Blind Justice

5th of November 2026

Ward Hadaway LLP
7th Floor
10 Chapel Walks
Manchester
M2 1HL
Your ref: RXB.SRA003.29. SRA ref: RGC-000205534

OPEN LETTER. By email. Published at blindjustice.org.uk and shared with the press.

Re: RGC-000205534 and the reconsideration your client agreed to on the 22nd of October 2026

Dear Sirs

We refer to your letter of the 22nd of October 2026 in response to our letter before claim of the 30th of September 2026. At paragraph 26 your client admitted that it had treated our Report as narrower in scope than it actually was, that the enquiries it made between the 1st Decision and the 2nd Decision were not detailed enough, and that its reasons were insufficient. At paragraph 27 it agreed to withdraw both decisions and to reconsider the Report, for that process to be completed by a decision maker not previously involved, and for reasons to be given that address each element of the Report.

Fourteen days have passed. We have received no confirmation that the reconsideration has begun, no indication of who is conducting it, no timetable, and no substantive communication of any kind about the one thing your client agreed to do.

What we have received instead is an invitation, issued on the 26th of October through your client's communications department, to a video meeting with its Director of Communications and two of its investigation directors. We declined that meeting as proposed the same day and asked to meet the person leading the regulator. Our records show 22 separate letters and emails addressed to or copying your client's Chief Executive since the 8th of April 2026; not one has drawn a reply from her. A regulator that answers a conceded claim for judicial review with an invitation from its communications department, while its Chief Executive remains silent and the agreed reconsideration shows no sign of having begun, is not treating this matter with the seriousness it demands.

We are alive to the course this suggests: let time pass, describe the matter as under review, and in due course issue the same decision again behind fuller reasons. Our own file already records one round of it. Between the 1st Decision and the 2nd Decision your client made further enquiries and reissued the same outcome, and it has now admitted in writing that those enquiries were not detailed enough. We hold documentary evidence of your client taking the same course in other cases. We will not be drawn into that cycle, and it would be a mistake to suppose that delay weakens our position. Both decisions stand withdrawn by agreement, any fresh decision will carry its

Blind Justice

own time limit under CPR 54.5, and a continuing failure to carry out the reconsideration your client agreed to is itself amenable to judicial review.

We therefore require the following, in writing, by 4pm on the 12th of November 2026:

1. Confirmation that the reconsideration of the Report has commenced, and the date on which it commenced.
2. The role and seniority of the decision maker, and confirmation that they have had no previous involvement, as agreed at paragraph 27.
3. The timetable to a decision.
4. Confirmation that the reconsideration addresses the Report in its full scope and includes the verification steps identified in our letter before claim, namely the SRA register, the court records for the appearances relied on, and the claims published on the firm's website.
5. Confirmation that written representations submitted by us will be placed before the decision maker before any decision is taken.

If we do not receive each of these by that time, we intend to issue proceedings for judicial review of your client's continuing failure to redetermine the Report, relying on paragraphs 26 and 27 of your letter, and this letter should be treated as notice of that intention in accordance with the Pre-Action Protocol for Judicial Review. The claim is being drafted now and will be issued without further correspondence. If the reconsideration ends with the earlier outcome repeated without the enquiries your client has admitted were lacking, a letter before claim in respect of that fresh decision will follow at once.

Your client should also be under no misconception about the alternative. More than one hundred and sixty people have now come to Blind Justice for help with the legal system, and more than sixty of them, including practising solicitors, have brought us their own accounts of reports to the SRA closed without investigation. If your client fails to perform what it agreed, the next judicial review will not necessarily be ours: we will lend our full support to a claim brought by one of the people who have come to us, and the admissions at paragraph 26 of your letter will be before the court whoever the claimant is.

A meeting with your client's Chief Executive is, in our view, essential, and we remain available for one in person or by video. A meeting with anyone else is not a substitute for it, and no meeting suspends anything set out above.

This is an open letter. It is published at blindjustice.org.uk and has been shared with the press.

Yours faithfully,



Edward Romain, ACILEX
Founder and CEO, Blind Justice UK