



# **Sarthak Mukherji**

## **Employee**

### **7270526**

**[Agreement Date: 3 July 2025](#)**

## **Decision - Agreement**

Outcome: Regulatory settlement agreement

Outcome date: 3 July 2025

Published date: 14 July 2025

## **Firm details**

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

Name: Cooley (UK) LLP

Address(es): 22 Bishopsgate, London, EC2N 4BQ

Firm ID: 617791

## **Outcome details**

This outcome was reached by agreement.

### **Reasons/basis**

#### **1. Agreed outcome**

1.1 Mr Sarthak Mukherji, a former employee of Cooley (UK) LLP (the Firm), agrees to the following outcome to the investigation of his conduct by the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA):

- a. to the SRA making an order under section 43 of the Solicitors Act 1974 (a section 43 order) in relation to Mr Mukherji that, from the date of this agreement:
  - i. no solicitor shall employ or remunerate him in connection with his practice as a solicitor
  - ii. no employee of a solicitor shall employ or remunerate him in connection with the solicitor's practice
  - iii. no recognised body shall employ or remunerate him
  - iv. no manager or employee of a recognised body shall employ or remunerate him in connection with the business of that body
  - v. no recognised body or manager or employee of such a body shall permit him to be a manager of the body



- vi. no recognised body or manager or employee of such body shall permit him to have an interest in the body

except in accordance with the SRA's prior permission

- b. to the publication of this agreement
- c. he will pay the costs of the investigation of £300.

## **2. Summary of facts**

2.1 Mr Mukherji worked as a paralegal at the Firm from 11 April 2022 until his resignation on 5 December 2024.

2.2 In September 2023, Mr Mukherji assisted with sending documents to a client for signing.

2.3 On 12 November 2024 a colleague wanted to refer to one of the documents, a disclosure letter, and asked Mr Mukherji to send him a copy from the file.

2.4 Mr Mukherji reviewed the file and noted that in error the disclosure letter had not been sent to the client in September 2023 and had therefore not been signed.

2.5 Mr Mukherji copied the client signatures from another document onto the disclosure letter and forwarded it to his colleague. He did not tell the colleague, at this time, that the disclosure letter had not been sent in September 2023 or that the client had not signed it.

2.6 Subsequently another colleague asked Mr Mukherji if the letter had been circulated to the company at the time of signing. He advised that he did not believe that it had.

2.7 The next day the colleague then asked how it had been saved as it was not with the other documents. Mr Mukherji said that 'it was just saved locally so it must have been sent separately.'

2.8 On 14 November 2024, Mr Mukherji contacted his colleague and admitted that he had copied and pasted the signatures of the client onto the disclosure letter

2.9 Mr Mukherji attended a meeting on 18 November to explain his actions. He resigned from his role on 5 December 2024 due to personal reasons.

## **3. Admissions**

3.1 Mr Mukherji makes the following admissions which the SRA accepts:



- a. he copied and pasted the client signatures from another document which had been signed by the clients, to mislead his colleagues that it had been signed and dated the previous year.
- b. He misled his colleague when he said that the disclosure letter must have been sent separately to the clients for signing.
- c. that copying and pasting the signatures onto the letter and misleading his colleague on the circumstances in which the disclosure letter was signed, involved conduct which means that it is undesirable for him to be involved in a legal practice.
- d. that his conduct set out above was dishonest.

#### **4. Why a section 43 order is appropriate**

4.1 The SRA's Enforcement Strategy and its guidance on how it regulates non-authorised persons, sets out its approach to using section 43 orders to control where a non-authorised person can work.

4.2 When considering whether a section 43 order is appropriate in this matter, the SRA has taken into account the admissions made by Mr Mukherji and the following mitigation which he has put forward:

- a. He admitted his conduct at an early stage.
- b. He has shown insight and expressed his remorse.
- c. He was worried about losing his job if it was discovered that the client had not signed the document and this caused him to act out of character
- d. He was worried about his colleagues getting into trouble for not noticing the letter had not been signed at the time.
- e. He has fully co-operated with the firm and the SRA.

4.3 The SRA and Mr Mukherji agree that a section 43 order is appropriate because:

- a. Mr Mukherji is not a solicitor
- b. his employment or remuneration at the Firm means that he was involved in a legal practice
- c. by copy and pasting signatures onto a letter to mislead his colleague that it had been signed at an earlier date, and misleading a colleague on the signing of the document, Mr Mukherji has occasioned or been party to an act or default in relation to a legal practice. Mr Mukherji's conduct in relation to that act or default makes it undesirable for him to be involved in a legal practice.

4.4 Mr Mukherji's conduct makes it undesirable for him to be involved in a legal practice because he was an experienced paralegal and was aware that he should not have misled his colleagues. Such conduct fails to uphold public trust and confidence in the solicitors' profession and in legal services provided by authorised persons.

#### **5. Publication**

5.1 The SRA considers it appropriate that this agreement is published in the interests of transparency in the regulatory process. Mr Mukherji agrees to the publication of this agreement.

#### **6. Acting in a way which is inconsistent with this agreement**

6.1 Mr Mukherji agrees that he will not deny the admissions made in this agreement or act in any way which is inconsistent with it.

#### **7. Costs**

7.1 Mr Mukherji agrees to pay the costs of the SRA's investigation in the sum of £300. Such costs are due within 28 days of a statement of costs due being issued by the SRA.

[Search again \[https://qлтt.sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/\]](https://qлтt.sra.org.uk/consumers/solicitor-check/)