QUANTUM AWARDED BY THE COURT		
Case name	Amount asked	Amount awarded
D'Agostini v Pipon & Co. and Pons v Others [1880 MR 31]	Rs6,000	Rs1,000
Ng King v Lai See Kwan 1940 MR 72	Rs1,500	Rs1,500
Gupta v Fincotex 1996 MR 72	Rs100,000	Rs50,000
Al-Rawas I.S.A.A v Pegasus Energy Limited & Ors 2006 SCJ 274	£163,660	£165,000 (legal fees for the two cases in Mauritius and England and travel accommodation for Respondent No.8 in Mauritius)
Vestalane Investments (Pty) Ltd v Federal Trust (Mauritius) Ltd 2007 SCJ 84	Rs4,800,000	Rs500,000 (Legal costs Business class tickets for witnesses from abroad- on the high side- such costs subject to taxation by the Master under Rule 4 of Legal Fees and Costs Rules)
AL-RAWAS I.S.A.A v Al TANI HH.S.K.B.H. & ORS 2013 SCJ 447	USD 1,0788,074	USD 650,988 (Claim reduced by 25% to deduct additional expenses which the counter claim would entail)
Atelier Etude Limousin & Ors v BPCE International et Outre Mer & Anor 2016 SCJ 300	Rs500,000 to each	Rs300,000 to each two defendants and Rs150,000 to each co-defendant No.1-4 (Expenses for defending the case)
Barnwell Enterprises Ltd v ECP Africa FII Investments LLC 2017 SCJ 133	USD 100,000	The Court ordered the Applicant to furnish the sum of USD 135, 360 to Respondent No.1 which is made up as follows: 1. Counsel's and attorney

<u> </u>	1	C 1.000
		fees 1,000
		2. Lawyer fee from USA
		40,000
		3. Counsel fee from UK
		25,000
		4. Expert fees
		(15,120+15,120+39,120) 69,
		360
		5. Total 135,360
		And for Respondent No.2,
		the sum of USD 69,360
		made up as follows:
		1. Expert fees (15,120 X 3+
		24, 000) 69,360
		, ,
Barnwell Enterprises Ltd	USD 703,290 reduced to	Legal fees (Counsel and
v ECP Africa FII	USD 370,290	Attorney fee in Mauritius)
Investments LLC 2018		USD 3,300
SCJ 119		2. Lawyer fee from USA
		USD 72,550
		3. Counsel fee from UK
		USD 87,650
		4. Costs of travel and
		accommodation USD
		64,120
		for 2 representatives and 2
		experts
		CAPOLIS

Not awarded in L'Hoir v Levieux 1909 MR 130 and Malletier L V v Tejoo A B 2017 SCJ 399: Defendant failed to raise in plea in limine at first occasion and before case was ripe for hearing