

IN THE MATTER OF ROBIN WYN JONES, solicitor

- AND -

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974

Mr. A.H. Isaacs (in the Chair)

Mr. D.E. Fordham

Mr. R.P.L. McMurtrie

Date Of Hearing: 11th July 1996

FINDINGS

of the Solicitors' Disciplinary Tribunal
constituted under the Solicitors Act 1974

An application was duly made on behalf of the Solicitors Complaints Bureau by Roger Field of Inhedge House, 31 Wolverhampton Street, Dudley, West Midlands on 19th April 1996 that Robin Wyn Jones, solicitor of Valley, Gwynedd might be required to answer the allegations contained in the statement which accompanied the application and that such Order might be made as the Tribunal should think right.

The allegation was that the respondent had been guilty of conduct unbefitting a solicitor in that he had been convicted of offences of falsely pretending to act under the authority of a Court and sentenced to a term of imprisonment.

The application was heard at the Court Room, No. 60 Carey Street, London WC2 on 11th July 1996 when Roger Field, solicitor and partner in the firm of Messrs. Higgs & Sons of Inhedge House, 31 Wolverhampton Street, Dudley, West Midlands appeared for the applicant and the respondent did not appear and was not represented. The respondent had on 7th July 1996 written to the applicant confirming that he admitted the allegation and that he would not attend before the Tribunal to make representations.

At the conclusion of the hearing the Tribunal Ordered that the respondent Robin Wyn Jones, solicitor of Valley, Gwynedd be STRUCK OFF the Roll of Solicitors and they further Ordered him to pay the costs of and incidental to the application and enquiry, fixed in the sum of £890 inclusive.'

The facts are set out in paragraphs 1 to 3 hereunder.

1. The respondent, born in 1963, was admitted a solicitor in 1991.
2. Between June 1993 and January 1994 the respondent was employed as an assistant solicitor by the firm of Amoo-Gottfried & Co., solicitors of 256 Lavender Hill, Clapham Junction, London SW11.
3. On 9th October 1995 at the Crown Court at Snaresbrook the respondent was upon his own confession convicted upon indictment of four counts of falsely pretending to act under the authority of a Court. He was sentenced to six months imprisonment on each count concurrent. On appeal the Court of Criminal Appeal quashed the sentence of six months imprisonment concurrent and substituted a sentence of six weeks imprisonment, to run concurrently.

The submissions of the applicant

4. The respondent had forged a Decree Nisi of divorce and three Decrees Absolute. Whilst drawing the attention of the Tribunal to the Judgment of the Court of Appeal Criminal Division which pointed out that the respondent had been subjected to overwhelming pressure at the time when he committed the offences, it was pointed out that the learned trial judge in passing sentence had made the following observations, "Court documents are likely to be acted upon by the other side and you know that everybody knows that. This is the point of having court documents. They are really reliable things which come with the authority of the court and they show that the court has considered it and has dealt with it and people can act upon it. That is why Parliament has placed so great an emphasis on the seriousness of this sort of thing."
5. In the submission of the applicant the respondent's actions were of the utmost seriousness and were certain to bring the solicitors' profession into disrepute.

The submissions of the respondent (contained in his before-mentioned letter of 7th July 1996)

6. The respondent indicated that the matter had been one of great sorrow and distress for him and he hoped that the injured parties had had an opportunity to redress the damage he caused through his actions.
7. The respondent confirmed that he did not hold a Practising Certificate and he had no immediate plans to return to the legal profession. He apologised and asked for his absence from the Tribunal's proceedings to be excused.

The Tribunal took note of the fact that the respondent had been working under very great pressure, however there was no pressure great enough to excuse the forgery by a solicitor of important court documents. It was right that the respondent should be struck off the Roll of Solicitors and pay costs in a fixed sum.

DATED this 3rd day of August 1996

on behalf of the Tribunal



A.H. Isaacs

