

Anca-Florina Mitrana

Solicitor

609875

[Sanction Date: 1 August 2024](#)

Decision - Sanction

Outcome: Rebuke

Outcome date: 1 August 2024

Published date: 6 September 2024

Firm details

Firm or organisation at time of matters giving rise to outcome

Name: Private Office Legal Services Limited

Address(es): First Floor, Albany House, 162-168 High Street, Waltham Cross, EN8 7DF

Firm ID: 626971

Firm or organisation at date of publication

Name: Taylor Rose Limited

Address(es): 69 Carter Lane, London, EC4V 5EQ

Firm ID: 623604

Outcome details

This outcome was reached by SRA decision.

Decision details

Who does this disciplinary decision relate to?

Ms Mitrana is a solicitor, currently working at Taylor Rose TTKW Limited, a regulated body.

At the time of the misconduct detailed below, Ms Mitrana was working at Private Office Legal Services Limited, a recognised body.

Short summary of decision



We have issued Ms Mitrana with a rebuke for failing to advise clients adequately or at all about high risks in schemes involving the purchase and subsequent subletting of leasehold rooms and/or suites in care homes.

The conduct took place from September 2017 to November 2018.

Facts of the misconduct

It was found that:

When acting as a newly qualified solicitor, Ms Mitrana failed to adequately advise her clients about high risks when acting for them in schemes involving the purchase and subsequent subletting of rooms/suites in care homes.

In doing so, Ms Mitrana failed to act in the best interests of her clients (Principle 4 2011), failed to provide them with a proper standard of service (Principle 5), failed to protect her clients' interests (Outcome O(1.2) Code of Conduct 2011) and failed to provide a competent service (Outcome O(1.5) Code of Conduct 2011).

Decision on sanction

It was decided that a rebuke was an appropriate and proportionate sanction.

This was because Ms Mitrana's conduct was serious by reference to the following factors in the SRA Enforcement Strategy:

1. Ms Mitrana's actions constituted more than a single negligent mistake.
2. There was an underlying concern in the public interest – namely that solicitors should ensure they provide proper advice to their clients about the risks inherent in such transactions.

A more serious sanction was not considered to be proportionate by reference to the following factors in the Enforcement Strategy:

1. Ms Mitrana was a newly qualified solicitor at the time of these events, working under the supervision of a more senior and experienced property lawyer.
2. There was a low risk of repetition.
3. There were no allegations of dishonesty or lack of integrity and Ms Mitrana had not acted intentionally in breach of her regulatory obligations.

Reasons/basis

SRA Principles 2011

Principle 4 You must act in the best interests of each client.

Principle 5 You must provide a proper standard of service to your clients.

SRA Code of Conduct 2011

Outcome O(1.2) You provide services to your clients in a manner which protects their interests in their matter, subject to the proper administration of justice.

Outcome O(1.5) The service you provide to clients is competent, delivered in a timely manner and takes account of your clients' needs and circumstances.

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