

Sensitivity: General

BEFORE THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

Case No:

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 (as amended)

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LIMITED

Applicant

and

TIMOTHY EAGLE

Respondent

**STATEMENT PURSUANT TO RULE 12 (2) OF THE SOLICITORS (DISCIPLINARY
PROCEEDINGS RULES) 2019**

I, Jonathan White am a Solicitor of Blake Morgan LLP, 6 New Street Square, London, EC4A 3DJ. I make this Statement on behalf of the Applicant, the Solicitors Regulation Authority Limited ("SRA").

The allegations

1. The allegations against the Respondent, Timothy Eagle, made by the SRA are that, on 23 December 2022 at Firm A's offices, while in practice as a Senior Partner at Firm A ("the Firm"):

Allegation 1 (Person A)

- 1.1 Said to Person A words to the effect of '[Person A] *you are just so sexy*', which was inappropriate and/or unwanted; and/or
- 1.2 Placed his hand on Person A's waist, which was inappropriate and/or unwanted; and/or

Sensitivity: General

- 1.3 Said to Person A words to the effect of '*if I was 20 years younger, I would like to fuck you right now*' which was inappropriate and/or unwanted.

Thereby breaching any or all of Principles 2, 5 and 6 of the SRA Principles 2019 ("the Principles") and Rule 1.5 of the Code of Conduct for Solicitors 2019 ("the Code").

The facts and matters relied upon in support of Allegation 1 are set out in paragraphs 11 to 21 below.

Allegation 2 (Person B)

- 2.1 Said to Person B words to the effect of '*your shoulders look lovely, I'd love to kiss them*', which was inappropriate and/or unwanted; and/ or
- 2.2 Kissed Person B's bare right shoulder despite being told by Person B not to do so, which was inappropriate and/or unwanted; and or;
- 2.3 Said to Person B words to the effect of "*I don't believe you every woman likes being kissed*", after Person B had told him to stop and that she did not like it, which was inappropriate and/or unwanted.

Thereby breaching any or all of Principles 2, 5 and 6 of the Principles and Rule 1.5 of the Code.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of Allegation 2 are set out in paragraphs 38 to 50 below.

Allegation 3 (Person C)

- 3.1 Said to Person C words to the effect of '*that dress is easy access*', which was inappropriate and/or unwanted; and/or
- 3.2 Gestured with his index and middle finger towards the middle of Person C's thighs where her dress met in the middle which was inappropriate and/or unwanted.

Thereby breaching any or all of Principles 2, 5 and 6 of the Principles and Rule 1.5 of the Code.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of Allegation 3 are set out in paragraphs 65 to 71 below.

Sensitivity: General

Allegation 4 (Person D)

4.1 Said to Person D words to the effect of '*we've got a bunch of really lovely colleagues here and I'd really love to fuck* [Person E]', which was inappropriate and/or unwanted.

Thereby breaching any or all of Principles 2, 5 and 6 of the Principles and Rule 1.5 of the Code.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of Allegation 4 are set out in paragraphs 85 to 88 below.

Sexual motivation

2. In addition, Allegations 1 to 4 inclusive are advanced on the basis that the Respondent's conduct was sexually motivated and/or sexual in nature. Sexual motivation and/or the conduct being sexual in nature is alleged as an aggravating feature of the Respondent's misconduct but is not an essential ingredient in proving the Allegations. For further particulars of sexual misconduct, please see paragraphs 103 to 107 below.

Appendices and Documents

2. I attach to this Statement the following appendices:

Appendix 1: Relevant Rules and Regulations

Appendix 2: Anonymisation Schedule

3. I attach to this statement a bundle of documents, marked "JW1" to which I refer in this statement. Unless otherwise stated, the page references ("JW1 p [X]") in this statement relate to documents contained in that bundle.

4. The bundle is divided into the following sections:

Section A: Investigation documents

Section B: Notice recommending referral of conduct to the Tribunal

Section C: Representations following the Notice.

Section D: Referral Decision.

Professional Details

5. The Respondent, who was born on 7 June 1959, is a solicitor, having been admitted to the Roll on 1 October 1983. At the material time he was a senior Partner at the Firm. The Respondent no longer works at the Firm and does not currently hold a practising certificate.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of the allegations

Background

6. The conduct in this matter came to the attention of the SRA when it received a self-report from the Respondent [JW1, p1], in which he informed the SRA that the Firm had commenced an investigation into his conduct occurring on 23 December 2022. This was followed by a report from the Firm's Managing Partner on 20 January 2023.
7. The alleged conduct on 23 December 2022, which was the date of the Firm's Christmas celebrations. The Firm had closed around lunchtime and a Christmas lunch was held at a venue in Norwich. The lunch finished at approximately 5.00pm. Some of the staff who had attended the lunch returned to the office to continue socialising [JW1, p28-29].
8. Approximately 25-30 staff who had attended the lunch, returned to the office, including the Respondent and Persons A-G.
9. The Respondent had been away from work for health reasons from September 2021 until August 2022 [D33]. By Christmas 2022 the Respondent was working four days a week [JW1, p27].
10. While at the office after the lunch, the Respondent had interactions with several colleagues. The Respondent was intoxicated, such that Person G and Person F spoke with the Respondent during the evening and suggested he go home [JW1, p140]. The Respondent declined to do so. Person F subsequently assisted the Respondent down the stairs and outside and into his partner's vehicle [JW1, p137].

Allegation 1 – (Person A)

11. Person A had started working at the Firm [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [JW1, p88].
12. Person A attended the Christmas lunch and then returned to the office with colleagues.
13. Person A went to her own office on the first floor. She collected a bottle of wine that a colleague had given her as a gift and took it to the kitchen on the third floor to put the wine in the fridge [JW1, p93].
14. During the evening, Person A went back into the kitchen to fill up her wine glass from the wine she had put in the fridge earlier. The Respondent was standing in front of the fridge. Person A had previously observed the Respondent to be intoxicated. Person A asked the Respondent if he would mind moving aside so that she could open the fridge [JW1, p94].
15. In response, the Respondent said “[Person A], *you are just so sexy*”. Person A was not sure what to say and so she laughed it off and said ‘thanks’. [JW1, p95].
16. As Person A was getting the wine bottle out of the fridge, the Respondent said to her “*if I was 20 years younger I would like to fuck you right now*”. This was said quietly. [JW1, p95]
17. As the Respondent said this, he put his left hand on the left side of Person A’s waist. The Respondent was standing close to Person A when doing so. [JW1, p95].
18. Person A decided to remove herself from the situation. She removed the wine bottle from the fridge and ran to three colleagues and told them what had happened [JW1, p96].
19. Person A subsequently observed the Respondent to be “*extremely drunk*” [JW1, p97].
20. Person A was not interested in having a sexualised conversation with the Respondent [JW1, p96].

Sensitivity: General

21. On 28 December 2022 the Respondent came into Person A's office and said words to the effect of "I don't know if I said anything to you, but I'm sorry if I did." [JW1, p98].

Allegation 1 – breaches of Principles and Code.Principle 5 (integrity)

22. The Respondent's actions amounted to a failure to act with integrity (i.e. with moral soundness, rectitude and steady adherence to an ethical code) in breach of Principle 2 of the SRA Principles. In *Wingate v Solicitors Regulation Authority v Malins [2018] EWCA Civ 366*, it was said that integrity connotes adherence to the ethical standards of one's own profession.
23. The Respondent was a senior Partner and was in a position of significant seniority and authority in relation to Person A, who was a junior employee of the Firm. The Respondent was therefore under a professional obligation to ensure that his behaviour reflected his senior role in the Firm. The Respondent was significantly older than Person A and this contributed to the power imbalance between the two of them.
24. The Respondent's actions took place in the context of a work event at the Firm's offices. This reinforced the position of authority and seniority that the Respondent had over Person A.
25. The Respondent had no reason to believe that Person A wanted him to make the comments he did or to touch her.
26. The Respondent's conduct in relation to Person A was manifestly inappropriate in all the circumstances described above. A solicitor acting with integrity would not tell a younger, junior member of staff that she was "sexy" and that he would "like to fuck" her and he would not touch her waist while doing so, or at all.
27. The fact that the Respondent was voluntarily intoxicated, aggravates his conduct in that a solicitor with integrity would not become so intoxicated as to behave in an inappropriate way to a junior member of staff at a work event.
28. The Respondent's health conditions do not explain the conduct that the Respondent engaged in while at the office on the afternoon and evening of 23 December 2022. Insofar as his tolerance of alcohol was reduced following bowel and liver surgery, common sense would have dictated that this was clearly foreseeable. A solicitor acting with integrity would take reasonable steps to ensure

Sensitivity: General

that any medical condition was properly managed in such a way so as to prevent inappropriate and unwanted behaviour in the work environment.

29. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 5.

Principle 2

30. The conduct alleged also amounted to a breach by the Respondent of the requirement to behave in a way which maintains the trust placed by the public in them and in the provision of legal services.

31. The public do not expect a senior Partner to behave in the manner set out at paragraphs 11 to 21 above.

32. Person A was shocked about what the Respondent had said to her [JW1, p97]. Person A describes being "*freaked out by what Tim had said*" to her. Person A was concerned that this incident "*may shape my outlook of Senior male colleagues as I embark on my career in the legal field*" [JW1, p99].

33. The public would be concerned about a situation in which a junior member of staff was made to feel shocked and apprehensive because of the conduct of a senior member of staff in the working environment.

34. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 2.

Principle 6

35. The Respondent's conduct was counter-inclusive and inconsistent with the requirement to encourage equality, diversity and inclusion. Employees should feel able to come to work without having to experience inappropriate and unwanted comments and touching, particularly from a senior partner.

36. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 6 of the Principles.

Rule 1.5

37. The Respondent plainly failed to treat Person A with respect. It is inherently disrespectful to speak to a colleague in such terms, or touch them, particularly a junior colleague where there is a significant power imbalance. Far from challenging behaviour that did not meet this standard, the Respondent was the perpetrator of that behaviour. The Respondent therefore breached Rule 1.5 of the Code.

Allegation 2 – (Person B)

38. At the material time, Person B was working at the Firm [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED] [JW1, p105].
39. Person B attended the Christmas lunch and then returned to the office with colleagues. On arrival at the office, Person B went to the kitchen area on the third floor [JW1, p108].
40. At approximately 6.10pm the Respondent approached Person B. The Respondent said to Person B “*you look nice*”, to which Person B replied “*thank you*” [JW1, p109].
41. The type of dress that Person B was wearing was one where Person B’s shoulders were fully exposed [JW1, p109].
42. The Respondent then said to Person B “*your shoulders look lovely, I’d love to kiss them*”. Person B responded, “*I’d rather you didn’t*” or “*Oh no Tim, don’t do that*”. [JW1, p110]
43. The Respondent then started to kiss Person B’s bare right shoulder. He did so with an open mouth. The kiss lasted between one and five seconds. Person B could feel the Respondent’s tongue on her skin, and found it a “*horrible, wet, caress feeling*”. [JW1, p110]
44. The Respondent was standing to the right of Person B, facing her. Person B was unable to step to the left as there was a divider there. [JW1, p110]
45. Person B immediately told the Respondent to stop and said “*no, stop it*”. The Respondent stopped straight away and asked “*why?*”. Person B replied, “*because I don’t like it*”. There were further exchanges, and the Respondent then said, “*I don’t believe you; every woman likes being kissed*”. [JW1, p110].
46. Person B and the Respondent had further exchanges, during which the Respondent reiterated that he did not believe Person B. Person B eventually told the Respondent “*I don’t like it, you are making me uncomfortable*”. [JW1, p110].
47. The Respondent called Person B a “*bitch*”. Person B responded by saying “*Tim!*”. The Respondent then said “*you’re just a fucking bitch and can fuck off*” and walked away. [JW1, p111].

Sensitivity: General

48. Worrying that she had 'caused a scene', Person B approached the Respondent and said to him that perhaps the word 'uncomfortable' had been the wrong word to use. The Respondent said "*I don't know what you are talking about, but clearly you're just being a bitch and you can fuck off*". [JW1, p111].
49. On 24 December 2022, Person B received a text message from the Respondent in which he wrote: *[Person B], I have been told I acted inappropriately towards you last night. I don't remember it at all, but of course that is no excuse. I am really really sorry. I never wanted to make you feel angry or upset or angry, and feel very bad about it, now I am aware. So sorry Tim*". [JW1, p120]
50. Person B thanked the Respondent for his apology and said "*Let's draw a line under it*". [JW1, p120].

Allegation 2 – breaches of Principles and Code.Principle 5 (integrity)

51. The SRA relies on the test for integrity set out at paragraph 22 above.
52. The Respondent was a senior Partner and was therefore in a position of seniority in relation to Person B. The Respondent was therefore under a professional obligation to ensure that his behaviour reflected his senior role in the Firm. The Respondent's actions took place in the context of a work event at the Firm's offices, and this reinforced the position of seniority that the Respondent had over Person B and in the Firm generally.
53. The Respondent had no reason to believe that Person B wanted him to make the comments he did or to touch her, indeed having suggested kissing her shoulders, Person B had made clear to the Respondent that this was not something she wanted to happen. Despite that he proceeded to kiss her on her shoulder. When Person B reiterated that such conduct was not wanted, the Respondent argued with her, that argument culminating in the Respondent repeatedly calling Person B a "*bitch*" and telling her to "*fuck off*".
54. The Respondent's conduct in relation to Person B was manifestly inappropriate in all the circumstances described above. A solicitor acting with integrity would not kiss a colleague in circumstances where it had been made clear to him that this was not wanted. A solicitor acting with integrity would not, having been reminded that the conduct was not wanted, verbally abuse that colleague.

Sensitivity: General

55. The fact that the Respondent was voluntarily intoxicated, aggravates his conduct in that a solicitor with integrity would not become so intoxicated as to behave in an inappropriate way to another member of staff at a work event.
56. The factors relating to alcohol and the Respondent's health, set out at paragraphs 27 to 28 above are repeated. The Respondent's conduct in relation to Person B was manifestly inappropriate in all the circumstances described above. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 5.

Principle 2

57. The conduct alleged also amounted to a breach by the Respondent of the requirement to behave in a way which maintains the trust placed by the public in them and in the provision of legal services.
58. The public do not expect a senior Partner to behave in the manner set out at paragraphs 38 to 50 above.
59. Person B has stated that "*I have lost all trust and respect in Tim*". Person B further stated; "*After this, hypothetically if I was working late or. If Tim went out on work events and came back to the office after drinking alcohol, I would not want to be on the same floor as him on my own. I do not want to be around Tim on my own full stop*". Person B has described the events of 23 December 2022 as "*a big shock*" to her [JW1, p115].
60. The public would be concerned that a senior Partner had made another colleague feel anxious about the prospect of being alone with them in the office.
61. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 2.

Principle 6

62. The Respondent's conduct was counter-inclusive and inconsistent with the requirement to encourage equality, diversity and inclusion. Staff and colleagues should feel able to come to work without having to experience inappropriate and unwanted comments and touching, particularly from a senior partner.
63. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 6 of the Principles.

Rule 1.5

Sensitivity: General

64. The Respondent plainly failed to treat Person B with respect. It is inherently disrespectful to speak to a colleague in such terms or touch them. Far from challenging behaviour that did not meet this standard, the Respondent was the perpetrator of that behaviour. The Respondent therefore breached Rule 1.5 of the Code.

Allegation 3 – (Person C)

65. [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]. [JW1, p55]

66. Person C attended the Christmas lunch and then returned to the office with colleagues. On arrival at the office, Person C went to her office on the first floor and subsequently to the communal area on the third floor. [JW1, p59]

67. During the evening, Person C was talking with the Respondent. In the course of the conversation the Respondent lent forward and gestured with his index and middle finger towards Person C's dress where it met in the middle of her thighs. [JW1, p60]

68. Whilst making this gesture, the Respondent said to Person C "*that dress is easy access*". [JW1, p60].

69. Person C responded "*err, no it isn't*". [JW1, p60] The conversation moved on and Person C subsequently moved away.

70. Person C subsequently observed the Respondent to be significantly intoxicated, to the extent that she suggested that he go home. [JW1, p61].

71. Person C worked from the office on 29 and 30 December 2022. On one of those days the Respondent was also in the office. Person C told him what he had said to her on 23 December 2022. The Respondent apologised to Person C and "advised he knew he had overstepped the mark and was under the impression that he had probably upset other people". [JW1, p64].

Allegation 3 – breaches of Principles and Code.Principle 5 (integrity)

72. The SRA relies on the test for integrity set out at paragraph 22 above.

Sensitivity: General

73. The Respondent was a senior Partner and was therefore in a position of seniority in relation to Person C. The Respondent was therefore under a professional obligation to ensure that his behaviour reflected his senior role in the Firm. The Respondent's actions took place in the context of a work event at the Firm's offices and this reinforced the position of seniority that the Respondent had over Person C and in the Firm generally.
74. The Respondent had no reason to believe that Person C wanted him to make the comments he did or gesture towards her thighs and dress while doing so.
75. The Respondent's conduct in relation to Person C was manifestly inappropriate in all the circumstances described above. A solicitor acting with integrity would not make inappropriate comments about a colleague's clothing at a work event.
76. The fact that the Respondent was voluntarily intoxicated, aggravates his conduct in that a solicitor with integrity would not become so intoxicated as to behave in an inappropriate way to another member of staff at a work event.
77. The factors relating to alcohol and the Respondent's health, set out at paragraphs 27 to 28 above are repeated. The Respondent's conduct in relation to Person C was manifestly inappropriate in all the circumstances described above. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 5.

Principle 2

78. The conduct alleged also amounted to a breach by the Respondent of the requirement to behave in a way which maintains the trust placed by the public in them and in the provision of legal services.
79. The public do not expect a senior Partner to behave in the manner set out at paragraphs 65 to 71 above.
80. Person C has stated that "*Everything that happened has had quite a big impact*". The public would be concerned about a senior partner behaving in such a way to a colleague in the work environment.
81. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 2.

Principle 6

82. The Respondent's conduct was counter-inclusive and inconsistent with the requirement to encourage equality, diversity and inclusion. Staff and colleagues

Sensitivity: General

should feel able to come to work without having to experience inappropriate and unwanted comments, particularly from a senior partner.

83. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 6 of the Principles.

Rule 1.5

84. The Respondent plainly failed to treat Person C with respect. It is inherently disrespectful to speak to a colleague in such terms. Far from challenging behaviour that did not meet this standard, the Respondent was the perpetrator of that behaviour. The Respondent therefore breached Rule 1.5 of the Code.

Allegation 4 – (Person D)

85. At the material time, [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]. [JW1, p26]

86. Person D attended the Christmas lunch and then returned to the office with colleagues. On arrival at the office, Person D went to her office on the first floor and subsequently to the communal area on the top floor. [JW1, p30]

87. During the course of the evening, Person D was speaking with the Respondent in the kitchen area. The Respondent said to her “*we’ve got a bunch of really lovely colleagues here and I’d really love to fuck [Person E]*”. [JW1, p31]

88. Person D spoke with the Respondent in the office on 29 December 2022. The Respondent told Person D that he apologised, and he could not remember any of the incident. The Respondent told Person D that he believed it was related to his illness. [JW1, p34]

Allegation 4 – breaches of Principles and Code.Principle 5 (integrity)

89. The SRA relies on the test for integrity set out at paragraph 22 above.

90. The Respondent was a senior Partner and was in a position of seniority in relation to Person D. The Respondent was therefore under a professional obligation to ensure that his behaviour reflected his senior role in the Firm. The Respondent’s actions took place in the context of a work event at the Firm’s offices and this reinforced the position of seniority that the Respondent had over Person D and in the Firm generally.

Sensitivity: General

91. The Respondent had no reason to believe that Person D wanted him to make the comments or to engage in a sexualised conversation about another colleague.
92. The Respondent's conduct in relation to Person D was manifestly inappropriate in all the circumstances described above. A solicitor acting with integrity would not make inappropriate comments to one colleague about another colleague at a work event.
93. The fact that the Respondent was voluntarily intoxicated, aggravates his conduct in that a solicitor with integrity would not become so intoxicated as to behave in an inappropriate way to another member of staff at a work event.
94. The factors relating to alcohol and the Respondent's health, set out at paragraphs 27 to 28 above are repeated. The Respondent's conduct in relation to Person D was manifestly inappropriate in all the circumstances described above. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 5.

Principle 2

95. The conduct alleged also amounted to a breach by the Respondent of the requirement to behave in a way which maintains the trust placed by the public in them and in the provision of legal services.
96. The public do not expect a senior Partner to behave in the manner set out at paragraphs 85 to 88 above.
97. Person D has stated that *"It has been really difficult for us [REDACTED]. I am unaffected by the comments Tim has made to me however we have several employees who have been affected"*. Person D further stated: *"I do share the feeling that it is sad his [the Respondent's] career has ended this way but working for the Firm I have signed up to a set of vision and values, that I need to uphold and his behaviour at the Christmas party fell a long way short of this vision and the values of the Practice"*.
98. The public would be concerned about a senior partner behaving in such a way to a colleague in the work environment.
99. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 2.

Principle 6

Sensitivity: General

100. The Respondent's conduct was counter-inclusive and inconsistent with the requirement to encourage equality, diversity and inclusion. Staff and colleagues should feel able to come to work without having to experience inappropriate and unwanted comments, particularly from a senior partner, including comments made about another colleague.
101. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 6 of the Principles.

Rule 1.5

102. The Respondent plainly failed to treat Person D and/or Person E with respect. It is inherently disrespectful to speak to a colleague in such terms, whether it is about them personally or another colleague. Far from challenging behaviour that did not meet this standard, the Respondent was the perpetrator of that behaviour. The Respondent therefore breached Rule 1.5 of the Code.

Sexual motivation/conduct being sexual in nature

103. The Applicant relies upon the test for sexual motivation set out in *Basson v General Medical Council [2018] EWHC 505. (Admin)*, which defined it at paragraph 14; "A sexual motive means that the conduct was done either in pursuit of sexual gratification or in pursuit of a future sexual relationship". The Applicant's case is that the Respondent's conduct was done either in pursuit of sexual gratification or in pursuit of a future sexual relationship. The Applicant's case is based on the following;
- 103.1 In relation to Person A, the language used towards her was overtly sexual and was accompanied by physical touching. The Respondent made clear that he considered Person A to be attractive and that, were he younger, he would wish to have sexual relations with her.
- 103.2 In relation to Person B, the language used was overtly sexual as it referred to kissing and was accompanied by a kiss on Person B's bare shoulder. The Respondent touched Person B in a way which indicates sexual gratification and/or pursuit of a future sexual relationship.
- 103.3 In relation to Person C, the language used was sexual in that the phrase "*that dress is easy access*", accompanied by a gesture towards Person C's thighs creates a clear inference that the Respondent was contemplating Person C's attire in a sexual way.

Sensitivity: General

- 103.4 In relation to the comments made to Person D about Person E, those comments were overtly sexual. The Respondent made clear that he considered Person E attractive and that he would wish to have sexual relations with her.
104. The Applicant's case is that the conduct was in any event, sexual in nature. The language used to Person A and B was overtly sexual and was accompanied by touching. The language used to Person C, taken together with his gesture, was clearly sexual. The language used to Person D was also overtly sexual and related to the Respondent having sexual feelings towards Person E.
105. The Respondent's touching of Person A was inherently sexual because it was accompanied by the sexualised language set out above.
106. The Respondent's touching of Person B was inherently sexual because it was a kiss on Person B's bare shoulder and was accompanied by the sexualised language set out above.
107. The Respondent's gesture to Person C was inherently sexual because it was accompanied by the sexualised language set out above.

The Respondent's position

108. As noted above, the Respondent self-reported on 13 January 2023 [JW1, p1]. In that report he wrote that he could not comment on the allegations due to a lack of memory during the relevant part of the evening, though he did recall being spoken to by Person G. The Respondent speculated that either his drink was spiked or that his medical condition and medication had contributed to a reduction in his alcohol tolerance.
109. On 8 March 2023 [JW1, p7], the Respondent provided replies to a request for further information on 23 February 2023 [JW1, p4]. The Respondent reiterated that he lacked memory of the events. The Respondent nevertheless "*in essence*" accepted that what he had been told was true. The Respondent stated that he had never engaged in this sort of behaviour before and reiterated that he believed there must be a medical reason for what occurred.
110. Correspondence continued during the investigation between the SRA and the Respondent and/or his solicitor, Mr West, mainly in relation to the possibility of medical evidence being available.

Sensitivity: General

111. Mr West provided explanations and representations in response to the Notice on 7 October 2024 [JW1, p197]. This repeated the Respondent's case as previously set out, enclosed medical evidence in the form of the Respondent's medical records and a letter from his GP and from consultants who treated him, most of which pre-date the incident. The Respondent has not provided a medical report. Mr West also provided a number of character references with his representations.

The SRA's investigation

112. The SRA has taken the following steps to investigate the allegations which it makes against the Respondent.

113. The SRA initially wrote to the Respondent on 23 February 2023 informing him that the matter was being investigated [JW1, p4]. The Respondent replied to this letter on 8 March 2023 [JW1, p7].

114. On 31 August 2024 a Notice Recommending Referral of Conduct to the Tribunal was prepared [JW1, p183]. The Respondent's representative, Mr West, responded to that Notice on 7 October 2024 [JW1, p197].

115. On 23 October 2024 an Authorised Officer of the SRA decided to refer the conduct of the Respondent to the Tribunal [JW1, p265]

I believe the contents of this statement are true.



.....

Dated this 24th day of January 2025

Sensitivity: General

BEFORE THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

Case No:

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 (as amended)

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY

Applicant

and

TIMOTHY EAGLE

Respondent

**APPENDIX 1 TO STATEMENT PURSUANT TO RULE 12 (2) SOLICITORS
(DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS RULES) 2019**

Relevant Rules and Regulations

SRA Principles 2019

- Principle 2 You act in a way that upholds public trust and confidence in the solicitors' profession and in legal services provided by authorised persons.
- Principle 5 You act with integrity.
- Principle 6 You act in a way that encourages equality, diversity and inclusion.

SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors 2019

- Rule 1.5 You treat colleagues fairly and with respect. You do not bully or harass them or discriminate unfairly against them. If you are a manager, you challenge behaviour that does not meet this standard.

Sensitivity: General