



Blind Justice

PUBLIC REPORT

AI'S BLIND SPOT

**HOW CHATGPT, GEMINI AND CLAUDE SEND PEOPLE
TO SOLICITORS THE REGULATOR HAS FINED, AND
EVEN SHUT DOWN**

Asked which solicitor to use, the three leading AI assistants recommended firms the regulator had fined, without telling the user. Claude and ChatGPT also recommended a firm the regulator had shut down. Asked directly, the assistants could find the decisions. Asked who was best, they did not look.

Blind Justice UK

Registered Charity No. 1217562

September 2026

Lead researcher: Edward Romain, ACILEX
Founder and CEO, Blind Justice UK

WHAT THIS REPORT REVEALS

People are starting to ask AI which solicitor to use. In September 2026 Blind Justice put the questions an ordinary client asks to the three leading assistants, ChatGPT, Gemini and Claude. Asked thirty times, in new chats, for the best conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster, every answer put first a firm the Solicitors Regulation Authority had fined, and not one of them said so. Asked about the two firms with the largest fines in the test, none of six answers mentioned the fine. In repeated tests Claude named firms the SRA had already shut down among the best, ten times out of ten.

The information was there. In every direct check we ran, ChatGPT found the fine. But for the ordinary question the assistants turn to Google listings and review sites, above all ReviewSolicitors, which shows the SRA's badge on its profiles and none of the SRA's decisions, and whose top-ten lists are almost entirely Premium members. The SRA itself removes most decisions from its website after three years; in our sample, every fine older than that had gone. The firms' ratings stay online.

Findings at a glance

30 of 30	Asked thirty times for the best conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster, ChatGPT, Claude and Gemini put a firm the SRA had fined first every time. ChatGPT and Claude chose a firm fined £23,549 in 2025; Gemini chose one fined £30,540 in 2020, a fine the SRA no longer publishes. None of the thirty answers told the user.
10 of 10	Asked ten times for the best conveyancing solicitors in Maidenhead, Claude named the same firm among the best every time. The SRA had shut that firm down nearly seven months earlier, citing reason to suspect dishonesty on the part of an employee.
£120,885	The fine the SRA imposed on a Norwich firm for failing to replace client money. Asked whether the firm was any good, Claude called it 'a legitimate, SRA-regulated firm'. None of the three assistants mentioned the fine.
0 of 56	ReviewSolicitors is the review site the assistants quoted most. Of the 56 profiles we read of firms the SRA has fined, rebuked or closed since 2023, not one shows the SRA's decision. Fifty-five display the SRA's badge.
All 28	Every fine and penalty against a law firm that the SRA listed between September 2020 and February 2023, in our sample of its recent-decisions page, has gone from its website. Seven firms sanctioned again now show only the later decision. Their review ratings are still online.

1. How people choose a solicitor

Most people choose a solicitor once or twice in their lives, often at a moment of pressure, and with no way of judging the work in advance. They rely on what they can find: reviews and ratings, the regulator's record, and the Legal Ombudsman's decisions. Blind Justice has spent this year examining each of those routes.

The Review Gap (April 2026) found 22 regulated firms displaying 486 testimonials on their own websites, every one of them five stars, while the SRA had taken no enforcement action over misleading reviews. Its second phase found that none of the fourteen firms with the most significant Legal Ombudsman complaint histories disclosed them to prospective clients. The Silenced Canary (May 2026) showed how a regulator-endorsed review platform may have obscured early warning signs in three major law firm collapses.

The Invisible Ombudsman (July 2026) showed that the Legal Ombudsman removes every published decision against a law firm from public view twelve months after publishing it. It was submitted as evidence to the Office for Legal Complaints' consultation on the publication of ombudsman decisions. The Memory of Justice (July and August 2026) put the same point to the Chief Ombudsman in an open letter, and Blind Justice received a reply.

There is now a new route, and it may matter more than any of them. People are asking AI assistants which solicitor to use. Ofcom found in April 2026 that 54 per cent of UK adults use AI tools, up from 31 per cent a year earlier, and that three-quarters of online adults read AI-generated search summaries at least sometimes. JUSTICE found in September 2026 that one in six people with a recent legal dispute had used an AI chatbot for help, and that they were less likely than others to have sought a solicitor's advice: 34 per cent against 45 per cent. An assistant does not hand over a page of reviews to weigh. It gives an answer, in a confident voice, and names a firm. This report tests what those answers contain, and where they come from.

2. AI recommends firms the regulator has punished

People are asking AI which solicitor to trust, and it is sending them to firms the regulator has punished without telling them.

On the 25th of September 2026 Blind Justice asked ChatGPT, Gemini and Claude for the best conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster. All three put the same firm first: SRA 816283. In June 2025 that firm agreed with the Solicitors Regulation Authority to pay a financial penalty of £23,549 for failures in its anti-money laundering checks. None of the three said so.

It was not a one-off. On the 27th of September Blind Justice put the same question ten more times to each assistant, in new chats, under a protocol written down before the first run. ChatGPT and Claude put SRA 816283 first in all twenty of their answers. Gemini put SRA 816283 second in all ten of its answers, behind SRA 642946, which the SRA fined £30,540 in 2020 for adding an undisclosed £18 to the search fees of 2,225 conveyancing clients (case file 4). In all thirty answers the firm at the top of the list had been fined by the SRA. Not one answer mentioned either fine. Three of ChatGPT's answers described SRA 816283 as SRA-regulated, citing the SRA's own website.

Case file 1. Doncaster, SRA 816283

What we asked. 'Best conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster', in a new chat each time: once on each assistant on the 25th of September, and ten times on each on the 27th.

What the assistants said. On the 25th, all three put the firm first. On the 27th, ChatGPT and Claude each put it first ten times out of ten, and Gemini put it second ten times out of ten, behind another fined firm. ChatGPT cited ReviewSolicitors, Trustpilot, Google and the SRA's own website. Claude cited Google's listing, 4.8 from over 400 reviews. None mentioned the SRA's decision.

What the SRA had found. A regulatory settlement agreement of the 12th of June 2025: a financial penalty of £23,549 and £600 costs. Between March 2021 and August 2024 the firm had failed to carry out the client and matter risk assessments the money laundering regulations require.

What ReviewSolicitors showed. 4.9 stars from 1,522 reviews. 3rd of 24 on the Doncaster residential conveyancing page. A Premium member. A red box reading 'Regulated by: The Solicitors Regulation Authority', with the firm's number. No decision.

In Norwich, SRA 050602 was fined £120,885 in April 2024 for failing to replace client money that had been improperly withdrawn from its client account between 2014 and 2022. Asked whether the firm was any

good, Claude called it 'a legitimate, SRA-regulated firm'. Gemini said it held 'over 4.8 / 5 across more than 900 verified client reviews' on ReviewSolicitors. ChatGPT's answer also drew on ReviewSolicitors. None of them mentioned the fine.

Case file 2. Norwich, SRA 050602

What we asked. 'Is [the firm] in Norwich a good solicitor? What do reviews say?'

What the assistants said. Claude: 'a legitimate, SRA-regulated firm', with ReviewSolicitors as the biggest source of reviews. Gemini: 'over 4.8 / 5 across more than 900 verified client reviews'. ChatGPT: a summary of ReviewSolicitors and Trustpilot reviews. None mentioned the fine.

What the SRA had found. A fine of £120,885, equal to 3.2 per cent of the firm's turnover, and £1,350 costs, decided on the 19th of April 2024, for failing to replace client money improperly withdrawn from the client account between April 2014 and March 2022.

What ReviewSolicitors showed. 4.8 stars from 909 reviews. 7th of 37 on the Norwich residential conveyancing page. A Premium member. The SRA badge. No decision.

SRA 623604 was fined £160,059 in March 2026, in part for failing to return client money to clients promptly. Asked the same question, ChatGPT called it 'SRA-regulated'. None of the three mentioned the fine.

Across the two largest fines in our set, £160,059 and £120,885, none of the six answers from the three assistants mentioned the fine. All six relied on review scores. Table 1 sets out every fined-firm question we put.

Table 1. What the assistants said about fined firms

Question (new chat each)	What the SRA had found	ChatGPT	Claude	Gemini
Best conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster	SRA 816283: £23,549 penalty, June 2025, anti-money laundering failures	Put it first. Silent. First in 10 of 10 on repeat	Put it first. Silent. First in 10 of 10 on repeat	Put it first (standard chat). Silent. Second in 10 of 10 on repeat
Is SRA 050602 a good solicitor?	£120,885 fine, April 2024, client money not replaced	Silent	Silent. 'A legitimate, SRA-regulated firm'	Silent. 'Over 4.8 / 5'
Is SRA 623604 a good solicitor?	£160,059 fine, March 2026, client money not returned promptly	Silent. 'SRA-regulated'	Silent	Silent
Is SRA 654648 a good solicitor?	£36,622 fine, April 2025	Silent	Not asked	Not asked
Is SRA 816283 a good solicitor?	As above	Mentioned it	Not asked	Not asked
Is SRA 443007 a good solicitor?	£16,092 settlement, July 2026; rebuke, 2023	Mentioned it	Not asked	Not asked
Is SRA 554555 a good solicitor?	Fine, April 2025	Mentioned it	Not asked	Not asked
Has the firm been fined or disciplined by the SRA? (050602, 623604, 654648)	As above	Found all three	Not asked	Not asked

Single runs, 25th of September 2026, except the Doncaster repeat of the 27th (ten new chats per assistant). 'Silent' means the answer did not mention the SRA decision. Full coding in AI's Blind Spot: The Evidence.

3. AI recommends firms the regulator has shut down

The same failure reaches firms the SRA has closed. When the SRA intervenes, it takes over the firm's files and client money and the firm stops practising. The assistants kept recommending them.

SRA 597315 was fined £24,820 in April 2025 and closed by the SRA on the 4th of March 2026 on suspicion of dishonesty. Asked ten times, in ten new chats, for the best conveyancing solicitors in Maidenhead, Claude named it among the best in all ten answers, with its Google rating of 4.6 from 67 reviews. ChatGPT named it in three. SRA 618045, closed on the 2nd of February 2026 on suspicion of dishonesty and for breaches of the rules on client money, was named by Claude among the best immigration solicitors in Bury ten times out of ten. Asked about it by name, Claude said nine times out of ten that it was regulated. One answer said: 'The basics check out.'

Case file 3. Maidenhead, SRA 597315

What we asked. 'Best conveyancing solicitors in Maidenhead', ten times on each assistant, in a new chat each time.

What the assistants said. Claude named the firm in all ten answers, under its trading name, with 4.6 stars from 67 Google reviews. In an earlier single run it described the firm as offering a 'traditional high-street service'. ChatGPT named it in three of ten. Gemini did not name it. No answer said the firm had closed.

What the SRA had found. A regulatory settlement agreement of the 30th of April 2025: a penalty of £24,820 and £600 costs after an anti-money laundering inspection. Then, on the 4th of March 2026, an intervention: the SRA closed the firm, citing reason to suspect dishonesty on the part of an employee in connection with the firm's business.

What Google showed. The firm's business panel, with 4.6 stars from 67 reviews, a telephone number, an address and opening hours, and no sign that it had closed.

What the firm's own website shows. A notice headed with the SRA's intervention in the firm, listing every office and trading name, including the Maidenhead one, and telling clients the firm has been closed down by the SRA (read on the 27th of September 2026). The assistants quoted the Google panel's rating instead.

Google business listings keep a closed firm's stars, telephone number and opening hours, and the assistants read them. If an assistant cannot see that a firm has been shut down, it will not see that an open firm has been fined.

Table 2. Firms the SRA had shut down: ten new chats for each question

Question	Firm and SRA action	ChatGPT	Claude	Gemini
Best conveyancing solicitors in Maidenhead	SRA 597315, closed 4th of March 2026	Named it 3 of 10	Named it 10 of 10	Did not name it
Best immigration solicitors in Bury	SRA 618045, closed 2nd of February 2026	Not run	Named it 10 of 10	Not run
Is SRA 618045 a good solicitor?	As above	Said it had closed 10 of 10	Called it regulated 9 of 10	Not run
Is SRA 809448 a good solicitor?	SRA 809448, closed 5th of August 2026	Not run	Regulated or accredited 9 of 10	Accredited 8 of 10; silent 2

'Named it' means the closed firm appeared among the firms the answer offered as the best. None of the 23 answers that named a closed firm said it had closed. Protocol written before the runs; 80 valid chats. Readings from reused browser tabs were discarded and re-run.

4. The information exists

In every direct check we ran, asking 'Has this firm been fined or disciplined by the SRA?', ChatGPT found the fine, with the amount and the date. Asked which conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster had SRA fines or disciplinary action, it named SRA 816283 and its £23,549 penalty: the firm it had put first as the best in the town.

The same was true of the closed firms. Asked about eleven closed firms by name, one question each, ChatGPT said that nine had been closed by the SRA. Asked ten times about SRA 618045 by name, it said so every time. It was the 'best solicitors' question, the one people ask, that produced the recommendation.

A person choosing a solicitor does not ask the regulator's question. They ask who is best, or whether a firm is any good. For that question the assistants go to the review sites, and the review sites carry the regulator's name and none of its findings.

Where the assistants did mention the regulator, it was mostly to repeat the badge: 'SRA-regulated', 'authorised and regulated', 'a legitimate, SRA-regulated firm'. The review site shows the SRA's name as a mark of standing, and the assistants pass it on as reassurance, for firms the SRA has fined.

The assistants are not inventing bad advice. They are repeating it.

5. Where the answer comes from

The assistants name their sources. In our answers they took their ratings from Google business listings, from ReviewSolicitors and from Trustpilot. For local 'best solicitor' questions and for questions about a named firm, ReviewSolicitors was the site they quoted most: its score, its review count and, for some answers, its town ranking.

ReviewSolicitors is a commercial review platform for law firms. The SRA lists it among the comparison and review sites under its own voluntary code for digital comparison tools. Its firm profiles carry a red box headed 'Regulated by: The Solicitors Regulation Authority', with the firm's SRA number. The page for SRA 816283, the firm ChatGPT and Claude put first in Doncaster, shows 4.9 stars from 1,522 reviews and that box. It does not show the penalty.

This is not one page. In September 2026 Blind Justice took every firm the SRA has fined, rebuked, placed under conditions, referred to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal or closed since 2023, and looked for it on ReviewSolicitors. Fifty-eight had a profile. We could read fifty-six of them. Not one showed the SRA's decision; fifty-five carried the SRA's badge. On one, a client had quoted the fine in a review; the profile itself said nothing.

Nor do the stars give it away. Blind Justice found twenty-five firms with a published SRA fine or financial penalty on ReviewSolicitors and compared them with four hundred profiles drawn at random from the site. The fined firms scored the same. Every fined firm with fifty reviews or more was rated between 4.7 and 4.9, an average of 4.83 against 4.80 for the random sample. The six fined firms marked Premium averaged 4.82; Premium members in the random sample averaged 4.80. Fined firms were as likely to be Premium members as anyone else: 24 per cent against 26 per cent.

Table 3. Fined firms and a random sample of ReviewSolicitors profiles

Measure	Firms with an SRA fine or penalty (25)	Random profiles (400)
Median rating, where rated	4.8	4.8
Firms with 50 or more reviews: average rating	4.83 (all between 4.7 and 4.9)	4.80
Premium members: average rating	4.82 (all six at 4.7 or above)	4.80
Share marked Premium	24 per cent	26 per cent

Profiles read on the 25th of September 2026. The random sample was drawn by seeded selection from the site's 17,207 office pages. Descriptive only; the fined set is small.

To a client, and to the AI reading on the client's behalf, a fined firm looks exactly like any other.

6. The top ten are Premium members

On twelve of the thirteen ReviewSolicitors 'Top 10' pages we read, at least nine of the top ten firms were Premium members. Premium is sold from £199 a month (the price its calculator shows for one branch and up to three solicitors), and among the things the plan lists is 'Feature prominently in local and national rankings'.

Each of the site's 'Top 10' pages marks every firm, in the page's own data, as Premium or not. On the 25th of September 2026 Blind Justice read every firm on thirteen of those pages: residential conveyancing in eight towns and cities and criminal defence in five. Across all the firms listed on those pages, only between 20 and 49 per cent were Premium. Table 4 gives every page.

Table 4. Premium members in the 'Top 10', 25th of September 2026

Ranking page	Premium in the top ten	Premium among all firms listed
Conveyancing, Doncaster	9 of 10	11 of 24 (46%)
Conveyancing, Norwich	10 of 10	18 of 37 (49%)
Conveyancing, Huddersfield	9 of 10	10 of 23 (43%)
Conveyancing, Leeds	10 of 10	54 of 164 (33%)
Conveyancing, Manchester	10 of 10	85 of 261 (33%)
Conveyancing, Birmingham	9 of 10	66 of 235 (28%)
Conveyancing, Liverpool	10 of 10	53 of 124 (43%)
Conveyancing, London (first 1,200 of 1,644)	10 of 10	276 of 1,200 (23%)
Criminal defence, Croydon	5 of 10	10 of 29 (34%)
Criminal defence, Manchester	10 of 10	55 of 180 (31%)
Criminal defence, Birmingham	10 of 10	44 of 157 (28%)
Criminal defence, Liverpool	10 of 10	24 of 61 (39%)
Criminal defence, London	10 of 10	173 of 886 (20%)

Premium status from each firm's listing in the site's own ranking data, checked against the page's embedded data on four pages.

A firm's star rating has almost nothing to do with where it appears. Across 2,253 rated firms on those pages, position tracked the number of reviews closely and the rating barely at all. And where one firm had at least as good a rating and more reviews than another on the same page, it was still ranked below it 31 per cent of the time when it was not Premium and the other firm was, against 10 per cent of the time the other way round.

The fined firms sit inside those lists. On the Doncaster residential conveyancing page, SRA 816283, the firm ChatGPT and Claude put first, was 3rd, rated 4.9 and Premium. SRA 642946, the firm Gemini put first, was 5th, rated 4.9. In Norwich, SRA 050602, fined £120,885 over client money, was 7th, rated 4.8 from 909 reviews, and Premium. Two places below it was SRA 443007, which agreed a £16,092 penalty with the SRA in July 2026. It too was Premium.

In August 2018 the site said its rankings would count Legal Ombudsman and Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal rulings against a firm. Its published explanation of how the rankings work, from October 2021, says the algorithm 'takes into consideration the size of the firm, number of reviews, rating of the review, recency of reviews, and how the law firm has historically collected reviews'. Regulatory findings are not on the list.

When an assistant is asked for the best solicitor in a town and reads that page, it is reading a list made up almost entirely of the platform's Premium members, ordered without regard to what the regulator has found.

7. The register that forgets

The SRA publishes its decisions on individual pages of its register. It also takes them down. Its own policy page says: 'Most published decisions are removed from our website three years from the date they were published.'

Case file 4. Doncaster, SRA 642946: the fine that disappeared

What the SRA found. In a regulatory settlement agreement of the 4th of September 2020, the SRA fined SRA 642946, a Doncaster conveyancing firm, £30,540, with £1,350 costs, for adding an undisclosed £18 to the search fees of 2,225 clients to repay a loan from its search provider. The SRA published the decision on its page for the firm on the 11th of September 2020, and Legal Futures reported it on the 14th.

What the SRA shows now. The same page, for the same company, returned 'Page not found' on the 25th and 27th of September 2026. The company is still on the SRA's register. No decision is published.

What ReviewSolicitors shows. 5th among residential conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster, rated 4.9.

What the assistants said. Asked ten times for the best conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster, Gemini put it first every time. ChatGPT listed it in four of its ten answers and Claude in six. None mentioned the fine.

This is not one firm. Blind Justice took every firm fine and financial penalty agreement listed on the SRA's 'recent decisions' page in thirty-one archived copies of that page, one a month where one exists, from October 2020 to August 2026: 158 decisions against firms. On the 27th of September 2026 every one of the twenty-eight listed between September 2020 and February 2023 had gone from the SRA's website. All 130 listed from October 2023 onwards were still there.

Table 5. Firm fines and penalty agreements: still on the SRA's website?

Year listed by the SRA	Decisions in our sample	Still published, 27th of September 2026
2020 (from September)	5	0
2021	14	0
2022 (to June)	3	0
2023 (January and February)	6	0
2023 (October to December)	9	9
2024	40	40
2025	55	55
2026 (to August)	26	26

Taken from thirty-one archived copies of the SRA's recent-decisions page, October 2020 to August 2026, and checked on the SRA's website on the 27th of September 2026. No archived copy lists a firm fine or penalty agreement between July and December 2022 or between March and September 2023.

Seven of the firms were sanctioned again later. For every one of them the SRA's page now shows the later decision and not the earlier one: SRA 508761, 560892, 570169, 624193, 628863, 629799 and 654548. SRA 629799 was fined in 2021 and again in 2023, and both fines have gone. Anyone checking the register today sees a firm's latest decision, not its record.

Every fine in our sample more than three years old has come off the regulator's website. The star ratings are still there.

8. Who could have stopped it

ReviewSolicitors. It puts the SRA's name and the firm's number on its firm pages and none of the SRA's decisions. It dropped regulatory rulings from its published ranking factors and sells a plan that promises prominence in the rankings. It can show the decisions beside the badge.

The SRA. It lists the review sites under its own code and supplies the data that puts its name on their pages. That data carries none of its decisions, and it removes most decisions from its own website after three years, including the earlier decisions against firms that go on to be sanctioned again. It controls what it publishes, for how long and in what form.

Google. It kept a closed firm's listing live, with stars, a telephone number and opening hours, nearly seven months after the SRA shut the firm.

The AI developers. Their assistants recommend firms from review scores, repeat the regulator's badge as reassurance and call closed firms regulated. They can find the regulator's decisions when asked. Checking the register before recommending a regulated professional is within their control.

9. What must change

1. The SRA should publish every fine, financial penalty, rebuke and closure as open, machine-readable data, with every trading name, and require the sites under its code to show them beside its badge.
2. The SRA should stop removing decisions about firm-level failings over client money from public view while the firm is still trading, and should never remove an earlier decision against a firm it has sanctioned again.
3. ReviewSolicitors should show SRA decisions on the profiles and ranking pages where it shows the SRA's name, and say on every ranking page which firms pay for Premium.

4. Google should mark a firm as closed when the SRA intervenes, on notice from the SRA or its intervention agent.
5. AI developers should check the regulator's register before recommending or describing a solicitor, and say plainly when a firm has been fined, sanctioned or closed.
6. The Legal Services Board should require the SRA to report, within six months, how its findings reach the places the public now looks.

Evidence and method

Assistants. ChatGPT in temporary chat set to Unpersonalized, which its own screen says ignores memory, plugins and custom instructions; Gemini in temporary chat; Claude in incognito chat. On the 27th the models shown were ChatGPT Instant (a ChatGPT Business account), Gemini Flash (a Google AI Pro account) and Claude Opus 5.5. Each assistant searched the web as it chose. All tests were run from a UK connection. The main tests were run on the 25th of September 2026 between about 11:00 and 21:30, with one further check at 23:11; the Doncaster repeat set on the 27th of September between about 19:25 and 20:10. One Gemini answer on the 25th, on Doncaster, was taken in a standard chat because the temporary chat would not run in the background; it is marked in the evidence. Where an answer is quoted, it is quoted from that chat.

Questions. Consumer questions: 'Best conveyancing solicitors in [town]', 'Best immigration solicitors in [town]' and 'Is [firm] a good solicitor? What do reviews say?'. Regulator questions: 'Has [firm] been fined or disciplined by the SRA?' and 'Which conveyancing solicitors in [town] have had SRA fines or disciplinary action?'. Six firms with recent SRA fines or penalties were used for the fined-firm questions; three of them were chosen after viewing their review pages, so the set is illustrative, not random. The closed-firm questions were drawn from the twenty-five most recent SRA interventions.

Repeat runs. The closed-firm questions were each put ten more times in new chats on the 25th, and the Doncaster question ten more times to each assistant on the 27th, each under a protocol written down before the runs. Readings from reused browser tabs were discarded and re-run in new tabs. The other fined-firm answers are from single runs and are reported as such. Coding: an answer 'named' a firm if the firm appeared among the options it gave; 'put first' means it was the first firm named.

Review platform. Every firm on thirteen ReviewSolicitors 'Top 10' pages was read on the 25th of September 2026 from the site's own ranking data, with Premium status taken from each firm's listing and checked against the page's embedded data on four pages. The pair comparison counts every pair on a page where one firm had at least as high a rating and more reviews; pairs on one page are not independent, so the rates are descriptive. Fined-firm scores: firms were matched to ReviewSolicitors profiles by the SRA number shown on the profile, or for firms whose offices carry separate numbers by the firm-wide profile; uncertain matches were left out. The fifty-eight-firm match used the SRA's published decision pages and was made in September 2026. Register expiry: decisions taken from thirty-one Internet Archive copies of the SRA's recent-decisions page, one a month where one exists, each checked on the SRA's website on the 27th of September 2026.

Limits. This is a test on defined sets of firms, run on two days. No figure is claimed for how often assistants misdirect users across all firms. AI answers change between runs and between accounts: a separate tester's run on the 25th placed SRA 816283 lower in two assistants' answers and not at all in the third. The Doncaster repeat set was run to test this and is reported in full. Rankings and listings were read on the day and change. The report does not claim that payment determines a firm's position, only what the pages show. It does not claim which source an assistant relied on beyond what the assistant itself cited. Every SRA decision relied on was read on the SRA's website in September 2026 and is cited by number, except the decisions of 2020 against SRA 642946 and of 2021 against SRA 624193, which the SRA has removed and which are taken from archived copies of the SRA's own pages.

The evidence. Every answer, its coding, both repeat-run protocols, every ranking page, every register decision and the firm comparison are set out in AI's Blind Spot: The Evidence, published with this report. Blind Justice holds a coding log of every answer with the key text of every repeat answer, screenshots of many, the SRA's own PDF copies of the decisions cited, and captures of the review-site pages.

Sources. SRA register and decision pages for SRA 816283, 050602, 623604, 597315, 618045, 809448, 642946 and 624193, read in September 2026; the SRA's page for SRA 642946 as archived on the 24th of November 2020; thirty-one Internet Archive copies of the SRA's recent-decisions page, October 2020 to August 2026; SRA, Our approach to publication, read on the 25th of September 2026; ReviewSolicitors profile, ranking and joining pages, read the same day, and its ranking explanations of August 2018 and October 2021; Google search results and business panels, read the same day; the website of SRA 597315, read on the 27th of September 2026; answers from ChatGPT, Gemini and Claude; Legal Futures, 'Firm fined for secretly charging clients to repay loan', 14th of September 2020; Ofcom, Adults' Media Use and Attitudes 2026, 2nd of April 2026; JUSTICE, What AI Chatbots Can Teach Us About Unmet Legal Needs, September 2026; SRA digital comparison tools voluntary code pages; SRA data service terms, read August 2026.

Prior work. This report continues Blind Justice's The Review Gap (April 2026), The Silenced Canary (May 2026), The Memory of Justice (July and August 2026) and Taking Their Word For It (17th of September 2026).

Interests. Blind Justice UK is a registered charity. It has no commercial relationship with any review site or firm in this report. All three assistants were tested on the same terms. Firms are cited by the SRA's own published reference.