

**Stuart Farrar**  
**Employee**  
**558850**

[Employee-related decision Date: 10 November 2023](#)

**Decision - Employee-related decision**

Outcome: Approval of employment (section 43)

Outcome date: 10 November 2023

Published date: 23 November 2023

**Firm details**

**Firm or organisation at time of matters giving rise to outcome**

Name: Hughes & Company

Address(es): The Old Bakery, Frogmore Street, Tring HP23 5XA

Firm ID: 69840

**Outcome details**

This outcome was reached by SRA decision.

**Decision details**

The SRA has put restrictions on where and how Mr Farrar can work in an SRA regulated firm. It was found that:

Mr Farrar, who is not a solicitor, was involved in a legal practice and has occasioned or been a party to an act or default which involved such conduct on his part that it is undesirable for him to be involved in a legal practice in any of the ways described in the order below.

**Reasons/basis**

**The facts of the case**

From March 2020 until November 2022 Mr Farrar was employed as a conveyancing assistant at Hughes & Company Solicitors (the firm) whose office is at The Old Bakery, Frogmore Street, Tring, Hertfordshire HP23 5XA.

While he was employed there, Mr Farrar obtained commissions from a conveyancing search company totalling £3,325 when he knew the firm did not allow its employees to receive commissions. He did not account to his employer or its clients for them. This conduct lacked integrity.

On 16 May 2022, Mr Farrar asked for and received from a client a payment in cash of £500 which he said was on account of costs when the client had already paid the firm £750 on account of costs and no further costs were due. He did not account to his firm for the £500. This was dishonest. The firm has subsequently reimbursed the client in full.

On two occasions in October 2022, Mr Farrar offered clients a discount on abortive conveyancing costs if they paid him in cash. This was dishonest.

### **Decision on outcome**

An order pursuant to section 43(2) of the Solicitors Act 1974 was imposed as Mr Farrar's conduct meant that it was undesirable for him to be involved in a legal practice without the SRA's prior approval.

This was because of the serious nature of his conduct, which was dishonest.

Mr Farrar was also ordered to pay a proportion of the SRA's costs of £1,350.

### **Other information**

### **What our Section 43 order means for Mr Farrar**

- i. no solicitor shall employ or remunerate him in connection with his/her 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; and
- vi. no recognised body or manager or employee of such a body shall permit him to have an interest in the body

except in accordance with the SRA's prior written permission.

[Search again \[https://www.sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/\]](https://www.sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/)