual salary review in 2010.

Cost of Increments for JJOs

3.13 JJOs are remunerated on the JSPS as set out in **Appendix C**. Save for the Special Magistrate and Magistrate ranks, which are on a pay scale of JSPS 1-6 and JSPS 7-10 respectively, pay progression in the other (and majority) levels of JJOs is limited. Only a small number of incremental creeps are granted to JJOs at JSPS 11-14 upon satisfactory completion of two or five years of service. JJOs serving on JSPS 15 and above have no increment. The cost of increments as a percentage of total payroll cost for JJOs in the past two years based on information from the Judiciary is set out in **Table 2** below –

Table 2 : Cost of increments for JJOs (2008-09 to 2009-10)

	2008-09	2009-10
JSPS 15-19	0%	0%
JSPS 1-14	0.39%	0.56%

Overseas Remuneration Arrangements

3.14 The Committee has kept track of major development, if any, on judicial remuneration in six overseas common law jurisdictions, namely, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, Singapore, the United Kingdom and the United States. There has been no change to the judicial remuneration systems in these jurisdictions in the past year. All the jurisdictions have taken conservative actions in their latest annual salary reviews for judges, including pay freeze, deferral of pay adjustment, or a reduced rate of increase as compared to the previous year. A key consideration behind the conservative actions is the jurisdiction's prevailing state of economy, which hinges much on the rate of recovery after the global economic downturn in 2008.

General Economic Situation and Cost of Living Adjustments in Hong Kong

3.15 The Administration has provided detailed information on Hong Kong's economic and fiscal indicators for the Committee's reference. The overall growth rate for Hong Kong's Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in real terms in 2009 was -2.8%. Stepping into 2010, with both domestic and external sectors growing vibrantly, our GDP registered a sharp year-on-year rise of 8.2% in real terms in the first quarter of 2010, largely returned to the peak in early 2008. However, in the light of the prevailing uncertainties in the external environment, the forecast GDP growth is maintained at 4-5% in 2010. The year-on-year changes in GDP in real terms are shown in **Table 3** below –

Table 3 : Changes in Gross Domestic Product in real terms

Year	Quarter	GDP year-on-year % change
2009	Q1	-7.7 %
	Q2	-3.8 %
	Q3	-2.4 %
	Q4	+2.5 %
2010	Q1	+8.2 %

(Source: Figures published by the Census and Statistics Department.)

3.16 Hong Kong's labour market has improved in 2010. The seasonally adjusted unemployment rate dropped to 4.6% in March to May 2010, as compared to 5.3% in the same period in 2009.

3.17 On changes in cost of living, the underlying⁹ Composite Consumer Price Index¹⁰ in the first five months of 2010 rose by 1.0% over a year earlier. Though inflation was still mild in the first five months of 2010, it may creep up modestly further in the coming months. The forecast rate of the underlying consumer price inflation in 2010 as a whole is 1.5%.

⁹ Underlying rates net out the effects of all one-off relief measures implemented by the Government.

¹⁰ Composite Consumer Price Index reflects the impact of consumer price change on the household sector as a whole.

Budgetary Situation of the Government

3.18 Based on the information from the Administration, the Government had a consolidated surplus of \$25.9 billion in 2009-10 and the fiscal reserves stood at \$520.3 billion as at end March 2010. For 2010-11, a deficit of \$3.8 billion and \$21.4 billion is estimated for the Operating Account and Capital Account respectively, which will result in a deficit of \$25.2 billion in the Consolidated Account, equivalent to 1.5% of our GDP.

3.19 The annual staff cost of the Judiciary in 2010-11 is estimated at about \$812 million, which is roughly 0.3% of the Government's total operating expenditure of \$251 billion in the 2010-11 Estimates.

Private Sector Pay Levels and Trends

3.20 The Committee notes that there is no comprehensive or representative pay trend survey on the legal sector, although there are small surveys conducted by individual recruitment agencies with limited coverage, which are of little relevance to the Judiciary. Such being the case, the Committee has made reference to the gross Pay Trend Indicators (PTIs) from the annual Pay Trend Survey (PTS)¹¹, which reflects the overall private sector pay trend. Taking into account the uniqueness of the Judiciary, direct comparison using the gross PTIs is not appropriate. As mentioned in paragraph 3.13 above, some JJOs

¹¹ The annual Pay Trend Survey (PTS) measures the year-on-year average pay movements of full-time employees in the private sector over a twelve-month period from 2 April of the previous year to 1 April of the current year. The Pay Trend Indicators (PTIs) derived from the PTS are divided into three bands, reflecting the average pay movements of private sector employees in three salary ranges, i.e. –

- (i) Lower Band covering employees in the salary range below \$15,785 per month;
- (ii) Middle Band covering employees in the salary range of \$15,785 to \$48,400 per month; and
- (iii) Upper Band covering employees in the salary range of \$48,401 to \$95,360 per month (the ceiling was \$97,545 in the 2009 PTS).

In the absence of a comprehensive or representative pay trend survey on the legal sector, the PTI for the Upper Band in the PTS is considered as a suitable reference for comparison with judicial salaries, which start at JSPS 1, currently at \$59,495 in dollar terms.

have incremental creeps at certain intervals. The gross PTIs already include merit and in-scale increment in the private sector. In order to have a fair and suitable comparison with the private sector, the cost of increments for JJOs should be subtracted from the relevant gross PTI to reflect the private sector pay trend suitable for comparison in the annual review of judicial salary.

3.21 The gross PTI of employees in the highest salary range (from \$48,401 to \$95,360 per month) as reflected from the PTS was -4.79% in 2009, and +2.2% in 2010. As judicial salary has remained unchanged in 2009 as recommended by the Committee, it would be appropriate for the Committee to take into account the private sector pay trends in 2009 and 2010 in succession. Subtracting the cost of increments for JJOs from the relevant gross PTIs in 2009 and 2010 shows that the private sector pay has not yet reverted to the level before 2009.

3.22 The Committee has also made reference to other private sector pay indicators, which by and large indicate similar trend as the PTS. Private sector remuneration generally went down in 2009. The market is gradually picking up in late 2009 and early 2010, but companies tend to adopt a prudent approach in pay adjustments, offering only modest pay increases.

Public Sector Pay as a Reference

3.23 Historically, there was an informal linkage between judicial salaries and senior civil service salaries before the implementation of the new mechanism for determining judicial remuneration. As concluded in the 2005 Report, while some reference to public sector pay is beneficial, pegging is not appropriate. De-linking judicial remuneration from that of the civil service will not only strengthen the perception of judicial independence, but also provide the necessary safeguard and reassurance to JJOs. The conclusion has also taken into account certain aspects that render it inappropriate for a direct comparison between the Judiciary and the civil service, e.g. judges do not have the collective

bargaining process on annual pay adjustment which the Administration has established with the civil service unions and staff associations¹². Public sector pay is hence one of the factors under the balanced approach for determining judicial remuneration.

3.24 As set out in the Judicial Committee's elaborations on its recommendation in the 2009 annual salary review, the Committee believes that the experience in 2009, including how public sector pay was taken as a reference, would shed light on future exercises. Moreover, the Committee considers that the arrangement in 2007 and 2008 would be a good arrangement for reference in future reviews on judicial remuneration.

3.25 In the context of the 2010 annual review, the Committee has made reference to the following –

- (a) In June 2009, the Chief Executive-in-Council decided to freeze the pay for civil servants in the Lower and Middle Bands, and to reduce the pay for the Upper Band and above by 5.38% in 2009-10. Taking into account the basket of factors, the Judicial Committee recommended and the Chief Executive-in-Council decided that judicial salaries should remain unchanged; and
- (b) In June 2010, the Chief Executive-in-Council decided that the pay for the Upper Band in the civil service should be increased by 1.6% with retrospective effect from 1 April 2010, subject to the approval from the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council. With this adjustment, the salaries for civil servants in the Upper Band have not yet recovered to the level before the pay reduction.

¹² The 2005 Report, paragraph 3.14.

The Judiciary's Position

3.26 The Judiciary has indicated that notwithstanding the positive figures after subtracting the cost of increments for JJOs, where applicable, from the gross PTIs, the Judiciary will not seek any pay increase for the judicial service in 2010-11, as the percentages of increase have yet to offset in full the respective percentages of decrease indicated from the corresponding figures in 2009-10 but not applied to the judicial service last year. In any case, there should not be any reduction in judicial pay as a matter of principle.

Chapter 4

Conclusion and Recommendation

4.1 The Committee notes that the information pertaining to the Judiciary has remained more or less unchanged, with an encouraging improvement in the vacancy situation at all levels of court after the series of recruitment in 2009, indicating that the Judiciary has not encountered any undue recruitment and retention problem at the present level of remuneration.

4.2 The Committee notes that there is no systemic change to the judicial remuneration systems in all the jurisdictions to which we have made reference. However, the financial turmoil has affected the global economy, resulting in conservative actions in the annual reviews of judicial salaries in all jurisdictions.

4.3 In Hong Kong, the pace of recovery has been promising. In the first quarter of 2010, the economy has recouped the lost ground since the peak in 2008. However, there are prevailing uncertainties in the external environment. As regards private sector pay trend, by subtracting the cost of increments for JJOs in 2009 and 2010 respectively from the relevant gross PTIs to reflect the private sector pay trend suitable for comparison in the context of the annual salary review for JJOs, the Committee notes that the private sector pay has not yet been restored to its previous level. Pay surveys from other agencies by and large indicate similar trend.

4.4 As regards public sector pay, as mentioned in paragraph 3.24, we have made reference to the arrangement in 2007 and 2008, and will continue to do so in future reviews. For the current exercise, we note that the Upper Band civil servants experienced a pay reduction of 5.38% with effect from 1 January 2010. With the announcement of the pay decision on 15 June 2010, subject to the

approval from the Finance Committee of the Legislative Council, the Upper Band would have a pay increase of 1.60% with retrospective effect from 1 April 2010. This has yet to bring the salary of the civil service Upper Band back to the level before the pay reduction.

4.5 The Judiciary has indicated that it would not seek any pay increase nor would it accept any pay reduction for the judicial service in 2010-11.

4.6 Taking into account the basket of factors, the Judicial Committee **recommends** that judicial salaries should remain unchanged in 2010-11.

4.7 For future reviews, the Judicial Committee would continue to adopt a balanced approach taking into account the basket of factors. Among others, we will closely monitor the private sector pay trends as reflected in the gross PTIs, the changes in the cost of increments for JJOs, and other pay indicators in surveys conducted by other agencies. As regards public sector pay, we will continue to make reference to the arrangement adopted in 2007 and 2008 in future reviews. Looking ahead, the Judicial Committee will also take into account the experience in the two Judicial Remuneration Reviews conducted under the approved mechanism.

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to both the Administration and the Judiciary for providing us with comprehensive and valuable information. Their contribution is most useful in facilitating our deliberation on the basket of factors under the approved mechanism for the determination of judicial remuneration. Our appreciation also goes to the Secretary General and the Joint Secretariat for their assistance in this review.

Standing Committee on Judicial Salaries and Conditions of Service

Terms of Reference

I. The Committee will advise and make recommendations to the Chief Executive on –

- (a) the structure, i.e. number of levels and salary level; and conditions of service and benefits other than salary appropriate to each rank of judges and judicial officers and other matters relating thereto;
- (b) matters relating to the system, institutional structure, methodology and mechanism for the determination of judicial salary and other matters relating thereto which the Chief Executive may refer to the Committee; and
- (c) any other matter as the Chief Executive may refer to the Committee.

II. The Committee will also, when it so determines, conduct an overall review of the matters referred to in I(a) above. In the course of this, the Committee should accept the existing internal structure of the Judiciary and not consider the creation of new judicial offices. If, however, the Committee in an overall review discovers anomalies, it may comment upon and refer such matters to the Chief Justice, Court of Final Appeal.

**Standing Committee on Judicial Salaries
and Conditions of Service**

Membership

Chairman

Mr Christopher Cheng Wai-chee, GBS, JP

Members

Mr Bernard Charnwut Chan, GBS, JP

Professor Chan Yuk-shee, BBS, JP

Sir C K Chow

Mr Lester Garson Huang, JP

Ms Jacqueline Pamela Leong, SC

Mr Brian David Li Man-bun

Judicial Service Pay Scale
(with effect from 1 April 2008)

Judicial Service Pay Scale (JSPS)		Rank
Point	\$	
19	241,750	✧ Chief Justice, Court of Final Appeal
18	235,100	✧ Permanent Judge, Court of Final Appeal ✧ Chief Judge of the High Court
17	211,900	✧ Justice of Appeal of the Court of Appeal of the High Court
16	202,000	✧ Judge of the Court of First Instance of the High Court
15	166,900	✧ Registrar, High Court ✧ Chief Judge of the District Court
14	(161,500)	✧ Senior Deputy Registrar, High Court ✧ Principal Family Court Judge, District Court
	(156,800)	
	152,200	
13	(151,200)	✧ Deputy Registrar, High Court ✧ Judge of the District Court ✧ Chief Magistrate
	(146,950)	
	142,700	
12	(130,300)	✧ Assistant Registrar, High Court ✧ Member, Lands Tribunal
	(126,500)	
	122,700	
11	(119,900)	✧ Registrar, District Court ✧ Principal Adjudicator, Small Claims Tribunal ✧ Principal Magistrate ✧ Principal Presiding Officer, Labour Tribunal
	(116,550)	
	113,100	
10	(109,700)	✧ Adjudicator, Small Claims Tribunal ✧ Coroner ✧ Deputy Registrar, District Court ✧ Presiding Officer, Labour Tribunal
	(106,400)	
	103,400	
10	(109,700)	✧ Magistrate
	(106,400)	
	103,400	
9	96,015	
8	93,770	
7	91,530	

Judicial Service Pay Scale (JSPS)		Rank
Point	\$	
6	70,295	✧ Special Magistrate
5	67,035	
4	63,925	
3	62,430	
2	60,955	
1	59,495	

Note: Figures in brackets (for JSPS 10 – 14) represent increments under which the officer may proceed to the first increment after satisfactory completion of two years of service in the rank and to the second increment after satisfactory completion of another three years of service in the rank.

Levels of Court and Judicial Ranks

Level of Court	Rank	Pay Scale (JSPS)
Court of Final Appeal	Chief Justice, Court of Final Appeal	19
	Permanent Judge, Court of Final Appeal	18
High Court, Court of Appeal	Chief Judge of the High Court	18
	Justice of Appeal of the Court of Appeal of the High Court	17
High Court, Court of First Instance	Judge of the Court of First Instance of the High Court	16
High Court, Masters' Office	Registrar, High Court	15
	Senior Deputy Registrar, High Court	14
	Deputy Registrar, High Court	13
	Assistant Registrar, High Court*	12
District Court	Chief Judge of the District Court	15
	Principal Family Court Judge, District Court	14
	Judge of the District Court	13
District Court, Masters' Office	Registrar, District Court	11
	Deputy Registrar, District Court	10
Lands Tribunal	Member, Lands Tribunal	12
Magistrates' Courts	Chief Magistrate	13
	Principal Magistrate	11
	Magistrate	7 – 10
	Special Magistrate	1 – 6
Labour Tribunal	Principal Presiding Officer, Labour Tribunal	11
	Presiding Officer, Labour Tribunal	10
Small Claims Tribunal	Principal Adjudicator, Small Claims Tribunal	11
	Adjudicator, Small Claims Tribunal	10
Obscene Articles Tribunal	Magistrate	7 – 10
Coroner's Court	Coroner	10

* There is at present no post in the rank of Assistant Registrar, High Court.

Caseloads in Different Levels of Court between 2007 and 2009

No. of Cases Level of Court	2007	2008	2009
Court of Final Appeal			
– application for leave to appeal	139	158	136
– appeals	44	42	33
– miscellaneous proceedings	3	2	2
Court of Appeal of the High Court			
– criminal appeals	488	439	486
– civil appeals	421	385	285
Court of First Instance of the High Court			
criminal jurisdiction			
– criminal cases	312	311	425
– confidential miscellaneous proceedings	56	64	64
– appeals from Magistrates' Courts	1 234	1 125	1 043
civil jurisdiction	20 657	21 514	26 564
probate cases	13 483	13 339	14 676
District Court			
– criminal cases	1 240	1 250	1 449
– civil cases	28 820	28 527	27 329
– divorce jurisdiction	18 131	18 364	19 616
Magistrates' Courts	314 214	337 442	327 439
Lands Tribunal	5 128	5 228	5 046
Labour Tribunal	6 160	7 199	7 758
Small Claims Tribunal	68 797	59 246	59 797
Obscene Articles Tribunal	70 212	44 464	13 507
Coroner's Court	175	151	182
Total	549 714	539 250	505 837

