

**Gemma Stanton**  
**Employee**  
**7266777**

**[Agreement Date: 12 June 2025](#)**

**Decision - Agreement**

Outcome: Regulatory settlement agreement

Outcome date: 12 June 2025

Published date: 12 June 2025

**Firm details**

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

Name: KJD Law Limited

Address(es): 8-10 Church Street, Ormskirk, L39 3AN England

Firm ID: 8004130

**Outcome details**

This outcome was reached by agreement.

**Decision details**

**1. Agreed outcome**

1.1 Gemma Stanton ('Ms Stanton'), a former employee of KJD Law Limited (the Firm), a recognised body, agrees to the following outcome to the investigation of her conduct by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA):

- a. to the SRA making an order under section 43 of the Solicitors Act 1974 (a section 43 order) in relation to Ms Stanton that, from the date of this agreement:
  - i. no solicitor shall employ or remunerate her in connection with his practice as a solicitor
  - ii. no employee of a solicitor shall employ or remunerate her in connection with the solicitor's practice
  - iii. no recognised body shall employ or remunerate her
  - iv. no manager or employee of a recognised body shall employ or remunerate her in connection with the business of that body



- v. no recognised body or manager or employee of such a body shall permit her to be a manager of the body
- vi. no recognised body or manager or employee of such body shall permit her to have an interest in the body

except in accordance with the SRA's prior permission

- b. to the publication of this agreement
- c. she will pay the costs of the investigation of £300.

## **2. Summary of facts**

2.1 Ms Stanton was employed as a post completion assistant at the Firm for around 10 months until 20 September 2024.

2.2 The Firm were instructed on the sale of property with two parcels of land. The client signed one transfer form (TR1) but due to an oversight by the fee earner was not asked to sign the second TR1.

2.3 Following completion, the buyer's solicitor requested the signed second TR1. The post completion team was asked by the fee earner to send the second TR1 to the client to sign.

2.4 On 5 September 2024, the fee earner checked with the post completion team if the client had returned the second signed TR1.

2.5 On the same day Ms Stanton emailed the second TR1 purportedly signed by the clients to the buyer's solicitor.

2.6 A solicitor at the Firm checked the second TR1 as they had been told by another fee earner that they had not witnessed the second TR1.

2.7 The solicitor thought that Ms Stanton had inserted the signature page from the first TR1 form onto the second TR1, which Ms Stanton later stated that she had. Ms Stanton was advised to tell the buyer's solicitor to disregard the emailed document and to remove the document from the post tray, which she did.

2.8 The solicitor analysed the documents more closely and noted the two signature pages differed slightly. When questioned Ms Stanton admitted to the Firm that she had traced the signatures of the clients and witnesses from the first TR1 to the second TR1.

2.9 Ms Stanton was suspended from the Firm on the same day and was dismissed on 20 September 2024.

## **3. Admissions**

3.1 Ms Stanton makes the following admissions which the SRA accepts:



- a. that her conduct in initially telling the Firm she had put the first TR1 signature page with the second TR1 was dishonest
- b. that her conduct in tracing the signatures of the clients and witness, to make it appear that the second TR1 had been signed by the fee earner and clients, was dishonest
- c. that it is undesirable for her to be involved in a legal practice

#### **4. Why a section 43 order is appropriate**

4.1 The SRA's Enforcement Strategy and its guidance on how it regulates non-authorised persons, sets out its approach to using section 43 orders to control where a non-authorised person can work.

4.2 When considering whether a section 43 order is appropriate in this matter, the SRA has taken into account the admissions made by Ms Stanton and the following mitigation which she has put forward:

- a. she has no previous history of acting dishonestly.
- b. she has shown insight and remorse, and accepted responsibility for her actions. She accepts she panicked as the matter was urgent and should have asked for help on what to do.
- c. she exercised poor judgement as she was inexperienced in her role and her supervisors were on leave at the time of the incident.
- d. her conduct caused no actual harm or impact as the fabricated document was withdrawn the same day.
- e. her conduct was isolated to the reported matter alone.
- f. she has co-operated fully with the SRA's investigation.

4.3 The SRA and Ms Stanton agree that a section 43 order is appropriate because:

1. she is not a solicitor
2. she was employed by the firm, a recognised body and so she was involved in a legal practice
3. by tracing the signatures of the clients and witness onto the second TR1, a document to convey land, Ms Stanton has occasioned or been party to an act or default in relation to a legal practice. Ms Stanton's conduct in relation to that act or default makes it undesirable for her to be involved in a legal practice.

4.4 Ms Stanton's conduct makes it undesirable for her to be involved in a legal practice because she acted in a way that was dishonest. Such conduct fails to uphold public trust and confidence in the solicitors' profession and in legal services provided by authorised persons. Furthermore, she initially misled her colleague by saying she had sent the first TR1 signature page and did not admit to tracing the signatures until questioned further.

#### **5. Publication**

5.1 The SRA considers it appropriate that this agreement is published in the interests of transparency in the regulatory process. Ms Stanton agrees to the publication of this agreement.

#### **6. Acting in a way which is inconsistent with this agreement**

6.1 Ms Stanton agrees that she will not deny the admissions made in this agreement or act in any way which is inconsistent with it.

#### **7. Costs**

7.1 Ms Stanton agrees to pay the costs of the SRA's investigation in the sum of £300. Such costs are due within 28 days of a statement of costs due being issued by the SRA.

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