



Justice Committee

Sarah Sackman KC MP,
Minister for Courts and Legal Services

By email only

20 October 2025

Dear Sarah,

Mazur judgement

I write with regard to the recent judgment in [*Mazur & Anor v Charles Russell Speechlys LLP \[2025\] EWHC 2341 \(KB\) \(16 September 2025\)*](#) and its significant ramifications for the legal profession. In the light of the judgment, I would be grateful if you could please let the Committee know:

1. What assessment has the MoJ undertaken on the impact of the judgment on the legal profession, and what steps will the MoJ be taking as a result – given, in particular, the potential for legal firms' litigation costs to increase significantly? This includes any consideration of:
 - a. The effective operation of the courts.
 - b. Provision of legal aid.
 - c. Access to justice, via legal advice, more broadly.
 - d. The structure of the legal profession (distinctions between, for example, solicitors and legal executives and other employees).
 - e. Whether the relevant provisions of the Legal Services Act 2007 need to be amended.
2. Do you consider that the existing Civil Procedure Rules contain any provisions that may cause any confusion over who is authorised to conduct litigation? In this context, we note this comment from the Law Society Gazette: "The Civil Procedure Rules could also be said to conflict with the Legal Services Act, defining 'legal representative' as including 'a solicitor's employee... who has been instructed to act for a party in relation to proceedings'." ([In focus: Mazur ruling is a seismic shift | News | Law Gazette](#).) If there may be confusion for those using the Rules, what plans are in place to make changes? If the MoJ is confident



Justice Committee

that there is no such confusion, please explain why it has been reported that such confusion may exist, and what steps may be necessary to ensure the existing Rules are not misunderstood more widely.

3. What do you consider to be the regulatory implications of the judgment, such as whether the advice and guidance being provided by existing regulators and other legal professional bodies is adequate, given the failings identified in the judgment? We note the following responses from the relevant professional bodies and regulators:
 - a. While the SRA appeared to admit that it gave erroneous advice in the case, it has not so far proposed to amend its generic guidance: [SRA | SRA Statement following the case of Julia Mazur & Ora v Charles Russell Speechlys LLP | Solicitors Regulation Authority](#).
 - b. The Law Society appears to consider that the SRA should update its guidance: [Mazur v Charles Russell Speechlys: what it means for litigators | The Law Society](#).
 - c. CILEX has provided some new guidance and will be updating in due course: [Mazur update from CILEX office holders: Message to members | CILEX](#)
 - d. CILEX Regulation has provided new guidance and is also undertaking further work: [Mazur - Litigation and supervision - CILEx Regulation](#).
 - e. The Legal Services Board has met with the various bodies, and is conducting a review: [LSB Statement: High Court Decision in Mazur - 13 October 2025 - The Legal Services Board](#).

At present, therefore, there appears to be some unresolved tension between the Law Society and SRA, and further work to be done to update guidance and support on this issue. There is also an obvious concern that regulators may have failed for many years to address adequately the illegal practice of allowing non-authorised employees to conduct litigation. In the light of this, does the MoJ consider that the current regulatory regime is satisfactory? If not, what is the MoJ proposing to do about it? The Committee identified a number of problems with the regulatory regime in its examination of the regulation of the legal professions during the last Parliament), including concerns about the relationship between professional bodies and regulators, and recommended a review of the



Justice Committee

Legal Services Board.¹ Please confirm whether such a review has been or will be carried out, and what other action has been or will be taken in the light of that letter.

Thank you in advance for your response which will provide helpful clarification and information on the situation to the legal profession.

Yours sincerely,

Andy Slaughter MP
Chair, Justice Committee

¹ [Letter from the Chair of the Justice Committee, Bob Neill MP, to the Lord Chancellor, Rt Hon Alex Chalk KC MP](#), 21 March 2024