



The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

The Council of the Inns of Court

Report of Finding and Sanction

Case Reference: 2022/0370/D5

Mr Anurag Mohindru KC

The Director-General of the Bar Standards Board

The Chair of the Bar Standards Board

The Treasurer of the Honourable Society of: Middle Temple, 2004.

Please note that on 30 June 2026 at a High Court Appeal, Mr Justice Johnson upheld Mr Mohindru KC's appeal and substituted the Tribunal's decision of disbarment to a suspension from 7 October 2025 – 30 June 2026.

Disciplinary Tribunal

Mr Anurag Mohindru KC

1. In accordance with an appointment made by the President of the Council of the Inns of Court contained in a Convening Order dated 19 August 2025, I, HH Nicholas Ainley, sat as Chairman of a Disciplinary Tribunal on 8-12 and 15-16 September 2025 to hear and determine 2 charges of professional misconduct contrary to the Code of Conduct of the Bar of England and Wales against Mr Anurag Mohindru KC, barrister of the Honourable Society of Middle Temple.

Panel Members

2. The other members of the Tribunal were:

Vince Cullen (Lay Member)

Ken Cameron (Lay Member)

The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

9 Gray's Inn Square,
London
WC1R 5JD
T: 020 3432 7350
E: info@tbtas.org.uk

The Council of the Inns of Court. Limited by Guarantee
Company Number: 8804708
Charity Number: 1155640
Registered Office:
9 Gray's Inn Square, London WC1R 5JD

Kane Simons (Barrister Member)

Jade Bucklow (Barrister Member)

Charges

3. The following charges were denied.

Charge 1

Statement of Offence

Professional misconduct, contrary to paragraphs 301(a)(i) and 301(a)(iii) of the Code of Conduct of the Bar of England and Wales (8th Edition).

Particulars of Offence

Mr Anurag Mohindru, a barrister and BSB regulated individual, engaged in dishonest and/or discreditable conduct and/or behaved in a way which is likely to diminish the trust and confidence in the legal profession or the administration of justice or otherwise bring the profession into disrepute in that, in the course of an application for tenancy at 23 Essex Street chambers, which he initiated in November 2012, he knowingly misled or attempted to mislead members of those chambers by asserting that he had studied biomedical science and/or medicine at Oxford University which statement(s) he knew to be untrue in that he knew he had not attended Oxford University.

Charge 2

Statement of Offence

Professional misconduct, contrary to paragraphs 301(a)(i) and 301(a)(iii) of the Code of Conduct of the Bar of England and Wales (8th Edition).

Particulars of Offence

Mr Anurag Mohindru, a barrister and BSB regulated individual, engaged in dishonest and/or discreditable conduct and/or behaved in a way which is likely to diminish the trust and confidence in the legal profession or the administration of justice or otherwise bring the profession into

The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

9 Gray's Inn Square,
London
WC1R 5JD
T: 020 3432 7350
E: info@tbts.org.uk

The Council of the Inns of Court. Limited by Guarantee
Company Number: 8804708
Charity Number: 1155640
Registered Office:
9 Gray's Inn Square, London WC1R 5JD

disrepute in that, in the course of an application for tenancy at 23 Essex Street chambers, which he initiated in November 2012 he knowingly misled or attempted to mislead members of those chambers by asserting that he had a medical qualification as a Medical Doctor which statement(s) he knew to be untrue in that he knew he did not have such a qualification.

Parties Present and Representation

4. The Respondent was present and was represented by Mr Mark Harries KC. The Bar Standards Board (“BSB”) was represented by Mr James Counsell KC.

Preliminary Matters

5. The BSB made an application to amend the Charge Sheet and this was not opposed by the Respondent’s counsel.
6. The Tribunal granted the BSB’s proposed amendments to the Charge Sheet.

Pleas

7. Mr Mohindru denied the charges.

Evidence

8. The following witnesses provided a witness statement and gave oral evidence which they were cross-examined on:
 - Ian Jobling (remote)
 - Simon Russell Flint KC
 - Mark Trafford KC
 - Richard Fowler
 - Hugh Forgan
 - Victoria Saunders (expert)

The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

9 Gray's Inn Square,
London
WC1R 5JD
T: 020 3432 7350
E: info@tbtas.org.uk

The Council of the Inns of Court. Limited by Guarantee
Company Number: 8804708
Charity Number: 1155640
Registered Office:
9 Gray's Inn Square, London WC1R 5JD

No case to answer application

9. Half time submission of No Case to Answer with respect to Charge 2 on behalf of the Respondent.
10. The Tribunal dismissed the application on the basis that there is clear and cogent evidence, at this stage and taking the evidence at its highest, that Mr Mohindru made specific and untrue allegations that he was a doctor during the interview. Therefore, there is a case to move forward.

Findings

11. In this case, the respondent faces two charges. The first is that he knowingly misled or attempted to mislead members of 23 Essex Street Chambers in the course of an application for tenancy which was initiated in November 2012, by asserting that he had studied biomedical science and/or medicine at Oxford University when he knew that to be untrue because he had not attended the university at all.
12. The second charge is that in the course of the same application he asserted that he had a medical qualification as a medical doctor which he knew to be untrue because he did not have such a qualification.
13. Both of these charges are of course charges of dishonesty. They are also old, dealing as they do with conduct alleged to have occurred in late 2012 or early 2013. The delay cannot be laid at the door of Mr Mohindru. It has occurred because these allegations were not reported to the BSB until the 5th of August 2021.
14. Because of their age, the criminal standard of proof applies to these charges. In other words, unless we are satisfied so that we are sure of Mr Mohindru's guilt the charges must be dismissed. They have of course been considered by us separately.

Our approach to the evidence

15. Mr. Mohindru has been in practice since 2004. During that time not only have his conduct and honesty never been impugned, they have been positively supported by the various eminent character witnesses from whom we have heard. His practice has been in criminal

The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

9 Gray's Inn Square,
London
WC1R 5JD
T: 020 3432 7350
E: info@tbtas.org.uk

The Council of the Inns of Court. Limited by Guarantee
Company Number: 8804708
Charity Number: 1155640
Registered Office:
9 Gray's Inn Square, London WC1R 5JD

law and it has been brilliantly successful. He was a very successful junior, took silk in 2020 and has made a considerable success as a silk as well.

16. To come to a conclusion that a person in his position has behaved dishonestly would require the most cogent evidence. Further, the particular lies that have been alleged are ones that would not just show dishonesty they would show recklessness, for reasons that will become apparent.
17. Accordingly, we consider that the appropriate approach to the evidence is to show extreme caution when acting on any BSB evidence against Mr Mohindru that is not independently corroborated unless that evidence is so striking in its nature as to render mistake a practical impossibility.
18. With that in mind we will deal first with the evidence of background, where that evidence is not in dispute and is independently evidenced. Mr Mohindru was born on the 10th of November 1974. In August 1994 when he was 19 he enrolled on the pre-medical program at St George's University. This is a US University with branches in the Caribbean. He completed that program in May 1995 and then in January 1996 enrolled in the doctor of medicine program at that university, completing the basic science part of it in May 1998 when he would have been 23. He did not complete the MD program. This is evidenced from the university records and can be and is relied on as an accurate record of what he did. The university has no record of him after 1998.
19. He has given evidence of employment or study in the US for a couple of years after that time in the medical field but there is no independent documentary evidence of this so we will not deal with this at this point.
20. The next record that we have that is entirely independent is that of his call to the bar on the 22nd of July 2004 at Middle Temple. He would then have been 29. There then followed pupillage and tenancy leading to his being in Lombard Chambers in 2012.
21. We must now turn to the evidence which was given to us by the witnesses.

The initial application and charge 2

The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

9 Gray's Inn Square,
London
WC1R 5JD
T: 020 3432 7350
E: info@tbtas.org.uk

The Council of the Inns of Court. Limited by Guarantee
Company Number: 8804708
Charity Number: 1155640
Registered Office:
9 Gray's Inn Square, London WC1R 5JD

22. That Mr Mohindru applied to 23 Essex Street for a tenancy in late 2012 is not disputed. How did this come about? Evidence on this point came from Mr Mohindru himself and from Ian Jobling a barrister who was, from the 11th of October 2012 to the 30th of September 2017, a member of 23 Essex Street and is the husband of Karen Todner, a solicitor whose firm at the relevant time briefed Mr Mohindru and were much impressed by him. They also sent work to 23 Essex Street.
23. Mr Jobling's evidence was that he had co-defended with Mr Mohindru in a case at Snaresbrook. He maintained in his witness statement that this was in 2012 or 2013 but accepted in cross-examination that it was in fact in 2008 or 2009. There is no doubt that he was impressed by Mr Mohindru. He said that Mr Mohindru phoned him up to say that he was interested in joining 23 Essex Street. Given the dates we have this contact can only have taken place between the 11th of October 2012 and the 20th of November 2012, which was the date of Mr Mohindru's letter of application to join Chambers.
24. Mr Jobling was adamant in his evidence that what really impressed him about Mr Mohindru was the fact that he had told him that he was dual qualified. That is, that he was not just a barrister but that he was a qualified medical doctor as well. If that was said it was and is obviously a lie. Mr Jobling stated in cross-examination that Mr Mohindru made it plain to him that he had qualified as a doctor and had been a medical practitioner for a while in the past. Mr. Jobling referred him to the Chambers' director, Mr Fowler, as a potential candidate for tenancy.
25. Mr Mohindru's recollection is vague when it comes to Mr Jobling. He thought that his application was prompted more by the solicitors, but that may not be an important difference.
26. No one else in Chambers had had any contact with Mr Mohindru at this point.
27. At some time before the 20th of November Mr Mohindru met Mr Fowler in Daly's Wine Bar off Fleet Street. The meeting went well and from evidence given to us by him Mr Fowler was obviously very impressed with Mr Mohindru as a potential candidate. It is not suggested in the evidence he gave that Mr Fowler had any representation made to him

The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

9 Gray's Inn Square,
London
WC1R 5JD
T: 020 3432 7350
E: info@tbts.org.uk

The Council of the Inns of Court. Limited by Guarantee
Company Number: 8804708
Charity Number: 1155640
Registered Office:
9 Gray's Inn Square, London WC1R 5JD

that Mr Mohindru was a doctor although the fact that Mr Mohindru had medical experience was mentioned.

28. On the 20th of November 2012 Mr Mohindru emailed a letter of formal application for tenancy together with a profile
29. There is nothing in the letter about medical experience and the only mention in the profile is "Anu has a medical background which gives him an advantage in acting for clients in criminal cases in which medical experts are involved". In light of his actual medical experience, that was a perfectly reasonable statement.
30. At some time later, we do not know when, but probably in February 2013, he came to 23 Essex Street for an interview. No note was made by anyone of the interview, which seems to have been conducted fairly informally. The interview panel consisted of Simon Russell Flint KC, Hugh Forgan now KC, Mark Trafford now KC, Ian Jobling, Mark Fenhalls now KC and Mr Fowler.
31. All of these gave evidence before us except Mr Fenhalls who did not, but whose recollection of what happened in the interview was vague and is unlikely to have taken matters further.
32. None of the participants in the interview who gave evidence recalled in cross-examination any specific claim by Mr Mohindru that he was a medical doctor. In light of that we do not feel that we need to cover in detail the evidence which any of them gave on this point.
33. A CV was submitted later to which we will return in some detail when dealing with charge 1 but in so far as charge 2 is concerned there is nothing in it that can be demonstrated to be false and indeed some of the medical experience referred to can be demonstrated to be true.
34. That is in effect the evidence in respect of the second charge. The only concrete evidence of misrepresentation comes from Mr Jobling; this is not corroborated by any other source, and of course it is now over 12 years old and at the time of his statement, the first time he was asked to commit anything to writing, was over a decade in the past.

The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

9 Gray's Inn Square,
London
WC1R 5JD
T: 020 3432 7350
E: info@tbtas.org.uk

The Council of the Inns of Court. Limited by Guarantee
Company Number: 8804708
Charity Number: 1155640
Registered Office:
9 Gray's Inn Square, London WC1R 5JD

35. Applying the approach to the evidence that we have taken, we do not feel that we could say that we were satisfied so that we were sure that this charge was made out. This is particularly so in light of evidence that was given that Mr Jobling's wife had, since the events with which we are dealing, and probably in 2016 to 2017 fallen out badly with Mr Mohindru for reasons we know nothing about. We do not say that this means that anything that Mr Jobling said to us was anything other than what he honestly believed, it simply reinforces our approach, which is not to rely on uncorroborated material, particularly in a case that is this old.
36. Accordingly, we dismiss the second charge.
37. The first charge alleges that Mr Mohindru asserted that he had studied at Oxford University. It is accepted that he didn't. This assertion is said to have been made on two occasions, the first at the interview at 23 Essex Street and the second in a CV that was subsequently sent to 23 Essex Street.

The interview

38. The participants have already been identified. Mr Mohindru's recollection is that nothing was said by him that could possibly give rise to any impression that he had studied at Oxford University. He recalls being asked questions about his involvement in cricket, and that is no surprise because he has played cricket to a very high standard and indeed we are told is now the chair of the Essex County Cricket Club. His involvement in cricket had already been mentioned by him in the earlier profile that we have mentioned. He said that it was never put to him, and so he never replied, that he had got a Blue. He accepted in cross-examination that the subject of Oxford might have come up but his only connection with Oxford of an academic nature was when re-sitting his A-levels, which would have been in the early 1990s, and that would be the only academic reference to Oxford he would have made.

The recollection of the other participants

39. Mr Jobling's recollection is that he did not have a particularly clear memory of what had been said at the interview and could not remember if an Oxford Blue was mentioned.

The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

9 Gray's Inn Square,
London
WC1R 5JD
T: 020 3432 7350
E: info@tbtas.org.uk

The Council of the Inns of Court. Limited by Guarantee
Company Number: 8804708
Charity Number: 1155640
Registered Office:
9 Gray's Inn Square, London WC1R 5JD

40. Mr Fowler's evidence in chief was that Mr Mohindru said he had attended Oxford University. He did not expand further on this in cross-examination. Mr Russell Flint in chief asserted that Mr Mohindru had said he had studied at Oxford University before going on to study in the USA. In cross-examination, he said that Mr Mohindru had implied that he had been at Oxford University.
41. Mr Trafford was more emphatic and said in cross-examination that he had directly asked Mr Mohindru "did you get a Blue" to which he got the answer "yes". If this was said it was a clear misrepresentation that Mr Mohindru had attended Oxford University. Mr Forgan said he could not remember how the issue of a Blue came up, but that it did, and that he was prompted by that during the interview to try and look Mr Mohindru up on his laptop to check up about it but that he could not find the answer then and there. Mr Trafford remembered Mr Forgan being on his laptop during the interview.
42. The fact that a number of people claim something happened and one person says that it didn't does not mean that it did. This is particularly so when those who recall something or claim they can are colleagues who are working, talking or gossiping to each other over a period of time, but unless we are to discount the evidence of Mr Forgan and the others entirely, which we do not, it seems to us that something must have prompted him during the interview to do whatever research he did on his laptop.
43. That is not the end of the matter, however, because for whatever reason it was decided to ask Mr Mohindru for a CV.
44. On the 21st of February 2013 at 15.03 Mr Mohindru sent a CV to Mr Fowler; four minutes later that CV was forwarded to all the participants in the interview. We have numerous copies of what purports to be that CV. Under the heading "Education" in the CV apart from other matters which Mr Mohindru accepts are correct, in line 2 it says "Medicine Oxford University 1993/1994".
45. Whilst, as we understand his evidence, Mr Mohindru does not dispute that he is the author of that document in its original form, he says he is not responsible for line 2. He says that the document has been maliciously corrupted by someone who is out to do him down by, at some date after it passed out of his control, inserting that entry about Oxford

The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

9 Gray's Inn Square,
London
WC1R 5JD
T: 020 3432 7350
E: info@tbtas.org.uk

The Council of the Inns of Court. Limited by Guarantee
Company Number: 8804708
Charity Number: 1155640
Registered Office:
9 Gray's Inn Square, London WC1R 5JD

University. This is obviously a point of crucial importance and one which was gone into in some detail.

46. A computer digital forensic expert, Ms Saunders, gave evidence before us and in the form of witness statements setting out her conclusions in respect of this document. Her evidence was not the subject of adverse challenge and we accept it. We will come back to this later.
47. To revert to the chronology, the members of 23 Essex Street who were on the interview panel say that this CV was discussed and, as far as their recollection goes, the CV that was produced before us is the CV that they received as well, but of course it is fanciful to assume that they would have a complete recollection of everything that was in the CV. Mr Trafford specifically stated, however, that he noticed the reference to studying medicine at Oxford University.
48. There was a further telephone conversation between Mr. Russell Flint and Mr Mohindru, but we do not have any detail of it and Mr Mohindru withdrew his application. He says, and we have no reason to doubt it, because we have evidence in support of the fact, that he was at the same time applying to Bell Yard chambers, which a few weeks later he joined, and there was therefore no need for him to continue with his application to 23 Essex Street.
49. There matters rest, until September 2018 when Mr Russell Flint Mr Trafford and Mr Forgan were all involved in a long case at Isleworth Crown Court. Something, and we have no evidence as to what it was, prompted Mr Russell Flint to send a copy that he had of the CV to Mr Trafford and Mr Forgan. Mr Russell Flint thought, when he gave evidence, that it was Mr Mohindru taking silk that prompted it, but that cannot be the case because that did not happen until 2020 and the date that the CV was sent by Mr Russell Flint to the others is the 28th of September 2018. It is common ground that the CV that existed on that date has never since been changed, and of course that is the one that contains the reference to Oxford University.

The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

9 Gray's Inn Square,
London
WC1R 5JD
T: 020 3432 7350
E: info@tbtas.org.uk

The Council of the Inns of Court. Limited by Guarantee
Company Number: 8804708
Charity Number: 1155640
Registered Office:
9 Gray's Inn Square, London WC1R 5JD

50. The next event of significance is the publication of Mr Mohindru's appointment as a silk which was on the 16th of January 2020. On the 22nd of January 2020 Mr Forgan sent Mr Trafford a copy of the CV. This was probably prompted by Mr Mohindru's appointment.
51. The next matter to which we should turn is the reporting of Mr Mohindru to the BSB. This happened on the 5th of August 2021 and contained a contention that Mr Mohindru had confirmed in writing the year he claimed to have attended Oxford University.
52. All the witnesses before us were asked whether they had reported this matter to the BSB and all denied doing so.

To return to the expert evidence

53. The earliest copy of the CV that exists as an electronic attachment, is that of the 28th of September 2018 and it has never been altered since.
54. Any alteration that took place to it must therefore have occurred between the 21st of February 2013 and that date. The metadata of that attachment shows a modification in the minutes before it was sent to Mr Fowler by 'AM', but nothing since. On the face of it therefore the evidence is that the document we have is the one that Mr Mohindru sent. The digital forensic expert was cross-examined on this point, and she accepted that there are tools that enable a sufficiently skilled operator to alter or remove the metadata on a particular document without leaving a trace. She accepted that it was impossible to exclude the possibility that that could have happened in this case, if an operator with sufficient skill and knowing what to look for made use of these tools. It was stated in submissions to us that this was not a matter that required particular skill, but here the expert disagreed, and we have had the advantage of listening again to her cross-examination. As it has been recorded she was of the view that one would need to have a good few years of experience in the computer field to have sufficient skill to do this without leaving a trace. That is powerful support for the contention that the document has not been corrupted or altered, but one must bear in mind Mr Mohindru's emphatic denial that it was he who inserted the falsehood about Oxford University.

The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

9 Gray's Inn Square,
London
WC1R 5JD
T: 020 3432 7350
E: info@tbts.org.uk

The Council of the Inns of Court. Limited by Guarantee
Company Number: 8804708
Charity Number: 1155640
Registered Office:
9 Gray's Inn Square, London WC1R 5JD

55. Here the context is important. Assuming that someone with sufficient skill and malice could do this, what else must they have known and what must they have been able to do?
56. First, they would have to have known that there was a question mark over what Mr Mohindru said in interview and that it related to Oxford, and that there was a CV in existence.
57. Second, they would have to be certain, before September 2018, that Mr Mohindru did not have a copy of the CV that he originally sent; because if he had, their forgery would immediately be exposed.
58. Third, they would have to have known the names of all the people who had received a copy of the CV in 2013.
59. Fourth, they would have to be in a position to gain access to all the email accounts of the recipients of the CV. Gaining access to one and missing out another would be fatal if the document in its original uncorrupted form survived anywhere. Gaining access would also be no mean task because either one would have to have administrator level access to all the email accounts, or one would need to know each person's password.
60. Fifth, this was all done before September 2018 and then followed by at least three years of complete inactivity.
61. We consider that these points when considered cumulatively, with the difficulty of doing this at all, point so powerfully away from the realistic possibility of later alterations by a third party as to make it plain beyond doubt to us that the CV that we have can only sensibly be the one that Mr Mohindru sent, and that being so it is clear corroboration of the evidence of the participants in the interview, which was that Mr Mohindru told them he had been at Oxford University and moreover was a cricketering Blue. The CV contains a lie for which he is responsible, not some other person. It was a reckless, foolish and completely unnecessary lie to say in interview and he doubled down on it in the CV. We do not consider any other possibility realistic. Accordingly, we find the first charge to be proved.

The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

9 Gray's Inn Square,
London
WC1R 5JD
T: 020 3432 7350
E: info@tbtas.org.uk

The Council of the Inns of Court. Limited by Guarantee
Company Number: 8804708
Charity Number: 1155640
Registered Office:
9 Gray's Inn Square, London WC1R 5JD

Sanction and Reasons

62. When one is dealing with dishonesty, even within the lower range, where there is limited culpability and no real danger of any harm the starting point is disbarment.
63. We have listened with care and considered anxiously all the submissions that have been made by Mr Harries KC on behalf of Mr Mohindru and we consider that everything that could possibly have been said on his behalf has been said. But we find it impossible to come to the conclusion, much as one may wish to, that these amount to exceptional circumstances. By which we mean, the exceptional circumstances that there would have to be to avoid disbarment as the only appropriate sanction. We have in mind the passage of time and the completely exemplary conduct of his professional career since these matters occurred, but what the sanctions guidance makes plain is that exceptional circumstances must relate in some way to the dishonesty itself, rather than to any personal mitigation. Here the lie was perpetrated twice over a period of a few days, once in a written CV to bolster a lie that had already been told orally. In other words, one lie was supporting the other. We cannot exclude from our consideration either the fact that he denied the charge, and here of course we are considering charge one. He is entitled to do that. But the defence that was run involved alleging far more serious dishonesty than was charged against him against unknown others, and one person who was named. We consider that this is not therefore a case in which there are exceptional circumstances relating to the dishonesty; it was not trivial, and, because of that, we are constrained in our judgement to order that Mr Mohindru be disbarred.
64. The Tribunal also directs that Mr Mohindru be suspended pending any appeal under rE227.1.
65. The Treasurer of the Honorable Society of Middle Temple is requested to take action on this report in accordance with rE239 of the Disciplinary Tribunal Regulations 2017.

Costs

66. Mr Mohindru is ordered to pay costs of £54,780 to the Bar Standards board.

The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

9 Gray's Inn Square,
London
WC1R 5JD
T: 020 3432 7350
E: info@tbtas.org.uk

The Council of the Inns of Court. Limited by Guarantee
Company Number: 8804708
Charity Number: 1155640
Registered Office:
9 Gray's Inn Square, London WC1R 5JD

Dated: 7 October 2025

**HH Nicholas Ainley
Chairman of the Tribunal**

The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

9 Gray's Inn Square,
London
WC1R 5JD
T: 020 3432 7350
E: info@tbtas.org.uk

The Council of the Inns of Court. Limited by Guarantee
Company Number: 8804708
Charity Number: 1155640
Registered Office:
9 Gray's Inn Square, London WC1R 5JD