Case No: 12824-2025

IN THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL
IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 (as amended)
BETWEEN:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LIMITED

Applicant

-and-

ZEESHAN SAQIB MIAN

Respondent

Respondent's Response/Answer to the Applicant's Rule 12(2) Statement

Introduction

1. This is the Respondent's Answer, without prejudice to the Respondent's public law challenge by way of judicial review, to the Applicant's Statement pursuant to Rule 12(2) dated 26 August 2025. The Respondent answers each paragraph of the Rule 12(2) Statement by the original numbering and headings, indicating Admit / Deny / Not admitted, together with concise technical and procedural objections. Where facts are not admitted, the Respondent requires strict proof and further and better particulars.

The Allegations

2. Paragraph 1: Admit in part, deny in part, and not admitted in part.
3. The Respondent admits that the Applicant alleges breaches under SRA Principles 2011 and Outcome 11.2 related to alleged non-disclosures to the BSB/Lincoln's Inn in 2016 and thereafter.
4. The Respondent does not admit any breach or misconduct.

5. The Respondent objects that the Applicant's pleading is defective and lacks particularity, necessary to enable a fair and proper response. In particular, the Statement fails to define the operative concepts "disciplinary proceedings", "pending", "relevant circumstances", and "prompt", and it fails to identify with precision the legal source and content of any SRA duty said to arise from BSB/Lincoln's Inn declarations. The Respondent requires strict proof and further and better particulars. The absence of these particulars is prejudicial because it prevents the Respondent from knowing the case to meet and pleading to material issues. The Respondent objects that the pleading is defective and lacks particularity, including failure to define the operative concepts "disciplinary proceedings", "pending", "relevant circumstances", "prompt", and to specify the precise SRA duty alleged to arise from BSB/Inn declarations.

6. The Respondent demands a clear articulation of how SRA Principles 2011 and Outcome 11.2 regulate disclosures to BSB/Lincoln's Inn during non-practice and Bar admission/call; require the Applicant to identify the rule text that creates any such duty, or concede none exists. The Respondent "remains on the Roll as a non-practising solicitor" and that the conduct was pre-call or vis-à-vis another regulator.

7. Paragraph 1.1 Not admitted and denied to the extent it alleges failure to disclose and/or false or misleading declarations. The Respondent objects that the pleading fails to set out with particularity the full wording of the declarations relied upon, and the contemporaneous facts said to constitute "relevant circumstances". Strict proof is required of the exact declaration wording and documents relied upon. The allegation that "

8. Paragraph 1.1.1 Not admitted. The chronology relied upon is noted, but strict proof is required of the scope of any "formal investigation" and whether it constituted "disciplinary proceedings pending" for Inn/BSB purposes. The SRA has been declining to disclose the data between 2016 and 2015. The SRA has failed to disclose material facts between December 2015 and 23 February 2016, when the application was hand delivered to the BSB on learning of the proposed action from

the SRA's supervisor. The SRA is required to disclose the relevant file notes from its system before requiring the Respondent to settle a full response. The declaration in question, *'any circumstances affecting me which might reasonably be considered to be relevant to the question whether I should be permitted to be called to the Bar'*, is relevant to the role of a barrister and not related to the role of manager/compliance officer of the SRA.

9. Paragraph 1.1.2 Not admitted. The Respondent objects that the Rule 12 pleading conflates consideration of practising certificate conditions with "disciplinary proceedings pending" and fails to plead definitions. The date "4 May 2016" is put in issue due to an internal inconsistency at paragraph 15, which states "4 May 2025"; strict proof and correction are required. The declarations produced in 1.1.2 (a) to 1.1.2 (f) were neither false nor misleading.

10. Paragraph 1.1.3 Not admitted. The failure to notify was justified by the relevance of the conditions to the role of a practising barrister. The notification also depended upon the particular knowledge of a reportable matter, and the reporting obligation arises from the date of the matter and/or the date of such knowledge.

    Paragraph 1.1 – concluding breach averment (Principles/Outcome) Denied. The Respondent denies any breach of Principles 2, 6, 7 of the SRA Principles 2011 and denies any failure to achieve Outcome 11.2. The pleading improperly treats Inn/BSB declarations as SRA "undertakings", which is objected to; strict proof is required that Outcome 11.2 applies to such third-party declarations. And thereby acted in breach of any or all of Principles 2, 6 and 7 of the SRA Principles 2011 … and failed to achieve Outcome 11.2 of the SRA Code of Conduct 2011.

11. Paragraph 1.2 Not admitted. The allegation is vaguely pleaded as to what "relevant regulatory and/or disciplinary information" required disclosure between 24 November 2016 and 20 December 2018, and under which SRA duty. Strict proof and further particulars are required, including how the 2011 Principles/Outcome 11.2 apply to non-practising status and to conduct vis-à-vis the BSB.

12. Paragraphs stating dishonesty (paras 37–48; 95–103) and recklessness (paras 66–70; 116–119) Denied. The allegations of dishonesty and, in the alternative, recklessness are not admitted. The Respondent objects to the use of propensity reasoning and hindsight and requires strict proof.

Appendices and Documents

13. Paragraphs 2–4: Admit administrative descriptions of the Applicant's bundle structure only. The Respondent objects that essential materials have not been provided or are incomplete, including the Rule 5 statement and complete investigation files with correct pagination and indexing. 2.

Professional Details

14. Paragraph 5 admitted as to dates of admission and practising certificate period only.
15. Paragraph 6 admitted as to the call date; the disbarment is not admitted, due to a pending challenge on the basis of perjury in a corporate witness statement provided by the SRA's investigation manager, for present purposes as collateral and prejudicial. Strict proof is required, and the Respondent objects to reliance upon collateral BTAS/BSB findings.
16. Paragraph 7 Admitted in part and not admitted in part. Dates concerning resignation and consultancy are admitted by reference to the bundle, and the SRA intervention date is noted; ownership characterisation is not admitted absent strict proof.
17. Paragraph 8 Not admitted. The Applicant is aware that the Respondent works as a consultant lawyer with a solicitors' firm. The Respondent's current employment status is not a matter for determination and is irrelevant to the alleged breaches; strict proof is required if relied upon.
18. Paragraph 9 Not admitted as to materiality and sufficiency. The chronology is not fully particularised, and a number of incorrect assertions, such as "commencement of formal investigation" on 15/12/2015 and three allegations are required to be redacted as they were not part of the 2019 SDT proceedings and recording these allegations is prejudicial in nature. The Applicant is put to strict proof that any

"formal investigation" was opened, its scope, and why that equates to "disciplinary proceedings pending," cross-referencing the Applicant's own statement that PC conditions are not disciplinary. This is also part of the pending challenge in JR.

19. Paragraphs 10–11. The date of submission is incorrect in paragraph 10. The application was delivered on 23 February 2016 after the supervisor had confirmed that the proposed action was conditional on the Respondent's practice certificate. The Respondent requires strict proof of the full text, and the BSB communications are said to evidence disclosure expectations. The Respondent maintains his position on the requirement of disclosure to the circumstances related to the practising barrister and not practising solicitors and/or compliance officers.

20. Paragraph 12: Admitted receipt of the 7 April 2016 email stating consideration of PC conditions; otherwise not admitted. The Respondent had been informed of this previously by a supervisor on around 22 February 2016.

21. Paragraph 13 admitted, the exemptions were granted on the basis of the Respondent's extensive litigation experience as a solicitor advocate.

22. Paragraph 14 – 15 Not admitted as to legal characterisation and scope of the Admission Declaration and Call Declaration as far as allegations are structured on the … wording: … 'disciplinary proceedings pending' … 'call into question my fitness' … 'will inform the Inn immediately' … 'comply with the BSB Handbook' … 'promptly inform the Inn' … The Applicant's case is embarrassing for want of particularity. The Applicant fails to define the operative concepts 'disciplinary proceedings', 'pending', 'relevant circumstances', 'prompt', and any SRA duty alleged to arise from BSB/Inn declarations. Strict proof is required of each definition and its applicability to the pleaded facts. Further, the Applicant's own materials concede 'practising certificate conditions are intended to address immediate risks and are not part of the disciplinary process,' which undermines any characterisation of Regulation 7 conditions as 'disciplinary proceedings pending' and gives rise to internal inconsistency. Unless proper particulars are served, the impugned paragraphs should be struck out, or the proceedings stayed pending compliance.

23. Paragraph 16 Not admitted as to the construction and applicability of Rule C65.3 to Regulation 7 PC conditions and/or investigations not constituting "disciplinary proceedings".

24. Paragraph 17 is admitted.

25. Paragraph 18 date is disputed. The letter was served on 24 May 2016, i.e., one day after the date of admission to Inn.

26. Paragraph 19 is admitted.

27. Paragraph 20 is admitted.

28. Paragraph 21 is admitted. This is the first time in the last 6 years that the SRA has correctly reproduced the email of the supervisor. The word "proportionate" was replaced by "further" in previous statements given on behalf of the SRA, and it prejudiced the Respondent in disciplinary proceedings of the BSB.

29. Paragraphs 22-23 are admitted. Regulatory supervisory authorities avoided providing a direct answer to the question raised by Mr Williams QC.

30. Paragraphs 24-25 are admitted.

31. Paragraph 26 is denied. The Respondent had no interest in the Firm. The SRA has never alleged such interest before this statement. The Applicant is put to strict proof.

32. Paragraph 27.2 (within the Applicant's narrative) Admit the Applicant's own policy statement that PC conditions address immediate risk and are not part of the disciplinary process, which undermines characterisation as "disciplinary proceedings pending". 27.2 Paragraph 5.2 states, 'Practising certificate conditions are intended to address immediate risks and are not part of the disciplinary process. Therefore, the imposition of conditions is dealt with separately and cannot be delayed. It might help if I explain that conditions … are not part of the disciplinary process.

33. Paragraphs 28-29 are a matter of record.

34. Paragraph 30 is incorrect as per the Respondent's understanding. The Respondent did not apply for a practice certificate for 2016-2017, and his Practice Certificate for 2015-2016 expired on 31 October 2016.

35. Paragraph 31: Admit the call date only.

36. The selective paragraphs of the statements produced in paragraphs 32 and 33 were based on the facts and matters miscommunicated to the BSB by the SRA's employees as to dates for investigation and pending investigation.

37. Paragraph 34 itself shows the perjury of the statement provided by the investigation manager. Certificate of Good Standing was not pre-dated to formally investigate the Respondent, but it was issued after the investigation was concluded and the contents of EWW of 15/12/2015 were being finalised to be served on the Respondent. This statement had other facts stated that were contrary to what was available on the SRA's record. The perjury in this statement resulted in disbarment of the Respondent, and the matter is currently pending consideration by the Court of Appeal.

38. Paragraphs 35-36 contain the best recollection of the events that the Respondent had for the period during which he had been suffering from severe depression and anxiety. The SRA had refused to disclose any data that was held by the SRA to assist the Respondent.

39. The Supreme Court Judgement in Ivey v Genting Casinos was decided in 2017. The alleged conduct in question is related to events in 2016. Therefore, it would be perverse to apply Ivey retrospectively to the alleged conduct.

40. "Allegations of dishonesty" are denied. The Respondent seeks from the Applicant to provide a particulars schedule identifying for each impugned statement: (a) the exact wording; (b) date/time and context; (c) the fact(s) said to render it false when made; (d) the Respondent's knowledge alleged at the time; and (e) the basis for any recklessness allegation. Propensity and hindsight reasoning are objected to. Failing compliance, the dishonesty limbs should be struck out for want of particularity.

41. Paragraph 38. The declaration date is not material, but the date of submitting this date, i.e., 23 February 2016, is relevant. On 23rd February 2016, the Respondent had indicative knowledge of the imposition of conditions restricting him from taking the role of a compliance officer/signatory of a client account and manager/supervisor. None of the potential conditions had an impact on restricting the Respondent from acting as a solicitor-advocate. Therefore, the Respondent had disclosed any circumstances considered to be relevant to being permitted to be called to the Bar.

38.1. The forensic investigation was not related to the Respondent's acting as a solicitor-advocate, i.e. relevant to being a barrister;

38.2. The EWW of 15 December 2015 did not start a "formal investigation, " nor is the function of EWW to start a formal investigation. It is correct that the involvement of Mr Hassan was related to the Respondent's involvement, but the SRA failed to disclose that the SRA was negligent in taking any actions or publishing any report on the character of Hassan, despite being notified previously on three occasions.

38.3. The Respondent's knowledge was "conditions" as an extent of action, and there is no evidence of an indication as to an application to the SDT.

38.4. The response of 11 January 2016 was a final response to EWW 2015, and a decision to restrict the Respondent's management role was made on 20 February 2016, on the basis of this response.

38.5 This declaration was true and accurate at the time of making.

42. Paragraph 39 – the Respondent was not under investigation at the time of declarations, but subject to a decision being prepared to impose conditions limited to restrictions on his supervisory and compliance officers' roles.

43. Paragraph 40 – the admission and call declarations, signed on 04 May 2016, were correct at the time of signing:

40.1. There were no pending proceedings against the Respondent. The SRA investigation did not commence on 15 December 2015, and imposition of conditions was notified to be limited to restricting the Respondent's management role as opposed to restricting him to act as a solicitor-advocate, which is relevant to a barrister.

40.2. The keyword in the declaration was *"reasonably be thought to call into question my fitness to become a practising barrister."* The proposed conditions, as then notified, had undoubtedly no relevance to the "fitness to become a practising barrister."

40.3. rC65.3 applies only to post-call conduct. Therefore, no duty arose at the time of signing the declarations. The Respondent had left the firm at the time of the signing of the declaration.

44. Paragraph 41 is denied. The Declaration 6 of Admission Declaration ceased to apply on 23 May 2016 when the Respondent became a student member. The Supervisor's Report, dated 20 May 2016, was served on him on 24 May 2016, i.e., one day after the Declaration 6 of Admission Declaration ceased to apply.

45. Paragraphs 42.1, 42.2 ad 42.4 are admitted as far as knowledge and beliefs were not affected by the depression at the material. 42.3 is denied. The Firm that the Respondent had built by investing golden years of life was destroyed, after the Respondent had left, by the negligence of SRA's supervision department, by allowing a solicitor with no training or record of practising other than criminal defence.

46. Paragraph 43 is denied.

47. Paragraph 44 is denied. Declarations were not false considering the relevant factors at the time of signing the declarations.

48. Paragraph 45 is admitted. The Respondent was not under investigation, hence nothing was to be declared. The conditions were not considered relevant.

49. Paragraph 46 - Respondent maintains his position. If the Applicant relates the Respondent's professional experience, then judgment by the Respondent could not

be considered untenable when the Applicant neither decide for proceedings to issue proceedings, as acknowledged in 42.4, nor produces evidence that would show an unambiguous notification of any intention to issue proceedings.

46.1. is denied. Fitness to practice as a barrister requires more than a practice certificate as a solicitor, and conditions restricting managing a solicitor's practice are not related to fitness to practice as a barrister.

46.2. The Applicant is wrong in relying on rC65.3 on pre-call conduct.

46.3. is denied. The relevancy is repeated along with the Respondent's knowledge, judgment and advice that he had obtained.

46.4. is denied. The conditions did not have the effect of restricting the Respondent's practice as a solicitor advocate.

46.5. A second opinion was obtained at the time of the call.

50. Paragraph 47 is denied. The speculative assertion is denied as the BSB and Inn itself acknowledged that a declaration of conditions would not have necessarily resulted in the refusal of the application.

51. Paragraph 48 is denied.

Principle 2 of the 2011 Principles - Integrity

52. Paragraphs 49-52 are denied. The Respondent denies that he acted without integrity.

Principle 6 of the 2011 Principles – Maintaining public trust

53. Paragraphs 53-57 are denied. The Respondent denies that he breached principle 6.

Principle 7 of the 2011 Principles – Compliance with Legal and Regulatory Obligations

54. Paragraphs 57-60 are denied. The Respondent denies that he breached principle 7.

Outcome 11.2 of the 2011 Code – Performance of Undertakings

55. Paragraphs 61–65 (as referenced) Not admitted. These paragraphs are embarrassing for lack of particularity and irrelevance to the 2011 Code.

56. The Applicant's attempt to treat Inn/BSB declarations as SRA "undertakings" engaging Outcome 11.2 is opposed. The Respondent requires strict proof of: (i) the definition relied upon; (ii) the alleged promisee/beneficiary; (iii) any agreed timeframe or "reasonable time" element; and (iv) the authority for treating third-party declarations to non-SRA bodies as SRA undertakings. Absent proper particulars, the Respondent seeks a strike-out of this limb. The pleading improperly treats Inn/BSB declarations as SRA "undertakings", which is objected to; strict proof is required that Outcome 11.2 applies to such third-party declarations.

57. The Respondent maintains that third-party Inn/BSB declarations are not SRA "undertakings" for Outcome 11.2; the Respondent require strict proof of the legal basis and strikes the allegation if none is provided. The Applicant is required to particularise who its assertion that "The declarations … meet this definition of 'undertaking'" and also provide the definition the SRA rely upon, the promisor/promisee, consideration/reliance, and the timescale element mandated by Outcome 11.2.

58. The Respondent requires the Applicant to plead the legal basis for applying SRA Principles and Outcome 11.2 to disclosures to third-party regulators in the context of Bar admission/call and/or periods.

59. The Respondent preserves objections that the Applicant is attempting to cross-enforce another regulator's regime without a pleaded jurisdictional hook. The Respondent objects that the Applicant relies on SRA Principles 2011 and Outcome 11.2 to regulate interactions with the BSB/Inn, while the Respondent's declarations were not related to legal practice and/or providing legal services in the context of Bar admission/call, without clearly pleading the jurisdictional basis for those duties.

Recklessness

60. Considering the particular knowledge and the Respondent's mental health conditions at the material time, the Paragraphs 66-79 (as referenced) are not admitted.

61. Allegations of recklessness are denied. The Applicant is required to provide a particulars schedule identifying for each impugned statement: (a) the exact wording; (b) date/time and context; (c) the fact(s) said to render it false when made; (d) the Respondent's knowledge alleged at the time; and (e) the basis for any recklessness allegation. Propensity and hindsight reasoning are objected to. Failing compliance, the reckless limbs should be struck out for want of particularity.

Allegation 1.2 – The Respondent failed to disclose relevant regulatory and/or disciplinary information to the BSB between 24 November 2016 and 20 December 2018

62. Paragraphs 71–90 (as referenced) Not admitted. There are many chronological and factual errors in these paragraphs. The Respondent requires strict proof and further particulars identifying the precise information said to be reportable, the legal basis for any ongoing SRA duty during non-practice, and how Rule C65.3 applies to Regulation 7 conditions or supervisory steps.

Jurisdiction, Remit and Temporal Applicability

63. The Respondent objects that the Applicant relies on SRA Principles 2011 and Outcome 11.2 to regulate interactions with the BSB/Inn while the Respondent was non-practising or in the context of Bar admission/call, without clearly pleading the jurisdictional basis for those duties. Strict proof is required. The statement alleges breaches of 'Principles 2, 6 and 7 of the SRA Principles 2011' and failure to achieve 'Outcome 11.2 …' for conduct prior to call and between 24 November 2016 and 20 December 2018, while noting the Respondent 'remains on the Roll as a non-practising solicitor'. 'He held a practising certificate between July 2007 and October 2016. The Respondent remains on the Roll as a non-practising solicitor.'

Improper reliance on collateral BSB/BTAS findings and opinion evidence

64. The Respondent objects to collateral reliance on BSB/BTAS findings, including disbarment and evaluative conclusions, as unfairly prejudicial and not determinative of SRA charges. An application is made below to exclude such material.

Staleness, delay and prejudice; administrative closure and file gaps

65. The Respondent relies on the Applicant's records evidencing administrative closure and file discontinuity, which prejudices a fair trial of the issues and undermines the pleaded narrative. Having reviewed our systems … 'Date Closed 30/11/2016.' I can confirm that the 'date closed' field … Date Closed 30/11/2016. There is no material on the CDT-1137974-2015 file during the period November 2016 to March 2018. From checking our records, we do not hold a file CDT-1137974-2016. CDT-1137974-2015 was merged with CDT-1126506-2014, which you have received CDT-1137974-2015 - … only contains papers between May and November 2015 … merged with CDT-1126506-2014… CDT-1162174-2016 - … contains papers between April 2016 and February 2018 and relates to the investigation into Denning Solicitors. Whether there is any data for the period November 2016 - March 2018 on CDT-1126506-2014

Missing Rule 5 statement; indexing/pagination defects

66. The Respondent objects that the Rule 5 statement was not provided and that the disclosed files are incomplete and/or merged with gaps, with pagination and indexing issues that impede a fair response and case preparation. On 26th June 2019 … The Rule 5 statement was not provided. We disclosed a PDF of file CDT-1126506-2014 … do not hold a file CDT-1137974-2016. I am instructed that this file is extremely limited and only contains papers between May and November 2015. A bundle of all correspondence passing between you and the SRA on this file.

Ambiguity over Regulation 7 PC conditions: "disciplinary proceedings" or "regulatory/enforcement action"

67. The Respondent contends that Regulation 7 practising certificate conditions are supervisory and risk-control measures, not "disciplinary proceedings", per the Applicant's own materials; the Applicant's pleading is ambiguous and internally inconsistent on this point. Practising certificate conditions are intended to address immediate risks and are not part of the disciplinary process. We can … impose conditions … during an investigation … at the end of an investigation, if we consider it an appropriate outcome. Rule C65.3 … 'disciplinary or other regulatory or enforcement' … including being the subject of disciplinary proceedings. Regulations 7 Practising certificate conditions

Improper characterisation of Inn/BSB declarations as SRA "undertakings" under Outcome 11.2

68. The Respondent objects to the characterisation that the Inn/BSB declarations are SRA "undertakings" for Outcome 11.2 and denies any breach of that outcome. Strict proof of the legal basis for that characterisation is required. 'The declarations … meet this definition of 'undertaking'.' … 'failed to perform the undertakings … thereby failed to achieve Outcome 11.2' Outcome 11.2 You perform all undertakings given by you within an agreed timescale or within a reasonable amount of time.

Date errors and internal inconsistencies

69. The Rule 12 statement contains apparent errors in various paragraphs, including 15, stating "4 May 2025" instead of 2016; corrections are required. The Respondent also notes other date corrections identified within the bundle correspondence concerning letters recommending conditions. Paragraph 15 states 'Also on 4 May 2025' … whereas … record … 4 May 2016. The date for the service of the letter for the recommendation of conditions is incorrect in paragraphs 18 and 41. The correct date is 24th May 2016 and not 20th May 2016.

Matters concerning PC conditions, investigations and closures (for context only)

70. Without admitting relevance or breach, the Respondent notes the Applicant's records regarding the imposition and appeal outcome of the 2016 PC conditions, closure validations, and investigation closures, all of which reinforce that Regulation 7 conditions were supervisory and not disciplinary. I can confirm that conditions were imposed on your PC on 2 September 2016 … upheld … on 2 November 2016. Supervision - Closure Validation Form … Date: 30.09.2016 … Outcome: Upheld at Adjudication. Supervision - Case Diary … Decision made to: … impose immediate PC conditions … need for immediate control. The above investigation has now been closed, and the report and appendices have been uploaded to Doxis. A final report was issued. I have now completed and issued my report to Denning Solicitors. My file is now closed. The above investigation has now been closed.

Reservation of rights

71. The Respondent reserves the right to amend this Answer upon receipt of proper particulars, disclosure compliant with the directions sought below, and corrected pagination and indexing.

General Technical Objections and Applications

72. The Respondent seeks the following directions:

(a) **Particulars**. An order that within 14 days the Applicant provide particulars defining "disciplinary proceedings", "pending", "relevant circumstances", and "prompt", and identifying the precise SRA duty said to arise from Inn/BSB declarations, with identification of the legal basis relied upon. Failure to define or properly particularise "disciplinary proceedings", "pending", "relevant circumstances", "prompt", and the precise SRA duty alleged.

(b) **Undertakings limb**. An order that within 14 days the Applicant provide particulars of the undertakings theory as set out at paragraph 3.2 above, failing which this limb be struck out. Improper characterisation of Inn/BSB declarations as SRA "undertakings" for Outcome 11.2.

(c) **Dates and chronology.** An order that within 14 days the Applicant serve a corrected chronology, including correction of the "4 May 2025/2016" inconsistency and the date of the conditions recommendation letter, with continuous pagination, exhibit cross-references, and certification of accuracy, and that the proceedings be stayed pending compliance. Internal inconsistency - date issue … '4 May 2025' vs '4 May 2016'. The correct date is 24th May 2016 and not 20th May 2016.

(d) **Dishonesty/recklessness** An order that within 14 days the Applicant provide a particulars schedule for each alleged dishonest/reckless statement or omission as set out above, failing which those limbs be struck out. The allegations of dishonesty and, in the alternative, recklessness are not admitted. The Respondent objects to the use of propensity reasoning and hindsight and requires strict proof.

(e) **Exclusion**. An order excluding collateral evaluative findings and opinion evidence from BSB/BTAS processes, admitting only primary facts strictly proved. The Respondent also submits that collateral BSB/BTAS findings and opinion evidence, including disbarment references and evaluative conclusions, are unfairly prejudicial and not determinative of SRA issues.

(f) Disclosure. An order that, within 14 days, the Applicant: disclose the Rule 5 statement; provide complete copies of CDT-1126506-2014, CDT-1137974-2015, CDT-1162174-2016 (and any CDT-1137974-2016 if extant), including merged segments, with a corrected continuous index and pagination; disclose SRA–BSB/Lincoln's Inn correspondence on notifications/reporting expectations. The Respondent seeks directions that the Applicant: (a) disclose the Rule 5 statement forthwith. Provide complete copies of CDT-1126506-2014, CDT-1137974-2015, CDT-1162174-2016 (and any CDT-1137974-2016 if extant), including any merged segments, with a corrected, continuous index and pagination. Disclose SRA-BSB/Lincoln's Inn correspondence relevant to notifications, reporting expectations, and any reliance upon Rule C65.3.

(g) **Closure/merger certification**. An order that within 14 days the Applicant certify the completeness of the disclosed files and provide explanations of any administrative closures and re-openings (including "Date Closed 30/11/2016") with date stamps, and identify any subsequent matters relied upon. Confirm and explain any administrative closures and re-openings, including the “Date Closed 30/11/2016” entries, and identify any subsequent matters relied upon.

(h) **Unless/Stay**. Unless the Applicant complies with (a)–(g) within 14 days, the proceedings shall be stayed and/or struck out in whole or part as the Tribunal considers just. Pending compliance, the Respondent seeks a stay of any obligation to plead substantively to factual or dishonesty/recklessness particulars. Stay. The Respondent applies for a stay of any obligation to plead substantively to factual or dishonesty/recklessness particulars pending compliance with the above directions and provision of proper particulars and corrected documents.

73. The Respondent further seeks such ancillary or consequential directions as the Tribunal considers appropriate to secure a fair and efficient determination. The Respondent seeks the dismissal of the Case against the Respondent and asks the Tribunal to deploy its procedural powers to prevent abusive conduct.

1) Strike-out and/or Further and Better Particulars

The Respondent applies to strike out, alternatively for an order that the Applicant provide further and better particulars, on grounds of defective pleading and lack of particularity, including: (a) Failure to define or properly particularise “disciplinary proceedings”, “pending”, “relevant circumstances”, “prompt”, and the precise SRA duty alleged; DEFINITIONS/TERMS USED OR IMPLIED … ‘disciplinary proceedings pending’ … ‘prompt’ … (b) Internal inconsistency on dates, including paragraph 15 stating “4 May 2025” contrary to the chronology; INTERNAL INCONSISTENCY – DATE ISSUE … ‘4 May 2025’ vs ‘4 May 2016’. (c) Improper characterisation of Inn/BSB declarations as SRA “undertakings” for Outcome 11.2; CHARACTERISATION … ‘meet this definition of ’undertaking’’ … (d) Ambiguity and inconsistency as to whether Regulation 7 PC conditions are “disciplinary proceedings” or other supervisory measures. ‘Practising certificate conditions … are not part of the disciplinary process.’ Practising certificate conditions … are not part of the disciplinary process.

Exclusion of Collateral Findings and Opinion Evidence

2) The Respondent applies to exclude facts that were not prosecuted in the 2019 SDT proceedings. The Respondent also submits that collateral BSB/BTAS findings and opinion evidence, including disbarment references and evaluative conclusions, are unfairly prejudicial and not determinative of SRA issues.

Directions for Disclosure and Corrected Pagination/Indexing

3) The Respondent seeks directions that the Applicant: (a) Disclose the Rule 5 statement forthwith; … The Rule 5 statement was not provided. (b) Provide complete copies of CDT-1126506-2014, CDT-1137974-2015, CDT-1162174-2016 (and any CDT-1137974-2016 if extant), including any merged segments, with a corrected, continuous index and pagination; CDT-1137974-2015 was merged with CDT-1126506-2014… There is no material on the CDT-1137974-2015 file during … Nov 2016 - Mar 2018. We do not hold a file CDT-1137974-2016. (c) Disclose SRA–BSB/Lincoln's Inn correspondence relevant to notifications, reporting expectations, and any reliance upon Rule C65.3; Rule C65.3 … prompt reporting … another Approved Regulator… (d) Confirm and explain any administrative closures and re-openings, including the "Date Closed 30/11/2016" entries, and identify any subsequent matters relied upon. … 'Date Closed 30/11/2016' … 'Date Closed 30/11/2016.'

Dishonesty/recklessness

4) The Applicant is required to insert a particulars schedule for each alleged dishonest statement, requiring (a) exact words, (b) date/time and context, (c) contemporaneous knowledge, (d) why false then (not with hindsight), and (e) how "recklessness" is put if dishonesty fails. Object to propensity and hindsight explicitly and tie to prejudice from the mental health contemporaneous context.

5) At the time of the relevant declarations, the Respondent's indicative knowledge was of potential conditions limited to management/compliance functions, not advocacy, and there was no unambiguous notification of any intention to issue disciplinary proceedings. On that basis, nothing existed which would reasonably be thought to call into question fitness to become a practising barrister. Strict proof is

required that any disclosure duty arose pre-call under rC65.3, which the Respondent maintains applies only post-call.

Statement of Truth

The Respondent believes that the facts stated in this witness statement are true.
The Respondent understands that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.

Signature Zeeshanmian
Dr Zeeshan Mian

22 June 2026