



**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL**

Royal Courts of Justice  
Strand, London, WC2A 2LL

Date: 22nd March 2011

**Before:**

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF ENGLAND AND WALES**  
**THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS**  
**THE CHANCELLOR OF THE HIGH COURT**  
**THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION**  
**LORD JUSTICE JACOB**

-----

**VALEDICTORY REMARKS ON THE RETIREMENT  
OF THE RT HON LORD JUSTICE JACOB**

-----

**Present in the (packed) Court of the Lord Chief Justice of England and Wales:  
Judges of the Court of Appeal and the High Court of Justice  
Judges' Clerks  
Staff of the Royal Courts of Justice  
Members of the Bar  
Solicitors  
Patent Agents  
Trade Mark Agents  
and  
Members of the Public**

Transcript of the Shorthand Notes of Marten Walsh Cherer Ltd.,  
1st Floor, Quality House, 6-9 Quality Court, Chancery Lane, London WC2A 1HP.  
Telephone No: 020 7067 2900. Fax No: 020 7831 6864

DX 410 LDE [info@martenwalshcherer.com](mailto:info@martenwalshcherer.com)

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** What a happy occasion! It is an amazing turn-out. How nice to see you all. I was going to do some character assassination on Lord Justice Jacob, but I have been told to hold my peace and say nothing and invite the Master of the Rolls to go first. So I shall. (*Laughter*)

**THE MASTER OF THE ROLLS:** This is an application by Lord Justice Jacob for permission to retire. (*Laughter*) If there was any ground for dismissing the application, I would unhesitatingly do so. I know that all his and my colleagues in the Court of Appeal wholeheartedly agree. Accordingly, this is the judgment of the court.

I turn to consider the arguments which can be advanced to support the contention that the Lord Justice's application should be dismissed.

First, although one can well understand the applicant's wish to spend more time with his splendid wife and family, the notion of "retiring" and "Jacob" are not exactly natural bedfellows. There is no more energetic or committed judge, whether in or out of court, than Lord Justice Jacob.

However, unfortunately, this point is met by the applicant's intention to lecture, write, bicycle, arbitrate, mediate, travel, teach, sit occasionally and watch Arsenal Football Club. So he will be as busy as ever.

Secondly, it is clear from the appearance of the applicant that he is far too young to retire. However, I have been referred to the case of *Who v Who*, which establishes that, despite his appearance, he is 70 years old, or virtually 70. So that point falls away.

Thirdly, the Lord Justice's written judgments are far too stylish and clear to permit him to step down. Consider the first two sentences of his judgment in *Ferguson v British Gas*, where he said this:

"It is one of the glories of this country that every now and then one of its citizens is prepared to take a stand against the big battalions of government or industry. Such a person is Lisa Ferguson, the claimant in this case."

I wonder who won! (*Laughter*) It is pure Denning in style.

But this point falls away because the Lord Justice will continue to write, sit and teach, and so his outstanding style will continue to be available despite his retirement.

The next ground that is raised is that the court cannot possibly lose his administrative abilities. He ran the Patents Court at first instance extremely well. He was an excellent Chancery supervisory judge on the Western, Midland and Welsh Circuits. As his successor, I can tell you that he was a very hard act to follow. In the Court of Appeal, he runs the IP appeals list brilliantly. He even lets me sit on the occasional appeal. I was a bit mystified why I was sitting on an appeal a few weeks ago which involved machinery that makes lavatory rolls and kitchen towel rolls. I only realised during the course of the first morning that, of course, he decided I should hear it because of my job as Master of the Rolls. (*Laughter*)

Unfortunately, this fourth ground falls away because, thanks to his guidance and leadership, the excellent team in the Court of Appeal consisting of Kim, Rob, Sally and Anne Marie has now learned how to manage appeals in IP cases.

Fifthly, it is said that his wonderful sense of humour and his engaging and idiosyncratic character cannot be lost to the Court of Appeal. Consider his judgment in *Rockwater v Technip* where he described that figure, familiar to patent practitioners, a man skilled in the art. “It is settled”, said Lord Justice Jacob, “that this man, if real, would be very boring — a nerd.” Later, he said: “The man can, in appropriate cases, be a team — an assembly of nerds. But”, he continued, “the skilled man is not a complete android.” The other members of the Court of Appeal agreed.

But this fifth ground cannot be sustained because his humour will be deployed for the benefit of his students and his audiences.

Sixthly, it is said that the Lord Justice is probably the most popular member of the Court of Appeal, with his sense of humour, quizzical stare, expressive eyebrows, and his lack of pomposity and side. He currently presides over what he calls “the bad boys’ corridor”. I shall spare the blushes of Lord Justice Hooper and Lord Justice Moses by not identifying the other members of that corridor. (*Laughter*) However, that point is unfortunately met by the fact that he has promised to come and see us very often.

Seventhly, there is the fact that he is the UK intellectual property supremo and we, therefore, cannot afford to lose him. He has tirelessly worked on difficult and technical judgments, and travelled to conferences throughout the world in support of IP, and, in particular, support of IP in the UK.

As a new boy in the area, I benefited enormously from Robin’s education and advice on my first few IP judgments. I should like to take the opportunity of thanking him for all his help on my early IP judgments, but I should make it clear that any errors in those judgments are entirely his. (*Laughter*) As to this ground, the truth is that his contribution to IP will continue as Professor at UCL and as a legal adviser and arbitrator.

The final ground that is put forward is the fact that we may lose his wonderful clerk Lorraine. However, this provides no basis for dismissing the application, as she will, I am happy to say, carry on working as a clerk in the Royal Courts.

In these circumstances, I have regretfully concluded that none of these arguments can be sustained and that Lord Justice Jacob should be entitled to retire. But he can only do so on his firm undertaking that he will have a long and happy retirement and that he will come and visit us frequently.

His application is therefore allowed but he will have to pay the costs on an indemnity basis. (*Laughter*)

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Mr. Thorley, do you want to make any submissions about the order that has just been made in relation to costs? Normally we like to hear the argument before we give the judgment. (*Laughter*)

**MR. SIMON THORLEY QC (3 New Square):** My Lords, Alice in Wonderland has always had a place in this court! (*Laughter*)

My Lords, the Master of the Rolls has given me eight minutes on which to eulogise on the subject of Lord Justice Jacob, who has just looked at his watch. My Lords, I think I could do it in eight words: Lord Justice Jacob is a thoroughly good bloke.

May I just amplify on that a little. The world of intellectual property owes him a very great debt for channelling his undoubted talents into this field, both as a practitioner and as a judge. The contribution that he has made over the last 45 years is immense.

I have had the privilege of observing the major part of this. I sat down on Sunday to write these notes and sent an e-mail to the Master of the Rolls to assure him that I was going to stay within the eight minutes because, having written it, I felt constrained to cross out the anecdotes and there was very little left. (*Laughter*)

My Lords, the first seriously contested application I had in these courts was before Mr. Justice Walton in the prefabricated courts which used to be in the courtyard behind. There was no question of the air-conditioning failing because there was none. It was against Mr. Robin Jacob. The case was called *Wombles Skips v Wombles Ltd*, a passing off case, and he won. He has never let me forget it. (*Laughter*)

Robin Jacob the barrister possessed many of the recognised virtues of our profession. He was quick to assimilate facts and to understand complex technology. He was decisive in forming an opinion, clear in his advice, with a ready ability to sort out the good arguments from the bad, and to pursue the good with succinct vigour. He had an infinite capacity for hard work and, above all, good health.

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** I am sorry to interrupt, Mr. Thorley. It sounds as though grandson Max is being removed from the court! (*Laughter*) He obviously takes after his grandfather, insisting on being heard. I am sorry to interrupt you.

**MR. SIMON THORLEY QC:** Insisting on being heard by interrupting, not an unknown family characteristic! (*Laughter*)

My Lords, you may have noted that I said he possessed many of the required virtues of being a barrister — but not all. I understand there were occasions when his instructing solicitors, whilst duly grateful for his clear advice, were a little surprised that it had been given without unduly disturbing the pristine condition of the papers that had been sent to him.

Above all, Robin Jacob the barrister was held in the highest esteem by his colleagues, particularly by his juniors which I was once — only once — and his opponents alike for the straightforward and good-natured way in which he conducted litigation. There was none of the wholly unnecessary carping, waspish, point-scoring advocacy which can render litigation tedious, unpleasant and, above all, expensive.

He would tease his opponents — usually me — usually unmercifully, but always with the great good humour that is an integral part of his make-up.

Time moved on and the Bar was deprived of the vibrancy of Robin Jacob QC. Would Mr. Justice Jacob lose the ebullience and good humour of our erstwhile colleague? Would he suffer from that dread disease of judgitis? Would he heck? The late Charles Sparrow once observed that he was unable to understand why his Lordship was only comfortable when conducting his court in the atmosphere of the music hall. A little exaggerated perhaps, but, provided you were well prepared, focused and short-winded (woe betide you if you were not), the addition of a little humour was welcome.

My Lords, as you all know, one of the greatest qualities of a judge is to conduct litigation in a way that leaves the losing party happy — in the sense that he has had a fair trial.

I was once instructed indirectly by a US lawyer from the deep South, whose drawl I can't possibly imitate. When we left court, he said, "That judge has comprehended the technology. He has listened to both sides of the argument. He appears to have understood them. Win or lose, I could not ask for anything more." My Lords, that is a tribute, I think, to a judge.

Mr. Justice Jacob as a trial judge was a great reformer, well in advance of the Woolf reforms. Timetables were streamlined, discovery was minimised and issues were crystallised. Patent trials in the 1970s and 1980s, and indeed early in the 1990s, regularly lasted for six weeks or more. My first big trial as a Silk against Robin Jacob QC was in front of a youthful Mr. Justice Morritt, which took just over five weeks to argue a fairly simple patent about, quite appropriately, babies' nappies. By the time Mr. Justice Jacob had left, trials were taking five to six days, and, what is more, he gave every impression on occasions of having read the papers in advance.

We then lost Mr. Justice Jacob to the Court of Appeal. Would his spontaneity be lost in the cerebral world of this court? Those responsible for listing know, however, how to bring the best out of their judges, and the newly elevated Lord Justice Jacob was assigned to a court presided over by Lord Justice Ward. The rest is history. *(Laughter)*

My Lord, may I take this opportunity to pay tribute to my Lord's clerk Lorraine Bennett, to whom first and foremost many happy returns, who has been more than equal to the daunting task of keeping you on the straight and narrow. Her methods were many and varied, including ringing me up one morning to ask if I would take you out to lunch because you were being a nuisance. *(Laughter)*

Now, my Lord, the time has come for you to ride off, no doubt on a rickety bicycle, into the colourful retirement sunset of academia. I know that when Treasurer of Gray's Inn you greatly enjoyed the company of the students. All I can say is that the students at UCL will be both fortunate and privileged when their paths cross with yours. Whether their vision of the Rt Hon Professor Sir Robin Jacob will entirely accord with reality is another matter.

My Lord, my time is up. I have spoken for eight minutes without interruption by you — a record. May I, on behalf of the Bar, wish your Lordship the most happy, fulfilled and lengthy retirement from the Bench.

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Thank you, Mr. Thorley. Miss May?

**MISS CHARLOTTE MAY (8 New Square):** My Lords.

It is an honour and a privilege to say a few words to my Lord, Lord Justice Jacob, on behalf of the Junior Bar.

Unlike Mr Thorley, I am only allowed four minutes. But, just like Mr Thorley, I rejoice in the fact that it will probably be the longest period a member of the Junior Bar will ever get to address my Lord without interruption, so I intend to make the most of it. Of course, whether or not your Lordship can resist temptation this time remains to be seen.

I have summarised my speech into three short points. And before you ask, my Lord, yes — they are my best points! *(Laughter)*

First, I must thank my Lord on behalf of the Junior Bar for the benefit of 18 years of my Lord's judging. Right from the very beginning, my Lord, you firmly stamped your personality on proceedings in your court. As a result, they were fast, efficient and full of good humour. Always commercially minded, your Lordship actively managed your cases to keep costs down — even before the days of CPR — and openly encouraged parties to settle if there was an obvious way out.

Mr. Thorley has already referred to your Lordship's legendary knack, when in practice, to pick out the crucial document in the instructions without reading them. Your Lordship's ability to get right to the heart of the issue never diminished as a judge. Within virtually the first five minutes of any hearing before my Lord, you would always ask the killer question. As an advocate, one merely hoped that it was to be fired at the opposition!

Thanks to my Lord's style and influence we now have a litigation system that is significantly more streamlined and efficient, and IP courts that are respected across Europe and internationally.

My second point is to thank my Lord on behalf of the Junior Bar for the benefit of 18 years of your Lordship's judgments. As a body of works, they comprise a masterpiece of learning in IP. No matter how complex, your Lordship has always had the ability to express the issue succinctly and to reason upon it in clear and straightforward language. Your Lordship manages to say what everyone else is thinking. Only recently your Lordship honestly described the excluded matter provisions in the EPC as something which does your head in! *(Laughter)*

But it is not only IP cases where your Lordship has left your mark. Over the years my Lord has given judgments on issues ranging from family law to planning to pensions to immigration, always with the same clarity and Denning-esque approach to justice. Like Lord Neuberger, I consider one of the more memorable decisions was the case of *Ferguson v British Gas* in which my Lord praised the courage of Ms Ferguson to take a stand against one of the big battalions of industry in what can only be described as a cracking read!

Now, they say that behind every successful man is a successful woman, and my Lord is no exception. I refer of course, to my Lord's wonderful wife Wendy, who has contributed to my Lord's success by providing constant support and encouragement

whilst running the family home and pursuing her own talent as an artist. We are very grateful to her too.

My third and last point is to wish my Lord well for the future. The Junior Bar is delighted that my Lord has been appointed as the first Sir Hugh Laddie Chair in IP at UCL, not least so that we can continue to benefit from my Lord's deep knowledge and understanding of the subject. According to the UCL website, it is my Lord's intention to make UCL one of the key world centres for *practical* IP law, research and teaching. There is no one better placed than my Lord to achieve this endeavour, and we wish you the very best.

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Thank you very much. Mr. Westmacott?

**MR. PHILIP WESTMACOTT (Intellectual Property Lawyers' Association):** My Lords.

I have instructions to speak without hesitation, deviation or repetition for no more than two minutes, but, unlike the radio panel game, the topic, Lord Justice Jacob, does not change from round to round. (*Laughter*)

So I asked my fellow solicitors — what should I say? There was no shortage of material, but, even applying a coarse filter, of the type to be found in Patent Offices around the world, I discovered that rather more than 12/14ths of the material they so kindly supplied had to be discarded as highly entertaining but entirely unsuitable for repetition in open court — rather like the infamous bundle 50 in the HCV litigation.

I hope I may be permitted to address my remarks primarily to Lord Justice Jacob. We are here to thank you, my Lord. First, for your undeniable energy and enthusiasm — as an effective junior barrister you earned the sobriquet “Bobbin’ Robin”. (*Laughter*)

Secondly, for your undoubted determination that “the mode of conducting the law in a patent case” was capable of remedy. Your method was to focus on essentials. This included reducing the number of documents. After all, as counsel, you personally had no wish to plough through volumes of documents. Why should the court? So, when in the HCV case the defendant noticed frequent references to a gentleman by the name of Rodney in the claimant's discovery, they demanded immediate disclosure of all Rodney's invention notebooks. You were delighted at your solicitors' reply: “Dear Sirs, Rodney is a chimpanzee.” (*Laughter*)

In mid-December 2008 a patent infringement case was started. The defendants decided to rely on just their best bit of prior art. Mr. Justice Lewison gave directions: the High Court tried the case before Easter 2009. You gave directions: the Court of Appeal decided the case by the end of July. A full decision of an appellate court on a patent in some seven months — I believe that is a world record. Maybe the proper recipients of the Lawyer Award for that case should have been you and Mr. Justice Lewison.

You have consistently been clear, maybe almost impatient, that IP cases should be conducted quickly, efficiently and at the minimum cost consistent with a fair outcome. Our clients are grateful for that.

One of the qualities we all seek in a judge is predictability. You have been known to describe certain pharmaceutical patents as ones which give the patent system a bad name and for which the only solution is a rapid and efficient method for obtaining revocation.

When the European Commission invited you to give an address when they presented preliminary views during the pharmaceutical sector inquiry, they may not have expected that you would start your speech with a quotation from the Pied Piper of Hamelin, or the almost equally famous writings of Mr. Thomas Blanco White. It turned out you had no problem with pharmaceutical patents as such — only with bad ones. An outcome is predictable only when all the evidence is considered. It appeared that the European Commission official who sat behind you, and whose face told a thousand words, had just discovered this — to his cost.

On the subject of eloquence, we are grateful for the amusing turns of phrase found in your many judgments. It is no coincidence that in no less than five of the last ten years, one of your remarks has been selected as the quotation of the year in the Annual Patent Review.

I cannot let this morning pass without remarking on your considerable loyalty: to your fellow judges, both in this country and abroad; to fellow members of the Bar and, in particular, junior members starting out on their careers. Indeed I can even, on occasion, recall your saying something really quite complimentary about select members of my own branch of the profession! (*Laughter*)

So (and, to misquote your judgment in *Gerber*, I hope that it will not be thought that I have built towers of appreciation on sands of unreliable evidence) you have shown yourself thus far — and, as has been said, your career is far from complete — as intelligent, enthusiastic, focused, a moderniser, knowledgeable, committed, witty and loyal. But there is one last virtue I should mention — humility.

In *Gerber*, you said: “Quantification of damage in a case such as the present is a much harder, less certain, task than I had hitherto thought. Although I have had to reach an answer I do not pretend it is an accurate measure of the damage ... It is just the best assessment I can make.”

My Lord we know that you have consistently done your best for your clients when you appeared as counsel, for litigants when a judge and for all those who use the courts in which you have sat.

For all of this, we, the IP solicitors, thank you.

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Thank you. Mr. Poore?

**MR. ALASDAIR POORE (Chartered Institute of Patent Attorneys):** My Lords, I am speaking on behalf of the Chartered Institute of Patent Attorneys, and I am pleased to say that this is not a geometric progression because in one minute I would find it hard to do justice to your Lordship’s extreme service to the intellectual property community.

Your Lordship was appointed to the Bench at a time when reform was in the air. I remember a fresh wind blowing through the Patents Court Users' Committee, as it was then called, before reform got its name changed, with a genuine desire to see change. I thought that the fresh wind would blow itself out on the rocks of the Lord Chancellor's Department. Maybe it was the effect of competition from the Patents County Court, but, more likely, it was your real interest in change.

We are now seeing the real benefit of that change, both in the Patents Court, and more widely, and even perhaps in the European Patents Court in due course, and, indeed, also your support (and challenges) to patent attorneys playing roles in those courts.

At the Bar, as you have heard, I guess, there were rumours — and I stress rumours — that, if you wanted Mr. Jacob QC to read the papers, there would of course be an extra charge. (*Laughter*)

Likewise, on the Bench, it would have been a mistake always to allow facts to detract from a good judgment. For example, what about *Aerotel*? The facts (as they later turned out) showed that the patent was bad for excluded subject matter. If the facts had taken their toll initially, we might have missed your incisive analysis of the patentability of computer implemented inventions.

*Aerotel* was followed in *Symbian* – a patent attorney litigator case, reported in CIPA in the following terms: “The clear and authoritative guidance from the Court of Appeal will end a difficult period of uncertainty and confusion for UK inventors”, which just goes to show that one should not let facts get in the way of a good press release. (*Laughter*)

These cases illustrate your often outspoken desire to ensure that intellectual property law is always subject to rigorous challenges, whether patents, trade marks or in other matters, and, incidentally, creates all the more work for patent attorneys.

Good things have to come to an end. But this one, we hope, will not. The intellectual zeal with which you have challenged a European view, especially the European Court of Justice (or CJEU, as we are now required to call it), can now be applied with all the more vigour in an academic environment, an environment untrammelled by any facts — or by the constraints of the law. Your challenging ideas and intellectual stimulus are something our members will relish, as will your students.

All our members will sincerely appreciate your service and regret your departure but look forward to a very stimulating future.

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Thank you very much. Mrs. Ramage?

**MRS. MAGGIE RAMAGE (The Institute of Trade Mark Attorneys):** My Lords, Lord Justice Jacob.

I have the pleasure to appear before you today on behalf of The Institute of Trade Mark Attorneys, as its President.

Lord Justice Jacob is known to us all as having strong views, and handing down strongly worded judgments, for example, as recently seen in the Decision of *L'Oréal v Bellure*.

In the early 1990s, I instructed Lord Justice Jacob, when he was in Chambers. At the time I was acting for Yellow Pages, as part of British Telecom, against Thomson Directories. Indeed, I remember visiting Lord Justice Jacob, or Robin Jacob, as he then was, on two separate occasions. On the first occasion, we had a lengthy conference in Chambers about strategy on the case at issue. Some months later, at the second conference, Lord Justice Jacob kicked off the discussion with the criticism, "You do not appear to have done anything I advised you to previously". (*Laughter*) This rather put us in our place, but it is a piece of advice I have always remembered. Listen to advice and act upon it.

Over the years, Lord Justice Jacob has been particularly supportive of our Institute and has been very keen to speak to our members at evening seminars and to attend various social events we have run. Indeed, when I became President of the Institute last spring, the Institute had an evening reception, to mark the occasion. This was the first time I had spoken on behalf of my Institute to the various distinguished guests, and one overriding memory I do have is of addressing all the guests, but being aware of one person in particular standing centre right, directly in my field of vision, grinning his head off, and generally willing me on. I certainly felt, on that occasion, that I had Lord Justice Jacob behind me.

My Institute has always had an excellent relationship with you, and I think it is fair to say that our members are grateful for the encouragement you have shown, particularly with what is now very much a growing group of trade mark litigators.

We in the Institute are indebted to you for your help over the years, and appreciate the encouragement you have given, both to our members generally, but also to me personally. We join together to wish you all the best in your new position as the first Sir Hugh Laddie Chair in Intellectual Property Law at UCL, as Director of The Institute Of Brand And Innovation Law. Indeed, I am sure that my members would join me in saying that we could not think of anybody better equipped to take on this role. We wish you all the very best for the future.

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Thank you very much. Lord Justice Jacob?

**LORD JUSTICE JACOB:** Lord Chief, Master of the Rolls, other members of the court, Mr. Thorley, Miss May, Mr. Westmacott, Mr. Poore, Mrs. Ramage.

17½ years ago, in thanking everyone for their speeches of welcome to me as a new judge, I ended by promising to do my best.

Well, I tried. (*Laughter*)

But sometimes higher courts — (*Laughter*) — and the European Courts of Justice said that my best wasn't good enough.

Lord Chief, for the purposes of today at least, I forgive them. (*Laughter*) They knew not what they were doing. (*Laughter*)

What I did not know 17½ years ago was how much I was going to enjoy the job. That enjoyment came, above all, from the people behind the scenes.

Of course I expected to meet other judges. What I did not expect was to find as much warmth and friendship as I did. I came out of the rather closed world of IP into the wider world — especially when I went on circuit.

That was all rather unexpected.

But what was totally unexpected was the staff here and on Circuit. What marvellous people! It is they who keep the great ship of the law on the road, if you see what I mean. *(Laughter)* They did it and do it unstintingly and with devotion. Thank you all, those who are present and those who are not.

May I mention a few.

Just before I started, I met Doug Noon, the greatest Superintendent ever of this mighty building. He gave me my first, very crummy room. It was small, filthy and cut off from all the other Chancery judges. He said he would sort it in due course — and he did, in spades. Others of his team are here — Dave Reynolds and Margaret Barrett in particular. This building has been so lucky to have them.

On my first morning in came Doug Bell with his then boss. Doug is one of the two greatest listing officers ever. The other is, of course, Anne Marie Munn.

Roger Little took me to a vast, dark cavern below — I still wonder whether it is there. It was full of furniture covered in dust and very dark. He said, “Have a chair”. *(Laughter)* Steve Burrows made sure that we were all safe and still does.

Then there have been the ushers, who keep every court running like clockwork. I thank you all. I can’t name them all, but I give special thanks to Penny McNulty, who looked after me for so many years in Chancery.

And then there have been the judges’ clerks. They are an absolutely amazing body of people, both here and on circuit. If anything is even slightly going wrong, it is sorted. Thank you all so much.

Thus I come to Lorraine, the power. Don, I hope you don’t mind if I tell the absolute truth. Lorraine is the best clerk of them all. *(Laughter)* She has been with me for over 13 of my 17½ years as judge. Through all that time she has been my guardian angel — always thinking ahead of me, always alert, always seeing trouble well before it even begins to surface. She is very cross with me for leaving and it is one of the things I regret most.

She will in due course be going to a new judge. He or she is probably here. I say to you now: if you get her, you have drawn first prize. Look after her well. She will repay in spades. If you don’t, I know where you live! *(Laughter)* Today is her birthday. Happy birthday, Lorraine, and thank you, thank you, thank you.

I am leaving this job with a very heavy heart, with huge misgivings, and wondering whether I have done the right thing. I am going to miss you all so so much. However, the new job does fill me with excitement and it is an opportunity not to be missed.

I hope to see you all at UCL early and often.

I hope I am going to have more time at home. Wendy is very worried about that. (*Laughter*) Either I am, in which case maybe she'll wish I wasn't, or, if I don't, she'll get cross. She has made so much possible.

I was warned by a fellow judge not to blub and I have just about done it.

Thank you all.

**THE LORD CHIEF JUSTICE:** Thank you. Thank you all very much for coming. It is an occasion which will be warm in Robin's mind.

---