



Roger Patrick Diavewa

Employee

658589

[Employee-related decision Date: 10 September 2020](#)

Decision - Employee-related decision

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

Outcome date: 10 September 2020

Published date: 22 September 2020

Firm details

Firm or organisation at date of publication

Name: Calices Solicitors

Address(es): Riga Mews, 32 Commercial Road, London E1 1LN

Firm ID: 558941

Outcome details

This outcome was reached by SRA decision.

Decision details

Solicitors Act 1974 - Section 43 Order

Reasons/basis

Roger Patrick Diavewa also known as Patrick Roger Diavewa and Patrick Diavewa worked for Calices Solicitors, Riga Mews, 32 Commercial Road, London E1 1LN as a litigation para-legal, between 2014 and 22 November 2018.

Mr Diavewa misled the Family Court by writing to the Court representing that Calices Solicitors were acting for a client when that firm was not retained or instructed by that client.

He also forged documentation which he served on the Upper Tribunal, and he received fees due to Calices Solicitors into his own personal bank account. In this respect it was found that Roger Patrick Diavewa had acted dishonestly.

FINDING

Mr Diavewa, 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.

ORDER

To make an order pursuant to section 43 that with effect from the date of the letter or email notifying Mr Diavewa of Wellingborough of this decision:

- 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 permission.

He was also directed to pay costs of £1,350.

This Order is subject to an Appeal to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal by Mr. Diavewa. The Order remains in force pending the SDT's decision on the Appeal.

On 15 January 2021, the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal ordered that Mr Diavewa's application for Revocation of the s43 Order be refused. The above Order therefore remains in force.

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