

Robust AI Complaints Filing & Follow-Up

Two-page concept note for a service that uses AI to standardise evidence intake, build regulator-ready complaint files, and coordinate lawful escalation with consumer bodies, civil-society groups, and media where a matter raises public-interest concerns.

1. The market problem

Complainants often face fragmented routes: first-tier provider complaints, professional regulators, ombudsman schemes, tribunals, and separate public-interest or media channels. Public criticism has focused on delay, opacity, and weak confidence in complaints handling. Recent reporting has highlighted criticism of BSB complaint handling, calls for stronger first-tier systems, and pressure for better transparency in the wider legal redress ecosystem.

2. Business proposition

- AI intake that converts raw emails, screenshots, judgments, and correspondence into a clean chronology, evidence index, issue matrix, and regulator-specific draft.
- A quality-control layer that checks relevance, duplication, missing exhibits, jurisdiction, limitation, and whether the matter belongs with a regulator, ombudsman, tribunal, or court.
- A follow-up engine that diaries acknowledgements, chases deadlines, tracks decision letters, and prepares review requests where a response appears formulaic or incomplete.



Why now. Public commentary has described serious dissatisfaction with parts of the complaints system, including criticism that BSB handling was "unacceptable and inexcusable," findings that complaints handling needed a "step-change improvement," and evidence that consumer confidence depends on a reliable mechanism for grievances.^{[1][2][3][4]}

Revenue model. Fixed-fee packages: intake review, bundle assembly, regulator submission drafting, review or appeal drafting, and optional public-interest escalation packs. For higher-risk matters, the business can partner with qualified solicitors, barristers, PR advisors, or investigative journalists rather than acting outside competence.

Core outputs. Complaint summary, chronology, exhibit list, allegation matrix, legal and regulatory issues list, action log, and a concise decision-gap note showing what evidence appears not to have been addressed.

Risk controls. No filing should go out without human review, source checking, privilege screening, and a defamation or publication risk check if external publicity is proposed.

References cited on this page: [1] Law Gazette - BSB complaint-handling uproar. [2] Law Gazette - Bar's watchdog comes under heavy fire. [3] Legal Services Consumer Panel - First-tier complaints. [4] Law Gazette - New complaints transparency rules for barristers.

Operating model, collaborations, and awareness channels

A robust offer is not just a drafting tool. It is a follow-through system: file cleanly, track the regulator's route, escalate proportionately, and preserve an audit trail showing what evidence was sent, what was acknowledged, and what appears to have been ignored.

- Build an intake pack with a chronology, exhibit list, issue matrix, and short cover note written for the correct body.
- Map the next step clearly: provider complaint, BSB, SRA, Legal Ombudsman, disciplinary process support, or court route.
- Run timed follow-up: acknowledgement checks, chase letters, review request deadlines, and escalation triggers.
- On receipt of a decision, compare the outcome letter against the evidence set and identify unexplained omissions or selective reading.

Suggested collaboration and follow-up links

Type	Organisation / outlet	Purpose
Official route	BSB Reporting Concerns	Barrister conduct reporting and process guidance.
Official route	SRA Report a Solicitor	Explains what the SRA will and will not investigate.
Redress	Legal Ombudsman - How to complain	Useful where the dispute is mainly about service and remedy.
Accountability	Spotlight on Corruption	Broader institutional accountability and reform framing.
Strategic action	Good Law Project - cases	Examples of public-interest campaigning and litigation.
Public law	Public Law Project	Useful where a public body decision may be unlawful or unfair.
Media	TBIJ - Contacting the Bureau	Investigative journalism contact route.
Media safety	TBIJ - How to talk to a journalist	Practical risk guidance before sharing sensitive material.

Awareness strategy. Publish only after legal review. Separate verified facts from commentary, keep contemporaneous documents, and avoid overstating what a regulator has ignored unless the omission is demonstrable from the correspondence record. Use media only where the issue is genuinely systemic or in the public interest, not as leverage for a private grievance.

Supporting background used for this concept: criticism of BSB complaints handling and reform pressure reported by Law Gazette and the Legal Services Consumer Panel, plus source-handling guidance published by TBIJ.