



Pamela Wareing

Employee

388598

This individual is also known as Pamela Shuffleton and Pamela McGough

[Employee-related decision Date: 28 September 2017](#)

Decision - Employee-related decision

Outcome: Control of non-qualified staff (Section 43 / Section 99 order)

Outcome date: 28 September 2017

Published date: 28 September 2017

Firm details

Firm or organisation at time of matters giving rise to outcome

Name: Esthams Solicitors Limited

Address(es): 292-302 Church Street, Blackpool, Lancashire, FY1 3QA

Firm ID: 443315

Outcome details

This outcome was reached by SRA decision.

Decision details

Pamela Wareing also known as Pamela Shuffelton and Pamela MCGough, a former employee of Easthams Solicitors Limited (Easthams) in Blackpool agrees to the following outcome to the investigation of her conduct by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA):

- a. to the SRA making 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 his 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; and
- 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. to the publication of this agreement.

Reasons/basis

Ms Wareing was the Head Cashier and the Compliance Officer for Finance and Administration (COFA) of Easthams until 20 December 2016 when she was dismissed by the firm.

Between 4 November 2016 and 19 December 2016 Ms Wareing made improper withdrawals in the sum of £526,473.40, comprising £267,000 taken from the firm's client bank account and £259,473.40 from the firm's office bank account. The money was paid to a purported soldier in the United States army. It was later established that Ms Wareing had been the victim of a fraud.

She attempted to cover up her actions by making false postings in relation to a probate matter.

The client funds were replaced by the directors of Easthams.

Ms Wareing was arrested on 20 December 2016 and has subsequently pleaded guilty to stealing the money from Easthams on 17 March 2017. She is due to be sentenced in October 2017.

Other information

Admissions

Ms Wareing makes the following admissions which the SRA accepts:

- (a) that she stole £526,473.40 from Eastham
- (b) that she sought to conceal her actions
- (c) that her conduct set out above was dishonest.

Why the agreed outcome is appropriate

Section 43 Order

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

- (a) Ms Wareing is not a solicitor



- (b) by virtue of her employment at Easthams she was involved in a legal practice
- (c) she has been convicted of an offence involving dishonesty which makes it undesirable for her to be involved in a legal practice.

The conviction makes it undesirable for Ms Wareing to be involved in a legal practice because she abused a position of trust in order to benefit herself to the detriment of others. This demonstrates that she cannot be relied upon to act in the best interests of a firm's clients and to play her part in protecting the money and assets of clients or a firm.

Acting in a way which is inconsistent with this Agreement

Ms Wareing agrees that she will not act in any way which is inconsistent with this agreement such as, for example, by denying responsibility for the conduct referred to above.

If Ms Wareing acts in a way which is inconsistent with this agreement the conduct which is subject to this agreement may be subject to further consideration by the SRA. That may result in a disciplinary sanction or a referral to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal on the original facts and allegations. Acting in a way which is inconsistent with this agreement may also constitute a separate breach of Principles 2, 6 and 7 of the SRA Principles 2011.

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