

Carlianne White
Solicitor
588173

[Agreement Date: 23 July 2024](#)

Decision - Agreement

Outcome: Regulatory settlement agreement

Outcome date: 23 July 2024

Published date: 24 July 2024

Firm details

Firm or organisation at date of publication and at time of matters giving rise to outcome

Name: Aaron & Partners LLP

Address(es): 5-7 Grosvenor Court, Foregate St, Chester, CH1 1HG

Firm ID: 401104

Outcome details

This outcome was reached by agreement.

Decision details

Agreed outcome

1.1 Ms Carlianne White (Ms White), a solicitor of Aaron & Partners LLP (the Firm), agrees to the following outcome to the investigation of her conduct by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA):

- a. she is rebuked
- b. to the publication of this agreement
- c. she will pay the costs of the investigation of £300.

Summary of Facts

2.1 On 8 September 2023, the SRA received a self-report from Ms White advising that she had been convicted at Llandudno Magistrates' Court on the same day of the offence of driving whilst unfit through excess alcohol, contrary to Section 5(1)(a) of the Road Traffic Act 1988 and Schedule 2 of the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988.



2.2 Ms White attended Llandudno Magistrates' Court on 8 September 2023, where she pleaded guilty. She was sentenced to:

- i. a 26-month driving disqualification (reduced by 26 weeks if she completed a course by 9 March 2024).
- ii. community order, with a requirement to carry out 120 hours of unpaid work in the next 12-months.

2.3 Ms White was also ordered to pay:

- i. a surcharge of £114
- ii. costs of £85.

Admissions

3.1 Ms White makes the following admissions which the SRA accepts:

- a. she admits that by driving whilst under the influence of excess alcohol, for which she was convicted, that she breached Principle 2 of the SRA Principles, which says:

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

Why a written rebuke is an appropriate outcome

4.1 The SRA's Enforcement Strategy 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 Ms White and the following mitigation which she has put forward:

- a. she made a prompt report to the SRA and co-operated fully with its investigation, including the timely provision of all necessary information
- b. the incident was isolated and out of character
- c. no harm was caused to person or property
- d. she cooperated with the police during their investigation, pleading guilty.

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

- a. Ms White was directly responsible for her conduct
- b. the conduct was reckless and disregarded the risk, or potential risk, of harm to others
- c. Ms White has shown remorse and insight into her conduct



4.4 A rebuke is appropriate to 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 Ms White and others. A rebuke therefore meets the requirements of rule 4.1 of the Regulatory and Disciplinary Procedure Rules.

Publication

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

Acting in a way which is inconsistent with this agreement

6.1 Ms White agrees that she will not deny the admissions made in this agreement or act in any way which is inconsistent with it.

6.2 If Ms White 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 Denying the admissions made or acting in a way which is inconsistent with this agreement may also constitute a separate breach of Principles 2 and 5 and paragraph 7.3 of the Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs and RFLs.

Costs

7.1 Ms White 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/)