

**Parveen Sidhu**  
**Solicitor**  
**339891**

[Agreement Date: 1 March 2024](#)

**Decision - Agreement**

Outcome: Regulatory settlement agreement

Outcome date: 1 March 2024

Published date: 4 March 2024

**Firm details**

**Firm or organisation at time of matters giving rise to outcome**

Name: Axiom Ince Limited

Address(es): 101 Wigmore Street, London W1U 1FA England

Firm ID: 628201

**Firm or organisation at date of publication**

Name: Taylor Rose TTKW Limited

Address(es): 58 Borough High Street, London SE1 1XF England

Firm ID: 623604

**Outcome details**

This outcome was reached by agreement.

**Decision details**

**1. Agreed outcome**

1.1 Ms Parveen Sidhu, a solicitor formerly at Axiom Ince Limited (the Firm), and now at Taylor Rose TTKW Limited 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.



## **2. Summary of Facts**

2.1 Ms Sidhu worked at the Firm in the conveyancing department.

2.2 Ms Sidhu was instructed, in May 2021 to sell two properties. One was owned jointly by mother and daughter, and one was owned by the daughter and her husband.

2.3 Ms Sidhu was also instructed to purchase a property which was to be paid for using funds from both sales. The purchase was to be registered in the joint names of the daughter and her husband alone.

2.4 Mrs Sidhu advised that a Declaration of Trust (the Declaration) be prepared, to reflect the agreement between the parties, and referred them to a colleague for the Declaration to be prepared. She advised that the Declaration would need to be in place on completion.

2.5 The parties instructed that the purchase be completed before Stamp Duty rates increased on 30 June 2021.

2.6 On 29 June 2021 Ms Sidhu completed the sales and purchase without the Declaration being executed. She did not take her clients instructions on completing the purchase without the Declaration. This meant the mother's contribution was not protected.

2.7 The mother's son subsequently complained to the firm and to the SRA.

## **3. Admissions**

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

- a. that by failing to take her clients instructions on completing the purchase without the Declaration being in place, she failed to consider and take account of one of her client's attributes, needs and circumstances, in breach of the SRA Code of Conduct, paragraph 3.4.
- b. she failed to act in the best interests of the client, in breach of Principle 7 of the SRA Principles.

## **4. 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 Sidhu and the following mitigation which she has put forward:



- a. work was highly pressurised at the time of completion due to a significantly increased workload due to the SDLT reduction ending.
- b. because of work pressures she overlooked taking her clients instructions on completing without the Declaration in place.
- c. this was an isolated incident and she has shown insight and remorse.
- d. she has co-operated fully with the SRA investigation.

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

- a. Ms Sidhu was directly responsible for her conduct.
- b. It was foreseeable that completing without the Declaration left the mother's contribution unprotected and that the parties may not agree the terms of the Declaration post-completion.
- c. the conduct was reckless as to risk of harm.

## **5. Publication**

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

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

6.1 Ms Sidhu 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 Sidhu 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 of the Principles and paragraph 7.3 of the Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs and RFLs.

## **7. Costs**

7.1 Ms Sidhu 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/)