

Waseem Hussain

Employee

7284444

[Agreement Date: 4 November 2025](#)

Decision - Agreement

Outcome: Regulatory settlement agreement

Outcome date: 4 November 2025

Published date: 13 November 2025

Firm details

Firm or organisation at time of matters giving rise to outcome

Name: Irwin Mitchell LLP

Address(es): Riverside East 2 Millsands SHEFFIELD S3 8DT England

Firm ID: 570654

Outcome details

This outcome was reached by agreement.

Decision details

1. Agreed outcome

1.1 Mr Waseem Hussain (Mr Hussain), worked at Irwin Mitchell LLP (the Firm). He agrees to the following outcome to the investigation of his 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 Mr Hussain that, from the date of this agreement:
 - i. no solicitor shall employ or remunerate him in connection with 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



- vi. no recognised body or manager or employee of such body shall permit him to have an interest in the body

except in accordance with the SRA's prior permission

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

2. Summary of facts

2.1 Mr Hussain, a non-authorised person, worked at the Firm as a paralegal between 29 April 2023 to 19 December 2024. He was part of the International Serious Injury team, which was supervised by a solicitor.

2.2 In May 2024, Mr Hussain began acting for Client A, who had instructed the Firm in connection with an international personal injury claim.

2.3 On 11 July 2024 Mr Hussain sent an email to Client A stating that, 'I can also confirm that the papers have been submitted to the Courts on the 8 July. We will now wait for the Court to issue a notice of issue which means the claim has been issued and the claim will enter the litigation process'.

2.4 On 6 November 2024, Client A contacted the Firm and raised a complaint regarding a lack of progress and communication from Mr Hussain. They also referred to having been told by Mr Hussain that the claim had been issued with the Court and was awaiting a notice of issue.

2.5 Mr Hussain's supervisor undertook a review of the file and established there was no evidence to show the claim had been issued or that any documents had been submitted to Court in and around the time the email of 11 July 2024 was sent to Client A.

2.6 In an email to his supervisor dated 7 November 2024, Mr Hussain acknowledged Client A's matter had not been issued at Court and admitted that his email to Client A was 'wrong and misleading'. He further stated that he had sent the email to 'appease the client'.

2.7 Following an investigation into Mr Hussain's conduct a formal disciplinary hearing took place and Mr Hussain was dismissed from the Firm on 19 November 2024.

2.8 Following Mr Hussain's dismissal, another client of Mr Hussain (Client B) raised a complaint in March 2025 about their personal injury matter.

2.9 The Firm investigated and identified that on 1 November 2024 Mr Hussain had sent an email to Client B stating that he had contacted a medico-legal expert to gather their medical records and instruct an expert.



2.10 The Firm found no evidence that Mr Hussain had in fact instructed the medico-legal company in and around the time the email was sent to Client B on 1 November 2024.

3. Admissions

3.1 Mr Hussain makes the following admissions which the SRA accepts:

- a. That on 11 July 2024, he misled Client A by stating that her claim has been issued at court, despite knowing this was not true.
- b. That on 1 November 2024, he misled Client B by stating he had instructed a medico-legal company to obtain Client B's medical evidence and engage an expert, when he had not done so.
- c. That his conduct as set out above was dishonest
- d. That, as a result of his conduct in relation to legal practice, he has engaged in behaviour of such a nature that it is undesirable for him to continue to be involved in 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 considered the admissions made by Mr Hussain and the following mitigation which he has put forward:

- a. he experienced a period off work which led to a significant backlog in his workload
- b. he accepts responsibility for his actions and acknowledges that he should not have sent misleading emails to his clients
- c. he has demonstrated insight and remorse and recognises the inconvenience caused to his clients.

4.3 The SRA and Mr Hussain agree that a section 43 order is appropriate because:

- a. Mr Hussain is not a solicitor
- b. he was undertaking work in the name, or under, the direction or supervision of a solicitor
- c. by providing misleading information in the emails Mr Hussain has occasioned or been party to an act or default in relation to a legal practice. Mr Hussain's conduct in relation to that act or default makes it undesirable for him to be involved in a legal practice.

Mr Hussain's conduct makes it undesirable for him to be involved in a legal practice because he admitted to acting dishonestly by sending emails which he knew contained false and misleading information. Such

conduct fails to uphold public trust and confidence in the solicitors' profession and in legal services provided by authorised persons.

5. Publication

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

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

6.1 Mr Hussain agrees that he will not deny the admissions made in this agreement or act in any way which is inconsistent with it.

7. Costs

7.1 Mr Hussain 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/)