

SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974

Case No. 12782-2025

BETWEEN:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LTD

Applicant

and

MANDEEP SUNNY SINGH THANDI

Respondent

Before:

Mrs L Boyce (in the chair)

Mr P Lewis

Mrs L McMahon-Hathway

Date of Hearing: 29 April 2026

Appearances

There were no appearances as the matter was dealt with on the papers.

JUDGMENT ON AN AGREED OUTCOME

Allegation

1. The allegation against the Respondent, Mandeep Sunny Singh Thandi made by the SRA, were that whilst in practice as a solicitor at Kenneth M. Barrow and Co Ltd, he received any or all of the following payment/s from Client A directly into his personal bank account, which she intended to be settlement of the Firm's fees:
 - 1.1. £10 on 13 November 2023.
 - 1.2. £1,000 on 17 November 2023.
 - 1.3. £2,000 on 27 November 2023: and
 - 1.4. £22,500 on 14 February 2024.

And thereby breached any or all of Principles 2, 4 and 5 of the SRA Principles ("the Principles").

2. Mr Thandi admitted the allegation, including that his conduct had been dishonest in breach of Principle 4.

Documents

3. The Tribunal had before it the following documents: -
 - Rule 12 Statement and Exhibit TW1 dated 10 June 2025.
 - Statement of Agreed Facts and Proposed Outcome dated 28 April 2026.

Background

4. Mr Thandi, who was born in 1985, was a solicitor having been admitted to the Roll in January 2014. Until his resignation on 4 March 2024, Mr Thandi was a solicitor and director at Kenneth M Barrow and Co Ltd, practising in crime.
5. In October 2023, Mr Thandi was instructed to represent Client A on a privately paying basis, Client A not qualifying for Legal Aid. Client A requested the Firm's bank details. Mr Thandi provided his own personal bank account details. Client A made the payments detailed at paragraph 1 above.
6. Whilst Mr Thandi paid counsel's fees from the monies received, he did not open a file with the Firm, nor did he transfer the monies received into the Firm's client account.

Application for the matter to be resolved by way of Agreed Outcome

7. The parties invited the Tribunal to deal with the Allegations against Mr Thandi in accordance with the Statement of Agreed Facts and Proposed Outcome annexed to this Judgment. The parties submitted that the outcome proposed was consistent with the Tribunal's Guidance Note on Sanctions.

Findings of Fact and Law

8. The Applicant was required to prove the allegations on the balance of probabilities. The Tribunal had due regard to its statutory duty, under section 6 of the Human Rights Act 1998, to act in a manner which was compatible with Mr Thandi's rights to a fair trial and to respect for their private and family life under Articles 6 and 8 of the European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms.
9. The Tribunal reviewed all the material before it and was satisfied on the balance of probabilities that Mr Thandi's admissions were properly made.
10. The Tribunal considered the Guidance Note on Sanction (11th edition – February 2025). In doing so the Tribunal assessed the culpability and harm identified together with the aggravating and mitigating factors that existed. The Tribunal determined that Mr Thandi knew that the monies had been paid to his personal account, as he had paid counsel's fees from his personal account. He had failed to open a file at the Firm and had failed to transfer the monies received to the Firm. The Tribunal did not accept that Mr Thandi's conduct was an error. The Tribunal was satisfied that Mr Thandi's conduct was deliberate. He had made no attempt to remedy the position and his explanation that he had given his personal account detailed in error was only provided after a complaint was made to the Firm about the payments into Mr Thandi's personal account. The Tribunal was satisfied Mr Thandi knew that the monies had been paid into his account, and he knew that they should have been paid to the Firm and had chosen not to do so. Ordinary and decent people would consider Mr Thandi's conduct to be dishonest.
11. The Tribunal determined that the only appropriate and proportionate sanction was to strike Mr Thandi off the Roll. The parties had agreed that the sanction the Tribunal should impose was to strike Mr Thandi off the Roll. Accordingly, the Tribunal approved the proposed sanction.

Costs

12. The parties had agreed costs in the sum of £23,085.00. The Tribunal considered those costs to be reasonable and proportionate. Accordingly, the Tribunal ordered Mr Thandi to pay costs in the agreed sum.

Statement of Full Order

13. The Tribunal ORDERED that the Respondent, MANDEEP SUNNY SINGH THANDI solicitor, be STRUCK OFF the Roll of Solicitors and it further Ordered that he do pay the costs of and incidental to this application and enquiry fixed in the sum of £23,085.00.

Dated this 12th day of May 2026

On behalf of the Tribunal

L. Boyce

L. Boyce
Chair

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974 (as amended)

AND IN THE MATTER OF:

SOLICITORS REGULATION AUTHORITY LIMITED

Applicant

and

MANDEEP SUNNY SINGH THANDI

Respondent

**STATEMENT OF AGREED FACTS
AND PROPOSED OUTCOME (“AOP”)**

By its application dated 10 June 2025, and the statement made pursuant to Rule 12(2) of the Solicitors (Disciplinary Proceedings) Rules 2019 (“the SDPR”) which accompanied that application (“the R12 statement”), the Solicitors Regulation Authority Limited (“the SRA”) brought proceedings before the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal (“the Tribunal”) making an allegation of misconduct against Mr Mandeep Sunny Singh Thandi (“the Respondent”).

The allegations

1. The allegation against the Respondent, made by the SRA within the R12 statement was that:

Whilst in practice as a solicitor at Kenneth M. Barrow and Co Ltd (“the Firm”), he received any or all of the following payment/s from Client A directly into his personal bank account, which she intended to be settlement of the Firm’s fees:

- 1.1. £10 on 13 November 2023;
- 1.2. £1,000 on 17 November 2023;

1.3. £2,000 on 27 November 2023: and

1.4. £2,500 on 14 February 2024

and thereby breached any or all of Principles 2, 4 and 5 of the SRA Principles (“the Principles”).

2. The Respondent, represented by Garrick Law Limited, admits the allegations set out at paragraph one of this AOP. He admits breaching Principles 2, 4 and 5 of the Principles.

Agreed Facts

3. The following facts and matters, which are relied upon by the SRA in support of the allegations set at paragraph one of this AOP, are agreed between the SRA and the Respondent:

3.1. The Respondent, born on August 1985, has a current practicing certificate (subject to conditions), having been admitted to the Roll on 16 January 2014. Until his resignation as a result of this matter on 4 March 2024, the Respondent was a solicitor and a director at the Firm, with a criminal law practice. He is an experienced, senior solicitor.

3.2. In October 2023, the Respondent, on behalf of the Firm, was instructed to act in a criminal matter for Client A. The Respondent was already acting for Client A’s partner, Client B, at the point he received Client A’s instructions. The Respondent met with Client A on 24 October 2023 to take instructions. Having confirmed that Client A did not meet the eligibility criteria for public funding due to her level of income, Client A’s retainer with the Firm was agreed based on her privately paying the Firm’s fees, eventually agreed to be for the sum of £6,000.

3.3. Having accepted Client A’s instructions to act in October 2023, the Respondent did not ensure a matter was opened on the Firm’s case management or finance systems which was the normal process when the Firm were instructed by a new client. There is a lack of evidence of Client

Due Diligence concerning the onboarding of Client A in October 2023. The absence of evidence of the same demonstrates that the Respondent deliberately kept her instructions 'off the books', as a means of appropriating the funds payable by her to the Firm.

3.4. Client A asked the Respondent to give her bank details for the Firm, so she could use them to pay the Firm's fees. In response, the Respondent provided his own personal bank details to Client A, instead of providing those of the Firm.

3.5. Client A then made four payments to the Respondent's personal bank account, as shown by screenshots taken by Client A of the content of her banking application, totalling £5,510. The Respondent retained these sums instead of transferring the money to the Firm:

3.5.1. £10 on 13 November 2023;

3.5.2. £1,000 on 17 November 2023;

3.5.3. £2,000 on 27 November 2023: and

3.5.4. £2,500 on 14 February 2024

3.6. On 14 February 2024, the Respondent paid Client A's Counsel's fees, in the sum of £1,200, from his own personal bank account (as per the entry described on the statement of transactions as "*Dere street baris*"). The remaining sum of funds received from Client A after 14 February 2024 retained in the Respondent's personal bank account was thus £4,310.

3.7. The Respondent did not transfer the remaining £4,310 to the Firm. A failure to settle Counsel's fees would have resulted in a complaint, which would have raised the alarm about the case within the Firm. Settling Counsel's fees, by way of a payment from his own personal bank account, enabled the Respondent to keep his engagement with Client A concealed from the Firm.

3.8. On 28 February 2024, Paul Donoghue of Swinburne Snowball & Jackson Solicitors telephoned and emailed Mr Barrow of the Firm, to state he had been instructed by Client A to the effect that she had made payments to the Respondent's personal bank account. Mr Barrow emailed the Respondent on the morning of 28 February 2024 to seek an explanation, then met with him that afternoon to interview him about the matter. Before he met him in interview, the Respondent was given access to the email from Mr Donoghue, and screenshots of Client A's banking application.

3.9. The Respondent did not tell the Firm about the receipt of money from Client A into his personal bank account, and his retention of such funds, until he was interviewed by Mr Barrow on 29 February 2024. During the interview the Respondent disingenuously claimed he provided his own personal bank details to, and received money from, Client A, in error.

3.10. Mr Barrow suspended the Respondent on 29 February 2024. The Respondent resigned from the Firm on 4 March 2024. The Firm refunded £5,500 to Client A given the Respondent's conduct. The Firm deducted £5,500 from a payment it made to the Respondent on 20 March 2024 as part of a consultancy agreement.

Non-Agreed Mitigation

4. The following mitigation, which is not agreed by the SRA, is put forward by the Respondent:

4.1. The Respondent has a clean regulatory record with no prior disciplinary findings.

4.2. During the relevant period the Respondent was experiencing significant personal difficulties.

4.3. The matter concerning Client A is an isolated incident of misconduct on the part of the Respondent.

4.4. The Respondent cooperated with the SRA's investigation into this matter.

Sanction proposed & Costs

5. It is proposed that the Respondent should be struck off the Roll of Solicitors, and it is agreed that the Respondent should pay the SRA's costs of this matter in the sum of £23,085.00.

Explanation as to why such an order would be in accordance with the Tribunal's sanctions guidance(11th edition)

6. The Respondent has admitted dishonesty. The Tribunal's Guidance Note on Sanction 11th Edition dated February 2025 ("the Guidance Note on Sanction") states, at paragraph 28:

*"Some of the most serious misconduct involves dishonesty, whether or not leading to criminal proceedings and criminal penalties. A finding that an allegation of dishonesty has been proved will almost invariably lead to striking off, save in exceptional circumstances (see **Solicitors Regulation Authority v Sharma [2010] EWHC 2022 (Admin)**)."*

7. In **Solicitors Regulation Authority v Sharma [2010] EWHC 2022 (Admin)** at paragraph 13, Coulson J summarised the consequences of a finding of dishonesty by the Tribunal against a solicitor as follows:

"(a) Save in exceptional circumstances, a finding of dishonesty will lead to the solicitor being struck off the Roll ... That is the normal and necessary penalty in cases of dishonesty..."

(b) There will be a small residual category where striking off will be a disproportionate sentence in all the circumstances ...

(c) In deciding whether or not a particular case falls into that category, relevant factors will include the nature, scope and extent of the dishonesty itself, whether it was momentary ... or over a lengthy period of time ... whether it was a benefit to the solicitor ... and whether it had an adverse effect on others..."

8. For the reasons described below, there are no exceptional circumstances here.
9. The seriousness of the misconduct is such that neither a Restriction Order, Reprimand, Fine or Suspension would be a sufficient sanction or in all the circumstances appropriate. There is a need to protect both the public and the reputation of the legal profession from future harm from the Respondent by removing their ability to practise. The protection of the public and the protection of the reputation of the legal profession justifies striking off the Roll.
10. This assessment takes into account that the level of the Respondent's culpability in respect of the allegation above is high as these were serious acts of dishonesty committed over a period of several months. He acted in a way to provide a benefit to himself by retaining the monies. The misconduct cannot be described as spontaneous, it was deliberate and was repeated. He acted in breach of a position of trust. He had direct control for the circumstances giving rise to the misconduct. He was an experienced solicitor and was aware of the relevant Principles.
11. In terms of harm, the Respondent's conduct departed from the integrity, probity and trustworthiness expected of a solicitor, thus harming the reputation of the legal profession. In the words of Sir Thomas Bingham MR in *Bolton v Law Society* [1993] EWCA Civ 32 a solicitor must be capable of being "trusted to the ends of the earth." The public would not expect a solicitor, who is an officer of the court, to provide his own personal bank details and facilitate the receipt of fees that were rightly payable to the Firm. The Respondent's conduct has served to undermine the trust that the public places in the profession. The extent of the harm caused by the Respondent's misconduct could reasonably have been foreseen.
12. The Respondent's conduct is aggravated by the following:
 - the misconduct was dishonest.
 - he knew or ought reasonably to have known that his conduct was in material breach of his obligations to protect the public and reputation of the profession.
 - he attempted to conceal his wrongdoing on more than one occasion.
 - the misconduct was deliberate, repeated, committed for a prolonged period, over several months.
 - There was a risk of loss in the form of the potential for the Firm to lose fees rightly payable to it by Client A.

13. Accordingly, the fair and proportionate penalty in this case is for the Respondent to be struck off the Roll of Solicitors. The seriousness of his conduct was such that a lesser sanction would be inappropriate, and a strike off is required for the protection of the public and the reputation of the legal profession.

.....

Dated: 28/04/2026

Stephen Parish
Senior Associate (FCILEx), Blake Morgan LLP
For and on behalf of the Applicant in these proceedings, the SRA



<

←
...

Dated: 28/04/2026

Mandeep Sunny Singh Thandi
Respondent in these proceedings