Solicitors Not on Record
Made Representations Before Court Five times

Law Society says complaint – is - Frivolous

Below is extraordinary & deeply disturbing[1]:

- Having reviewed court paperwork in detail, a homeowner discovered that solicitors acting for Mars Capital, had made representations to the court on five separate occasions in 2025 while not on record.
- Throughout this period the hearings continued to be listed under Bank of Ireland and different set of solicitors.
- The appearances were conducted ex parte and without notice to the borrower, despite the proceedings directly affecting his property rights.
- He submitted a formal complaint to the @LSRAIreland supported by documentary evidence.
- The @LSRAIreland initially informed him that the matter was being treated as one of serious professional misconduct.
- At that stage the complaint had not yet reached active investigation status and remained under assessment for admissibility.

So far so satisfactory & predictable.

- The borrower then received an email from the LSRA stating that the complaint was now considered “frivolous and vexatious” and was therefore now not admissible.
- It is difficult to know what to say…
- This is verifiable & raises a series of questions that the LSRA has never publicly addressed to the best of my knowledge.
- When solicitors make repeated representations to the court while not on record, and when the court listing continues to name a different firm and a different institutional client, what standard of professional conduct does the Authority apply?

[1] Copied from a post on X and reformatted for sharing here by www.irldefrauded.com

- Does the fact that the underlying client is a fund such as Mars Capital alter the expectation that a solicitor should appear on the record and that the court list should accurately reflect the parties and their representatives?

- What new information or change in circumstances prompted that reclassification?

- Was the borrower given a clear opportunity to address the specific grounds on which the complaint was ultimately found inadmissible, particularly in light of the documentary evidence of five off-record appearances in 2025?

- If the same pattern of conduct — repeated off-record representations, continued use of an outdated court listing naming Bank of Ireland and other solicitors and the absence of notice — had been directed against a private individual or a small commercial entity rather than by solicitors acting for Mars Capital, would the Authority's assessment of seriousness and admissibility have been the same?

- Does the economic power of the client influence the threshold at which a complaint supported by concrete evidence is deemed frivolous?

- The Authority exists to maintain public confidence in the regulation of the legal profession.

When a complaint is first treated as serious professional misconduct & later dismissed as frivolous and vexatious without a transparent explanation of the change in view, what steps does the Authority take to demonstrate that its processes remain independent of the institutional power of the parties involved?

- The logical conclusion is that the LSRA has now given carte blanche to lawyers acting for financial institutions to treat court rules as completely superfluous.

- That cannot be right.

- This outcome strongly suggests that inappropriate conflicts of interest are at play.