

SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974

Case No. 10979-2012

BETWEEN:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY

Applicant

and

PATRICIA ANN ROONEY

Respondent

Before:

Mr J. Astle (in the chair)

Mr J. P. Davies

Mr R. Slack

Date of Hearing: 16 October 2013

Appearances

Mr Andrew Bullock, counsel of the Solicitors Regulation Authority, The Cube, 199 Wharfside Street, Birmingham B1 1RN for the Applicant

The Respondent did not attend and was not represented

JUDGMENT

Allegations

1. The allegation made against the Respondent on behalf of the Solicitors Regulation Authority, is that she has, in the opinion of the Law Society, occasioned or been a party to an act or default in relation to a legal practice which involved conduct on her part of such a nature that, in the opinion of the Society, it would be undesirable for her to be involved in a legal practice in one or more of the ways mentioned in Section 43(1)(a) of the Solicitors Act 1974, as amended by the Legal Services Act 2007, in that she:
 - 1.1 Acted contrary to Rules 1.02 and 1.06 of the Solicitors' Code of Conduct 2007 in the following respects:
 - 1.1.1 she misappropriated client monies belonging to her employer;
 - 1.1.2 used those misappropriated monies for the benefit of herself and her partner; and
 - 1.1.3 took steps to conceal the removal of these funds from her employer.

Documents

2. The Tribunal reviewed all of the documents submitted on behalf of the Applicant and the Respondent, which included:

Applicant

- Application dated 25 April 2012;
- Rule 8 Statement and exhibit "ATBR/1" dated 25 April 2012;
- Authorities Bundle;
- Statement of Costs dated 7 October 2013

Respondent

- None.

Preliminary Matter

3. Mr Bullock informed the Tribunal that there had been consistent problems with effecting service upon the Respondent and at a previous hearing before the Tribunal on 5 September 2013 an Order was made by the Tribunal directing service by advertisement in The Times and Leicester Mercury newspapers. He said that the advertisements had been duly placed and that had been accepted as good service on the Respondent.
4. Mr Bullock confirmed that there had been no engagement by the Respondent and she was not in attendance at the substantive hearing. He invited the Tribunal to proceed in the absence of the Respondent.

The Tribunal's Decision

5. The Tribunal was satisfied that proper service had been affected on the Respondent by way of advertisement in The Times and the Leicester Mercury and it was content for the hearing to proceed in the absence of the Respondent who had been given the opportunity to attend and had not done so.

Factual Background

6. The Respondent was an unadmitted person and had been employed as a cashier and office manager by Andrew M Ford Solicitors, trading as Quality Solicitors Andrew Ford in Leicester ("the firm").
7. On 4 February 2011 Mr Andrew Ford, the senior partner in the firm, had become aware of an anomaly in the firm's accounts. Together with his two other partners he had investigated the matter and discovered that the sum of £75,429.30 had been misappropriated from the firm's client bank accounts.
8. On 7 February 2011 Mr Ford had reported the matter to the Applicant by email and to the firm's professional indemnity insurers. The firm's indemnity insurers, Aon Risk Services instructed the firm of Carter Backer Winter LLP ("CBW"), chartered accountants, to carry out an investigation and, on 28 February 2011, they produced a report of their investigation.
9. In March 2011 proceedings were issued in the High Court of Justice in the name of the firm against the Respondent and a Mr John Wilkins, her partner and the recipient of most of the misappropriated funds. In the course of those proceedings terms of settlement were agreed by the solicitors acting for the firm and solicitors acting for the Respondent whereby the Respondent agreed to repay the misappropriated monies together with interest and costs in the total sum of £84,000 on or before 31 August 2011. The Respondent had paid these monies in full on or before that date.
10. On 4 May 2011 the Applicant wrote to the Respondent and invited her to comment on the allegations contained in an email from Mr Ford to the Applicant dated 7 February 2011, namely that she had dishonestly misappropriated the sum of £75,429.30 from the firm's client bank accounts. The Respondent did not reply to the Applicant's letter.
11. The Respondent's conduct was referred to the Tribunal.

Witnesses

12. None

Findings of Fact and Law

13. The Applicant was required to prove the allegations beyond reasonable doubt. The Tribunal had due regard to the Respondent's rights to a fair trial and to respect for her private and family life under Articles 6 and 8 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.

14. **Allegation 1 - The allegation made against the Respondent on behalf of the Solicitors Regulation Authority, is that she has, in the opinion of the Law Society, occasioned or been a party to an act or default in relation to a legal practice which involved conduct on her part of such a nature that, in the opinion of the Society, it would be undesirable for her to be involved in a legal practice in one or more of the ways mentioned in Section 43(1)(a) of the Solicitors Act 1974, as amended by the Legal Services Act 2007, in that she:**

1.1 Acted contrary to Rules 1.02 and 1.06 of the Solicitors' Code of Conduct 2007 in the following respects:

- 1.1.1 she misappropriated client monies belonging to her employer;**
- 1.1.2 used those misappropriated monies for the benefit of herself and her partner; and**
- 1.1.3 took steps to conceal the removal of these funds from her employer.**

Submissions on behalf of the Applicant

14.1 Mr Bullock referred the Tribunal to the Rule 8 Statement. He also referred to the extract from the Solicitors Act 1974 (as amended) in relation to Section 43 (2) which states:

“43...

...

- (2) An order made by the Society or the Tribunal under this subsection is an order which states one or more of the following-
 - (a) that as from the specified date –
 - (i) no solicitor shall employ or remunerate, in connection with his practice as a solicitor, the person with respect to whom the order is made,
 - (ii) no employee of a solicitor shall employ or remunerate, in connection with the solicitors' practice, the person with respect to whom the order is made,
 - (iii) no recognised body shall employ or remunerate that person,
 - and
 - (iv) no manager or employee of a recognised body shall employ or remunerate that person in connection with the business of that body,

except in accordance with a Society permission;

- (b) that as from the specified date no recognised body or manager or employee of such a body shall, except in accordance with a Society permission, permit the person with respect to whom the order is made to be a manager of the body;
- (c) that as from the specified date no recognised body or manager or employee of such a body shall, except in accordance with a Society permission, permit the person with respect to whom the order is made to have an interest in the body”.

- 14.2 Mr Bullock said that the Applicant’s case was put on the basis that the Respondent had misappropriated clients’ money from her former employer and had used that money for her own benefit and had sought to conceal her actions.
- 14.3 Mr Bullock referred the Tribunal to the report by Mr Paul Smethurst of CBW dated 28 February 2011 being the forensic accountant’s report which he said explained the nature of the misappropriations by the Respondent. He also referred the Tribunal to the witness statement of Mr Andrew Ford, the senior partner of the firm, dated 25 April 2012 upon which he said the Applicant placed reliance and which had been notified to the Respondent in the advertisements in the newspapers per Rule 14 (2) of the Solicitors (Disciplinary Proceedings) Rules 2007. He said that the Applicant sought to rely on this witness statement and it was deemed served upon the Respondent within the required 21 days prior to the substantive hearing. Mr Bullock said that no counter-notice had been served upon the Applicant. Mr Bullock said that he also relied upon the investigative correspondence which was contained within the exhibit bundle.
- 14.4 In relation to the CBW forensic accountant’s report Mr Bullock said that he did not seek to prove his case by reference to that document but by reference to the documents exhibited to the statement of Mr Ford and his account of what had taken place as detailed in his statement.
- 14.5 Mr Bullock also acknowledged that there had been civil proceedings and he submitted that there had been a tacit admission by the Respondent in those proceedings regarding her conduct in relation to the misappropriation of the firm’s money.
- 14.6 Mr Bullock said that he also relied upon the authorities to which he referred the Tribunal. These were the cases of Ojelade v The Law Society [2006] EWHC 2210 (Admin), Gregory v The Law Society [2007] EWHC 1724 (Admin) and R (Ex Parte) Solicitors Regulation Authority v Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal, Solicitors Regulation Authority v Ali [2013] EWHC 2584 (Admin). In the case of Ojelade, Mr Justice Ouseley stated:

“...

- 12. The position, in my judgment, is this. The starting point is that a Section 43 Order is not a punishment. As was submitted by the Law Society to the Tribunal, and as is plainly correct, Section 43 is a

regulatory provision designed to afford safeguards and exercise control over those employed by solicitors when in any given case that was considered to be appropriate. It should not be viewed as a punishment. The fundamental principle involved was the maintenance of the good reputation of the solicitors' profession, both in the interests of the profession and of the public. The collective reputation of that profession was of importance to the public and there had to be confidence in solicitors and in those employed by solicitors' firms. I agree with those comments. That is the purpose of it.

13. The impact which making such an Order may have of course, varies from person to person, but it is important also that it is open to an appellant to seek to have the order revoked and meanwhile to seek permission, as has happened here, from the Law Society in order that employment continue..."

14.7 In the case of Gregory, Mr Justice Treacy stated:

"...

18. I turn next to consider Section 43 in its broad terms. Section 43 is not punitive in nature. It is there to protect the public, to provide safeguards and to exercise control over those who work for solicitors, in circumstances where there is necessity for such control shown by their past conduct...An Order made under Section 43 does not prohibit a person from working for a solicitor...

...

21. True it is that he was acquitted of acting dishonestly in either case, but Section 43(1)(b) does not require a finding of dishonesty...but conduct falling short of that may suffice if it was of a nature which made it undesirable for the person concerned to be employed in connection with a solicitors (sic) practice..."

14.8 In the Solicitors Regulation Authority v Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal and Ali case Mr Justice Wilkie stated:

"...

41. However, that said, in my judgment the main thrust of the criticisms made of the Tribunal's decision and its reasoning by Mr Dutton QC on behalf of the Authority are well made. True it is that, in their written decision, they [the Tribunal] pose the correct question...namely whether it was, in all the circumstances, any longer necessary for the level of regulatory control to be imposed upon the Applicant. But the reasoning they use in support of their conclusion that it was no longer necessary for such a level of control to be imposed, in my judgment, was wholly misconceived and flawed. As they themselves acknowledge, the Section 43 Order has a regulatory function, not a

penal function, that is why the Order is of indefinite duration, subject to revocation upon review. The purpose of the Order is to safeguard the public and the Society's reputation by ensuring that a person is currently only employed where a satisfactory level of supervision has been organised and for as long as that person requires such a level of supervision before being permitted to work effectively under his own steam...".

- 14.9 Mr Bullock submitted that the question for the Tribunal was whether, if it found the case proved, it was appropriate and proportionate to make the Section 43 Order against the Respondent in order to protect the public and the reputation of the profession. Mr Bullock submitted that it was an appropriate and proportionate order for the Tribunal to make on the basis that the Respondent had made a number of improper withdrawals from the firm's client accounts over a 16 month period between July 2009 and November 2010.
- 14.10 Mr Bullock said that at all material times in 2009 to 2010 the firm had held two client bank accounts; a current account and an interest bearing account. The Respondent had been employed by the firm as a cashier and office manager between 2004 and December 2010. The firm itself had closed as at 30 September 2012.
- 14.11 Mr Andrew Ford, the firm's senior partner had supervised the Respondent and she had reported to him. As the cashier the Respondent was responsible for the day to day operation of the firm's client and office accounts and her duties had included undertaking daily bank reconciliations of the firm's bank accounts; making daily postings to the firm's client and office accounts; banking including depositing money at the firm's bank and operating the firm's electronic online banking system known as HSBC.net. The Respondent had also had authority to effect electronic transfers using HSBC.net to and from the firm's client and office bank accounts as well as within the firm's internal client ledgers on AlphaLaw [its legal software system known as AlphaLaw Vantage].
- 14.12 Mr Bullock submitted that between July 2009 and December 2010 the Respondent had misappropriated the sum of £75,217.29 from the firm's two client bank accounts by making unauthorised withdrawals. Funds totalling £69,717.29, as detailed in the statement of Mr Ford and the report of CBW, had been paid to Mr John Wilkins by way of two cheques in his favour and seven transfers direct to his bank account, all from the firm's two client accounts. Mr Bullock said that none of these payments were authorised by the partners of the firm and were wholly unrelated to any matter in which the firm was acting. In addition, the Respondent did not have cheque signing authority but the system in place at the firm at the material time required a requisition to be raised which would be submitted to the Respondent and the Respondent would make the accounting entry and present the cheque to a partner or BK, a legal executive employed by the firm, to be signed.
- 14.13 Mr Bullock said that in addition the Respondent had caused a further £5,500 to be transferred without authorisation and which was thereby misappropriated, to an account in the name of "Ironsides Solicitors". He said that this had been a practice in Northampton and Leicester which had closed in February 1997 and was a firm in relation to which the Respondent had had a connection as she had been employed

there as a cashier. Mr Bullock submitted that it could be inferred that the Respondent had retained some means of control over Ironsides Solicitors since 1997 but this was not known.

- 14.14 At the material time Mr Bullock said it was believed that Mr John Wilkins was the Respondent's partner or at least an associate of hers. He referred the Tribunal to a health insurance nomination form for the firm which showed the Respondent's name and alongside that Mr John Wilkins who was also covered under the scheme. Mr Bullock submitted that by the unauthorised withdrawals the Respondent had also benefitted.
- 14.15 Mr Bullock referred the Tribunal to screen prints and copy cheques in support of the unauthorised withdrawals. He said that whilst nothing on the face of the transfers showed who had made them, the evidence relied upon by the Applicant was the implicit admission of the Respondent in the civil proceedings by having repaid all of the misappropriated funds and the circumstantial evidence that she had made the transfers; such transfers had ceased when she left the firm.
- 14.16 In relation to the concealment Mr Bullock submitted that there had been two stages; firstly that a dummy client ledger had been created by the Respondent named "Vantage" in AlphaLaw under number V78/1 on or around 2 August 2009. She had subsequently posted all of the unauthorised withdrawals to the dummy client ledger and in doing so Mr Bullock said that she ensured that the total of the individual client ledger accounts matched the total sum of money held in the firm's two client bank accounts. In relation to the entries on the dummy client ledger Mr Bullock told the Tribunal that they bore no relation to underlying movement of funds and were nonsense; they had been created to ensure that the total debit balance on the client ledger matched the total withdrawals to date.
- 14.17 Secondly, Mr Bullock submitted that the Respondent had used various practices to conceal the dummy client ledger account and the misappropriations from Mr Ford in the month end reports she prepared and submitted to him for his approval. He said that this included leaving out from the Selection Report the page showing the overdrawn dummy client ledger account or by omitting the relevant entry from the report. Mr Bullock referred the Tribunal to the Selection Report dated 27 February 2010 which showed the entry for V78/1 but referred to a "Mr D Vaja" and showed a debit on client account of "-35,000.00". He said this was to create an impression that this was a legitimate client ledger and not the "Vantage" dummy ledger.
- 14.18 Mr Bullock referred to the CBW report, which stated in relation to the suggestion that pages had been omitted from reports given to Mr Ford:

"...

29. In the monthly summary of client ledger balances this balance would have appeared as an overdrawn client account. Andrew Ford reviewed the total page of the client ledger balances each month and various methods were adopted to hide the existence of this overdrawn balance...

30. In general terms the most common approach was to simply leave out the page showing the overdrawn account. In other instances the appearance of the overdrawn account was “doctored” out possibly by cutting and pasting over a hard copy of the printout and then photocopying the amended schedule”.
- 14.19 Mr Bullock told the Tribunal that in fairness to the Respondent the Applicant did not know upon what basis CBW/Mr Smethurst had arrived at his view that pages had been withheld from the reconciliations.
- 14.20 Mr Bullock said that it was not until 4-5 February 2011, after the Respondent had left the firm that the firm’s partners became aware of the monies having been misappropriated from the firm’s client accounts as a result of an alert having been generated by the firm’s accounting software. He said that this had been at the time of the first reconciliation since the Respondent had left the firm on 31 December 2010. The firm had notified its professional indemnity insurers and they in turn had instructed solicitors to issue proceedings in the High Court in the name of the firm against the Respondent and Mr Wilkins. These proceedings were issued in the High Court of Justice in the Queen’s Bench Division on or around 18 March 2011.
- 14.21 Mr Bullock said that on or around 20 April 2011 the terms of settlement were agreed between the solicitors on behalf of the firm and the solicitors instructed by the Respondent and were embodied in a Consent Order. Under the terms of settlement the Respondent agreed to repay the misappropriated funds together with interest and costs in the total sum of £84,000 by 31 August 2011. Mr Bullock told the Tribunal that the Respondent had repaid the full amount by that date.
- 14.22 Mr Bullock said that it was the Applicant’s case that the Respondent was the author of the fraud and the principal piece of evidence in support of that was the fact that the Respondent had agreed to repay the misappropriated funds plus interest and costs in the total sum of £84,000 to the firm in settlement of the civil proceedings. Mr Bullock also referred the Tribunal to the witness statement of Mr Ford in support of this, which stated:
- “ ...
24. In March 2011, proceedings were issued in the name of the Firm in the High Court of Justice, Queen’s Bench Division, against Mrs Rooney and Mr Wilkins. The Firm was represented by Reynolds Porter Chamberlain LLP on instructions from the Firm’s PI [professional indemnity] insurers.
25. There is now shown to me marked “AMF/7” a copy of a Consent Order in those proceedings dated 20 April 2011 signed by Reynolds Porter Chamberlain LLP and Hollingsworths, the firm of solicitors acting for Mrs Rooney. Under the terms set out in the Schedule to the Consent Order, Mrs Rooney agreed, amongst other matters, to repay to the Firm in full and final settlement the amount of the unauthorised withdrawals plus interest and costs in the total sum of £84,000”.

- 14.23 Mr Bullock acknowledged that whilst there was no formal admission by the Respondent, it was difficult to see how or why the Respondent would have agreed to repay the £84,000 to the firm otherwise than on the basis that the money was due from her and that thereby, she had been responsible for the fraud. Mr Bullock submitted that the Respondent's agreement to repay the £84,000 representing the unauthorised withdrawals was an implicit admission by her that she had been the author of the fraud.
- 14.24 Mr Bullock said that he relied upon other circumstantial material which supported that the Respondent had been the author of the fraud, namely:
- 14.24.1 that the Respondent had had the ability to make electronic payments from the firm's client accounts and had been responsible for the day to day accounts and it had been the practice of the partners to delegate financial transactions to her which had allowed her the means and opportunity to misappropriate the funds;
 - 14.24.2 there were known connections between her and Mr Wilkins and Ironsides Solicitors both of whom were recipients of the misappropriated funds;
 - 14.24.3 this had been a fraud which required concealment and the Respondent as the firm's cashier was best placed to have achieved that, by her ability to have doctored the ledgers and to have withheld documents from Mr Ford, which had only come to light after she had left the firm; and
 - 14.24.4 that it was significant that the improper withdrawals and false postings had ceased once the Respondent had left the firm.
- 14.25 Mr Bullock submitted that in all the circumstances the Tribunal could be satisfied that it was appropriate to make a Section 43 Order against the Respondent to protect the public and the reputation of the profession where there had been a fraud perpetrated over a long period of time involving a significant sum and which had been concealed. In response to a question from the Tribunal Mr Bullock said that initially the police had been involved but that they had not pursued any investigations once the Respondent had repaid the monies.
- 14.26 Mr Bullock said that the Respondent had been written to by the Applicant as at 4 May 2011 and was asked to explain her conduct but no response had been received from her to date.

Submissions of the Respondent

- 14.27 None.

The Tribunal's Findings

- 14.28 The Tribunal had listened carefully to Mr Bullock's submissions and had read all of the documents to which it had been referred including the authorities and Section 43 of the Solicitors Act 1974 (as amended).
- 14.29 The Tribunal confirmed at the outset that it had made its decision applying the higher standard being the standard applicable to cases before the Tribunal.
- 14.30 The Tribunal was satisfied so that it was sure that the Respondent had been responsible for the fraud perpetrated against her former employers over a lengthy period of time and for a significant amount of money which had been siphoned from the firm by the Respondent and paid to her partner or associate Mr John Wilkins and to an account in the name of Ironsides Solicitors, which whilst it was no longer a viable firm, the Respondent had previously worked at as a cashier.
- 14.31 The Tribunal took into account in finding the allegation proved that the Respondent had had the ability to make electronic payments from the firm's client account which had afforded her the means and opportunity to make the unauthorised withdrawals. She had also, as the firm's cashier, been best placed to conceal the fraud which she had succeeded in doing over a lengthy period of time, the fraud only coming to light when she had left the firm and it was satisfied that it was significant that the withdrawals and false postings had ceased when the Respondent had left the firm.
- 14.32 Of particular importance in the Tribunal's findings was the fact that the Respondent and Mr Wilkins had entered into a Consent Order in civil proceedings, brought in the name of the firm, the terms of settlement of which included that "...Mrs Rooney agreed, amongst other things, to repay to the Firm in full and final settlement the amount of the unauthorised withdrawals plus interest and costs in the total sum of £84,000".
- 14.33 The Tribunal was satisfied to the higher standard that the Respondent was the author of the fraud and it found the allegation against her proved on the facts and on the documents.

Previous Disciplinary Matters

15. None.

Mitigation

16. None.

Sanction

17. Having found the allegation against the Respondent proved, the Tribunal ordered that the Respondent be subject to a Section 43 Order as from 16 October 2013.
18. The Tribunal was satisfied that in the interests of protecting the public and the reputation of the profession this was an appropriate and proportionate order. The

order is a regulatory order and not intended to be punitive but in all the circumstances the Tribunal found that the Respondent could not be allowed to return to or become involved in the legal profession again in the future without proper safeguards being in place.

Costs

19. Mr Bullock referred the Tribunal to the Applicant's Statement of Costs. He asked the Tribunal to summarily assess the costs in the sum sought of £13,275.15.
20. Mr Bullock said that the costs included those of the Applicant's previous legal representative who had undertaken the majority of work in the case for which their costs amounted to £7,788.35. He said that substantial costs had been incurred in seeking to locate the Respondent including Enquiry Agents' fees and the advertisements.
21. In response to a question from the Tribunal Mr Bullock said that the time spent on the investigation by the Applicant totalling 16 hours and £1,350 in costs represented the time recorded on the Applicant's file by the investigating officer and prior to the case being transferred to the Legal Department. He said that it was charged according to the Applicant's Costs of Investigations Regulations 2011. The investigating officer would have had to go through the report from the firm and the forensic accountant's report and to have sent out the investigatory correspondence to the Respondent. A Memorandum would then have had to be prepared and a bundle for the decision maker to make the referral to the Tribunal.
22. Mr Bullock confirmed that the previous legal representative had prepared the Rule 8 Statement and bundle which was recorded as having taken approximately 8 hours to prepare and draft.
23. In relation to his own costs Mr Bullock acknowledged that time spent at the hearing would be less than his estimate of 6 hours. He acknowledged also that he had appeared before the Tribunal on the previous day and therefore the travel time of 4 hours could be apportioned. He told the Tribunal that he was able to say in good conscience that he had spent 8 hours preparing for the case in relation to which he had been instructed approximately three weeks previously. He said that he had tried to be conservative in his costs claimed and that he could not reasonably have prepared the case in less than 5 hours as he had had to follow the paper trail to ensure that he could explain exactly how the fraud had been perpetrated.
24. In relation to the investigation costs Mr Bullock acknowledged that the costs claimed of £1,350 were in the top bracket for internal investigations and he acceded that he could not resist a reduction to £600, which would reduce the costs claimed for the internal investigation by one grade.
25. Mr Bullock asked the Tribunal to take into account that the Respondent had been the author of her own misfortune with regard to the disbursements incurred and time spent in instructing Enquiry Agents, seeking to locate the Respondent and the advertisements.

26. The Tribunal listened carefully to Mr Bullock's submissions with regard to costs. It was concerned that the costs appeared high for what had been a relatively straightforward case involving a four page Rule 8 Statement and where a lot of work had already been undertaken by the firm concerned and the forensic accountants.
27. The Tribunal had not received any financial documentation from the Respondent as to her means.
28. The Tribunal was satisfied that the proceedings had been properly brought and having allowed for some reduction in the costs as acknowledged by Mr Bullock and allowing for an element of duplication, it summarily assessed the costs in the sum of £10,500 and ordered that these be paid by the Respondent.

Statement of Full Order

29. The Tribunal ORDERED that as from 16th day of October 2013 except in accordance with Law Society permission:-
 - (i) no solicitor shall employ or remunerate, in connection with his practice as a solicitor Patricia Ann Rooney;
 - (ii) no employee of a solicitor shall employ or remunerate, in connection with the solicitor's practice the said Patricia Ann Rooney;
 - (iii) no recognised body shall employ or remunerate the said Patricia Ann Rooney;
 - (iv) no manager or employee of a recognised body shall employ or remunerate the said Patricia Ann Rooney in connection with the business of that body;
 - (v) no recognised body or manager or employee of such a body shall permit the said Patricia Ann Rooney to be a manager of the body;
 - (vi) no recognised body or manager or employee of such a body shall permit the said Patricia Ann Rooney to have an interest in the body;

And the Tribunal further Ordered that the said Patricia Ann Rooney do pay the costs of and incidental to this application and enquiry fixed in the sum of £10,500.00.

Dated this 14th day of November 2013
On behalf of the Tribunal

J. Astle
Chairman