

SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974

Case No. 12943-2026

BETWEEN:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LTD

Applicant

and

ANGELA STANTON

Respondent

Before:

Mrs L Boyce (in the chair)
Mrs L Nabou
Dr A Richards

Date of Hearing: 16 September 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 the Respondent were that, whilst in practice as a solicitor at Beverley Morris Solicitors:
2. From 9 June–17 July 2020, while acting for Client A and Client B in registering a legal charge over Property C, the Respondent failed to act in Client A's best interests and/or provide a competent service. She failed to undertake adequate customer due diligence, obtain Client A's authority or consent, identify that Witness D benefited from the loan, and protect funds due to Client A.
3. This breached paragraphs 3.1, 3.2, 4.2, 6.4 and 8.1 of the SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors and Principles 2, 5 and 7 of the SRA Principles 2019.
4. From 22 July 2021–16 January 2023, while acting in connection with the sale of Property F, the Respondent failed to act in Client E's best interests, preferred Client B's interests, and provided misleading and inaccurate information to Client E. She acted despite a conflict or significant risk of conflict; withheld material information; gave an undertaking and transferred sale proceeds for Client B's benefit without Client E's consent; failed to account accurately to Client E; and altered or supplied misleading financial statements and information about Client E's remaining funds.
5. This breached paragraphs 1.4, 3.1, 4.2, 6.2 and 6.4 of the SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors and Principles 2, 3, 4 (in relation to the misleading-information allegations only), 5 and 7 of the SRA Principles 2019.

Admissions

6. The Respondent admitted the allegations in full, including all associated breaches of the Principles, including lack of integrity and dishonesty, and the Codes of Conduct.

Documents

7. The Tribunal had before it the following documents: -
 - Rule 12 Statement and Exhibit CS1 dated 5 June 2026.
 - Applicant's Statement of Costs dated 5 June 2026.
 - Statement of Agreed Facts and Proposed Outcome signed by the Respondent on 27 August 2026 and the Applicant on 1 September 2026.

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

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

Professional Details

9. The Respondent was a solicitor, having been admitted to the Roll in March 1980. At the time of the hearing, she was retired and did not have a practising certificate.

Factual Background

10. The allegations concerned the Respondent's conduct in two conveyancing matters involving properties jointly owned by Client B and, respectively, Client A and Client E.
11. Client B was a property developer for whom the Respondent had previously acted in multiple transactions. At the time of the first allegation, Client B was in a personal relationship with Client A; at the time of the second, Client B was in a personal relationship with Client E.
12. The first allegation concerned the Respondent's conduct between 9 June and 17 July 2020, while acting for Client A and Client B in connection with the registration of a legal charge over Property C, which they jointly owned. The Respondent failed to undertake adequate customer due diligence, obtain Client A's authority or consent, identify that Witness D benefited from the loan, and protect money due to Client A. Client A reported the matter to the SRA on 1 September 2024.
13. The second allegation concerned the Respondent's conduct between 22 July 2021 and 16 January 2023 in connection with the sale of Property F, which Client E and Client B jointly owned, and subsequent events. The Respondent preferred Client B's interests over those of Client E, made unauthorised use and transfer of sale proceeds, and provided misleading and inaccurate information to Client E. Client E applied to the SRA Compensation Fund on 10 August 2023.
14. Client B died on 20 April 2023, before Client E's Compensation Fund application and Client A's report to the SRA.

Findings of Fact and Law

15. 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.

Seriousness

16. In approaching each of the allegations, the Tribunal had regard to Dentons UK and Middle East LLP v SRA [2026] EWCA Civ 508, in which the Court of Appeal held that there was an inherent requirement of seriousness in determining whether a solicitor's conduct amounted to breaches of the SRA Principles or the mandatory provisions of the SRA Code. The question for the Tribunal was whether the conduct would be regarded by competent and reputable solicitors as sufficiently serious to be categorised as professional misconduct.

17. The Tribunal was satisfied that the seriousness threshold was met because the Respondent had acted dishonestly and significant harm had resulted from her actions.
18. 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

19. 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. The Tribunal's overriding objective, when considering sanction, was the need to maintain public confidence in the integrity of the profession. In determining sanction, it was the Tribunal's role to assess the seriousness of the proven misconduct and to impose a sanction that was fair and proportionate in all the circumstances.
20. The Respondent was dishonest and lacked integrity while providing legal services to Client E and lacked integrity in respect of her dealings with Client A. Her misconduct was deliberate and repeated, and she knew or ought reasonably to have known that her conduct was in material breach of professional obligations to protect the public and the reputation of the legal profession. She had failed to protect client interests and client money, had provided misleading and inaccurate information and had engaged in conduct which preferred the interests of Client B over clients to whom she owed professional duties.
21. The Tribunal noted that the Respondent did not obtain any personal advantage from her conduct, had been quick to accept her own wrongdoing, had cooperated fully with the regulator and had no previous disciplinary findings against her.
22. The Tribunal determined that the Respondent had been in full control of her actions and that the seriousness of her conduct was extremely high. As the Respondent's conduct was dishonest and untrustworthy, the Tribunal observed that a finding of dishonesty would, absent exceptional circumstances, require an order striking the solicitor from the roll.
23. Having considered the authorities, in particular SRA v Sharma [2010] EWHC 2022 (Admin) and SRA v James [2018] EWHC 2058 (Admin), the Tribunal did not find any exceptional circumstances justifying any lesser sanction than striking off, which was an appropriate and proportionate sanction which sought to maintain the reputation of the solicitors' profession (Bolton v The Law Society [1994] 1 WLR 512).

Costs

24. The parties agreed that the Respondent should pay costs in the sum of £18,000.00. The Tribunal determined that the agreed amount was reasonable and proportionate. Accordingly, the Tribunal ordered that the Respondent pay costs in the agreed sum.

Statement of Full Order

25. The Tribunal ordered that the Respondent, ANGELA STANTON, Solicitor, SRA ID number 118662, be STRUCK OFF the Roll of Solicitors and it further ordered that the Respondent pay the costs of and incidental to this application and enquiry fixed in the sum of £18,000.00.

Dated this 23rd day of September 2026
On behalf of the Tribunal

L Boyce

L Boyce
Chair

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 -

ANGELA STANTON

Respondent

STATEMENT OF AGREED FACTS AND PROPOSED OUTCOME

1. By its application dated 5 June 2026, and the statement made pursuant to Rule 12(2) of the Solicitors (Disciplinary Proceedings) Rules 2019 which accompanied that application, the Solicitors Regulation Authority Limited ("the SRA") brought proceedings before the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal, making two allegations of misconduct against Angela Stanton ("the Respondent").

The Allegations

2. The allegations against the Respondent, made by the SRA within that statement, are that, whilst in practice as a solicitor at Beverley Morris Solicitors ("the Firm"), she:

- 2.1. Between 9 June 2020 and 17 July 2020, whilst acting for Client A and Client B, failed to act in the best interests of Client A and / or provide a competent standard of service, in that she:

(a) failed to conduct adequate customer due diligence when registering a legal charge for Client A and Client B on Property C,

(b) failed to obtain Client A's authority to act and / or consent for Client B to give instructions on her behalf,

(c) failed to identify that Witness D, the witness to the legal charge, benefitted from the loan,

(d) failed to protect client money by distributing funds that were due to Client A to Client B and Witness D instead.

And in doing so she breached any or all of Paragraphs 3.1, 3.2, 4.2, 6.4 and 8.1 of the SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs, RFLs and RSLs 2019 ("the SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors") and Principles 2, 5 and 7 of the SRA Principles 2019 ("the SRA Principles").

2.2. Between 22 July 2021 and 16 January 2023, failed to act in the best interests of her client, Client E, and / or preferred the interests of Client B over Client E, and / or provided information to Client E which she knew or ought to have known was misleading and inaccurate, in that she:

(a) between 22 July 2021 and 27 October 2021, acted for both Client E and Client B in respect of the sale of Property F, in circumstances where there was a conflict of interest or a significant risk of a conflict which would result in Client E suffering a financial loss.

(b) on or about 23 September 2021, failed to inform Client E of a pending application in respect of an additional charge on Property F;

(c) on or about 24 September 2021, provided an undertaking to Person G to repay a debt of Client B on completion of the sale of Property F without the consent of Client E;

(d) on or about 27 September 2021, failed to inform Client E that there were insufficient funds remaining after completion of the sale of Property F to allow purchase of a further property;

(e) on or about 30 September 2021, failed to provide a financial statement to Client E in respect of the sale of Property F;

(f) on or about 30 September 2021, transferred Client E's share of the proceeds of sale from Property F to Client B without the consent of Client E;

(g) between 24 September 2021 and 20 October 2021, failed to disclose material information to Client E regarding the source of funds to purchase other properties;

(h) on or about 4 May 2022, altered the financial statements relating to Property F and then provided them to Client E when she knew they were misleading and inaccurate;

(i) between 27 September 2021 and 15 February 2023, provided inaccurate information, which she knew was inaccurate and misleading, to Client E in respect of her remaining funds after the completion of the sale of Property F.

And in doing so she breached any or all of Paragraphs 1.4, 3.1, 4.2, 6.2, 6.4 of the SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors and Principles 2, 3, 4 (in respect of allegations 1.2(h) and 1.2(i) only), 5 and 7 of the SRA Principles.

Admissions

3. The Respondent admits all of the allegations and breaches that are applicable to each.
4. The Applicant has considered the admissions being made and whether these admissions and the outcome proposed in this document, meet the public interest having regard to the gravity of the matters alleged. For the reasons explained in more detail below, and subject to the Tribunal's approval, the Applicant is satisfied that the admissions and outcome do satisfy the public interest.
5. The Applicant and Respondent invite the Tribunal to approve this Agreed Outcome on this basis. The Parties consider in all the circumstances that the proposed Agreed Outcome represents a proportionate outcome to the proceedings which is in the public interest.

Agreed Facts

6. The following facts and matters, which are relied upon by the Applicant in support of the allegations set out within paragraph 2 of this statement, are agreed between the Applicant and the Respondent.
7. References to certain individuals and entities have been anonymised as per the schedule to the Rule 12 statement.

Professional Details

9. The Respondent was born on July 1953 and admitted as a solicitor on 15 March 1980.
10. At the relevant time, the Respondent was a solicitor at the Firm and specialised in conveyancing. She held the roles of Compliance Officer for Finance and Administration and Money Laundering Compliance Officer.
11. The Respondent has now retired from practice and does not have a practising certificate.

The facts and matters relied upon in support of the allegations

Background

12. The conduct in this matter concerns the Respondent's actions:
 - 12.1. between June and July 2020, in registering a charge against Property C, of which Client A and Client B were co-owners. This was the subject of a report by Client A to the SRA on 1 September 2024.
 - 12.2. between September 2021 and January of 2023, in respect of the sale of Property F, of which Client E and Client B were co-owners, and the events following the sale. This was the subject of a Compensation Fund application by Client E to the SRA on 10 August 2023.
13. Client B was a property developer who the Respondent had acted for previously in respect of multiple transactions. At the material times in respect of each allegation, Client B was in personal relationships with Client A and Client E.
14. Client B sadly died on 20 April 2023.

Factual background – first allegation

15. On 5 June 2020, the Respondent was instructed in relation to a charge being placed on Property C, which Client B jointly owned with Client A. The Respondent used Client B's email address to correspond with both Client B and Client A in relation to the instructions.

16. In her letter confirming the instructions, the Respondent requested that Client A and Client B sign and return an attached declaration and agreement within 7 days. The Respondent further indicated that 'in accordance with the requirements of Money Laundering Regulations' both Client A and Client B should 'EACH bring in ALL documents' that had been specified for the purposes of identification and verification.
17. The declaration was returned (and purportedly signed by both Client A and Client B) on 9 June 2020. No further customer due diligence was undertaken by the Respondent.
18. Client B attended the Respondent's offices on 15 July 2020 and the two discussed the implications of the charge being put on Property C and the loan that Client B was taking out which was linked to this charge. The loan was for £320,000 and was provided by Sound Property Management Limited.
19. The Respondent asked Client B why Client A had not attended given that she was required to sign documents. Client B is reported by the Respondent as saying that 'she [Client A] was busy and couldn't make it.' Client B undertook to take the documents to Client A and get them signed and witnessed.
20. On 16 July 2020, the Respondent confirmed that Client B would receive a balance of £316,940.40 upon the completion of the charge the following day. This figure represented the loan amount less various fees and charges.
21. Later on the same day, the Respondent issued a further financial statement which indicated that the balance payable to Client B was actually £196,916.40 given that a payment of £120,000 was to be paid to Witness D and that there were some further bank fees.
22. On 17 July 2020, a deed which recorded the loan arrangement between Client B and Client A and Sound Property Management Limited and placed a charge on Property C, was signed by Client B and (purportedly) Client A. It was also witnessed by Witness D.
23. In her report to the SRA on September 2024, Client A stated that:

'[Client B] 'was able to get a...charge applied on our home,...without my knowledge, consent or signature with Sound Property Management. The documents were not signed by me, the witness on the mortgage documents, [Witness D] who I have never met received £120,000.00 of the proceeds without my knowledge or consent. I have not received any letters, emails telephone calls from [the Firm]. I have never received any separate legal advice regarding this matter.'

Factual background – second allegation

24. On 22 July 2021, Client B and Client E instructed the Respondent in relation to the sale of their jointly owned property, Property F for £1,300,000.

25. Client E understood that Property F was subject to a charge which related to a loan of £330,000 and that, once this had been repaid, Client B and Client E would split the remaining balance (of £970,000). It was further understood by Client E that she would receive £507,000, enough money to allow her to purchase a new property for her and her daughter to live in and that this property would be solely in her name.

26. On 3 September 2021, Client E instructed the Respondent in relation to a connected purchase of a lower value new build property. The agreed purchase price for that property was £495,000.

27. On 27 September 2021 (and just prior to the completion date in respect of the sale of Property F), Client E sought confirmation from the Respondent as to whether she needed her bank details for transfer of the proceeds of the sale. The Respondent responded on the same day stating:

'I've told [Client B] that since we have now received the draft contract and supporting documents for your purchase of the new build property, we can keep the net sale proceeds in our client account pending completion of your purchase. We can also use the funds to pay the deposit on exchange.... So we won't be sending any funds to you following the completion of sale.'

28. Client E then asked the Respondent to confirm that she would 'keep the full £495,000 for the house purchase plus the stamp duty money on account for me' and the Respondent responded 'Yes, [Client E], we will be keeping the whole of the net sale proceeds on completion.' It is apparent from this response that the Respondent did not seek to correct

Client E as to the amount of money that would be stored on account for Client E. The true position at that point was that after all liabilities had been met, the net sale proceeds of Property F would be £40,000 and thus Client E would be entitled to £20,000.

29. On 4 October 2021, Client E emailed the Respondent in the following terms:

'Now that [Property F] has completed can you please confirm to me what is happening with the proceeds of sale and that you have all the purchase money and stamp duty money that I need to purchase the new build?'

30. On 5 October 2021, the Respondent replied and stated:

'I confirm that I am holding the net sale proceeds from the sale of [Property F] and there will be sufficient funds to complete your purchase of the new build... and pay the stamp duty land tax.'

It is apparent from this response that the Respondent did not seek to correct Client E as to the amount of money stored on account for Client E. The true position at that point was that there were nominal or no funds remaining from the net sale proceeds and that this would be clearly insufficient to enable Client E to purchase the new build property.

31. On 20 October 2021, Client E exchanged contracts on the purchase of the new build property and £48,500 was paid by way of deposit, with a proposed completion date of May 2022.

32. In April 2022, Client E learnt that there had been a fire at the new build property and that it would not be possible to proceed with the purchase. Client E instead agreed to buy a different new build property with a higher purchase price of £584,995. Client E agreed with Client B that he would gift her £80,000 to cover the price difference.

33. On 22 April 2022, Client E emailed the Respondent and asked her to 'please confirm how much money you are holding for me there so I can work out exactly how much more I need.'

34. On 26 April 2022, the Respondent responded and stated:

'My completions assistant is extremely busy at the moment and has a backlog of financial statements which I've asked her to prepare so I will add yours to the list and will send you the information which you have requested shortly.'

35. Shortly after this email exchange, Client E then received two financial statements from the Firm. Both indicated that the Firm held £507,000 as 'funds from sale of [Property F].' These statements were later shown to be inaccurate and incorrect. These misleading statements were produced at the direction of the Respondent.

36. On 18 May 2022, the Respondent emailed Client E a client care letter confirming that the Firm had been instructed in relation to the purchase of the different new build property.

37. 29 June 2022, the Respondent emailed Client E to confirm that:

'the funds which we are holding are still on the ledger for your former purchase and I forgot we are holding these. There is no need for you to send us any additional funds for the deposit.'

38. On 29 July 2022, Client E received confirmation from the Firm that contracts had been exchanged in respect of her purchase of the substitute new build property. The proposed completion date was December 2022.

39. On 15 November 2022, Client E emailed the Respondent asking for confirmation as to how much money was needed to complete the purchase on the different new build property.

40. The Respondent replied on the same day stating 'as you have probably seen, I have retired from practice now but I will look into this and get back to you shortly.'

41. On 21 November 2022, the Respondent emailed Client E as follows:

'However, [Client B] called me this afternoon and informed me that there will be a shortfall of approximately £175,000 when it comes to the completion of your purchase, including our fees and disbursements.'

42. On 23 November 2022, the Respondent emailed Client E in the following terms:

'Please accept my apologies for the delay in sending you a financial statement for your purchase. As you know I have officially retired from practice and am not working in the office any longer. However, I have had to ask my assistant.... to prepare the statement as I can't work with Excel to prepare these myself... You will see that there is a balance of £180,144.00 required to complete your purchase, including our fees and disbursements, and with these funds coming from either a mortgage on the property or from [Client B], there will be sufficient funds to complete the purchase.'

43. The Respondent provided Client E with an updated financial statement that stated that only £351,500 had been received from the sale of Property F. This statement was later shown to be inaccurate and incorrect.
44. In January 2023, Client E learnt from Client A that 'he had taken all the money [the Respondent] was holding' and that she would 'need to get a bridging loan of approximately £505,000 and borrow £20,000 from family and friends to make up the funds for completion.'
45. On 15 February 2023, Client E spoke to the Respondent by telephone and asked her where all her money had gone. Client E recalls the Respondent saying 'I don't know.'
46. On 8 October 2023, Client E made a formal complaint about the Respondent and the Firm.
47. As a result of this complaint, Client E gained access to emails sent by the Respondent in September 2021 and the financial records in respect of the sale of Property F. The emails indicated that, on completion of the sale, in accordance with an undertaking provided by the Respondent on 24 September 2021, Person G had been paid £300,000 of the proceeds of the sale of Property F. This undertaking was in respect of a debt owed by Client B to Person G and it was offered in exchange for Person G withdrawing their application to register a charge on Property F. The financial records further indicated a 'redemption' payment of £954,459.19 had been paid to Handf Finance Limited. After accounting for other fees, this meant that there was only approximately £40,000 remaining by way of net proceeds of sale. Client E states that she was not aware of any of the information contained within the emails or the financial records (including the undertaking) and that it had not been brought to her attention by the Respondent at any time.
48. A further email released to Client E as a result of her complaint indicated that, on 1 October 2021, Client B had been paid £40,000 out of the net proceeds of sale of Property F. This

demonstrated that between October 2021 and November 2022, when the Respondent was corresponding with Client E in respect of the sale proceeds from Property F, the Respondent was aware that the balance due to Client E was significantly lower (between £0 and £20,000) than Client E evidently thought it was (approximately £500,000), given the content of her emails.

The Respondent's position

49. The Respondent accepts that:

49.1. Between 9 June 2020 and 17 July 2020, in respect of Client A, she failed to:

49.1.1. conduct adequate customer due diligence when registering the legal charge for Client A and Client B on Property C

49.1.2. obtain Client A's authority to act and / or consent for Client B to give instructions on her behalf,

49.1.3. identify that Witness D, the witness to the legal charge, benefitted from the loan,

49.1.4. protect client money by distributing funds that were due to Client A to Client B and Witness D instead

49.2. Between 22 July 2021 and 16 January 2023, in respect of Client E, she:

49.2.1. Failed to act in Client E's best interests and preferred the interests of Client B over Client E in that she:

49.2.1.1. acted for both Client E and Client B in respect of the sale of Property F, in circumstances where there was a conflict of interest or a significant risk of a conflict which would result in Client E suffering a financial loss;

49.2.1.2. did not inform Client E of a pending application in respect of an additional charge on Property F;

49.2.1.3. on or about 24 September 2021, provided an undertaking to Person G to repay a debt of Client B on completion of the sale of Property F without the consent of Client E;

49.2.1.4. did not inform Client E that there were insufficient funds remaining after completion of the sale of Property F to allow purchase of a further property;

49.2.1.5. did not provide a financial statement to Client E on completion of the sale of Property F;

49.2.1.6. transferred Client E's share of the proceeds of sale from Property F to Client B without the consent of Client E;

49.2.1.7. did not disclose material information to Client E regarding the source of funds to purchase other properties;

49.2.2. Provided information to Client E which she knew was misleading and inaccurate in that she:

49.2.2.1. altered the financial statements relating to Property F and then provided them to Client E;

49.2.2.2. provided inaccurate information to Client E in respect of her remaining funds after the completion of the sale of Property F.

50. By the Respondent's conduct, she admits that she breached all of:

50.1. The following Principles:

50.1.1. Principle 2;

50.1.2. Principle 3;

50.1.3. Principle 4 (in respect of allegations 2.2(h) and (i) only);

50.1.4. Principle 5;

50.1.5. Principle 7.

50.2. The following Paragraphs of the Code:

- 50.2.1. Paragraph 1.4
- 50.2.2. Paragraph 3.1
- 50.2.3. Paragraph 3.2
- 50.2.4. Paragraph 4.2
- 50.2.5. Paragraph 6.2
- 50.2.6. Paragraph 6.4
- 50.2.7. Paragraph 8.1

Aggravating factors

51. The principal factors which aggravate the seriousness of the Respondent's misconduct are:

- 51.1. Dishonesty;
- 51.2. Misconduct which was deliberate and / or repeated;
- 51.3. Misconduct where the Respondent knew or ought reasonably to have known that the conduct was in material breach of professional obligations to protect the public and the reputation of the legal profession.

Non-agreed mitigation

52. The Respondent regrets the action taken and that she allowed herself to prefer the interests of one client and in doing so negatively impacted others or other clients.

53. The Respondent has unreservedly apologised for the breaches and throughout the investigation has not sought to deny wrongdoing and put the SRA at additional inconvenience of having to prove the allegations made.

54. There were quick admissions made by the Respondent.

55. There was full and open disclosure of all information requested and provided. The Respondent's transparency throughout has enabled the SRA to quickly understand the issues relating to her handling of the transactions.

56. The Respondent co-operated throughout the investigation providing full input and quick responses when required and made no attempts to conceal the facts or diminish their consequences.

57. There is no evidence of serious or persistent poor levels of competence with regard to any other clients or matters handled by The Respondent.

58. These were two distinct incidents, albeit with significant consequences.

59. There have been no previous incidents of misconduct or behaviour or regulatory breaches by the Respondent, she has operated in a compliant way throughout her career which has spanned across some 50 years representing thousands of clients without causing any regulatory concerns or breaches.

60. The Respondent did not obtain any personal benefit or advantage financial or otherwise from her conduct.

61. The affected parties have now been fairly compensated for the losses they incurred.

Sanction proposed

62. It is therefore proposed that:

62.1. The Respondent be struck off the Roll of Solicitors.

62.2. The Respondent pay the Applicant's agreed costs of £18,000.

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

63. The Respondent has admitted dishonesty and lack of integrity in the course of providing legal services to Client E, and lack of integrity in respect of her dealings with Client A. Her admitted misconduct involved serious failures to protect client interests and client money, the provision of misleading and inaccurate information, and conduct which preferred the interests of Client B over those of clients to whom she owed professional duties.

64. 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))."

65. In *Sharma* (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..."

66. For the reasons set out below, there are no exceptional circumstances here.

67. The present case does not fall within the small residual category in which striking off would be disproportionate. The Respondent's dishonesty was not technical, peripheral or momentary. It arose in the course of client work, concerned the handling and explanation of substantial client funds, and involved the provision of information which she knew was misleading and inaccurate. The misconduct also caused, or risked causing, serious financial prejudice to vulnerable clients who were entitled to rely upon the Respondent to protect their interests, give them accurate information and safeguard money to which they were entitled. In those circumstances, the misconduct went to the heart of the trust placed in solicitors and seriously undermined public confidence in the profession.

68. The Respondent's misconduct was not an isolated incident, and therefore cannot be attributed to a momentary lapse in judgement. The breaches occurred over the course of four years – time in which the Respondent had ample opportunity to cease further breaches and comply with her professional obligations. She did not do so.

69. Having considered the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal's Guidance Note on Sanctions, it is apparent that 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.

70. Accordingly, the fair and proportionate penalty in this case is for the Respondent to be struck off the Roll of Solicitors.

Summary

71. 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 Applicant's costs in the sum of £18,000.

.....
Shubhaa Krishnan

For and on behalf of the SRA

Dated: ~~August 2026~~
~~XXXXXX~~

...

Angela Stanton
Respondent in these proceedings

.....
Dated: 27 August 2026

