

SOLICITORS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL

IN THE MATTER OF THE SOLICITORS ACT 1974

Case No: 12905-2026

BETWEEN:

PARVINDER CHOPRA

Applicant

and

KUNAL GADHVI

First Respondent

and

ALICE COURT

Second Respondent

Before:

Ms T Cullen (Chair)

Mr D Green

Mrs L McMahon-Hathway

Date of Consideration: 25 February 2026

Appearances

The application was considered on the papers.

**MEMORANDUM OF DECISION IN RESPECT OF
CERTIFICATION OF A LAY APPLICATION**

Relevant Background

1. Mr Parvinder Chopra submitted a lay application against Mr Kunal Gadhvi and Ms Alice Court, solicitors with Irwin Mitchell LLP, dated 11 February 2026.
2. On 13 February 2026, the application was first considered by a single solicitor member under Rule 13(1) of the Solicitors (Disciplinary Proceedings) Rules 2019 (“SDPR”) to determine whether there was a case for the Respondents to answer. Rule 3 SDPR sets out that a ‘case to answer’ means that it is ‘an arguable case’.
3. The single solicitor member did not consider that the application raised an arguable case, and the application was not certified. It was referred for consideration by a panel of three members of the Tribunal under Rule 13(3) SDPR.
4. The Tribunal reviewed all the material provided by the Applicant which included:
 - Application and statement in support.
 - Exhibits to the application.
5. Mr Chopra alleged that, over a period of five years, there was persistent professional misconduct by the Respondents which undermined public trust and confidence in the legal profession, including:
 - i. the alleged advancement of a legal narrative contrary to official insolvency records, court-appointed liquidator correspondence, and Companies House filings,
 - ii. the use and reliance upon unauthorised persons to sign documents and attend court, notwithstanding Mr Chopra having repeatedly put the Respondents on notice that the involvement of these persons was unauthorised and
 - iii. litigation allegedly conducted by an unauthorised person in contravention of The Legal Services Act 2007 as interpreted in Mazur & Anor v Charles Russell Speechlys LLP [2025] EWHC 2341 (KB)

The Tribunal’s Decision

6. The Tribunal considered the application under Rule 13 SDPR, which required only that the application disclose a real, as opposed to fanciful, prospect of success.
7. The Tribunal carefully reviewed the material submitted in support of the application and considered the allegations made against the Respondents.
8. The Tribunal recognised that the litigation in which the alleged conduct had occurred had had a substantial impact on Mr Chopra.
9. The Tribunal found that there was insufficient evidence to support a case to answer in respect of (i) the alleged advancement of a legal narrative contrary to official insolvency records, court-appointed liquidator correspondence, and Companies House filings, and (ii) the use and reliance upon unauthorised persons to sign documents and attend court.

10. With regard to whether litigation may have been conducted in contravention of the court's determination in Mazur & Anor v Charles Russell Speechlys LLP [2025] EWHC 2341 (KB), the Tribunal was aware that this decision was currently the subject of an appeal to the Court of Appeal. Mr Chopra may consider it appropriate to make a further application once the decision from the court of appeal is available.
11. Having considered this matter fully, the Tribunal did not consider that the application before it disclosed an arguable case against Mr Gadhvi and Ms Court. Accordingly, the Tribunal did not certify the application.
12. Should Mr Chopra wish to challenge the Tribunal's decision not to certify this matter, he should apply to the Administrative Court.

Dated this 3rd day of March 2026

On behalf of the Tribunal

T. Cullen

T. Cullen
Chair