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

NICHOLAS NIKOLA STOJANOVIC

Respondent

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

I, Anna Roberts, 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, Nicholas Stojanovic, made by the SRA are that whilst in practice as a solicitor at Ramsdens Solicitors LLP:

1.1 On 20 March 2024, the Respondent gave untrue and / or misleading information to Client X by informing Client X that the Respondent was awaiting a psychiatrist's report, which the Respondent had already received on 19 February 2024, and in doing so the Respondent thereby breached any or all of:

1.1.1 Principle 2 of the SRA Principles 2019 ('the Principles');

1.1.2 Principle 4 of the Principles;

1.1.3 Principle 5 of the Principles;

1.1.4 Principle 7 of the Principles; and

1.1.5 Paragraph 1.4 of the Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs and RFLs 2019 ('the Code').

The facts and matters relied upon in support of this allegation are set out in paragraphs 6 – 20 and 21 – 32 below.

1.2 On 28 March 2024, the Respondent gave untrue and / or misleading information to Client X by informing Client X that there had been no change to his case, implying that the Respondent was still awaiting a psychiatrist's report, which the Respondent had already received on 19 February 2024, and in doing so the Respondent thereby breached any or all of:

1.2.1 Principle 2 of the Principles;

1.2.2 Principle 4 of the Principles;

1.2.3 Principle 5 of the Principles;

1.2.4 Principle 7 of the Principles; and

1.2.5 Paragraph 1.4 of the Code.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of this allegation are set out in paragraphs 6 – 20 and 33 – 45 below.

1.3 On 19 April 2024, the Respondent gave untrue and / or misleading information to Client X by informing Client X that the Respondent was awaiting a psychiatrist's report, which the Respondent had already received on 19 February 2024, and in doing so the Respondent thereby breached any or all of:

1.3.1 Principle 2 of the Principles;

1.3.2 Principle 4 of the Principles;

1.3.3 Principle 5 of the Principles;

1.3.4 Principle 7 of the Principles; and

1.3.5 Paragraph 1.4 of the Code.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of this allegation are set out in paragraphs 6 – 20 and 46 – 58 below.

Appendices and Documents

2. I attach to this Statement Appendix 1, an Anonymisation Schedule.

3. I attach to this Statement Appendix 2, a Schedule of the Principles, Rules and Paragraphs of the Code relied upon in this Statement.

4. I also attach to this Statement a bundle of documents, marked **'AR1'** to which I refer in this Statement. Unless otherwise stated, the page references **'AR1 p [X]'** in this Statement (which appear in red at the top centre of the page) relate to documents contained in that bundle.

Professional Details

5. The Respondent was born on [redacted] 1973 and was 50 years of age at the time of the alleged conduct. He is a solicitor, having been admitted to the Roll on 1 July 2003. The Respondent has held a practising certificate free from conditions from 1 July 2003.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of the allegations

Background

6. The Respondent commenced employment with Ramsdens Solicitors LLP ('the Firm') on 10 January 2022 as a Solicitor and Senior Associate in the Personal Injury and Clinical Negligence team. The allegations relate to the Respondent's employment with the Firm.

7. Client X instructed the Firm in January 2019 in relation to a complex clinical negligence claim. Client X's claim followed a failed operation which led to serious physical complications. Client X's mental health was also impaired. The Respondent took over conduct of Client X's case in January 2022. He found Client X "*challenging to represent*", as his mood could be very unpredictable, making communications difficult. Client X was prone to anxiety, paranoia and anger. On one occasion, Client X upset the Respondent's assistant, as a result of which it was agreed with Client X that Client X would not speak with the Respondent's assistant **(AR1 p52-53, p80, p63)**. After a conference with counsel in January 2023, the Respondent instructed several medical experts to provide reports in support of Client X's case. This included a psychiatrist's report from Dr Hosker ('the Report'). Client X was anxious and pushed for

progress, contacting the Respondent regularly for updates on his case **(AR1 p63)**.

8. On 19 February 2024, the Respondent received an email from the medical agency attaching the Report, dated 5 February 2024. The Respondent was able to access the Report from approximately 10:23 hours on 19 February 2024, after some initial issues with password access **(AR1 p20-21, p74)**.

9. On 20 March 2024, the Respondent spoke with Client X on the telephone, telling him: "*We have 2 out of the 3 new [reports] and we are awaiting the psych. We cannot do much without this".* During the telephone call, Client X became frustrated, believing that the Respondent was attributing delay in the case to him. The Respondent stated that the delay was being caused by the absence of the Report. Client X threatened to instruct someone else to which the Respondent replied that this was Client X's choice but if this was said to try and change something, it would not "*alter anything my end. I can only do what I can do and will not be held to ransom*." **(AR1 p65-66).**

10. On 28 March 2024, the Respondent emailed Client X in response to a missed call, stating: "*Sorry I missed your call yesterday. Just to advise there is no change at this end".* By stating that there was *"no change at this end"* the email implied that the Respondent had still not received the Report, noting that this was the principal topic of the last conversation between them on 20 March 2024 **(AR1 p67)**.

11. On 19 April 2024, the Respondent emailed Client X giving him a brief overview of the status of his claim. The Respondent summarised the expert medical reports received to date, noting that: "*The only report awaited now is from our Psychiatrist Dr Hosker…*" He stated that: "*The aim is when the final report is in that I will offer you all the options open to you to move your claim forward*" **(AR1 p68-69)**.

12. The Respondent made a file note recording his time reviewing the file and drafting the update to Client X on 19 April 2024. There was no reference in the file note to the fact that the Respondent already had the Report or his reason for not disclosing it to Client X **(AR1 p70)**.

13. On 14 May 2024, the Respondent emailed Client X with the Report and his advice letter **(AR1 p31, 214-248)**. He followed this up with a further letter on 16 May 2024 setting out proposed next steps in the case **(AR1 p32-35)**. The Respondent correctly recorded the date of the Report as 5 February 2024.

14. On 20 May 2024, Client X emailed the Respondent asking him to confirm the date he received the Report and also asking for details of the Respondent's overseeing partner. The Respondent responded to confirm that he had received the Report on 19 February 2024 and gave Client X the details for Mr Nicholas Armitage ('Mr Armitage'), Head of Personal Injury and Clinical Negligence and Complaints Partner **(AR1 p36-42)**.

15. The Respondent telephoned Mr Armitage on 20 May 2024 to inform him that he might be getting a complaint from a client. He told Mr Armitage that he *"had received an expert report on a matter and did not want to deal with it at the time".* He confirmed that he had now written to the client with his advice and the Report, dated February 2024. Mr Armitage asked the Respondent if he had told the client that he had not received the Report when he had. The Respondent confirmed this to be the case, explaining that he had "*told the client in the past that he had not received the report as he needed time to deal with a difficult claim and client".* He explained that the client had now picked up on the date of the Report and asked him to confirm when he received it as well as asking for the Respondent's manager's details **(AR1 p60)**.

16. On 23 May 2024, Mr Armitage spoke with Client X and his wife by telephone. Client X asserted that his matter "*had been going on too long and that was affecting his mental health*". He stated that the Respondent had previously agreed that the Respondent would send the Report on to him as soon as the Respondent received it and before he had read it. Client X wanted an explanation as to why it had taken three months for the Respondent to send the Report. Client X believed that the Respondent had a motive for not giving him the Report and he wanted to know what this was **(AR1 p61-62)**. The Respondent later confirmed to Mr Armitage that he had agreed with Client X that he would send the Report on to him as soon as he received it and before he had read it **(AR1 p64)**.

17. Mr Armitage undertook an initial investigation of the matter. This included reviewing the case file from February 2024 **(AR1 p63)**. On 28 May 2024, Mr Armitage emailed the results of his investigation to Mr Jonathan Cornes ('Mr Cornes'), the COLP **(AR1 p46-47)**. In his review document **(AR1 p63-64)**, he noted that in initial discussion with the Respondent on 20 May 2024, the Respondent explained that he had *" received an expert report on a matter and did not want to deal with it at the time"* and accepted that "*he had not told the client he had received the report when he had*". Mr Armitage also noted that: "*There were no extenuating circumstances offered*". Mr Armitage's review document did not reference any file notes or other documents on the case file recording that the Respondent had discussed his decision not to inform Client X that he had received the Report with anyone else in the Firm. Further, the review document did not reference any file notes or other documents on the case file recording that the Respondent had sought a medical opinion on whether or not to disclose the Report to Client X.

18. On 11 June 2024, the Respondent attended a conference with counsel with Client X**.** On 12 June 2024, the Respondent emailed Mr Armitage to confirm that he had apologised to Client X for not sending the Report straight away. The Respondent stated that he had "*explained that at that point this was the only report and I wanted to see and advised on ahead of sending this given it was potentially the most sensitive opinion and it had unfortunately taken way longer to get to it to give that advice. A full file review was done at the same point covering all the evidence and reports which required a great deal of time to do so".* The Respondent acknowledged to Client X that this was *"a very poor judgment call"* and that he should have sent the Report and advised it would take time to get the follow up actions done. The Respondent assured Client X that there was no sinister reason for the delay or holding the Report back **(AR1 p48)**.

19. On 17 June 2024, Mr Armitage submitted a report to the Firm's Human Resources Department **(AR1 p72-73)**. In terms of the Respondent's reason for not disclosing the Report, he stated that:

    a. The Respondent did not disclose the Report when he received it as "*he needed time that the client would not give him and therefore he did not want to give him a report which was sensitive and detailed".*

b. The Respondent *"was worried about the effect of providing the report without advice and the effect that would have on the client, in a situation where [the Respondent] needed more time to review the whole file*."

20. On 21 June 2024, the Firm reported the Respondent to the SRA.

Allegation 1.1 – On 20 March 2024, the Respondent gave untrue and / or misleading information to Client X by informing Client X that the Respondent was awaiting a psychiatrist's report, which the Respondent had already received on 19 February 2024.

21. Paragraphs 8 and 9 are repeated.

22. At the time of speaking with Client X on the telephone on 20 March 2024, informing him that the Respondent was still awaiting the Report, the Respondent knew or believed that he already had the Report, having received it on 19 February 2024. The Respondent therefore gave information to Client X that he knew was untrue and/or misleading.

Allegation 1.1 - Breaches of the SRA Principles and the Code

Principle 4 (honesty)

23. 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".*

24. When the Respondent spoke with Client X on the telephone on 20 March 2024, telling him that he was awaiting the Report, the Respondent knew or believed:

24.1 that he had already received the Report on 19 February 2024;

24.2 that the Report had been in his possession, unactioned, for over 1 month;

24.3 that Client X was a vulnerable client with mental health issues;

24.4 that Client X was also a challenging client, subject to mood swings which made communication difficult, and prone to anxiety, paranoia and anger;

24.5 that Client X was waiting for the Report, to enable his case to progress;

24.6 that he had promised Client X that he would send the Report to him as soon as he received it;

24.7 that Client X was anxious about not having received the Report and the delay in his case;

24.8 that once he had disclosed the Report to Client X or told Client X that he had received it, Client X would demand and/ or require immediate advice and support to understand the Report, its impact on the overall case and next steps;

24.9 that if the Respondent was not in a position to fully advise Client X once Client X had received the Report or been informed of its receipt by the Respondent, Client X would become anxious, paranoid and angry;

24.10 that reviewing the Report, its impact on the overall case and next steps would be time-intensive;

24.11 that the Respondent did not have capacity at that time to review the Report, its impact on the overall case and next steps;

24.12 that the Respondent had made a deliberate decision to tell Client X that he had not received the Report, to secure himself more time to deal with the Report and avoid confrontation with this challenging client.

25. In these circumstances, the Respondent's actions in knowingly giving untrue and / or misleading information to Client X, telling him that he was awaiting the

Report even though the Respondent was in receipt of it, were dishonest by the objective standards of ordinary people. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 4 of the SRA Principles.

Principle 5 (integrity)

26. 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 5 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 and involves more than mere honesty.

27. The Judgment states that: "*…the term "integrity" is a useful shorthand to express the higher standards which society expects from professional persons and which the professions expect from their own members…The underlying rationale is that the professions have a privileged and trusted role in our society. In return, they are required to live up to their own professional standards…".*

28. A solicitor of integrity is expected to be scrupulous about the accuracy of any information provided by them. Such a solicitor of integrity would ensure that any information they provided to a client was strictly true and accurate. This is particularly important when a client is vulnerable and suffers from mental health issues and where furnishing them with untrue or misleading information could have serious repercussions for their health and well-being. By providing untrue and / or misleading information to Client X, the Respondent's behaviour fell short of the high standards that society expects from solicitors and therefore lacked integrity, in breach of Principle 5 of the SRA Principles.

Principle 2 (upholding trust and confidence)

29. Solicitors are members of a profession which is to be trusted to the ends of the earth. The public must be able to place their confidence in solicitors during times when they are at their most vulnerable. A member of the public would expect a solicitor to be truthful in all of their dealings with their client. A member of the public would not expect a solicitor to knowingly provide untrue or misleading information to a client, particularly where a client is vulnerable and suffers from mental health issues and where furnishing them with untrue or

misleading information could have serious repercussions for their health and well-being.

30. By knowingly providing untrue and / or misleading information to Client X, the Respondent failed to act in a way that upholds public trust and confidence in the solicitors' profession and in legal services provided by authorised persons and therefore breached Principle 2 of the SRA Principles.

Principle 7 (acting in the best interests of your client)

31. Solicitors must act in the best interests of their client. A solicitor acting in the best interests of Client X, a vulnerable client with mental health issues, would have progressed his case as soon as possible, knowing that his case had already been ongoing since January 2019 and knowing how anxious he was about further delay **(AR1 p48)**. Contrary to this, the Respondent failed to take any action on receipt of the Report for over 1 month and then provided Client X with untrue or misleading information, claiming to still be awaiting the Report. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 7 of the SRA Principles.

Paragraph 1.4 of the Code

32. Paragraph 1.4 of the Code states that: "*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)*". By telling Client X that the Respondent was still awaiting the Report, when he had in fact received it, the Respondent misled Client X. The Respondent therefore breached Paragraph 1.4 of the Code.

Allegation 1.2 - On 28 March 2024, the Respondent gave untrue and / or misleading information to Client X by informing Client X that there had been no change to his case, implying that the Respondent was still awaiting a psychiatrist's report, which the Respondent had already received on 19 February 2024.

33. Paragraphs 8 and 10 are repeated.

34. When the Respondent spoke with Client X on the telephone on 20 March 2024, as detailed in paragraph 9 of this Statement, the principal topic of their discussion was the delay in Client X's case, allegedly caused by the fact that the Report was still outstanding. Accordingly, at the time of the Respondent emailing Client X on 28 March 2024, telling him that that there had been no change to his case, the Respondent was implying that he was still awaiting the Report. There had in fact been a change to Client X's case because the Respondent had received the Report on 19 February 2024, as detailed in paragraph 8 of this Statement. The Respondent therefore gave information to Client X that he knew was untrue and/or misleading, both expressly and by inference.

Allegation 1.2 - Breaches of the SRA Principles and the Code

Principle 4 (honesty)

35. Paragraph 23 is repeated.

36. When the Respondent emailed Client X on 28 March 2024, telling him that there had been no change to his case, and thereby implying that the Respondent was still awaiting the Report, the Respondent knew or believed:

    36.1 that he had already received the Report on 19 February 2024;

    36.2 that the Report had been in his possession, unactioned, for over 5 weeks;

    36.3 that Client X was a vulnerable client with mental health issues;

    36.4 that Client X was also a challenging client, subject to mood swings which made communication difficult, and prone to anxiety, paranoia and anger;

    36.5 that Client X was waiting for the Report, to enable his case to progress;

    36.6 that the Respondent had promised Client X that he would send the Report to him as soon as the Respondent received it;

    36.7 that Client X was anxious about not having received the Report and the delay in his case;

    36.8 that once the Respondent had disclosed the Report to Client X or told Client X that he had received it, Client X would demand and/or require immediate advice and support to understand the Report, its impact on the overall case and next steps;

36.9 that if the Respondent was not in a position to fully advise Client X once Client X had received the Report or been informed of its receipt by the Respondent, Client X would become anxious, paranoid and angry;

36.10 that reviewing the Report, its impact on the overall case and next steps would be time-intensive;

36.11 that the Respondent still did not have capacity at that time to review the Report, its impact on the overall case and next steps;

36.12 that the Respondent had made a deliberate decision to tell Client X that he had not received the Report, to secure himself more time to deal with the Report and avoid confrontation with this challenging client;

36.13 that the Respondent had already provided untrue and/or misleading information to Client X on 20 March 2024, forming a course of conduct.

37. In these circumstances, the Respondent's actions in knowingly giving untrue and / or misleading information to Client X, telling him that the Respondent was awaiting the Report even though the Respondent was in receipt of it, were dishonest by the objective standards of ordinary people. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 4 of the SRA Principles.

Principle 5 (integrity)

38. Paragraphs 26, 27 and 28 are repeated.

39. The Respondent's lack of integrity was compounded by the fact that he had already provided untrue and / or misleading information to Client X, on 20 March 2024, forming a course of conduct.

Principle 2 (maintaining trust and confidence)

40. Paragraphs 29 and 30 are repeated.

41. The Respondent's failure to act in a way that upholds public trust and confidence was compounded by the fact that he had already provided untrue and / or misleading information to Client X, on 20 March 2024, forming a course of conduct.

Principle 7 (acting in the best interests of your client)

42. Paragraph 31 is repeated.

43. The Respondent's failure to act in the best interests of his client was compounded by the fact that he had now delayed even longer in taking any action on receipt of the Report, over 5 weeks **(AR1 p48)**. He had also already provided Client X with untrue or misleading information on 20 March 2024, claiming to still be awaiting the Report, forming a course of conduct.

Paragraph 1.4 of the Code

44. Paragraph 32 is repeated.

45. The Respondent's breach of the Code was compounded by the fact that he had already misled Client X on 20 March 2024, forming a course of conduct.

Allegation 1.3 - On 19 April 2024, the Respondent gave untrue and / or misleading information to Client X by informing Client X that the Respondent was awaiting a psychiatrist's report, which the Respondent had already received on 19 February 2024.

46. Paragraphs 8, 11 and 12 are repeated.

47. At the time of emailing Client X on 19 April 2024, telling him that the Respondent was still awaiting the Report, the Respondent knew or believed that he already had the Report, having received it on 19 February 2024. The Respondent therefore gave information to Client X that he knew was untrue and/or misleading.

Allegation 1.3 - Breaches of the SRA Principles and the Code

Principle 4 (honesty)

48. Paragraph 23 is repeated.

49. When the Respondent emailed Client X on 28 March 2024, telling him that the Respondent was awaiting the Report, the knew or believed:

    49.1 that he had already received the Report on 19 February 2024;

49.2 that the Report had been in his possession, unactioned, for 2 months;

49.3 that Client X was a vulnerable client with mental health issues;

49.4 that Client X was also a challenging client, subject to mood swings which made communication difficult, and prone to anxiety, paranoia and anger;

49.5 that Client X was waiting for the Report, to enable his case to progress;

49.6 that he had promised Client X that he would send the Report to him as soon as he received it;

49.7 that Client X was anxious about not having received the Report and the delay in his case;

49.8 that once he had disclosed the Report to Client X or told Client X that he had received it, Client X would demand and/or require immediate advice and support to understand the Report, its impact on the overall case and next steps;

49.9 that if the Respondent was not in a position to fully advise Client X once Client X had received the Report or been informed of its receipt by the Respondent, Client X would become anxious, paranoid and angry;

49.10 that reviewing the Report, its impact on the overall case and next steps would be time-intensive;

49.11 that the Respondent still did not have capacity at that time to review the Report, its impact on the overall case and next steps;

49.12 that the Respondent had made a deliberate decision to tell Client X that he had not received the Report, to secure himself more time to deal with the Report and avoid confrontation with this challenging client;

49.13 that he had already provided untrue and/or misleading information to Client X on two previous occasions, 20 March 2024 and 28 March 2024, continuing a course of conduct.

50. In these circumstances, the Respondent's actions in knowingly giving untrue and / or misleading information to Client X, telling him that he was awaiting the Report even though he was in receipt of it, were dishonest by the objective standards of ordinary people. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 4 of the SRA Principles.

Principle 5 (integrity)

51. Paragraphs 26, 27 and 28 are repeated.

52. The Respondent's lack of integrity was compounded by the fact that he had already provided untrue and / or misleading information to Client X on two previous occasions, on 20 March 2024 and 28 March 2024, continuing a course of conduct.

Principle 2 (upholding trust and confidence)

53. Paragraphs 29 and 30 are repeated.

54. The Respondent's failure to act in a way that upholds public trust and confidence was compounded by the fact that he had already provided untrue and / or misleading information to Client X, on two previous occasions, on 20 March 2024 and 28 March 2024, continuing a course of conduct.

Principle 7 (acting in the best interests of your client)

55. Paragraph 31 is repeated.

56. The Respondent's failure to act in the best interests of his client was compounded by the fact that he had now delayed for two months in taking any action on receipt of the Report **(AR1 p48)**. He had also already provided Client X with untrue or misleading information on two previous occasions, on 20 March 2024 and 28 March 2024, continuing a course of conduct.

Paragraph 1.4 of the Code

57. Paragraph 32 is repeated.

58. The Respondent's breach of the Code is compounded by the fact that he had already misled Client X on two previous occasions, 20 March 2024 and 28 March 2024, continuing a course of conduct.

SRA Investigation

59. An Investigation Officer of the SRA investigated the allegations made against the Respondent.

60. On 19 August 2025 the Investigation Officer sent a Notice recommending referral of the Respondent's conduct to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal **(AR1 p 5-15)**.

61. The Respondent provided representations on the Notice dated 26 September 2025 and accompanying documents **(AR1 p78-103)**. In these representations the Respondent denied the allegations. He stated that Client X was a vulnerable and challenging client, prone to anxiety and anger. Disclosure of the Report, absent clarity about the next steps, would in the Respondent's judgement have caused deterioration in Client X's well-being and adverse consequences for Client X's family. The Respondent therefore decided to delay disclosure of the Report, until a managed context was available. The Respondent asserts this decision was motivated by a genuine and honest belief that it was in the client's best interests to do so.

62. On 27 October 2025, an Authorised Officer of the SRA decided to refer the conduct of the Respondent to the Tribunal **(ARI p210-213)**.

I believe the contents of this statement are true.

A L Roberts

Anna Roberts
Dated this 6 day of February 2026

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

NICHOLAS NIKOLA STOJANOVIC

Respondent

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

Relevant Rules and Regulations

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 4	with honesty.
Principle 5	with integrity.
Principle 7	in the best interests of your 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).