

Beenu Rudki

Employee

652806

Agreement Date: 30 April 2019

Decision - Agreement

Outcome: Regulatory settlement agreement

Outcome date: 30 April 2019

Published date: 14 May 2019

Firm details

Firm or organisation at time of matters giving rise to outcome

Name: Lewis Silkin LLP

Address(es): 5 Chancery Lane, Clifford's Inn, London, EC4A 1BL

Firm ID: 439493

Outcome details

This outcome was reached by agreement.

Decision details

Agreed outcome

1.1 Beenu Rudki, a former employee of Lewis Silkin LLP (the Firm), agrees to the following outcome to the SBA's investigation of her conduct:

- a. to the making of an order, under section 43 of the Solicitors Act 1974 (a Section 43 Order), in relation to her that, from the date of this agreement:
 - i. no solicitor shall employ or remunerate her in connection with their practice as a solicitor
 - ii. no employee of a solicitor shall employ or remunerate her in connection with the solicitor's practice
 - iii. no recognised body shall employ or remunerate her
 - iv. no manager or employee of a recognised body shall employ or remunerate her in connection with the business of that body
 - v. no recognised body or manager or employee of such a body shall permit her to be a manager of the body



- vi. no recognised body or manager or employee of such body shall permit her to have an interest in the body

except in accordance with the SRA's prior permission.

- b. she is rebuked
- c. to the publication of this agreement
- d. she will pay the costs of the investigation in the sum of £600.

Reasons/basis

Summary of Facts

Ms Rudki was employed by the Firm as an Immigration Director. The Firm was instructed by a client to provide immigration advice. The matter was dealt with by a partner, Ms Rudki and a paralegal.

On 27 October 2017, Ms Rudki had an email exchange with the client to clarify issues that had arisen in relation to a Sponsor License Application. None of the emails sent by Ms Rudki contained costs information. In January 2018, the client emailed Ms Rudki to question whether they had been provided with costs information.

Ms Rudki accessed one of the emails she had sent to the client on 27 October 2017. She added the costs information the client wanted. Ms Rudki then sent the amended email to the client, making it appear that the costs information had been included in the original version of the email sent to the client in October 2017, when it had not.

Later in January, the client emailed a partner at the Firm raising concerns about the costs information provided. The Firm investigated Ms Rudki's conduct. Throughout the investigation Ms Rudki denied having amended the October email.

On 6 February 2018, before the disciplinary process was complete, Ms Rudki resigned from the Firm.

The SRA and Ms Rudki agree that a Section 43 Order is appropriate because:

- a. Ms Rudki is not a solicitor
- b. by virtue of her employment and remuneration at the Firm she was involved in a legal practice
- c. by misleading her client and the Firm Ms Rudki has occasioned or been party to an act or default in relation to a legal practice. Ms Rudki's conduct in relation to that act or default makes it undesirable for her to be involved in a legal practice.

Ms Rudki's conduct makes it undesirable for her to be involved in a legal practice because her actions demonstrate that she cannot be relied upon to deal with clients or her employers honestly.

In deciding that the agreed outcome is proportionate, the SRA has taken into account the admissions made by Ms Rudki and the following mitigation which she has put forward:

- a. at the time of the misconduct, Ms Rudki was suffering from stress, anxiety and depression which, in the opinion of her consultant psychiatrist, may have impaired her judgement.

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