



RISK BULLETIN

Solicitor Edition

Mazur & Anor v Charles Russell Speechlys LLP

November 2025

This bulletin focuses on the fallout from Mr Justice Sheldon's judgement in ***Mazur & Anor v Charles Russell Speechlys LLP [2025] EWHC 2341 (KB)*** ("Mazur"), delivered on 16 September 2025.

"Our view is that the judgement in the recent case of Julia Mazur & Ors v Charles Russell Speechlys LLP doesn't change the position in law. Sheldon J said the Legal Services Act (LSA) makes it clear that only regulated individuals can conduct litigation as it's a reserved legal activity. Non-authorised individuals can support litigation – as they do in other areas – but only an authorised individual, such as a solicitor, should be conducting litigation."

SRA Statement, dated 1 October 2025

In summary, Mr Justice Sheldon ruled that Peter Middleton, an experienced paralegal who had signed the Particulars of Claim and conducted virtually all of the procedural steps in debt recovery proceedings brought by CRS against Mr & Mrs Mazur (albeit under supervision) had been "conducting" litigation in breach of the Legal Services Act 2007.

The Legal Services Act 2007 states that only those who are authorised or exempt under the Act are entitled to conduct litigation, with unauthorised staff (i.e. paralegals, trainees, and Chartered Legal Executives without litigation rights) only being allowed to "support" an authorised individual.



Ultimately, the ruling has caused more confusion than certainty, which, in turn, has sparked much understandable concern. Most glaring has been the lack of clarity regarding what actually constitutes "conducting" litigation, and where the boundary between "supporting" and "conducting" sits. The SRA issued a brief statement following the ruling (as set out above), which simply stated that it has always been the case that conducting litigation is a reserved legal activity, and the Law Society is currently pressing the SRA for further guidance as to what this actually means in practice.



On 16 October 2025, the Law Society produced its own guidance, with the Law Society President Mark Evans clarifying:

“Non-authorised staff can undertake work prior to the issuing of proceedings, as it doesn’t amount to the reserved activity of the conduct of litigation, and can provide extensive assistance to an authorised person. They can help draft pleadings, particulars of claim, applications, correspondence, witness statements and can sign a statement of truth.”

The Law Society's *Mazur* practice note provides further detail as follows:

“The definition of the conduct of litigation is narrow and limited to formal steps in proceedings. For example, the issuing, filing and serving of applications and statements of case. Much of the work involved in litigation can nonetheless be carried out by non-authorised staff – either as it does not amount to the reserved activity of the conduct of litigation or as it falls within their role assisting an authorised person.”

The Law Society's *Mazur* practice note is available [here](#).

Hopefully, the statements by the Law Society should help to quell some nerves. Ultimately, it appears that unauthorised individuals cannot issue, file, or serve documents during proceedings, but they can undertake all other steps in litigation. Further, the Law Society has shed some light on the definition of “conduct”, and offered their view that it should be considered in narrow terms. This means that, although *Mazur* will affect high-volume litigation firms who utilise unauthorised members of staff to issue, file, and serve documents during proceedings, those individuals can still perform the majority of work on litigation matters. That said, the SRA has yet to endorse the Law Society's guidance.

In lieu of any additional steer from the SRA , firms must take measures to mitigate possible risks, which could include the following (non-exhaustive) list:

- Perform an audit of current litigation processes to identify any practices which could constitute “conduct”;
- Draw clear boundaries between the roles taken by authorised and non-authorised staff in line with the Law Society's guidance;
- Ensure robust supervision by authorised staff;
- Provide all staff with training on *Mazur* and the associated risks; and
- Update policies and procedures to reflect the potential changes caused by *Mazur*.

NOTE

- We will review our guidance if/when the SRA provides further clarification
- Nothing in this note is intended to be legal advice.