



## **Hudson & Co**

**Willow Chambers, Park Farm, Beverston, Tetbury ,  
GL8 8TT**

**Recognised sole practitioner  
068556**

**[Agreement Date: 13 May 2025](#)**

### **Decision - Agreement**

Outcome: Regulatory settlement agreement

Outcome date: 13 May 2025

Published date: 16 May 2025

### **Firm details**

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

Name: Hudson & Co

Address(es): Willow Chambers, Park Farm, Beverston, Tetbury, GL8 8TT

Firm ID: 68556

### **Outcome details**

This outcome was reached by agreement.

#### **Decision details**

##### **1. Agreed outcome**

1.1 Hudson & Co (the firm), a recognised sole practice, agrees to the following outcome to the investigation of its conduct by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA):

- a. it is rebuked
- b. to the publication of this agreement
- c. it will pay the costs of the investigation of £300.

##### **2. Summary of Facts**

2.1 The firm acted for family A (the clients) for many years, assisting them with their business affairs in the UK.



2.2 In July 2023, the clients ended their retainer with the firm and asked for their files and client money to be transferred to their new representatives.

2.3 The firm transferred the most recent two years' worth of files, however, the remaining files and financial records were not transferred until August 2024, more than a year after the clients' initial request.

2.4 The firm informed the clients that it would not release their money until the firm's final bill was rendered and their costs were paid.

2.5 Despite the retainer ending in July 2023, the firm has not billed the clients for work completed in the last two years of the retainer and continues to retain the clients' money totalling £24,266.94 with no proper reason to do so.

### **3. Admissions**

3.1 The firm makes the following admissions which the SRA accepts:

- a. It failed to transfer the clients' files to their new representative in a timely manner, in breach of paragraph 4.2 of the Code of Conduct for Firms.
- b. It failed to promptly return client money, in breach of Paragraph 2.5 of the SRA Accounts Rules.

### **4. Why a written rebuke is an appropriate outcome**

4.1 The SRA's Enforcement Strategy sets out its approach to the use of its enforcement powers where there has been a failure to meet its standards or requirements.

4.2 When considering the appropriate sanctions and controls in this matter, the SRA has taken into account the admissions made by the firm and the following mitigation which it has put forward:

- a. Some of the delay has been due to the personal circumstances of the firm's sole practitioner.
- b. The most recent documents were provided to the new representatives within a reasonable timeframe.
- c. There is no evidence of intent to cause harm and impact to the clients. The firm suspended their billing in the final years of the retainer to assist their clients during a difficult financial period.
- d. The firm has no adverse regulatory history.
- e. The conduct was isolated to this one matter.
- f. There is no evidence to suggest dishonesty or misuse of client money.

4.3 The SRA considers that a written rebuke is the appropriate outcome because:



- a. The firm was directly responsible for its conduct, being aware of the obligation to return the documents and client funds in a timely manner.
- b. The firm has not provided a reasonable explanation for not releasing the client money promptly or for the excessive delay in rendering their final bill.
- c. As the conduct involves client money, it requires a sanction to be applied in order to uphold public confidence in the delivery of legal services.
- d. There has been an impact on the clients as their new representatives have been unable to fully advise them without access to all historical documents.
- e. There has been a further impact on the clients as they have not been able to file correct tax returns. As a result, they may face a financial penalty.
- f. Mr Hudson, the firm's sole practitioner, is an experienced solicitor who would be expected to ensure his firm appropriately, and promptly, deals with a straightforward transfer of files and client funds.
- g. The firm failed to respond to queries raised by the SRA on 4 November 2024.

## **5. Publication**

5.1 The SRA considers it appropriate that this agreement is published in the interests of transparency in the regulatory and disciplinary process. Hudson & Co agrees to the publication of this agreement.

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

6.1 Hudson & Co agrees that it will not deny the admissions made in this agreement or act in any way which is inconsistent with it.

6.2 If Hudson & Co denies the admissions or acts in a way which is inconsistent with this agreement, the conduct which is subject to this agreement may be considered further by the SRA. That may result in a disciplinary outcome or a referral to the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal on the original facts and allegations.

6.3 Acting in a way which is inconsistent with this agreement may also constitute a separate breach of principles 2 and 5 of the Principles and paragraph 3.2 of the Code of Conduct for Firms.

## **7. Costs**

7.1 Hudson & Co 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 \[https://guidance.sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/\]](https://guidance.sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/)