

The London Gazette

Bublished by Authority

Registered as a Newspaper at the Post Office

MONDAY, 3rd APRIL 1995

State Intelligence

ROYAL WARRANT OF PRECEDENCE

Queen Anne's Gate, London S.W.1 1st March 1995

The QUEEN has been graciously pleased to ordain that Jennifer Smith-Bingham and Diana Harrap shall henceforth have, hold and enjoy the same title, rank, place, pre-eminence and precedence as the daughters of a Viscount which would have been due to them had their father Ian Stanley Akers-Douglas survived his cousin Eric Alexander Viscount Chilston and thereby succeeded to the title and dignity of Viscount Chilston.

And to command that the said Royal concession and declaration be recorded in Her Majesty's College of Arms.

DUCHY OF LANCASTER—HIGH SHERIFFS

The QUEEN picked the names of the following High Sheriffs on the Lites for the Counties of the Duchy of Lancaster on 15th March

Lancashire: Ralph William Goodall Esq. of Hoghton, Preston. Greater Manchester: Major Edmund Travis Gartside of Bamford,

Merseyside: Anthony Wilson Shone Esq. of West Kirby, Wirral. (3 SI) F. N. J. Davies

TREASURY SOLICITOR

KUDOS OFFICE ENVIRONMENTS LIMITED

The Solicitor for the affairs of Her Majesty's Treasury in whom the assets of Kudos Office Environments Limited (No. 2433943) (the Company) vested pursuant to section 654 of the Companies Act 1985 on its dissolution under section 652 of the said Act on 12th January 1993 in pursuance of the power granted by section 656 of the said Act hereby disclaims the Crown's title (if any) in Unit A7D, St. Mark's Place, Newark, Nottinghamshire comprised in an Underlease dated 1st November 1988 and made between (1) Royal Insurance plc (2) the Company and (3) Christopher Philip Lawler registered under Title Number NT 234864 the vesting of the same having come to his notice on 25th March 1994.

S. L. Sargant, Assistant Treasury Solicitor (39 & 40 Vict. c. 18 s. 3).

(1 SI) 20th March 1995.

In the High Court of Justice (Queen's Bench Division) **Divisional Court**

Before the Right Honourable Lord Justice Leggatt and the Honourable Mr. Justice Buxton

In the Matter of Section 42 of the Supreme Court Act 1981 (as amended by section 24 of the Prosecution of Offences Act 1985) between Her Majesty's Attorney General, Applicant and Bernard Alfred Gough, Respondent.

Upon reading the Originating Motion herein dated the 10th day of January 1995 issued by the Applicant, Her Majesty's Attorney General seeking a civil proceedings order against the above-named Respondent pursuant to section 42 of the Supreme Court Act 1981 (as amended by section 24 of the Prosecution of Offences Act

(i) no civil proceedings shall without the leave of the High Court be instituted by the above-named (or in the name of B. A. Gough Equipment Ltd.) in any Court and

(ii) that any civil proceedings instituted by the said Bernard Alfred Gough (or in the name of B. A. Gough Equipment Ltd.) in any Court before the making of the Order shall not be continued by the said Bernard Alfred Gough without the leave of the High Court and

(iii) that no application (other than an application for leave under section 42 of the said Act) shall without leave of the High Court be made by the said Bernard Alfred Gough in any civil proceedings instituted in any Court whether by Bernard Alfred Gough or another on the ground that the said Bernard Alfred Gough has habitually and persistently and without any reasonable ground instituted vexatious civil proceedings in the High Court and made vexatious applications in civil proceedings in the High Court;

And upon reading the affidavits of Ian William Noble sworn the 9th day of January 1995 and the 21st February 1995 together with the exhibits thereto on behalf of the Applicant, Her Majesty's Attorney General in support of these proceedings;

And upon reading the affidavits of Bernard Alfred Gough sworn the 27th day of February 1995 and the 17th day of March 1995 together with the exhibits referred to therein filed on behalf of the Respondent;

And upon hearing Mr. R. Jay of Counsel on behalf of the

Applicant and the Respondent appearing in person;
And upon an application by the Respondent to adjourn today's hearing having been refused;

And the Court making no Order as to costs;