CASE NO.

BEFORE THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LIMITED

Applicant

- and –

SIMON LANGFORD

Respondent

STATEMENT PURSUANT TO RULE 12 (2) OF THE SOLICITORS (DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS) RULES 2019

I, **JOHN LUCAROTTI**, am a Barrister and Partner at Blake Morgan LLP of Apex Plaza, Forbury Road, Reading, RG1 1AX.

I make this statement on behalf of the Applicant, the Solicitors Regulation Authority Limited ("**the SRA**").

The Allegations

1. The allegations against the Respondent, Mr Simon Langford, made by the Applicant, are that, whilst in practice as a solicitor at Sayers Solicitors, ("the Firm") he:

   1.1. Between June 2019 and April 2024, failed to register Property B at His Majesty's Land Registry ("HMLR") on behalf of Mr and Mrs A, despite having been instructed to do so, and in doing so he breached any or all of Principle 7 of the SRA Principles 2019 ("the Principles") and 3.2 of the Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs and RFLs ("the Code").

The facts and matters relied upon in support of this allegation are set out in paragraphs 10 to 24 and 46 to 51 below.

1.2. Between 17 November 2021 and 1 November 2023, on up to seven occasions, provided false and/or misleading information to Mrs A in respect of the status of Property B's registration at HMLR, and in doing so, he breached any or all of Principles 2, 4 and 5 of the Principles, and Paragraph 1.4 of the Code.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of this allegation are set out in paragraphs 10 to 24 and 52 to 65 below.

1.3. Between 22 May 2023 and 27 November 2023, failed to assist with and/or respond to requisitions received from HMLR in respect of Property C in a timely manner, and in doing so he breached Principle 2 of the Principles.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of this allegation are set out in paragraphs 25 to 31 and 66 to 70 below.

1.4. Between December 2023 and February 2025, failed to perform and/or discharge an undertaking he gave to Premier Property Lawyers and in doing so he breached any or all of Principles 2 and 5 of the Principles and Paragraph 1.3 of the Code.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of this allegation are set out in paragraphs 33 to 41 and 71 to 88 below.

1.5. Between 27 February 2024 and February 2025, failed to co-operate with investigations by the SRA and/or respond promptly to its enquiries, and in doing so, he breached any or all of Principles 2 and 5 of the Principles and Paragraphs 7.3 and 7.4 of the Code.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of this allegation are set out in paragraphs 42 to 45 and 89 to 105 below.

Appendices and Documents

2. The following appendices are attached to and relied upon in this Statement:

2.1. Appendix 1: Relevant rules and regulations.

2.2. Appendix 2: Anonymisation Schedule.

3. I also attach to this statement a bundle of documents, marked **Exhibit JL1**, to which I refer in this statement. Unless otherwise stated, page references in this statement relate to that exhibit, using the format [**JL1, X**].

4. The bundle is divided into the following sections:

4.1. Section A: Witness statements plus exhibits

4.2. Section B: Relevant correspondence between the Applicant and the Respondent

4.3. Section C: SRA Notice plus response

Professional Details

5. The Respondent was born on [redacted] 1955 and admitted as a solicitor on 15 June 1979.

6. At the relevant time, the Respondent was the owner, manager and sole solicitor at the Firm and specialised in conveyancing. He held the roles of Compliance Officer for Legal Practice ('COLP'), Compliance Officer for Finance and Administration, Money Laundering Compliance Officer and Money Laundering Reporting Officer.

7. The Respondent is still working in the same roles at the Firm.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of the allegations

Background

8. The conduct in this matter concerns three separate conveyancing transactions conducted by the Respondent between 2019 and 2025:

8.1. Property B (the subject of allegations 1.1 and 1.2) – for which the Respondent acted for the buyers between April 2019 and April 2024.

8.2. Property C (the subject of allegation 1.3) – for which the Respondent acted for the vendors between August 2022 and November 2023.

8.3. Property D (the subject of allegation 1.4) – for which the Respondent acted for the vendors between August 2023 and December 2024.

9. The final allegation (allegation 1.5) relates to the Respondent's engagement with the Applicant in respect of its investigations into allegations 1.1 to 1.4.

Property B

10. On 16 April 2019, Mrs A instructed the Respondent in respect of the purchase of Property B by her and her husband (Mr A). This included registering the purchase with HMLR. **[JL1, 1 (para 3)]**

11. On 26 June 2019, the Respondent informed Mrs A that the purchase of Property B had been completed. **[JL1, 2 (para 6) and 17]**

12. In the middle of 2020, Mrs A noticed that the property was "*not appearing on any sold property price websites*" **[JL1, 2 (para 8)]**. She was concerned that there was an issue as regards the registration with HMLR. In the autumn of 2020, she emailed the Respondent about this **[JL1, 2 (para 8)]**. He stated that he would make enquiries into what had happened. **[JL1, 2 (para 8) and 18]**

13. By the beginning of 2021, the Respondent had not provided any further response to Mrs A's enquiries. Mrs A then made further email requests in January **[JL1, 2 (para 10) and 20]** and June 2021 **[JL1, 2 (para 11) and 21]**. The Respondent did not respond to these emails. **[JL1, 2, (paras 10 and 11)]**

14. On 17 November 2021, Mrs A called the Respondent's office and requested an update **[JL1, 2 (para 12)]**. The Respondent emailed Mrs A and stated the following: *"I am awaiting the completed registration to come trough (sic) from the LR – all of he (sic) LA's have been drafted and i shall get them out to you i (sic) one batch…."* **[JL1, 2 (para 12) and 23]**

15. On 31 January 2022, having heard nothing further from the Respondent, Mrs A requested a further update **[JL1**, **3 (para 16) and 24]**. The Respondent responded by email on the

same date and stated: *"Waiting for Willows registration to come throuh (sic) but will get on them later toady (sic)."* **[JL1, 3 (para 17) and 25]**

16. On 21 February 2022, Mrs A requested a further update. The Respondent emailed back and stated: *"The completed registration has not come through – I will get someone to chase it today / tomorrow."* **[JL1, 3 (para 17) and 27]**

17. On 30 November 2022, Mrs A emailed the Respondent **[JL1, 3 (para 21) and 31]**. She asked how the registration of Property B was progressing and noted the considerable delay since its purchase. The Respondent emailed back and stated: **[JL1, 4 (para 22), and 31]**

    "It is quite ridiculous [Mrs A] and i can hardly claim to be blameless. Yes i am ridiculously busy but this needs to be Sorted out once and for all. It is an embarrassment apart from anything else. I understand has (sic) a "watch" noted against this title and he should receive notification from the LR within next couple of days that the application for registration is back in with them abn (sic) being processed. I am truly sorry this had taken so long."

18. On 1 April 2023, Mrs A learnt from HMLR that, in actual fact, no further applications had been filed since 5 August 2019, when the original application by the Firm had been rejected. **[JL1, 4 (para 24) and 33]**

19. On 3 April 2023, Mrs A forwarded this information to the Respondent and asked for an explanation. The Respondent replied: *"This went back in – but I shall have it checked."* **[JL1, 4 (para 25) and 34]**

20. On 3 May 2023, Mrs A asked for a further update. The Respondent replied: *[Mrs A] I know you are rightly kicking my backside re your registration and i will see what i cando (sic) to profress (sic) today/tomorrow."* **[JL1, 5 (para 29) and XX]**

21. On 1 November 2023, Mrs A asked the Respondent to confirm that he had filed the application for Property B (along with other properties) with HMLR **[JL1, 5 (para 33) and 38]**. The Respondent replied by email, *"correct, yes have been lodged, I shall let you have the LR references for them when they come through."* **[JL1, 5 (para 34) and 38]**

22. On 18 January 2024, Mrs A sought an update from HMLR **[JL1, 5 (para 36) and 39]**. On 26 January 2024, HMLR responded and stated: *"Unfortunately, no application has yet been received on any of the three title numbers since 2019."* **[JL1, 6 (para 37) and 40]**

23. This was notified to the Respondent the same day, in relation to which he did not reply. [**JL1, 6 (para 38) and 41**]

24. On 26 March 2024, Mrs A referred the Respondent to the Applicant.

Property C

25. In 2022, the Respondent acted for the sellers of Property C, which was a leasehold property. Knight Richardson solicitors acted for the purchasers. **[JL1, 113 (para 6)]**

26. The sale completed on 2 December 2022. Knight Richardson then submitted an application to HMLR to register the purchase. **[JL1, 113 (para 8)]**

27. On 19 May 2023, HMLR sent a requisition to Knight Richardson regarding the application. It contained two points. Knight Richardson were not able to respond to either of these points without information from the Respondent. **[JL1, 114 (para 15)]**

28. Between 22 May and 22 November 2023, Knight Richardson sent six emails to the Respondent, requesting a response to the requisition. **[JL1, 114 (para 17) and 131-136]**

29. The Respondent did not respond to the first five emails. **[JL1, 116 (para 34)]**

30. In respect of the sixth email, which was sent by Knight Richardson on 22 November 2023, and stated "*Please note that your failure to assist with the matters has now been reported to the SRA",* the Respondent emailed *"Could please email us a copy of the requisition and we shall see what we can do to assist."* **[JL1, 137]**

31. On 28 November 2023, the Respondent provided information in relation to the first point raised in the requisition from HMLR. **[JL1, 114 (para 20) and 140]**

32. On 23 November 2023, Knight Richardson reported the Respondent to the Applicant. **[JL1, 116]**

Property D

33. In 2023, the Respondent acted for the sellers of Property D, which was a leasehold property. Premier Property Lawyers acted for the purchasers. **[JL1, 226 (para 6)]**

34. As part of the transaction, the purchasers required a leasehold extension. **[JL1, 226 (para 8)]**

35. The Respondent drafted the necessary documents for a lease extension, including a deed of variation. **[JL1, 226 (para 9)]**

36. The Respondent also undertook to apply to register the lease extension with HMLR within three days of completion and to not allow the application to lapse **[JL1, 226 (para 12)]**. This undertaking was recorded in additional clauses added to the contract on 1 November 2023, which stated as follows: **[JL1, 239]**

    "The seller's conveyancer undertakes to submit the application to register the Lease extension within 3 days of completion and will not allow the application to lapse."

37. The undertaking contained within the Rider appended to the contract is consistent with the following, accepted definition of an undertaking:
    (See: https://www.sra.org.uk/solicitors/standards-regulations/glossary)

    "a statement, given orally or in writing, whether or not it includes the word 'undertake' or 'undertaking', to someone who reasonably places reliance on it, that you or a third party will do something or cause something to be done, or refrain from doing something"

38. The sale of Property D completed on 15 December 2023. **[JL1, 226 (para 10)]** On the same day, the Respondent wrote to Premier Property Lawyers and stated: **[JL1, 161 (para 16) and 188]**

    "You have of course asked us to register the Lease extension at the Land Registry and we will do so immediately upon receipt of the document from Bolt Burdon. We will let you know when the document has reached us and has been lodged for registration."

39. Between 20 March 2024 and 5 December 2024, Premier Property Lawyers, in respect of the registration of the lease extension **[JL1, 161-162 (paras 16-19) and 189-221]**:

39.1. emailed the Respondent on 26 occasions

39.2. called the Respondent on 22 occasions

39.3. wrote letters to the Respondent on two occasions

40. Notwithstanding the communications detailed above, the Respondent did not register the leasehold extension with HMLR **[JL1, 162 (para 20)]**.

41. On 16 October 2024, Premier Property Lawyers reported the Respondent to the Applicant **[JL1, 162 (para 23) and 222]**.

The Applicant's investigation

42. The Applicant contacted the Respondent in relation to each of the reports received as detailed above at paragraphs 24, 32 and 41. **[JL1, 250-288]**

43. In respect of the report from Knight Richardson, the Applicant contacted the Respondent on 12 occasions between 19 February and 2 May 2024 and requested a response to its enquiries around the report **[JL1, 254-267]**. The Respondent did not provide a response until 14 May 2024 **[JL1, 267]**.

44. In respect of the report from Mrs A, the Applicant contacted the Respondent on 11 occasions between 11 June 2024 and 1 October 2024 and requested a response to its enquiries around the report **[JL1, 270-281]**. The Respondent did not provide a substantive response during that time period.

45. In respect of the report from Premier Property Lawyers, the Applicant contacted the Respondent on five occasions between 9 December 2024 and 13 January 2025 and requested a response to its enquiries around the report **[282-288]**. The Respondent did not provide a substantive response.

Allegation 1.1

46. The Applicant relies upon paragraphs 10 to 24 above.

Representations made by the Respondent

47. In his response to the Notice dated 20 March 2025, the Respondent stated **[JL1, 324]**:

"I have considered the Notice and recommendations. Whilst I do not agree fully with some the facts stated I cannot deny the thrust of the allegations…In respect of the allegation made by [Mrs A], admitted"

Breaches of the Code and the Principles

Paragraph 3.2 of the Code

48. In 2019, the Respondent was instructed by his clients to register Property B with HMLR. By 2024, he still had not done so. On any analysis, the service provided by the Respondent to Mr and Mrs A was not delivered in a competent or timely manner.

49. By his actions, the Respondent therefore breached Paragraph 3.2 of the Code.

Principle 7

50. In failing to perform a key part of the conveyancing process, namely registering the purchase with HMLR, the Respondent exposed his clients to risk and uncertainty over a prolonged period of time. This delay and risk exposure was avoidable and clearly not in the best interests of his clients.

51. In doing so, the Respondent breached Principle 7 of the Principles.

Allegation 1.2

52. The Applicant relies upon paragraphs 10 to 24 above.

Representations made by the Respondent

53. In his response to the Notice dated 20 March 2025, the Respondent stated:

"I have considered the Notice and recommendations. Whilst I do not agree fully with some the facts stated I cannot deny the thrust of the allegations…In respect of the allegation made by [Mrs A], admitted"

Breaches of the Code and the Principles

Paragraph 1.4 of the Code

54. The information provided by the Respondent to Mrs A between 2021 and 2024 in respect of the status of the application to HMLR was evidently false and misleading.

55. The Respondent therefore breached Paragraph 1.4 of the Code.

Principle 4

56. The Applicant relies upon the test for dishonesty stated by the Supreme Court in *Ivey v Genting Casinos* [2017] UKSC 67:

"When dishonesty is in question the fact-finding tribunal must first ascertain (subjectively) the actual state of the individual's knowledge or belief as to the facts. The reasonableness or otherwise of his belief is a matter of evidence (often in practice determinative) going to whether he held the belief, but it is not an additional requirement that his belief must be reasonable; the question is whether it is genuinely held. When once his actual state of mind as to knowledge or belief as to facts is established, the question whether his conduct was honest or dishonest is to be determined by the fact-finder by applying the (objective) standards of ordinary decent people. There is no requirement that the defendant must appreciate that what he has done is, by those standards, dishonest."

57. At the time of any and each of the seven occasions set out at paragraphs 14 to 21 that the Respondent corresponded with Mrs A in respect of the registration of Property B with HMLR, he knew that:

57.1. The applications for registration were not pending with HMLR, because they had not been lodged;

57.2. The information he was providing to Mrs A falsely gave the impression that the applications were pending with HMLR;

57.3. Mrs A was entitled to know the true status of the application to HMLR in respect of Property A.

58. Given the state of his knowledge and belief, the Respondent acted dishonestly by the standards of ordinary decent people. His actions were conscious and deliberate. Ordinary

decent people would consider it dishonest for a solicitor to knowingly provide information to a client that would create a false impression as to the actual position with their transaction.

59. By his conduct, the Respondent therefore acted dishonestly and breached Principle 4 of the Principles.

Principle 5

60. In *Wingate v SRA* [2018] EWCA Civ 366, the Court of Appeal held that integrity connotes adherence to the ethical standards of one's profession. Lord Justice Jackson held:

"*Integrity is a broader concept than honesty. In professional codes of conduct the term "integrity" is a useful shorthand to express the higher standards which society expects from professional persons and which the professions expect from their own members…*

Integrity connotes adherence to the ethical standards of one's own profession. That involves more than mere honesty….

Obviously, neither courts nor professional tribunals must set unrealistically high standards, as was observed during argument. The duty of integrity does not require professional people to be paragons of virtue. In every instance, professional integrity is linked to the manner in which that particular professions professes to serve the public."

61. The Respondent was in a position of trust and responsibility as a solicitor. He owed a duty to his client to ensure the accuracy of information provided in relation to the status of the matter. A solicitor acting with integrity would not give information which they knew to be false and/or misleading to their client, especially when they were aware that the information was of importance to the client.

62. The Respondent has therefore breached Principle 5 of the Principles.

Principle 2

63. The Respondent's conduct would diminish the trust the public places in solicitors and in the delivery of legal services. This is because the public would not expect a solicitor to mislead their client, not least over a prolonged period of time.

64. Public confidence in the Respondence, in solicitors and in the provision of legal services is likely to be undermined by solicitors making false representations to clients about the status of their matters.

65. The Respondent has therefore breached Principle 2 of the Principles.

Allegation 1.3

66. The Applicant relies upon paragraphs 25 to 32 above.

Representations made by the Respondent

67. In his response to the Notice dated 20 March 2025, the Respondent stated:

"I have considered the Notice and recommendations. Whilst I do not agree fully with some the facts stated I cannot deny the thrust of the allegations…In respect of the allegation made by Knight Richardson – admitted"

Breaches of the Code and the Principles

Principle 2

68. The conduct alleged amounted to a breach by the Respondent of the requirement to behave in a way which maintains the trust placed by the public in him and in the provision of legal services.

69. The public are entitled to expect that solicitors will work in a collaborative and professional fashion in respect of property transactions. In not responding for six months to the various requests from Knight Richardson for information about requisitions, the Respondent was not behaving in a way which promoted confidence in the solicitors' profession.

70. In doing so, the Respondent breached Principle 2 of the Principles.

Allegation 1.4

71. The Applicant relies upon paragraphs 33 to 40 above.

Representations made by the Respondent

72. In his response to the Notice dated 20 March 2025, the Respondent stated:

> *"I have considered the Notice and recommendations. Whilst I do not agree fully with some the facts stated I cannot deny the thrust of the allegations…In respect of the allegation made by PPL – admitted"*

Breaches of the Code and the Principles

Paragraph 1.3

73. In *Briggs v Law Society [2005] EWHC 1830 (Admin)* Lady Justice Smith stated as follows:

> *"Undertakings are the bedrock of our system of conveyancing. The recipient of an undertaking must be able to assume that once given it will be scrupulously performed. If property purchasers and mortgage lenders cannot have complete confidence in the safety of the money they put into the hands of a solicitor in the course of a property transaction, our system of conveyancing would soon break down. The breach of an undertaking given by a solicitor damages public confidence in the profession and in the system of undertakings upon which property transactions depend."*

74. On 15 December 2023, the Respondent undertook to submit the application concerning the lease extension to HMLR within three days. This undertaking was never performed. Accordingly, the Respondent did not perform the undertaking that he had given.

75. In doing so, the Respondent breached Paragraph 1.3 of the Code.

Principle 5

76. The Applicant relies upon the test for integrity stated in *Wingate v SRA* as set out at paragraph 60 above.

77. As an experienced solicitor, the Respondent would have understood the reliance placed on the undertaking by PPL.

78. The Applicant's guidance on undertakings stipulates that:

"… *breach of an undertaking by authorised individuals and firms - including solicitors and incorporated practices - would give rise to a breach of professional conduct and could result in disciplinary action being taken against the solicitor, the firm, its members and/or directors*."

79. As an experienced solicitor, the Respondent is trusted to ensure that all undertakings given by him or on behalf of the Firm are performed and discharged within the time specified.

80. A solicitor acting with integrity would perform and discharge an agreed undertaking within the agreed timescale, or at the very least, perform it after they had been reminded about it by other parties. They would not ignore requests for compliance leading to a report to the Applicant

81. In this matter, the Respondent failed to ensure that the lease extension was registered at HMLR within three days of completion pursuant to his undertaking. This was accordingly in breach of the undertaking the Respondent provided

82. The Respondent was reminded of his undertaking on many occasions and yet still did not perform it.

83. Ultimately, PPL was required to report the Respondent to the Applicant. The Applicant was subsequently required to utilise its resources to investigate his failure to discharge his professional obligations, which should not have been necessary.

84. The Respondent therefore failed to act according to higher standards expected of a solicitor and breached Principle 5 of the Principles.

85. The Respondent has, therefore, failed to uphold the higher standards which both society and the profession expects from a solicitor.

<u>Principle 2</u>

86. The Respondent's failure to perform the undertaking in the circumstances described at paragraphs 33 to 39 would diminish public trust and confidence in the solicitors' profession. Undertakings are a fundamental part of the legal system and, particularly, the systems common to land transactions. A solicitor who does not pay due regard to their undertakings

damages public trust and confidence in the profession and the reliance the public need to place on the undertaking system.

87. Public confidence in the Respondent, in solicitors and in the provision of legal services is therefore likely to be undermined by solicitors acting in this manner. The Respondent's inaction also had the potential to cause detriment to the affected client and lender.

88. The Respondent therefore breached Principle 2 of the Principles.

Allegation 1.5

89. The Applicant relies upon paragraphs 42 to 45 above.

Representations made by the Respondent

90. The Respondent did not make any representations regarding this allegation in his response.

Breaches of the Code and the Principles

Paragraphs 7.3 and 7.4 of the Code

91. The Respondent had a duty to engage with and cooperate with the Applicant in relation to its investigations into his conduct. This duty was reiterated to the Respondent on many occasions during the relevant time period.

92. In respect of the investigation concerning Property B, the Respondent failed to Respond to a Production Notice and other enquiries by the Applicant.

93. In respect of the investigation concerning Property C, the Respondent's engagement with the investigation was minimal and only after repeated chasers from the Applicant.

94. In respect of the investigation concerning Property D, the Respondent did not respond to the Applicant's enquiries.

95. The Respondent's failure to cooperate promptly with the Applicant means that the Respondent has breached Paragraphs 7.3 and 7.4 of the Code.

Principle 5

96. The Applicant relies upon the test for integrity stated in *Wingate v SRA*, as set out at paragraph 60 above.

97. The Respondent was required to cooperate with the Applicant in relation to its investigations and failed to do so. He did not respond promptly or at all to the enquires made of him. His failings concerned three separate complaints and occurred over a protracted period of time. That had the effect or prolonging the investigations unnecessarily. The Applicant's resources were expended in repeating requests for responses, which the Respondent was required to provide.

98. At all times, the Respondent was the owner of the Firm and its COLP. He was also an experienced solicitor. Despite this, he demonstrated a flagrant unwillingness to adhere to his regulatory obligations in connection with the Applicant.

99. A solicitor acting with integrity and in accordance with the higher standards expected of professional people would ensure that they responded to the Applicant's enquiries in a timely manner. In this case, the Respondent has largely ignored the Applicant's frequent requests for cooperation, notwithstanding the various warnings given by the Applicant as to duties upon him and the consequences of non-engagement.

100. By his actions, the Respondent has therefore failed to uphold the higher standards which society and the profession expects from a professional person and its members and breached Principle 5 of the Principes.

Principle 2

101. The conduct alleged amounted to a breach by the Respondent of the requirement to behave in a way which maintains the trust placed by the public in him and in the provision of legal services.

102. Public confidence in the Respondent, in solicitors and in the provision of legal services is likely to be undermined by solicitors disregarding their obligations to cooperate with their regulator in relation to investigations. The consequences of the Respondent's actions included significant delay in the progress of complaints in relation to the Firm.

103. Clients who make complaints should expect to have those matters dealt with in a reasonable manner and within a reasonable time period.

104. Public trust and confidence in the solicitors' profession would be diminished if the public was aware that the Respondent had largely ignored the Applicant's repeated attempts to obtain information about the matters relating to allegations 1.1 to 1.4. This would be exacerbated by the fact that the matters under investigation related primarily to a failure by the Respondent to promptly act or respond to other parties.

105. The Respondent has therefore breached Principle 2 of the Principles.

Referral to the Tribunal

106. The Respondent was sent a copy of the Notice Recommending Referral to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal, dated 25 February 2025. **[JL1, 289]**

107. On 20 March 2025, he responded by email. The substance of his reply in relation to the allegations is recorded at paragraphs 47, 53, 67, 72 and 90. **[JL1, 324]**

108. He also stated: *"In each case my actions or inactions fell beneath my usual standards and the professional standards which could have been expected of me… I deeply regret my actions/inactions which have led to these complaints."* **[JL1, 324]**

109. On 21 May 2025, an Authorised Decision Officer of the Applicant decided to refer the Respondent to the Tribunal. **[JL1, 325]**

Statement of Truth

I believe that the facts and matters stated in this statement are true.

Signed:

Dated: 13 November 2025

CASE NO.

BEFORE THE SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

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

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LIMITED

Applicant

- and –

SIMON LANGFORD

Respondent

APPENDIX 1 TO STATEMENT PURSUANT TO RULE 12 (2)

SOLICITORS (DISCIPLINARY PROCEEDINGS) RULES 2019

Relevant Rules and Regulations

The SRA Principles 2019

You act:

Principle 2	in a way that upholds public trust and confidence in the solicitors' profession and in the legal services provided
Principle 4	with honesty
Principle 5	with integrity
Principle 7	in the best interests of each client

The SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs and RFLs 2019

1.3	You perform all undertakings given by you, and so within an agreed timescale or if no timescale has been agreed then within a reasonable amount of time
1.4	You do not mislead or attempt to mislead their clients, the court or others by their own acts or omissions or being complicit in the acts or omissions of others

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

7.3 You cooperate with the SRA, other regulators, ombudsmen, and those bodies, with a role overseeing and supervising the delivery of, or investigating concerns in relation to, legal services

7.4 You respond promptly to the SRA and:

(a) provide full and accurate explanations, information and documents in response to any request or requirement; and

(b) ensure that relevant information which is held by you, or by third parties carrying out functions on your behalf which are critical to the delivery of your legal services, is available for inspection by the SRA