

# **SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL**

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974

Case No. 12760-2025

## **BETWEEN:**

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LTD

Applicant

and

SAMINA AHMED

Respondent

---

Before:

Mrs F Kyriacou (in the chair)

Mrs C Evans

Ms J Rowe

Date of Hearing: 06 November 2025

---

## **Appearances**

Delme Griffiths, Solicitor, of Blake Morgan LLP, One Central Square, Cardiff, CF10 1FS  
for the Applicant.

Samina Ahmed, Respondent of 7 Newbold Hall Drive, Rochdale, OL16 3AG, represented  
herself.

---

## **JUDGMENT**

---

## **Allegations**

1. The allegation against Ms Samina Ahmed, the Respondent, made by the SRA is that, while in practice as a Solicitor at Tuckers Solicitors LLP (“the Firm”):
  - 1.1. Between 1 July 2021 and 30 June 2022, recorded time on the Firm’s case management system that she knew, or ought to have known, did not accurately reflect the work that she had completed, and thereby breached any or all of:
    - 1.1.1. Principles 2, 4 and 5 of the SRA Principles 2019 (“the Principles”); and
    - 1.1.2. Paragraph 1.4 of the SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs and RFLs 2019 (“the Code”).

### PROVED

The facts and matters relied upon in support of this allegation are set out in paragraphs 5 to 70 of the Applicant’s Rule 12 Statement dated 28 April 2025.

## **Executive Summary**

2. The Tribunal found Ms Ahmed’s admissions to have been properly made and found allegation 1.1 proved in its entirety, together with all associated breaches of the Principles, including dishonesty and lack of integrity, and the Code of Conduct.

## **Sanction**

3. The Tribunal ordered that Samina Ahmed be struck off the Roll of Solicitors and it further ordered that she pay costs in the sum of £5,000.00. The Tribunal’s reasons can be found [\[here\]](#)

## **Documents**

4. The Tribunal considered all of the documents in the case which included (but was not limited to):
  - The Applicant’s Rule 12 Statement and Exhibit dated 28 April 2025
  - The Respondent’s Answer dated 30 June 2025
  - Agreed Joint Party Update dated 10 October 2025
  - Statement of Agreed Facts (“SOAF”) dated 29 October 2025

## **Background**

5. Ms Ahmed was a non-practising solicitor, born in February 1979 and admitted to the Roll in 2005. For approximately 17 years, until 2 September 2022, the Respondent was employed as a Prison Law Solicitor for the Firm. Ms Ahmed’s practice at the Firm

centred on clients in prison and representation at parole hearings, as funded by the Legal Aid Agency (“LAA”). She was a senior solicitor who was a supervisor of trainees.

## **Preliminary Matters**

6. Application for anonymity
- 6.1 Pursuant to Rule 35(9) of the Solicitors (Disciplinary Proceedings) Rules 2019 (“the SDPR”) Mr Griffiths applied for a restriction on the publication and disclosure of the Anonymisation Schedule within the SOAF on the basis that it referred to clients of the Firm.
- 6.2 Ms Ahmed had no objection to the granting of this application.
- 6.3 The Tribunal was satisfied, pursuant to R 35(9) SDPR, of the need to protect the confidentiality of the clients whose identities are set out in the Anonymisation Schedule which forms part of the SOAF, and, in the interests of justice, ordered that the schedule shall not be published or disclosed to any person other than the parties without the permission of the Tribunal.

## **Findings of Fact and Law**

7. The Applicant was required to prove the allegations on a balance of probabilities. The Tribunal had due regard to its statutory duty, under section 6 of the Human Rights Act 1998, to act in a manner which was compatible with the Respondent’s right 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.

## Agreed Facts

8. **Allegation 1 - While Ms Samina Ahmed, the Respondent, was in practice as a solicitor at the Firm: (1.1) Between 1 July 2021 and 30 June 2022, she recorded time on the Firm’s case management system that she knew, or ought to have known, did not accurately reflect the work that she had completed, and thereby breached any or all of: (1.1.1) Principles 2, 4 and 5 of the Principles; and (1.1.2) Paragraph 1.4 of the Code.**

## Summary of Agreed Facts

- 8.1 Ms Ahmed knowingly recorded false time entries. Between 1 July 2021 and 30 June 2022, she recorded 7,511.70 hours over 266 days (an average of 28.24 hours/day), which included 133 days for which she recorded more than 24 hours, which was an impossibility. Ms Ahmed continued to do this, even after being warned in a meeting on 7 April 2022, and by so doing she misled the Firm.
- 8.2 Ms Ahmed’s misleading time entries were used to bill the LAA and were high enough that the fixed fee structure, agreed as per the *Prison Law 2017 Standard Crime Contract* was exceeded, allowing actual time spent on a matter to be recovered, which in turn incurred a greater cost to the public purse.

- 8.3 As a result of being exposed to systemic billing abuse, the LAA overpaid the Firm £98,093.12, which the Firm had to repay. The Firm was thereby exposed to economic harm as it had relied on those sums as part of its financial planning and budgeting.
- 8.4 Ms Ahmed was motivated by the Firm's bonus scheme which rewarded high billing. Ms Ahmed aimed to reach the highest bonus tier (400% of salary), potentially earning £69,300. No bonus was paid, however, as the Firm discovered the misconduct in time.
- 8.5 As a result of Ms Ahmed's conduct falling far below expected standards, she acted dishonestly, failed to act with integrity, undermined public trust and confidence in the profession and misled both the LAA, into paying for work, which was not done, and the Firm, into believing that she was eligible for a bonus.

### The Tribunal's Findings

- 8.6 The Tribunal reviewed all the material before it and adopted the SOAF. The Tribunal was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Ms Ahmed's admissions were properly made and that the allegations were proved.
- 8.7 The Tribunal found that Ms Ahmed acted dishonestly and without integrity in recording time against matters where she had not and could not have completed the work claimed. In so doing she had failed to uphold public trust and confidence in the profession.
- 8.8 The Tribunal found that Ms Ahmed breached Principles 2, 4 and 5 of the 2019 Principles. In addition, she breached paragraph 1.4 of the Code for Solicitors by misleading her clients, the Firm and the LAA.

### **Previous Disciplinary Matters**

- 9. None

### **Sanction**

- 10. The Tribunal referred to its Guidance Note on Sanctions (11<sup>th</sup> edition – February 2025) when considering sanction. The Tribunal's overriding objective, when considering sanction, was the need to maintain public confidence in the integrity of the profession. In determining sanction, it was the Tribunal's role to assess the seriousness of the proven misconduct and to impose a sanction that was fair and proportionate in all the circumstances.
- 11. The Tribunal found that the seriousness of Ms Ahmed's dishonest conduct was at the highest level and the resulting, foreseeable harm, both to others and to the reputation of the profession, was such that the sanction of striking off the Roll was fair, reasonable and proportionate.

## Costs

### The Applicant's Submissions

12. Mr Griffiths applied for costs in the sum of £49,600.50 as set out in the schedule dated 3 November 2025. The sum claimed included a reduction of approximately 20% from the net solicitor agent costs incurred, to reflect the admissions made by Ms Ahmed in the SOAF.
13. Mr Griffiths referred to the specific factors on the questions of costs to be taken into account pursuant by the Tribunal pursuant to R 43(4) SDPR and stated that:
  - The Applicant had been successful. All of its allegations were extremely serious and were pursued reasonably and properly, leading to admissions of dishonesty and lack of integrity.
  - The sum claimed by the applicant reflected the amount of time spent on the matter by the Applicant, which was proportionate and unreasonable. It was inevitable that a substantial amount of investigatory work had been required at the outset, particularly as the matter was initially denied and fully contested until July 2025. A lot of time had been spent subsequently on without prejudice negotiations, in an effort to agree an outcome. Ms Ahmed had failed to make an offer to settle the question of costs at any time.
  - Mr Griffiths had prepared a detailed breakdown of the exact time spent by first his client in investigatory work and subsequently his firm in the schedule dated 3 November 2025. Whilst contracted under a fixed fee agreement, the nominal hourly rate for the Applicant's representatives was below guideline hourly rates.
  - The issue of Ms Ahmed's means was in dispute and Mr Griffiths submitted that Ms Ahmed had not established, as set out in Barnes v SRA Ltd [2022] EWHC 677 (Admin), that she would never be able to satisfy an order for costs.
  - Mr Griffiths clarified that Ms Ahmed had submitted two statements of means, dated 28 July 2025 and 30 October 2025. In the latter, Ms Ahmed's expenditure had increased but so had her income because she was presently employed. Mr Griffiths referred the Tribunal to the fact that Ms Ahmed was the sole proprietor of her home, in which she held significant equity, notwithstanding the differential between Ms Ahmed's valuation of the property and the applicant's, which was based on an internet valuation site. Ms Ahmed was also no longer subject to a credit card debt as declared in the first statement.

### The Respondent's Submissions

14. Ms Ahmed acknowledged that she was currently employed as an apprentice with Wigan Council and that her income was higher than when she had previously been employed in the retail sector. She submitted, however, that her income barely covered her outgoings and that she remained in receipt of universal credit and child benefit. She was a single parent to three children.

15. Ms Ahmed explained that her outgoings had increased on her second statement of means because she had recorded her expenses more comprehensively, including car finance. She also explained that she had suffered mental health issues but had recovered to the point where she was able to carry out her current employment.
16. In all the circumstances, however, Ms Ahmed submitted that notwithstanding the opportunities she had had to settle the issue of costs, she had failed to make an offer for the reason that she was unable afford to pay anything.

### The Tribunal's Findings

17. The Tribunal found that the case had been properly brought by the Applicant and that it involved serious allegations of dishonesty and lack of integrity. The Tribunal accepted Mr Griffiths' submissions that the applicant's costs were reasonable and proportionate.
18. The Tribunal took into account Ms Ahmed's modest financial means and had regard to the case of Barnes. The Tribunal did not consider that Ms Ahmed was entirely unable to meet a costs order in a reasonable period; however, it considered it appropriate to reduce the total amount of costs to reflect a fair contribution, taking into account Ms Ahmed's limited means.
19. Balancing all of these factors, the seriousness of the allegations, the conduct of the parties, and the proportionality of the costs claimed, the Tribunal exercised its discretion under Rule 43 to determine a fair and reasonable sum. It was satisfied that the figure of £5,000 was a reasonable contribution, consistent with the principles of compensation, fairness, proportionality and reasonableness.
20. Accordingly, the Tribunal ordered that Ms Ahmed pay the Applicant's costs in the sum of £5,000.00.

### **Statement of Full Order**

21. The Tribunal ORDERED that the Respondent, SAMINA AHMED, 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 £5,000.00.

Dated this 15<sup>th</sup> day of December 2025

On behalf of the Tribunal

*F. Kyriacou*

F. Kyriacou  
Chair