



For Publication Re: Why the SRA's Decision Matters to Every Community

1 message

ivegn@yahoo.co.uk <ivegn@yahoo.co.uk>

20 February 2026 at 19:41

To: RACE CODE CHESS REPARATION NATION LIMITED <thereparationnation@gmail.com>, "goodthingzinlife@gmail.com" <goodthingzinlife@gmail.com>, "charlesharris187@gmail.com" <charlesharris187@gmail.com>, "V. Dyer" <vernelladyer123@gmail.com>, Claudia Smith <claudiasmith25@gmail.com>, "clementderek04@gmail.com" <clementderek04@gmail.com>, Donna Spence <dspence2011@hotmail.co.uk>, Pamela Grey <pamelagrey67@gmail.com>, Stoprepossessionexperts Info <info@stoprepossessionexperts.com>, Completeituk Co Info <info@completeituk.co.uk>, LadyC PARKINS <ladycparkins1@gmail.com>, Trustee Admin <thftrust1@gmail.com>, Anthony Wallace <anthony62wallace@gmail.com>, Margaret Bonney <margaretbonney@yahoo.co.uk>, Clapperpriest <clapperpriest@yahoo.com>, "claysten8@gmail.com" <claysten8@gmail.com>, ":Randolph :." <randolph@btinternet.com>, "Juris Privati \"of Private Right" <jurisprivati@protonmail.com>

For Publication**Re: Why the SRA's Decision Matters to Every Community**

Dear John,

I am writing to draw urgent public attention to an issue that goes far beyond one family, one solicitor's firm, or one regulatory decision. It concerns the Solicitors Regulation Authority's (SRA) refusal to investigate serious concerns about a law firm's conduct in a mortgage possession case—concerns involving missing legal documents, questionable authority to evict, and potential misrepresentation to the Land Registry.

This is not a technical dispute.

This is a **community issue**, and it affects every homeowner, every tenant, and every person who relies on the legal system to protect them.

Here is why this matters.

1. If a solicitor can evict without proving authority, anyone's home is at risk

In the case at hand, the solicitor firm could not produce:

- the Deed of Assignment,
- the Power of Attorney,
- or the original mortgage agreement.

These are the documents that prove who actually owns a mortgage and who has the right to enforce it. Without them, an eviction should not proceed.

Yet the SRA accepted the firm's explanation that it was "unaware" of these documents.

If a law firm can enforce possession without proving its authority, then **no family's home is safe**.

2. The regulator's decision contains errors that undermine public trust

The SRA's decision claims the complaint was received in **November 2026**, even though the decision is dated **February 2026**.

A regulator cannot protect the public if it cannot even place a complaint in time.

This raises serious questions about whether the correct file was reviewed, whether the evidence was properly considered, and whether the decision was produced using a template rather than genuine scrutiny.

When regulators make mistakes, the public pays the price.

3. The court did not resolve the issue—and the SRA used that as an excuse

The SRA said the matter could be dealt with by the court.

But the court refused to examine the missing documents because of a **technicality** in the paperwork—not because the concerns lacked merit.

The judge said:

“The court is not here to remedy and make applications better.”

So:

- The court did not check the documents.
- The SRA did not check the documents.
- The eviction process continued anyway.

This is how people lose homes without anyone checking the basics.

4. This is a structural problem, not an isolated case

When regulators defer to courts, and courts defer to procedure, the result is a **gap in accountability**.

That gap is where:

- wrongful evictions happen,
- vulnerable families fall through the cracks,
- and communities lose faith in the system.

This is not about one solicitor's firm.

It is about a regulatory culture that too often trusts institutions over individuals, and paperwork over justice.

5. There is a racialised dimension we cannot ignore

In this case:

- A Black paralegal's right to speak in court was challenged.
- He was only granted "limited" rights of audience.
- The court refused to hear the substance because of technicalities.
- The SRA relied on the court's refusal to avoid investigating.
- A Black family faces eviction based on untested assumptions.

No one is alleging intentional racism.

But the **outcome** reflects the same structural disadvantages Black communities face across housing, policing, education, and now—regulation.

When systems fail, they fail the same people first.

6. The community deserves transparency and accountability

We need:

- A full review of the SRA's decision.
- A proper investigation into the missing documents.
- Clear answers about how this decision was made.
- Stronger protections for homeowners facing possession.
- A regulator that acts in the public interest—not in the interests of convenience.

This is not just a legal issue.

It is a **community safety issue**.

When regulators look away, families lose homes, trust erodes, and injustice becomes normalised.

We cannot allow that.

Yours sincerely,

George T. Nomen

Paralegal | Forensic Document Examiner | Community Advocate

-  **Doctrinal critique of SRA decision RGC-000175478.docx**
16K
-  **__Regulatory Abdication and Racialised Risk in Professional Discipline_ (1).docx**
13K
-  **__Regulatory Abdication and Racialised Risk in Professional Discipline_.docx**
14K
-  **When Regulators Look Away_ How the SRA's Decision Leaves Homeowners Exposed.docx**
12K
-   **When Regulators Look Away_ What the SRA Decision Means for Ordinary People.docx**
987K
-  **BLACK JUSTICE RESEARCH CENTRE (4).docx**
15K
-  **RGC-000175478 - DNI (1).pdf**
145K