Introduction

The Legal Ombudsman’s role is two-fold: to investigate complaints about the service people have received from their legal service provider; and to feedback to the profession on the trends and issues we see in our role as the complaint handling body for the legal sector.

Since the Legal Ombudsman started accepting complaints, back in October 2010, complaint trends have remained fairly steady. For instance, complaints about costs, communication issues and delays are usually the top issues that consumers complain to us about.

While we do not always decide there has been poor service (in approximately 34% of all cases we do not direct any remedy), we are concerned that the levels and types of complaints remain consistent. At the same time we know that most of the compensation we order is below £250, which indicates that there is a consistent level of more minor issues occurring; and that providers are not always able to resolve issues themselves during their first tier complaints process.

The aim of this publication is to draw attention to the types of cases that our investigators and ombudsmen review on a daily basis. We have selected a range of complaints, which were investigated recently across various areas of law, covering different types of issues. In each case we set out what firms could have done differently to prevent the poor service happening in the first place; and, where appropriate, how they could have responded to the complaint more effectively.

In the future we intend to focus on different complaint areas and issues, so if there is an area you would like us to focus on, let us know.
Lessons learned from the case studies

In this publication we have included a range of cases for you to look at. Here are some of the trends we have seen in these case studies.

Common trends in the case work

Costs information
We still see plenty of cases where the costs information provided to customer was not sufficient. Often the biggest mistake firms make is not putting the information in writing or recording it properly on their case management system. Whether it’s initial quotes, fee reductions or increased costs, it is important to document the information.

For more information you can also see:
An ombudsman’s view of good costs service.

Finalising conveyancing transactions
Residential conveyancing continues to attract the most complaints, which are rising along with the market. A number of the complaints we have included highlight the issues that can arise post-completion. In all of these cases the purchase of the property was fine, but it was the post-completion work that let the firms down.

For more information you can also see:
Losing the plot: Residential conveyancing complaints and their causes
On the move: A guide for first time buyers

Keeping track of documents
During this quarter we investigated a number of cases where firms had either closed down or merged, so customers were unable to access files kept in storage. This highlights the need for firms to ensure that documents in storage are managed correctly, and to put in place clear audited systems to ensure documents can be retrieved when firms close down or merge.
Common trends in complaint handling

We have also looked at the first tier complaints correspondence (or lack of) in each case. Here are some of the issues we see on a regular basis.

*When can the Legal Ombudsman begin an investigation?*

Firms often query when we can begin investigating a complaint. The two relevant parts of our scheme rules are:

**Scheme rule 1.6** Complaint means an oral or written expression of dissatisfaction\(^1\).

**Scheme rule 4.2** But a complainant can use the Legal Ombudsman if: a) the complaint has not been resolved to the complainant’s satisfaction within eight weeks of being made to the authorised person;\(^2\)

These rules mean the complaint can be verbal as well as written, and it does not have to start with the words “this is a formal complaint”. After eight weeks we can begin our investigation.

In one of the cases in this publication the firm argued that we had no jurisdiction to investigate since the customer had only emailed his concerns to staff rather than following their complaint procedure. But in our view the customer had clearly made an expression of dissatisfaction. The firm should have subsequently started its complaint process. Because more than eight weeks had passed we could begin our investigation.

*Don’t ignore complaints from customers*

Unfortunately we still see a significant number of complaints where the firm do not respond to a customer’s “expression of dissatisfaction” until they receive a prompt from the Legal Ombudsman. This could lead to an automatic case fee if we investigate. One of our requirements is that the firm takes all reasonable steps, under their complaint procedure, to try to

---

\(^1\) Scheme Rule 1.6


\(^2\) Scheme rule 4.2a
resolve the complaint. If a clear complaint is ignored in the first place we are unlikely to say that they took all reasonable steps.

The tone and format of complaint responses
We often see complaint responses that use inappropriate language and which can, in a few cases, be offensive. Firms should bear in mind that the purpose of the complaints procedure is to try and resolve issues. The language and method of responding should facilitate this. Even where you disagree with the customer, your response should be measured and clearly set out your reasons.

Here is an example, from one firm’s response to a complaint, where the tone of voice is unlikely to help resolve the issue:

“Dear Mr X, You have just sent an email to Mr A which he has forwarded to me. Please ensure all correspondence is sent to me personally… You are ignoring the fact that I emailed you on X following your conversation with a colleague and you failed to respond to my email. Why did you fail to respond? Why did you not reply and lodge a formal complaint?”

Sometimes it can be useful to put yourself in the customer’s shoes. Would this type of response encourage you to try and resolve the issues? We know that complaints can sometimes feel like a personal attack, so it can be useful to consider whether you are best placed to respond.

Here is another example where the solicitor did respond to the complaint but, rather than completing a proper response, simply added in a sentence at the end of the customer’s points, for example:

“Historically, attempts I have made to contact you, over the past six months, have often been ignored. I think I have responded to all of your emails bar one from 21 August which I missed. Apologies there.”

While it is good that the firm responded to the complaint and they have actually apologised, the style of response probably doesn’t help the customer to feel that their complaint has been given proper consideration.
Think about complaints objectively and consider the impact
We often see complaint correspondence where the firm re-state certain facts or defend their position without considering the impact of their actions on the customer. For example, in one case study, the firm re-stated that they had accepted the work, completed it in a short space of time, and sent any post by the standard method. But they did not consider the impact on their customer and whether they could have reasonably done anything to prevent it.

When we look at complaints, and remedies in particular, we always seek to identify what the impact of any poor service was. Any remedy should try to compensate for this impact.

Finalise your complaints process and provide correct signposting information
We still see plenty of complaints where the firm does not tell the customer they have finished their complaints process, or that they can bring their complaint to the Legal Ombudsman. Again, we will check this, especially when we consider whether a case fee should be waived.

Further advice about all of these areas can be found in:
- Our Guide to good complaints handling
- Our Signposting pack
- The LSB’s First tier complaints guidance

Complaints data
You can find data about the complaints we investigate on our website but here are some key points to recap. All data is for year 2014/15.

Complaints by area of law

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Law</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential conveyancing</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family law</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal injury</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wills and probate</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litigation</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the top five areas of law for complaints, and the complaint levels have remained consistent for the last five years. However, we
have seen a reduction in family law complaints (from 18% to 14%) and
an increase in residential conveyancing (from 17.5% in 2011/12 to 23%
in 2014/15).

**Most common complaints**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complaint</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Failure to advise</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not following instructions</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delays(^3)</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor costs information(^4)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failing to communicate(^5)</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These are the top five complaints that consumers make. Complaints in
these areas have remained fairly consistent over the last five years.

---

\(^3\) This combines two categories: delay and failure to progress
\(^4\) This combines two categories: costs information deficient and costs excessive
\(^5\) This combines two categories: failure to reply and failure to keep informed
Case studies

Clarity on costs

Case Study 1: Undocumented costs information

The case:

Mrs P instructed a firm to assist in repossession proceedings against her tenant in April 2014. The firm estimated likely costs of between £750 and £1,000 plus VAT. Mrs P agreed to the firm’s estimate and paid a £500 deposit plus a further £600 six months later. She also paid an additional £300 for the firm to issue proceedings in court. This information was not put in writing at the time.

The firm met with Mrs P 10 months later and informed her that the original estimate had been exceeded. They wanted a further £1,500 to bring the account up to date. The firm had drafted a client care letter with this information but it was not given to Mrs P at the meeting. Mrs P complained that the firm had run up costs of more than double the original estimate without telling her.

The Legal Ombudsman directed the firm to limit their fees to £1,123 inclusive of VAT and to refund the original £300 as court proceedings were never issued.

How did we decide on the remedy?

• Firstly, it was clear from the evidence that Mrs P had paid £300 specifically for the firm to issue court proceedings. This did not happen; therefore it was clear that this should be refunded.

• An ombudsman also concluded that the firms’ cost information in this case was very poor. We do accept that an estimate is just that, an estimate of costs based on the circumstances at the time. We will usually consider that a 10-15% difference in costs is reasonable, but the onus is on the firm to provide the best possible cost information. The firm had neither provided the cost information in writing nor increased the estimate when they began doing more work.
• In the ombudsman’s view it was only reasonable for Mrs P to pay what she agreed to in the initial meeting. But the additional costs incurred beyond this had to be refunded.

This case highlights to legal service providers, the importance of:

• *Putting cost information in writing.* A discussion had clearly taken place about costs and Mrs P was happy with the original estimate. However, we would still expect the firm to put this in writing. This would have ensured that both parties had a clear understanding, while covering the firm in the event of any issues arising at a later stage.

• *Telling customers if the estimate is likely to be exceeded.* Customers are always likely to be concerned if their final bill is significantly higher than the original estimate; particularly if there has been no indication that additional work was required. We recognise that sometimes unforeseen circumstances do arise, which mean that costs can increase. However, customers should always be informed when costs are likely to increase, and the reasons why. This will ensure they have all the information about their case and can make informed decisions.

### Case Study 2: Increasing costs

**The case:**

Mrs J instructed a firm regarding the sale and purchase of a property in May 2014.

She entered a verbal agreement for a fee of £200 with her friend, who was a solicitor at the firm. The latter having been taken ill, was replaced by another solicitor. The firm did not quote any other fees verbally or in writing, though there was evidence from an attendance note that the new solicitor would have to charge increased fees. The conveyance also turned out to be more complicated than expected, which meant the firm incurred more costs.

Mrs J complained that she was charged more than expected as the final bill was more than £2,000.

*The Legal Ombudsman decided that the firm should refund 50% of the fee which amounted to £1,000.*

The Legal Ombudsman’s investigation found that:
• While the attendance note indicates that Mrs J should have been informed that the fees would be higher, the firm had not taken any steps to make this happen. Therefore, Mrs J could not have expected the final bill to be so high.

• The firm had carried out work, which had provided value to Mrs J. However, the lack of cost information was so substantial that we directed a remedy of 50% of their fee amounting to £1,000.

How did we decide on this remedy?

• It was clear from our investigation that the firm had not provided any cost information to Mrs J throughout the process, particularly when the new solicitor took over the case or when it became clear that the sale and purchase was becoming more complicated. It is good practice for a firm to send a letter at the beginning of the instruction, regardless of the relationship with the customer. And we expect a firm to update their customer if costs increase beyond the original estimate.

• The ombudsman did take into account that a meeting had taken place with the new solicitor, and that Mrs J should have been aware that she was going to pay more than the £200 she had initially agreed. However, it was also clear that Mrs J had received some benefit. The firm had undertaken substantial work on her behalf. In deciding on a 50% fee reduction the ombudsman therefore balanced the benefit Mrs J received from the work with the fact that she had no idea what the final bill was going to be.

The case highlights to legal service providers, the importance of:

• Documenting the instructions, whatever the relationship. Even though Mrs J was friends with the original solicitor it would still have been good practice to provide the usual client care letter, which would have included cost information. Just because there is a friendship or perhaps a previous business relationship does not guarantee problems won’t arise.

• Ensuring that changes in instructions are documented. Whilst Mrs J knew that the conveyance was becoming more complicated, the full extent of the costs would have come as a complete surprise to her. Customers should never be in a position where they are surprised by their costs. Where possible costs should be documented in advance for the benefit of both parties.
Unacceptable delays

Case Study 3: Unexplained delays

Mrs E instructed a firm to help her pursue outstanding maintenance from her daughters’ father. Due to ill health Mrs E had a friend help with the correspondence.

The firm were due to seek legal aid support for Mrs E and sent out the relevant forms for her to complete. Mrs E’s friend returned the forms and supporting evidence promptly. They chased the firm a month later, at which point the firm asked for the documents to be sent in a different format; they were unable to open the original.

After hearing nothing further for two months Mrs E’s friend sent a letter of complaint. The firm responded to this and apologised that the information had not actually been sent to the solicitor. They asked for the information to be sent again as they were still unable to open the attachment. The information was sent by post.

Again they heard nothing from the firm and so they sent a further letter of complaint and then contacted the Legal Ombudsman two months later. The firm responded to the complaint after they had been prompted by the Legal Ombudsman. They apologised for the lack of service and explained that the matter was supposed to have been passed onto a new solicitor. However, this didn’t happen. The new solicitor had not received the complaint letters either. They accepted that not responding to the complaint had made the situation worse. To resolve the complaint they offered to continue with the retainer.

An ombudsman directed the firm to pay compensation of £500 to recognise the impact of the poor service.

How did we decide on this remedy?

- When we investigated the complaint it was clear that the firms’ service had not been of a reasonable standard as they had not progressed Mrs E’s case at all over a six month period. And they had only responded to Mrs E after she had instigated contact. While each incidence of poor
service was relatively minor in itself, when we considered them together they added up to a considerable level of poor service.

- The Ombudsman also took into account that Mrs E had ill health, which the firm would have been aware of since she had a friend helping her out with the correspondence. Therefore, we concluded that the level of stress and inconvenience was considerable; particularly taking into account her ill health.
- The compensation of £500 recognised that the poor service had had a greater impact on Mrs E than it may have had on another individual, and also that the poor service took place over an extended period of time.
- In this case Mrs E was also seeking compensation because she believed she had lost out financially due to the firm’s delays. However the ombudsman did not agree with this view, concluding that Mrs E still had the opportunity to approach another firm and continue with the work.

The case highlights to legal service providers, the importance of:

- **Responding to correspondence.** This is clearly a case where mistakes have been made from the outset. However, there does not seem to have been any process in place to alert the firm to outstanding actions or a lack of action.
- **Having an adequate complaint process in place.** In this case the firm had stated that the complaint letters did not get through to the solicitor on the case. Firms should have processes in place, which ensure that complaints are drawn to the attention of the correct person.
- **Recognising the impact of poor service when they respond to a complaint.** While the firm did eventually provide a full response to the complaint, acknowledging its failings, they did not consider the impact their poor service had on Mrs E. While in other situations we may not have directed a remedy, or directed a lesser amount, it was clear to the firm that she suffered with significant health problems and, therefore, the impact on her was going to be greater.

### Making customers aware of their options

**Case Study 4: What are the challenges?**

**The case:**

Mr S instructed a firm regarding an employment matter in June 2013.
After receiving advice from the firm about his chances of success, Mr S decided to make a claim via an employment tribunal. In their initial advice the firm said that he should consider both the strength of his case and whether the employer would be able to pay any award if he was successful. The employer’s financial status could be researched for a small fee. He was also advised that they could make an application for costs if successful, but there was no guarantee of claiming these.

His claim was partially successful and, because he was disappointed with the amount he had been awarded, he wanted to make a costs application. The firm advised that as the judgement was not completely in his favour the chances of a successful costs application were 35%; he would therefore be better trying to recover the award from the employer. The employer offered a payment plan option but went into liquidation before Mr S formally agreed to the plan.

The firm informed Mr S that he would need to recover his award though an insolvency service as an unsecured creditor.

Mr S complained that the firm should have explained the potential challenges of getting awards paid.

The Legal Ombudsman directed the firm to pay Mr S compensation of £250.

How did we decide on the remedy?

- In a case like this we would only usually look at providing compensation for the worry, distress or inconvenience that the customer has experienced. We could only look at a fee reduction, or compensation for financial loss, if there was clear evidence that the customer would have stopped the litigation or taken a different course of action had the service been reasonable in the first place.

- In this case the ombudsman concluded that the firm could have done more to ensure Mr S understood the potential risks of pursuing his case. While the written information provided by the firm suggested that Mr S looked at his employers financial stability, the information did not help him to understand what might happen if they could not pay an award. The firm had plenty of opportunities to provide Mr S with more context, which would have helped him discern the likelihood of getting money at the end of the case.
• However, there was not enough evidence to suggest that Mr S would have stopped the case against his employer if he had received more contextual information.

• The compensation of £250 recognised that Mr S would have been disappointed when his employer became insolvent and he realised he may not actually receive his claim. The firm could have prepared him better for this situation.

The case highlights to legal service providers, the importance of:

*Setting the work in context.* In this case it could be argued that the firm had told Mr S what to do and that was sufficient. However, in our view the information from the firm did not provide Mr S with an overall picture of the potential challenges of getting his award paid and therefore a clear understanding of how his case might finish. Our compensation in this case reflected the emotional impact. We felt that Mr S would have been unprepared for the difficulties he faced in obtaining his award. However, we were unprepared to go further as we also recognised that Mr S could have enquired further with the firm.

**Case study 5: Small mistakes with a significant impact**

Mr R instructed a firm to apply for citizenship for himself, his wife and child. The application had to be submitted within a week before the rules changed. Applying after this date would lead to further checks and therefore costs for Mr R.

The firm completed all the work and sent it by second class post to the Home Office, two days before the rules were due to change. The firm did not consult with Mr R about how to send the application and, unfortunately, it arrived at the Home Office one day after the rules had changed. As a result all the applications failed because they were based on the old rules.

The firms’ fees for the failed applications came to £3,000.

*An ombudsman directed the firm to refund fees of £3,000 plus the application fees of £350. In addition, a further compensation payment of £300 was ordered to acknowledge the distress and the inconvenience caused by the failed applications.*

How did we decide on the remedy?
• The firm had clearly worked hard to pull together all the relevant information and get it ready to send off in good time. However, they had not consulted with Mr R about how to post the applications to the Home Office. Given the short deadline this would have been a reasonable step to take, allowing Mr R to decide whether to take the risk of second class post, or pay more for a quicker alternative.

• This could have potentially been a negligence claim as the firm missed a key date which they were aware of. The Legal Ombudsman can look at these cases, but we will always look at it from a service perspective. We concluded that because the firm did not consider advising Mr R about alternative postal options they missed a key deadline and therefore the work the firm had done on the applications held no value for Mr R and his family. Therefore, we recommended a full refund of the firms’ fees, plus the application fees.

• In addition we recommended compensation of £300 to acknowledge the upset and stress that the situation caused Mr R and his family. However, although it was a serious situation, we would be unlikely to go beyond this amount because they still had the opportunity to reapply for citizenship.

The case highlights to legal service providers, the importance of:

• Checking with clients when it is clear there is a risk involved in a course of action. It is important that clients are given the opportunity to make informed decisions. If the firm had taken the small step of asking Mr R about the postage, and he had accepted the risk involved in sending the applications second class, then the firm’s service would have been reasonable. Instead the firm took the decision upon itself, when they were aware of an important deadline and were therefore responsible for the impact of that decision.

Getting post-completion work right

Case Study 6: Delays in post-completion work

Mr Z instructed a firm in the purchase of a leasehold property. When he instructed the firm he was told that he would be provided with a provisional completion statement when the sale completed, but that they would retain a sum to cover unexpected costs until the property had been registered.
The purchase finalised in April. The firm chased the managing agents regarding the certificate of compliance, which would enable them to register the ownership in May. The agents responded to this request in July. The firm requested the certificate in October and the registration of the property completed in December of the same year.

Mr Z received the balance of funds and the completion statement in March of the following year.

An ombudsman directed the firm to pay Mr Z £300 compensation for the delays and inconvenience he had experienced.

How did we decide on this remedy?

- When we investigated the complaint we decided that there had been poor service. While the managing agents had contributed to some of the delay, the firm clearly delayed in requesting the certificate in the first place, and there was no evidence to suggest that they had chased up on the issue. There was also no explanation for why it took the firm a further three months to release the final balance and send the completion statement. In addition the firm had not kept Mr Z up to date with any progress on registering the property or releasing the funds.

- In this case the ombudsman decided that a payment of £300 compensation would be appropriate as Mr Z had experienced delays. These had gone on for some time, which meant that he had to chase the firm on a number of occasions. However, the ombudsman did not think that a remedy such as a refund of fees would be appropriate: the majority of the conveyancing work had taken place as required and Mr Z had clearly received a benefit from this work.

The case highlights to legal service providers, the importance of:

- **Finalising all conveyancing matters in good time.** In this case, while the actual sale of the property seemed to go through in good order, there were clear delays in finalising all aspects of the transaction. These aspects are of course equally important. The customer should not have to be in a position where they are concerned that the purchase has not been finalised correctly.

- **Telling customers what is happening.** In this case the majority of delays were with the firm although the managing agents did account for some of the delay. It is important to let customers know when there are delays
and what is causing them, particularly if they are the result of external factors.

**Keeping documents safe**

**Case Study 7: Lost documents**

**The case:**

Ms B instructed a firm in June 2012, following the death of her husband. A letter was prepared by the firm setting out the agreement reached by family members about her husband’s estate. Ms B asked the firm to administer the estate and look after the signed letter.

Ms B requested the original letter from the firm in February 2015. However, the firm had merged with another company, during which time some files were lost. Despite extensive searches the firm was unable to find the original letter; but it did provide a certified copy.

Ms B complained that the firm failed to keep the original letter safe. She said the letter was important as it provided proof of ownership of her house in Italy. Delays in providing the document prevented her from purchasing a new property.

The firm offered compensation of £250 to Ms B in response to the complaint in recognition of the distress caused to her by the loss of the original document. *We agreed that the firms’ offer of £250 was suitable as it acknowledged the inconvenience and distress that Ms B had experienced when the original letter could not be found.*

**How did we decide on the remedy?**

In a case like this there are several remedies which we could consider: a fee reduction, compensation for the lost opportunity to purchase a new property, or compensation for the inconvenience Ms B suffered.

- An ombudsman firstly concluded that a fee reduction would not be reasonable. The original work completed by the firm had been done correctly and it had provided value because an agreement had been reached with the family.

- We could not recommend compensation for the lost purchase of a new property. This was because Ms B had no evidence to show that the certified copy of the letter could not be used in Italy. If there had been
evidence to suggest otherwise we could have considered compensation in this area. However, we would need to be satisfied that there was a clear link between the lack of the original letter and any actual costs she had incurred.

- We could see that the loss of the original document would have been upsetting for Ms B, and had led to a degree of inconvenience. We agreed that £250 was reasonable compensation. We would not recommend a higher level because the firm had clearly gone out of its way to try and resolve the situation.

The case highlights to legal service providers, that:

- *It is important to take care of files in storage, particularly when firms merge or close down.* While the firm clearly went out of its way to try and find the file it was probably lost at the point when the firms merged. We often receive complaints of this nature. It is important that firms make sure that documents can be tracked.

- *We will not offer compensation if there is no evidence of loss.* Consumers often feel that their service provider’s actions have led to substantial financial loss. In this case the consumer felt the certified letter would not be sufficient. But she had not taken any steps to establish this or obtain any evidence that she would be in a worse position because of her solicitor’s actions. There has to be a causal link between the poor service and the loss.

**Case Study 8: Keeping documents safe**

The case:

Mr F and his wife instructed a firm to prepare mirror wills for them, and to arrange for the severance of their joint tenancy in a property in November 2013. They also asked the firm to store the wills and documents. Mr and Mrs F paid £685 for the work.

The firm ceased trading in November 2014.

When Mr and Mrs F tried to obtain the wills they were unable to obtain them from the firms’ storage. It then became apparent that the firm had failed to apply to the Land Registry for the joint tenancy to be severed. *The Legal Ombudsman directed the firm to refund Mr and Mrs F 50% of the fixed fee and to pay them compensation of £150.*
How did we decide on the remedy?

- An ombudsman decided a 50% fee reduction would be appropriate because Mr F had received some value from the service. While they did not have the final wills they did have an earlier draft which they could use as the basis for replacements at a lower expense. However, they would clearly have to go elsewhere for the work to be completed.

- The ombudsman also recommended compensation of £150 as we recognised that Mr F and his wife would have been shocked when they realised the firm had not carried out the work they had paid for. However there had not been any long-lasting consequence of this poor service. Mr F would be able to finalise the wills and have the tenancy severed without too much difficulty.

The case highlights to legal service providers, the importance of:

- *Taking care of files in storage, particularly when firms merge or close down.* As we highlighted in case study one, it is vital that firms think about their document storage; particularly when they are closing down, or merging with other firms. Customers rightly expect to be able to access their documents regardless.

- *Ensuring work is completed or handed over before a firm closes down.* It is important for firms that are in the process of closing down to check that instructions are fully completed and, where necessary, that arrangements are made with the customer to hand the instruction over.

- *Former partners and insurers being liable for remedies in these types of cases.* Just because a firm has closed down doesn’t not mean that the customer has no right of redress. We will attempt to locate former partners in order to resolve the complaint. The customer can also approach either the firms’ indemnity insurer or the SRA compensation fund.
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