

ILEC practice test audio transcripts

This is the Cambridge International Legal English Certificate, Listening Test.

Sample Paper

Look at the Information for Candidates on the front of your question paper. This paper requires you to listen to a selection of recorded material and answer the accompanying questions.

There are four parts to the test. You will hear each part twice.

There will be a pause before each part to allow you to look through the questions, and other pauses to let you think about your answers. At the end of every pause, you will hear this sound.

You should write your answers in the spaces provided on the question paper. You will have five minutes at the end to transfer your answers to the separate answer sheet.

There will now be a pause. You must ask any questions now, as you will not be allowed to speak during the test.

Now open your question paper and look at Part 1.

Part 1

You will hear three different extracts. For questions 1–6, choose the answer (A, B or C) which fits best according to what you hear. There are two questions for each extract.

You will hear each extract twice.

Extract 1

The six months I spent in Milan were amazing. It wasn't just that I was part of a smaller team, it was also that I had to work with other local firms. I'd worked with the Italian office before, during a banking deal, but being on the spot meant that I could really grasp how things work out there. That experience helps a lot when you get home. I think that the firm's smaller European offices are different from, say, Hong Kong or Singapore – which are much more what I would be used to back home – so it was a good choice for me.

I think sometimes as a trainee it can be difficult to see the significance of some of the work you do. It took me a while to appreciate the fact that without the routine elements, transactions simply can't complete successfully. Working in the firm's Milan office was an eye-opener for me, as it's a smaller outfit than back home and there's less in the way of practical support, so it made me realise the importance of getting every detail right and still being efficient about it. Even as a trainee, there's a need to manage effectively and delegate.

Now you will hear the recording again.

Extract 2

Lawyer: Robert, good morning. Thank you for coming. I just wanted to update you on where we are concerning your case.

Client: Oh, yes, that would be really useful.

Lawyer: Basically, what's happened is that some neighbouring homeowners have been granted a Temporary Restraining Order, preventing your company from carrying out any further chemical operations on your property. What happened was that their lawyers were able to convince a judge that your chemical operations are contrary to your zoning status. They've also got some evidence that chemicals may be leaking onto their land. That's how they met the requirements necessary to get an order, and they've posted a bond to cover any loss you might incur.

Client: So when do I get any say in the matter? It seems ridiculous that they're complaining about the chemical operations when the local authority has no problems with it. We've been doing it for six years.

Lawyer: Yes, I know, Robert ... and with the local authorities on our side, I wouldn't be overly worried. However, apparently the homeowners do have some photographs to submit which may well support their argument. A hearing is scheduled for next week to determine whether cause exists to continue the order or not pending a full trial. At the hearing, you'll need to testify and provide the technical background.

Client: I see.

Now you will hear the recording again.

Extract 3

Woman: Your new recruit called me about the Thwaite case the other day. How's she getting on?

Man: Claudia? She's not doing badly, actually. She certainly keeps the paperwork moving – which is more than can be said for her predecessor, I must say. I'm already able to leave most routine aspects of cases to her without feeling I need to look over her shoulder every two minutes to make sure she's coping OK. My only reservation would be that I feel she's got a little too involved in this Thwaite case; that she's not quite embraced the firm's team approach completely. I'll have to find a way of broaching the issue with her. What about your chap, Pedro?

Woman: Oh, Pedro's doing fine, too – just a few rough edges. I got a bit worried about his interpretation of one client's needs, though. He hadn't quite realised that some of the work he was undertaking, though appropriate enough in itself, was rather time-hungry in ways that weren't moving things forward – I had to explain the cost specifics. He took what I said very well and probably just needs to attend a session on research techniques, you know, something on targeting the answerable questions.

Now you will hear the recording again.

That is the end of Part 1.

Part 2

You will hear part of a consultation between a lawyer and a new client, Anna Krupa, who is planning to set up her own business. For questions 7–11, choose the best answer, A, B or C.

You will hear the recording twice. You now have 45 seconds to look at Part 2.

Lawyer: Good morning. I'm Malcolm Travis.

Anna: Good morning. Anna Krupa.

Lawyer: Pleased to meet you. First of all, I have to ask you, has the firm acted on your behalf in any other matter?

Anna: Not exactly. My husband was a client of your firm some years ago. He works in the insurance sector, but it wasn't a commercial matter – his siblings were contesting the contents of their parents' will – so it's of no relevance to what we're dealing with now. But he was happy with the firm, so that's why I'm here.

Lawyer: And I understand you're interested in setting up your own business?

Anna: That's right. It's time to capitalise on my experience and training. I've been lucky; soon after graduating, I got work with an innovative software company and was involved in a highly successful project. Then I was head-hunted by a larger company, where I stayed for 12 years. That was my last job. I got quite a generous severance package from them, which I've put to good use. I've taken time out to develop some research projects of my own, free from the pressure of having to look for another post.

Lawyer: Why did you leave them, may I ask?

Anna: Well, I had some minor differences with my line manager. You know, little things like I wanted to upgrade the medical insurance plan that was part of the salary package, and they refused to pay. But although it was a combination of factors, the main trigger was getting passed over for a promotion. That's when I decided that I'd rather work for myself – so I quit. It was

quite amicable, but I'm still a little bitter about not getting the credit I felt I deserved.

Lawyer: And do you have a copy of the employment agreement? The reason I ask is because often they contain a restrictive covenant.

Anna: I do remember that there was something that prevented me from taking their customers, but I don't think it said anything about not competing with them in a more general sense – you know, geographical location, confidentiality, those sorts of things. In any case, if memory serves me correctly, it was only operative for one year after leaving, and that's passed now – but I'll check it out. I've still got the agreement somewhere – would you take a look at it for me to make certain?

Lawyer: Absolutely, I would need to. So what are your priorities at the moment?

Anna: Well, I've come up with what is basically a new kind of software package – an invention if you like. I've already applied for a patent, so that's all in hand, but I need to be thinking about a business plan before I approach the bank for a loan to cover the start-up costs. You know, I have to conduct live trials, think about business premises, even staff eventually. But I want to keep my overheads down, so I'm looking for ways of doing that which allow me to maximise any investment I make. Could you advise me on such things?

Lawyer: Indeed we could. Let's talk about the business plan first. Now you will hear the recording again.

That is the end of Part 2.

Part 3

You will hear an announcement at a seminar about a future conference on the subject of taxation law in South America. For questions 12–20, complete the sentences.

You will hear the recording twice. You now have one minute to look at Part 3.

We've got a few minutes before our next session, so there's just time to give you some information about an upcoming conference on the topic of tax incentives in Latin America. The two-day conference will be held in Miami, Florida, on the 17th and 18th of March and is being presented by the taxation section of the International Bar Association.

Delegates will have the opportunity to update their legal knowledge and meet leading international tax lawyers and industry experts. The conference should appeal to accountants, economists and corporate lawyers dealing with international tax issues in Latin America.

If you register now, conference fees can be as little as \$485, even for non-IBA members who fall into certain categories; for example, lawyers under 30, full-time academics and judges. To get these reductions, however, you must register before the 18th of February. After that, fees increase to \$845 for non-members and \$745 for IBA members. If you wish to attend the conference dinner, there is an additional charge of \$120.

Otherwise, fees cover attendance at all working sessions. These will be in English, and English–Spanish interpreting will be provided. You will also receive, in advance, all conference materials, including any speakers' papers submitted before the 11th of February, and you'll be able to get on to the IBA website in the seven days prior to the conference. During the conference itself, lunches, light refreshments and evening receptions are also included in the fee.

A key feature of this conference is that it will be run partly as a competition for selected young lawyers who will each present papers on a particular incentive or disincentive in a Latin American jurisdiction. The best speaker amongst them will be presented with an award at the Closing Reception. If you'd like to take part, you need first of all to be under 40 years of age and be ready to do a 15-minute presentation. The topics of the six

sessions are as follows: on the first day, sessions will focus on tax incentives in oil and mining activities and in the financial services sector. If none of those topics appeals, then the following day's programme might hold more interest for you. That's when the emphasis will be on tax incentives in utilities, in ecotourism and in the real-estate sector. Each speaker needs to present a particular incentive or disincentive in a local Latin American jurisdiction, together with the reasons for implementing it. The effectiveness of local tax arrangements for attracting foreign investment should also be addressed. Each presentation will be followed by a panel discussion which further investigates the issues raised.

Finally, if you're hoping to attend the conference – whether as a speaker or a delegate – and you live outside the USA, you may need to think about a visa. The conference organisers would like to stress, though, that they are unable to issue a letter in support of any application until they have received a completed registration form and the full fees.

So, if you'd like more information about the conference ...

Now you will hear the recording again.

That is the end of Part 3.

Part 4

Now look at the fourth and last part of the test. Part 4 consists of two tasks.

You will hear five short extracts in which various employees of a law firm called Haddiscoe are talking about working for the company. Look at Task 1. For questions 21–25, choose from the list A–F the thing that impressed each speaker about the firm initially. Now look at Task 2. For questions 26–30, choose from the list A–F what each speaker regards as the most valuable experience they have gained whilst with the firm.

You will hear the recording twice. While you listen, you must complete both tasks.

You now have 40 seconds to look at Part 4.

- 1 I'd applied to various law firms and been put off by the very traditional image you get from all the paperwork they send you. Haddiscoe stood out as different, they dispensed with all that; just invited me in for a fairly laid-back interview, which really suited me. Once I'd settled in, I realised not everything was quite as flexible and friendly as the recruitment staff had suggested. But never mind; I got the chance to work with people who really know their stuff in fairly specialist areas of the law. They could be difficult at times, and it was a steep learning curve for me, but brilliant training – giving me a future as a specialist in those areas, too.
- 2 I'd trained with another firm where working conditions were excellent, but I was fairly ambitious, and could tell from the interview that at Haddiscoe I'd be able to branch out into all sorts of areas that interested me for the future – particularly the regulation of financial markets. I couldn't have got that anywhere else so early on in my career. You couldn't pick and choose, of course, but I was lucky, getting taken on as assistant to a partner on a multi-million-dollar financing deal. I got to work directly with the financiers, drafting a whole document from scratch. It was only one aspect of the project, but that direct contact gave me real insights into that branch of the law.
- 3 At first, I wasn't sure that I fitted Haddiscoe's image, having trained in a more traditional firm, but I did eventually find I had lots in common with my colleagues. What actually attracted me was the firm's willingness to experiment with different ways of working, even for more junior staff; staggered hours, the option of working at home sometimes – it was all refreshingly forward-looking. Once there, the most beneficial thing for me personally was working as part of a team on complex international projects where we'd liaise closely with various overseas offices. It wouldn't have been my choice, because nothing in my previous

training had prepared me for that, but I gradually acquired the necessary expertise.

- 4** I'd read a very positive article about Haddiscoe in the press, but it was only at the interview that I sensed how intent they were on expansion. I reckoned that would mean training opportunities, interesting work with high-profile clients, etc., so I didn't even apply to any other firms. In actual fact, I've mostly been involved with fairly routine work with little opportunity to branch out. It wouldn't have been my choice, but it has meant that I'm trusted to do more things on my own. Like when the partner takes me along to meetings and then leaves all the follow-up to me – drafting the documents, preparing for the signing, etc. Some colleagues recruited more recently don't really get that.
- 5** Friends working at Haddiscoe seemed quite enthusiastic, but colleagues aren't everything, so I got hold of a copy of the firm's mission statement. It might not be the best way to choose an employer, but I found myself in sympathy with their general approach and so applied. I was pleasantly surprised by the variety and the scale of the litigation projects I got involved in, though I have to be flexible. But the real plus for me is the chance I get to pass my knowledge and experience on to newer recruits. Devoting time to the induction course means less contact with clients, which might mean less higher-level work in the future, but the rewards far outweigh any drawbacks.

Now you will hear the recording again.

That is the end of Part 4. There will now be a five-minute pause to allow you to transfer your answers to the separate answer sheet. Be sure to follow the numbering of all the questions. The question papers and answer sheets will then be collected by your supervisor. I'll remind you when there is one minute left, so that you're sure to finish in time.

You have one more minute left.

That is the end of the test.

ILEC practice test answer key

Reading

1 D 2 A 3 B 4 A 5 C 6 D 7 D 8 C 9 B 10 A 11 C 12 B
13 NONE 14 IN 15 TO 16 SUCH 17 DO 18 BEEN
19 AS 20 ALTHOUGH/THOUGH/WHILE WHILST
21 OF 22 OR 23 HOW 24 ALL 25 FRAMEWORK
26 OBLIGATIONS 27 PROSPEROUS 28 ACCOUNTABLE
29 VIRTUALLY 30 SETTLEMENT 31 EVASION
32 IRREGULARITY/IRREGULARITIES 33 OFFENCE/OFFENSE
34 FACILITATE 35 DISCIPLINARY 36 DISCLOSURE
37 B 38 D 39 A 40 D 41 C 42 B 43 F 44 C 45 E 46 G
47 A 48 D 49 B 50 C 51 C 52 B 53 D 54 A

Listening

1 B 2 C 3 B 4 B 5 A 6 C 7 A 8 C 9 B 10 A 11 C
12 ACCOUNTANTS/ECONOMISTS 13 (FULL-TIME) JUDGES
14 745/SEVEN-HUNDRED AND FORTY-FIVE (DOLLARS)
15 WEBSITE 16 COMPETITION 17 OIL/MINING
18 REAL ESTATE 19 (PANEL) DISCUSSION 20 VISA
21 A 22 D 23 E 24 C 25 F 26 F 27 C 28 D
29 E 30 A