

# **Shahraq Hussain**

## **Employee**

### **7024559**

[Employee-related decision Date: 7 August 2024](#)

## **Decision - Employee-related decision**

Outcome: Control of non-qualified staff (Section 43 / Section 99 order)

Outcome date: 7 August 2024

Published date: 19 August 2024

## **Firm details**

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

Name: DAC Beachcroft LLP

Address(es): Tricorn House, 51-53 Hagley Rd, Birmingham B16 8TP

Firm ID: 440774

## **Outcome details**

This outcome was reached by SRA decision.

### **Decision details**

#### **Who does this decision relate to?**

Shahraq Hussain, whose last known address was in Hodge Hill, Birmingham.

A person who is or was involved in a legal practice but is not a solicitor.

### **Summary of decision**

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

Mr Hussain, 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.

### **The facts of the case**

Mr Hussain, a law graduate, secured employment as a paralegal in the Motor Fraud Team at DAC Beachcroft, a recognised body in February 2023.

In a pre-employment questionnaire Mr Hussain completed online, he was asked:

- 'Are you, or have you ever been the subject of any civil proceedings, arbitration or litigation, including proceedings that have led, or may lead to a County Court Judgment (CCJ) or other judgment debts, in the United Kingdom or elsewhere?'
- 'Do you have any judgment debts (including CCJs) made under a court order still outstanding, whether in full or in part? If you have answered YES, please give details of the dates, initial amount, how much is still outstanding and circumstances involved. If still outstanding, please give details of any Repayment Plan in progress.'

Mr Hussain answered 'no' to both questions.

He had however been found to be fundamentally dishonest in his conduct of a personal injury claim. By order dated 21 October 2019 issued at Birmingham County Court his claim was dismissed and he was directed to pay the second defendant's costs.

It was found that on 24 January 2023, Mr Hussain completed an online pre-employment questionnaire during the pre-screening and recruitment processes at DAC Beachcroft which was false and misleading in that he failed to disclose that (1) he had received a court order in which a personal injury claim pursued by him was found to be fundamentally dishonest and (2) he had received a resultant judgment debt.

Mr Hussain's conduct was dishonest.

### **Decision on outcome**

An order pursuant to section 43(2) of the Solicitors Act 1974 was imposed as Mr Hussain's conduct meant that it was undesirable for him to be involved in a legal practice without the SRA's prior approval. The order pursuant to section 43 was made with effect from the date of the letter or email notifying Mr Hussain of this decision.

Mr Hussain was also ordered to pay the SRA's costs of £600.

### **What our Section 43 order means**

- i. no solicitor shall employ or remunerate him in connection with his/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; 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/)