



Report of Finding and Sanction

Respondent	Waheed Ur Rehman MIAN
Case reference	2025/0543/D5
Inn of Court	Lincoln's Inn (1998)
Status at hearing	Unregistered
Hearing date	14 July 2026
Tribunal Type	5 Person Tribunal

Tribunal members

Chair	HH Nigel Godsmark KC
Barrister member	Robert Earl
Barrister member	Alexander Horne
Lay member	Clara Cheetham
Lay member	Stéph Pandit

Representatives

Bar Standards Board	Winston Jacob
Respondent	Present and representing themselves

Outcome

Findings	All charges admitted (qualified as to dates in Charge 1)
Sanction	BSB not to issue a practising certificate for 9 months
Costs	£ 4,980 to the Bar Standards Board

1. In accordance with an appointment made by the President of the Council of the Inns of Court contained in a Convening Order dated 26 June 2026 the Tribunal sat on 14 July 2026 to hear and determine four charges of professional misconduct contrary to the Code of Conduct of the Bar of England and Wales against Waheed Ur Rehman Mian barrister of the Honourable Society of Lincoln's Inn.

Charges

2. The following charges were admitted

Charge 1

Statement of Offence

Professional misconduct, contrary to Core Duty 5 and/or rC8 of the BSB Handbook (versions 3.0 to 4.3).

Particulars of Offence

Mr Mian, a barrister, between 30 June 2017 and 19 November 2019, acted in a manner which was likely to diminish the trust and confidence which the public places in him or in the profession and/or could reasonably be seen by the public to undermine his integrity, in that he failed to disclose to clients, investing in proposed development projects, that he and his law firm, M-R Solicitors LLP, had a relevant connection to and/or interest in businesses involved in the development projects and thereby allowed M-R Solicitors LLP to represent clients in circumstances where he knew, or ought to have known, there was, or was a significant risk of, a conflict of interest.

Charge 2

Statement of Offence

Professional misconduct, contrary to Core Duty 5 and/or rC8 of the BSB Handbook (versions 3.0 to 4.3).

Particulars of Offence

Mr Mian, a barrister, between 30 June 2017 and 19 November 2019, acted in a manner which was likely to diminish the trust and confidence which the public places in him or in the profession and/or could reasonably be seen by the public to

undermine his integrity, in that he failed to adequately advise clients involved in the development projects of the risks inherent in such investment schemes and failed to ensure clients fully understood those risks.

Charge 3

Statement of Offence

Professional misconduct, contrary to Core Duty 5 and/or rC8 of the BSB Handbook (versions 3.0 to 4.3).

Particulars of Offence

Mr Mian, a barrister, between 30 June 2017 and 19 November 2019, acted in a manner which was likely to diminish the trust and confidence which the public places in him or in the profession and/or could reasonably be seen by the public to undermine his integrity in that, he failed to ensure clients were informed about issues relating to obtaining planning permission for the proposed development projects, prior to releasing client funds to the property development company, Aronex Developments Limited.

Charge 4

Statement of Offence

Professional misconduct, contrary to Core Duty 5 of the Code of Conduct of the BSB Handbook (versions 3.0 to 4.3).

Particulars of Offence

Mr Mian, a barrister, between 30 June 2017 and 19 November 2019, acted in a manner which was likely to diminish the trust and confidence which the public places in him or in the profession in that he failed to provide any and/or adequate supervision to a junior staff member of M-R Solicitors LLP who was representing clients in relation to the proposed development projects.

Parties Present and Representation

3. The Respondent was present and was not represented. The Bar Standards Board ("BSB") was represented by Mr Winston Jacob.

Pleas

4. Mr Mian admitted all the charges. In relation to charge 1, his admission was qualified in that he maintained that he only knew about his wife's directorship in Aronex Developments Limited from June 2019.

Evidence/Background

5. Mr Mian was called to the Bar at Lincolns Inn on 23 July 1998. He has never had a practising certificate. However he is dually qualified as a solicitor and has practised in that capacity.
6. In the period from June 2017 to November 2019 Mr Mian was the principal solicitor in a law firm, M-R solicitors. He was also the Compliance Officer for Legal Practice ("COLP") and the Compliance Officer for Finance and Administration ("COFA"). During that period, the firm accepted instructions from clients who were seeking to invest in a property development scheme in Leicester. The scheme involved the development of multiuse accommodation by a company, Aronex Developments Ltd. ("Aronex"). Clients would purchase a leasehold interest in units of the development which they could sublet (probably to students). Management of the properties was undertaken by another company, Mughni Ltd. These purchases were made "off plan" i.e before construction of the properties in question.
7. Clients were required to pay a substantial sum, approximately 70% of the purchase price, prior to completion. Such schemes had previously, in 2013, been identified by the Solicitors Regulation Authority as masking potentially high-risk property investment.
8. In November 2019, Aronex went into liquidation. There had been problems with planning permission for the development of the properties and some withdrawal of interest by foreign investors following Brexit. A number of clients lost money with creditors receiving either 28p in the £ or 13p in the £ depending upon the property in which they had invested.
9. Mr Mian's wife, Sobi Waheed, was a director of Aronex from November 2013 until July 2019. Another director of Aronex from November 2017 was Mr Asher Quereshi who was an employee of M-R Solicitors from January 2011 until December 2017. A director and shareholder in the scheme management company, Mughni Ltd, was Mr Naveed Ahmed who was also an employee of M-R Solicitors from November 2012

until August 2020. Aronex traded from premises leased from, and next door to, M-R Solicitors from at least October 2018.

10. Following a full forensic investigation by the SRA, Mr Mian was charged with four matters contrary to the SRA Code of Conduct. In summary, these were:-
 - a) failing to disclose to clients a relevant connection in the development projects giving rise to actual or potential conflict-of-interest;
 - b) failing adequately to advise clients as to the risks of this off plan development scheme;
 - c) failing to ensure that clients were informed about issues relating to planning permission in the scheme; and
 - d) failing to provide adequate supervision to junior staff representing clients.
11. The last charge related to Mr Mian having left the conduct of the client files to a trainee solicitor after a number of his more experienced staff had left.
12. Mr Mian admitted these charges before a Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal but denied that he had been aware of his wife's directorship in Aronex before June 2019. The Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal rejected that contention and found that Mr Mian had been so aware. That fact, together with the connections through Mr Qureshi, Mr Ahmed and the letting of adjacent property by M-R Solicitors to Aronex led the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal to conclude that Mr Mian knew or ought to have known of an actual or potential conflict-of-interest. They found that Mr Mian "failed to adhere to the ethical standards of the profession pursuant to the definition of integrity that was stated in *Wingate*".
13. In its decision dated 4 April 2025 the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal suspended Mr Mian from the Roll for a period of six months.
14. Mr Mian self-reported this finding to the Bar Standards Board (BSB) who have, as a consequence, brought these four charges against Mr Mian based essentially upon the evidence before, and findings of, the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal.
15. In his response to the charges, Mr Mian admitted each of the four allegations made against him by the BSB, with the aforementioned qualification concerning the dates in relation to Charge 1.
16. The matter came before an Inns of Court Disciplinary Tribunal on 4 March 2026. The four charges were put to Mr Mian and he admitted them. However as the proceedings progressed it became less clear to precisely what Mr Mian was

admitting. He maintained that he had not known of his wife's directorship in Aronex prior to June 2019 and also that he had always acted with integrity. He said that his admission to Charge one was on the basis of the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal finding that he ought to have known that his wife was a director of Aronex. It appeared to the panel members sitting that day that Mr Mian was seeking to resile from his full admission to Charge 1. The hearing was adjourned so that preparations could be made for a hearing to resolve any factual issue as to the extent of Mr Mian's knowledge of his wife's directorship during the period June 2017 to November 2019.

17. This matter was relisted for 14 and 15 July 2026. Unfortunately, the chair of the panel of 4 March became unable to sit on these dates and was replaced by the current panel chair. The day before the adjourned hearing, another of the original panel members, Ms Ryan, fell ill and was replaced at short notice by Mr Earl. This being at least a 40% fresh panel it was agreed that the hearing should start anew.
18. At the beginning of this hearing, for the benefit of at least the fresh panel members, Mr Mian was asked to clarify what it was that he was disputing in relation to Charge 1. He told the panel that he had known of his wife's directorship during the charge period but not until June 2019. He continued to deny that he had acted without integrity.
19. This panel then considered the extent to which it was necessary for it to resolve these factual issues since:-
 - a) The alleged misconduct related primarily to Mr Mian's role as a solicitor which had already been considered by the appropriate specialist disciplinary body. It had found that he did have knowledge of his wife's directorship throughout the relevant period and had acted without integrity.
 - b) That body had already imposed sanctions amounting to suspension from practice and an order for costs.
 - c) Mr Mian does not hold a practising certificate as a barrister and never has.
 - d) The BSB made it clear that it was not alleging dishonesty or lack of integrity on the part of Mr Mian. The charges brought against him were not as breaches of Core Duty 3 (acting without integrity) but rather as breaches of Core Duty 5 (acting in a manner likely to diminish the trust and confidence which the public places in him or in the profession and/or could reasonably be seen by the public to undermine its integrity).

- e) We were conscious that it was not our role to punish Mr Mian for a second time, but rather to protect the public and maintain confidence in the Bar. Further, that we need to focus on the nature of the misconduct relevant in the context of the Bar to determine the appropriate sanction. Whilst not in any way bound by the findings of the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal, we were conscious that Mr Mian's misconduct related primarily to his role as a solicitor rather than a barrister.

20. In the circumstances we doubted whether re-litigating the issue of date of knowledge would greatly affect the sanctions which we could impose. We therefore indicated that we did not consider that it would be proportionate or sufficiently helpful to us to resolve this issue over a period of two days. We decided to proceed on the basis of Mr Mian's qualified admission to Charge 1. We did not find it necessary to resolve the issue of Mr Mian's denial of lack of integrity, as this was not the subject of a charge in any event. At the same time we made it clear that if, during the hearing, it appeared to us that we did need to resolve such factual issues then we could re-visit our decision.
21. In mitigation, Mr Mian denied that his actions were financially motivated and denied that any harm arose out of any conflict of interest saying that it occurred because of the financial difficulties which befell Aronex. He emphasised that clients had not suffered any actual financial loss as a result of professional indemnity insurance payments to them. In fact he suggested that some clients had received in compensation, slightly more than they had paid over. He suggested that his culpability was low and the harm suffered was low.
22. Mr Mian told us that the sanctions imposed upon him had already resulted in the closure of M-R Solicitors. He was now a 25% share partner in a new firm where he concentrates on immigration work. He appears in court as a solicitor. He said that he had never had a practising certificate as a barrister and whilst he had considered applying for one in 2019 he had been told that he would need to do six months pupillage before he was eligible. He said he had no intention to seek a practising certificate, at least for one or two years.
23. Mr Mian emphasised the damage to his reputation which arose out of the findings of the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal. He expressed the concern that his reputation would be further damaged by sanctions imposed by this tribunal as people would think that these were related to fresh allegations of further misconduct. He also

emphasised his previous good disciplinary record and that these matters were now at least six years old with no complaint against him in the meantime.

24. There was in fact a previous BTAS finding against Mr Mian in 2000 arising out of his insurance position whilst practising, in respect of which he received advice. We attach little weight to this, it being many years in the past and of a completely different nature.

Findings and Sanction

25. We find, on the basis of Mr Mian's admissions, that he is in breach of Core Duty 5 in the manner set out in the four charges, with the qualification that his admission in relation to the date of his knowledge of his wife's directorship in Aronex is June 2019. We do not consider it proportionate or necessary to investigate further the extent of the breach in terms of duration.
26. We agree with the parties that the appropriate sanction group for dealing with charges 1, 2 and 3 is the sanction group related to obligations to clients, Group K.
27. Looking at culpability and seriousness. In terms of culpability, looking at the three charges together, we regard this as significant. There was a financial benefit, if only from the work coming in from clients to Mr Mian's firm. The risk to clients themselves we consider would be very high. They were not aware of the connections between M-R Solicitors and the development scheme before making their investments, were not advised of the risks in general or the planning situation in particular.
28. Had they been advised of the conflict of interest, then, as indeed one client remarked, they would probably have gone elsewhere. Had they gone elsewhere, they may well have received other advice as to the wisdom of parting with substantial sums of money up front on a scheme such as this. Also, there was an inadequate administration system with Mr Mian as the compliance officer for legal practice. We find significant culpability.
29. We regard harm as moderate. There is impact on clients in terms of distress, as well as loss of investment return and loss of use of money until the investment losses could be recouped. Insurers had to be involved to remedy the losses. Much of this was covered by insurance, but as the point was made by the panel and accepted, that is not free money. It comes from other practitioners.
30. The point made by Mr Mian that many of the clients made a small net gain is, in our view, unrealistic and shows serious lack of insight.

31. There is also a considerable impact on the confidence of the public in the legal profession (annex 2). We assess moderate harm in relation to these three charges.
32. We regard an aggravating feature to be a failure on the part of Mr Mian to grasp why this is serious and how people have suffered. To that extent, there is a lack of remorse. We are bound to say that Mr Mian appeared to be more concerned with the damage to his own reputation than he was to the damage to the reputation of the profession.
33. There is no significant mitigation. Mr Mian suggests that he was abroad during much of the time with which we are primarily concerned. That is a distinctly double-edged point because there was no one left to deal with the mess that was evolving in his absence. He was the principal solicitor, he was the compliance officer.
34. Significant culpability, moderate harm, slightly aggravated. This takes us, in our judgment, into the border territories between upper and middle seriousness for indicative sanctions. The watershed between those two categories is a 12-month suspension.
35. Looking at the fourth charge, inadequate supervision, this related to Mr Mian's appointment of a trainee solicitor to deal with the client affairs surrounding these business transactions. The appropriate misconduct is breach of obligations to the regulator – Group L
36. The risk to clients was eminently foreseeable and the risks were very great indeed. This was a risky investment, despite all the warnings of the SRA as to the nature of these schemes, and there was a serious failure in practical administration for which Mr Mian was primarily responsible.
37. We consider culpability to be significant and harm to be significant. The potential harm to clients was very great. We have also taken account of Mr Mian's responsibilities within the firm. We place this in the upper level of seriousness and indicative sanctions for Group L obligations to the regulator. That would be an indicative sanction of up to 12 months suspension.
38. We take into account the fact that there has already been an adjudication in relation to the same matters, and we are deeply conscious of the dangers of potentially punishing Mr Mian twice. He's already been dealt with by the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal. These were matters which related to his conduct primarily as a solicitor and they are the specialist tribunal in relation to those matters

39. Mr Mian has no practising certificate as a barrister. Therefore, any suspension would need to be prospective – a prohibition on obtaining a practising certificate for a period. We bear in mind that Mr Mian has already been sanctioned for this misconduct by the branch of the legal profession most closely related to his obligations and duties. We bear in mind totality and proportionality. We bear in mind that Mr Mian would need to do six months pupillage before he can apply for a practising certificate. This leads us to reduce the twelve month suspension otherwise indicated.

40. We conclude that the appropriate sanction, concurrently in relation to each of the charges to which he has admitted misconduct, is a period of nine months suspension. He will be prohibited from applying for a practising certificate for a period of nine months from 14 July 2026.

41. I should say in passing that Mr Mian raised the question of reputational damage, saying that he thought that people would consider that he had done things twice and was being punished for separate events. That would be an ill-informed conclusion. and we are not influenced by the potential of un-informed social media gossip to misinterpret a sanction that we impose.

42. Mr Mian cannot apply for a practising certificate for a period of nine months, effective immediately (14 July 2026).

Costs

43. Mr Mian is ordered to pay costs of £4,980 to the Bar Standards Board.

Dated: 22 July 2026

**His Honour N Godsmark KC
Chairman of the Tribunal**