

**THE SOLICITORS (SCOTLAND) ACT 1980  
THE SCOTTISH SOLICITORS' DISCIPLINE TRIBUNAL  
(SSDT RULES 2024)**

**FINDINGS**

**in Complaint**

**by**

**THE COUNCIL OF THE LAW SOCIETY of  
SCOTLAND, Atria One, 144 Morrison Street,  
Edinburgh**

**Complainers**

**against**

**DOUGLAS BURNETT, Burnett Legal Services  
Limited, 6 King's Gate, Aberdeen**

**Respondent**

1. A Complaint dated 12 August 2025 was lodged with the Scottish Solicitors' Discipline Tribunal by the Council of the Law Society of Scotland, Atria One, 144 Morrison Street, Edinburgh (hereinafter referred to as "the Complainers") averring that Douglas Burnett, Burnett Legal Services Limited, 6 King's Gate, Aberdeen (hereinafter referred to as "the Respondent") was a practitioner who may have been guilty of professional misconduct.
2. The complaint was made by the Council on behalf of AH and the late ST (hereinafter referred to as "the Complaint Originators"). ST died during the investigation of this matter and the complaint has been taken forward by AH and the Executors of the late ST.
3. The Tribunal caused a copy of the Complaint as lodged to be served upon the Respondent. No Answers were lodged for the Respondent. A letter dated 24 October 2025 was lodged on behalf of the Respondent by Nicola Irvine, Solicitor, Glasgow. This outlined the Respondent's position. The Tribunal fixed a virtual hearing to take place on 16 December 2025. Notice was duly served on the parties.
4. At the virtual hearing on 16 December 2025, the Complainers were represented by their Fiscal, Gavin Whyte, Solicitor, Edinburgh. The Respondent was present and represented himself. No evidence was led. Parties made submissions.

5. Having given careful consideration to the terms of the Complaint, the Tribunal found the following facts established:-

- 5.1 The Respondent is Douglas Burnett born on 30 April 1953. He was admitted as a solicitor on 6 January 1977. He retired from practice as a solicitor on 31 October 2024 and is not currently in possession of a practising certificate.
- 5.2 The Respondent was the sole executor in the estates of both Mrs H (who died on 4 July 2006) and Mr H (who died on 22 October 2009). Mr and Mrs H were the parents of the Complaint Originators.
- 5.3 Mr and Mrs H lived on farm A. In addition to the farm, Mr H owned various areas of agricultural land relating to it.
- 5.4 In 2008, Mr H acquired farm B comprising a farmhouse with adjoining steading and land. Mr H gifted one half of the title of farm B to Complaint Originator AH and his wife.

#### **Mrs H's Executry**

- 5.5 In 2006, the Respondent accepted instructions to administer the estate of Mrs H.
- 5.6 There was a delay in administering the estate between 30 August 2006 and 1 September 2009 and between October 2009 and July 2015.
- 5.7 An application for confirmation was submitted in May 2013 and granted on 28 November 2013.
- 5.8 The Respondent did not provide regular updates on progress with the estate to the Complaint Originators between 1 September 2006 and 17 September 2009, 22 October 2009 and 20 December 2013 and January 2014 and July 2015.
- 5.9 The Respondent did not respond to requests from the Complaint Originators for updates on progress of the estate.
- 5.10 The Respondent did not explain the content of the account of charge when sent with the discharge.

- 5.11 The Respondent:-
- 5.11.1 Did not deliver the Inheritance Tax (“IHT”) accounts to HM Revenue and Customs (“HMRC”) timeously.
  - 5.11.2 Did not use the appropriate life assurance policy to pay IHT due in connection with a failed lifetime gift despite one being set up for this purpose.
  - 5.11.3 Delayed in providing HMRC with information required from Royal Skandia.
  - 5.11.4 Incurred interest charges by submitting the IHT 400 three years late.
- 5.12 From February 2007, there was a delay in/failure to distribute funds from the estate (received from a life assurance policy) to three beneficiaries.
- 5.13 The estate account was not reconciled correctly in that the file was closed on or around 2 July 2015 on the basis that it had been completed and all funds distributed. Thereafter, AH’s Charge and Discharge were prepared on the basis that the sum of £165,433.57 was still due from Mrs H’s estate. This sum was not properly accounted for.
- 5.14 Between July 2006 and December 2013 there was a delay in notifying National Savings and Investments (“NSI”) of Mrs H’s death. There was also a delay and/or failure to credit payments received timeously (such as NSI Cheques), crediting payments which should have been credited to Mr H’s estate. Inappropriate transfers were made between client accounts.

### **Mr H’s Executry**

- 5.15 In 2009, the Respondent accepted instructions to administer the estate of Mr H.
- 
- 5.16 There was a delay in administering the estate of Mr H between November 2009 and July 2015. There were repeated requests to progress matters. The initial executry letters gathering information about Mr H’s estate were not sent until May 2010. There was a delay with the bereavement/withdrawal forms.
- 5.17 Between October 2009 and September 2014 the IHT accounts were not delivered to HMRC timeously. The Respondent did not complete the IHT account, respond to requests for information from HMRC, clarify that the funeral costs amounted to £5000.00 for IHT purposes or clarify the full statement of IHT liability.
- 5.18 The Respondent instructed Counsel to prepare an Opinion on agricultural property relief.

5.19 From November 2009, there was a delay in/failure to distribute funds from the estate to three beneficiaries despite the Respondent being in a position to do so at that time.

5.20 On or around 2 July 2015, there was a failure to reconcile the estate account. The Respondent did not accurately record the figures relating to the interest on Mrs H's estate and inappropriately recorded the payment of funds due to HMRC to meet IHT on Mr H's estate.

6. Having considered the foregoing circumstances, the Tribunal found the Respondent guilty of professional misconduct singly and *in cumulo* as follows:-

6.1 In 2006 and 2009 the Respondent accepted instructions to administer two different estates without having the competence and appropriate skills to complete these matters within a reasonable timescale contrary to Article 5 of the Code of Conduct for Scottish Solicitors 2002 ("the 2002 Rules"), Rule 10 of the Solicitors (Scotland) (Standards of Conduct) Practice Rules 2008 ("the 2008 Rules") and Rule B1.10 of The Law Society of Scotland Practice Rules 2011 ("the 2011 Rules") respectively.

6.2 By accepting those instructions, the Respondent did not act in the interests of his clients contrary to Rule 3 of the 2008 Rules and Rule B1.4 of the 2011 Rules.

6.3 By failing to provide regular updates on the progress of both estates to the principal beneficiaries (despite requests for information), failing to provide necessary and requested information to HMRC in relation to inheritance tax ("IHT") (including submitting the IHT 400 3 years late and incurring interest charges as a result), and failing to notify NSI of Mrs H's death, the Respondent failed to communicate effectively in breach of Article 5 of the 2002 Rules, Rule 9 of the 2008 Rules and Rule B1.9 of the 2011 Rules respectively.

6.4 By delaying/failing to distribute available funds to three beneficiaries in both estates within a reasonable timescale, the Respondent failed in act in the best interests of his clients, provide adequate professional services or act with competence and appropriate skill contrary to Articles 2 and 5 of the 2002 Rules, Rules 3, 9 and 10 of the 2008 Rules and Rules B1.4 and B1.9 of the 2011 Rules respectively.

7. The Tribunal pronounced an Interlocutor in the following terms:-

By Video Conference, 16 December 2025. The Tribunal having considered the Complaint dated 25 August 2025 at the instance of the Council of the Law Society of Scotland, Atria One, 144 Morrison Street, Edinburgh against Douglas Burnett, Burnett Legal Services Limited, 6 King's Gate, Aberdeen; Finds the Respondent guilty of professional misconduct in respect of his breaches of Articles 2 and 5 of the Code of Conduct for Scottish Solicitors 2002, Rules 3, 9, 10 and 11 of the Solicitors (Scotland) (Standards of Conduct) Practice Rules 2008 and Rules B1.4, B1.9 and B1.10 of the Law Society of Scotland Practice Rules 2011; Censures the Respondent; Fines the Respondent in the sum of £6,000 to be Forfeit to His Majesty; Finds the Respondent liable in the expenses of the Complainers and of the Tribunal including expenses of the Clerk, chargeable as the same may be taxed by the Auditor of the Court of Session on a party and party basis in terms of Schedule 1 of the Act of Sederunt (Taxation of Judicial Expenses Rules) 2019 as amended with a unit rate of £18.00; and Direct that publicity will be given to this decision and that this publicity should include the name of the Respondent but need not identify any other person. Allow the Complaint Originators 28 days from the date of intimation of these findings to lodge a written claim for compensation, if so advised.

**(signed)**

**Colin Bell**  
**Chair**

8. A copy of the foregoing together with a copy of the Findings certified by the Clerk to the Tribunal as correct were duly sent to the Respondent by recorded delivery service on **3 MARCH 2020**.

**IN THE NAME OF THE TRIBUNAL**



**Colin Bell  
Chair**

**NOTE**

At the virtual Hearing on 16 December 2025, the Complainers were represented by their Fiscal, Gavin Whyte, Solicitor, Edinburgh. The Respondent was present and represented himself.

The Tribunal had before it the Complaint, a letter dated 24 October 2025 sent on behalf of the Respondent by Nicola Irvine, Solicitor, Glasgow and a Joint Minute. The aforementioned letter from Nicola Irvine stated that:-

*“I have been instructed not to lodge answers. [The Respondent] does not have the resources to fund his representation before the Tribunal and seeks to minimise any expense arising from these proceedings. However, I have set out his position briefly below, which it is hoped will be of assistance to the Tribunal in determining the complaint.*

*[The Respondent] accepts that his professional conduct fell short of the required standard in relation to the two executry transactions referred to. He employed executry staff to assist him in the administration of executry estates. Although a great deal of work was carried out by him, he accepts that he had insufficient resource to complete the work within a reasonable timescale. His firm’s fees in respect of the work carried out were not met and, as averred by the Council, he passed his files to new solicitors instructed without exercising a lien.*

*“[The Respondent] accepts that his conduct in cumulo amounts to professional misconduct.”*

The Joint Minute was lodged with the Tribunal Office on 15 December 2025. It had been signed by Ms Irvine on behalf of the Respondent. The Respondent confirmed that he had seen the Joint Minute and agreed with it. He also confirmed that he was representing himself at the Hearing.

The Tribunal noted that the Joint Minute agreed the averment in section B, page 5 of the Complaint which stated that the Respondent held a practising certificate. However, previous correspondence from Ms Irvine stated that the Respondent did not hold a practising certificate and the Respondent confirmed that to be the case. The Fiscal moved to amend the Complaint to reflect this. There was no objection to this motion and the Tribunal allowed the amendment.

The Joint Minute agreed the statements of facts, allegations and duties in the Complaint, therefore no evidence required to be led. Parties made submissions.

## **SUBMISSIONS FOR THE COMPLAINERS**

The Fiscal stated that there were 12 issues narrated in the statement of allegations numbers 1 to 13 in the Complaint. Issue 8 was absent as the Scottish Legal Complaints Commissions (“SLCC”) had concluded that no further action was required in relation to that matter which had been originally raised by the Complaint Originators. The Fiscal added that the facts in this case were significantly linked and the numbering was deliberate and not an error.

The Fiscal explained that there were two Complaint Originators. The Respondent was the Sole Executor of both executries. The first executry was that of Mrs H who died in July 2006. The second was that of Mr H who died in 2009. Confirmation of both estates was granted in 2013. The Fiscal submitted that, in relation to both executries, the Respondent accepted instructions to administer both matters without the capacity, knowledge, skill or experience to do so within a reasonable timescale. Given that the Respondent had failed to complete Mrs H’s estate by the time Mr H died, the Fiscal argued that the Respondent should have paused to consider whether he had the capacity to accept instructions in relation to Mr H’s estate also. It was clear that Mr H’s estate was more complex than Mrs H’s and involved agricultural heritable property. The Fiscal said he would explain why the Respondent’s conduct amounted to professional misconduct singly and *in cumulo*.

The Fiscal argued that there were significant delays in administering both estates characterised by long periods of inactivity without any plausible explanation. The Respondent took three years to make initial enquiries about Mrs H’s estate and ignored correspondence from HMRC. It took the Respondent 6 months to resubmit an application for confirmation when it was returned by the Sheriff Court. In total, it took the Respondent 7 years to obtain confirmation for Mrs H’s estate which was not granted until 28 November 2013. The Fiscal argued that a competent solicitor should have completed administration of the estates within a couple of years, particularly following Mr H’s death in 2009.

It was explained that, until Mr H’s death on 22 October 2009, Mr H was the sole beneficiary of Mrs H. On 23 July 2009, the Respondent wrote to Mr H stating that he intended to produce the final Confirmation Statement identifying Mrs H’s entire estate by the end of August 2009 when, in fact, he had not yet begun to make enquiries. The Fiscal submitted that this was a stark failure of the Respondent which met the test for professional misconduct.

Highlighting the Respondent's failure to communicate effectively with HMRC, the Fiscal submitted that interest charges in excess of £10,000 were incurred due to the Respondent's inaction. Not only were the delays in communication lengthy but they resulted in significant consequences for the estates and beneficiaries.

Mrs H made specific bequests of £5,000 each in favour of three beneficiaries. Separately, Mr H made specific bequests of £10,000 each to the same three beneficiaries. In February 2007, Mrs H's estate received payment of £204,140.60 from Scottish Equitable. Mrs H's estate was wealthy. Despite being in a position to do so, the Respondent did not pay the bequests to the beneficiaries in the line with the respective wills. The Fiscal submitted that these failures singly amounted to professional misconduct.

The Fiscal submitted that the Respondent had a duty to account to the beneficiaries of both estates. However, the Respondent had failed to reconcile the executory account correctly by closing Mr H's file on or around 2 July 2015 on the basis that matters had been completed, but failing to account for the sum of £165,433.33 which was still due into the estate from Mrs H's estate. In addition, payment of IHT on Mrs H's estate was not recorded on the ledger for her executory or within the estate accounts. As well as failing to reconcile both executory accounts correctly, the Fiscal argued that the Respondent lacked the ability or competence to do so.

The Fiscal argued that the Respondent acted inappropriately by failing to notify NSI of Mrs H's death (which occurred on 4 July 2006) until 1 September 2009. It was submitted that the Respondent also failed to credit payments due from Mrs H's estate to Mr H's estate accordingly and that he made inappropriate transfers between client accounts. For example, IHT payments for Mrs H were paid from funds held on Mr H's executory and paid direct from same; the funds were not credited to the ledger for Mrs H's executory and paid to HMRC from there. The IHT payment was funded by a specific bond in Mrs H's estate.

The Respondent accepted instructions to administer Mr H's estate following his death on 22 October 2009. However, at that point in time, the Respondent had only recently issued some initial enquiry letters for Mrs H's estate. The Respondent did not send out letters regarding accounts until 2010. As a result of those delays, the value of Mrs H's estate was not known at the time of Mr H's death. The Fiscal submitted that the administration of Mrs H's estate should have been completed well before Mr H's death. However, the Respondent did not deal with matters timeously and he did not have the competence to do so. The entire process took 5 years and 10 months which, the Fiscal argued, was excessive.

The Fiscal argued that the Respondent had unduly delayed in administering Mr H's estate between November 2009 and July 2015 despite repeated requests from the Complaint Originators to progress matters. The Fiscal referred to periods inactivity from the Respondent and a delay in ascertaining the value of the estate overall. He described a "substantial delay" regarding the C1 inventory which was returned by the Sheriff Court in November 2011 for correction but which was not resubmitted until January 2013. Forms received from banks were with the Respondent for a month before they were completed and returned.

The Fiscal submitted that the Respondent failed to communicate effectively with HMRC in relation to IHT due on the estate between October 2009 and September 2014. He added that numerous reminders were sent to the Respondent by HMRC. They also tried to contact the Respondent by telephone on several occasions. However, the Respondent ignored correspondence from HMRC. The Fiscal explained that, at the last minute, the Respondent instructed Counsel's Opinion in relation to agricultural relief. He argued that, not only should the Respondent have sought an opinion far earlier (if at all), but that this instruction incurred a significant and unnecessary cost. Despite failing to pay legacies to the three beneficiaries described above, the Respondent paid Counsel's fee in full on 22 January 2015.

The Fiscal referred to the test for professional misconduct laid out in the case of Sharp v Council of the Law Society of Scotland 1984 SLT 313. In particular, the Fiscal referred to the Respondent's significant delays in dealing with both executries and said that the effect on the beneficiaries was notable. The Fiscal said that it was a complex Complaint. He asked the Tribunal to take those factors into account when making a decision. The Fiscal submitted that the Tribunal should not hesitate to conclude that the Respondent's conduct was serious and reprehensible and, in light of his admitted conduct, find him guilty of professional misconduct both singly and *in cumulo*.

## **SUBMISSIONS FOR THE RESPONDENT**

The Respondent said that his "downfall" was failing to log all conversations he had with the parties. He added that he received weekly phone calls from the Complaint Originators but was waiting for HMRC.

The Respondent expressly accepted that there had been delays in the work he carried out but said that Mr H's estate was complicated. He described Mr H as a retired farmer who was still working as a "herder" for a neighbour and said that this caused problems in terms of the applicable agricultural relief. The Respondent said that he had delegated some of the work to an "exceptional" paralegal who discovered an English case on tax law which was relevant and cited by Counsel. The Respondent submitted that this research led to £125,000

of tax relief for the estate. The Respondent added that he did not charge for the considerable time and research which was carried out in relation to this matter.

## TRIBUNAL QUESTIONS

A member of the Tribunal asked the Respondent what type of practice he ran and what type of work he typically undertook. The Respondent said that he primarily dealt with property and some executries. He described the work he dealt with as “all quite straightforward” and said that he was perhaps lulled into the comfort of speaking to Mr H regularly and updating him that way. However, the Respondent acknowledged that he was unable to prove that he had done so as there were no notes on the relevant files.

Another Tribunal member had noted the Respondent had referred to delegating work to paralegals and asked if they were executry paralegals. The Respondent replied that one person was an executry paralegal and the other had a lot of experience in executry work.

The same Tribunal member asked the Respondent to confirm what stage the estates were currently at. The Respondent said he believed that both estates were now completed.

## DECISION

On the basis of the admitted facts and submissions from both parties, the Tribunal was satisfied that the Respondent acted in the manner detailed in the averments of fact set out in the Complaint. The Tribunal therefore found the above facts to be established. The Respondent had also admitted that his conduct had breached the duties detailed in the Complaint.

Although the Respondent admitted professional misconduct, it remained for the Tribunal to consider whether the admitted conduct met the test as set out in the case of Sharp (cited above) which states that:-

*“There are certain standards of conduct to be expected of competent and reputable solicitors. A departure from these standards which would be regarded by competent and reputable solicitors as serious and reprehensible may properly be categorised as professional misconduct. Whether or not the conduct complained of is a breach of rules or some other actings or omissions, the same question falls to be asked and answered and in every case it will be essential to consider the whole circumstances and the degree of culpability which ought properly to be attached to the individual against whom the complaint is to be made.”*

Thereafter, the Tribunal had to consider whether the admitted conduct amount to professional misconduct singly or *in cumulo*.

The Tribunal carefully considered all the information before it. The legal members of the Tribunal observed that, on average, executries can take 6 to 12 months to complete if straightforward, or 18 months to 2 years if more involved. Although it fully acknowledged that complex executries (including farm estates) can take longer than that, and delays can occur, the Tribunal observed that it was very unusual for the delays to be as significant as in this case. If delays do occur, it is vital for solicitors to keep clients informed and ensure that clear records are maintained and regularly reviewed. In this case, it was clear to the Tribunal that the Respondent's inaction, lack of capacity and failures had resulted in an extraordinary delay in administering both estates.

Although the Respondent described having experience of some executry work, it was clear that he lacked the capacity and competence to deal with more complex cases. He should have realised this and, ultimately, declined to act. The Tribunal also noted that the Respondent was aware that both estates involved a farm and that should have alerted him to possible difficulties and caused him to consider his capacity to deal with the work. The Respondent's failure to do that permeated the entire Complaint. In addition, the Respondent should not have accepted instructions to deal with Mr H's estate given his admitted failures and the delays which were occurring with Mrs H's estate. That was wholly unacceptable and caused further problems.

The Respondent should not have delegated this work to a paralegal, albeit an experienced one. If a paralegal was required to assist in these matters, the Respondent should have set clear tasks and taken the overall lead. He should have supervised staff working on the cases very closely.

The Respondent's failures and delays were present throughout both transactions from the beginning; starting with delayed attempts to value the assets. The Tribunal unanimously agreed that a period of three years before issuing initial letters was unreasonable. The Respondent had conceded that he had not kept proper records of phone calls. However, if he had completed the work timeously, then the value of both estates would have been ascertained within a reasonable timeframe.

The failure to reconcile estate accounts and gather and complete all necessary paperwork was not acceptable to the Tribunal. Although the Respondent had admitted the conduct and breaches, he displayed a somewhat cavalier attitude to matters which was of concern. It was clear that the estates were wealthy and the Respondent's conduct had resulted in significant consequences for the estate overall and the beneficiaries. The

failure to pay out legacies was also unacceptable, particularly as the Respondent was in funds to do so. The Tribunal stated that prompt payment of legacy bequests is one of the most important parts of settling an estate and solicitors should action bequests as quickly as possible. The bequests in this case were of some value.

In all the circumstances, the Respondent's conduct fell below the standard expected of a competent and reputable solicitor. There were prolonged, repeated and numerous examples of conduct which were serious and reprehensible and which impacted the estates, beneficiaries and damaged the reputation of the legal profession in Scotland. The Tribunal had no hesitation in finding the Respondent guilty of professional misconduct singly and *in cumulo*.

### **SUBMISSIONS ON SANCTION, PUBLICITY AND EXPENSES**

The Fiscal confirmed that there were no previous finding of professional misconduct against the Respondent. There was one previous finding of unsatisfactory professional conduct. He asked the Tribunal to make an award of expenses against the Respondent. The Fiscal also asked the Tribunal to order that the decision be published naming the Respondent but no other party.

The Respondent said there had been no "malfeasance" on his part. He had considered Mrs H, Mr H and their family as friends as he had acted for them for a number of years. The Respondent said that things "turned sour" after Mr H died and that his "downfall" was his failure to record everything on the files.

The Respondent accepted that administration of the estates took longer than they should have. However, he submitted that the delay was not as long as perceived and did not extend to 7 years. He said there had been lots of "to-ings and fro-ings" and that a lot of time was spent researching the law on agricultural relief. He said that there was no delay in instructing Counsel.

The Respondent said that a lot of time was spent dealing with correspondence in respect of a substantial professional indemnity insurance claim which was made against him. This resulted in an increased insurance premium.

In terms of his personal circumstances, the Respondent said that he had a limited income which had reduced since his retirement and would continue to decrease as he wound up the affairs of his clients. A Tribunal member asked the Respondent to clarify whether he was still working. The Respondent replied that he was "winding things up" and helping people he had known for a long time with their affairs. He said that his clients wanted him to assist them but stated that he was no longer working as a solicitor.

In relation to expenses, the Respondent asked the Tribunal to take his income into account. He described his income as modest in comparison to other lawyers and comprised mainly of “introductory fees” from other lawyers which would eventually “dry up”. The Respondent asked the Tribunal to be fair and reasonable in relation to the question of expenses.

In relation to publicity, the Respondent described these proceedings as a sad ending to his 41 years of practice as a solicitor. He considered this matter to be “a large blot on landscape of [his] professional career”.

The Respondent said he could not recall the previous finding of unsatisfactory professional misconduct referred to by the Fiscal. The Fiscal deferred to the Respondent’s record card.

### **DECISION ON SANCTION, PUBLICITY AND EXPENSES**

The Tribunal carefully considered the aggravating and mitigating factors in this case. Although the Fiscal had mentioned a previous finding of unsatisfactory professional conduct, no further information was available to the Tribunal.

The Respondent had taken advice on this matter, fully engaged with these proceedings and had acted in a respectful manner towards the Tribunal. The Respondent had entered a Joint Minute which expedited matters.


However, the Respondent displayed an astonishing lack of insight during the course of the Hearing which was of concern to the Tribunal. He had not expressed any remorse for his actions; instead, he seemed to be in denial about the extent of his conduct and the impact it had. The Respondent’s conduct had affected a number of people and extended to organisations such as HMRC also. This was not acceptable. In terms of recompense for losses incurred by his former clients, the Respondent had described a successful professional indemnity insurance claim.

The Tribunal concluded that the Respondent’s actions were damaging to the profession and constituted a risk to the public. That risk was reduced given that the Respondent had retired and did not hold a practising certificate although the Tribunal were concerned about the nature of the work still being done by the Respondent.

The Tribunal censured the Respondent. In terms of further sanction, the Tribunal noted its decision in the case of Law Society of Scotland-v-Kevin John Boyd (23 November 2023) in which a fine of £2000 was applied.

The Tribunal concluded that the Respondent's conduct was more serious than in the Boyd case and that, in all the circumstances presented to it, a fine of £6000 adequately reflected the gravity of matters.

The Tribunal decided that the appropriate award of expenses was one in favour of the Complainers. The Tribunal ordered that publicity should be given to the decision to include the name of the Respondent but there was no requirement to identify any other person. The Tribunal allowed the Complaint Originators a period of 28 days from the date of intimation of these findings to lodge an updated claim for compensation with Tribunal Office if they wish to do so.



**Colin Bell**  
Chair