



LEGAL SERVICES BOARD

Legal Services Board
One Kemble Street
London
WC2B 4AN

www.legalservicesboard.org.uk

23 October 2017

Fol request (Ref: 20170905/01)

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Request 1:

Text from LSB response:

As an oversight regulator, the LSB does not have jurisdiction to review approved regulators' decisions or processes regarding individual cases. In fact, the Legal Services Act 2007 explicitly prohibits the LSB from exercising its powers to give a direction requiring an approved regulator to take steps in respect of a disciplinary case or other regulatory proceedings

Fol Request:

[REDACTED] *Can you please refer me to the section of the 2007 Act which states this?*

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2007/29/section/32>

Section 32 (5):

The Board may not exercise its powers under this section so as to give a direction requiring an approved regulator to take steps in respect of a specific disciplinary case or other specific regulatory proceedings (as opposed to all, or a specified class of, such cases or proceedings).

Request 2: How many complaints about actions of the SRA have you received in last ten years?

The LSB is not a complaint handling body. Section 32(5) of the Legal Services Act precludes the LSB from directing an approved regulator to "take steps in respect of a specific disciplinary case or other specific regulatory proceedings...". We do receive correspondence from members of the public

and others about the performance and activities of the regulators, although not all of these would necessarily be classified as complaints. The numbers of such contacts received from July 2011 (the date the LSB first started to record this information) about the SRA is 202.

Request 3: How many of those complaints relate to refusals to compensate clients whose funds have been misappropriated by practitioners that they licence?

As advised in response to question 1, the LSB is not a complaints handling body. We do not categorise the correspondence received under the heading you ask about. We have however conducted a search of our records and of the 202 recorded pieces of correspondence about the SRA, there appear to be two that allege “refusals to compensate clients whose funds have been misappropriated by practitioners that they licence”.

Request 4: How many complaints relate to refusal of SRA to provide proper justifications for these compensation fund refusals?

As advised in response to question 1, the LSB is not a complaints handling body. Of the two pieces of correspondence identified in response to question 3, zero relate to “refusal of the SRA to provide proper justifications for these compensation fund refusals”.

Request 5: How many complaints relate to refusal by SRA to investigate practitioners who commit fraud against members of the public?

As advised in response to question 1, the LSB is not a complaints handling body. We do not categorise the correspondence received under the heading you ask about. We have however conducted a search of our records and of the 202 recorded pieces of correspondence about the SRA we have identified two that appear to allege “refusal by the SRA to investigate practitioners who commit fraud against members of the public”.

Request 6: Please refer me to the public documents that show that you have in fact acted on the complaints that you have received in any way? Where is this evidence base kept and how can the public at large gain access to it?

As previously explained, we use the intelligence we receive from members of the public and others to inform our work generally. This material is held within the LSB and is not available to the public.

If you are dissatisfied with this response to your request for information, you have the right to ask for an internal review / to submit a complaint (see [LSB's Freedom of information – Complaints procedure](#)).

The reference for your request, which should be quoted in all correspondence, is: 20170905/01.