

Patrick White Employee 7157386

Employee-related decision Date: 24 July 2025

Decision - Employee-related decision

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

Outcome date: 24 July 2025

Published date: 13 August 2025

Firm details

Firm or organisation at time of matters giving rise to outcome

Name: Parkerwall Ltd

Address(es): Offices 6 & 7, 66 Long Lane, Walton, Liverpool, L9 7BN

Firm ID: 629890

Outcome details

This outcome was reached by SRA decision.

Decision details

Who does this decision relate to?

Mr Patrick White, whose last known address was in Widnes.

A person who is or was involved in a legal practice but is not a solicitor.

Summary of decision

The SRA has put restrictions on where and how Mr White can work in an SRA regulated firm. It was found that:

Mr White, who is not a solicitor, was involved in a legal practice and has occasioned or been a party to an act or default which involved such conduct on his part that it is undesirable for him to be involved in a legal practice in any of the ways described in the order below.

The facts of the case



Mr White was employed as a part time Office Manager at Parkerwall Limited (the firm). The firm is a recognised body.

His employment contract with the firm commenced in March 2019 and ended in July 2023. He worked both as an employee of the firm and as a provider of consultancy services. His role involved the arrangement of After the Event (ATE) insurance policies for clients and sourcing and introducing new work to the firm. Mr White is not a solicitor.

It was found that Mr White, during the course of his employment:

- a. Misappropriated £300,000 from a loan that was made to the firm into his own company bank account;
- b. Forged the signature of Ms Suzanne Wall, the owner of the firm, on a loan agreement dated 17 March 2021;
- c. Misappropriated £210,295 from issue fees that were due to the firm into his own company bank account;
- d. Claimed issue fees from the firm's disbursements funding provider for 110 claims when only 2 had been issued; and
- e. Took payment from a client due to the firm of £26,042.20, into his company bank account

Decision on outcome

An order pursuant to section 43(2) of the Solicitors Act 1974 was imposed as Mr White's conduct meant that it was undesirable for him to be involved in a legal practice without the SRA's prior approval. The order pursuant to section 43 was made with effect from the date of the letter or email notifying Mr White of this decision.

Mr White's conduct was very serious. The forensic investigation uncovered compelling evidence of serious misappropriation of company and client funds on the part of Mr White, involving sustained and deliberate efforts to defraud and deceive others. This has had a damning effect on the firm and its finances and is wholly unethical and unjustifiable behaviour for a member of the profession, particularly someone in a senior position. Mr White's conduct is illustrative of a complete and wilful disregard for the obligations the firm owed to its clients, for his own regulatory obligations as an employee of a regulated firm, and for the rules governing the profession as a whole.

Mr White was also ordered to pay a proportion of the SRA's costs of £600.

What our Section 43 order means

- i. no solicitor shall employ or remunerate him in connection with his/her practice as a solicitor;
- ii. no employee of a solicitor shall employ or remunerate him in connection with the solicitor's practice;



- iii. no recognised body shall employ or remunerate him;
- iv. no manager or employee of a recognised body shall employ or remunerate him in connection with the business of that body;
- v. no recognised body or manager or employee of such a body shall permit him to be a manager of the body; and
- vi. no recognised body or manager or employee of such a body shall permit him to have an interest in the body

except in accordance with the SRA's prior written permission. Search again [https://www.sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/]