

The Legal Quality Standard of Ireland



APRIL 2026 - ARTICLES & ITEMS OF INTEREST

TEN STEPS TO EFFECTIVELY SUPERVISE JUNIOR SOLICITORS AND TRAINEES

On the 6 April 2026, the Guidance and Ethics Committee prepared a brief guide to assist solicitors who train, supervise or mentor junior colleagues. It is intended as a practical reference guide only and not as a code of conduct or set of rules.

This practice note sets out the following ten steps and expands upon each of the ten steps listed below.

Ten Steps

1. Set clear expectations early
2. Be thoughtful with task allocation
3. Give regular, practical feedback
4. Take a mentoring approach
5. Stay involved, especially early on
6. Create a supportive work environment
7. Focus on practical skills
8. Help them get organised
9. Introduce client interaction gradually
10. Check progress and set goals

To view this practice note in full see [Ten steps to effectively supervise junior solicitors and trainees](#)

LSRA PUBLISH COMPLAINTS REPORT 1 FOR 2026 (WITH FOCUS ON WILLS AND PROBATE)

On 29 April 2026, the Legal Services Regulatory Authority (LSRA) published its Independent Complaints Handling Report 1 for 2026. The 68-page report provides details of the number and nature of complaints about legal practitioners (solicitors and barristers) received and investigated during the reporting period of 3 September 2025 to the 6 March 2026.

The focus of this report is on wills and probate. Pages 22 – 41 of the report set out some commonly used terms in relation to wills and probate, they outline the roles and responsibilities of the parties involved and offer good practice tips. The report also contains 6 related case studies, each scenario offering lessons to the public and lessons to the practitioner.

LSRA report shows: -

- 1000 complaints received, increase of 19% from the previous six-month period where 841 complaints were received.
- 960 related to solicitors and 40 related to barristers.

The 1000 individual complaints received can be broken down as follows:-

- 594 complaints (54.9%) related to alleged misconduct only.
- 219 complaints (21.9%) related to legal services of an inadequate standard only.
- 13 complaints (1.3%) related to excessive costs (overcharging) only.
- 119 complaints (11.9%) related to misconduct and inadequate legal services.
- 4 complaints (0.4%) related to misconduct and excessive costs.
- 66 complaints (6.6%) related to inadequate legal services and excessive costs.
- 30 complaints (3.0%) related to misconduct, inadequate legal services and excessive costs.
- Complaints for excessive costs were highest in the practice areas of litigation and family.
- Complaints for inadequate legal services were highest in the practice areas of litigation and conveyancing.

Total complaints closed and outcomes

There were 1139 complaints closed in this reporting period:

- 586 (50.2%) inadmissible complaints.
- 240 (20.5%) complaints resolved with the assistance of the LSRA
- 130 (11.1%) not upheld complaints.
- 86 (7.4%) upheld complaints.
- 16 (1.4%) withdrawn
- 41 (3.5%) referred to LPDT
- 69 (5.9%) Other

To view this report in full see [FINAL-Complaints-Report-1-2026-double-page-spread.pdf](#)

AI IS MAINSTREAM IN LAW BUT CLIENTS ARE NOT BEING TOLD

On the 8 April 2026 the Law Society of England and Wales published an article by Michael Cross titled 'AI is mainstream in law but clients are not told'.

The UK and Ireland Legal Insights Report 2026, published by Canada-headquartered Clio, found that 89% of legal professionals surveyed now use AI tools in some capacity; 70% adopting them in the past year. However, only 7% of clients recall their lawyer disclosing that AI was involved in their matter.

These findings are based on surveys of more than 500 legal professionals and 500 members of the public across UK and Irish jurisdictions.

According to the authors, the legal sector in the UK and Ireland has reached a pivotal moment: 'the question is no longer whether to adopt legal AI; the question is how best to integrate it.'

However, the speed of AI adoption has outpaced formal governance in many firms: 17% of firms have no formal AI policy in place, despite allowing and even encouraging AI use, the report found. It described the disclosure picture as 'concerning': while 81% of firms say they disclose AI use to clients at least occasionally, only 7% of clients recall their lawyer proactively sharing that AI was involved in their matter.

To view this article in full see [AI is mainstream in law - but clients are not told, survey for Clio finds | Law Gazette](#)

AI IS ACCELERATING CYBER THREATS – LAW FIRMS MUST STRENGTHEN THEIR DEFENCES

On the 31 March 2026 the Law Society of England and Wales published an article by Mitigo a trusted cyber risk partner to The Law Society titled 'AI is turbo-charging cyber attacks. Is your law firm ready?'

Artificial intelligence has changed the rules of cybercrime. Attacks that once required significant skill and resource can now be executed at scale, at speed and with unsettling precision. Handling large amounts of sensitive client information makes law firms attractive targets for cybercriminals, with attacks on UK law firm's surging by 77% in a single year.

It is clear that AI is accelerating cyber threats - and law firms must strengthen their defences.

How Criminals Are Using AI Against Law Firms

Phishing emails used to be easier to spot - poor grammar, odd phrasing, something slightly off. That is no longer the case. AI can now generate grammatically perfect, convincing messages that replicate the writing style of colleagues, partners or clients, complete with the right logos and tone. For law firms managing client correspondence and financial transactions, this significantly increases the risk of convincing payment diversion or email account takeovers.

Then there are deepfakes. In 2024, a finance worker transferred \$25 million after a video call in which every participant - including the CFO - was a deepfake. For law firms, this tactic could easily target conveyancing, M&A or litigation teams who routinely authorise significant

transfers under time pressure - a convincing deepfake posing as a client, lender or senior partner is all it takes.

The article states the repercussions are severe and most law firms are not ready.

Cyber attacks are inevitable. What you do now is what matters. The right response comes down to three things:

Assess your exposure: Start with an independent risk assessment - covering people, processes and governance, not just technology. Your IT provider cannot do this objectively. With AI lowering the bar for attackers, gaps that once seemed minor are now critical for law firms.

Act on the gaps: Build and test an incident response plan. If your firm suffered a cyber attack tomorrow – AI-driven or otherwise - would you survive? Furthermore, if your staff are using AI tools such as Copilot or ChatGPT, ensure clear policies are in place on what client data is being shared.

Assure ongoing resilience: Board-level accountability is no longer optional - cyber risk is a leadership issue, not an IT one. Treat it as an ongoing discipline, not a one-off exercise. That means regular assessments, continuous oversight, and having a trusted cyber partner with specialist legal sector expertise.

To view this article in full together with links to related reports see [Insight: AI is turbo-charging cyber attacks. Is your law firm ready? | Law Gazette](#)

CENTRAL BANK FINDS ONE IN THREE ADULTS HAVE EXPERIENCED FRAUD OR SCAMS

On the 28 April 2026, the Law Society of Ireland top stories published a news item titled 'Central bank finds one in three defrauded.'

The nationally representative study of nearly 3,000 adults found that 35% had been targeted, with almost two-thirds of victims suffering financial losses.

Despite the prevalence of scams, 38% of victims did not report the incident to their financial-service provider or any authority, raising concerns that the true scale of fraud is being underestimated.

Official figures show reported payment fraud in Ireland reached €160 million in 2024, marking a 24.5% increase on the previous year. However, the Central Bank said the actual financial impact on consumers was likely to be higher due to underreporting.

Behaviours linked to higher risk included:

- Purchasing from unfamiliar websites,
- Sharing financial details through insecure channels,
- Sending money to individuals met online,
- Responding to unsolicited offers,
- Failing to use multi-factor authentication and,
- Making frequent high-value online purchases.

The study also found that “fraud literacy” was associated with lower risk of falling victim.

To view this article in full see [Central Bank finds one in three defrauded](#)

WRC ISSUES ANNUAL REPORT

On the 24 April 2026, the Workplace Relations Commission published its annual report.

Mr. Alan Dillon T.D. Minister of State with special responsibility for Employment, Small Businesses and Retail stated *“This Annual Report highlights the scale and efficiency of the work delivered by the Workplace Relations Commission on a daily basis. In 2025, the WRC handled over 64,000 information and advisory calls, completed more than 5,000 workplace inspections, issued over 2,500 adjudication decisions with decisions delivered within a median of 39 working days, and recovered more than €1.5 million in unpaid wages. This level of delivery, alongside the introduction of a new strategy and a dedicated Continuous Improvement Office, demonstrates a highly productive organisation focused on practical outcomes, compliance and timely resolution providing clarity and certainty for employers, particularly small businesses, while ensuring strong protections are upheld for employees in the workplace.”*

To view same see [annual-report-2025.pdf](#)

FIRM BLAMES ACQUISITIONS AFTER RECEIVING £160,000 SRA FINE OVER CLIENT ACCOUNT ISSUES

On the 23 April 2026 the Law Society of England and Wales published an article titled ‘Firm blames acquisitions after £160,000 SRA fine over client account issues’.

Taylor Rose, the UK national firm that was fined £160,000 by the Solicitors Regulation Authority has blamed legacy issues from the businesses it had acquired. The regulator sanctioned the firm for failing to reconcile items in the main client account and failed to promptly return money to clients.

In a statement, the firm said the issues round bank reconciliations and residual balances primarily related to the acquisitions of 2 firms, both of which had entered administration.

The regulator’s investigators established that from 2022 to 2025 Taylor Rose failed to have in place effective systems and controls to ensure compliance. It also failed to promptly return client money from 2018 to 2025. Possible breaches of the accounts rules were not promptly reported.

The conduct was found to have continued for longer than was reasonable. There was no loss to clients and a low risk of harm.

Taylor Rose said its strengthened financial compliance team has put in place robust procedures to prevent any future issues across the whole business, including companies it has acquired and integrated. Reconciliations are now undertaken daily, thanks to a new case management system, and will be automated with stronger controls in place. The firm has also restructured its finance team to put greater focus and tighter controls on residual balances.

To view this article in full see [Law firm Taylor Rose blames acquisitions after £160,000 SRA fine over client account issues | Law Gazette](#)