<u>BEFORE THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL</u> **Case No:**

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LIMITED

<u>Applicant</u>

and

BABATUNDE OLADELE OJO

<u>Respondent</u>

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 and I make this Statement on behalf of the Applicant, the Solicitors Regulation Authority Limited ("SRA").

<u>The allegations</u>

1. The allegations against the Respondent, Babatunde Oladele Ojo, made by the SRA are that:

   1.1 Between 7 September 2021 and 9 February 2024, whilst in practice as a solicitor at Green Management Solutions Limited, and/or GMSL Legal Services, ("the Firm") he conducted reserved legal activities from the Firm, when the Firm and/or the Respondent had not been authorised to do so by the SRA or any other approved regulator and in doing so he thereby breached any or all of Principles 2, 5 and 7 of the SRA Principles ("the Principles"), Regulations 9.1 and 10.1 of the SRA Authorisation of Individuals Regulations

2019 (“the AIRs”) and Rule 5.1 of the SRA Authorisations of Firms Rules 2019 (“the AFRs”).

The facts and matters relied upon in support of this allegation are set out in paragraphs 5 to 27 below.

1.2 Between 24 January 2023 and 9 February 2024, he made statements to the Court and/or the other party’s solicitor about his regulatory status which were inaccurate and/or misleading and in doing so he thereby breached any or all of Principles 1, 2, 4 and 5 of the Principles and Paragraph 1.4 of the SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs and RFLs (“the Code for Solicitors”).

The facts and matters relied upon in support of this allegation are set out in paragraphs 35 to 42 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 [“initials of person signing the Rule 12 statement”1 eg “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

Section E: Other documents

Professional Details

5. The Respondent, who was born on [redacted] 1970, is a solicitor, having been admitted to the Roll on 17 March 2014 [**JW1, p299**]. The Respondent does not currently hold a Practising Certificate and has not done so since 8 December 2022. The Respondent was also called to the Bar in November 2010. Since being called to the Bar he has not held a practising certificate and has not been registered for public direct access work [**JW1, p297**]. The Respondent's relevant regulatory history is set out in further detail below.

6. Green Management Solutions Legal Services, also known as GMSL Legal Services has an address at PO Box 2963, Purley, Surrey, CR8 1YB. On 19 June 2019 the Respondent applied for authorisation for this company, but subsequently withdrew it. This company has not been authorised by the SRA at any time. [**JW1, p300**]

7. Green Management Solutions Limited has an address at 3,4 Pleydell Gardens, Folkestone, Kent, CT20 2DN. The SRA records show that the Respondent was partner at this firm from 1 July 2009. This is a non-SRA regulated firm [**JW1, p300**].

8. SRA records also show that the Respondent had a position as an employee opened and closed on 1 July 2009 at a company, also called Green Management Solutions Limited with an address at 55a Denmark Hill, London, SE5 8RS. This was a pre-recognised entity [**JW1, p300**].

9. For the purposes of this Rule 12 Statement, the companies described at paragraphs 6 and 7 above are collectively referred to as "the Firm" unless otherwise specified.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of the allegations

Background

10. The conduct in this matter came to the attention of the SRA in June 2023 when Margaret Young, a solicitor at Taylor Rose MW Solicitors, made report to the SRA regarding the Respondent's conduct of a matter in which he was representing the other side in relation to the recovery of a sum awarded to Ms Young's client by the Employment Tribunal. This involved proceedings in Basildon and Chelmsford County Courts and the High Court. The details of Ms

Young's complaint are set out in her witness statement dated 6 June 2024 [**JW1, p4-p10**].

11. In summary, the allegations are that the Respondent conducted reserved legal activities without the appropriate authorisation to do so and that he made inaccurate and/or misleading statements to the Court about his regulatory status.

Allegation 1.1 – [conducting reserved legal activities without authorisation]

Authorisation and reserved legal activities

12. An "authorised person" is defined under section 18 of the Legal Services Act 2007 ("the LSA"):

"(1) For the purposes of this Act "authorised person", in relation to an activity ("the relevant activity") which is a reserved legal activity, means —
(a) a person who is authorised to carry on the relevant activity by a relevant approved regulator in relation to the relevant activity (other than by virtue of a licence under Part 5), or
(b) a licensable body which, by virtue of such a licence, is authorised to carry on the relevant activity by a licensing authority in relation to the reserved legal activity."

13. A "reserved legal activity" is defined under section 12 of the LSA as follows:

"(1) In this Act "reserved legal activity" means—

(a) the exercise of a right of audience;

(b) the conduct of litigation;

(c) reserved instrument activities;

(d) probate activities;

(e) notarial activities;

(f) the administration of oaths.

(2) Schedule 2 makes provision about what constitutes each of those activities".

14. Schedule 2(b) of the LSA defines "conduct of litigation" as;

"(a) the issuing of proceedings before any court in England and Wales,

(b) the commencement, prosecution and defence of such proceedings, and

(c) the performance of any ancillary functions in relation to such proceedings (such as entering appearances to actions)."

McKenzie Friends

15. The Practice Guidance: McKenzie Friends (Civil and Family Courts) issued by the Master of the Rolls and the President of the Family Division dated 12 July 2010 [**JW1, p328-p332**] states as follows [**JW1, p328**]:

What McKenzie Friends may do
MFs may: i) provide moral support for litigants; ii) take notes iii) help with case papers; iv) quietly give advice on any aspect of the conduct of a case.

What McKenzie Friends may not do
MFs may not i) act as the litigants' agent in relation to the proceedings ii) manage litigants' cases outside court, for example by signing court documents; or iii) address the court, make oral submissions or examine witnesses.

<u>The Respondent's authorisation</u>

16. The Respondent held a practising certificate from 17 March 2014 continuously until 8 December 2022, when it was revoked due him not renewing it for the 2022-2023 practising year [**JW1, p299**].

17. Prior to this revocation, on 25 October 2022, the following conditions were imposed on his practising certificate for the remainder of the 2021-2022 practising year [**JW1, p300**]:

a. Mr Ojo shall not act as a manager or owner of any authorised body.

b. Subject to condition 1, Mr Ojo may only act as a solicitor, only as an employee where the role has first been approved by us.

c. Mr Ojo may not practise on his own account under Regulation 10(2)(a) or (b) of the SRA Authorisation of Individuals Regulations.

d. Mr Ojo may not act as a compliance officer for legal practice (COLP) or compliance officer for finance and administration (COFA) for any authorised body.

e. Mr Ojo does not hold, receive, or have access to client money, or act as a signatory to any client or office account, or have the power to authorise electronic transfers from any client account.

18. The Respondent has not held a practising certificate since 8 December 2022 [**JW1, p299**].

The Firm's authorisation

19. As referred to at paragraphs 6 and 7 above, the Firm has never been authorised by the SRA. This was confirmed in a Regulatory Settlement Agreement dated 17 October 2017 between the SRA and the Respondent [**JW1, p1 and p300**].

The Respondent's ability to conduct reserved legal activities

20. The position prior to 25 October 2022, therefore, was that the Respondent could not offer reserved legal activities through the Firm at any time. He was not registered as a sole practitioner, and the Firm was not authorised [**JW1, p299**]. That remained the position between 25 October 2022 and 8 December 2022, save that the Respondent was permitted to act as a solicitor only as an employee where the role had been prior authorised by the SRA. The conditions also prohibited the Respondent for practising on his own [**JW1, p299**].

21. From 8 December 2022 onwards, the Respondent could not carry out reserved legal activities at all, as he did not have a practising certificate [**JW1, p299**].

County Court proceedings involving the Respondent

22. Ms Young represented Party A, who had won an award at the Employment Tribunal in 2012 of £120,615.24 against Party B. In February 2014 the parties agreed the terms of a Tomlin order. On 7 September 2021, this was converted into a Court order. Party B was represented by the Respondent [**JW1, p5**].

23. The Respondent submitted a number of documents and applications to the Court on behalf of Party B. These documents described the Respondent as Party B's

solicitor or legal representative or legal adviser, and referred to the Firm as representing Party B. Such applications and documents included:

23.1 Appellant's Notice dated 16 September 2021 [**JW1, p20**]. This form stated that Party B was legally represented and described the name of the firm acting for the appellant as "GMSL Legal Services" [**JW1, p22**] and was signed "B. Ojo (Applicant's legal representative)". In the box that states "If signing on behalf of firm or company give position or office held" the Respondent typed "Solicitor" [**JW1, p27**].

23.2 Application Notice N244 dated 25 November 2021 [**JW1, p48**] in which the name of the firm acting for Party B is GMSL Legal Services and is signed "B. Ojo" as the Applicant's legal representative [**JW1, p50**].

23.3 Appellant's Notice dated 22 December 2021 completed in the same manner as that of 16 September 2021 [**JW1, p89**].

23.4 Grounds in support of application to vary the order of 5 November 2021, dated 22 December 2021 [**JW1, p101**]. Although the document has the name of Party B typed next to 'Full Name', the typed signature is that of the Respondent. The document is eight pages in length and contains 25 paragraphs.

23.5 Application Notice N244 dated 24 May 2022, completed in a similar manner as that of 25 November 2021. The Respondent signed this form using a handwritten signature and underneath he stated that the applicant's legal representative's firm was GMSL Legal Services and his own position as a solicitor [**JW1, p105**].

23.6 Application Notice N244 dated 13 June 2023 in which the Firm was named as Party B's representative. The Respondent signed as the 'Applicant's legal representative (as defined by CPR 2.3(1))'. He described his position as a "Legal Adviser" [**JW1, p279**]. A legal representative is defined in CPR 2.3(1) as follows:

'legal representative' means a –
(a) barrister;
(b) solicitor;
(c) solicitor's employee;
(d) manager of a body recognised under section 9 of the Administration of Justice Act 1985; or

(e) person who, for the purposes of the Legal Services Act 2007, is an authorised person in relation to an activity which constitutes the conduct of litigation (within the meaning of that Act),

who has been instructed to act for a party in relation to proceedings;

23.7 Application Notice N244 dated 8 January 2024, which was completed in similar terms to that of 13 June 2023 [**JW1, p292-p296**].

23.8 Appellant's Notice dated 8 February 2024 [**JW1, p219-227**]. The form is completed to show that Party B is legally represented by "direct access counsel instructed to conduct litigation on your behalf" [**JW1, p221**]. The address provided for Party B is that of the Firm. Section 12 details the vulnerability submitted in the matter. It is written in the third person [**JW1, p226**]. The document is signed by Party B but refers to her legal representative's firm as being the Firm [**JW1, p227**]. The email address lawyers@gmsllegalservices.co.uk is on the form [**JW1, p219**].

24. The Respondent engaged in correspondence with Ms Young and the Court during this period. The Respondent's emails were sent from lawyers@gmsllegalservices.co.uk and the footers described the Firm as *"GMSL Legal Services is a trading name of Green Management Solutions Ltd which is registered in England & Wales Registration No 06232322. Our Solicitor(s) is/are regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority*" [**JW1, p129**]. This wording remained after 8 December 2022, for example on 3 February 2023 [**JW1, p140**] and 6 February 2023 [**JW1, p143**]. By the time of the correspondence sent to the Court in January and February 2024, the reference to "Our Solicitor(s)" being regulated by the SRA no longer appeared on the email footers. None of the email footers made any reference to the Firm not being authorised by the SRA.

25. The emails related to the ongoing litigation between Party A and Party B on matters such as:

25.1 Submitting documents to the Court and following up on submission of documents, for example on 23 December 2021 [**JW1, p109**], 3 February 2022 [**JW1, p111**], 11 February 2022 [**JW1, p113**], 26 February 2022 [**JW1, p116**], 7 February 2024, [**JW1, p251**].

25.2 Corresponding with Ms Young about possible settlement, for example on 11 August 2022 (marked 'without prejudice') [JW1, p129], 5 September 2022 [**JW1, p132**] 4 October 2022 [**JW1, p133**], 20 October 2022 [**JW1, p134**], 14 November 2022 [**JW1, p135**], 17 November 2022 [**JW1, p137**], 18 November 2022

[**JW1, p139**], 24 January 2023 [**JW1, p140**], 3 February 2023 [**JW1, p141**], and 6 February 2023 [**JW1, p143**].

25.3 Corresponding with the Court about consideration of applications, for example on 22 January 2024 [**JW1, p256**], 25 January 2024, [**JW1, p254**] and 5 February 2024 [**JW1, p252**].

26. On 26 September 2023, the Respondent drafted a witness statement which he updated on 14 October 2023. In that witness statement he stated that was a “family friend” of Party B and that he was “assisting her with the matter”. In that witness statement the Respondent invited the Court to dismiss Party A’s application [**JW1, p283-p287**].

27. On the evening of 9 February 2024, Mrs Justice Lang heard an out of hours application for interim relief which had been made by the Respondent on behalf of Party B. The Order stated “AND UPON hearing Mr Tunde Ojo, Solicitor for the Appellant, on the telephone;” [**JW1, p274**].

Breaches of Principles and Code

<u>Principle 5 (integrity)</u>

28. 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.

29. A solicitor acting with integrity would not conduct reserved legal activities from a firm that was not authorised. Further, a solicitor acting with integrity would not do so when this was in clear breach of conditions imposed on his practising certificate, as was the case from 25 October 2022, or in circumstances where he held no practising certificate, as was the case from 8 December 2022. Despite lacking the appropriate authorisation, the Respondent actively engaged in reserved legal activities, including conducting litigation and exercising rights of audience on 9 February 2024.

30. On behalf of Party B, the Respondent drafted and submitted applications, made submissions and corresponded with Party A’s solicitor. The Respondent’s communications gave the inevitable impression that he was acting as Party B’s solicitor and gave no indication that he was not authorised to act as such. The Respondent’s conduct went beyond what is permitted under the guidance for

McKenzie Friends. The Respondent's description of himself as "Legal Advisor" in the application of 13 June 2023, after his practising certificate had been revoked, should be distinguished and viewed in the context of previous communications with the Court and Ms Young, in which he described himself as the solicitor acting for Party B, for example on 24 May 2022.

31. The Respondent's conduct continued for over two years. By failing to adhere to the authorisation regulations, the Respondent demonstrated a lack of integrity and therefore breached Principle 5 of the SRA Principles.

Principle 2 (maintaining trust)

32. The conduct alleged also amounted to a breach by the Respondent of the requirement to behave in a way which maintains the trust and confidence placed in them and in the provision of legal services, by the public. The public is entitled to expect that solicitors conducting reserved legal activities have the proper authorisation to do so at all times. The Respondent's failure to adhere to the relevant regulations and rules on multiple occasions over a period spanning more than two years would undermine the trust the public places in him and in the provision of legal services. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 2 of the SRA Principles.

Principle 7

33. The best interests of clients are not served by their cases being handled by solicitors that do not have the authorisation to carry out the work. Clients are entitled to assume that solicitors are properly authorised. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 7 of the SRA Principles.

Rule 5.1 of the AFRs and Regulations 9.1 and 10.2 of the AIRs

34. The SRA relies on paragraphs 5 to 27 above as evidence that the Respondent failed to adhere to Rule 5.1 of the AFRs, in that the Firm was not a recognised body and the Respondent was not a recognised sole practice. In breaching Rule 5.1 of the AFRs, the Respondent breached Regulation 10.1 of the AIRs in that he acted as a sole practitioner when his Firm was not authorised as such, none of the exceptions in Regulation 10.2 applying. After 8 December 2022, the Respondent was also in breach of Regulation 9.1 of the AIRs as he did not hold a practising certificate but continued to carry on reserved legal activities.

Allegation 1.2 – [misleading statements]

35. The SRA relies on all communications with the Court and Ms Young from the Respondent as set out in paragraphs 23.6, 23.7, 24.1, 24.3, 26 and 27 above. This includes, but is not limited to, the Respondent appearing by telephone at the hearing on 9 February 2024 before Mrs Justice Lang. In addition, the SRA relies on the following facts and matters.

36. On 6 February 2023 Ms Young challenged the Respondent as to his regulatory status. She noted that he was prohibited from managing a law firm or to work for a solicitor's practice without permission from the SRA [**JW1, p143**]. In fact, by this point, the Respondent did not hold a practising certificate.

37. The Respondent replied the same day [**JW1, p143**] and wrote:

"*Many thanks for your mail. I'll be shortly providing explanations for this and the need for the conclusion of [Party B]'s matter. Hope that clarifies it for now*."

38. On 7 February 2023, the Respondent wrote to Ms Young and enclosed medical information about himself and the effect of his health on his sleeping hours. In that email the Respondent wrote [**JW1, p145**]:

"*Needless to say that there were historical conduct and or professional issues that would warrant possible compliant [sic] to the SRA but we supposed rather than pursuing those, the focus should be on resolving the matter and ensuring the parties move on*."

39. On 12 February 2023 the Respondent wrote to Ms Young [**JW1, p161**] and again referred to his health issues and personal matters that he had been dealing with, including a bereavement. In that email he wrote:

"*Of course part of the reasons, I have not been able to deal with the SRA matter you attached and they are aware of my circumstances and I am just trying to recuperate enough, so I can deal with it and get my certificate renewed which only expired, end of November. However, I do also qualify initially as a Barrister (Non-Practising), which of course qualifies me as a Legal Adviser, in addition to being a Solicitor albeit yet to renew my certificate at the moment."*

"The [email] *signature sent of course was true and had always been in there and if this is a problem in the circumstances then…*"

40. As noted in paragraph 5 above, although the Respondent had been called to the Bar, he had never held a practising certificate [**JW1, p297**]. The effect of this is that the Respondent was not permitted to describe himself as barrister or to give advice about a legal case. He was also not permitted to represent someone in Court [**JW1, p297-p298**]. The Respondent, in the application of 13 June 2023, had also described himself as a legal adviser within the meaning of CPR 2.3(1) as described at paragraph 23.6 above. The definition of legal representative at CPR 2.3(1) did not reflect the Respondent's regulatory status.

41. On 13 July 2023 the SRA wrote to the Respondent, following the report made by Ms Young, and noted that he appeared to be conducting litigation on behalf of clients and providing legal advice through the Firm [**JW1, p319**]. The Respondent replied the same day and said that he had previously been assisting Party B "*on a pro-bono basis*" and was "*now assisting her as a McKenzie friend and or mere legal adviser not as her Solicitor*". [**JW1, p320**]. The Respondent maintained this position in a further email of 24 August 2023 in response to notification that he was being investigated [**JW1, p326**].

42. On 8 February 2024, the Respondent made the application to the Court, which is described in paragraphs 23.7, 23.8 and 27 above.

Breaches of Principles and Code

<u>Principle 4 (dishonesty)</u>

43. The Applicant relies upon the test for dishonesty stated by the Supreme Court in *Ivey v Genting Casinos [2017] UKSC 67*, which applies to all forms of legal proceedings, namely that the person has acted dishonestly by the ordinary standards of reasonable and honest people:

"*When dishonesty is in question the fact-finding tribunal must first ascertain (subjectively) the actual state of the individual's knowledge or belief as to the facts. The reasonableness or otherwise of his belief is a matter of evidence (often in practice determinative) going to whether he held the belief, but it is not an additional requirement that his belief must be reasonable; the question is whether it is genuinely held. When once his actual state of mind as to knowledge or belief as to facts is established, the question whether his conduct was honest or dishonest is to be determined by the fact-finder by applying the (objective) standards of ordinary decent people. There is no requirement that the defendant must appreciate that what he has done is, by those standards, dishonest."*

44. At all or any of the times that the Respondent communicated with the Court and/or Ms Young, including during the hearing on 9 February 2024, he knew or believed the following matters:

    44.1 That he did not have a practising certificate issued by the SRA. In his email to Ms Young on 12 February 2023 the Respondent acknowledged that his certificate had "expired", which he thought had occurred at the end of November 2022 [JW1, p161], after which he told her that he was also a barrister.

    44.2 That he was not registered as a barrister and did not have a practising certificate issued by the Bar Standards Board.

    44.3 That, as a result of not having a practising certificate (either as a solicitor or barrister), he was not entitled to conduct reserved legal activities. As noted above, the Respondent changed his description of himself from that given previously to "Legal Advisor" in the application of 13 June 2023, after his practising certificate had been revoked, having previously described himself as Party B's solicitor. It can be inferred that the Respondent would not have done so had he not been aware that his practising certificate had been revoked and that this had impacted his ability to conduct litigation.

    44.4 That Mrs Justice Lang had, on 9 February 2024, proceeded on the understanding that the Respondent was Party B's solicitor. There is no evidence that the Respondent made any effort to correct the position, either during the hearing or subsequently.

    44.5 That he was not a McKenzie Friend or 'legal advisor', but that he was continuing to act, for all material purposes, in exactly the same way after the revocation of his practising certificate as he had been beforehand.

45. Members of the public would consider it dishonest to make statements about his regulatory status which gave the misleading impression that he was properly authorised to conduct reserved legal activities. In those circumstances, the Respondent was dishonest by the standards of ordinary decent people and breached Principle 4 of the SRA Principles.

<u>Principle 5 (integrity)</u>

46. The Applicant relies upon the test for integrity set out at paragraph 28 above. A solicitor acting with integrity would ensure with best efforts to not make misleading statements to the Court and the solicitor acting for the other party in proceedings as to their regulatory status. The clear impression given from the Respondent's communications was that he was properly authorised to conduct litigation, when

this was not the true position. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 5 of the SRA Principles.

Principle 1 (maintaining the rule of law and the proper administration of justice)

47. The proper administration of justice relies on solicitors, who are officers of the Court, giving accurate information to the Court and other parties and not misleading them. This is of particular importance during hearings. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 1 of the SRA Principles.

Principle 2 (maintaining trust)

48. The conduct alleged also amounted to a breach by the Respondent of the requirement to behave in a way which maintains the trust and confidence placed in them and in the provision of legal services, by the public. The public is entitled to expect that solicitors will provide information to the Court and other parties that is not inaccurate or misleading, and if they did so, then to make efforts to correct that information. The Respondent's repeated misleading and inaccurate statements over a period spanning more than a year would undermine the trust the public places in him and in the provision of legal services. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 2 of the SRA Principles.

Paragraph 1.4 of the Code for Solicitors

49. Paragraphs 35 to 42 above are relied on as evidence that the Respondent provided misleading information to the Court and to Ms Young, in breach of Paragraph 1.4 of the Code for Solicitors.

The SRA's investigation

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

51. In addition to the correspondence referred to at paragraph 41 above, correspondence continued between the SRA and the Respondent. This culminated in a Notice recommending referral of the Respondent's conduct to the Tribunal was issued on 4 October 2024. The Respondent provided representations on that Notice on 6 October 2024 [**JW1, p451**], 12 October 2024 [**JW1, p463**], 25 November 2024 [**JW1, p464**], as well as correspondence relating to a complaint made by the Respondent about the SRA's handling of the matter.

52. On 28 March 2025, an Authorised Officer of the SRA decided to refer the conduct of the Respondent to the Tribunal [**JW1, p465**].

I believe the contents of this statement are true.

....

Jonathan White

Dated this 23rd day of October 2025

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

BABATUNDE OLADELE OJO

Respondent

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

Relevant Rules and Regulations

SRA Principles 2019

You act:

Principle 1	in a way that upholds the constitutional principle of the rule of law, and the proper administration of justice.
Principle 2	in a way that upholds public trust and confidence in the solicitors' profession and in legal services provided by authorised persons.
Principle 4	with honesty
Principle 5	with integrity
Principle 7	in the best interest of each client

SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs, RFLs and RSLs 2019

Paragraph 1.4	You do not mislead or attempt to mislead your clients, the court or others, either by your own acts or omissions or allowing or being complicit in the acts or omissions of others (including your client).

SRA Authorisation of Firms Rules 2019

Rule 5.1	If you are a recognised body or a recognised sole practice authorised by the SRA you are entitled to carry on: a. All reserved legal activities except notarial activities; and b. Immigration work.

SRA Authorisation of Individuals Rules 2019

Regulation 9.1	Subject to regulations 9.2, 9.3, 9.5 to 9.10 and 10.2(b), if you are a solicitor with a current practising certificate, or a REL, you are entitled to carry on all reserved legal activities except notarial activities.
Regulation 10.1	Subject to regulation 10.2, if you are a solicitor or an REL you must not act as a sole practitioner unless your practice is authorised as a recognised sole practice.