

SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974

Case No:12883-2026

BETWEEN:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LTD

Applicant

and

DEMI CHRISTINE PERRIN

Respondent

Before:

Mrs L Murphy (in the Chair)
Miss O. Davies
Ms E Keen

Date of Hearing: 25 June 2026

Appearances

There were no appearances and the application was dealt with on the papers.

JUDGMENT ON AN AGREED OUTCOME

Allegations

1. The allegations against the Respondent, Demi Christine Perrin, made by the SRA are that, while in practice as a solicitor at Blackhurst Budd Limited ("the Firm"):
 - 1.1 On 3 January 2023 asked a colleague to hide the file of Client A, with the intention that the Firm would thereby be prevented from discovering that she had not undertaken work on the file and thereby breached any or all of:
 - 1.1.1 Principle 4 of the SRA Principles ("the Principles").
 - 1.1.2 Principle 5 of the Principles.
 - 1.1.3 Principle 2 of the Principles.
 - 1.1.4 Paragraph 1.4 of the SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs, RFLs and RSLs.
 - 1.2 On 17 January 2023, made false statements to the Managing Director of the Firm during meetings, in an attempt to mislead him about work undertaken on the file of Client A and/or her request to a colleague to hide that file and thereby breached any or all of:
 - 1.2.1 Principle 2 of the Principles.
 - 1.2.2 Principle 5 of the Principles.
 - 1.2.3 Principle 4 of the Principles.
 - 1.2.4 Paragraph 1.4 of the Code for Solicitors.

Documents

2. The Tribunal considered all the documents in the case which were contained in the case electronic bundle which included the following:
 - (a) The Applicant's Rule 12 Statement dated 7 January 2026.
 - (b) The Statement in Response to the Applicant's Rule 12 Statement dated 11 March 2026; and
 - (c) The Statement of Agreed Facts and Outcome dated 20 June 2026.

Background

3. The Respondent was admitted to the Roll of Solicitors on 2 June 2022.
4. The Respondent joined the Firm in August 2019 and was subsequently awarded a training contract. Following qualification on the 2 June 2022, she worked in the Family Department. The Respondent was dismissed from the Firm on 19 May 2023.

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

5. 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 Sanction.

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.
7. The Tribunal reviewed all the material before it and was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the Respondent's admissions were properly made.

Sanction

8. The Tribunal considered the Guidance Note on Sanction (11th Edition–February 2025). and the proper approach to sanctions as set out in *Fuglers and others v SRA* [2014] EWHC 179. The Tribunal's overriding objective when considering sanction, was the need to maintain public confidence in the integrity of the profession.
9. In determining sanction, the Tribunal's role was to assess the seriousness of the proven misconduct and to impose a sanction that was fair and proportionate in all the circumstances. In determining the seriousness of the misconduct, the Tribunal considered the Respondent's culpability and harm identified together with the aggravating and mitigating factors that existed.
10. The Tribunal noted that the Respondent had admitted dishonesty arising from her deliberate concealment of a client file and the making of false and misleading statements to her employer. The Tribunal took into account the mitigation put forward on the Respondent's behalf, including the circumstances relating to her mental health. Nevertheless, the Tribunal determined that, in the absence of exceptional circumstances, the appropriate and proportionate sanction was to strike the Respondent off the Roll of Solicitors.
11. Accordingly, the Tribunal approved the sanction proposed by the parties.

Costs

12. After the Applicant considered the means of the Respondent, it was agreed by the parties that no order for costs should be made. Accordingly, the Tribunal made no order as to costs.

Statement of Full Order

13. The Tribunal ORDERED that the Respondent, DEMI CHRISTINE PERRIN, solicitor, be STRUCK OFF the Roll of Solicitors and the Tribunal ORDERS that there be no Order as to costs.

Dated this 30th day of July 2026
On behalf of the Tribunal

L Murphy

L Murphy
Chair

BEFORE THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

Case No: 12883-2026

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LIMITED

Applicant

and

DEMI CHRISTINE PERRIN

Respondent

STATEMENT OF AGREED FACTS AND PROPOSED OUTCOME

By its application dated 8 January 2026 and the statement made pursuant to Rule 12(2) of the Solicitors (Disciplinary Proceedings) Rules 2019 ("the Rule 12 Statement") which accompanied that application, the Solicitors Regulation Authority Limited ("the SRA") brought proceedings before the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal, making two allegations of misconduct against the Respondent, Demi Christine Perrin.

The allegations

1. The allegations against the Respondent, Demi Christine Perrin, made by the SRA are that, while in practice as a solicitor at Blackhurst Budd Limited, 22 Edward Street, Blackpool, FY1 1BA ("the Firm"):
 - 1.1 On 3 January 2023 asked a colleague to hide the file of Client A, with the intention that the Firm would thereby be prevented from discovering that she had not undertaken work on the file and thereby breached any or all of:
 - 1.1.1 Principle 4 of the SRA Principles ("the Principles")

1.1.2 Principle 5 of the Principles

1.1.3 Principle 2 of the Principles

1.1.4 Paragraph 1.4 SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs, RFLs and RSLs
("the Code for Solicitors")

1.2 On 17 January 2023, made false statements to the Managing Director of the Firm, during meetings, in an attempt to mislead him about work undertaken on the file of Client A and/or her request to a colleague to hide that file and thereby breached any or all of:

1.2.1 Principle 2 of the Principles

1.2.2 Principle 5 of the Principles

1.2.3 Principle 4 of the Principles

1.2.4 Paragraph 1.4 of the Code for Solicitors

Agreed Facts

2. On the 11 March 2026, the Respondent filed and served an Answer in which she admitted the Allegations in full.

Professional Details

3. The Respondent was born on June 1995 and admitted to the Roll of Solicitors on 2 June 2022. The Respondent joined the Firm in August 2019 and was subsequently awarded a training contract. On qualification, she worked in the Family Department. The Respondent was dismissed from the Firm on 19 May 2023.
4. The Respondent is currently not working as a solicitor and has not held a practising certificate since December 2023.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of the allegations

Background

5. A report was made by Mr Warren Spencer to the Applicant on 2nd June 2023. Mr Spencer is the Managing Director ("MD") of the Firm that employed the Respondent at the time of the alleged conduct. It reported matters of honesty and integrity with regards to performance issues and work that had not been undertaken on client files.
6. The Firm undertook an internal investigation, during which the Respondent admitted the facts of the conduct alleged. She said: *"I accept this took place and I regret this and cannot excuse my actions. In hindsight, I was not mentally or physically ready to return to the office following my hospitalisation. I made a serious error of judgement under extreme circumstances, and I am very sorry this happened"*.

Allegation 1.1

7. Issues arose as to the Respondent's performance on a number of files with regards to work done, a lack of case progression and billing. These issues came to light during regular, routine file audits that were undertaken in August 2022.
8. The Respondent was contacted by Mr Spencer about the concerns, by email on 7 September 2022. She replied on 9 September 2022 providing explanations on specific files. Accordingly, the Respondent was aware that the Firm had some issues with her performance.
9. Further billing delays were raised in December 2022. The Respondent was spoken to, on this occasion, by Mr Spencer. She said that she had forgotten a couple of times to send bills to clients, but that it would not happen again.
10. The Firm became aware that, over the Christmas break, the Respondent had been admitted to hospital. She produced a note setting out that she was not fit to work for fourteen days.
11. During the Respondent's absence, Ms Emslie (Head of the Family department at the Firm) monitored her cases. Ms Emslie was notified by a colleague in the

Sensitivity: General

Conveyancing Department, Chelsey Ford, that whilst the Respondent had been off work, she had contacted Ms Ford and asked her to "hide a file". This file was a "First Registration" file that Ms Ford had helped the Respondent in November 2022 with.

12. Ms Ford refused to hide the file. It concerned the case of Client A.
13. Ms Emslie located the file and, upon looking at it, discovered that, despite having had the file since "mid-2022", the Respondent had not lodged the First Registration Application with the Land Registry.
14. Mr Spencer determined that he would need to speak to the Respondent on her return to work.
15. On 17 January 2023, Mr Spencer was approached by the Firm's Practice Manager/ Head of HR, Anna-Clare Munby, who said that the Respondent, who had just returned to work, had been to see her and said that, upon looking through her files, she had realised that she had made "a number of mistakes".
16. On 17 January 2023, Mr Spencer arranged for a meeting with the Respondent, with Ms Munby present, to take place at 3 pm on that same day.
17. Minutes were taken of the meeting in which the Respondent was asked questions about the file of Client A. Mr Spencer asked what progress that Respondent had made on the file. She replied that the First Registration Application had been sent to the Land Registry for the First Registration. She said that she was waiting to hear from the Land Registry.
18. Mr Spencer later queried this account and said that he had looked into the file history and could see no action having been taken since July 2022. The Respondent maintained her account.
19. Mr Spencer notified her about what Ms Ford had informed Ms Emslie, namely that the Respondent had asked Ms Ford to hide the file of Client A. The Respondent denied such a request and said that she was confused as to why there was no

record of the fact that she had sent the application to the Land Registry and was confused as to why Ms Ford would say such a thing.

20. Following the meeting, Mr Spencer asked a colleague to check whether the application for First Registration had actually been made. The colleague not only checked the file again, they also contacted the Land Registry, who confirmed that no such application had been received.
21. Mr Spencer then held a second meeting with the Respondent at 4:20pm on the 17 January 2023. During the meeting, the Respondent was asked again about the file of Client A. She maintained that she had sent the First Registration to the Land Registry in November 2022. She said that she did so in a way that had not left any digital footprint, printing off and sending a hard copy without any covering letter.
22. Mr Spencer told the Respondent that he would have to contact the Land Registry to do a thorough search to see if they received the application. The Respondent stated that she could not guarantee the Land Registry had received it and confirmed her explanation that she had gone into the case history, had carried out the work but the Firm's system had not recorded it. Mr Spencer told the Respondent that he would contact, if needs be, the Firm's IT Department to find out when the file had been accessed. He gave her "one last opportunity to confirm her position". The Respondent then admitted that she had not sent the First Registration to the Land Registry. However, the Respondent maintained that she had not asked Ms Ford to hide the file and had not spoken to her about it.
23. On 19 January 2023 the Respondent asked for time off to see her GP.
24. On 20 January 2023, she did not attend work and was off work until 26 April 2023.
25. On 26 April 2023, when the Respondent returned to work, she was formally suspended from the Firm, pending a disciplinary investigation. The Respondent was notified of this by way of a letter dated 26 April 2023 from Mr Spencer. The letter set out the nature of the allegations regarding the file of Client A as follows:

Sensitivity: General

- i) you lied to myself, as Managing Director, COLP, of the practice in relation to the file of Client A, as to the progress of that matter. During the course of our first meeting, you repeatedly stated that you had sent an application off to the land registry for first registration. At our second meeting you again repeatedly maintained that you had sent an application off to the land registry for first registration and then finally accepted that you had not in fact sent off the application.
 - ii) that you instructed another member of staff (Chelsey Ford) to hide that file whilst you were in hospital at the beginning of January.
- 26. On 2 May 2023, the Firm received an email from the Respondent in relation to the Firm's letter of suspension, which inter alia, stated the following:
 - i. *"I accept that this took place [lied to Mr Spencer during the two meetings on 17 January 2023 and asked Ms Ford to hide the file.]"*
 - ii. *"I cannot excuse my actions".*
 - iii. *"In hindsight, I was not mentally or physically ready to return to the office following my hospitalisation".*
 - iv. *"I made a serious error of judgement under extreme circumstances."*
 - v. *"[I] am very sorry this happened".*
- 27. The Respondent's admission that she had asked Ms Ford to hide the file of Client A was over three months after the meetings with Mr Spencer, during which she had denied the conduct alleged. However, it is accepted that the Respondent was signed off sick from 19 January 2023 until 25 April 2023 and then hospitalised on 15 May 2023 until 16 May 2023.
- 27. On 4 May 2023, Mr Spencer met with the Respondent for an Investigatory Meeting. During this meeting, the Respondent:
 - i. Accepted that the notes prepared by the firm for the meetings on 17 January 2023 were accurate, stating that she *"had no issue with the summaries of the meetings...although she was poorly at the time so does not recollect them fully"*.
 - ii. *"Confirmed that her initial response had been a lie"*, in respect of sending the Application to the Land Registry for First Registration.

- iii. *"Confirmed that her explanation in relation to her activities on the file (apart from having gone through with [Ms Ford] in November, who had shown her what to do) were lies"*.
- iv. Accepted that she had discussed hiding the file with Ms Ford.
- v. Admitted that she had lied in the January meeting about asking Ms Ford to hide the file of Client A.
- vi. Accepted she had not acted with integrity.
- vii. Stated that she had let the Firm know previously about stress and personal issues that she was struggling with but did not inform them that she was ill.

28. On 5 May 2023, the Firm wrote to the Respondent to notify her that she was required to attend a Disciplinary Meeting on 16 May 2023. When notifying her of the date of the disciplinary meeting, the Firm sent the Respondent the notes of the first and second meeting on 17 January 2023, the notes of the Investigation Meeting on 4 May 2023 and the Statements of Sharon Emslie and Anna Clare Mumby.

29. The Respondent was also sent a copy of the Firm's Disciplinary Report dated 5 May 2023 prepared by Mr Spencer.

30. Due to the Respondent's health issues, the Disciplinary Meeting was moved to 19 May 2023.

31. On 19 May 2023, Ian Bentley, a solicitor and Director, conducted the Firm's Disciplinary Meeting. During this meeting, the Respondent confirmed she had received the Disciplinary Report dated 5 May 2023 and *"declined to add anything further"*. She *"accepted that she had already responded during the investigative process and that she had admitted lying to Mr Spencer"*. The decision of the disciplinary meeting was that the Respondent was dismissed for gross misconduct.

Breaches - Allegation 1.1

Principle 4: You must act with honesty

32. The Respondent accepts that asking a colleague to hide a client's file was dishonest in accordance with the test set out in the case of *Ivey (Appellant) v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockfords (Respondent)* [2017] UKSC 67. The Respondent

Sensitivity: General

admits that a member of the public would find such conduct to be dishonest, applying the standards of ordinary decent people, given that the Respondent knew that:

- i) She was asking a colleague to do something that she should not do, namely hide a file.
- ii) She knew that trying to hide a client's file was a serious matter.
- iii) She knew that wider issues had been raised within the Firm concerning her performance.
- iv) Her motivation in trying to hide the client's file was to conceal from her Firm that she had not sent an application to the Land Registry.
- v) Her motivation was accordingly to seek to destroy and/or conceal evidence from the Firm of her poor performance on behalf of a client.
- vi) She was going to make a false claim that she had done the work and any examination of the file would prove her lie.

Principle 5: You act with Integrity

33. In *Wingate v Solicitors Regulation Authority v Malins* [2018] EWCA Civ 366 it was said that integrity (ie. moral soundness, rectitude and steady adherence to an ethical code) connotes adherence to the ethical standards of one's own professions.

34. The Respondent accepts that a solicitor who was acting with integrity and in accordance with the higher standards that society expects from professional persons (including solicitors) would not ask a colleague to hide a client's file. Further, they would not ask a colleague so to act in order to seek to conceal a lack of work done on that file. The Respondent accepts that by acting in this way, her actions fell below the standards expected of her as a solicitor and she failed to act with integrity, i.e. with moral soundness, rectitude and steady adherence to an ethical code, and has acted in breach of Principle 5.

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

35. Behaviour, within or outside practice, which undermines public confidence damages not only any individual involved but also the ability of the legal profession as whole to serve society.
36. The trust that the public places in solicitors and in the provision of legal services, depends upon the reputation of the solicitors' profession as one in which every member, of whatever standing, may be trusted to the ends of the earth. Solicitors are required to discharge their professional duties with integrity, probity and trustworthiness. The Respondent admits that she has failed to do this by asking a colleague to hide a file, in order to seek to conceal her lack of work on behalf of Client A. Such conduct damages trust and confidence in the solicitor's profession. The public should be able to trust and have confidence in the fact that solicitors will not seek to hide the legal files of clients for their own personal gain in avoiding potential professional criticism and censure by their employer. In so acting, the Respondent accepts that she has breached Principle 2.

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).

37. The Respondent accepts that she has breached Paragraph 1.4 of the Code for Solicitors because asking a colleague to hide a file, would have had the potential to mislead her colleagues in the Firm and/or the client as to the work that had been done on it. If the file had been hidden, others could have been misled and proceeded on the basis that the application had been sent.
38. Such an act showed an intention to hide information from her employer and/or the client. This action is in breach of paragraph 1.4 of the Code for Solicitors.

Allegation 1.2

39. The facts relevant to allegation 1.2 are set out in paragraphs 16 to 31 above.

Breaches – Allegation 1.2

Principle 4: You act with honesty

40. The Respondent admits that making false statements to the MD of her firm, in an attempt to mislead him about work undertaken on a client file, was dishonest in accordance with the test as set out in *Ivey (Appellant) v Genting Casinos (UK) Ltd t/a Crockfords, supra*. The Respondent accepts that a member of the public would find her conduct to be dishonest, applying the standards of ordinary decent people, given that:

- i) She knew that she had asked her colleague to hide the file and therefore any contention that she had not so asked was false.
- ii) She knew that she had not sent the Application to the Land Registry and therefore it was false to claim that she had. Further, it was an untruth to claim that:
 - a) She had printed out the documents and that was why there was no digital trace in the file.
 - b) She had not written a covering letter when she sent off the Application and that is why it appeared that she had not sent it, when she had.
 - c) She had gone onto the case history and carried out the work but the Firm's system had not recorded it.
- iii) She had a significant period of time to think before giving her account.
- iv) The account related to memorable and serious events that she would not forget.
- v) She maintained her false account by stating it multiple times.
- vi) When she was told that the Land Registry could be requested to undertake thorough searches and the IT Department could undertake enquiries, she admitted that she had not done the work.
- vii) When she was told that her colleague had confirmed that she had asked her to hide the file, she then admitted that she had done so.
- viii) She therefore knew that she was making false statements.

Principle 5: You act with Integrity

41. In *Wingate v Solicitors Regulation Authority v Malins [2018] EWCA Civ 366, supra*, it was said that integrity (i.e. moral soundness rectitude and steady adherence to an ethical code) connotes adherence to the ethical standards of one's own profession.

42. The Respondent accepts that a solicitor acting with integrity would not say things that were false and misleading, to the MD of her Firm, in order to seek to conceal a lack of work undertaken in respect of a client's file. This conduct (particularly when repeated) indicates a wilful regard of standards and ethics, with an indifference to the consequences of such a breach.
43. In Mr Spencer's Disciplinary Report dated 5 May 2023, he states that if the file of Client A had been successfully hidden, as per the Respondent's request, it could have resulted in disastrous consequences, for the client, members of staff and the practice. The Respondent's actions show a disregard for the standards and actions that would be expected of a solicitor in such circumstances. The public would expect a solicitor, who had not carried out work on a file, to be frank and advise their employer of the position so that it could be rectified. In maintaining the false statements to the Firm, rather than giving the Firm the opportunity to rectify the position, the Respondent accepts that she showed a lack of regard for the client and the Firm.
44. The Respondent admits that she has acted with less than complete integrity and probity. By failing to act to the higher standards that society expects from solicitors, and to which other solicitors would have expected her to act, she has breached Principle 5.

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

45. The Respondent accepts that making false statements to a fellow lawyer about actions to do with a client's file, in order to seek to conceal that the work required had in fact not been done and to avoid potential professional criticism and censure by an employer, seriously undermines the trust that the public should be entitled to have in solicitors and the solicitors' profession. The public is entitled to expect that a solicitor will be honest about the work that she has done and would not make false statements to their MD in order to conceal what has occurred.

Paragraph 1.4 SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors

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).

46. The Respondent has admitted that she tried to mislead and, but for the MD's own investigations, could have misled the MD of the Firm, by falsely stating that she had done work on the file and had not asked a colleague to hide the file. Her written, and oral, statements were demonstrably misleading and designed to be so.

47. Further, Client A could have been misled that work had been done, which had not been and/or that the file had been lost, when it had not been.

Respondent's Non-Agreed Mitigation

The following mitigation is put forward by the Respondent, but their inclusion in this document does not amount to adoption or endorsement of such points by the SRA.

48. During the time I was off sick, I was hospitalised on 4 separate occasions. I was also hospitalised from 11th May 2023 - 16th May 2023.

49. During this meeting mentioned in para 30/31, I was unwell.

50. The Respondent has been co-operative with the SRA's investigation and during these proceedings.

51. The Respondent repeatedly informed the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) that she would be willing to voluntarily remove herself from the Roll due to her medical conditions, with the intention of saving both time and costs for all parties involved.

52. The Respondent suffers from several significant medical conditions, many of which remain ongoing. The Respondent was admitted to hospital in relation to these health issues as recently as March 2026.

53. The Respondent has experienced severe mental health difficulties and, at various times, contemplated suicide. As a result, the respondent sought and received professional mental health support.

54. The Respondent has accepted the allegations made against her and has demonstrated genuine remorse for her conduct.

Proposed Sanction

55. The proposed sanction is that the Respondent is struck-off the Roll of Solicitors. The Respondent has provided a Statement of Means which has been considered by the Applicant. Due to the Respondent's financial circumstances, it is agreed that the Respondent will pay no costs.

Explanation why such an order would be in accordance with the Tribunal's Guidance Note on Sanction (11th edition)

56. The Respondent has admitted dishonesty. The Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal's "Guidance Note on Sanction" (10th edition), at paragraph 47, 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))."*

57. In 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 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..."

58. The Respondent's conduct was serious and involved acting with dishonesty and lack of integrity. The Respondent gave false and misleading information, to the MD of her Firm, in order to seek to conceal a lack of work undertaken in respect of a client's file. The Respondent maintained her false account by recounting it multiple

times. The Respondent had a significant period of time to think before giving her account.

59. In assessing culpability, the Respondent was responsible for her own behaviour and the circumstances giving rise to the misconduct. The Respondent had multiple opportunities to be open and honest with her employer but instead continued with her false account to avoid potential professional criticism and censure by her employer.

60. The potential for harm was significant. If the file was successfully hidden, it could have resulted in disastrous consequences, for the client, members of staff and the practice. Client A could have been misled that work had been done, which had not been and/or that the file had been lost, when it had not been.

61. The misconduct was aggravated by the fact that the Respondent maintained the false pretence over a period of time (from August 2022 until May 2023). The Respondent knew or ought to have known that her dishonesty and lack of integrity in relation her responsibilities posed a risk to the client and the Firm.

62. The Respondent's misconduct was serious and the case does not fall within the small residual category where striking off would be a disproportionate sentence. The Respondent does have health issues for which she has been receiving treatment. However, we are of the view that those issues do not fall within any exceptional circumstances so as to alter the proposed sanction. Accordingly, the fair and proportionate penalty in this case is for the Respondent to be struck off the Roll of Solicitors.


Dated 22/06/26 **ANASTAIR HJ WILLCOX**
[Name] on behalf of the Solicitors Regulation Authority Limited. **INTERIM HEAD - INVESTIGATIONS, ENFORCEMENT & LITIGATION**

Sensitivity: General

D Perrin

.....

Dated: 20.06.2026

Respondent in the proceedings.