

SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974

Case No. 11041-2012

BETWEEN:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY

Applicant

and

ZEESHAN HAMEED BUTT

First Respondent

and

SAMINA IQBAL

Second Respondent

Before:

Mr L. N. Gilford (in the chair)

Ms A. Banks

Mr S. Marquez

Date of Hearing: 7th May 2013

Appearances

Mr Geoffrey Hudson, Partner, Penningtons Solicitors LLP, Abacus House, 33 Gutter Lane, London, EC2V 8AR for the Applicant.

The Respondents did not appear and were not represented.

JUDGMENT

Allegations

1. The allegations against the Respondents, Zeeshan Hameed Butt and Samina Iqbal were that:

Contained in a Rule 5 Statement dated 10 August 2012

- 1.1 they provided inaccurate and/or misleading information to the SRA regarding the bank accounts held by their practice in breach of Rule 1.02 and Rule 1.06 of the Solicitors Code of Conduct 2007 (“the 2007 Code”);
- 1.2 they failed to comply with requests made by the SRA for the production of books of accounts in breach of Rules 34(1), 34(8) of the Solicitors Accounts Rules 1998 (“SAR”) and Rules 20.05 and 20.08 of the 2007 Code;

Contained in a Rule 7 Statement dated 11 December 2012

- 1.3 they made inaccurate statements to the SRA contrary to Rules 1.02 and/or 1.06 of the 2007 Code

Dishonesty was alleged in relation to allegations 1.1 and 1.3 but it was not necessary to prove dishonesty for the allegations to be made out.

2. The allegation against the First Respondent, Zashen Hameed Butt alone, contained in the Rule 5 Statement dated 10 August 2012 was that:
 - 2.1 he failed to disclose material facts to a lender client in breach of Rule 1.02, 1.04 and 1.06 of the 2007 Code.

Documents

3. The Tribunal reviewed all the documents submitted by the parties, which included:

Applicant:

- Application dated 10 August 2012;
- Rule 5 Statement dated 10 August 2012 together with exhibit “JBW1”;
- Rule 7 Statement dated 11 December 2012 together with exhibit “JBW2”;
- Written Submissions of the Applicant;
- Schedule of Costs of the Applicant dated 23 April 2013.

Respondents:

- None

Tribunal:

- Memorandum of Application Determined without a Hearing dated 14 January 2013.

Preliminary Matter

4. Mr Hudson noted that neither of the Respondents was present. He told the Tribunal that the Notice of Hearing had been properly served upon the First Respondent in Islamabad, in accordance with the Directions of the Tribunal on 14 January 2013 and he could also say that Notice of the Hearing had been sent to the Second Respondent at her last known address.
5. The Tribunal was satisfied that Notice of the Hearing had been properly served on both of the Respondents. The Tribunal had applied the principles laid down in R v Hayward, Jones and Purvis [2001] EWCA Crim 168. The Tribunal had concluded that this was a rare and exceptional case where the hearing should continue in the absence of both of the Respondents. The Respondents had not engaged in the proceedings and the Tribunal did not believe that any adjournment would result in their attendance. The Tribunal therefore determined that the hearing should proceed in the absence of both of the Respondents.

Factual Background

6. The First Respondent was born in November 1975 and was admitted as a solicitor on 15 December 2006. He did not hold a current practising certificate.
7. The Second Respondent was born in June 1984 and was first registered as a registered foreign lawyer on 15 March 2011. Her name remained on the register.
8. Both Respondents formerly practised together as equity partners in PWC Solicitors (“PWC”) of Suite 21, 1st Floor, Holborn Gate, 330 High Street, Holborn, London WC1 7QT. PWC Solicitors was formed on 20 March 2006. The First Respondent purchased the firm from Mr I A-W on 10 March 2011 and the Second Respondent joined the firm in June 2011 as an equity partner. The SRA intervened in the practice on 16 August 2011.
9. An inspection was commenced at PWC on 18 July 2011 by Investigation Officers of the SRA (“IOs”). As a result an Interim Forensic Investigation Report (“FI Report”) dated 8 August 2011 was prepared.
10. During the investigation four meetings were held with the Respondents by the IOs on 18 July 2011, 19 July 2011, 27 July 2011 and 2 August 2011. Both Respondents were present at each of the four meetings. Investigation Officer Mr Gary Page prepared notes of the meetings on 18 and 19 July and 2 August and Investigation Officer Mr Taranjeet Babra prepared notes of the meeting on 27 July.

Allegation 1.1 - inaccurate information concerning bank accounts

11. Prior to commencing the inspection, standard SRA inspection letters were handed to the First Respondent and also to the Second Respondent on 18 July 2011. Those letters provided, amongst other things, that records for all bank accounts for the previous six months should be made available to the IOs. The Respondents were given adequate time to read and consider the letters.

12. An appendix to the letters required the Respondents to write to each bank and building society at which accounts were held and obtain details of the balances on each account and confirmation that these were the only accounts held by them. Also attached to the letter was a section 44B notice requiring production of all the records set out.
13. At the commencement of the investigation the First Respondent provided to the IOs an application to the Bank of Ireland for a bank account signed by both Respondents on 15 June 2011. He was unable to identify the address of the branch to which the application had been made. However, the IOs ascertained from copies of bank statements supplied to them that the account was in Croydon and that a client account and an office account were held in the name of the firm.
14. In the meeting on 18 July 2011 the First Respondent in the presence of the Second Respondent stated that he had made an application to National Westminster Bank plc (Sutton branch), and to Lloyds TSB plc (Ilford branch), to open bank accounts.
15. On 27 July 2011 the First Respondent in the presence of the Second Respondent stated that:
 - the application to Lloyds TSB for office and client account bank accounts had been refused;
 - an office account had been opened with National Westminster Bank and that he had also applied for a client account;
 - no other applications had been made to open bank accounts with any other banking institutions;
 - he held no documentation in relation to the applications for bank accounts made to NatWest or Lloyds TSB; and
 - that Lloyds TSB did not provide a reason for rejection of his application for a bank account.
16. The SRA made further enquiries with six leading banks and discovered that accounts were held in the name of PWC Solicitors as follows:
 - HSBC Bank Plc;
 - Royal Bank of Scotland Plc (NatWest); and
 - Lloyds TSB Plc.
17. A court order was obtained on 2 August 2011 against those three banks requiring delivery up of all documentation relating to the accounts held in the name of PWC Solicitors.
18. Lloyds TSB confirmed that a client account and an office account had been opened with credit balances of £250 and £200 respectively which had been credited to the accounts on 14 July. The accounts were held in the joint names of the Respondents trading as PWC Solicitors.

19. The First Respondent had stated on 27 July in the meeting with the IO in the presence of the Second Respondent that Lloyds TSB had refused the application for bank accounts. This was an inaccurate representation as two accounts had already been opened with Lloyds TSB. The Second Respondent failed to correct the First Respondent's representation at the time or at any point in time thereafter.
20. Royal Bank of Scotland (NatWest) confirmed that a client account and office account had been opened on 14 July 2011 with credit balances of £200 in each account. The bank confirmed by letter dated 4 August 2011 that in addition to the client and office accounts in the names of PWC Solicitors the First Respondent held two accounts in his own name and the Second Respondent held two accounts in her own name. Both Respondents had signed the application form for the accounts on 24 June 2011. The bank held copies of the Respondents' practising certificates as well as a copy of the Second Respondent's passport. Both Respondents were signatories to the accounts in the name of PWC Solicitors.
21. The First Respondent had stated on 27 July 2011 in the meeting with the IO in the presence of the Second Respondent that the firm only had a NatWest office account and that they had applied for a NatWest client account. The client account was in existence on 14 July 2011 and £200 was already credited to it. The representation made on 27 July that the firm had applied for a client account was inaccurate as the client account was already in existence as at that date. The Second Respondent failed to correct the First Respondent's representation at the time or at any other point in time thereafter.
22. HSBC confirmed subsequent to the preparation of the FI Report that a client account and an office account had been opened on 15 July 2011 with credit balances of £250 and £200 respectively. The Second Respondent had provided to the bank a copy of her HMRC PAYE Coding Notice dated 4 July and also a copy of a utility bill by way of identification evidence.
23. The First Respondent had stated on 27 July in the meeting with the IO in the presence of the Second Respondent that no other applications had been made to other banks to open accounts in the name of the practice other than those already identified. This was an inaccurate representation as two accounts had already been opened with HSBC before the meeting. The Second Respondent failed to correct the First Respondent's representation at the time or at any point in time thereafter.

Allegation 1.2 - failure to produce documents to SRA

24. The SRA inspection letters required the Respondents to deliver up to the IOs their books of account.
25. At the commencement of the inspection on 18 July the Respondents were only able to produce to the IOs a list of liabilities to the firm's clients as at 29 April 2011.
26. The Respondents stated that the books of account were with their accountant but that he was on holiday.

27. Subsequent enquiries by the IO with the accountant revealed that the books of account were with the Respondents.
28. On 19 July 2012 the Respondents were asked by the IOs to provide the cheque stubs for the issued cheques shown on the bank statements provided.
29. On 27 July 2012 the First Respondent stated to the IO in the presence of the Second Respondent that the books of account were with his accountant, that they would be available on 2 August 2011 and that the accountant held the reconciliations, ledgers and old cheque books.
30. Certain documents were provided by letter dated 29 July 2011 but still the cashbook; client matter ledgers; cheque books and paying in books were not delivered up to the SRA.
31. On 2 August 2011 the IOs visited the firm to obtain the missing books of account. The Second Respondent only was present. She was asked to provide the chequebooks, stubs and cashbook and client ledgers quoted on the reconciliation statements. She failed to provide the documents requested.
32. On 3 August 2011 the First Respondent emailed the IO regarding the outstanding documents and acknowledging that there were accounting records yet to be provided.
33. The Respondents failed to provide any further documents to the SRA. As a result the IO was unable to ascertain whether the list of client balances was correctly extracted from the clients' ledgers.

Allegation 1.3 - inaccurate statements to the SRA

34. At the meeting on 18 July 2011 both Respondents stated that they did not have any current client matters and were not progressing any client matters.
35. At the meeting on 27 July 2011 both Respondents stated that they were not working on client matters and that they had no current or potential/prospective clients. They explained that they had been contacted in June by one potential client who was a client of a former fee earner but that he did not take the matter any further.
36. The representations made to the IOs on 18 and 27 July 2011 by the Respondents that they did not have any current client matters and potential/prospective clients were inaccurate. PWC was acting in a number of conveyancing transactions during this period.

Sale of Flat 1, Gareth Drive

37. PWC acted in the sale of Flat 1, 16 Gareth Drive from 20 July to 12 August 2011.
38. The sale of Flat 1 was completed on 12 August when £115,450.25 was transferred to the PWC client account with Bank of Ireland.
39. It was subsequently discovered that the owner of the property was not selling it and was in fact still paying the mortgage over it.

Sale of 18 Harmsworth Way

40. PWC acted in the sale of 18 Harmsworth Way. Contracts for the sale were exchanged on 26 July 2011.
41. A 10% deposit of £165,000 was paid to the PWC client account on 10 August. The sale of 18 Harmsworth Way was completed on 15 August 2011 when £1,485,000 was transferred to the PWC client account.

Sale of 215A Browning Road

42. PWC acted in the sale of 215A Browning Road. Contracts for the sale were exchanged on 29 July 2011.
43. A deposit cheque for £13,500 payable on exchange of contracts was credited to the PWC client account with Bank of Ireland on 15 August 2011.

Sale of 238 Goosemoor Lane, 14 Shireland Road and 40 Hampton Court Road

44. PWC acted in the sale by auction of properties in Birmingham. Contracts for the sale were exchanged on 22 July 2011.
45. Completion monies were transferred to the PWC client account with Bank of Ireland on 10 August (£112,500) for one property (238 Goosemoor Lane) and on 12 August 2011 (£159,000) for the two other properties (14 Shireland Road and 40 Hampton Court Road).
46. The purchasers' solicitor did not receive completion statements from PWC. Further, the existing mortgages over the properties were not discharged by PWC.

Sale of 262A and 262B Dersingham Avenue

47. PWC acted in the sale of 262A and 262B Dersingham Avenue in July and August 2011.

PWC Client Account

48. On 10 August 2011 the balance in client account stood at £1,361.43.
49. The following payments were received by the firm:

Date	Amount	Property
10/08/11	£112,500.00	238 Goosemoor Lane
10/08/11	£165,000.00	Deposit 18 Harmsworth Way
12/08/11	£115,450.25	Flat 1 Gareth Drive

12/08/11	£159,000.00	14 Shireland Road and 40 Hampton Court Road
15/08/11	£1,485,00.00	18 Harmsworth Road
15/08/11	£13,500.00	Deposit 215A Browning Way

50. Each of the six payments made into the client account was paid as either a deposit or completion monies in relation to a conveyancing transaction or what the payer believed to be a conveyancing transaction under which clients or purported clients of PWC were the vendors.
51. However, none of the proceeds of these payments were ever paid to the relevant purported vendors or to their mortgagees or to anyone else entitled to payment from such proceeds. The proceeds of these payments were all misapplied by being paid to third parties none of whom had any claim or entitlement to any of those particular monies in the PWC client account.
52. Payments were made out of client account to third parties as follows:
- 11 August 2011: £112,000
12 August 2011: £314,997
15 August 2011: £480,000; £249,987; £240,000; £220,000; £200,089 and £219,100
53. All of the payments were made to third parties who had no entitlement to those funds. The SRA issued civil proceedings against the third parties in respect of these payments.

Allegation 2.1 - failure to disclose material facts to a lender

54. The First Respondent was acting for Mrs IB in the purchase of 1 Cherry Walk and acting for the lender Barclays/Woolwich.
55. The First Respondent was unable to produce a file relating to this matter.
56. A statement from the Fraud Manager of Barclays established that the Certificate of Title was signed by the First Respondent on 16 July 2011 (should read 16 June 2011). Funds of £147,965 were released to PWC by the lender and paid to the vendor's solicitors "W" Solicitors on 17 June 2011. The deposit was said by "W" Solicitors to have been paid direct to the vendor.
57. Office Copy Entries for the property showed that the vendor had completed the purchase of the property on 24 May 2011.
58. The First Respondent acted in breach of the Council for Mortgage Lenders' Handbook and thereby failed to disclose material facts to his lender client as follows:

- That the vendor had been registered as owner of the property for less than six months; and
- That the firm did not have control over payment of all the purchase money.

SRA Investigation

59. A copy of the Forensic Investigation Report was forwarded to the Respondents by letters dated 26 August 2011. The conveyancing transactions were not identified in the letters but the Respondents were requested to comment upon an allegation that the representations made to the IOs in interviews on 18 and 27 July 2011 that they had no current client matters were inaccurate.
60. The Respondents did not respond or provide any explanation to the SRA.

Witnesses

61. Mr Gary Page, Investigation Officer of the SRA and Mr Taranjeet Babra gave sworn oral evidence. Their evidence is included within the detailed Findings.

Findings of Fact and Law

62. The Tribunal had due regard to the Respondents' rights to a fair trial and to respect for their private and family life under Articles 6 and 8 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.
63. The Applicant was required to prove the allegations beyond reasonable doubt.
64. **1. The allegations against the Respondents, Zeeshan Hameed Butt and Samina Iqbal were that:**

1.1 they provided inaccurate and/or misleading information to the SRA regarding the bank accounts held by their practice in breach of Rule 1.02 and Rule 1.06 of the Solicitors Code of Conduct 2007 ("the 2007 Code");

1.2 they failed to comply with requests made by the SRA for the production of books of accounts in breach of Rules 34(1), 34(8) of the Solicitors Accounts Rules 1998 and Rules 20.05 and 20.08 of the 2007 Code;

1.3 they made inaccurate statements to the SRA contrary to Rules 1.02 and/or 1.06 of the 2007 Code

Dishonesty was alleged in relation to allegations 1.1 and 1.3 but it was not necessary to prove dishonesty for the allegation to be made out.

2. The allegation against the First Respondent, Zashen Hameed Butt alone, was that:

2.1 he failed to disclose material facts to a lender client in breach of Rule 1.02, 1.04 and 1.06 of the 2007 Code.

- 64.1 Mr Hudson told the Tribunal that the efforts made by both Respondents to conceal their wrongdoing could be seen from the documentation. There were transactions which bore the hallmarks of conveyancing fraud and the Respondents' misconduct arose from their attempts to dishonestly conceal those transactions from the Investigation Officers of the SRA. The Applicant said that their conduct in this respect was deliberate and planned. The Respondents should have given full explanations and been frank with the IOs but their responses were delayed and incomplete. The First Respondent had lied to the IOs and the Second Respondent had allowed them to be given false information by the First Respondent.
- 64.2 Mr Hudson took the Tribunal through the Applicant's written submissions. The Respondents had been required to produce certain accounting documents to the IOs and were also required to write to each bank or building society at which the firm's bank accounts were held requesting the bank to confirm balances as at 30 June 2011 and that those were the only accounts held by them in connection with the practice. However, there was no evidence that either of the Respondents had written to such banks or building societies.
- 64.3 The only accounts material produced by the Respondents on 18 July 2011 was a list of liabilities to PWC's clients as at 29 April 2011. The Respondents told the IOs that all of their other books of account were with their accountant who was on holiday and would not be available until 2 August 2011. The IOs, however, made their own enquiries and established that all the records had in fact been returned to the firm. Certain documents were then provided to the IOs but the cashbook, client matter ledgers, cheque books and paying in books were not provided. When the IOs attended the firm again on 2 August 2011 to obtain the missing items, the First Respondent was not present and the Second Respondent was unable to produce the items, saying she did not have access to them. She told the Investigation Officer Mr Page that the reason for this was that the documents in question related to conveyancing matters which the First Respondent dealt with. This was a significant assertion given the denial to the IOs at the meetings on 18 and 27 July 2011 that the firm was undertaking any conveyancing.
- 64.4 The First Respondent acknowledged that there were documents outstanding by email on 3 August 2011. The remaining documents were never received. In Mr Hudson's submission the Respondents were consequently in breach of the relevant Rules of the SAR and Rules 20.05 and 20.08 of the 2007 Code. In Mr Hudson's submission these provisions in the SAR and the 2007 Code served a serious public interest in that they were there for the protection of the public. These were serious and continuing breaches.
- 64.5 Dishonesty was alleged against both Respondents in respect of the misleading and inaccurate information given to the IOs. On an objective basis the making of false statements to the SRA as the regulator of the profession would be regarded as acting dishonestly. On a subjective basis it was contended that the Respondents were aware on 18 and 27 July 2011 that they were acting in conveyancing transactions but nonetheless deliberately made false statements to the IOs that they had no current matters. It was further submitted that the Respondents' motive in doing so on 18 and 27 July 2011 was to prevent the SRA investigating the conveyancing transactions

before client account monies could be diverted between 11 and 15 August 2011 to third parties who had no claim or entitlement to those monies.

- 64.6 With regard to the provision of misleading or inaccurate information regarding the firm's bank accounts, Mr Hudson took the Tribunal to pages 146 to 147 of exhibit JBW1 where it could be seen that, in the presence of the Second Respondent, the First Respondent had told one of the IOs, Mr Babra, untruths about the opening of bank accounts. Statements made by the First Respondent in the Second Respondent's presence were inaccurate and misleading in the following respects:
- (a) The First Respondent had said that an application to Lloyds Bank had been refused but in fact a client account had been opened on 14 July 2011 with a balance of £250 and an office bank account had been opened on the same date with a balance of £200.
 - (b) The First Respondent had told Mr Babra that an office account had been opened with NatWest, to which he had also applied to open a client account, whereas a client account had in fact been opened with NatWest on 14 July 2011, prior to both interviews.
 - (c) The First Respondent had told Mr Babra that no other applications had been made to open bank accounts with any other banking institutions, whereas additional applications had been made to HSBC for client deposit accounts and business current accounts. Mr Hudson took the Tribunal to the relevant bank statements at pages 67 and 68 of JBW1 and to NatWest Bank's letter at pages 69-70. HSBC Bank statements were at pages 152-156 of JBW1.
- 64.7 So far as the Second Respondent was concerned, she knew that the First Respondent was being questioned about these matters in his capacity as a principal of the firm, that he was responding on behalf of both of them, and that the information he gave to Mr Babra was wrong. She nevertheless did not correct the information that was given by the First Respondent to Mr Babra. In Mr Hudson's submission, for a registered foreign lawyer constantly to allow the SRA to be misled in the manner described was dishonest behaviour by the ordinary standards of reasonable and honest people. The Second Respondent's clear intention, which she shared with the First Respondent, was to conceal the existence of these additional accounts from the SRA and it was in Mr Hudson's submission inconceivable that she did not also know that such concealment was by those same standards dishonest.
- 64.8 The Applicant also said that the Respondents had made inaccurate statements concerning current client matters. Those statements were recorded in the notes of the meetings they had attended on 18 July 2011 and on 27 July 2011. The information they gave to the IOs on both occasions was false and deliberately misleading.
- 64.9 Mr Hudson took the Tribunal through the facts surrounding the conveyancing transactions and told the Tribunal that none of the deposit or completion monies received by PWC was paid to the vendors or purported vendors, and that sums totalling in excess of £2 million were instead paid to third parties who had no entitlement to them. The dates of these conveyancing transactions were contemporaneous with the interviews of the Respondents.

- 64.10 Mr Hudson took the Tribunal through his written submissions regarding Allegation 2.1 against the First Respondent alone. He said that the Barclays Bank instructions to the First Respondent were expressed to be subject to the Council of Mortgage lenders Handbook. He had breached the terms of his lender client's instructions in two important respects. He had not notified his lender client that the vendor had been registered as the owner of the property for less than 6 months and he had not informed his lender client that part of the purchase monies had been paid by way of a deposit directly to the vendor. This latter breach was of the requirement placed on the First Respondent by his lender client to disclose that his firm did not have control over the payment of all the purchase money.
- 64.11 In his evidence Mr Page confirmed that he was the author of the Forensic Investigation Report and that it was accurate and true to the best of his knowledge and belief. He also confirmed that his witness statement dated 24 July 2012 at page 139 of JBW1 was true to the best of his knowledge and belief. He confirmed that his handwritten notes of interviews with the Respondents at pages 129-135 of JBW1 were an accurate record of what had happened at the interviews, as were the typed transcripts of those notes at pages 136-138 of JBW1.
- 64.12 In his evidence Mr Babra confirmed that his signed witness statement which appeared at page 150 of JBW1 was true to the best of his knowledge and belief and that his handwritten notes of the interview on 27 July 2011 which appeared between pages 140-145 of that exhibit were accurate to the best of his knowledge and belief. He confirmed that an accurate typed version of his manuscript notes appeared at pages 146-149 of JBW1.
- 64.13 The Tribunal had considered all of the documentation before it most carefully and had listened to what Mr Hudson had had to say. The Tribunal found each of the allegations against each of the Respondents to have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt on the facts and documents before it. So far as the allegation of dishonesty in relation to allegations 1.1 and 1.3 was concerned, the Tribunal had applied the test in Twinsectra v Yardley & Others [2002] UKHL 12 and was satisfied so that it was sure that in acting as they did the Respondents had been dishonest by the ordinary standards of reasonable and honest people and that they themselves had known that by those same standards their actions had been dishonest. The Tribunal accordingly found the allegation of dishonesty in relation to allegations 1.1 and 1.3 to have been proved beyond a reasonable doubt.

Previous Disciplinary Matters

65. None

Sanction

66. The Tribunal referred to its Guidance Note on Sanctions when considering sanction.
67. The Tribunal considered this to be a case of the utmost seriousness where dishonesty towards their professional Regulator had been proved against both of the Respondents. In the circumstances the Tribunal had concluded that the only fair and proportionate sanction in order to protect the public and the reputation of the

profession was that of strike off from the Roll of Solicitors of the First Respondent and strike off from of the Register of Foreign Lawyers of the Second Respondent.

Costs

68. Mr Hudson applied for costs in the sum of £29,332.50 and told the Tribunal that Schedules of Costs had been served on both Respondents on 23 April 2013, no response having been obtained. In Mr Hudson's submission the case had been properly brought and the charge-out rates and time spent were reasonable. There was one small change to the Schedule in that the estimated time for the hearing had been scheduled at seven hours and the hearing had actually lasted five hours. Mr Hudson asked that the Tribunal summarily assess the costs and impose them upon the Respondents jointly and severally.
69. The Tribunal had examined the Applicant's Costs Schedule and found it to be reasonable. The Tribunal would summarily assess costs in the sum of £28,500.

Statement of Full Order

70. The Tribunal Ordered that the First Respondent, Zeeshan Hameed Butt, solicitor, be Struck Off the Roll of Solicitors and it further Ordered that he do pay the costs of and incidental to this application and enquiry fixed in the sum of £28,500.00 jointly and severally with the Second Respondent, Samina Iqbal.
71. The Tribunal Ordered that the Second Respondent, Samina Iqbal, registered foreign lawyer, be Struck Off the Register of Foreign Lawyers and it further Ordered that she do pay the costs of and incidental to this application and enquiry fixed in the sum of £28,500.00 jointly and severally with the First Respondent Zeeshan Hameed Butt.

DATED this 12th day of June 2013
On behalf of the Tribunal

L. N. Gilford
Chairman