



Decision not to investigate

Case reference number:	RGC-000175478
Date:	18 February 2026
Investigation officer:	Lauren Smith
Relevant firm and SRA number:	Mewies Solicitors Limited (635346)

Matters considered

On 13 November 2026, we received a report from George Nomen in relation to Mr Clive Shepherd which raised the following concerns about Mewies Solicitors Limited:

1. Failure to disclose requested legal authority
2. Attempt to enforce eviction without legal standing
3. Misrepresentation of interests to Land Registry

Our assessment

We assessed the report by:

- Reviewing the report form, supporting evidence and correspondence provided by George Nomen.
- Reviewing the documents and information provided by Mewies Solicitors Limited.
- Considering the relevant provisions of the [SRA Principles \(2019\)](#), the [Code of Conduct for Solicitors RELs, RFLs and RSLs](#), and the [Code of Conduct for Firms](#).
- Reviewing internal records relating to Mewies Solicitors Limited.
- Applying the Assessment Threshold Test to determine whether the concerns raised are capable of resulting in regulatory action.

We considered our Guidance on [Making decisions to investigate concerns](#) which sets out a three stage Assessment Threshold Test used to decide whether we should investigate, and our [Enforcement Strategy](#) which supports that Test when we decide if a potential breach is sufficiently serious to justify us taking action. We also considered our [Topic guide on Competence and Standard of Service](#).

Our reasons for not investigating

Concern 1 – Failure to disclose request legal authority

It was reported that the firm deliberately failed to disclose requested legal authority such as a Deed of Assignment, Power of Attorney and original mortgage agreement.

This report raised concerns as to the firm's compliance with Paragraph 1.4 of the SRA Code of Conduct which states no attempt should be made to mislead others.

Information provided by the firm highlights its unawareness as to the existence of some of these documents. Additionally, no conclusive evidence has been provided that suggests the firm wrongfully or deliberately withheld documentation in an attempt to mislead.

Further information and documentation provided by the firm indicates the potential for this concern to be brought before the court by Mr Nomen. It should be noted that where possible the SRA avoid making decisions that may prejudice any ongoing or potential proceedings, unless the concerns are deemed so serious that the risk of potential prejudice is proportionate.

In this case, we do not believe there to be breach of our Rules and do not consider further investigation to be proportionate.

Concern 2 – Attempt to enforce eviction without legal standing

It was reported that the firm wrongfully attempted to enforce eviction without legal standing.

This report initially raised concerns as to the firm's compliance with Paragraph 1.2 of the SRA Code of Conduct, which states one should not abuse their position by taking unfair advantage of others.

The legal standing of an attempt for eviction is a matter for the courts to decide and is beyond the regulatory authority of the SRA to investigate.

Continually, information provided shows that the firm were acting on the instruction of its client to whom it owes the overarching duty of acting in the best interests of.

We do not consider there to be a breach of our Rules by the firm, based on the evidence we have seen.

Concern 3 – Misrepresentation of interest to Land Registry

It was reported that the firm wrongfully misrepresented the interests of parties in an application to the Land Registry.

This report raised concerns as to the firm's compliance with Paragraph 1.4 of the SRA Code of Conduct which states no attempt should be made to mislead others.

Information provided by the firm indicates these interests were correctly represented. There is no conclusive evidence to support the notion that this be untrue.

Additionally, it should be noted that the standing and validity of an application to the Land Registry is for the Land Registry to decide upon.

Therefore, we do not consider there to be a breach of our Rules by the firm, based on the evidence we have seen.

Decision

For the reasons set out above, I have decided not to investigate this matter. This decision is made under Rule 1.1 of the SRA Regulatory and Disciplinary Procedure Rules (RDPRs) as to whether the matter should be considered under Rule 3 of the RDPRs.

Appeal/Review

Under the SRA Application, Notice, Review and Appeal Rules, there is no right of appeal or review of this decision by either the person who reported the concerns to us, or the subject of this decision.



.....

Signature of Investigation Officer