



Christopher Harris

Employee

7267980

[Agreement Date: 28 March 2025](#)

Decision - Agreement

Outcome: Regulatory settlement agreement

Outcome date: 28 March 2025

Published date: 11 April 2025

Firm details

Firm or organisation at time of matters giving rise to outcome

Name: Admiral Law Limited

Address(es): Ty Admiral, David Street, Cardiff, CF10 2EH

Firm ID: 596862

Outcome details

This outcome was reached by agreement.

Decision details

1. Agreed outcome

1.1 Christopher Harris, a former employee of Admiral Law (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 Christopher Harris 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 Christopher Harris was an employee of the Firm for 10 years. His last role was as a Team Manager in the New Client Unit.

2.2 On 18 December 2023, Mr Harris spoke with a client and agreed to escalate their concerns following the Firm's complaints process. He did not do this.

2.3 On 12 January 2024 when the client chased the matter he misled the client as to the position of the complaint.

2.4 The telephone attendance notes of the phonecalls with the client dated 18 December 2023 and 12 January 2024 Mr Harris created, were deliberately inaccurate in that they did not reflect the true content of the call. The notes were misleading to hide his failure to progress the complaint.

2.5 Following an internal investigation, Mr Harris was dismissed on 2 May 2024.

3. Admissions

3.1 Christopher Harris makes the following admissions which the SRA accepts:

- a. That he misled the client on 12 January 2024 by stating that his complaint had been forwarded to the Compliance Team when it had not.
- b. That his attendance notes of the calls dated 18 December 2023 and 12 January 2024 did not accurately reflect the telephone calls and would mislead colleagues.
- c. The wording of the attendance note of the call on 12 January 2024 was deliberately fabricated to cover up the error Mr Harris had made in not forwarding the complaint to compliance.
- d. That his conduct set out above 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 Christopher Harris.

4.3 The SRA and Christopher Harris agree that a section 43 order is appropriate because: a. Christopher Harris is not a solicitor b. by undertaking work in the name of, or under the direction and supervision of a solicitor, he was involved in a legal practice c. by misleading a client and then falsifying an attendance note of the conversation Christopher Harris has occasioned or been party to an act or default in relation to a legal practice. Mr Harris's conduct in relation to that act or default makes it undesirable for him to be involved in a legal practice.

4.4 Mr Harris's conduct makes it undesirable for him to be involved in a legal practice because it demonstrates he was willing to mislead a client and falsify attendance notes in order to mislead colleagues rather than admit a mistake. A person willing to do this is not suitable to work in legal practice. If such conduct were to be repeated in future, it would pose a risk to clients and public trust.

5. Publication

5.1 The SRA will publish this decision. This is a requirement of the Legal Services Board's rules. We must publish information on enforcement action or sanctions imposed against a licensed body or manager or employee of a licensed body. There is no discretion in the rules for us not to do this.

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

6.1 Christopher Harris 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 Christopher Harris 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 \[https://beta.sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/\]](https://beta.sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/)