

SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974

Case No. 12787-2025

BETWEEN:

CYPRIAN AKPELISHI AMGBAH

Applicant

and

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LTD

Respondent

Before:

Mr J Abramson (in the chair)

Mrs A Sprawson

Ms E Keen

Date of Hearing: 15 September 2025

Appearances

The Applicant attended the hearing and represented himself.

Kathryn Hughes, counsel, QEB Hollis Whiteman 1-2 Laurence Pountney Hill London EC4R 0EU for the Respondent.

JUDGMENT

Relevant Background

1. The Applicant is a former solicitor having been admitted to the Roll on 15 June 2002.
2. The Respondent started an inspection of Christchurch Solicitors where the Applicant was the sole equity partner in July 2007 leading to a report dated 7 December 2007. There had been a previous report by the Respondent in 2006 which expressed concerns over how the Applicant reconciled his client account. The Respondent discovered in July 2007 that no postings concerning client or office accounts had been completed since April 2007.
3. The Respondent also conducted an inspection of Elijah & Co where the Applicant was a salaried partner in September 2007 resulting in a report dated 1 April 2008. The Respondent discovered extensive and serious breaches of the Solicitors' Accounts Rules 1998 ("SAR").
4. The resultant disciplinary proceedings against the Applicant commenced in 2008 and the allegations are detailed below.

Substantive Proceedings in 2009

5. The Applicant appeared before the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal ("the Tribunal") on 9 June 2009. The Tribunal found proved the following allegations against the Applicant:

1.1. Failed to comply with Rules 32(1), 32(5) and 32(7) of the SAR by failing to maintain adequate accounts records, being unable to readily ascertain the current balance on each client ledger and by failing to carry out reconciliations;

1.2. Failed to produce accounts records and other documents to the SRA either in the form required or at all, contrary to Rules 34(1) and 34(3) of the SAR;

1.3. Withdrew client monies from the client account otherwise than in accordance with Rule 22(1) of the SAR;

1.4. Failed to comply with Rule 6 of the SAR;

1.5. Withdrew monies in excess of the monies held for the client, contrary to Rule 22(5) of the SAR;

1.6. Provided banking facilities through his client account, contrary to Rule 15 (note ix) of the SAR;

1.7. Made round sum transfers from client to office account to aid the cash flow of his business, contrary to Rule 19(2) of the SAR;

1.8. Failed to remedy Accounts Rules breaches promptly, upon discovery, contrary to Rule 7 of the SAR;

1.9. Held client monies in office account, contrary to Rule 15(1) of the SAR;

1.10. Ignored the Law Society's Money Laundering Guidance, including the "Blue Card" Warning on Money Laundering;

1.11. Held office money in client account, contrary to Rule 15(2) of the SAR;

1.12. Failed to adequately supervise his accounts staff, contrary to Rule 5.01 of the Solicitors Code of Conduct;

1.13. Made secret profits, contrary to Rules 1.02, 1.04, 1.05 and 1.06 of the Solicitors Code of Conduct and Rule 22 of the SAR;

2. Allegations 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9 and 1.10 were advanced on the basis that the conduct was dishonest. Allegations 1.11, 1.12 and 1.13 were offences of strict liability and dishonesty was not alleged.

6. The Applicant admitted allegations 1.1, 1.2, 1.4, 1.8, 1.11, 1.12 and 1.13.
7. The Applicant admitted allegations 1.3, 1.5, 1.7, 1.9 save for the dishonesty element of all of the allegations.
8. The Applicant denied allegations 1.6 and 1.10 in their entirety. In relation to allegation 1.6 the Tribunal said even on the basis of the Applicant's own submissions, at least two transactions were carried out by the Applicant, on behalf of a client (K), which had no apparent relation to the provision of legal services. In respect of money paid to a driver and money paid for a privately funded operation within the NHS. The Tribunal considered letters initially sent out by the First Respondent's practice to K. There appeared to be no underlying legal transaction in which the Applicant was providing legal advice. The Tribunal was sure that in effect banking facilities were being provided.
9. Further, it found that on 18 May 2006 the Applicant paid into the office account £67,782 from the client, K, the same day he accepted the initial instructions. The Applicant took the view that these monies should be paid into office account so that money laundering checks could be made. The payment into office account was in clear breach of the money laundering regulations, as conceded in submissions on behalf of the Applicant. The money should not have been paid into the solicitor's accounts until after the appropriate checks had been made. It was clear the relevant guidance was ignored as was made plain by the payment of money into the account before proper checks had been made. The Tribunal was sure that allegation 1.10 was made out.
10. In relation to the dishonesty allegations the Tribunal applied the test¹ set down in the case **Twinsectra Ltd v Yardley and others [2002] 2 All ER 377** ("Twinsectra"). The Tribunal did not have the benefit of hearing evidence from the Applicant. They were sure that in relation to allegations 1.3, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, 1.9 and 1.10 that the Applicant had acted dishonestly because:-
 - (i) £67,782 of client K's money was paid into office account;
 - (ii) No proper checks were made beforehand;

¹ Twinsectra was the test for dishonesty in place at the time of the substantive proceedings in 2009.

- (iii) The Applicant took £10,000 by way of a fixed fee and took more money for other expenses;
 - (iv) He put money into office account at a time when without it he may have exceeded his overdraft limit. He made round sum transfers; and
 - (v) He admitted being dishonest on those matters to the SRA Investigation Officer, although he equivocated about it in his statement.
11. At the conclusion of the hearing the Tribunal ordered that the Applicant be struck from the Roll. They further ordered him to pay 60% of the costs of and incidental to the application.

The Applicant's Appeal

12. On 8 November 2009, the Applicant filed an appellant's notice and grounds of appeal against the Order of the Tribunal dated 16 October 2009 ("the Appeal"). The Applicant appealed on the grounds that the Tribunal:-
- failed to objectively assess the evidence in support of the Applicant's case thereby reaching an unfair decision;
 - misapplied the case of *Twinsectra*;
 - failed to appreciate the relevance of the impressive evidence of good character placed before it.
13. The Appeal was considered by Lord Justice Laws and Mr Justice Irwin on 6 May 2010 who rejected each of the grounds as follows:-
- *"There is nothing to show that the Tribunal misunderstood the evidence or reached a conclusion on any factual matter which ought to alert this court to the possibility that there might have been an error"*
 - *"there is no question of the SDT having misunderstood the Twinsectra test."* Indeed, the Court found that there was *"nothing in the point."*
 - *"there is simply no basis for supposing that the Tribunal failed to take proper account of the testimonials placed before them."* The Court added that in its view, the decision of the Tribunal was *"very well justified"* and that the decision to strike off the Applicant *"cannot be criticised"*
14. For the reasons outlined above the court rejected the Appeal. Costs in the sum of £12,159.55 were ordered against the Applicant.

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

15. The Application was dated 19 May 2025 and was supported by:-

- The Applicant's Statement in support of Application for Restoration to the Roll dated 16 June 2025 which can be viewed [[here](#)].
- The Applicant's Reply to the Respondent's Answer to his application dated 6 August 2025 which can be viewed [[here](#)].
- The Applicant's Exhibit containing documentary evidence including character references in support of his application.
- Law Society Gazette advert placed by the Applicant dated 4 July 2025.
- Barking & Dagenham Post advert placed by the Applicant dated 9 July 2025.

Witnesses

16. The evidence is quoted or summarised in the findings below. The evidence referred to will be that which was relevant to the findings of the Tribunal, and to facts or issues in dispute between the parties. For the avoidance of doubt, the Tribunal read all of the documents in the case. The absence of any reference to particular evidence should not be taken as an indication that the Tribunal did not read, hear or consider that evidence.
17. The following witnesses provided oral evidence during the hearing:-
 - The Applicant
 - Grace Osewele
 - Ablodun Adewole
 - Richard Ugoh

Applicant's Submissions and Evidence

18. The Applicant accepted full responsibility for the misconduct that led to his being struck off. Although he had initially denied certain allegations at the time of the substantive disciplinary hearing and the Appeal, the Applicant now fully accepted the Tribunal's findings.
19. The Applicant acknowledged that office banking facilities were improperly used and that money was received into the solicitor's accounts without appropriate due diligence, in breach of money laundering regulations. While he initially appealed the Tribunal's decision to the High Court, that appeal being unsuccessful. The Applicant clarified that he now accepted that the Tribunal was correct in its findings, and that the dishonesty found was not only a result of ignorance, but also a breach of the profession's high ethical standards. The Applicant submitted that he regretted not giving evidence at the original hearing. On reflection he viewed that decision as a misjudgement on his part.
20. The Applicant emphasised his remorse, describing the experience of being struck off as a humbling one. He expressed shame for having damaged the reputation of the legal profession and undermining public confidence in it. The Applicant was clear that, had the facts amounted to theft or fraud involving client loss, he would not have brought this application.

21. The Applicant acknowledged that his conduct was unacceptable, particularly the lack of proper understanding of the accounts rules and anti-money laundering obligations. Nonetheless, the Applicant asserted that his failures stemmed from inexperience and a lack of proper oversight rather than from any malicious intent. The Applicant submitted that he now had a far more comprehensive understanding of legal and regulatory frameworks and emphasised his commitment to upholding the highest standards if restored to the Roll.
22. In relation to rehabilitation and professional development, the Applicant referenced his employment as an Immigration Caseworker. This employment was subject to approval from the Respondent², which had imposed restrictions and conditions on his practice. The Applicant confirmed that he has fully complied with those conditions.
23. The Respondent first granted the Applicant permission in May 2020 to work under supervision, limited to immigration work. In July 2023, his permissions were expanded to include family law, probate, and general litigation, reflecting the Respondent's assessment of his progress and reduced regulatory risk. The Respondent had noted that while his original misconduct was serious, given the Applicant's compliance and employment history, he did not present an ongoing risk to clients or public confidence.
24. The Applicant referenced his training in areas including legal ethics, regulatory compliance, the Solicitors Accounts Rules, and immigration law. Details of one course only, on accounts rules (dated 2020), were formally submitted as evidence. The Applicant explained that he had completed numerous additional professional courses and chosen to provide selected examples to the Tribunal rather than an exhaustive list. He noted that the volume of material running to over 100 pages of course material demonstrated what had been covered and completed.
25. The Applicant submitted that he was an active member of a number of professional associations including Immigration Law Practitioners' Association, International Bar Association, Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants, Commonwealth Lawyers Association and the Nigerian Bar Association.
26. The Applicant emphasised that since being struck off, he has had no client complaints, faced no further regulatory action and had no criminal convictions. This record over a sustained period was said to demonstrate his rehabilitation and suitability for restoration.
27. The Applicant outlined several motivating factors for seeking restoration including that it would enhance and increase the effectiveness of his representation of clients. While he currently supported clients in his caseworker role, being restored to the Roll would allow him fully to represent clients and act as a solicitor, thereby better serving the public. The Applicant also submitted that he viewed restoration to the Roll as a step towards full professional responsibility, subjecting himself once again to the high standards expected of solicitors and demonstrating his integrity to clients, colleagues, and the courts. Accountability was said to be at the heart of the Application. The Applicant also referred to his significant rehabilitation and submitted that his record justified trust being placed in him again by the profession and the public.

² Pursuant to S.41 of the Solicitors Act 1974

28. The Applicant acknowledged that the Respondent opposed his application and submitted that his application was founded on rehabilitation and current suitability for practice, without seeking to deny the seriousness of his past misconduct and its consequences.
29. In response to criticism levelled by the Respondent for failing to mention the Appeal in his application, the Applicant explained that there was no intention on his part to minimise or avoid. The Applicant explained that omitting that detail was a deliberate decision as he did not seek to revisit or challenge those proceedings (which he now accepts unequivocally). The Applicant emphasised that he regretted his past misconduct but that his application for restoration should be assessed based on his current position and future prospects. The Applicant submitted that he now meets the standards of trustworthiness, integrity and probity required for restoration to the Roll and invited the Tribunal to have regard to the steps taken as part of his rehabilitation.
30. The Applicant submitted that he recognised the paramount importance of maintaining public confidence in the profession and the administration of justice. The Applicant contended that his restoration would not undermine that confidence, as he has already been entrusted with significant responsibilities by SRA-authorized firms, under supervision, without incident.
31. The Applicant referenced the consistent regulatory oversight from the Respondent, which included decisions in 2020, 2022, and 2023 permitting and expanding his permissible employment within the profession. The Applicant submitted that this represented relevant evidence that he no longer posed a risk to the profession, clients, or public confidence. The Applicant maintained that the only substantive change restoration would bring is the return of the “solicitor” title; his work, supervision, and responsibilities would remain largely the same.
32. The Applicant submitted that his restoration to the Roll would not diminish public confidence in the profession. He emphasised that he was committed to upholding the integrity and high standards of the profession moving forward. The Applicant confirmed that he remained willing to accept conditions and supervision as necessary upon any return to practice.

Respondent Submissions

33. The Respondent’s Answer to the application dated 18 July 2025 can be viewed [\[here\]](#).
34. The Respondent opposed the application citing, *inter alia*, the seriousness of the Applicant’s original misconduct and the insufficiency of the evidence provided in support of his rehabilitation.
35. In relation to the seriousness of the Applicant’s underlying conduct, the Respondent submitted that the Applicant was struck off the Roll after a total of 13 allegations, including six involving dishonesty, were found proved by the Tribunal. The dishonesty took place over a prolonged period and involved premeditated and planned deception. The Tribunal’s Guidance Note³ emphasised that such conduct constituted an almost

³ Guidance Note on Other Powers of the Tribunal (7th Edition), February 2025.

insurmountable obstacle to a successful application for restoration. As a consequence of the serious nature of the Applicant's conduct it was highly likely that, if the Applicant was restored to the Roll, the reputation of the profession and public confidence in the provision of legal services would be seriously undermined.

36. The Respondent contended that the Applicant did not adequately demonstrate insight, remorse, or sufficient reflection into the causes of the original misconduct. While the Applicant had made a general statement of acknowledgment and had expressed an understanding of the importance of trust in the profession, the Respondent noted that there had been no apology for the damage caused to the profession, nor any substantive exploration of what had gone wrong and why.
37. The application statement included a single paragraph, asserting that the Applicant accepted responsibility and had spent time reflecting. The Respondent submitted that this lacked depth and failed to display genuine insight into the gravity of the misconduct. In particular, there was no reference in the application to the unsuccessful appeal to the High Court, which had challenged the Tribunal's original findings. This demonstrated a continued reluctance fully to accept the nature and seriousness of the misconduct.
38. On rehabilitation, the Respondent addressed the Applicant's employment within the profession and his record of training and continuing professional development.
39. On 13 May 2020, the Applicant was granted permission by the Respondent to work as an Immigration Caseworker and took up a position with David Wyld & Co on 1 June 2020. On 4 July 2023, further permission with conditions was granted by the Respondent allowing the Applicant to undertake immigration law, family law, probate and general litigation cases. A reference letter dated 9 June 2025 and signed by Grace Osewele, a partner at David Wyld & Co. supports the Application. Ms Osewele states that she is "*aware that... [the Applicant] is happy to still be under the same conditions as previously accepted by the SRA, namely that he will continue to be directly supervised by the partners of the firm*" and in particular by her. She states further that the Applicant "*will not have any access to office or client account, will not be a signatory to any client account or office account and will not have any responsibility for the firm's accounting functions.*"
40. In relation to supervision, the Respondent noted that the Applicant's current supervisor, Ms Osewele, supported the application and confirmed that he remained subject to close supervision. In her oral evidence, however, she stated that she met with the Applicant infrequently and that he was not entrusted with a high volume of cases under her direct supervision. The Respondent submitted that this undermined the probative value of her endorsement, as her insight into the Applicant's day-to-day conduct and judgment was necessarily limited.
41. The Respondent noted the positive references relied on by the Applicant in support of his application and the oral evidence received by the Tribunal from witnesses attesting to his character and professionalism. The Respondent referred to **Bolton v The Law Society [1994] 1 WLR 512** ("Bolton") in which Sir Thomas Bingham, the then Master of the Rolls, stated:

“It often happens that a solicitor appearing before the Tribunal can adduce a wealth of glowing tributes from his professional brethren. He can often show that for him and his family the consequences of striking off or suspension would be little short of tragic. Often he will say, convincingly, that he has learned his lesson and will not offend again. On applying for restoration after striking off, all these points may be made, and the former solicitor may also be able to point to real efforts made to re-establish himself and redeem his reputation. All these matters are relevant and should be considered. But none of them touches the essential issue, which is the need to maintain among members of the public a well-founded confidence that any solicitor whom they instruct will be a person of unquestionable integrity, probity and trustworthiness....”

42. The Respondent invited the Tribunal to consider that there had been a noticeable flurry of training and continuing professional development activity in 2020, coinciding with his application for permission to work within the legal sector. There was a further cluster of activity in 2025, shortly before the present application for restoration to the Roll. The Respondent submitted that such courses, particularly when undertaken in anticipation of regulatory applications, carried limited evidential weight.
43. The Respondent invited the Tribunal to consider the impact upon the reputation of the profession and the trust the public places in the provision of legal services. When considering whether the Applicant should be restored to the Roll, regard should be had to the comments made by the Court in Bolton⁴, Thobani⁵, Kaberry⁶ and Ellis-Carr⁷.
44. In Bolton, Sir Thomas Bingham stated that “...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.”
45. The Tribunal was invited to consider whether restoration would affect the good name and reputation of the solicitors’ profession, whether it would be contrary to the interests of the public and whether there was any real prospect that the Applicant can be regarded as someone who is fit to be on the Roll.
46. The Respondent submitted that allowing the restoration to the Roll in the Applicant’s case would affect the good name and reputation of the solicitors’ profession and that it would damage the public confidence in the provision of legal services. In view of the very serious findings made against him, which included multiple instances of dishonesty, the public would not consider the Applicant to be a fit person to be on the Roll.
47. The Respondent respectfully submitted that, in all the circumstances, the Applicant was not a suitable person to be re-admitted to the Roll, that this is not an exceptional case, and that the Applicant’s application to be restored to the Roll should be rejected.

⁴ Bolton v Law Society 1 WLR 512 (“Bolton”)

⁵ Thobani v The Solicitors Regulation Authority [2011] EWHC 3783 (Admin) (“Thobani”)

⁶ SRA v Simon Kaberry [2012] EWHC 3883 (Admin) (“Kaberry”)

⁷ Ellis-Carr v Solicitors Regulation Authority [2014] EWHC 2411 (Admin) (“Ellis-Carr”)

The Tribunal's Decision

48. The Tribunal referred to 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.
49. 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.
50. The Tribunal, in considering the application paid significant regard to (amongst other things) the guidance provided by Bolton "... *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...*"
51. 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....*"
52. The Tribunal also noted the principle promulgated in Kaberry 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...*"
53. The Tribunal considered carefully the judgment from the substantive proceedings in 2009 and the judgment of Lord Justice Laws and Mr Justice Irwin in the 2010 High Court Appeal. The Tribunal also considered the oral evidence received from the

Applicant and the other witnesses, the documentary evidence filed by the parties and the submissions made in the course of the hearing.

54. The matters leading to the Applicant's removal from the Roll were of the utmost gravity in view of the proven allegations of dishonesty.
55. The Applicant's application for restoration to the Roll was made around 16 years after he had been struck off the Roll. It was, therefore, not premature. The Tribunal noted that the Applicant had undertaken relevant and meaningful work in the profession since 2020, following permission for approved employment granted by the SRA.
56. The Tribunal considered the character evidence relied upon by the Applicant, in particular, the oral evidence of Mr Ugoh and Mr Adewole who had known the Applicant for many years. Although their evidence provided insight into the Applicant's integrity, aptitude and commitment to the profession, the Tribunal felt that the evidence was of limited weight regarding the Applicant's rehabilitation, as they had no direct or recent professional experience of working with the Applicant. The Tribunal noted that the Application would have benefitted from evidence from solicitors with recent experience of supervising and/or working closely with the Applicant.
57. Ms Osewele confirmed that she supervised the Applicant in the authorised employment undertaken at her firm. The Tribunal found her evidence to be clear and the arrangements in place at her firm regarding her supervision of the Applicant to be conscientious. Ms Osewele also detailed how the restrictions on the Applicant's practice, mandated by the SRA, had been operationalised. The Tribunal accepted the Applicant's evidence that, moving forward, he had no desire to practise as a manager or partner or to have any client money responsibilities. The Applicant indicated that, were he to be readmitted to the Roll, he would happily continue to work under conditions restricting his practice as a measure of regulatory control.
58. Ms Osewele was positive about the Applicant's work and she submitted that he had, in her view, been rehabilitated. The Tribunal found, however, that the weight that could be attached to her evidence regarding the Applicant's current practice was tempered by the infrequency of her professional interactions with him and the low volume of cases where she supervised the Applicant's work.
59. The Applicant had submitted evidence of his participation in professional courses and training activities as part of his rehabilitation. The Tribunal noted that there was a flurry of this type of training activity in advance of his regulatory application, rather than a consistent pattern of training over time. The Tribunal found that this did not demonstrate a sustained commitment to maintaining and updating his knowledge and remaining abreast of developments in legal practice. The Applicant stated that he had submitted only a specimen of the available evidence of his training activities in support of his application for restoration to the Roll. The Tribunal noted that his application would have benefited from comprehensive supporting evidence regarding the professional courses referred to by the Applicant in his oral evidence, both in relation to course content and their completion dates.
60. The Tribunal considered the Applicant's evidence of rehabilitation in light of his expressions of remorse regarding the circumstances that brought about the substantive

proceedings. The Applicant had stated in his oral evidence that he was involved in his local community including acting a trustee at a church. This was an important example of his giving back and assisting his community with his professional expertise. The Applicant did not submit any references or evidence of this work and the Tribunal noted that such evidence would have assisted the Application.

61. The Tribunal found that the Applicant had clearly taken positive steps towards rehabilitation however the weight that could be attached to this was impacted by the Applicant's failure to support what had been said in evidence with supporting documentary material.
62. The Tribunal noted that no objections had been made in response to the publication of the advertisements.
63. The Tribunal was required to consider the Application on its merits and determine whether the public would be protected, whether 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.
64. The Respondent's misconduct included six allegations of dishonesty that occurred over a protracted period of time involving a variety of breaches that had been discovered by the SRA rather than through the Applicant's firm's compliance processes. The Tribunal's finding of dishonesty was subsequently upheld by two judges of the High Court. Consequently, the Applicant faced a high bar in seeking restoration to the Roll.
65. In light of the Tribunal's findings regarding the Applicant's absence or paucity of supporting evidence of rehabilitation, considered in the context of the seriousness of the misconduct that had been found proved at the substantive hearing and upheld on appeal, the Tribunal found that, based on the evidence before the Tribunal, the high threshold for restoration to the Roll was not met.
66. The Tribunal concluded that it would not be in the public interest to restore the Applicant to the Roll of Solicitors. The Tribunal therefore REFUSED the Application.

Costs

67. Ms Hughes applied for the Respondent's costs in defending the Application of £4,709.59 as particularised in the Respondent's Statement of Costs dated 9 September 2025.
68. The Applicant did not oppose the application.

The Tribunal's Decision

69. The Tribunal considered the costs claimed to be reasonable and proportionate to the application.
70. The Tribunal noted that the Applicant had not filed a Statement of Means pursuant to Rule 43(5) The Solicitors (Disciplinary Proceedings) Rules 2019, nor had any

submissions been advanced regarding his means at the hearing. The Applicant had not opposed the application for costs. The Tribunal therefore GRANTED the application for costs in the sum of £4709.59.

Statement of Full Order

71. The Tribunal ORDERED that the application of CYPRIAN AKPELISHI AMGBAH 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 £4,709.59.

Dated this 29th day of October 2025

On behalf of the Tribunal

J Abramson

J. Abramson
Chair