



Agencies where KEYSTONE LAW has already been mentioned in our complaints;

SDT's Case No. 12905-2026 - Kunal Gadhvi, Alice Court (Email : enquiries@solicitorsdt.com) c/o Ray Dhanowa Tel : 020 7329 4808.

Companies House Ref: COH1836943X - (Email : enquiries@companieshouse.gov.uk) c/o Ellen.

BSB Ref : 2025 3734/3735/3736 - (Email : contactus@barstandardsboard.org.uk) c/o Ms Manjit Mandair . Also (Email : ReviewatBSB@barstandardsboard.org.uk).

IP Complaint CMPT12026/00297 - (Email : IP.Complaints@insolvency.gov.uk)

The Insolvency Service OFFICIAL SENSITIVE: PV/7542/2025, PV/0774/2026

(Email : intelligence.live@insolvency.gov.uk) c/o Jacob Collier

Police Crime Reference Number: RF26010062846C

1. Teresa Cullen - Chair at Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal - dismisses our complaint of alleged crimes. (25th Feb 2026).

A) Teresa Cullen is a Partner at Keystone law, the very firm investigated for being in 'connivance' with Mark Coote and Mark Endersby directors. These are the same directors represented by now Irwin Mitchell LLP, previously represented by Keystone law and found by Lord Coulson to be in 'connivance' (8th Sept 2017).

2. Gavin Ballance - Partner at KEYSTONE LAW.

Keystone Law once for the same directors Mark Endersby and Mark Cootes pursues 3 interim orders in the courts, even after having the evidence in front of him of the injustice , LIE's by Irwin Mitchell to the courts and a litigant in person and the 'unauthorised person' within Irwin Mitchell used to obtain the DCC that KEYSTONE LAW rely on.

3. We say Lord Coulson was not wrong in his judgement.We ask the SDT to reopen the SRA case against KEYSTONE LAW.

The added disturbance caused by T Cullen of Keystone law (SDT CHAIR) and Gavin Ballance gives no public confidence. |



Listed law firm given clean bill of health by SRA as two ABS pioneers move on



2 May 2018
Posted by Neil Rose

Listed firm Keystone Law has reassured investors that the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) has ended its investigation into a case in which a High Court judge accused it of conniving with clients to try and avoid a debt.

It highlighted the regulator's probe in its admission document last November, and in an update to the market yesterday said that "the SRA has confirmed that it will be taking steps to close its file in relation to the matter, that it will not be undertaking further investigation and that no disciplinary action will be taken".



Jackson: Consultancy role

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.



Teresa Cullen

Partner

Jurisdiction: England & Wales

T: 020 3319 3700

E: teresa.cullen@keystonelaw.co.uk



The Honourable Mr Justice Coulson

'What is unusual here, in my judgment, is the connivance of Keystone Law.'

<https://www.bailli.org/>




GAVIN BALLANCE
Partner
England & Wales
020 3319 3700
gavin.ballance@keystonelaw.co.uk

KEYSTONE LAW

48 Chancery Lane
London WC2A 1PL
020 3319 3700
020 3319 3700
www.keystonelaw.co.uk

IRAMA PTE LIMITED
32 Gatcombe Mews
Hanger Lane
Ealing
London W5 3HF

4th February 2026

Dear Sirs,

**FORMARK SCAFFOLDING (HOLDINGS) LTD V IRAMA PTE LTD
NOTICE OF INTERIM CHARGING ORDER
PROPERTY: ABINGDON TOWN FOOTBALL CLUB**

We confirm that we have been instructed on behalf of Formark Scaffolding (Holdings) Ltd of The Old Gas Works, 1 Godstone Road, Whyteleafe, Surrey CR3 0EG. Our client has obtained an Interim Charging Order dated 28th January 2026 against IRAMA PTE Limited.



PC

Inbox - Lagpat 12 February 2026 at 16:23

Oversight Concern – SRA Handling of Keystone Law Following Judicial Findings

To: report@sra.org.uk, enquiries@legalservicesboard.org.uk, SDT Enquiries, enquiries@lawsociety.org.uk, Public Enquiries SFO,

Cc: contactcentre@sra.org.uk, foi@sra.org.uk, market.integrity@fca.org.uk, firm.queries@fca.org.uk, consumer.queries@fca.org.uk, aimregulation@lseg.com, chris.bannister@keystonelaw.co.uk, barry.adamson@keystonelaw.co.uk, claude.alleston@keystonelaw.co.uk, issuer.services@lseg.com, companysecretary@keystonelaw.co.uk, info@keystonelaw.co.uk, gavin.ballance@keystonelaw.co.uk, enquiries@keystonelaw.co.uk

Hide

Dear Sir/Madam,

I write to raise a formal oversight concern regarding the Solicitors Regulation Authority's handling of regulatory issues arising from judicial findings in *Bernhards v Astrosoccer 4 U Ltd* and related proceedings involving directors connected to Keystone Law matters.

In *Bernhards v Astrosoccer 4 U Ltd*, the Court made serious observations regarding conduct in litigation, including reference to "connivance." Lord Coulson has also previously examined conduct involving the same directors in related contexts.

It was publicly reported that the SRA was gathering information following those findings.

However, no clear public explanation appears to have been provided regarding:

- Whether a formal investigation was opened,
- The stage at which it concluded,
- The regulatory reasoning applied,
- Or why no published outcome was issued.

Keystone Law has continued to act in matters involving the same directors.

There are ongoing disputes in which substantial damages are alleged by IRAMA PTE Ltd and Mr Ian Rush MBE. These developments materially elevate the public interest dimension.

The issue is not the merits of civil proceedings. Rather, it is whether the SRA:

- Properly assessed judicial findings under the Enforcement Strategy;
- Adequately considered integrity and public confidence principles;
- Reassessed the position when further related disputes emerged;
- Ensured consistent application of regulatory scrutiny.

Under the Legal Services Act 2007, the Legal Services Board has a statutory duty to ensure approved regulators act compatibly with regulatory objectives, including:

- Protecting and promoting the public interest,
- Supporting the constitutional principle of the rule of law,
- Protecting and promoting the interests of consumers,
- Promoting adherence to professional principles.

Where High Court findings include references to "connivance," and subsequent related disputes arise involving a publicly listed firm, transparency in regulatory handling becomes essential to maintaining confidence in legal regulation.

I respectfully request that the Legal Services Board:

- Review whether the SRA's handling of this matter met its statutory objectives;
- Consider whether further supervisory engagement with the SRA is appropriate;
- Seek clarification from the SRA regarding its decision-making and any reassessment in light of subsequent developments.

This complaint is made in the public interest and in the interests of regulatory consistency and transparency.

Please see the Audio presentation of this matter including references to Keystone law and the directors Mark Coote and Mark Endersby.

<https://vimeo.com/1084401817>

Yours faithfully,

Perry Chopra

IRAMA PTE LTD

Tel : 07889 469557



Claremont

Inbox - Lagpat 11 February 2026 at 17:25

KEYSTONE LAW 'IN CONNIVANCE' ??? <https://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWHC/TCC/2017/2425.html>

To: gavin.ballance@keystonelaw.co.uk,

Cc: claude.alleston@keystonelaw.co.uk, dave.alleear@keystonelaw.co.uk, sabina.ahmed@keystonelaw.co.uk, roopa.ahluwalia@keystonelaw.co.uk, susan.anand@keystonelaw.co.uk, alyona.antonenko@keystonelaw.co.uk, ruth.abrams@keystonelaw.co.uk, barry.adamson@keystonelaw.co.uk, chris.bannister@keystonelaw.co.uk, carolyn.bane@keystonelaw.co.uk, mailin.bala@keystonelaw.co.uk, ilona.avramenko@keystonelaw.co.uk, Enquiries@solicitorsdt.com, nicholas.barclay@keystonelaw.co.uk, lawrence.abramson@keystonelaw.co.uk, nick.alfille@keystonelaw.co.uk, irfan.baluch@keystonelaw.co.uk, susan.apthorp@keystonelaw.co.uk, richard.arnot@keystonelaw.co.uk, kash.balogun@keystonelaw.co.uk, Media JusticeForSport, Leah Saich, BSB Contact Us, contactus@legalservicesboard.org.uk, enquiries@legalombudsman.org.uk

Hide

unusual here, in my judgment, is the connivance of Keystone Law.

Dear Keystone Law Partners,

IRAMA PTE LTD will be filing complaints to seek the reopening of the “connivance” concerns previously associated with Keystone Law and the conduct identified by Mr Justice Coulson in relation to Mark Coote and Mark Endersby (Astrosoccer 4 U Ltd).

We have further evidence that, despite the known history of disruption and the court’s findings, Keystone Law through Gavin Ballance is facilitating these same individuals again. In our view, this is not an innocent oversight: it is happening with knowledge of the facts and the established pattern, and it is continuing to prejudice creditors and third parties.

In brief:

- Coote and Endersby (directors connected to Astrosoccer 4 U Ltd) have driven prolonged disruption, including the “WFC” disturbance at Administrators MHA and Herron Fisher.
- Irwin Mitchell have advanced a continuing false narrative for these individuals in court proceedings against IRAMA PTE LTD, contrary to insolvency realities and administrator positions, causing significant harm to IRAMA PTE LTD and Liverpool FC Legend Mr Ian Rush MBE.
- Against that backdrop, we are surprised that Gavin Ballance of KEYSTONE LAW, with full knowledge of these issues, has chosen to assist these same disruptors again.

IRAMA is also preparing a strictly factual public communications campaign referencing Lord Coulson’s findings and the continuing pattern of conduct.

We invite Keystone Law to respond within 3 days with:

1. Confirmation of the scope of any instructions Keystone Law is acting on for Coote/Endersby (and related entities).
2. Confirmation of what internal safeguards were applied in light of Lord Coulson’s findings and the prior connivance concerns.

We will proceed to file complaints with the relevant authorities and regulators, including a request that the prior connivance issues be reviewed in light of the new evidence.

Yours faithfully,

Perry Chopra
IRAMA PTE LTD
pc@claremont.world
+44 07889 469557



Claremont

Inbox - justic...edia@gmail.com 13 January 2026 at 15:28

Subject: Notice of Intended Police Report – Abuse of Insolvency Process and Court Proceedings

To: gavin.ballance@keystonelaw.co.uk, endersby@formark.co.uk, Enquiries@keystonelaw.co.uk,

Cc: JusticeForSport Media, ENQUIRIES@keystonelaw.co.uk <ENQUIRIES@KEYSTONELAW.CO.UK>

[Hide](#)

Dear Sirs,

Re: Abuse of Insolvency Processes and Court Proceedings – Intended Police Report

We write to formally notify you of serious concerns arising from our investigations into the misuse of insolvency procedures and court processes involving a network of companies, directors, and legal advisers.

Our findings indicate a recurring pattern whereby disruptive directors deploy insolvency mechanisms not for genuine statutory purposes, but as strategic tools to obstruct justice, evade liabilities, and exert improper pressure through the courts.

In particular, we are concerned about the role of law firms who appear to protect or enable such directors, thereby facilitating:

- misleading or abusive insolvency filings,
- enforcement actions tainted by prior conflicts,
- and litigation strategies designed to exhaust, intimidate, or improperly disadvantage opposing parties.

A central example concerns:

- Astrosoccer4u Ltd, controlled in practice by Mr Mark Coote and Mr Mark Endersby,
- the use of insolvency threats and restructuring steps judicially criticised by Justice Coulson in the High Court,
- and the involvement of Keystone Law, who have also acted in related matters for the directors of Formark Scaffolding (Holdings) Ltd, giving rise to serious concerns of bias and conflict.

These matters echo previous High Court findings in which insolvency procedures were described as being misused, and where the conduct of legal advisers was criticised as involving *connivance* in such abuse. These concerns were investigated by the SRA.

Police report

We confirm that a police report has been filed concerning suspected economic crime, abuse of insolvency processes, and misleading of the courts.

Our findings contribute to a wider public-interest concern regarding how insolvency law can be distorted when legal advisers fail to act independently and ethically.

This notification is provided so that:

- relevant oversight bodies are aware of the issues,
- appropriate regulatory and investigative steps can be considered,
- and evidence preservation can be ensured.

We are willing to provide supporting documentation and further detail upon request.

Yours faithfully,
IRAMA PTE LTD
Director: Perry Chopra

07889 469557

The **Judicial College Equal Treatment Bench Book** says litigants in person are operating in “an alien environment,” that courts and tribunals “have not always been receptive to their needs,” and that they will often feel “at a profound disadvantage.” It also quotes Lord Woolf’s observation that “all too often” the litigant in person is regarded as “a problem for judges and for the court system rather than a person for whom the system of civil justice exists.” [Courts and Tribu...](#)

The **Civil Justice Council report** makes a similar point. It says self-represented litigants are often described as “a problem for the system,” but stresses they are legitimate users of it and that “Courts and tribunals exist for their users, not the other way round.” That is useful if you want to show the system itself has recognised a structural bias in attitude, even if not an express legal preference for solicitors. [Courts and Tribu...](#)

There is also UK legal press directly reflecting this concern. **Law Gazette** reported judges were told not to treat litigants in person as “an unwelcome problem,” which is strong language for showing that this perception exists and has been serious enough to require official guidance. [lawgazette.co.uk](#)