



## **Rayhane Nafla**

### **Employee**

### **839393**

[Employee-related decision Date: 23 May 2025](#)

### **Decision - Employee-related decision**

Outcome: Control of non-qualified staff (Section 43 / Section 99 order)

Outcome date: 23 May 2025

Published date: 8 July 2025

### **Firm details**

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

Name: Fragomen LLP

Address(es): 1st Floor, 95 Gresham Street, London, EC2V 7NA

Firm ID: 459836

### **Outcome details**

This outcome was reached by SRA decision.

#### **Decision details**

##### **Who does this decision relate to?**

Miss Rayhane Nafla whose last known address was in Chiswick, London.

A person who is or was involved in a legal practice but is not a solicitor.

##### **Summary of decision**

The SRA has put restrictions on where and how Miss Rayhane Nafla can work in an SRA regulated firm. It was found that:

Miss Nafla, who is not a solicitor, is or was involved in a legal practice and has occasioned or been a party to an act or default which involved such conduct on her part that it is undesirable for her to be involved in a legal practice in any of the ways described in the order below.

##### **The facts of the case**



Miss Nafla applied for and secured a role as Senior Legal Counsel at a firm of solicitors. On five separate occasions during the recruitment process Miss Nafla misrepresented facts (both in writing and verbally) concerning her employment history that she knew to be untrue, inaccurate or incomplete. This was misleading and dishonest. There were numerous opportunities for her to clarify and correct that misinformation when she was questioned by the firm. Miss Nafla did not take any of these and was instead evasive and refused to engage at all once questions began to be asked in the course of background checks made by the firm.

### **Decision on outcome**

An order pursuant to section 43(2) of the Solicitors Act 1974 was imposed as Miss Nafla's conduct meant that it was undesirable for her to be involved in a legal practice without the SRA's prior approval. The order pursuant to section 43 was made with effect from the date of the letter or email notifying Miss Nafla of Chiswick, London of this decision:

Miss Nafla's conduct was serious because the information about her employment history was repeatedly dishonest and misleading. She had several opportunities to correct this which she did not take. Her behaviour was intended to secure a personal advantage and displayed a lack of integrity.

Miss Nafla was also ordered to pay a proportion of the SRA's costs of £600.

### **What our Section 43 order means**

- i. no solicitor shall employ or remunerate her in connection with his/her practice as a solicitor;
- ii. no employee of a solicitor shall employ or remunerate her in connection with the solicitor's practice;
- iii. no recognised body shall employ or remunerate her;
- iv. no manager or employee of a recognised body shall employ or remunerate her in connection with the business of that body;
- v. no recognised body or manager or employee of such a body shall permit her to be a manager of the body; and
- vi. no recognised body or manager or employee of such a body shall permit her to have an interest in the body

except in accordance with the SRA's prior written permission.

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