SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 Case No. 12723-2025

BETWEEN:

CHARLES JAMES ETE Applicant

and

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LTD Respondent

Before:

Ms T Cullen (in the chair)
Ms B Patel
Mr D Kearney

Date of Hearing: 2 June 2025

Appearances

David Lonsdale, counsel, 33 Bedford Row, London, WC1R 4JH for the Applicant.

Montu Miah, counsel, employed by the Solicitors Regulation Authority Ltd, The Cube, 199 Wharfside Street, Birmingham, B1 1RN for the Respondent.

JUDGMENT

Relevant Background

1. The Respondent was admitted to the roll of solicitors in March 1997. He was the sole equity partner and owner of Charles Ete & Co Solicitors, a firm which was established in March 2004, and whose practice address was 19 Thames Road, Barking, London, IG11 0HN. Following a decision by the SRA's Adjudication Panel to intervene into Charles Ete & Co Solicitors, the Applicant's practising certificate was suspended.

2. The Applicant was also the sole principal and owner of Pride Solicitors Ltd, a recognised body established in June 2014, until it was also the subject of intervention on 7 January 2019. Its practice address was Office 3, 4th Floor, Ferguson House, 113 Cranbrook Road, Ilford IG1 4P.

Substantive Proceedings in 2021

3. The Applicant appeared before the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal ("the Tribunal") between 8 to 12 March 2021 and 1 to 3 June 2021 along with another Respondent in the proceedings. The Tribunal found substantiated the following allegations against the Applicant:

> *"While in practice as a Partner at Charles Ete & Co Solicitors and Pride Solicitors Ltd:*
>
> *1.1. In or around May and July 2018 he caused or allowed payments to be made from Charles Ete & Co Solicitors' client account which were:*
>
> *1.1.1. Made other than in accordance with Rule 20.1 of the SRA Accounts Rules 2011;*
>
> *1.1.2. Improper; and in breach of Principles 2, 6, and 10 of the SRA Principles 2011;*
>
> *1.2. In 2018 he caused, allowed, or acted in transactions which bore hallmarks of fraud, in breach of Principles 2, 6, and 10 of the SRA Principles 2011;*
>
> *1.3. In 2018 he caused or allowed a minimum client account shortage of £1,236,335.64 to arise on the Charles Ete & Co Solicitors' client account, which was not replaced promptly on discovery or at all, in breach of Principles 2, 6 and 10 of the SRA Principles 2011, and Rules 6 and 7 of the SRA Accounts Rules 2011;*
>
> *1.4. In 2018 he caused or allowed Charles Ete & Co's client bank account to be used as a banking facility in breach of Principles 2 and 6 of the SRA Principles 2011, and Rule 14.5 of the SRA Accounts Rules 2011;*
>
> *1.5. In 2018 he failed to exercise any or adequate supervision or control over an individual using the name of Person A, in breach of Principles 2, 6 and 8 of the SRA Principles 2011, and failed to achieve Outcome 7.8 of the SRA Code of Conduct 2011;*

1.6. In 2018 he failed to take any or adequate steps to verify the identity and regulatory status of the individual using the name of Person A before allowing said individual to practice as a solicitor and in doing so breached Principles 6 and 8 of the SRA Principles 2011;

1.7. In 2018 he misled insurers in correspondence dated 10 July 2018 in breach of Principles 2, 6 and 8 of the SRA Principles 2011;

1.8. In 2018 he failed to appoint a COLP and COFA at Pride Solicitors, in breach of Principles 7 and 8 of the SRA Principles 2011 and Rule 8.5(b) and (d) of the SRA Authorisation Rules 2011; and

1.9. Dishonesty:

1.9.1. He misled insurers in correspondence dated 10 July 2018.

4. The following allegation was found not proven:

- *"In 2018 he failed to cooperate fully with the SRA and its intervention agents, in breach of Principles 2 and 7."*

5. In relation to the allegation of dishonesty set out at 1.9 above, the Applicant had acted in two conveyancing transactions in which red flags were ignored and purchase monies were improperly paid out to third parties. During the course of a sale ("the transaction") the buyer's solicitors, ST Solicitors, raised questions about the Applicant's identification of his client.

6. In their report to the SRA dated 4 July 2018, ST Solicitors stated:

> "*We believe that the firm of Charles Ete failed to carry out any identity checks or money laundering checks to verify that the seller was the person entitled to sell the property. Our client has not received good title and has suffered a loss of 350,000 through the falsity of the statement by Charles Ete that induced our client to purchase the property. The matter has been reported to our insurer and the metropolitan police."*

7. ST Solicitors sent 3 emails to the Applicant:

i) An email dated 4 July 2018 from ST Solicitors to the Firm informing the Applicant that that the writer had "*now reported this crime to the police and placed our insurers on notice*";

ii) A further email of 4 July 2018 in which the writer from ST Solicitors stated that he had been in touch with a Police Chief Inspector and "*unless I receive satisfactory responses by 4pm today I am reporting you for fraud*"; and

iii) A further email of the same date in which the writer stated that the information provided by the Applicant was inadequate, made reference to a fraudulent transaction and stated, "*it has been reported to the police, SRA and our insurer*."

8. The Applicant then signed a professional indemnity insurance renewal form ("the Form") six days later. The Form required confirmation that the Applicant had "*made due and careful enquiry*" and that he was "*not aware of any claims*" or "*circumstances likely to give rise to claims, in the last 6 years*".

9. The Applicant gave this confirmation in the knowledge that he had been informed six days previously by ST Solicitors that the transaction in which the Applicant acted for the purported seller may be fraudulent and that the matter had been reported to the Respondent, ST Solicitors' insurers, and the Police.

10. In determining the outcome of the substrative proceedings in 2021 the Tribunal found that it was inconceivable that the Applicant was not aware that this was a matter which he should have declared to his insurer on the basis that a claim was likely to arise. The Tribunal found the Applicant's denial of this in evidence unconvincing and lacking in credibility.

11. The Tribunal found that the Applicant was aware that he should have reported these issues but that he chose not to do so. He therefore knowingly misled his insurers:-

> *"As to the state of the First Respondent's knowledge, the Tribunal had found that the First Respondent was well aware that he should have reported these issues to his insurer but that he elected not to do so. He may have believed that no successful claim would result, but he was aware that there was a major issue with the relevant transaction; that the purchaser's solicitor considered the transaction to be fraudulent and considered the client identification steps taken by the First Respondent to have been inadequate. He was aware that he should have reported these issues but elected not to do so. Once the above findings as to his knowledge and belief as to the facts had been made, the Tribunal found on the balance of probabilities that ordinary decent people would regard the First Respondent's conduct as dishonest. He had completed the form untruthfully. The aggravating allegation of dishonesty was accordingly proved to the requisite standard*."

12. The Tribunal also stated:

> "*The misconduct found proved was aggravated by the fact that the allegations included a finding of dishonest conduct. The other misconduct was repeated (across two transactions). The governance failures were systemic and extended over time. The Tribunal considered that the First Respondent had concealed the true position from his insurer (although he had subsequently notified them of the issues). The First Respondent had blamed others for many of the issues with which the allegations were concerned. He blamed Person A, Mr F and the Applicant. In some cases, this was warranted and he was himself duped by Person A and his purported clients, but the First Respondent did not accept responsibility for matters within his control. The fact that the First Respondent should have known that the conduct complained of was conduct in material breach of his obligations as a solicitor to protect the public and the reputation of the legal profession was a further aggravating factor.*"

13. The Tribunal made an order in respect of the Applicant striking him from the roll of solicitors for England and Wales.

The Appeal

14. On 24 June 2021, the Applicant filed an appellant's notice and grounds of appeal against the Order of the Tribunal dated 3 June 2021 ("the Appeal"). The Appeal was heard on 12 July 2022 and all grounds of the Appeal were refused by Mr Justice Linden.

15. In dismissing the Applicant's Appeal concerning the allegation that he dishonestly misled his insurers, Mr Justice Linden found:

> "*As I have noted, the Tribunal directed itself carefully and correctly as to the Ivey test. It was particularly clear that the first limb of the test simply concerns the subjective knowledge and beliefs of the person in question. It considered Mr Ete's evidence and arguments in relation to that issue and clearly rejected them as lacking in credibility. Its finding was that Mr Ete was aware that he should declare the matter and that he elected not to do so. As will be seen below, it considered that his motivation for doing so was to secure the insurance and to give himself time to attempt to resolve the issues which had arisen. These findings were based on the SDT's assessment of the whole of the evidence: see [85] above. It saw and heard Mr Ete give evidence and be cross examined, and there is in my judgment no basis on which I am able to hold that its findings were wrong*."

Application for Restoration to the Roll ("the Application")

16. The Application was dated 8 January 2025 and was supported by:-

- The Applicant's Statement in support of Application for Restoration to the Roll (endorsed with statement of truth) dated 8 January 2025 which can be viewed [**here**]
- The Applicant's Reply to the Respondent's Answer to his application (endorsed with statement of truth) dated 25 March 2025 which can be viewed [**here**]
- The Applicant's Exhibit "CE" containing documentary evidence including character references in support of his application
- Law Society Gazette advert placed by the Applicant dated 21 February 2025
- Barking & Dagenham Post advert placed by the Applicant dated 5 February 2025

Applicant Submissions

17. Mr Lonsdale, on behalf of the Applicant, submitted that the findings against the Applicant fell into two distinct categories. The first related to the handling of client monies, which, while serious, did not involve a finding of dishonesty. Rather, the Tribunal had concluded that the Applicant failed to respond appropriately to warning

signs, thereby falling below the standards expected of a solicitor. It was accepted that this amounted to misconduct however Mr Lonsdale emphasised that it was not of the same gravity as the dishonesty finding arising from the separate insurance matter.

18. The dishonesty finding concerned a single act, committed on one occasion, and did not result in any financial loss to the insurer. While acknowledging the seriousness of any finding of dishonesty, Mr Lonsdale submitted that the Court should consider the incident in its full context. The Applicant had never previously been accused of dishonesty and was, both before and since the incident, widely regarded as a person of integrity.

19. The Applicant's character references attested to his reputation and his honesty. Mr Lonsdale noted that had any member of the public felt otherwise, they would have come forward following the public notification of the proceedings, which they did not, a fact said to point to the isolated nature of the misconduct.

20. As to rehabilitation, Mr Lonsdale acknowledged that the Applicant initially appealed the findings and therefore did not accept them at the outset. However, it was submitted that he has now fully accepted the Tribunal's determination and bitterly regrets his conduct in the insurance matter.

21. Mr Lonsdale submitted that there was no realistic prospect of repetition as the Applicant would not be returning to a role involving the handling of client funds or the type of work that gave rise to the misconduct. His proposed area of practice involved legally aided family law work and this was described as often involving harrowing and demanding cases that would allow him to contribute meaningfully to society. Mr Lonsdale submitted that this choice reflected the Applicant's genuine desire to use his skills in the public interest and resume his role as a taxpayer contributing to the common good.

22. It was not suggested that the hurdles to readmission should be ignored by the Tribunal, but rather that, in light of the singular nature of the dishonesty, the absence of any pattern of misconduct and the fact that the gross negligence arose in an area the Applicant would not return to, the Tribunal should consider affording him a second chance.

Oral Evidence of the Applicant

23. The Applicant confirmed that he now unequivocally accepted the findings of the High Court following the Appeal.

24 The Applicant confirmed that he was not currently in employment and had not worked since the SRA Intervention into his practice in 2019. He had declined to remain on state benefits and had instead been financially supported by family. The Applicant confirmed that a friend had provided financial assistance in relation to his application to the Tribunal and had paid his Counsel's fees for the hearing.

25. The Applicant was involved in his church and regularly offered legal advice to members of the congregation when requested to do.

26. The Applicant referred the Tribunal to a Training Record detailing the courses he had undertaken since being struck off the Roll of Solicitors for England and Wales**.**

27. The Applicant stated that he had an offer of employment from Blackwhite Solicitors and that he could commence in this role immediately should his application to the Tribunal for restoration succeed. The Applicant stated that he offered advice on cases to this firm on an ad hoc basis as they would occasionally raise queries with him regarding difficult cases that they were conducting that were within his area of expertise.

28. The Applicant stated that he would have no financial responsibilities in the proposed role at this firm and that Blackwhite Solicitors did not hold any client money or operate a client account in any event. The Applicant also confirmed that there would be adequate supervision arrangements in place and regular training in place at Blackwhite Solicitors in this new role.

29. The Applicant described how a typical case for him in the proposed role would involve representing parents in proceedings against local authorities and social services in which he had vast professional experience.

30. The Applicant confirmed that he had undertaken no legal work since his Practising Certificate was suspended following the intervention into his firm/s in January 2019.

31. The Applicant was challenged by Mr Miah regarding the extent of the period that had elapsed since he was struck off in 2021. Mr Miah suggested that the relevant period commenced following the conclusion of the High Court appeal on 1 August 2022 and therefore the Applicant's application for restoration to the roll was premature. The Applicant disagreed and invited the Tribunal to regard the relevant period as commencing when his Practising Certificate was suspended in January 2019.

32. Mr Miah stated that as the Applicant had not been in employment since January 2019 he had not demonstrated how he had developed insight and had not undertaken any roles requiring trustworthiness. The Applicant stated that he volunteered at his church and this voluntary work was evidenced by a character reference from the church Pastor.

33. Mr Miah recited the Tribunal's findings in relation to the Applicant demonstrating manifest incompetence:-

> *"The Tribunal accepted the submission that the failure to carry out meaningful checks on Person A's work and experience amounted to manifest incompetence and a breach of Principle 6. The Tribunal found proved to the requisite standard that displaying such manifest incompetence in the running of his firms in the context of an individual given a free rein to conduct legal work in which significant sums of client and purchaser money was inevitably involved, amounted to a failure to behave in a way that maintained the trust the public places in the First Respondent and the provision of legal services. The alleged breach of Principle 6 was thus proved on the balance of probabilities".* The Applicant stated that following the conclusion of his appeal to the High Court he now accepted those findings adding that his return to practice would be in

family law and the finding of manifest incompetence did not apply to that area of his work.

34. Mr Miah queried whether the authors of the various character references had been provided with the Judgments from the Tribunal and High Court prior to completing their references in support of his application. The Applicant stated that he had informed them where the documents could be found online but could not be sure if they had each read the extent of the Judgments in full.

35. Mr Miah questioned the Applicant on his purported offer of employment from Blackwhite Solicitors. The reference from Blackwhite Solicitors did not explicitly state that the Applicant had been offered a role at the firm. The reference did not detail what the role would involve, the remuneration or the supervision arrangements and Mr Miah stated that it was therefore vague and lacking in clarity. The Applicant stated that the wording of the letter merely reflected the customarily cautious approach that solicitors adopt in correspondence and that the offer of employment was legitimate.

36. Mr Miah queried whether the Applicant had paid the costs order made by the Tribunal in favour of the SRA following the substantive proceedings in 2021. The Applicant confirmed that he had made no payments towards that costs order as he was impecunious although if his application was successful he would contact the SRA to make arrangements for regular repayments towards the outstanding amount.

37. Mr Miah queried whether the approximate £1 million shortfall on his firm's client account prior to the SRA Intervention had been replaced. The Applicant was uncertain of the position stating that there were no civil claims against him and he assumed they had been settled.

38. The Applicant accepted, in the context of the present proceedings and the outcome of his application, that the protection of the public and reputation came before any personal misfortune on his part.

39. The Applicant was asked about the supervision arrangements in his prospective role at Blackwhite solicitors. The Applicant had stated in his evidence that the firm would contact him from time to time with ad hoc queries regarding family law cases given his expertise in that practice area and it was suggested that the firm may therefore lack a solicitor of sufficient experience to supervise his work. The Applicant reassured the Tribunal that the firm did have family law solicitors who were suitably experienced and could supervise his work.

40. The Applicant was asked to confirm that he had not been in employment for a period of approximately 6 years since the SRA Intervention. The Applicant confirmed that this was the case and that he was heavily involved at his church on a voluntary basis. An element of this volunteering included providing legal advice to parishioners from time to time. The Applicant confirmed he referred these parishioners onto solicitors in the event that applications to the courts were required. The Applicant also referenced that his family caring responsibilities and commitments demanded a significant proportion of his time.

Respondent Submissions

41. The Respondent's Answer to the application dated 10 March 2025 can be viewed **[here].**

42. Mr Miah referenced that the Applicant had conceded that there was no evidence of employment within the profession in the period since he was struck off the Roll. Mr Miah also cited the absence of wider relevant evidence of rehabilitation submitted by the Applicant in support of his application.

43. Mr Miah cited the outstanding costs awarded to the SRA following the Substantive Proceedings in 2021**.** The Tribunal was referred to its Guidance Note on Other Powers of the Tribunal (6th Edition – March 2022) ('the Guidance Note') regarding "…*the extent to which the applicant has repaid any losses sustained by others as a result of the applicant's original misconduct, including any fines and cost orders made by the Tribunal. The applicant must be in a position to demonstrate that they have made a sustained effort to meet any such liability."* The Applicant had accepted that the costs remained outstanding.

44. Mr Miah submitted that the application was premature. The relevant period for determining this was said to have commenced following the conclusion of the High Court appeal on 1 August 2022 and therefore the Applicant's application for restoration to the Roll was premature. Mr Miah referenced the Guidance Note which stated that "…*the period which has elapsed since the order of strike off/removal was made. Save in the most exceptional circumstances an application for restoration within six years of the original strike off/removal is likely to be regarded by the Tribunal as premature."*

45. Mr Miah challenged the extent to which there was evidence provided by the Applicant demonstrating insight regarding serious risks that formed the basis of the original disciplinary proceedings. Mr Miah submitted that the Tribunal could not be confident that the Applicant would not repeat the conduct which led to him being struck from the Roll. The reputation of the profession and public confidence in the provision of legal services would therefore be significantly undermined if a solicitor was restored to the Roll when the public could not be confident the solicitor in question had developed insight into the reasons that led to them being struck from the Roll.

46. Mr Miah submitted that allowing an application to restore to the Roll an applicant who had behaved in the way in which this Applicant had, and who continued to demonstrate a lack of insight, would damage the reputation of the profession and damage public confidence in the provision of legal services. Mr Miah submitted that the public would not consider the Applicant to be a fit and proper person to be on the Roll.

<u>The Tribunal's Decision</u>

47. The Tribunal referred the Guidance Note which stated that an application for restoration to the Roll should be supported by a statement setting out:

- Details of the original order of the Tribunal leading to strike off removal.

- Details of the Applicant's employment and training history since the Tribunal's order.

- Details of the Applicant's intentions as to and any offers of employment within the legal profession in the event the application is successful.

48. The Tribunal noted that an application for restoration is not an appeal against the original decision to strike off the Applicant. The Tribunal's function when considering an application for restoration is to determine whether the Applicant has established that they are now a fit and proper person to have their name restored to the Roll.

49. The Tribunal, in considering the application paid significant regard to (amongst other things) the guidance provided by Bolton v Law Society 1 WLR 512:

> *"… Only infrequently, particularly in recent years, has [the Tribunal] been willing to order the restoration to the Roll of a solicitor against whom serious dishonesty had been established, even after a passage of years, and even where the solicitor had made every effort to re-establish himself and redeem his reputation ... the most fundamental (purpose of sanction] of all: to maintain the reputation of the solicitors' profession as one in which every member, of whatever standing, may be trusted to the ends of the earth. To maintain this reputation and sustain public confidence in the integrity of the profession it is often necessary that those guilty of serious lapses are not only expelled but denied re-admission…"*

50. Additionally, the guidance provided by Lord Donaldson in Case No. 5 of 1987 (unreported):

> *"… however sympathetic one may be towards an individual member of either branch of the legal profession, if you fall very seriously below the standards of that profession and are expelled from it, there is a public interest in the profession itself in hardening its heart if any question arises of your rejoining it. Neither branch of the profession is short of people who have never fallen from grace. There is considerable public interest in the public as a whole being able to deal with members of those professions knowing that, save in the most exceptional circumstances, they can be sure that none of them have ever been guilty of any dishonesty at all…."*

51. The Tribunal also noted the principle promulgated in Solicitors Regulation Authority v Kaberry [2012] EWHC 3883 (Admin) that:

> *"… a finding of dishonesty by the Tribunal or a criminal conviction recorded against an applicant involving dishonesty can constitute an almost insurmountable obstacle to a successful application for restoration…"*

52. The Tribunal considered carefully the Judgment from the Substantive Proceedings in 2021 and the 2022 High Court Appeal Judgment of Mr Justice Linden. The Tribunal also considered the oral evidence received from the Applicant, the documentary evidence filed by the parties and the submissions of the parties in the course of the

hearing. The Tribunal found that the matters leading to the Applicant's removal from the Roll were of the utmost gravity.

53. The Tribunal considered the period that had elapsed since the order of strike off was made against the Applicant. The Applicant's position was that the relevant period commenced when his Practising Certificate was suspended in January 2019 whereas the Respondent had submitted that the relevant period commenced at the conclusion of the High Court appeal in August 2022. The Tribunal however determined that the relevant period commenced when the Applicant was struck off the Roll on 3 June 2021.

54. The Guidance Note provided that save in the most exceptional circumstances an application for restoration within six years of the original strike off is likely to be regarded by the Tribunal as premature. The Tribunal therefore found that the Applicant's application was premature.

55. The Tribunal noted that there was no evidence of any, let alone substantial or satisfactory, employment within the legal profession in England and Wales demonstrating that trust and confidence had been placed in the Applicant. There was no evidence of the legal work undertaken by the Applicant on behalf of parishioners at his church. A firm that wished to employ the Applicant as a legal assistant or paralegal could have applied to the SRA for permission[1]. There had been no such application, including from the firm that had indicated an interest in employing him should he be restored to the Roll.

56. The Tribunal found the Applicant's evidence of training undertaken since he had been struck off as limited. The Applicant's application would have benefited from reflective and focused training demonstrating insight into the faults that were identified in the allegations.

57. The Tribunal found that the Applicant's application was not supported by satisfactory evidence of rehabilitation through legal employment and training.

58. The Tribunal found that whilst there was some evidence of insight by the Applicant, it was concerned regarding his lack of curiosity in understanding and explaining the shortfall on his firm's client account and the various outstanding costs owed to the SRA arising from it having been required to discharge its regulatory functions in relation his conduct and the operation of his firm.

59. The Guidance Note indicated that the extent to which an applicant has repaid any losses sustained by others as a result of his original misconduct, including any fines and cost orders made by the Tribunal, was a relevant factor to be considered in determining an application for restoration to the Roll. The Applicant must be in a position to demonstrate that they have made a sustained effort to meet any such liability. The Applicant and Respondent confirmed that the Applicant had made no repayments to the SRA in respect of the regulatory costs owed that had been ordered by the Tribunal.

[1] Pursuant to S.41 of the Solicitors Act 1974

60. The Tribunal noted that whilst the Applicant had provided character references in support of his application they lacked detail particularly in relation to whether the referees had, in the course of completing their references, read the 2021 Judgment from the Substantive Proceedings and the 2022 High Court Appeal Judgment of Mr Justice Linden. This limited the weight that could be attached to the Applicant's character references. The Applicant had referred to a potential offer of employment from Blackwhite Solicitors however the reference provided on behalf of that firm did not confirm definitively that such an offer had been made and was silent on details of his purported role and the training and supervision arrangements that would be in place should he return to practice at that firm.

61. The Tribunal took account of the character references and the fact that no objection had been taken following the publication of the advertisements. However, those factors did not outweigh the concerns in relation to rehabilitation, employment, insight and the unpaid costs due to the SRA.

62. The Tribunal was required to consider the application on its merits and determine whether the public would be protected, the reputation of the profession within England and Wales would be upheld and whether public confidence in the regulatory process would be maintained in the event that the Applicant were granted restoration to the Roll. The Tribunal found that none of those factors were adequately, if at all, met on the written application, oral evidence and submissions received.

63. The Tribunal determined that it would not be in the public interest to restore the Applicant to the Roll of Solicitors.

64. The Tribunal therefore REFUSED the application.

Costs

65. Mr Miah applied for the Respondent's costs in the sum of £3,527.60 as particularised in the Respondent's Statement of Costs dated 23 May 2025.

66. Mr Lonsdale did not oppose the Respondent's application for costs in principle however he invited the Tribunal to have regard for the Applicant's financial circumstances and his impecuniosity when determining the amount of any costs order awarded to the Respondent. The Applicant had omitted to file a statement of means pursuant to Rule 43(5) The Solicitors (Disciplinary Proceedings) Rules 2019 in advance of the hearing however he was given leave to provide a statement of means in the course of the hearing.

67. The Tribunal considered this statement and the oral evidence received from the Applicant and determined that it was appropriate to slightly reduce the amount of costs ordered in favour of the Respondent in light of the Applicant's financial circumstances.

68. The Tribunal therefore GRANTED the application for costs in the sum of £3,000.

Statement of Full Order

69. The Tribunal ORDERED that the application of CHARLES JAMES ETE for restoration to the Roll of Solicitors be REFUSED it further Ordered that the Applicant do pay the costs of and incidental to the response to this application fixed in the sum of £3,000.00.

DATED AND FILED WITH THE LAW SOCIETY
This 16th day of July 2025

On behalf of the Tribunal

T. Cullen

T. Cullen
Chair