

# Alastair James Melville

## Employee

### 617205

*Employee-related decision Date: 9 March 2021*

#### *Decision - Employee-related decision*

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

Outcome date: 9 March 2021

Published date: 10 June 2021

#### *Firm details*

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

Name: Taylor Rose TTKW Limited

Address(es): 13 – 15 Moorgate London EC2R 6AD

Firm ID: 623604

#### *Outcome details*

This outcome was reached by SRA decision.

#### *Decision details*

Mr Melville was made subject to a disqualification order pursuant to section 99 of the Legal Services Act 2007. This order prevents him from holding any of the following roles in a licensed body:

- Head of Legal Practice.
- Head of Finance and Administration.
- A manager
- An employee.

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

#### *Reasons/basis*

Alastair James Melville, who is not a solicitor, was employed by Taylor Rose TTKW Limited whose head office is at 58 Borough High Street, London between 1 September 2013 and 11 October 2019 when he was dismissed.

It was found that:

1. On 15 September 2017, Mr Melville caused a withdrawal of client money in the sum of £17,125 for a purpose which was unconnected to that client matter. He therefore breached Principles 2, 6 and 10 of the SRA Principles 2011 and Rules 1.2 (c) and 20.1 (f) of the SRA Accounts Rules 2011.
2. On 23 May 2019, Mr Melville caused a withdrawal of client money in the sum of £10,000 for a purpose which was unconnected to that client matter.

He therefore breached Principles 2, 6 and 10 of the SRA Principles 2011 and Rules 1.2 (c) and 20.1 (f) of the SRA Accounts Rules 2011.

3. On 22 May 2019, Mr Melville made untrue statements to a client via email. In doing so he acted dishonestly and breached Principles 2 and 6 of the SRA Principles 2011.
4. Between 1 August 2018 and 22 August 2019, Mr Melville falsely held out, to clients, third parties and the firm, that he was a qualified solicitor. He therefore breached Principle 7 of the SRA Principles 2011.

Search again [/consumers/solicitor-check]