



## **Elliot Parker**

### **Employee**

### **834405**

[Agreement Date: 7 November 2022](#)

### **Decision - Agreement**

Outcome: Regulatory settlement agreement

Outcome date: 7 November 2022

Published date: 9 November 2022

### **Firm details**

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

Name: Ian Henery Solicitors Ltd

Address(es): Quickjay Buildings, Bilston Street, Willenhall, WV13 2AW

Firm ID: 519162

### **Outcome details**

This outcome was reached by agreement.

#### **Reasons/basis**

##### **1. Agreed outcome**

1.1 Elliot Parker ("Mr Parker"), a former employee of Ian Henery Solicitors Ltd ("the Firm"), agrees to the following outcome to the investigation of his 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 Mr Parker that, from the date of this agreement:
  - i. no solicitor shall employ or remunerate him in connection with his 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



vi. no recognised body or manager or employee of such body shall permit him to have an interest in the body

except in accordance with the SRA's prior permission

b. to the publication of this agreement

c. he will pay the costs of the investigation of £300.

## **2. Summary of facts**

2.1 Mr Parker was employed by the Firm as a paralegal between 8 September 2020 and 10 September 2021.

2.2 During his employment, Mr Parker was training to be an accredited police station representative. On 30 July 2021, Mr Parker submitted documents to the course provider. The documents submitted were case studies which purported to show that he had shadowed his supervisor during two attendances at a police station on 14 June 2021 and 5 July 2021 respectively.

2.3 The Firm confirmed that Mr Parker was not present for either of the police station attendances.

2.4 On 6 August 2021, Mr Parker contacted the course provider and asked for the case studies to be withdrawn from the assessment process. He was advised that this would not be possible as these cases had already been sent to an assessor.

2.5 Mr Parker confirmed to the course provider that while the case studies submitted were genuine cases, he was not present at either of the attendances. He explained that he used case files completed by his supervisor during her own attendances at the police station.

2.6 On 10 August 2021, Mr Parker informed the Firm that he 'did dishonestly resubmit my Part A observation cases' and offered his apologies.

2.7 A disciplinary meeting took place at the Firm on 13 August 2021. Mr Parker offered his resignation to the Firm on the same day, which was accepted.

## **3. Admissions**

3.1 Mr Parker makes the following admissions which the SRA accepts:

- a. He picked up two police station files for clients that his supervisor had attended at the police station. He used these files to complete case studies for his own police station accreditation portfolio giving the impression he was present at the attendances.
- b. He submitted the case studies to the course provider, which included details of the two police station attendances, knowing he



had not been present.

c. His conduct was dishonest.

#### **4. Why a section 43 order is appropriate**

4.1 The SRA's Enforcement Strategy and its guidance on how it regulates non-authorised persons, sets out its approach to using section 43 orders to control where a non-authorised person can work.

4.2 When considering whether a section 43 order is appropriate in this matter, the SRA has taken into account the admissions made by Mr Parker and the following mitigation which he has put forward:

- a. He informed the course provider and the Firm of his actions.
- b. He has apologised for his actions.

4.3 The SRA and Mr Parker agree that a section 43 order is appropriate because:

- a. Mr Parker is not a solicitor
- b. His employment or remuneration at the Firm means he was involved in a legal practice.
- c. By submitting two police station files prepared by his supervisor, in the form of case studies to the course provider in order to complete his own police accreditation portfolio, giving the impression that he was present when he knew he wasn't, Mr Parker has occasioned or been party to an act or default in relation to a legal practice. Mr Parker's conduct in relation to that act or default makes it undesirable for him to be involved in a legal practice.

4.4 Mr Parker's conduct makes it undesirable for him to be involved in a legal practice because it was dishonest, demonstrating a propensity to mislead others. Such conduct is not compatible with the ethical behaviour the SRA expects of everyone it regulates and undermines trust and confidence in legal services.

#### **5. Publication**

5.1 The SRA considers it appropriate that this agreement is published in the interests of transparency in the regulatory process. Mr Parker agrees to the publication of this agreement.

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

6.1 Mr Parker agrees that he will not deny the admissions made in this agreement or act in any way which is inconsistent with it.

#### **7. Costs**

7.1 Mr Parker agrees to pay the costs of the SRA's investigation in the sum of £300. Such costs are due within 28 days of a statement of costs due being issued by the SRA.

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