

Helen Heselwood

Solicitor

275297

Agreement Date: 28 April 2022

Decision - Agreement

Outcome: Regulatory settlement agreement

Outcome date: 28 April 2022

Published date: 5 May 2022

Firm details

Firm or organisation at time of matters giving rise to outcome

Name: Heselwood & Grant Solicitors Limited

Address(es): 4A Clifton Square, Lytham St Annes, FY8 5JP

Firm ID: 617594

Firm or organisation at date of publication

Name: GLM Legal LLP

Address(es): 1.03 The Boat Shed, 12 Exchange Quay, Salford, M5 3EQ

Firm ID: 620443

Outcome details

This outcome was reached by agreement.

Reasons/basis

1. Agreed outcome

1.1 Helen Heselwood, a solicitor and former director of Heselwood & Grant Solicitors Limited (the Firm), 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 £600.

2. Summary of Facts



2.1 Ms Heselwood was a director and the Compliance Officer for Legal Practice at the Firm until its closure on 29 October 2021.

2.2 The Firm provided probate services for clients, including estate administration. It was referred a significant proportion of its probate work by Company A.

2.3 Company A was a genealogist business and not authorised and regulated by the SRA. Its services included identifying and locating potential beneficiaries to intestate estates. Acting on information received from government departments, it would make unsolicited approaches to members of the public who it believed were potential beneficiaries.

2.4 The Firm was aware of Company A's use of unsolicited targeted approaches to acquire and introduce members of the public to the Firm.

2.5 The Firm would then act for the beneficiaries to administer the estate.

2.6 Company A's acquisition and introductions to the Firm were conducted in a manner that, if it were regulated by the SRA, would be in breach of regulatory requirements.

3. Admissions

3.1 Ms Heselwood admits and the SRA accepts that by accepting referred clients from Company A in circumstances where Company A had contacted those clients by way of unsolicited approaches, she has breached paragraph 5.1(e) of the SRA Code of Conduct for Solicitors, RELs and RFLs.

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 Heselwood and the following mitigation which she has put forward:

- a. she has co-operated with the SRA's investigation
- b. she has shown insight and understanding of her regulatory obligations
- c. there have been no adverse regulatory decisions made against her previously.

4.3 The SRA considers that a written rebuke is the appropriate outcome because:



- a. the number of clients referred by Company A accounted for a significant proportion of the Firm's work
- b. some sanction is required to uphold public confidence in the delivery of legal services
- c. The risk of repetition is low.

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 Heselwood agrees to the publication of this agreement.

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

6.1 Ms Heselwood 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 Heselwood 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 and RFLs.

7. Costs

7.1 Ms Heselwood agrees to pay the costs of the SRA's investigation in the sum of £600. 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/>]