

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

ANTHONY NOWOGRODZKI

Respondent

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

I, Max Hinchcliffe, am a Solicitor employed by the Solicitors Regulation Authority Limited of The Cube, 199 Wharfside Street, Birmingham, B1 1RN. I make this Statement on behalf of the Applicant, the Solicitors Regulation Authority Limited ("SRA").

The allegations

1. The allegations against the Respondent, Anthony Nowogrodzki, made by the Applicant are that:

1.1 Between January 2024 and 28 January 2024 ill-treated a child under the age of 16, and on 27 January 2024 assaulted a child by beating, and in doing so breached any or all of:

1.1.1 Principles 2 and 5 of the SRA Principles ("the Principles").

Sensitivity: General

The facts and matters relied upon in support of this allegation are set out in paragraphs 9 to 13 below.

Appendices and Documents

2. I attach to this Statement the following appendices:

Appendix 1: Relevant Rules and Regulations

3. I attach to this statement a bundle of documents, marked “**MH1**” to which I refer in this statement.
4. Unless otherwise stated, the page references in this statement relate to documents contained in that bundle using the format [**MH1**, pp].
5. The bundle is divided into the following sections:
- Section A: Documentary Evidence
- Section B: Correspondence

Professional Details

6. The Respondent, who was born on [REDACTED] 1966, is a solicitor having been admitted to the Roll on 15 July 1991.
7. The Respondent does not currently hold a practising certificate.
8. At the time of the offences to which the conviction relates, he held a practising certificate, free of conditions, and was employed by the Crown Prosecution Service where he worked as a prosecutor.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of the allegation**Background**

9. The conduct in this matter came to the attention of the Applicant when the Respondent self-reported the fact of his conviction on 3 October 2024 [**MH1**, p.28].

Sensitivity: General

10. The Respondent gave full permission for matters relating to his conviction to be disclosed by his defence representative, who provided:
 - 10.1. The police summary of the offence [MH1, p.53]
 - 10.2. The prosecution sentencing note [MH1, p.33]
 - 10.3. The order for imprisonment [MH1, p.45]
 - 10.4. The restraining order made on conviction [MH1, p.46]
 - 10.5. Social Care records [MH1, p.62]
11. Upon investigation of the matter the Investigation Officer obtained the order which provided the victim with anonymity [MH1, p.64] as well as the sentencing remarks made by His Honour Judge Hart [MH1, p.48] and Certificate of Conviction [MH1, p.32].

Allegation 1.1**Conviction for cruelty to a person under 16 and assault by beating**

12. The drafting of this section, so far as it relates to how the Respondent and the victim are known to one another, has been made deliberately vague in order to preserve the anonymity afforded to the victim by virtue of the anonymity order (referred to at paragraph 11 above) made in their favour.
13. The following chronology sets out the allegation:
 - 13.1. On 31 January 2024 the victim made disclosures to police that the defendant had been verbally abusive towards them and separately hit them with a shoe. A transcript of the verbal abuse is contained within the prosecution sentencing note (specifically at [MH1, p.35]).
 - 13.2. The Respondent was arrested and interviewed on the same day whereupon he denied the offences alleged. Once charged the matter was timetabled for a trial.

Sensitivity: General

- 13.3. On 11 July 2024 the Respondent pleaded guilty following the victim attending court to give their pre-recorded evidence.
- 13.4. On 30 September 2024 the Respondent was sentenced to:
- 13.4.1. 14 months' imprisonment for the offence of child cruelty, and
- 13.4.2. 3 months' imprisonment for the offence of assault by beating, to run concurrently.
- 13.5. The Learned Judge referred to the mitigating factors present, namely that the Respondent lost his good character, his lack of any previous convictions, and work pressures that he faced. He specifically stated:
- “How you were reduced to that mental state may be partly explained by that advanced by [the Respondent’s barrister], but some of it may be inexplicable or inexplicable to anyone apart from you, and so you have been brought so low from the heights at which you were before this offending, a respected, professional man in a responsible position with a blameless and blameworthy lack of career. It has never been suggested and the references make it clear that you are someone who would never have been thought of as capable of offending at all, let alone of this sort.”*
- 13.6. The Respondent had been remanded into custody while he awaited his trial, and he was released following his sentencing for the remainder of it to be spent on licence.
- 13.7. On 3 October 2025 the Respondent referred himself to the Applicant with the fact of his conviction.
- 13.8. The Applicant relies on Rule 32(1) Solicitors (Disciplinary Proceedings) Rules 2019 when referring to the Certificate of Conviction as conclusive proof of the Respondent’s guilt of the offences of which he was certified to have been convicted.

The Respondent’s position in respect of allegation 1.1

14. The Respondent, having initially denied the allegations, pleaded guilty to the offences with which he was charged and was sentenced accordingly with some credit being preserved [MH1, p.50].

Principle 2 (Maintaining public trust and confidence)

Sensitivity: General

15. Although the Respondent's conduct fell outside the remit of his practice, it nonetheless falls foul of the high standard which is expected of solicitors, and by virtue of his conviction the Respondent has likely tarnished the reputation of the profession.
16. The public would not expect a solicitor to behave in such a way that caused suffering to a child so serious that it amounted to criminal offending worthy of an immediate custodial sentence, nor would the public expect that a solicitor working for the Crown Prosecution Service, or indeed working in any capacity, to engage in such conduct.
17. Furthermore it is asserted that the effect of the public knowing that a solicitor has served a term of imprisonment carries with it a very real risk that the profession is brought into disrepute.
18. Consequently it is alleged that the Respondent has failed to maintain public trust and confidence in the profession and thereby breached Principle 2.

Principle 5 (integrity)

19. The SRA's Topic guide, '*Criminal offences outside of practice*', last updated on 25 November 2019 [MH1 p.96], states:

'Serious criminal conduct outside of practice raises questions of integrity and is likely to damage public confidence.'

20. The Respondent's conviction shows a clear failure to act with integrity i.e. with moral soundness, rectitude and steady adherence to an ethical code. 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. This duty applies to what solicitors both say and do, which during the relevant time amounted to criminal offending so serious that a term of imprisonment was imposed.
21. By virtue of the lack of integrity which the Respondent demonstrated during the relevant period which led to his conviction, he failed to act with integrity and thereby breached Principle 5.

The SRA's investigation

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

Sensitivity: General

- 22.1. On 3 October 2024 the Respondent self-referred the fact of his conviction to the Applicant
- 22.2. On 14 October 2024 the Applicant wrote to the Respondent's solicitor who had conduct of criminal proceedings asking for any documents relevant to the conviction, however there was an issue with the email address provided and therefore further enquiries were made.
- 22.3. On 14 November 2024 the Respondent's solicitor provided a summary of the criminal proceedings.
- 22.4. On 20 November 2024 the Applicant responded and asked for the certificate of conviction, sentencing remarks, and charge sheet or any other information from the police.
- 22.5. On 22 November the Respondent's solicitor provided the documents in paragraphs 10.1-10.5 above.
- 22.6. On 4 December 2024 the Applicant requested a transcript of the sentencing remarks from Bristol Crown Court.
- 22.7. On 20 December 2024 the Applicant received the certificate of conviction from Bristol Crown Court.
- 22.8. On 20 January 2025 the Applicant received the transcript of the Learned Judge's sentencing remarks.
- 22.9. On 6 February 2025 the Applicant received the Anonymity Order from Bristol Crown Court.
23. On 21 May 2025 the Respondent asked, upon notice being given to him that the Investigation Officer would be making a recommendation to refer him to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal, whether his removal from the Roll would suitably dispose of the need for the matter to be referred, and cited his receipt of benefits as a reason why.
24. On 18 June 2025 the Applicant responded to the above stating that due to the seriousness of the allegation the only suitable outcome would be a referral.
25. On 7 August 2025 an Authorised Officer of the Applicant made the decision to refer the conduct of the Respondent to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal.

I believe the contents of this statement are true.

Sensitivity: General

Signed: Max Hinchcliffe

Dated this 9th day of October 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 LIMITED

Applicant

and

ANTHONY NOWOGRODZKI

Respondent

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

Relevant Rules and Regulations

Allegation 1.1

SRA Principles 2019

You act:

Principle 2: in a way that upholds public trust and confidence in the solicitors' profession and in legal services provided by authorised persons.

Principle 5: with integrity.