

SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974

Case No. 11314-2014

BETWEEN:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY

Applicant

and

LAURA CATHERINE HOLLOWAY

Respondent

Before:

Miss N. Lucking (in the chair)

Mr L. N. Gilford

Mr G. Fisher

Date of Hearing: 30 March 2016

Appearances

Mr Andrew Bullock, Solicitor employed by the Solicitors Regulation Authority of the Cube, 199 Wharfside Street, Birmingham B1 1RN for the Applicant.

The Respondent did not appear and was not represented.

JUDGMENT

Allegations

1. The allegations made against the Respondent by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (“SRA”) were that:
 - 1.1 By failing to take timely and appropriate action in relation to a Notice to Pay Fee from the Croydon County Court dated 17 May 2013 (“the Notice”) in respect of proceedings between her client DST and DDCL (“the DST Claim”) she:
 - 1.1.1 failed to act in the best interests of her client in breach of Principle 4 of the SRA Principles 2011 (“the Principles”); and
 - 1.1.2 failed to provide a proper standard of service to her client in breach of Principle 5 of the Principles.
 - 1.2 By Fabricating two letters to the Croydon County Court (“the Court”) purportedly dated 24 June and 18 September 2013 (“the Letters”) together with an application notice to the Court to reinstate the struck out DST Claim dated 24 June 2013 (“the Application Notice”) she:
 - 1.2.1 failed to act with integrity in breach of Principle 2 of the Principles; and
 - 1.2.2 failed to behave in a way that maintains the trust the public places in her and in the provision of legal services in breach of Principle 6 of the Principles.
 - 1.3 By misleading her employers that she had submitted the Application Notice to the Court to have the struck out DST Claim reinstated she:
 - 1.3.1 failed to act with integrity in breach of Principle 2 of the Principles; and
 - 1.3.2 failed to behave in a way that maintains the trust the public places in her and in the provision of legal services in breach of Principle 6 of the Principles.
 - 1.4 By failing to respond to the EWW letter dated 27 May 2014 sent to her by the SRA, she failed to cooperate with her regulator in an open, timely and cooperative way in breach of Principle 7 of the Principles.
2. While dishonesty was alleged with respect to allegations 1.2 and 1.3, proof of dishonesty was not essential to sustain those allegations.

Documents

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

Applicant

- Notice of Application dated 9 December 2014
- Rule 5 Statement and Exhibit EP1 dated 9 December 2014
- Applicant’s Statement of Costs dated 22 March 2016

Preliminary Matter

4. The Respondent did not attend the hearing and was not represented. There had been limited contact between the Applicant and the Respondent; there had been no contact by the Respondent with the Tribunal in relation to the proceedings.
5. Mr Bullock applied for the case to proceed in the Respondent's absence, pursuant to Rule 16(2) of the Solicitors (Disciplinary Proceedings) Rules 2007 ("SDPR"), which provided that:

"If the Tribunal is satisfied that notice of the hearing was served on the Respondent in accordance with these Rules, the Tribunal shall have the power to hear and determine an application notwithstanding that the Respondent fails to attend in person or is not represented at the hearing."
6. Mr Bullock submitted that the Respondent had been sent four separate notifications of the hearing date, namely
 - The notification sent by the Tribunal on 16 November 2015
 - The certificate of readiness sent by the SRA on 23 February 2016
 - Statutory notices sent by the SRA on 8 March 2016
 - Costs Schedule sent by the SRA on 22 March 2016
7. All correspondence sent by the SRA had been sent to the Respondent's home address and, via email, to the email address that the Respondent had stated was her preferable address. In the circumstances, it was submitted that the Tribunal could be satisfied that the Respondent had been properly notified of the hearing date.

The Tribunal's Decision

8. The Tribunal was satisfied that the proceedings, and notice of the hearing date, had been properly served on the Respondent.
9. The Tribunal considered whether it would be fair to proceed in the Respondent's absence. The Tribunal had regard to the principles in Jones. The Respondent had not served any evidence or complied with the Tribunal's directions. She was alleged to have acted dishonestly; the serious nature of that allegation meant that it was in the public interest and in the interests of justice that this case should be heard and determined as promptly as possible.
10. The Tribunal determined that the nature and circumstances of the Respondent's lack of communication showed that she had deliberately absented herself from the proceedings and waived her right to appear. Accordingly, the Tribunal was satisfied that in this instance the Respondent had chosen voluntarily and deliberately to absent herself from the hearing. There was nothing to indicate that she would attend or engage with the proceedings if the case were adjourned. In light of these circumstances, it was just to proceed with the case, in the Respondent's absence.

11. The Tribunal deemed all allegations against the Respondent to be denied, and required the Applicant to prove all allegations beyond reasonable doubt.

Factual Background

12. The Respondent was born in 1987 and was admitted to the Roll of Solicitors in October 2011. At the date of the hearing, she remained on the Roll, but did not have a current practising certificate. At all material times up to 15 November 2013, she was employed as an Associate Solicitor in the Real Estate Litigation team at a Firm, based mainly in the Firm's Sheffield office. She was supervised by PB, a partner at the Firm.
13. Between 9 and 23 October 2013, the Respondent was on annual leave. The Firm received a letter from the Defendants to the DST Claim, stating that the Claim had been struck out. As PB had previously understood that the matter was adjourned, not struck out, attempts were made to clarify the position. The subsequent investigation revealed the following:–
 - Documents found in the Respondent's room showed that the DST Claim had in fact been struck out in June 2013 for failure to pay the trial fee; and
 - There was no evidence to indicate that the Respondent had advised her client that the DST Claim had been struck out or that she had notified PB or anyone else at the Firm.
14. A meeting took place between PB, VT (a representative of the Human Resources Department of the Firm) and the Respondent on 28 October 2013, at which time the DST Claim was discussed. The Respondent had been advised prior to the meeting of the correspondence regarding the striking out of the case.
15. During that meeting the Respondent informed PB that she had twice sent copies of an application to reinstate that matter to the Court. When challenged as to why there was not a copy of the Application Notice or the covering correspondence (the Letters) on the file, the Respondent stated that copies of the Letters and Application Notice might be in her "re-file" file, and that she might have over typed one. The Respondent further stated that she had called the Court; when they could not confirm that the 24 June 2013 letter had been received, she re-sent it and assumed it would be listed in Court. The Respondent stated that she had not overlooked paying the trial fee; she did not receive notice that the trial fee was payable.
16. With respect to the information provided to her client, the Respondent explained that she had not informed the client that the case had been struck out, despite numerous requests for updates, as she thought the case would be reinstated. After several emails from the client, the Respondent responded on 27 September 2013, when she promised to send the client a copy of the correspondence. The Respondent advised PB that she had sent a copy of the correspondence to the client as requested, however when PB pointed out this answer differed from the answer the Respondent had given earlier that morning she replied that maybe she didn't send it then.

17. The meeting was then briefly adjourned to enable the Respondent to find copies of the Letters for PB, which she duly provided 15 minutes later. The Respondent stated that she had now filed the documents in the correct place on the document management system.
18. At the end of the meeting the Respondent was handed a letter by VT confirming that she had been suspended with immediate effect and that a disciplinary investigation would take place.
19. The following day, the Firm's HS called the Court, and was advised that no correspondence nor the Application Notice had been received from the Firm in June 2013. Furthermore, upon investigation, it was found that the Letters provided by the Respondent in the meeting were both created on the Firm's document management system on 28 October 2013 during the adjournment in that meeting. The Application Notice was created earlier in the day on 28 October 2013.
20. On 11 November 2013 a letter was sent to the Respondent by the Firm requesting her attendance at a formal disciplinary hearing on 15 November 2013. The letter identified, amongst other issues, the Respondent's apparent dishonesty in respect of the DST Claim, in particular:

“Your assurance at the meeting on 28 October 2013 that an application to reinstate the claim had been made by you to the court when neither the court nor our systems evidence that this was the case and that specifically neither of those letters referred to above and dated 24 June 2013 and 18 September 2013 were sent to the court along with the application which you produced at the meeting on 28 October 2013;

The content of a letter you sent to the other side's lawyers on 16 September 2013 in which you confirmed that a court application had been sent to the court for issue to reinstate the claim. The court confirmed on 29 October 2013 that no correspondence or application has been received by them seeking reinstatement of the claim; and

Your response when asked at the meeting on 28 October 2013 as to whether or not you had overlooked paying the trial fee. You stated it had not been overlooked and that you had not received notice that the trial fee was payable from the court. A copy of the Notice to Pay has since been located on the file so you either were or should have been aware”.
21. The disciplinary meeting took place on 15 November 2013. During that meeting, the Respondent stated that she had done the Letters beforehand but that she could not find them on worksite and didn't think she had saved them, but didn't think anyone would believe her so she redid them. Further, she had found the signed Application Notice in the pile of filing in her office, but created another copy. She admitted not informing anyone that the documents she brought to the meeting were reproduced.
22. When asked why she did not tell someone that the case had been struck out, the Respondent stated:

“I panicked, it was at the same time as I was having my end of year review. There had been other issues and PB screamed at me so I didn’t want to say anything I just tried to sort it out. I had some other issues and didn’t want to add to the problems”.

23. When questioned about why she had not sent a fee with her application, the Respondent stated that she tried to issue without the fee so that no one would find out about it. The Respondent also accepted that the reason she had not advised the client that the DST Claim had been struck out was because the whole thing was a mess, she felt out of her depth and didn’t know what to do.
24. At the end of the meeting the Respondent was advised that in view of the seriousness of the matters discussed, and the fact that she had falsified documents which was misleading and amounted to dishonesty, her employment was terminated with immediate effect. This was confirmed in a letter to her dated 15 November 2013. The Respondent sent an email dated 22 November 2013 raising various points to be considered in mitigation.
25. At the Respondent’s request, an appeal hearing took place on 12 December 2013. The Respondent admitted that she had done things wrong, and further stated that she had nothing to add to the points raised at the meeting on 15 November 2013, and instead wanted to give a proper account of herself.
26. The Respondent raised a number of points, including the additional responsibility she claimed she had, including supervising a trainee despite being the most junior qualified member of the team, running her own files (including complex cases) without appropriate guidance and her own billing. The Respondent also claimed that she had a lack of supervision and secretarial support.
27. When asked about her thoughts before producing the Letters and the signed Application Notice at the previous meeting, the Respondent replied that she “was so far down a path by then there was no point”. The Respondent also admitted that she was aware how serious the mistakes she had made were.
28. A letter dated 23 December 2013 was sent to the Respondent by the Firm confirming that her appeal hearing had been unsuccessful. The letter stated:

“You accept that you falsified documents..... At the disciplinary hearing you admitted that you yourself created these particular documents on 28 October 2013. At the appeal hearing you also accepted this was the case.

You do not dispute the factual findings which were made following the firm’s disciplinary proceedings”.
29. By a letter dated 3 February 2014, the Firm reported the Respondent’s conduct to the SRA. The SRA sent an EWW letter dated 27 May 2014 to the Respondent, asking for her to submit her response to the allegations by 13 June 2014. Despite the Respondent seemingly signing for the EWW letter on delivery, she did not respond, or offer any explanation for her actions.

Witnesses

30. None.

Findings of Fact and Law

31. 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.
32. **Allegation 1.1 – Failing to take timely and appropriate action in relation to the Notice**
- 32.1 A Notice to Pay Fee in respect of a claim brought by the Respondents client's, DST, was sent to the Respondent by the Court on 17 May 2013. The Notice advised the Respondent that her client's claim had been listed for hearing on 24 October 2013, for which a trial fee of £545 was payable. The Notice further stated that if the fee was not paid, or application for fee remission made, by 29 May 2013, the trial would be vacated and the claim struck out without further order of the Court.
- 32.2 The Respondent failed to ensure that the trial fee of £545 was paid by 29 May 2013. In accordance with the terms of the Notice, the claim was struck out, without the client's knowledge, leaving them liable to pay the Defendant's costs.
- 32.3 It was submitted that by failing to pay the trial fee in accordance with the Notice, and thereafter failing to apply to have the struck out claim reinstated as per the letter of 12 June 2013, the Respondent failed to (a) act in the best interests of, and (b) provide a proper standard of service to her client and therefore breached Principles 5 and 6 of the Principles.
- 32.4 The Tribunal determined that the Respondent had failed to inform her client of the true position, despite numerous requests for an update. Her failures had exposed her client to financial harm; the striking out of the claim left DST liable for the Defendant's costs. The Tribunal found that in failing to pay the trial fee, and thereafter, failing to take appropriate action to reinstate her client's claim, the Respondent had not acted in the best interests of her client or provided a proper standard of service and had breached the Principles as alleged and pleaded. Accordingly the Tribunal found Allegation 1.1 proved beyond reasonable doubt on the evidence and the submissions.
33. **Allegation 1.2 – fabricating letters to the Court together with the Application Notice**
- 33.1 During the disciplinary meeting on 15 November 2013, the Respondent admitted fabricating the Letters and the Application Notice, stating she could not find copies of the documents she had previously prepared in the system, and didn't think anyone would believe her. During her subsequent appeal, the Respondent did not raise any objection to the factual findings of the disciplinary hearing, accepting that she had done things wrong, and instead wished to "give a proper account" of herself.

- 33.2 It was submitted that by fabricating the Letters and the Application Notice, the Respondent failed to act with integrity and failed to behave in a way that maintained the trust the public places in her and in the provision of legal services, and therefore breached Principles 2 and 6 of the Principles.
- 33.3 The Tribunal noted that the Respondent had admitted to her employers that she had created the Letters during the short adjournment of the meeting on 28 October 2013 and that the Application Notice has been created earlier the same day, after she was aware that PB intended to discuss the DST matter at the meeting. The Tribunal did not accept that the Respondent was simply reproducing the Letters and the Application Notice that had already been sent out. There was no record of these ever having been received by the Court. Further, there was no evidence on the documentary or electronic filing system at the Firm that the Letters and Application Notice had been created any earlier than 28 October 2013. The Respondent had the opportunity, at the meeting, to inform her employers of the true position however she chose not to do so. The Tribunal found that the Respondent's actions lacked integrity and that she had failed to behave in a way that maintains the trust the public placed in her and the provision of legal services. Accordingly, the Tribunal found allegation 1.2 proved beyond reasonable doubt on the evidence and the submissions.
34. **Allegation 1.3 – misleading her employers that she had submitted the Application Notice to the Court to reinstate the claim**
- 34.1 By producing copies of the Letters and the Application Notice to PB at the meeting on 28 October 2013, without admitting that they had been created on that day, the Respondent misled her employers about her conduct of the DST file. It was only at the disciplinary meeting on 15 November 2013 that the Respondent admitted fabricating the Letters and the Application Notice, stating that she could not find the existing copies she had previously created on the system, and did not think anyone would believe her.
- 34.2 The Respondent also maintained that although she could not find a copy of the Application Notice on the work system, she had found the signed Application in a pile of filing in her office, and it was this document that she gave to PB on 28 October 2013. She did not explain however why she had created a further copy of the Application on the work system, given that she had a signed copy, nor why there was purportedly a signed copy in her filing, if she had sent the Application Notice to the Court as claimed.
- 34.3 The Respondent had denied receiving the Notice from the Court, yet the Notice was found on the relevant file. She accepted receiving the letter dated 12 June 2013 which stated a fee had to be paid when issuing the application. The Respondent initially explained that the reason that she had not sent a fee out with the Application Notice was that she had hardly ever sent a fee when issuing an application, however she later maintained that she sent the application without a fee so no one would find out about it.

- 34.4 There was nothing on the Firm's system to show that original copies of either the Letters or the Application Notice were produced prior to 28 October 2013 as claimed by the Respondent. When HS called the Court, the Court confirmed that no correspondence had been received from the Respondent in June 2013, nor was there any record of the letter dated 18 September 2013 ever having been received by the Court.
- 34.5 Furthermore, the letter dated 15 November 2013 from the Firm to the Respondent confirmed her dismissal, at least in part, for handling the DST matter "in a misleading and dishonest manner". The Respondent did not object to the factual findings of the disciplinary hearing, but maintained she could not raise the fact that the case had been struck out with her supervising partner as:
- "she was less and less happy with her job, and thought that PB knew that. When anything was raised with PB she had a quick temper and did not give a positive response. This was not an atmosphere in which they were encouraged to talk about issues".
- 34.6 It was submitted that by denying that she had received the Notice and thereafter producing fabricated and post-dated copies of the Letters and the Application Notice (to create a misleading impression that she had submitted the Application Notice to the Court), the Respondent failed to act with integrity and failed to behave in a way that maintained the trust the public places in her and in the provision of legal services, and therefore breached Principles 2 and 6 of the SRA Principles.
- 34.7 The Tribunal found that in attempting to pass off the fabricated letters and Application Notice as genuine pre-existing copies, the Respondent had created the misleading impression that she had submitted the Application Notice to the Court. The Tribunal determined that the Letters and the Application Notice had been created specifically to create the impression that they had been sent on the date on the face of the Letters. In the circumstances, the Respondent had purposefully tried to mislead her employers. Accordingly, the Tribunal found allegation 1.3 proved beyond reasonable doubt on the evidence and the submissions.
35. **Allegation 1.4 – failing to co-operate with the regulator in an open, timely and cooperative manner**
- 35.1 Following the Firm's letter dated 3 February 2014 to the SRA reporting the Respondents conduct, and EWW letter was sent to the Respondent on 27 May 2014, requesting a response by 13 June 2014. The EWW letter was sent by recorded delivery post, and was purportedly signed for by the Respondent. The Respondent failed to provide a response to the EWW letter by 13 June 2014 or at all.
- 35.2 It was submitted that in failing to respond to the SRA's letter of 27 May 2014, the Respondent failed to cooperate in an open, timely and cooperative manner with her regulator, and therefore breached Principle 7 of the Principles.
- 35.3 The Tribunal found that the Respondent had failed to provide a response to the EWW letter by the stated deadline, or at all. Further, she had failed to engage with the proceedings. The Tribunal determined that in failing to respond to the Applicant, the

Respondent had failed to deal with the Applicant in an open, timely and co-operative manner, and thus had breached Principle 7 as pleaded. Accordingly, the Tribunal found allegation 1.4 proved beyond reasonable doubt on the evidence and the submissions.

36. Dishonesty

- 36.1 The Respondent's actions were dishonest according to the combined test laid down in Twinsectra v Yardley and Others [2002] UKHL 12 ("Twinsectra"), which required that the person had acted dishonestly by the ordinary standards of reasonable and honest people, and realised that by those standards he or she was acting dishonestly.
- 36.2 In fabricating the post-dated Letters and Application Notice, and misleading her employers that she had not received the Notice and thereafter maintaining that she had submitted the Application Notice to the Court, the Respondent acted dishonestly by the ordinary standards of reasonable and honest people.
- 36.3 Not only was her conduct in fabricating the Letters and the Application Notice and misleading her employers that she had not received the Notice, and had thereafter submitted the Application Notice to reinstate the Claim, dishonest by the ordinary standards of reasonable and honest people, but she must have been aware that it was dishonest by those standards for the following reasons:-
- The Respondent made the conscious and deliberate decision to fabricate the Application Notice before attending the meeting on 28 October 2013 knowing the DST case was to be discussed. During the adjournment in that meeting she made a further conscious and deliberate decision to fabricate the Letters so she could provide a copy to PB as requested.
 - The Respondent falsified the Letters and the Application Notice to conceal the fact that the DST Claim had been struck out due to her failure to pay the trial fee and her subsequent failure to rectify the situation by making an application to reinstate the claim as per the Court's letter to the Respondent dated 12 June 2013.
 - The Respondent did not dispute the factual findings of the disciplinary meeting on 15 November 2013, including the finding that she had handled the DST matter in a dishonest manner which led to her subsequent summary dismissal.
- 36.4 Applying the Twinsectra test, the Tribunal found that there could be no doubt that reasonable and honest people, applying ordinary standards, would consider that a solicitor who fabricated letters and an Application Notice in an attempt to mislead her employers had acted dishonestly, and therefore the objective test was satisfied. The Respondent had admitted to the Firm that she had fabricated the Letters and Application Notice. The admission was only made when the Respondent was herself made aware that the Firm knew the dates of the creation of the documents. The Tribunal noted that the Application Notice had been created on 28 October 2013, prior to the meeting where it was to be discussed. When asked about the Letters, the Respondent used the short adjournment of the meeting to create them. The Respondent, had she been acting honestly, would have owned up to her failures. She consciously tried to mislead her employers by producing the Letters and the

Application Notice. It was clearly dishonest for her to pass off the correspondence as having been sent out in June and September, when they had just been created. She chose to deliberately create a false paper trail in the hope that it would conceal her errors. The Tribunal determined that the Respondent knew her actions were dishonest, and knew that they were dishonest by the ordinary standards of reasonable and honest people. The Tribunal thus found that the subjective test was also satisfied. This was a case of blatant dishonesty which met both limbs of the Twinsectra test. The Tribunal thus found dishonesty proven beyond reasonable doubt.

- 36.5 The Tribunal did not accept that the Respondent's alleged tacit acceptance of the allegation of dishonesty contained in the letter of 15 November 2013 was, in and of itself, evidence of dishonesty.

Previous Disciplinary Matters

37. None.

Mitigation

38. None.

Sanction

39. The Tribunal had regard to the Guidance Note on Sanction (4th Edition). The Tribunal firstly considered the seriousness of the Respondent's admitted and proven conduct. The Tribunal found the Respondent to be completely culpable for the breaches; the misconduct having arisen as a direct result of her sole actions. The Respondent had clearly been motivated by her desire to conceal her failures on the DST matter. The Respondent was a fairly junior solicitor, however her actions were so blatantly dishonest that her lack of experience was no justification for her actions. Her actions were clearly planned: she created the Application Notice prior to attending the meeting, and having stated that the Letters existed, created them in the short adjournment. The Tribunal found that in acting in the way that she did, the Respondent had caused harm to the profession and the public; as per Coulson J in Solicitors Regulation Authority v Sharma [2010] EWHC 2022 Admin ("Sharma"):

"34. there is harm to the public every time a solicitor behaves dishonestly. It is in the public interest to ensure that, as it was put in Bolton, a solicitor can be "trusted to the ends of the earth"."

40. The Tribunal found the Respondent's conduct to be aggravated by her proven dishonesty. Her dishonest conduct was deliberate and calculated. The Tribunal determined that the Respondent knew that her conduct was in material breach of her obligation to protect the public and the reputation of the profession. The Tribunal further determined that her misconduct was further aggravated by her non-compliance with the Applicant during the course of the investigation and the proceedings. She had attempted to conceal her failures using dishonest methods.

41. The Tribunal determined that the Respondent's misconduct was not motivated by personal financial gain, but was an attempt to stay out of trouble with the Firm and her client.
42. Given the serious nature of the proven allegations, the Tribunal considered and rejected the lesser sanctions within its sentencing powers, such as no order, a reprimand or restrictions. The Tribunal had regard to the case of Bolton v Law Society [1994] 2 All ER 486 in which Sir Thomas Bingham stated:

“...Lapses from the required standard (of complete integrity, probity and trustworthiness)...may...be of varying degrees. The most serious involves proven dishonesty...In such cases the tribunal has almost invariably, no matter how strong the mitigation advanced by the solicitor, ordered that he be struck off the roll of solicitors.”
43. The Respondent had failed to attend the hearing or offer any explanation for her conduct to the SRA or the Tribunal. There was no mitigation advanced on her behalf, and the Tribunal found no circumstances that gave rise to its considering this case in line with the residual exceptional circumstances category referred to in the case of Sharma such as to reduce the sanction. The Tribunal decided that in view of the serious nature of the misconduct, in that it involved proven dishonesty, the only appropriate and proportionate sanction was to strike the Respondent off the Roll of Solicitors.

Costs

44. Mr Bullock made an application for the Respondent to pay the costs of the proceedings. The total costs set out on the schedule were in the sum of £6,837.12. He advised that there should be a reduction in the charges for his preparation for hearing time, and the advocacy time as both were estimates, and both had taken less time than estimated.
45. The Tribunal considered carefully the schedule of costs. It noted the concessions made by Mr Bullock. The Tribunal determined that the reasonable and proportionate costs of the proceedings should be summarily assessed at £5,900.
46. The Tribunal considered whether there ought to be any adjustment to that figure in the light of the Respondent's means. The Respondent had not submitted a financial statement, and the Tribunal had no evidence of her means. The Tribunal's sanction order meant that she could not work as a solicitor, however, her age meant that there were other occupations in which she could seek work. Thus the Tribunal found no reason to reduce the costs or delay enforcement.

Statement of Full Order

47. The Tribunal Ordered that the Respondent, LAURA CATHERINE HOLLOWAY, solicitor, be STRUCK OFF the Roll of Solicitors and it further Ordered that she do pay the costs of and incidental to this application and enquiry fixed in the sum of £5,900.00.

Dated this 6th day of April 2016
On behalf of the Tribunal

N. Lucking
Chairman