

SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974

Case No. 12860-2025

BETWEEN:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LTD

Applicant

and

RACHEL PARKER

Respondent

Before:

Mrs C Evans (in the chair)

Ms H Hasan

Dr Priya Iyer

Date of Hearing: 19 February 2026

Appearances

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

JUDGMENT ON AN AGREED OUTCOME

Allegations

1. The allegations against Ms Parker, made by the Solicitors Regulation Authority Limited (“the SRA”) were that, while in practice as a Solicitor at Buckles Solicitors LLP (“the Firm”):
 - 1.1 Between 23 September 2022 and 23 November 2023, she made statements to clients, colleagues, and others in correspondence and/or in telephone conversations, which she knew or ought to have known were misleading in that she told them:
 - 1.1.1 she had submitted applications for Grants of Probate (“GOPs”); and
 - 1.1.2 she had chased with the Probate Registry applications for GOPs when she had not done so, and thereby breached any or all of Principles 2, 4 and 5 of the SRA Principles (“the Principles”) and Paragraphs 1.4 and 3.2 of the SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs and RFLS (“the Code for Solicitors”).
2. Ms Parker admitted the allegations, including that her conduct was dishonest in breach of Principle 4 of the Principles.

Documents

3. The Tribunal had before it the following documents: -
 - Rule 12 Statement and Exhibit AHJW1 dated 17 October 2025
 - Statement of Agreed Facts and Proposed Outcome dated 10 February 2026

Professional Details

4. Ms Parker was admitted to the Roll in February 2019. She did not hold a current Practising Certificate. Her employment with the Firm terminated when she was dismissed on 12 March 2024.

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

5. The parties invited the Tribunal to deal with the Allegations against Ms Parker 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 (11th edition - February 2025).

Findings of Fact and Law

6. The Applicant was required to prove the allegations on the 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 rights 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.
7. The Tribunal reviewed all the material before it and was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Ms Parker’s admissions were properly made.

8. The Tribunal considered the Guidance Note on Sanction (11th edition - February 2025). In doing so the Tribunal assessed the culpability and harm identified together with the aggravating and mitigating factors that existed. Between 23 September 2022 and 23 November 2023 Ms Parker made statements in correspondence and during telephone calls to clients, colleagues and Barclays Bank which suggested that she had submitted GOP applications and chased GOP applications with the Probate Registry when she had not. At least eight instances of this misconduct were identified. The Tribunal found that the dishonest conduct was deliberate, calculated and repeated over a period of over a year. Ms Parker created a substantial risk of serious harm to her clients.
9. The Tribunal found that Ms Parker tried to conceal her wrongdoing as she did not state when asked that she had not submitted the GOP applications or chased the Probate Registry. The Tribunal further found that Ms Parker knew or ought reasonably to have known that her misconduct was a material breach of her professional obligations to protect the public and the reputation of the legal profession. The Tribunal determined that, in light of the dishonesty, the only appropriate and proportionate sanction was to strike Ms Parker off the Roll of Solicitors. The Tribunal did not find that there were any exceptional circumstances that would justify a lesser sanction.
10. Accordingly, the Tribunal approved the sanction proposed by the parties.

Costs

11. The parties had agreed costs in the sum of £5,000. The Tribunal found the agreed sum to be reasonable and proportionate. Accordingly, the Tribunal ordered Ms Parker to pay costs in the agreed sum.

Statement of Full Order

12. The Tribunal ORDERED that the Respondent, RACHEL PARKER, 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 13th day of March 2026

On behalf of the Tribunal

C. Evans

C. Evans
Chair

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 (as amended)

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LIMITED

Applicant

and

RACHEL PARKER

Respondent

STATEMENT OF AGREED FACTS AND PROPOSED OUTCOME

1. By its application dated 16 October 2025 and the statement dated 17 October 2025 made pursuant to Rule 12 of the Solicitors (Disciplinary Proceedings) Rules 2019 which accompanied that application, the Solicitors Regulation Authority Ltd (“**the SRA**”) brought proceedings before the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (“**the Tribunal**”) making one allegation of misconduct against Rachel Parker (“**the Respondent**”).

The allegations

2. The allegation against the Respondent made by the SRA is that, while in practice as a Senior Solicitor at Buckles Solicitors LLP (“**the Firm**”):

- 2.1 Between 23 September 2022 and 23 November 2023, she made statements to clients, colleagues, and others in correspondence and/or in telephone conversations, which she knew or ought to have known were misleading in that she told them:

- 2.1.1 she had submitted applications for Grants of Probate (“**GOPs**”); and

- 2.1.2 she had chased with the Probate Registry applications for GOPs

when she had not done so, and thereby breached any or all of Principles 2, 4, and 5 of the SRA Principles (“**the Principles**”) and Paragraphs 1.4 and 3.2 of the SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs, and RFLs (“**the Code for Solicitors**”).

Admissions

3. The Respondent admits each and all of the allegations and breaches set out within paragraph 2 above. The Respondent also accepts the factual basis of the admitted allegations as set out within this document.

Agreed facts

Background

4. The following facts and matters are agreed between the SRA and the Respondent.
5. The Respondent, who was born on July 1989, is a solicitor having been admitted to the Roll on 1 February 2019 (SRA ID: 584388). She currently does not hold a practising certificate. At the time of the allegations, she was a solicitor in the Firm’s Private Client office, where she practised exclusively in their Estate Administration team.
6. The conduct in this matter came to the attention of the SRA on 24 March 2024, when the Director of Risk and Compliance at the Firm informed the SRA that the Respondent had given notice to resign on 11 December 2023. She was placed on gardening leave with an agreed formal end of employment date of 12 March 2024. The Respondent formally left the Firm on 12 March 2024 and a subsequent internal investigation into her handling of eight client probate matters was conducted.
7. The alleged conduct occurred between approximately 23 September 2022 and 23 November 2023.
8. In summary, the Respondent’s role was to make applications to the Probate Registry for GOPs. Where an IHT400 form is required (on taxable estates where inheritance tax or IHT is due or would be subject to IHT but for the estate qualifying for exemptions or reliefs), there are two stages to an application for probate. The first stage involves the submission of the IHT form to HM Revenue & Customs (HMRC). The second stage, is the application to the Probate Registry within HM Courts & Tribunal Service (HMCTS), which includes the original will and a legal

statement signed by the proving executors. The applicant must wait 20 working days before submitting the application to the Probate Registry. A GOP will only be issued if both stages are satisfied.

9. Current guidance issued by the Probate Registry suggests that the application for a GOP is estimated to take 16 weeks, starting from the date on which the application is made to the Probate Registry.

10. Between 23 September 2022 and 23 November 2023, the Respondent made statements in correspondence and/or during telephone calls to clients, colleagues, and Barclays Bank which suggested that she had:

10.1. submitted GOP applications on behalf of clients;

10.2. chased GOP applications with the Probate Registry,

when she had not. There were eight such instances.

Allegation 1.1 – Making statements to clients, colleagues, and others in emails and / or in telephone conversations, which she knew or ought to have known were misleading

Case 1: Deceased 1

11. Clients 1 and 2, the son and daughter-in-law respectively of Deceased 1, instructed the Firm in connection with the estate of Deceased 1, who died in September 2022. The Respondent was the solicitor responsible for this matter. It was necessary to obtain a GOP in order to administer the estate.

12. On 24 March 2023, the Firm's case management system showed that a letter was sent to HMRC, stating that the completed IHT400 and IHT421 forms were enclosed. A cover sheet recorded on 19 April 2023 showed that documents were to be sent to HMCTS to obtain the GOP. There is no response or acknowledgement from HMCTS, although a letter from HMRC records that the Respondent had sent the IHT400 and covering letter on 29 September 2023.

13. On 7 July 2023, the Respondent stated to Client 2 in an email: "*I am yet to receive the Grant of Probate but am chasing the Registry...*". There is no evidence in the Firm's case management system to show that the Respondent, or anyone else,

had corresponded with the Probate Registry between 19 April 2023 and 29 September 2023.

14. On 30 October 2023, HMRC sent a letter to the Respondent, in which they requested a copy of the will and any codicils, which had not been included with the IHT400, and stated that they "*had not been able to speak to*" the Respondent "*on the telephone on Friday 27 October 2023*" and on "*30 October 2023*". A copy of the will is required for GOP applications.

Case 2: Deceased 2

15. Client 3, the son of Deceased 2, instructed the Firm in connection with the estate of Deceased 2, who died in August 2023. The Respondent was the solicitor responsible for this matter.
16. The estate was complex, and included properties held in a trust as well as an overseas property. The sale of the properties were being dealt with by a paralegal in the Firm, namely Paralegal 1. It was necessary to obtain a GOP before property sales could proceed.
17. On 23 November 2023, the Respondent emailed her colleague Paralegal 1, stating that the client had "*signed the probate papers and the application is submitted*" The Respondent also stated that "*it will likely be 16-20 weeks before the Grant is issued*". In fact, no such application was made until after the Respondent left the Firm.
18. On 19 December 2023, Paralegal 2, a paralegal in the Firm, emailed the Respondent to state: "*We have received the signed legal statement [for the estate]. There is a mistake on the date the deceased was born, so if you wanted to share the case with me, I will be more than happy to sort the date and then get the application submitted.*"
19. On 6 March 2024, there was a meeting between the Firm and Client 3, during which the client passed an original copy of the will to the Firm.
20. During a telephone meeting on 1 March 2024, Client 3 expressed his disappointment when informed that the Firm had not yet submitted the application for the GOP, and stated that he had been told repeatedly by members of staff at the Firm that the application had been filed, and he was expecting to come through any day. The telephone note of this conversation states that the client was "*very concerned*" and "*incredibly disappointed*" that an application for a grant of probate had not been submitted, and that the client stated that ongoing property matters related to the estate which would be "*adversely affected*". The client had previously

handed all the original documentation to the Respondent, and expressed concern when asked to provide his father's original will.

Case 3: Deceased 3

21. Clients 4, 5, 6, and 7, the four daughters of Deceased 3, instructed the Firm in connection with the estate of Deceased 3, who died in August 2022. The Respondent was the solicitor responsible for this matter.
22. The estate was "*complex*", and included properties in England and France which had to be valued.
23. On 21 December 2022, the Respondent sent the IHT400 to the clients for their approval. On 3 January 2023, the signed IHT400 was sent to HMRC. On 24 January 2023, the application for a GOP was made to HMCTS. The properties were put up for sale, and some potential buyers were identified. However, no further progress could be made until the GOP was obtained.
24. On 30 June 2023, one of the clients emailed the Respondent for an update on the case. On 1 July 2023, the client emailed Stephen Duffy, one of the Firm's partners, complaining about the delay and the lack of response from the Respondent.
25. On 3 July 2023, the Respondent sent an email to all the clients, in which she stated: "*I appreciate how frustrating this is and I have been regularly chasing the Registry since we hit the 16 week timeframe. I had thought I'd advised you that I was chasing them regularly but my apologies if this was not clear. Although it is often futile to chase them, we still do chase regularly in the hope that it will get the Grant issued, so please do be assured that I am doing so*". Furthermore, the Respondent stated: "*I will chase the Registry again this afternoon and let you know the outcome*".

Case 4: Deceased 4

26. Clients 8 and 9, the two sons of Deceased 4, instructed the Firm in connection with the estate of Deceased 4, who died in December 2022. The Respondent was the solicitor responsible for this matter.
27. The estate included a property which could only be sold on obtaining the GOP. On 15 March 2023, the Respondent sent an email to Client 8, in which she stated: "*I have submitted the Probate Application, so we are likely to receive this in roughly 16 weeks' time.*"

28. The relevant IHT forms (IHT400 and IHT421) were completed, sent to the clients for signature, and sent to HMRC on 20 March 2023.
29. However, the Respondent did not submit the GOP application to the Probate Registry, despite telling her client that she had done so.
30. The Firm's case management system shows very little activity between 20 March 2023 and 6 November 2023.
31. On 6 November 2023, the client complained to another member of staff at the Firm.
32. On 7 November 2023, Fee Earner 1, the Respondent's supervisor, emailed her stating that there had been a complaint on the matter. The Respondent's supervisor stated that whilst the Respondent had submitted the application to HMRC in March, there was no Legal Statement on the file and it had not been submitted to the Probate Registry. The Respondent's supervisor asked the Respondent to (among other things) submit the application to the Probate Registry.

Case 5: Deceased 5

33. Deceased 5 died in a care home and without close relatives in August 2021. The Respondent was the solicitor responsible for this matter. Two employees of the Firm, Client 10 and Client 11, were instructed to act as executors of the estate, which was to form a charitable trust.
34. The Firm sent letters to Barclays Bank on 14 March 2022 and 30 November 2022. This prompted a reply from Barclays Bank on 23 February 2023, in which it stated that it needed a GOP or Letters of Administration to release funds. There was a further reply to the same effect on 26 April 2023.
35. The Respondent took no steps in response to this letter until 4 September 2023, at which time she prepared a letter to Barclays Bank purporting to enclose a certified copy of the GOP. No further steps were taken by the Respondent in relation to this matter.
36. On 19 February 2024, the Firm received a letter from Barclays Bank, stating that they still required a GOP. At this stage, the matter had been transferred to Fee Earner 2 at the Firm. Fee Earner 2 telephoned Barclays twice on 15 March 2024. Barclays Bank confirmed that it had never received a GOP, had received no correspondence from the Firm since 2022 and did not receive the letter of September 2023 either.

37. The Firm's case management system showed that no application for probate in this case was ever made and it would not have been possible for the Respondent to enclose a certified copy of the GOP with the letter of 4 September 2023.

Case 6: Deceased 6

38. The Firm was instructed by Client 12, who was the representative of the elderly parents of a Deceased 6, who died in March 2023, in connection with the administration of the estate of Deceased 6. The Respondent was the solicitor responsible for this matter.

39. On 30 October 2023, Client 12 asked for an update.

40. On 21 November 2023, the Respondent stated in an email, "*The Probate Application has been submitted, so it is a bit of a waiting game for the Grant to be issued at the moment.*".

41. On 30 November 2023, Paralegal 2, a paralegal, emailed the Respondent asking whether the application for a GOP had been sent and offering to send it to the Probate Registry.

42. On 12 December 2023, the Respondent sent an email to the executors' representative, in which she stated that she was mistaken in believing the GOP had been made in November. The Respondent apologised and stated that she had submitted the application that day. The application was subsequently acknowledged as received by HMCTS on 22 December 2023.

Case 7: Deceased 7

43. The Firm was instructed by the husband (Client 15) and two sons (Clients 13 and 14) of a lady (Deceased 7) who died in January 2022. The Respondent was the solicitor responsible for this matter.

44. Instructions were taken to apply for a GOP at a meeting on 11 February 2022.

45. On 15 September 2022, Client 13 emailed the Respondent asking for an update. The Respondent replied on 23 September 2022, stating: "*The application is with the Probate Registry at the moment but they are unfortunately taking several months to process even straight forward applications at the moment. I am chasing this application, together with several others that the Probate Registry haven't processed yet, and hope to have better news for you soon.*"

46. On 25 January 2023, Client 13 again emailed the Respondent asking for an update. On 7 February 2023, the Respondent replied: *"I am still chasing the Probate Registry unfortunately. There are a large number of applications that they are taking well over a year to process, so hopefully it will not be much longer."*
47. On 26 June 2023, Client 13 emailed the Respondent again, stating: *"I don't understand why this is taking so long. I know of people who passed away after my Mum, with much more complex estates who have had their probates finalised months ago. Can you let me know what is happening and update regularly please as my Dad has become concerned about this."*
48. On 27 June 2023, the Respondent replied to Client 13, stating: *"I fully appreciate your frustration with the length of time this is taking. I am chasing the Probate Registry and until the Grant comes through I am halted on what I can progress. Unfortunately the Probate Registry has been a lottery for the last few years issuing some applications quickly and taking a ridiculous amount of time over others. I am sorry this has become a concern for your Dad and can certainly update you regularly to put his mind at rest. I'll chase the Probate Registry again tomorrow and update you after I have done so and will continue to regularly update you thereafter".*
49. On 27 September 2023, the Respondent responded to Client 13, who had informed her that his deceased mother's Premium Bonds had won a prize, stating: *"I have checked up on the Probate Application and whilst the Registry are not willing to give timeframes, they did confirm that the application is being examined at the moment. I can't guarantee what that means in terms of when it will be issued but it is definitely progress and hopefully means it won't be much longer now."*
50. There is no evidence of any steps having been taken by the Respondent to obtain a GOP for the client's estate from the initial meeting with the clients in February 2022 until 27 September 2023, when the Probate Registry confirmed that it had received documents in support of an application and that a GOP would usually be granted within about 16 weeks of submitting the application.

Case 8: Deceased 8 and 9

51. Client 16 instructed the Firm in connection with the administration of the estates of his mother, Deceased 8, who died in February 2023, and Deceased 8's daughter, Deceased 9, who died in May 2023. Deceased 9 had been an executor of Deceased 8's estate. The Respondent was the solicitor responsible for the matter.
52. The estate included three properties, all of which were jointly owned by the lady and her daughter.

53. On 17 October 2023, the Respondent emailed the Firm's Residential Conveyancing department, stating: "*I am dealing with the estates of both [Person A and Person B], the joint owners of the property, and grant applications have been made in both estates. I am expecting to receive the grants around February time, and the buyer has been made aware of the timeframe.*"
54. On 17 October 2023, during a telephone conversation with Client 16, the Respondent advised him that the timeframe for issue of the GOP was 3-4 months. The Respondent re-stated this time estimate in an email to one of the beneficiaries on the same day: "*I would expect the Grants of Probate to be issued in around 3-4 months' time*".
55. On 22 December 2023, the Respondent emailed Paralegal 2, a paralegal the Firm, asking her to "*submit the application online*" on the file. Therefore, no application had been made prior to this date by the Respondent.
56. The application for GOP was ultimately submitted on or around 15 February 2024.

Aggravating factors

57. The principal factors which aggravate the seriousness of the Respondent's misconduct are:
- 57.1. Dishonesty;
- 57.2. Misconduct which was deliberate and calculated and/or repeated;
- 57.3. Concealment of wrongdoing, as the Respondent did not state when asked that she had not submitted the GOP applications and/or chased the Probate Registry; and
- 57.4. Misconduct where the Respondent knew or ought reasonably to have known that the conduct described as in material breach of professional obligations to protect the public and the reputation of the legal profession.

Non-agreed mitigation

58. The following mitigation, which is not agreed by the SRA, is advanced by the Respondent:
- 58.1 The Respondent was admitted as a solicitor on 1 February 2019, and other than the matters, which are the subject of this AO, has a prior exemplary regulatory and disciplinary history.

58.2 The Respondent was experiencing significant mental health challenges, including symptoms consistent with anxiety and depression and which were exacerbated by excessive workloads, personal stressors, and a lack of adequate support at work. These difficulties directly contributed to her inability to manage deadlines, communications, and follow through on tasks.

58.3 There was no personal gain sought, or obtained, by the Respondent.

58.4 The Respondent has cooperated with the SRA during the course of its investigation and within the SDT proceedings.

58.5 The Respondent offers her sincere, and genuine, apology for the identified and admitted breaches.

59. However, the Respondent does not contend that the mitigation set out above amounts to exceptional circumstances which would justify the Tribunal making any order other than she should be struck off the Roll.

Proposed penalty and costs

60. The admitted misconduct is at the highest level of seriousness. The SRA contends, and the Respondent accepts, that the proper penalty in this case is that the Respondent should be struck off the Roll of Solicitors.

61. It is further agreed, with respect to costs, that the Respondent should pay the SRA's costs of this matter as agreed in the sum of £5,000.00.

Explanation as to why such an order would be in accordance with the Tribunal's sanctions guidance

62. The Respondent has admitted dishonesty. The Tribunal's *Guidance Note on Sanction* (11th edition), at paragraph 28, states that: "*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 proved will almost invariably lead to striking off, save in exceptional circumstances (see Solicitors Regulation Authority v Sharma [2010] EWHC 2022 (Admin)).*"

63. In *Sharma*, Coulson J summarised the consequences of a finding of dishonesty by the Tribunal against a solicitor:

“(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 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 extent 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...”

64. For the reasons set out below, there are no exceptional circumstances here.
65. Clients, colleagues, and third parties were entitled to rely on the accuracy of the Respondent’s statements as to ongoing matters. By misleading clients, colleagues, and others as to steps taken to obtain a GOP or to chase the Probate Registry, the Respondent created a substantial risk of serious harm to her clients. By way of example, a delay in obtaining a GOP may well limit the ability of client to manage a deceased’s estate, which could reduce the value of that estate.
66. The Respondent’s misconduct was not an isolated incident, and therefore cannot be attributed to a momentary lapse in judgement. The allegation is supported by eight cases in which the Respondent breached her professional obligations.
67. The breaches occurred over a year – time in which the Respondent had ample opportunity to cease further breaches and comply with her professional obligations. She did not do so.
68. Having considered the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal’s *Guidance Note on Sanctions*, the seriousness of the Respondent’s misconduct is at the highest level. It is submitted that strike off is required for the protection of the public and the reputation of the legal profession, and that a lesser sanction would be inappropriate.

Summary

69. It is submitted that the proposed outcome, which has been agreed between the parties, is that the Respondent should be struck off the Roll of Solicitors. This is

proportionate and in the public interest. Further, the Respondent should pay the SRA's costs in the sum of £5,000.00.

On behalf of the SRA:


Annabel Joester

Head of Legal and Enforcement

Dated this 11th day of February 2026.

On behalf of the Respondent

.....
Rachel Parker

Dated this 10th day of February 2026

BEFORE THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

Case No:

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 (as amended)

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY

Applicant

and

RACHEL PARKER

Respondent

**APPENDIX 1 TO STATEMENT OF
AGREED FACTS AND PROPOSED OUTCOME**

Relevant Rules and Regulations

Allegation 1.1: Making statements to clients, colleagues, and others in emails and / or in telephone conversations, which she knew or ought to have known were misleading

SRA Principles

Principle 2 You act in a way that upholds public trust and confidence in the solicitors' profession and in legal services provided by authorised persons.

Principle 4 You act with honesty.

Principle 5 You act with integrity.

SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs, and RFLs

Paragraph 1.4 You do not mislead or attempt to mislead your clients, the court or others, either by your own acts or omissions or

allowing or being complicit in the acts or omissions of others
(including your client).

Paragraph 3.2 You ensure that the service you provide to clients is competent
and delivered in a timely manner.

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 (as amended)

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY

Applicant

and

RACHEL PARKER

Respondent

**APPENDIX 2 TO STATEMENT OF
AGREED FACTS AND PROPOSED OUTCOME**

Anonymisation Schedule

Deceased 1:

Deceased 2:

Deceased 3:

Deceased 4:

Deceased 5:

Deceased 6:

Deceased 7:

Deceased 8:

Deceased 9:

Client 1:

Client 2:

Client 3:

Client 4:

Client 5:

Client 6:

Client 7:

Client 8:

Client 9:

Client 10:

Client 11:

Client 12:

Client 13:

Client 14:

Client 15:

Client 16:

Paralegal 1:

Paralegal 2:

Fee Earner 1:

Fee Earner 2: