

## The Legal Quality Standard of Ireland



### MARCH 2026 - ARTICLES & ITEMS OF INTEREST

#### **SUSPICIOUS TRANSACTION REPORTING IN CONVEYANCING**

On the 26 March 2026, the Conveyancing Committee published a Practice Note titled 'Suspicious transaction reporting in conveyancing'.

This Practice Note is issued jointly by the Regulation of Practice and Conveyancing Committees. Its purpose is:

- to remind solicitors of their reporting obligations relating to money laundering and terrorist financing, and the consequences for solicitors who fail to comply;
- to draw attention to certain client behaviours in conveyancing transactions which, in the opinion of those Committees, should cause practitioners to consider if a suspicious transaction report (STR) may be warranted; and
- to suggest some best practices.

Both Committees wish to emphasise that the considerations in this note apply equally to past instructions, as well as to current and future cases.

To view this practice note see [Suspicious transaction reporting in conveyancing](#)

## **AUTHORISED SIGNATORIES ON CLIENT ACCOUNTS**

On the 23 March 2026, the Regulation of Practice Committee published a Practice Note titled 'Authorised Signatories on Client Accounts'.

This Practice Note reminds solicitors of their obligations under Regulation 9(5) of the Solicitors Accounts Regulations 2023 in relation to authorised signatories on client accounts and the steps required where non-compliance has been identified. It is intended for partners and sole practitioners responsible for the operation and oversight of client accounts.

To view this practice note in full see [Authorised signatories on Client Account](#)

## **DPC FINES UNIVERSITY OF LIMERICK €98,000 FOR GDPR BREACHES**

On the 2 March 2026, the Data Protection Commission (DPC) published its final decision following an inquiry into a personal data breach in University of Limerick.

This decision arises from an own-volition inquiry into the University of Limerick following a series of personal data breaches that occurred between November 2018 and January 2020.

The DPC assessed University of Limerick's technical and organisational measures for ensuring the security of personal data that it processed, and also examined compliance with the controller's obligation to notify breaches promptly.

The DPC's decision finds that University of Limerick:

- did not implement appropriate technical and organisational measures to ensure the security of personal data as required by Articles 5(1)(f) and 32(1) GDPR,
- failed in three cases to inform persons affected by a high-risk breach without undue delay in accordance with Article 34(1) GDPR,
- did not fully comply with the requirements of Article 30(1) GDPR in its initial record of processing activity.
- did not report three breach notifications without undue delay in accordance with Article 33(1) GDPR.

The DPC reprimanded University of Limerick and imposed administrative fines totalling €98,000.

To view this article in full and for the link to the full decision see [The Data Protection Commission Publishes Final Decision Following Inquiry into University of Limerick | 02/03/2026 | Data Protection Commission](#)

## **REPORT OF STATUTORY REVIEW ON THE RIGHT TO REQUEST REMOTE WORK LEGISLATION**

On the 5 March 2026, the Department of Enterprise, Tourism and Employment published a Statutory Review Report: Part 3 of the Work Life Balance and Miscellaneous Provisions Act 2023.

The right to request a remote working arrangement came into force for all employees on 6 March 2024. This right is provided for within Part 3 of the Work Life Balance Act. As required by Section 29 of the Act, a legislative review of the operation of the remote working provisions must be carried out not earlier than one year and not later than two years following the commencement of the legislation.

Some of the findings from the Statutory Review Report include:

- The statutory review finds that Ireland’s right to request remote work legislation is functioning effectively, with 94% of requests approved fully or partially.
- Just over a third of employees (35%) and less than half of employers (47%) were aware of the Code’s existence.
- Awareness is notably higher among urban employees (53%) compared to their rural counterparts, where it falls to 38%. A similar divide exists along gender lines, with male employees (55%) being significantly more likely to be aware of the legislation than female employees (41%).
- While a majority (57%) correctly identified that an employer must provide reasons for a refusal in writing, knowledge of other key obligations was significantly lower. Only 40% knew that a response must be provided within a specific timeframe, and just 28% believed an employer must prove a refusal would not be discriminatory.
- Employees who have been through the process report significant benefits, particularly in relation to their work-life balance (71% positive impact) and personal productivity (68% positive impact). This suggests that securing a formal remote work arrangement delivers tangible, positive outcomes for the individual. Crucially, this positive view is mirrored by employers. Employers who have managed a formal request also report positive impacts on key business metrics, including staff morale (46% positive impact) and staff retention (41% positive impact).
- The single most common suggestion for improvement, raised by over a third of Public Consultation respondents (36%), was a call to simplify the request process from start to finish.
- While this framework aims to balance employee flexibility with business needs, some perceive the system as favouring employers. In response, the Minister will ask the WRC to revise the Code of Practice to strengthen clarity, transparency and dialogue. Changes under consideration include improved application templates, clearer reasoning requirements for employers, structured internal appeals processes, enhanced consultation, clarified timelines and greater use of WRC mediation services.

To view this report in full see [Statutory Review Report Part 3 of the Work Life Balance and Miscellaneous Provisions Act 2023](#)

## **10 STEPS TO PLANNING FOR DISASTER**

In the March edition of the Law Society Gazette, the Guidance and Ethic Committee have published a Practice Note titled ‘Ten steps to planning for disaster’.

*It states ‘How your firm reacts and adapts to a disastrous or emergency event can mean the difference between resuming work with some business continuity, without leaving your clients stranded, or in the worst-case scenario, closing your firm. Being unprepared for emergencies*

*can also leave your firm's staff, clients, and data vulnerable and at risk, including breaches of confidentiality, non-compliance with GDPR, or professional negligence.'*

Below are extracts taken from the 10 steps.

*'1) Carry out an inventory, consider including the following in your inventory:*

- Software – make a list of any software your firm uses. How many licenses do you have? Ensure that passwords or credentials are stored securely in an encrypted system.*
- Hardware – how many computers, servers, or other pieces of physical hardware does your firm have – and where are they located?*
- Client files – should a disaster occur, have a list of all client files (digital and physical) so that they can be recovered.*
- Locations – note the locations of everything. Include cloud and physical storage solutions, encrypted backups, and remote-access protocols, ensuring compliance with confidentiality and GDPR.*

*2) Do a risk assessment - include everything in your inventory for a risk assessment. Identify the impact of each risk and ways to mitigate risks. This should include cyber-risks, data loss, fraud exposure, reputational damage and regulatory breaches, in addition to physical risks, such as fire or flood.*

*3) Identify and group critical services, systems, and data. For example, if client data is located on a single server, or has no back up, this could be considered critical.*

*4) Identify supporting tools - do you ensure to back up your data? How often? Where is it located (consider whether all your back-ups are in a separate, secure location)?*

*5) Assign responsible individuals - nominate specific individuals to take responsibility for plans and procedures in the event of a disastrous or emergency event.*

*6) Determine how to handle sensitive information - document clear procedures for protecting and recovering essential records (such as employment, financial, and client files) while maintaining confidentiality, privilege, and GDPR compliance.*

*7) Communications plan - prepare a written communications plan for use in emergencies.*

*8) Test and review the plan*

*9) Finance - try to maintain a buffer to cover unexpected expenses that may occur.*

*10) Do not panic – ask for help! Reach out to colleagues, mentors, the Consult a Colleague helpline, or Law Society resources for assistance.'*

To view this practice note in full see page 56 of the [Gazette Magazine](#) or see [Ten steps to planning for disaster](#)

## **SOLICITOR SUSPENDED FOR 6 MONTHS AND FINED £25,000 COSTS FOR NOT FOLLOWING LEGAL FORMALITIES REGARDING THE VALID EXECUTION OF A DEED**

On the 31 March 2026, the Law Society of England and Wales reported on the circumstances where a solicitor was suspended and fined.

Victoria Burdett, who worked for Kent firm Robinson Allfree, had signed to verify her managing partner's signature to a deed after the person who had witnessed it did not complete the details.

Burdett told the Solicitors Disciplinary Tribunal she was trying to be helpful given the urgency of getting the deed completed and submitted her actions were based on a 'flawed understanding' of the law regarding attestation. She accepted she made an error of judgement but believed she was acting properly rather than with dishonest intent.

The tribunal found it 'difficult to accept' that a solicitor with 22 years of private client experience was unaware of the legal formalities required for the valid execution of a deed

Burdett was suspended for six months and ordered to pay £25,000 costs.

To view this article in full see [Solicitor with 22 years' experience found dishonest over deed shortcut but avoids strike-off amid significant mitigation | Law Gazette](#)

## **ENGLISH COURT NAMES BARRISTER OVER AI ERRORS**

On the 31 March 2026, the Irish Law Society Top Stories referenced an article where an English court named a barrister over AI errors.

'A recorder in a family court in England has ruled that a barrister who presented the court with incorrect information produced by AI searches should be named, according to the England-and-Wales Law Society Gazette.

She accepted that she had used a widely known AI tool to help prepare the skeleton argument and apologised for inadvertently misleading the court.

The barrister urged the court not to publish either the judgment or her name, saying that this would amount to "character assassination, which would place her at risk of actual and psychological harm.

According to the Gazette, Howard said that the judgment should be published, as it was another example where AI hallucinations had led to the court being misled by a person representing themselves relying on the AI tool without reference to their duty to check the citations.'

To view this article in full see [English court names barrister over AI errors](#)

## LAW FIRMS FACE HIGHER AML FINES THAN ACCOUNTANTS

On the 3 March 2026, an article was published on the Law Society of England and Wales, stating how law firms are being fined up to six times more than their accountancy counterparts for breaches of anti-money laundering regulations, a new report has revealed.

The Office for Professional Body Anti-Money Laundering Supervision (OPBAS) published its annual review of the effectiveness of the 25 organisations tasked with preventing financial crime in the accountancy and legal sectors. This is likely to be one of the last years in which such a report is made, as the government has outlined plans for a single regulator, the Financial Conduct Authority, to take over the work of all 25.

The OPBAS report adds: ‘The total sum of fines issued collectively by the accountancy sector is similar to the legal sector, but the average fine amount is over six times lower. This suggests lower average penalties. We are looking at this closely, with the accountancy sector generally receiving lower scores than the legal sector in their enforcement effectiveness scores in this cycle.

To view this article in full see [AML enforcement gap widens: Law firms face higher fines and more inspections than accountancy practices | Law Gazette](#)