

Michelle Chapman Solicitor 604363

Agreement Date: 24 June 2025

Decision - Agreement

Outcome: Regulatory settlement agreement

Outcome date: 24 June 2025

Published date: 25 June 2025

Firm details

Firm or organisation at time of matters giving rise to outcome

Name: Bromleys Solicitors LLP

Address(es): 50 Wellington Road, Ashton-under-Lyne, OL6 6XL

Firm ID: 558557

Firm or organisation at date of publication

Name: North Ainley Solicitors

Address(es): 34/36 Clegg Street Oldham OL1 1PS

Firm ID: 58840

Outcome details

This outcome was reached by agreement.

Decision details

1. Agreed outcome

- 1.1 Michelle Chapman (Ms Chapman), a solicitor of North Ainley Solicitors, 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 Between 28 November 2022 and 22 September 2023, Ms Chapman was employed as a solicitor by Bromleys Solicitors LLP (the Firm) in the Private Client Team.
- 2.2 Upon leaving her employment with the Firm in September 2023, Ms Chapman removed a number of documents containing client information and shared these with an unrelated third party without the knowledge or permission of those clients and/or the Firm.

3. Admissions

- 3.1 Ms Chapman makes the following admissions which the SRA accepts:
 - a. she breached client confidentiality by removing and sharing documents containing client information from the Firm without the knowledge or permission of the clients and/or the Firm contrary to paragraph 6.3 of the Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs, RFLs and RSLs
 - she failed to act in a way that upholds public trust and confidence in the solicitors' profession and in the legal services provided by authorised persons, breaching Principle 2 of the SRA Principles 2019.

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 Chapman and the following mitigation which she has put forward:
 - a. Ms Chapman's personal circumstances during the time she left the Firm
 - b. Ms Chapman self-reported to the SRA.
- 4.3 The SRA considers that a written rebuke is the appropriate outcome because:
 - a. Ms Chapman's conduct was reckless as to risk of harm and her regulatory obligations
 - b. Ms Chapman has cooperated with the investigation
 - c. Ms Chapman has demonstrated insight and remorse
 - d. there is a low risk of repetition
 - e. there has been no lasting or significant harm
 - f. a public sanction is required to uphold public confidence in the delivery of legal services.

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. Ms Chapman agrees to the publication of this agreement.

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

- 6.1 Ms Chapman 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 Chapman 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, RFLs and RSLs.

7. Costs

7.1 Ms Chapman 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/]