

# **SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL**

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974

Case No. 12774-2025

## **BETWEEN:**

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LTD.

Applicant

and

PAUL SIMON GREEN

Respondent

---

Before:

Ms H Hasan (in the Chair)

Mrs F Kyriacou

Ms J. Rowe

Date of Hearing: 27 October 2025

---

## **Appearances**

There were no appearances as the matter was dealt with on the papers.

---

## **JUDGMENT ON AN AGREED OUTCOME**

---

## **Allegations**

1. The allegations against the Respondent, Paul Simon Green, made by the Applicant within that statement are that, while in practice as a solicitor at Barlow Robbins LLP (“the Firm”), a Recognised Body, and insofar as while in practice, as a solicitor at Judge Sykes Frixou, a Recognised Body, he:

- 1.1. Between 1 January 2010 and 30 August 2010 conspired to make untrue or misleading representations in connection with the purchase of ‘Property 1’, in breach of sections 1 and 2 of the Fraud Act 2006, including representations to Santander and others as to the true identity of the purchaser of ‘Property 1’ the identity of those who would be contributing to the purchase price, the source of the monies that comprised the deposit and the identity of those who would be making payments towards the mortgage, contrary to section 1(1) of the Criminal Law Act 1977.

In so doing he breached any or all of Rules 1.01, 1.02 and 1.06 of the Solicitors’ Code of Conduct 2007.

- 1.2 Between 31 May 2010 and 30 October 2015 converted property, namely money, which, as he knew or suspected, constituted or represented Mr James Alexander Green’s benefit from criminal conduct, contrary to section 327 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002.

In so doing he breached any or all of Rules 1.01, 1.02 and 1.06 of the Solicitors’ Code of Conduct 2007 (for conduct before 6 October 2011) and Principles 1, 2 and 6 of the SRA Principles 2011 (for conduct after 6 October 2011).

2. In addition, allegations 1.1 and 1.2 are advanced on the basis that Mr Green's conduct was dishonest. Dishonesty is alleged as an aggravating feature of Mr Green’s misconduct but is not an essential ingredient in proving the allegations.

## **Documents**

3. The Tribunal had before it the following documents:-
  - Rule 12 Statement and Exhibit NG1 dated 21 May 2025;
  - Respondent’s Answer and Exhibits dated 28 May 2025;
  - Statement of Agreed Facts and Proposed Outcome dated 24 October 2025.

## **Professional Details**

4. The Respondent is a solicitor admitted to the Roll on 2 January 2008.
5. At the material time in respect of the first allegation, the Respondent was employed by the Firm as an Associate Solicitor in its Dispute Resolution department, between 1 January 2010 and 30 August 2010.

6. In respect of the second allegation, the Respondent was employed by the Firm between 31 May 2010 and February 2015 and was then employed by Judge Sykes Frixou Limited as a partner in the Dispute Resolution department, between 1 March 2015 until 30 October 2015.
7. The Respondent remains on the Roll but does not currently hold a practising certificate.

#### **Application for the matter to be resolved by way of Agreed Outcome**

8. The parties invited the Tribunal to deal with the Allegations against the Respondent in accordance with the Statement of Agreed Facts and Outcome annexed to this Judgment. The parties submitted that the outcome proposed was consistent with the Tribunal's Guidance Note on Sanctions.

#### **Findings of Fact and Law**

9. The Applicant was required to prove the allegations to the civil standard, namely on the balance of probabilities. The Tribunal had due regard to its statutory duty under section 6 of the Human Rights Act 1998.
10. Having reviewed all the material before it, the Tribunal was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent's admissions were properly made.
11. In determining sanction, the Tribunal considered the Guidance Note on Sanctions (11<sup>th</sup> Edition, February 2025). It assessed the Respondent's culpability and the harm caused, alongside the relevant aggravating and mitigating factors. The Respondent had admitted all of the allegations, and the Tribunal found that his dishonesty constituted an aggravating feature.
12. Having found the Respondent's conduct to be dishonest, the Tribunal noted that, save in exceptional circumstances, such a finding will ordinarily result in an order striking the solicitor from the Roll. The Tribunal was satisfied that this case did not fall within the small residual category where a strike-off would be disproportionate. Accordingly, it determined that the appropriate sanction was to strike the Respondent from the Roll.

#### **Costs**

13. The parties had agreed costs in the sum of £3,000. The Tribunal found the agreed sum to be reasonable and proportionate. Accordingly, the Tribunal ordered the Respondent to pay costs in the agreed sum.

#### **Statement of Full Order**

14. The Tribunal ORDERED that the Respondent, PAUL SIMON GREEN, 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 £3,000.

Dated this 4<sup>th</sup> day of November 2025  
On behalf of the Tribunal

*H Hasan*

H Hasan  
Chair

BEFORE THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

Case No: 12774-2025

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 (AS AMENDED)

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LIMITED

Applicant

and

PAUL SIMON GREEN

Respondent

---

---

**STATEMENT OF AGREED FACTS AND PROPOSED OUTCOME**

---

---

1. By its application dated 21 May 2025, and the statement made pursuant to Rule 12 (2) of the Solicitors (Disciplinary Proceedings) Rules 2019 which accompanied that application, which was later amended by way of applications dated 8 August 2025, and 28 August 2025 and which was granted by the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (the "Tribunal") on 28 August 2025. The Solicitors Regulation Authority Limited ("the SRA") have brought proceedings before the Tribunal making two allegations of misconduct against Mr Paul Simon Green (the "Respondent").

**The allegations**

2. The allegations against the Respondent, made by the Applicant within that statement are that, while in practice as a solicitor at Barlow Robbins LLP ("the Firm"), a Recognised Body, and insofar as while in practice, as a solicitor at Judge Sykes Frixou, a Recognised Body, he:

- 2.1 Between 1 January 2010 and 30 August 2010 conspired to make untrue or misleading representations in connection with the purchase of Property 1, in breach of sections 1 and 2 of the Fraud Act 2006, including representations to Santander and others as to the true identity of the purchaser of Property 1, the identity of those who would be contributing to the purchase price, the source of

the monies that comprised the deposit and the identity of those who would be making payments towards the mortgage, contrary to section 1(1) of the Criminal Law Act 1977. In doing so he breached all of Rule 1.01, Rule 1.02, Rule 1.06 of the Solicitors Code of Conduct for 2007.

The Applicant relies on the Respondent's conviction for conspiracy to commit fraud by false representations, contrary to section 1(1) of the Criminal Law Act 1977, and sections 1 and 2 of the Fraud Act 2006, in the Southampton Crown Court on 23 May 2024, as evidence that he was guilty of those offences and relies upon the findings of fact upon which those convictions was based as proof of those facts.

2.2 Between 31 May 2010 and 30 October 2015 converted property, namely money, which he knew or suspected, constituted or represented Mr James Alexander Green's benefit from criminal conduct, contrary to section 327 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002. In doing so he breached Rule 1.01, Rule 1.02 and Rule 1.06 of the Solicitors Code of Conduct for 2007 (for conduct before 6 October 2011) and Principle 1, Principle 2 and Principle 6 of the SRA Principles 2011 (for conduct after 6 October 2011).

The Applicant relies on the Respondent's conviction for conversion of criminal property contrary to section 327 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002, in the Southampton Crown Court, on 23 May 2024 as evidence that he was guilty of that offence and relies upon the findings of fact upon which that conviction was based as proof of those facts.

### **Dishonesty**

3. In addition, allegations 2.1 and 2.2 above are advanced on the basis that the Respondent's conduct was dishonest. Dishonesty is alleged as an aggravating feature of the Respondent's misconduct but is not an essential ingredient in proving the allegations.

### **Admissions**

4. On 28 May 2025, the Respondent filed and served an Answer to the Rule 12 Statement in which he admitted all allegations.

### **Agreed Facts**

5. The following facts and matters, which are relied upon by the Applicant in support of the allegations set out within paragraphs two and three of this Statement are agreed between the Applicant and the Respondent.

### **Professional Details**

6. The Respondent, who was born        September 1978, is a solicitor having been admitted to the Roll on 2 January 2008.
7. At the material time, in respect of the first allegation, the Respondent was employed by the Firm as an Associate Solicitor in their Dispute Resolution department between the 1 January 2010 and 30 August 2010. In respect of the second allegation, the Respondent was employed by the Firm, between 31 May 2010 and February 2015 and was then employed by Judge Sykes Frixou Limited, as a Partner in their Dispute Resolution department, between 1 March 2015 until 30 October 2015.
8. The Respondent remains on the Roll but does not currently hold a practising certificate. The last practising certificate the Respondent held was for the 2023/2024 practice year and was subject to conditions which were imposed on 8 April 2024. The conditions imposed on the Respondent's practising certificate during this period was that (1) he shall not act as a manager or owner of any authorised body, authorised non-SRA firm or legal services body; (2) not permitted to be a compliance officer for legal practice (COLP) or compliance officer for finance and administration (COFA) for any authorised body, or head of legal practice (HOLP) or head of finance and administration (HOFA) for any authorised body; (3) not permitted to provide reserved or unreserved legal services on his own account under regulations 10.2 (a) or (b) of the SRA Authorisation of Individuals Regulations; and (4) subject to the conditions above he may act as a solicitor only as an employee and only where the employment has first been approved by the SRA.

## **Background**

9. The conduct in this matter came to the attention of the SRA on 17 December 2019, when the Respondent notified the SRA that he had been interviewed by Hampshire Constabulary on suspicion of conspiracy to commit mortgage fraud and money laundering. He stated at the time that he denied the allegations made against him.
10. On 8 November 2022 the Respondent self-reported to the SRA that he was due to appear before Southampton Magistrates Court in relation to money laundering offences on 18 November 2022. At that time, the Respondent stated that he would be pleading not guilty. The Respondent also informed the SRA that he had resigned as a director of the Firm, and his colleague had taken over the COLP and MLRO roles.

## **Criminal proceedings**

11. On 4 November 2022, the Respondent was charged with two offences relating to mortgage fraud and converting money.
12. On 23 May 2024, the Respondent was tried and convicted at the Southampton Crown Court of conspiracy to commit fraud by false representation and converting criminal property, namely money. The Respondent's certificate of conviction records says that the Respondent was convicted of *"Conspire to commit fraud by false representation, conceal/disguise/ convert/transfer/remove criminal property"*.
13. On 21 June 2024, at Southampton Crown Court, the Respondent was sentenced to 26 months imprisonment. The Respondent was also ordered to pay a victim surcharge in the sum of £120.00. His Honour Judge Peter Henry (HHJ Henry) said in the sentencing remarks at paragraph 2 at page 12, that the Respondent would *"serve half of that sentence before you are released on licence and supervision"*.

## **Details of the offences**

14. The Respondent purchased Property 1 by way of obtaining a residential mortgage from Santander. The Respondent made representations to Santander that he would be the sole beneficial owner of Property 1, it would be registered in his sole name and that all mortgage payments would be made by him. The Respondent knew that



the application he provided contained false information because he knew that his brother, Mr James Alexander Green ("Mr James Green"), would be contributing to the purchase price, making mortgage re-payments and would be residing in the Property 1.

15. A review of the Respondent's bank accounts statements showed large credits were received from Mr James Green in June and July 2010, around the time of the purchase of Property 1. Between 14 September 2010 to 7 September 2015, there were 62 cash payments to the Respondent's bank account(s) in Southampton bank branches totalling £49,871.04. Between 26 October 2010 to 28 September 2015, 60 direct debit payments were made from the Respondent's bank account to the mortgage account totalling £47,528.55.
16. The money was paid to Santander by Mr James Green and was obtained through crime. The Respondent would or ought to have known or suspected that he was converting Mr James Green's property (money) which was from the benefit of crime contrary to section 327 of the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002.
17. HHJ Henry in the sentencing remarks dated 21 June 2024, set out the circumstances of how the Respondent and his brother, Mr James Green, worked with each other and said at paragraph one of page 9 *"In respect of Counts 3 and 6, however, you James Green, were convicted of transferring criminal property in the form of the proceeds of your drug dealing into the private mortgage accounts of Paul Green. And Paul Green, the jury convicted you of converting drug money received from your brother by receiving cash into your accounts. That cash was then used to pay off the monthly repayments on the mortgage and you also received the cash into your Santander account, which paid off the capital"*.
18. In the sentencing remarks, HHJ Henry also said at paragraphs two and three of page 9 *"Miss Clare has argued on your behalf, Paul Green, that there is no evidence of any significant planning. It was not sophisticated, and it was simply allowing your brother to pay money into your accounts. I do not accept that. To approach it in that way is to ignore the fact that albeit I said in my view the mortgage fraud was in itself a small part of the sentencing exercise, it was a significant part in the scheme to get the laundering going. There was a plan to set up this mortgage in order to buy this house and the drug money was used over a considerable period of time to pay off that mortgage. It is significant that drug money was used to pay off the mortgage before even the first mortgage payment was due, and it is clear from the somewhat*

*triumphant messages between you two brothers, when the mortgage was paid off ten years earlier, that what was expected at that time, although things may have changed subsequently, was that once the mortgage had been paid off, the house would be transferred to you James Green, from Paul Green".*

19. In relation to the Respondent's evidence at the hearing, HHJ Henry said in the sentencing remarks at paragraph 2 at page 10, that *"the jury, in my judgment, clearly took the view that contrary to the evidence that you have to the effect that you never looked at bank statements. That you had no idea about the mortgage. Contrary to that view, in my judgment, you were hands on with what was going on. And you may have been acted misguidedly, I do not know, to help your brother but it is clearly that you did know very much more than you were prepared to admit".*

20. HHJ Henry said in the sentencing remarks in relation to the Respondent's position as a solicitor, at paragraph two and three of page 3, *"I have heard evidence of your positive good character, as I say, during the trial, including how proud you were to have become a solicitor. Sadly, by your criminal conduct, you have thrown all that away. You will have no chance now of continuing with that profession undoubtedly, sadly, it will be difficult for you to find employment of that sort of calibre. Also, of course, you have thrown away your good name".* HHJ Henry was of the view that given the serious nature of the conviction, the Respondent would have 'no chance' of continuing to act as a solicitor.

### **Non-Agreed mitigation**

21. The Respondent was asked to provide mitigation on 20 August 2025, and on the same day he confirmed that he had decided not to advance any points of mitigation. It is noted that the Respondent does not contend that there are any exceptional circumstances which would justify the Tribunal in making any order other than he be struck off the Roll.

### **Penalty Proposed and costs**

22. It is therefore proposed, and the Respondent accepts, that the proper penalty in this case is for him to be struck off the Roll of Solicitors.

23. With respect to costs, it is further agreed that the Respondent should pay the SRA's costs of this matter agreed in the sum of £3,000.00.

**Explanation as to why such an order would accord with the Tribunal's sanctions guidance**

24. The parties submit that the proposed outcome represents the appropriate resolution of the matter, consistent with the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal's Guidance Note on Sanctions 11<sup>th</sup> Edition ("Guidance Note") dated February 2025. The Guidance sets out one of the main functions of the Tribunal which is *"to protect the public from harm, and to maintain public confidence in the reputation of the legal profession (and those that provide legal services) for honesty, probity, trustworthiness, independence and integrity"*.
25. The Tribunal's Guidance Note details the Tribunal's approach to sanction, which is set out in *Fuglers and Others v Solicitors Regulation Authority* [2014] EWHC 179 (per Popplewell J) as follows: *"28. There are three stages to the approach. The first stage is to assess the seriousness of the misconduct. The second stage is to keep in mind the purpose for which sanctions are imposed by such a tribunal. The third stage is to choose the sanction which appropriately fulfils that purpose for the seriousness of the conduct in question"*.
26. The Tribunal, when determining the appropriate sanction, first must consider the seriousness of the misconduct. In determining seriousness, the Tribunal must consider the Respondent's culpability for their conduct and the harm caused or the harm that was intended or might reasonably be foreseen to have been caused by their actions. The Respondent wanted to purchase Property 1. The Respondent misled his mortgage provider by providing information which he knew was false. He also accepted funds into his bank account from his brother, Mr James Green, to pay the mortgage, which he knew or ought to have known came from the proceeds of crime. HHJ Henry said in the sentencing remarks at paragraph 3 of page 9 that *"There was a plan to set up this mortgage in order to buy this house and the drug money was used over a considerable period of time to pay off that mortgage"*.
27. The Tribunal's Guidance Note says *"The Tribunal will determine the harm caused by this misconduct and in doing will assess: (1) the impact of the respondent's misconduct on those directly or indirectly affected by the misconduct, the public, and*



*the reputation of the legal profession. The greater the extend of the respondent's departure from the "complete integrity, probity and trustworthiness" expected of a solicitor, the greater harm to the legal profession's reputation; (2) the extend of the harm that was intended or might reasonably have been seen foreseen to be caused by the respondent's misconduct".* The Respondent's mortgage was paid using money obtained from crime. This is serious as many vulnerable people would have indirectly been affected by the Respondent's misconduct. A solicitor who has been convicted of these offences would undoubtedly cause harm to the reputation of the legal profession. The Respondent has admitted both allegations made against him, and the parties agree that the culpability of the Respondent is therefore high.

### **Aggravating factors**

28. The Tribunal's Guidance Note says that there are factors that aggravate the seriousness of the misconduct. The relevant aggravating factors relating to the Respondent's conduct are as follows:

- Dishonesty, where alleged and proved;
- Misconduct involving the commission of a criminal offence, not limited to dishonesty;
- Misconduct which was deliberate and calculated or repeated;
- Misconduct continuing over a period of time; and
- Misconduct where the respondent knew or ought reasonably to have known that the conduct complained of was in material breach of obligations to protect the public and the reputation of the legal profession.

### **Dishonesty, criminal offences, deliberate, long period of time and breach**

29. The Respondent was convicted on 23 May 2024, for conspiracy to commit fraud by false representation and converting criminal property. This conduct by its very nature is dishonest.

30. The Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal's Guidance note at paragraph 28 says "*Some of the most serious misconduct involves dishonesty, whether or not leading to criminal proceedings and criminal penalties. A finding that an allegation of dishonesty has been provided will almost invariably lead to striking off, save in exceptional circumstances (see Solicitors Regulation Authority v Sharma [2010] EWHC 2022 (Admin))*".

31. In *Solicitors Regulation Authority V Sharma* [2010] EWHC 2022 (Admin) at [13] Coulson J summarised the consequences of a finding of dishonesty by the Tribunal against a solicitor as follows:
- (a) *"Save in exceptional circumstances, a finding of dishonesty will lead to the solicitor being struck off the Roll....That is the normal and necessary penalty in cases of dishonesty....."*
  - (b) *"There will be a small number of residual category where striking off will be a disproportionate sentence in all the circumstances....."*
  - (c) *"In deciding whether or not a particular case falls into that category, relevant factors will include the nature, scope and extend of the dishonesty itself, whether it was momentary... or over a lengthy period of time...whether it was a benefit to the solicitor.... And whether it had an adverse effect on others...."*
32. It is submitted that this case does not fall within the small residual category were striking off would be a disproportionate sanction. Accordingly, the proportionate sanction in this case is for the Respondent to be struck off the Roll of Solicitors.
33. The Tribunal's Guidance Note on Sanction says that misconduct involving the commission of a criminal offence aggravates the seriousness of the misconduct. The Respondent pleaded not guilty. HHJ Henry in the sentencing remarks said at paragraph one of page eleven *"...Paul Green, is 26 months and that gives you 25% discount for the delay and a significant discount for the effect upon your family. Had you pleaded guilty, that might have been different, but this is a very serious offence, committed by you, albeit I have not regarded it as an aggravating feature but there you were, a solicitor, knowing that your brother was paying all this cash into your accounts. And this is minimum sentence I can impose"*.
34. Solicitors who commit serious criminal offences should not be permitted to remain on the Roll. As was said by Sir Brian Leveson, then the President of the Queen's Bench Division, in *Solicitors Regulation Authority v Farrimond* [2018] EWHC 321 (Admin) at [34] *"...it is beyond argument that a solicitor sentenced to any substantial terms of imprisonment should not be permitted to remain on the Roll even if suspended"*

*indefinitely....".* The Respondent received a substantial term of imprisonment and the offence of which he was convicted is unquestionably serious.

35. There is a need to protect the public and the reputation of the legal profession from future risk of the Respondent. The Respondent was convicted of conspiracy to commit fraud by false representation and converting money. These are serious acts of dishonesty committed over an extended period which benefited the Respondent and his brother, Mr James Green. This conduct is dishonest. The Tribunal's guidance makes it clear a finding of dishonesty has been proved will almost invariably lead to striking off.
36. In the circumstances, an appropriate sanction to protect the public which is proportionate to the seriousness of the admitted misconduct is that the Respondent should be struck off the Roll of Solicitors.

### **Summary**

37. In all the circumstances of the case, the seriousness of the misconduct in which the Respondent was convicted of, consideration of the necessity to protect the public and maintaining the reputation of the profession, it is submitted that the proposed outcome, which has been agreed between the parties, is proportionate and in the public interest, that the Respondent should be struck off the Roll of solicitors. Further that the Respondent should pay the SRA's costs in the sum of £3,000.

Dated this 24 day of October 2025

.....  
**Head of Legal upon behalf of the SRA**

.....  
**Paul Simon Green**