



## ANB Law (ANB Law)

Kingswood House, 168 Park Road,

Peterborough , PE1 2UF

Recognised sole practitioner

470666

*Fined Date: 16 November 2021*

### *Decision - Fined*

Outcome: Fine

Outcome date: 16 November 2021

Published date: 22 December 2021

### *Firm details*

No detail provided:

### *Outcome details*

This outcome was reached by SRA decision.

### *Decision details*

ANB Law is a recognised sole practice whose head office is at Kingswood House, 168 Park Road, Peterborough, PE1 2UF.

The SRA Transparency Rules came into effect on 6 December 2018. They require all firms authorised and regulated by the SRA to display specified information on their websites if they provide certain types of legal services. The purpose of the Rules is to ensure people have accurate and relevant information about a solicitor or firm when they are considering purchasing legal services. They are intended to help members of the public and small businesses make informed choices, improving competition in the legal market.

The firm failed to publish mandatory details about costs and its complaints procedure on its website in breach of rules 1.1 and 2.1 of the SRA Transparency Rules. It failed to display the SRA digital badge on its website in breach of rule 4.1 of the SRA Transparency Rules.

The firm was ordered to pay a financial penalty of £1,000 and costs of £300.

The following conditions were imposed on the firm's authorisation with immediate effect:

1. If the firm publishes as available any of the services specified in rules 1.3 or 1.4 of the Transparency Rules, it must provide evidence to the SRA's reasonable satisfaction that, in respect of each of those services:

- a. it publishes the information specified in rule 1.5 of the Transparency Rules, and
- b. such information is clear and accessible and is in a prominent place on its website in accordance with rule 1.6 of the Transparency Rules.
- c. Such evidence must be provided to the SRA within 30 days of this condition coming into effect.

2. If the firm has a website, it must provide evidence to the SRA's reasonable satisfaction, that it is complying with rule 2.1 of the Transparency Rules (complaints information). Such evidence must be provided to the SRA within 30 days of this condition coming into effect.

3. If the firm has a website, it must provide evidence to the SRA's reasonable satisfaction that it publishes in a prominent position on its website, the SRA's digital badge. Such evidence must be provided to the SRA within 30 days of this condition coming into effect.

*Control of practice* Date: 12 August 2021

### ***Decision - Control of practice***

Outcome: Condition

Outcome date: 12 August 2021

Published date: 17 August 2021

### ***Firm details***

No detail provided:

### ***Outcome details***

This outcome was reached by SRA decision.

### ***Decision details***

The following conditions were imposed on ANB Law's authorisation with immediate effect:

1. If the firm publishes as available any of the services specified in rules 1.3 or 1.4 of the SRA Transparency Rules, the firm must in respect of each of those services provide evidence to the SRA's reasonable satisfaction that it:



- a. publishes on its website the information specified in rule 1.5 of the Transparency Rules; and
- b. that such information is clear and accessible and in a prominent place on its website, in accordance with rule 1.6 of the Transparency Rules.

The firm must provide the SRA with the required evidence within 30 days of this condition coming into effect.

2. If the firm has a website, it shall, within 30 days of this condition coming into effect, provide evidence to the SRA's reasonable satisfaction that it is complying with rule 2.1 of the Transparency Rules (complaints information).
3. If the firm has a website, it must, within 30 days of this condition coming into effect, provide evidence to the SRA's reasonable satisfaction that it publishes in a prominent position on its website, the SRA's digital badge.

#### *Reasons/basis*

The adjudicator is satisfied it is in the public interest to impose conditions for the following reasons:

- The firm has provided no evidence that it is now in compliance with the Rules and there is a risk that the firm will not comply with these without conditions being imposed. This is evidenced by the firm's continued non-compliance with the rules despite being made aware of the relevant requirements since at least 9 June 2021.
- The firm's conduct is likely to be repeated in the absence of conditions. This is demonstrated by the firm's failure to ensure compliance despite the SRA's emailed letter of 9 June 2021 and the failure to comply following the investigation officer's notice.
- Conditions will address the risk of repetition, and the recommended conditions are reasonable and proportionate, realistic and measurable.
- There is no evidence to date that the firm's conduct has caused any lasting significant harm to consumers or third parties.

Search again [<https://www.sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/>]