

David Bridges

Solicitor

396392

[Sanction Date: 16 July 2024](#)

Decision - Sanction

Outcome: Rebuke

Outcome date: 16 July 2024

Published date: 22 July 2024

Firm details

No detail provided:

Outcome details

This outcome was reached by SRA decision.

Decision details

David Keith Bridges (Mr Bridges), a solicitor, agrees to the following outcome to the investigation of his conduct by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA):

- he is rebuked
- to the publication of this agreement
- he will pay the costs of the investigation of £300.

Reasons/basis

2. Summary of Facts

2.1 On 9 January 2023, Mr Bridges was investigated by the police after his neighbours reported several incidents when, while under the influence of alcohol on 7 and 9 January 2023, he had:

2.1.1 damaged their front door by punching it with his fist

2.1.2 shouted and swore at them in an intimidating way; and

2.1.3 spat at them.

2.2 On 24 February 2023 at St Albans Magistrates Court, Mr Bridges pleaded guilty to and was convicted of:



2.2.1 causing damage to property, contrary to Section 1(1) of the Criminal Damage Act 1971

2.2.2 using threatening abuse/ insulting words/ behaviour intending to cause harassment/ alarm/distress in contravention of section 4A of the Public Order Act 1986; and

2.2.3 assaulting a person by spitting at them in contravention of s39 of the Criminal Justice Act 1988.

2.3 On 3 April 2023, Mr Bridges was sentenced to the following in respect of the three offences described at paragraph 2.2:

- a. 80 hours of unpaid work; and
- b. a 36-month restraining order prohibiting him from contacting his neighbours.

2.4 Mr Bridges was also directed to complete a six-month alcohol treatment order and make the following payments:

- a. £2,200 compensation
- b. £114 victim surcharge; and
- c. £85 costs.

2.5 Mr Bridges was investigated by the police again when on 25 and 26 August 2023, he shouted and swore at his neighbours, contrary to the terms of the restraining order that had been imposed on 3 April 2023.

2.6 On 29 September 2023 at St Albans Magistrates Court, he pleaded guilty to and was convicted of the conduct described at paragraph 2.5, an offence that was contrary to section 5 (5) and (6) of the Protection from Harassment Act 1997.

2.7 As a result of the conviction, Mr Bridges was directed to pay £465 made up of:

- a. £200 fine
- b. £100 compensation
- c. £80 victim surcharge; and
- d. £85 costs.

2.8 On 29 September 2023, St Albans Magistrates Court also made a variation to the sentence imposed by it on 3 April 2023. In its order, it removed the requirement that Mr Bridges completed 80-hours unpaid work.

3. Admissions

3.1 Mr Bridges admits and the SRA accepts that by:



- pleading guilty on 24 February 2023 to his conduct on 7 and 9 January 2023 and the three offences described at paragraph 2.2; and
- pleading guilty on 29 September 2023 to his conduct on 25 and 26 August 2023 and the offence described at paragraph 2.6

and being convicted of those offences, he breached:

- a. Principle 1 of the SRA Principles (the Principles) which says that you act in a way that upholds the constitutional principle of the rule of law and the proper administration of justice
- b. Principle 2 of the Principles, which says that you act in a way that upholds public trust and confidence in the solicitors profession and in legal services provided by authorised persons; and
- c. Principle 5 of the Principles, which says that you act with integrity.

4. Why a written rebuke is an appropriate outcome

4.1 The SRA's Enforcement Strategy and its topic guide on criminal offences outside of practice sets out its approach to the use of its enforcement powers where there has been a failure to meet its standards or requirements.

4.2 When considering the appropriate sanctions and controls in this matter, the SRA has taken into account the admissions made by Mr Bridges and the following mitigation which he has put forward:

- a. he promptly reported his convictions to the SRA
- b. he has shown insight and remorse for his conduct and co-operated throughout the SRA's investigation
- c. he has no other adverse regulatory history
- d. there was no lasting and/or significant harm to the neighbours and/or their property.

4.3 The SRA considers that a written rebuke is the appropriate outcome because:

- a. the conduct or behaviour was reckless as to the risk of harm/regulatory obligations
- b. as a consequence of the offences committed resulting in the second conviction, the conduct persisted longer than reasonable.

4.4 A rebuke is appropriate to maintain professional standards and uphold public confidence in the solicitors' profession and in legal services provided by authorised persons.

4.5 A rebuke is also intended to deter the individual and others from similar behaviour in the future. Any lesser sanction would not provide a credible deterrent to Mr Bridges and others. A rebuke therefore meets



the requirements of rule 3.1 of the Regulatory and Disciplinary Procedure Rules.

5. Publication

5.1 The SRA considers it appropriate that this agreement is published in the interests of transparency in the regulatory and disciplinary process. Mr Bridges agrees to the publication of this agreement.

6. Acting in a way which is inconsistent with this agreement

6.1 Mr Bridges agrees that he will not deny the admissions made in this agreement or act in any way which is inconsistent with it.

6.2 If Mr Bridges denies the admissions or acts in a way which is inconsistent with this agreement, the conduct which is subject to this agreement may be considered further by the SRA. That may result in a disciplinary outcome or a referral to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal on the original facts and allegations.

6.3 Acting in a way which is inconsistent with this agreement may also constitute a separate breach of principles 2 and 5 of the Principles, and paragraph 7.3 of the Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs and RFLs.

7. Costs

7.1 Mr Bridges agrees to pay the costs of the SRA's investigation in the sum of £300. Such costs are due within 28 days of a statement of costs due being issued by the SRA.

[Search again \[https://www.sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/\]](https://www.sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/)