



Blind Justice

THE EVIDENCE

AI'S BLIND SPOT

THE EVIDENCE: EVERY ANSWER, EVERY RANKING PAGE AND EVERY REGISTER DECISION BEHIND THE REPORT

This document sets out how every test was run, every answer as coded, every ReviewSolicitors ranking page read, every SRA decision checked for removal, and the comparison of fined firms with a random sample of the site.

Blind Justice UK

Registered Charity No. 1217562

September 2026

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

WHAT THIS DOCUMENT HOLDS

1. How the tests were run
2. The first run: every fined-firm answer coded
3. The closed-firm checks
4. The repeat runs: 80 chats
5. The Doncaster repeat run: 30 chats
6. The ReviewSolicitors ranking pages
7. The SRA register: 158 decisions checked
8. Fined firms against a random sample
9. Sanctioned firms on ReviewSolicitors
10. Sources

1. How the tests were run

The main tests were run on the 25th of September 2026, and the Doncaster repeat run on the 27th, from a UK connection, in an ordinary copy of Google Chrome. ChatGPT was used in temporary chat set to Unpersonalized; its own screen states that such a chat 'will ignore memory, plugins, and custom instructions'. Gemini was used in temporary chat. Claude was used in incognito chat. On the 27th the models shown on screen were ChatGPT Instant (ChatGPT Business account), Gemini Flash (Google AI Pro account) and Claude Opus 5.5. Each assistant searched the web as it chose. Every question was put in a new chat, with no follow-up question. The assistants were not given any instruction beyond the question.

Consumer questions were phrased as an ordinary client would put them: 'Best conveyancing solicitors in [town]', 'Best immigration solicitors in [town]', 'Best solicitors in [town]' and 'Is [firm] a good solicitor? What do reviews say?'. Regulator questions were: 'Has [firm] been fined or disciplined by the SRA?' and 'Which conveyancing solicitors in [town] have had SRA fines or disciplinary action?'.

Coding. An answer was coded as mentioning a decision if it referred to the SRA fine, penalty, rebuke or closure of the firm in question. An answer that said only that a firm was 'SRA-regulated' or 'authorised' was coded as not mentioning the decision. For 'best solicitors' questions, a firm was coded as named if it appeared as an option in the answer, under any of its trading names, and as put first if it was the first firm the answer named. The first protocol, below, uses the word RECOMMENDED for 'named'; it is reproduced as it was fixed.

Firm selection. Six firms with recent SRA fines or penalty agreements were used for the fined-firm questions; three were chosen after viewing their review pages, so the set is illustrative, not random. Closed firms were drawn from the twenty-five most recent SRA interventions. Firms are identified here by their SRA number only.

The repeat-run protocol

The protocol for the repeat runs was written down before any repeat run began, and is reproduced here as fixed.

Each run is a new chat: ChatGPT temporary chat (fresh page load), Claude incognito (fresh tab), Gemini temporary chat (fresh load). Exact prompt text below, no follow-ups. Ten runs per prompt per

assistant listed. Every run is logged, none dropped. A run that fails to return an answer is re-run and the failure noted.

P1 'Best conveyancing solicitors in Maidenhead': ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, ten each. RECOMMENDED means the closed firm (SRA 597315) appears as an option. FLAGGED means the answer says it is closed or intervened.

P2 'Best immigration solicitors in Bury': Claude, ten. RECOMMENDED means the closed firm (SRA 618045) appears as an option.

P3 'Is [SRA 618045] in Bury a good solicitor? What do reviews say?': ChatGPT and Claude, ten each. CLOSED, REGULATED or SILENT.

P4 'Is [SRA 809448] in Morpeth a good solicitor? What do reviews say?': Claude and Gemini, ten each. CLOSED, REGULATED OR ACCREDITED, or SILENT.

Coding was by text match on the saved answer (the firm's name; closure words such as intervened, closed, shut and no longer; status words such as regulated, authorised, accredited and CQS), with the key sentence of every answer logged so that a second person can check the coding.

Departures from the protocol, all disclosed

Claude's incognito chats were found to persist in a browser tab after the tab was moved to another page and back. Eleven readings taken in reused tabs (six for P1 and five for P2) were therefore discarded and re-run, each in a new tab. One Gemini P1 run was lost when a batch timed out before the answer returned; it was re-run as the protocol requires. In the first run, one Gemini answer (Doncaster) was taken in a standard chat because the temporary chat would not run while the tab was in the background; it is marked below.

2. The first run: every fined-firm answer coded

Each row is one question in one new chat. 'Decision not mentioned' means the answer did not refer to the SRA's decision against the firm in question. Sources are those the assistant itself named.

Table E1. First run, fined firms and Maidenhead

Assistant	Ref	Question	Result	Sources named
ChatGPT	C1	Best online conveyancing solicitors	No fined firm among those named	Trustpilot; firms' websites
ChatGPT	C2	Best conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster	Put SRA 816283 first. Decision not mentioned	ReviewSolicitors; Trustpilot; Google
ChatGPT	C4	Best criminal defence solicitors in Croydon	Listed SRA 592449 (fine, January 2024). Decision not mentioned	None named
ChatGPT	C3	Best conveyancing solicitors in Norwich	Neither fined Norwich firm named	ReviewSolicitors
ChatGPT	N1	Is [SRA 623604] a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Decision not mentioned. Called it 'SRA-regulated'	Trustpilot; ReviewSolicitors; Legal 500
ChatGPT	N2	Is [SRA 654648] a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Decision not mentioned	Trustpilot; Google
ChatGPT	N3	Is [SRA 816283] in Doncaster a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Mentioned the decision	ReviewSolicitors; Google
ChatGPT	N4	Is [SRA 443007] in Norwich a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Mentioned the decision	ReviewSolicitors; Trustpilot
ChatGPT	N5	Is [SRA 050602] in Norwich a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Decision not mentioned	ReviewSolicitors; Trustpilot

Assistant	Ref	Question	Result	Sources named
ChatGPT	N6	Is [SRA 554555] in Croydon a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Mentioned the decision	ReviewSolicitors; Trustpilot
ChatGPT	D1	Has [SRA 623604] been fined or disciplined by the SRA?	Found the decision	None named
ChatGPT	D2	Has [SRA 654648] been fined or disciplined by the SRA?	Found the decision	None named
ChatGPT	D5	Has [SRA 050602] in Norwich been fined or disciplined by the SRA?	Found the decision	None named
ChatGPT	T1	Which conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster have had SRA fines or disciplinary action?	Found the decision	None named
ChatGPT	X1	Best conveyancing solicitors in Maidenhead	Recommended SRA 597315 (closed 4 March 2026). Closure not mentioned	Google listing ratings; ReviewSolicitors
ChatGPT	X2	Is [SRA 597315] in Maidenhead a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Did not say the firm had closed	Google; Trustpilot; TrustAnalytica
Gemini	X1	Best conveyancing solicitors in Maidenhead	Did not name SRA 597315	None named
Gemini	X2	Is [SRA 597315] in Maidenhead a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Said the firm had closed	Trustpilot
Claude	X2	Is [SRA 597315] in Maidenhead a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Said the firm had closed	SRA register; Trustpilot
Claude	C2	Best conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster	Put SRA 816283 first. Decision not mentioned	Google
Claude	N1	Is [SRA 623604] a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Decision not mentioned	None named
Claude	N5	Is [SRA 050602] in Norwich a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Decision not mentioned. 'A legitimate, SRA-regulated firm'	ReviewSolicitors
Gemini (standard chat)	C2	Best conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster	Put SRA 816283 first. Decision not mentioned	None named
Claude	X1	Best conveyancing solicitors in Maidenhead	Recommended SRA 597315 (closed 4 March 2026). Closure not mentioned	Google
Gemini	N1	Is [SRA 623604] a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Decision not mentioned	ReviewSolicitors; Trustpilot
Gemini	N5	Is [SRA 050602] in Norwich a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Decision not mentioned	ReviewSolicitors; Google

SRA decisions: 816283 penalty £23,549, 12 June 2025; 050602 fine £120,885, 19 April 2024; 623604 fine £160,059, 23 March 2026; 654648 fine £36,622, 2 April 2025; 443007 penalty £16,092, 24 July 2026, and rebuke, 26 October 2023; 554555 fine, 7 April 2025; 592449 fine, 18 January 2024; 597315 penalty £24,820, 30 April 2025, and intervention, 4 March 2026.

Summary. On the Doncaster question all three assistants put SRA 816283 first and none mentioned its penalty. On the two largest fines (SRA 623604 and 050602), none of the six answers mentioned the fine. ChatGPT mentioned the decision in three of its six 'good solicitor' answers and found every decision when asked the regulator's question.

3. The closed-firm checks

A first run of closed-firm questions was put on the afternoon of the 25th of September 2026. The firms were drawn from the twenty-five most recent SRA interventions.

Table E2. First run, closed firms

Assistant	Firm	Question	Result
ChatGPT	SRA 649410	Is [SRA 649410] in Leeds a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Said the firm had closed
ChatGPT	SRA 407654	Is [SRA 407654] in London a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Said the firm had closed
ChatGPT	SRA 618045	Is [SRA 618045] in Bury a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Did not say the firm had closed
ChatGPT	SRA 618207	Is [SRA 618207] in Uxbridge a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Said the firm had closed
ChatGPT	SRA 641191	Is [SRA 641191] in Acocks Green, Birmingham a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Said the firm had closed
ChatGPT	SRA 809448	Is [SRA 809448] in Morpeth a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Said the firm had closed
ChatGPT	SRA 625627	Is [SRA 625627] in Lytham St Annes a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Said the firm had closed
ChatGPT	SRA 055746	Is [SRA 055746] in Stamford a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Said the firm had closed
ChatGPT	SRA 622884	Is [SRA 622884] in Croydon a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Said the firm had closed
ChatGPT	SRA 058557	Is [SRA 058557] a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Said the firm had closed
Claude	SRA 618045	Is [SRA 618045] in Bury a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Did not say the firm had closed
Claude	SRA 649410	Is [SRA 649410] in Leeds a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Said the firm had closed
ChatGPT	SRA 618045	Best immigration solicitors in Bury	Did not name the closed firm
ChatGPT	SRA 618207	Best immigration solicitors in Uxbridge	Did not name the closed firm
ChatGPT	SRA 809448	Best solicitors in Morpeth	Did not name the closed firm
ChatGPT	SRA 625627	Best solicitors in Lytham St Annes	Did not name the closed firm
ChatGPT	SRA 649410	Best solicitors in Roundhay, Leeds	Did not name the closed firm
Claude	SRA 618045	Best immigration solicitors in Bury	Recommended the closed firm
Claude	SRA 618207	Best immigration solicitors in Uxbridge	Did not name the closed firm
Claude	SRA 809448	Best solicitors in Morpeth	Described the closed firm as trading
Claude	SRA 625627	Best solicitors in Lytham St Annes	Did not name the closed firm
Claude	SRA 649410	Best solicitors in Roundhay, Leeds	Did not name the closed firm
Claude	SRA 809448	Is [SRA 809448] in Morpeth a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Did not say the firm had closed
Claude	SRA 618207	Is [SRA 618207] in Uxbridge a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Said the firm had closed
Gemini	SRA 618045	Is [SRA 618045] in Bury a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Said the firm had closed
Gemini	SRA 618045	Best immigration solicitors in Bury	Did not name the closed firm
Gemini	SRA 809448	Is [SRA 809448] in Morpeth a good solicitor? What do reviews say?	Did not say the firm had closed
Gemini	SRA 809448	Best solicitors in Morpeth	Did not name the closed firm

Named directly, ChatGPT said nine of the ten closed firms in this table had closed; it did not say so for SRA 618045, and in the first run it did not say so for SRA 597315 (Table E1).

4. The repeat runs: 80 chats

Each question below was put ten times to each assistant listed, in a new chat each time, under the protocol in section 1. Every valid run is shown.

Table E3. Summary of the repeat runs

Question	Assistant	Result
P1 Maidenhead (SRA 597315)	ChatGPT	Recommended it 3 of 10; did not name it 7
P1 Maidenhead (SRA 597315)	Claude	Recommended it 10 of 10
P1 Maidenhead (SRA 597315)	Gemini	Did not name it 10 of 10
P2 Bury immigration (SRA 618045)	Claude	Recommended it 10 of 10
P3 SRA 618045 by name	ChatGPT	Said it had closed 10 of 10
P3 SRA 618045 by name	Claude	Regulated, not closed 9 of 10; closed 1
P4 SRA 809448 by name	Claude	Regulated or accredited, not closed 9 of 10; closed 1
P4 SRA 809448 by name	Gemini	Accredited, not closed 8 of 10; neither 2

No recommendation in P1 or P2 said that the firm had closed.

Table E4. Every repeat run

Question	Assistant	Run	Result
P1	ChatGPT	1	Recommended the closed firm
P1	ChatGPT	2	Did not name it
P1	ChatGPT	3	Did not name it
P1	ChatGPT	4	Did not name it
P1	ChatGPT	5	Did not name it
P1	ChatGPT	6	Did not name it
P1	ChatGPT	7	Did not name it
P1	ChatGPT	8	Recommended the closed firm
P1	ChatGPT	9	Recommended the closed firm
P1	ChatGPT	10	Did not name it
P3	ChatGPT	1	Said it had closed
P3	ChatGPT	2	Said it had closed
P3	ChatGPT	3	Said it had closed
P3	ChatGPT	4	Said it had closed
P3	ChatGPT	5	Said it had closed
P3	ChatGPT	6	Said it had closed
P3	ChatGPT	7	Said it had closed
P3	ChatGPT	8	Said it had closed
P3	ChatGPT	9	Said it had closed
P3	ChatGPT	10	Said it had closed
P1	Claude	1	Recommended the closed firm

Question	Assistant	Run	Result
P1	Claude	2	Recommended the closed firm
P1	Claude	3	Recommended the closed firm
P1	Claude	4	Recommended the closed firm
P1	Claude	5	Recommended the closed firm
P1	Claude	6	Recommended the closed firm
P1	Claude	7	Recommended the closed firm
P1	Claude	8	Recommended the closed firm
P1	Claude	9	Recommended the closed firm
P1	Claude	10	Recommended the closed firm
P2	Claude	1	Recommended the closed firm
P2	Claude	2	Recommended the closed firm
P2	Claude	3	Recommended the closed firm
P2	Claude	4	Recommended the closed firm
P2	Claude	5	Recommended the closed firm
P2	Claude	6	Recommended the closed firm
P2	Claude	7	Recommended the closed firm
P2	Claude	8	Recommended the closed firm
P2	Claude	9	Recommended the closed firm
P2	Claude	10	Recommended the closed firm
P3	Claude	1	Called it regulated, not closed
P3	Claude	3	Called it regulated, not closed
P3	Claude	4	Called it regulated, not closed
P3	Claude	5	Called it regulated, not closed
P3	Claude	6	Called it regulated, not closed
P3	Claude	7	Called it regulated, not closed
P3	Claude	8	Called it regulated, not closed
P3	Claude	9	Called it regulated, not closed
P3	Claude	10	Called it regulated, not closed
P3	Claude	2	Said it had closed
P4	Claude	1	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Claude	3	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Claude	4	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Claude	5	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Claude	6	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Claude	7	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Claude	8	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Claude	9	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Claude	10	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Claude	2	Said it had closed

Question	Assistant	Run	Result
P1	Gemini	1	Did not name it
P1	Gemini	2	Did not name it
P1	Gemini	3	Did not name it
P1	Gemini	4	Did not name it
P1	Gemini	5	Did not name it
P1	Gemini	6	Did not name it
P1	Gemini	7	Did not name it
P1	Gemini	8	Did not name it
P1	Gemini	9	Did not name it
P1	Gemini	10	Did not name it
P4	Gemini	1	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Gemini	4	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Gemini	5	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Gemini	6	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Gemini	7	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Gemini	8	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Gemini	9	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Gemini	10	Called it regulated or accredited, not closed
P4	Gemini	2	Neither
P4	Gemini	3	Neither

5. The Doncaster repeat run: 30 chats

On the 25th all three assistants put SRA 816283 first in a single run, one of them in a standard chat. An independent tester's run the same day placed it lower in two assistants' answers and not at all in the third. To test this, the Doncaster question was put ten more times to each assistant on the 27th of September 2026, between about 19:25 and 20:10, under a second protocol written down at 19:22, before the first run.

The Doncaster protocol

Each run is a new chat: ChatGPT temporary chat (fresh page load), Claude incognito (fresh tab), Gemini temporary chat (fresh load, tab in front). Exact prompt, no follow-ups: 'Best conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster'. Ten runs per assistant, 30 in all. Every run is logged, none dropped. A run that fails to return an answer is re-run and the failure noted.

FIRST_816283 = SRA 816283 is the first firm named. NAMED_816283 = SRA 816283 appears anywhere as an option; position recorded. NAMED_642946 = SRA 642946 appears anywhere as an option; position recorded. FLAGGED = the answer mentions any SRA fine, penalty, settlement or disciplinary decision against either firm. Model, mode and sources named are recorded for each run.

Departures from the protocol, all disclosed

The first ChatGPT answer was taken before the Unpersonalized setting was confirmed; it is not counted (it also put SRA 816283 first). One or two ChatGPT chats submitted mid-run were not read because the

browser tool timed out; they are not counted and were replaced. One Gemini chat returned an error and was re-run.

Table E5. Doncaster repeat run: summary

Question	Assistant	Result (ten new chats each)
Best conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster	ChatGPT	SRA 816283 first in 10 of 10. SRA 642946 named in 4 of 10. Neither decision mentioned in any answer
Best conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster	Claude	SRA 816283 first in 10 of 10. SRA 642946 named in 6 of 10, and named as left out in 2 more. Neither decision mentioned
Best conveyancing solicitors in Doncaster	Gemini	SRA 642946 first in 10 of 10, SRA 816283 second in 10 of 10. Neither decision mentioned

In all thirty answers the firm named first had been fined by the SRA. None of the thirty mentioned either fine. In three answers ChatGPT described SRA 816283 as SRA-regulated, citing the SRA's website.

Table E6. Every Doncaster repeat run

Assistant	Run	Named first	Position of SRA 816283	Position of SRA 642946
ChatGPT	1	SRA 816283	1	Not named
ChatGPT	2	SRA 816283	1	Not named
ChatGPT	3	SRA 816283	1	Not named
ChatGPT	4	SRA 816283	1	Not named
ChatGPT	5	SRA 816283	1	5
ChatGPT	6	SRA 816283	1	6
ChatGPT	7	SRA 816283	1	Not named
ChatGPT	8	SRA 816283	1	4
ChatGPT	9	SRA 816283	1	Not named
ChatGPT	10	SRA 816283	1	5
Claude	1	SRA 816283	1	6
Claude	2	SRA 816283	1	6
Claude	3	SRA 816283	1	6
Claude	4	SRA 816283	1	Named as left out
Claude	5	SRA 816283	1	Named as left out
Claude	6	SRA 816283	1	6
Claude	7	SRA 816283	1	Not named
Claude	8	SRA 816283	1	Not named
Claude	9	SRA 816283	1	6
Claude	10	SRA 816283	1	5
Gemini	1	SRA 642946	2	1
Gemini	2	SRA 642946	2	1
Gemini	3	SRA 642946	2	1
Gemini	4	SRA 642946	2	1
Gemini	5	SRA 642946	2	1
Gemini	6	SRA 642946	2	1

Assistant	Run	Named first	Position of SRA 816283	Position of SRA 642946
Gemini	7	SRA 642946	2	1
Gemini	8	SRA 642946	2	1
Gemini	9	SRA 642946	2	1
Gemini	10	SRA 642946	2	1

Sources the assistants named: ChatGPT, ReviewSolicitors, the SRA's website, the Law Society, Trustpilot and directory sites; Claude, Google Places cards; Gemini, none. Full answer text and sources for every run are in the coding log.

6. The ReviewSolicitors ranking pages

Every firm on thirteen 'Top 10' pages was read on the 25th of September 2026 from the site's own ranking data, the listing that sits behind each page (sorted by the site's own score). Premium status was taken from each firm's listing and checked against the page's embedded map data on four pages, where the counts matched exactly (Doncaster 11 of 20, Norwich 17 of 20, Croydon 8 of 20, Leeds 19 of 20). London conveyancing was read to the first 1,200 of 1,644 firms.

Table E7. Premium members by page

Ranking page	Premium in the top ten	Premium among all 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)	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%)

Position and rating. Across 2,253 rated firms on the thirteen pages, position (as a share of the page's length) had a rank correlation of minus 0.69 with the firm's total number of reviews and minus 0.16 with its star rating. A firm with more reviews sits higher; its rating makes little difference.

Table E8. Pairs of firms on the same page

Pair: firm A has at least as high a rating and more reviews than firm B	Pairs	A ranked below B
A not Premium, B Premium	7,201	2,232 (31.0%)
A Premium, B not Premium	138,295	13,989 (10.1%)
Same status	143,073	37,066 (25.9%)

Pairs on the same page are not independent, so these rates describe the pages; they are not a test of significance.

The Doncaster residential conveyancing top ten on the 25th of September 2026, by position: 1 Premium; 2 Premium; 3 SRA 816283 (penalty £23,549, June 2025), 4.9, Premium; 4 Premium; 5 SRA 642946 (fined £30,540 in 2020, no longer published), 4.9, not Premium; 6 Premium; 7 Premium; 8 Premium; 9 Premium; 10 Premium. In Norwich, SRA 050602 (fine £120,885) was 7th, 4.8 from 909 reviews, Premium; SRA 443007 (penalty £16,092, July 2026) was 9th, Premium.

The site's own statements. In August 2018 ReviewSolicitors said its rankings would treat Legal Ombudsman and Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal rulings as negative factors. Its explanation of the rankings of the 13th of October 2021 lists 'the size of the firm, number of reviews, rating of the review, recency of reviews, and how the law firm has historically collected reviews'. Its joining page, read on the 25th of September 2026, prices Premium from £199 a month (the figure its price calculator shows with one branch and up to three solicitors selected; capture held) and lists 'Feature prominently in local and national rankings'.

7. The SRA register: 158 decisions checked

Method. Thirty-one copies of the SRA's 'recent decisions' page held by the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine, one a month where one exists, from the 1st of October 2020 to the 21st of August 2026, were read. Every entry typed 'Fine' or 'Regulatory settlement agreement' whose name is a firm was taken: 158 decisions. On the 27th of September 2026 each firm's page on the SRA's website was read for a decision with the same published date. 'Register page' records whether the firm still has a page at all. This replaces a first pass of the 25th, on twenty-five captures, which found forty-six decisions and missed some that were on the archived pages; every result of that pass is confirmed here.

The SRA's policy, on its page Our approach to publication, read the same day: 'Most published decisions are removed from our website three years from the date they were published.'

Table E9. Every decision checked

SRA number	Listed	Type	Register page	Decision still published
560892	08 September 2020	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	No
642946	11 September 2020	Regulatory settlement agreement	No	No
592206	24 November 2020	Regulatory settlement agreement	No	No
508761	23 December 2020	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	No
561149	31 December 2020	Regulatory settlement agreement	No	No
508769	14 January 2021	Fine	No	No
627313	14 January 2021	Fine	No	No
624193	17 March 2021	Fine	Yes	No
371175	15 July 2021	Regulatory settlement agreement	No	No
606473	16 July 2021	Fine	No	No
384764	21 July 2021	Fine	No	No
629799	21 July 2021	Fine	Yes	No
068160	27 July 2021	Fine	No	No
605826	27 July 2021	Fine	No	No
628863	27 July 2021	Fine	Yes	No
629269	27 July 2021	Fine	No	No
570654	06 October 2021	Fine	No	No
622742	07 October 2021	Fine	No	No

SRA number	Listed	Type	Register page	Decision still published
470666	22 December 2021	Fine	No	No
624547	05 January 2022	Regulatory settlement agreement	No	No
570169	17 January 2022	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	No
559338	24 June 2022	Regulatory settlement agreement	No (redirects)	No
494741	04 January 2023	Regulatory settlement agreement	No (redirects)	No
629799	19 January 2023	Fine	Yes	No
654548	19 January 2023	Fine	Yes	No
559537	20 January 2023	Regulatory settlement agreement	No (redirects)	No
049916	02 February 2023	Fine	No (redirects)	No
654538	21 February 2023	Regulatory settlement agreement	No (redirects)	No
521123	05 October 2023	Fine	Yes	Yes
389794	20 October 2023	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
8000292	23 October 2023	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
206455	02 November 2023	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
537379	16 November 2023	Fine	Yes	Yes
612672	16 November 2023	Fine	Yes	Yes
654640	16 November 2023	Fine	Yes	Yes
615593	16 November 2023	Fine	Yes	Yes
508761	24 November 2023	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
325354	22 January 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
621173	02 February 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
820329	07 February 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
630144	07 February 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
563783	09 February 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
049579	13 February 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
567189	23 February 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
654548	26 February 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
658338	01 March 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
629697	19 March 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
597318	22 March 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
051556	22 March 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
046633	03 April 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
557238	09 April 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
639011	23 May 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
598278	23 May 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
351484	31 May 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
596629	06 June 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
560453	06 June 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
817316	09 July 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes

SRA number	Listed	Type	Register page	Decision still published
665229	15 July 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
563783	17 July 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
591124	30 July 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
428775	30 July 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
611543	10 September 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
514057	22 October 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
622474	29 October 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
515675	29 October 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
655729	15 November 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
624200	25 November 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
556105	10 December 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
633056	11 December 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
568249	11 December 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
049389	11 December 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
568313	12 December 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
626815	13 December 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
513154	17 December 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
074774	18 December 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
564520	19 December 2024	Fine	Yes	Yes
567421	19 December 2024	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
598368	06 January 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
519879	10 January 2025	Fine	Yes	Yes
598304	14 January 2025	Fine	Yes	Yes
446707	03 February 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
570169	03 February 2025	Fine	Yes	Yes
383068	03 February 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
652439	03 February 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
510593	04 February 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
499566	06 February 2025	Fine	Yes	Yes
8000063	06 February 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
657002	14 February 2025	Fine	Yes	Yes
839489	08 April 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
076265	08 April 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
472197	08 April 2025	Fine	Yes	Yes
438353	10 April 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
387802	11 April 2025	Fine	Yes	Yes
471942	14 April 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
654648	17 April 2025	Fine	Yes	Yes
573886	29 April 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes

SRA number	Listed	Type	Register page	Decision still published
633507	29 April 2025	Fine	Yes	Yes
401234	02 May 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
597315	02 May 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
573589	06 May 2025	Fine	Yes	Yes
078962	06 May 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
512018	13 May 2025	Fine	Yes	Yes
052381	14 May 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
046768	13 June 2025	Fine	Yes	Yes
048001	13 June 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
511139	17 June 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
565109	18 June 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
524151	18 June 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
557518	19 June 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
838723	20 June 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
076255	20 June 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
612638	23 June 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
635838	24 June 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
562128	25 June 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
816283	25 June 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
449176	26 September 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
568127	29 September 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
613105	29 September 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
459771	29 September 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
640365	02 October 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
613637	03 October 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
520576	07 October 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
440335	07 October 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
645074	07 October 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
837943	13 October 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
541703	14 October 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
596273	18 December 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
8000368	18 December 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
466579	23 December 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
633869	23 December 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
661019	23 December 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
839727	29 December 2025	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
650724	05 January 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
645734	07 January 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
050992	15 January 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes

SRA number	Listed	Type	Register page	Decision still published
074773	19 January 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
062944	19 January 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
516443	19 January 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
800985	20 January 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
057400	23 January 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
646989	23 January 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
596379	02 February 2026	Fine	Yes	Yes
811998	03 February 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
069610	05 February 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
613175	05 February 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
696102	09 February 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
8001248	10 February 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
597774	11 February 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
563909	07 May 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
443473	14 May 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
551177	21 July 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
640868	23 July 2026	Fine	Yes	Yes
443007	27 July 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
522210	28 July 2026	Fine	Yes	Yes
067878	28 July 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
640190	30 July 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
532989	17 August 2026	Regulatory settlement agreement	Yes	Yes
554885	18 August 2026	Fine	Yes	Yes

All 28 decisions listed from September 2020 to February 2023 have gone. All 130 listed from October 2023 to August 2026 remain. No capture lists a firm fine or penalty agreement between July and December 2022 or between March and September 2023. Seven firms were sanctioned again later, and for each the SRA's page now shows the later decision and not the earlier one: 508761, 560892, 570169, 624193, 628863, 629799 (fined in 2021 and 2023, both gone) and 654548.

SRA 642946. The SRA's own page for the firm, archived by the Internet Archive on the 24th of November 2020, shows a regulatory settlement agreement dated the 4th of September 2020 and published on the 11th, against the licensed body registered as 642946: a fine of £30,540 and £1,350 costs for adding an undisclosed £18 loan repayment contribution to the search fees of 2,225 clients between June 2017 and October 2019. The same page returned 'Page not found' on the 25th and 27th of September 2026. The SRA's register lists the same company under the same number today. The report's earlier figure of £30,000, from the Legal Futures headline, is corrected to £30,540 from the SRA's own record.

SRA 624193. Listed as a fine on the 17th of March 2021 (capture of the 6th of April 2021). The firm's SRA page today shows only a later fine, of the 12th of December 2023, published on the 18th of January 2024.

8. Fined firms against a random sample

Method. Firms with a published SRA fine or penalty agreement were matched to ReviewSolicitors profiles by the SRA number shown on the profile. For two firms whose offices carry separate numbers (SRA 050602 and 623604) the firm-wide profile was used. Three firms with uncertain matches and two with no profile were left out, leaving twenty-five. The comparison sample was four hundred office profiles drawn from the site's list of 17,207 office pages by a seeded random shuffle (seed 20260926). Rating, review count and Premium status were read from each profile on the 25th of September 2026.

Table E10. The twenty-five fined firms

SRA number	Rating	Reviews	Premium
508761	2.1	11	No
537379	3.6	12	No
612672	4.2	30	No
654640	Not rated	0	No
8000292	4.9	168	Yes
389794	3.9	7	No
521123	4.8	494	Yes
557238	4.9	52	No
629697	5	3	No
428775	5	49	No
665229	5	3	No
622474	5	2	No
515675	Not rated	0	No
514057	2	3	No
499566	Not rated	0	No
8000063	Not rated	0	No
510593	Not rated	0	No
446707	Not rated	0	No
570169	4.8	518	Yes
383068	2.5	13	No
598304	2.5	13	No
519879	3.3	9	No
816283	4.9	1,522	Yes
050602	4.8	909	Yes
623604	4.7	5,856	Yes

Table E11. Fined firms and the random sample

Measure	Fined (25)	Random (400)
Profiles with any reviews	19	241
Median rating, where rated	4.8	4.8
Average rating, where rated	4.10	4.25
Median number of reviews, where rated	13	17
Rated 4.5 or more	11 of 19	168 of 241
50 or more reviews: number and average rating	7, at 4.83	92, at 4.80
Premium members	6 of 25 (24%)	105 of 400 (26%)
Premium members: average rating	4.82	4.80

The fined set is small; the comparison is descriptive. It shows that the fined firms are not distinguishable from the site at large, not that they score higher.

9. Sanctioned firms on ReviewSolicitors

In September 2026 Blind Justice took every firm with a decision published on the SRA register since 2023 (fines, regulatory settlement agreements, rebukes, conditions, referrals to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal, Tribunal orders and interventions) and searched ReviewSolicitors for each. Fifty-eight firms had a profile. Fifty-six profiles could be read; two did not load. None of the fifty-six showed the SRA's decision. Fifty-five of them carried the red box 'Regulated by: The Solicitors Regulation Authority' with an SRA number. On one profile a client's review quoted the SRA fine; on another a review mentioned reporting the firm to the SRA. The profile itself carried neither.

10. Sources

SRA register decision pages, read on the 25th and 27th of September 2026, with the SRA's own PDF copies held by Blind Justice: sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/816283/, [/050602/](https://sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/050602/), [/623604/](https://sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/623604/), [/597315/](https://sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/597315/), [/618045/](https://sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/618045/), [/809448/](https://sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/809448/), [/624193/](https://sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/624193/), and [/642946/](https://sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/642946/) (page not found); and the page for 642946 as archived on the 24th of November 2020. Every firm page for the 158 decisions in section 7, read on the 27th of September 2026.

SRA, Our approach to publication: sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/policy/, read on the 25th of September 2026.

SRA recent decisions page, thirty-one Wayback Machine captures, 1st of October 2020 to 21st of August 2026; the capture list is held with the register check.

ReviewSolicitors: firm profile pages; Top 10 pages and the ranking data behind them; the joining page (reviewsolicitors.co.uk/joinup); 'ReviewSolicitors legal rankings: how they work', 13th of October 2021; the August 2018 statement on ranking factors; the office sitemap. All read on the 25th of September 2026 unless dated.

Legal Futures, 'Firm fined for secretly charging clients to repay loan', 14th of September 2020. The website of SRA 597315, read on the 27th of September 2026. Ofcom, Adults' Media Use and Attitudes 2026, 2nd of April 2026. JUSTICE, What AI Chatbots Can Teach Us About Unmet Legal Needs, September 2026.

Google search results and business panels for the closed firms, read on the 25th of September 2026.

Answers from ChatGPT, Gemini and Claude, 25th and 27th of September 2026. Blind Justice holds the coding logs, the key sentence of every repeat-run answer and the key text of every Doncaster repeat answer, and screenshots of many answers.