



## Chucks, Billy - 422975

### Decisions

---

To view the decision against this individual, click the decision below.

- Employee-related decision - 25 January 2013 [*link: javascript:decision\_display\_by\_id('Decision-1')*]

You are viewing Employee-related decision - 25 January 2013

### Decision - employee-related decision

---

**Outcome:** Control of non-qualified staff (section 43 order)

**Outcome date:** 25 January 2013

**Published date:** 8 February 2013

### Firm details

---

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

**Name:** Chris Solicitors

**Address(es):**

136 Kingsland High Street, London E8 2NS

**Firm ID:** 546392

### Outcome details

---

This outcome was reached by SRA decision.

#### Decision details

Pursuant to Section 43(2) of the Solicitors Act 1974 (as amended) it is ordered that

- (i) no solicitor shall employ or remunerate, in connection with his practice as a solicitor;
- (ii) no employee of a solicitor shall employ or remunerate, in connection with the solicitor's practice;
- (iii) no recognised body shall employ or remunerate;
- (iv) no manager or employee of a recognised body shall employ or remunerate in connection with the business of that body

Mr Billy Chucks except in accordance with a Society permission.

- (v) no recognised body or manager or employee of such a body shall, except in accordance with a Society permission, permit Mr Billy Chucks to be a manager of the body;
- (vi) no recognised body or manager or employee of such a body shall, except in accordance with a Society permission, permit Mr Billy Chucks to have an interest in the body

## Reasons/basis

### The Facts:

It is alleged that in the course of his employment working for various firms of solicitors Mr Chucks has conducted himself improperly.

### Evidence:

It is reported that whilst employed by various legal practices: Mr Chucks failed to comply with restrictions on his attendance imposed by a number of hospital trusts, and that he prepared a "consent to disclosure" request at a hospital for a client who has confirmed that he had not instructed Mr Chucks to act on his behalf, and that he improperly removed clients' files/documentation without authority from a former employer. Those papers have not yet been returned.

I have seen documentation setting out the allegations and Mr Chucks responses. I do not find that he has satisfactorily explained his conduct. The standard of proof is balance of probabilities.

## FINDINGS

I FIND that Mr Billy Chucks, (Date of birth: 23 August 1975) of London who is or was involved in legal practice but is not a solicitor has, in the Society's opinion occasioned or been a party to, with or without the connivance of a solicitor, an act or default in relation to a legal practice which involved conduct on his part of such a nature that in the Society's opinion it would be undesirable for him to be involved in a legal practice in one or more of the ways mentioned in sub-section (1A) of Section 43.

## REASONS

Mr Chucks is expected to conduct himself appropriately and in accordance with standards of behaviour which apply to all those regulated by the SRA and to all aspects of practice. I find it is more likely than not that he did not carry out his responsibilities properly in at least two matters that the SRA has investigated.

This includes being on hospital premises after he knew that a ban prohibiting his attendance had been imposed. On one occasion police were called to the hospital as a result. He had objected to the bans imposed but he did not take any action to challenge these through the appropriate legal route. This is not conduct that is consistent with Mr Chucks obligation to uphold the rule of law and the proper administration of justice, or behave in a way that maintains the trust the public places in him and in the provision of legal services and is compliant with his regulatory obligations.

Also, it is a matter of grave concern that client's papers, improperly in Mr Chucks' possession, are not held securely and client confidentiality is compromised. An assurance given that these would be returned to the firm of solicitors responsible for their safe keeping has not been honoured. In these respects, he has failed to meet his obligation to act in the client's best interests or provide a proper standard of service to clients and ensure protection of client assets.

For these reasons, I have concluded that it would be undesirable for Mr Chucks to be involved in a legal practice.

The effect of this Order is that he may not be employed in legal practice without the knowledge and prior approval of the SRA. Any approval granted is likely to be subject to strict conditions in order to protect clients and the public.

## Help and more information

---

- What does "Control of non-qualified staff (section 43 order)" mean?
- To check whether a decision remains in force, contact us [[link: /contact-us](#)].
- **Search** the Law Society directory for solicitors named Billy Chucks [[link: http://www.lawsociety.org.uk/find-a-solicitor/?view=solicitorsearch &SURNAME= Chucks &FORENAMES= Billy](http://www.lawsociety.org.uk/find-a-solicitor/?view=solicitorsearch &SURNAME= Chucks &FORENAMES= Billy)].