



# **Kashine Taylor**

## **Employee**

### **824024**

[Employee-related decision Date: 12 May 2025](#)

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

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

Outcome date: 12 May 2025

Published date: 5 June 2025

## **Firm details**

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

Name: Derbyshire County Council

Address(es):

Firm ID: 64781

## **Outcome details**

This outcome was reached by SRA decision.

### **Decision details**

Kashine Taylor whose last known address was in Nottingham. 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 Ms Taylor can work in an SRA regulated firm. It was found that: Ms Taylor, who is not a solicitor, 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**

Ms Taylor, a law graduate who had completed her training but who had not been admitted to the Roll secured employment with Derbyshire County Council (DCC), a recognised body on 4 March 2024 as a solicitor.



Ms Taylor practised and acted as a solicitor until 27 March 2024 when she knew she was unqualified to do so.

Ms Taylor failed to inform DCC that she was not qualified and told DCC that the SRA had not emailed her Practising Certificate (PC) to her, latterly stating she was not aware she needed to make a separate application for a PC even though she had made two previous applications to be admitted to the Roll before commencing employment with DCC.

Ms Taylor had also told Eliot Mather LLP, a recognised body, on 20 September 2023 that the reason her admission to the Roll and her PC being issued was delayed was the fault of the SRA when she had not yet made an application to be admitted to the Roll.

**Ms Taylor's conduct was dishonest.**

### **Decision on outcome**

An order pursuant to section 43(2) of the Solicitors Act 1974 was imposed as Ms Taylor'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 Ms Taylor of this decision. Ms Taylor was also ordered to pay the SRA's costs of £1,350. 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/)