



CODE OF CONDUCT

JONATHAN C. DUNSMOOR

(Complainant)

and

CALLUM TONY EVANS

(First Respondent)

and

GRESHAM INTERNATIONAL

(Second Respondent)

CODE OF CONDUCT DECISION 1 OF 2025
DECISION OF THE REGISTRAR AYESHA BIN KALBAN

Summary of the Complaint

1. On 12 September 2024, Mr. Jonathan C. Dunsmoor (“Mr. Dunsmoor” or the “Complainant”) submitted a formal complaint (the “Complaint”) against Mr. Callum Evans (“Mr. Evans” or the “First Respondent”) and Gresham International (“Gresham” or the “Second Respondent”) (jointly, the “Respondents”).
2. In summary, the Complaint submits that the Respondents breached the DIFC Courts’ Mandatory Code of Conduct for Legal Practitioners (the “Code”) through the following actions:
 - a. Unlicensed practice of law: Operating as a full-service law firm within Dubai without proper registration or authorisation, thereby breaching the undertaking submitted upon seeking Part I registration with the DIFC Courts’ Register of Legal Practitioners (the “Register”).

- b. Misrepresentation: Misrepresentation of legal qualifications, professional qualifications, and services.
 - c. In addition, the Complaint raises several ancillary allegations, including, but not limited to:
 - i. Misleading statements about Mr. Evans' educational qualifications.
 - ii. Public claims made during appearances and interviews projecting inaccurate representations of the Respondents' expertise.
 - iii. Marketing content and professional titles used by the Respondents, which the Complainant argues are not recognised under any regulatory frameworks.
3. For the purposes of this decision, I will limit its determination to issues that are within the DIFC Courts' jurisdiction, in accordance with the Code.

Complaint – Procedural History

- 4. On 12 September 2024, the Complaint was submitted to the DIFC Courts' Registrar via email.
- 5. On 30 September 2024, the Register forwarded the Complaint to the Respondents, pursuant to Paragraph F-35 of the Code, requesting a response by 21 October 2024.
- 6. On 30 September 2024, Mr. Evans submitted a detailed response to the Register, addressing each allegation in the Complaint.
- 7. On 2 October 2024, the Complainant submitted supplementary materials, including email correspondence and marketing materials.
- 8. On 29 October 2024, the Register sought further clarifications from the Respondents, specifically regarding:
 - a. Professional and regulatory licenses.
 - b. The nature of business conducted in Dubai.
- 9. On 31 October 2024, Mr. Evans clarified the following points:
 - a. Gresham International's operations in Dubai are limited and primarily logistical in nature. No legal work is undertaken within Dubai without securing proper permissions from the

Government of Dubai's Legal Affairs Department.

- b. Most operations are conducted from Ras Al Khaimah (RAK), where the firm is duly licensed and regulated.
10. On 4 November 2024, the Register requested documentation to verify the firm's professional license. It emphasised that while Mr. Evans was registered individually with Chartered Institute of Legal Executives (CILEX), the firm itself required professional licensing under the DIFC Courts' Part I registration.
11. On 8 November 2024, Mr. Evans provided the following explanation:
- a. Due to the ongoing CILEX and the Solicitors Regulation Authority (SRA) merger, new firm-level registrations had been paused.
 - b. The Respondents proposed registering their RAK entity with the DIFC Courts for Part I registration, given its compliance with RAK Courts' regulatory requirements.

Details of the Complaint

The Complaint

12. The Complainant, Mr. Dunsmoor, submits that the Respondents violated the DIFC Courts' Code in the following ways:
- a. **Unlicensed Practice of Law:** Operating as a full-service law firm within Dubai without registering with the Legal Affairs Department, thereby breaching their undertaking to the DIFC Courts.
 - b. **Misrepresentation:** Making exaggerated claims about Mr. Evans' expertise and prior legal experience, including misleading public statements.
 - c. **Additional allegations include:**
 - i. Misleading marketing content and professional titles not recognised under regulatory frameworks.
 - ii. Statements made during public appearances and interviews projecting an inaccurate image of the Respondents' professional capabilities.

The Response

13. The Respondents deny all allegations and assert full compliance with applicable laws and regulations.
14. The Respondents assert that their operations are fully compliant with all applicable legal and regulatory requirements. They emphasise that Gresham International operates as a legal consulting firm within RAK and holds a valid business license, duly registered with the RAK Courts. They contend that the Dubai address listed on their website is used solely as a Regus office for logistical purposes, facilitating client meetings and interactions for Gresham International (Gibraltar), a separate non-legal services entity. The Respondents have clarified that this arrangement does not constitute an economic presence in Dubai, as confirmed by the relevant Free Zone authorities. Furthermore, they assert that any legal work performed in Dubai is undertaken only with temporary permissions from the Legal Consultant Affairs Section of Dubai, and they have submitted evidence of previously obtained permissions to support this claim.
15. They also reject any allegations of misrepresentation, maintaining that Mr. Evans holds a valid practicing certificate from the CILEX, confirming his qualifications and good standing.
16. The Respondents attribute any perceived ambiguities in marketing materials to misinterpretations and deny any intent to mislead.

Findings

17. To be found in breach of the Code is a serious matter. The Code imposes significant sanctions on practitioners found in breach, including suspension or removal from the Register. These sanctions ensure the highest standards of professional conduct are maintained. Accordingly, the Court must carefully evaluate the evidence to determine, on the balance of probabilities, whether a breach has occurred.
18. I will only examine issues that fall within the Courts' powers and pertain to its Mandatory Code of Conduct for Legal Practitioners. The issues are set out as follows:
 - a. Unauthorised Practice of Law in Dubai
 - i. The Complainant alleges that Gresham International engaged in unauthorised legal practice within Dubai, evidenced by a Dubai address and references to

UAE-wide legal consultancy services. The Complainant submits that this constitutes an economic presence requiring registration with the Legal Affairs Department.

- ii. The Respondents submitted substantial evidence clarifying that their operations are based in RAK, where they are duly licensed and regulated. The Dubai address is used solely for logistical purposes such as client meetings and does not establish a legal presence. Temporary permissions are obtained for specific legal work in Dubai, as evidenced by prior permits.
- iii. After carefully evaluating the submissions, evidence, and arguments presented by both parties, the Court finds that the Complainant has not provided sufficient evidence to substantiate the claims of unauthorised legal practice or misrepresentation. The Respondents' documentation establishes that their primary operations are based in RAK, where they are licensed and regulated by the RAK Courts. The Dubai address is used solely for logistical purposes and does not establish a legal presence requiring registration. Furthermore, the Respondents have demonstrated that any legal work conducted in Dubai is done in compliance with the Legal Affairs Department's requirements. On the balance of probabilities, I find the Respondents' explanations credible and supported by evidence. Consequently, it is determined that the Respondents have not breached the Code.

b. Misrepresentation of Qualifications and Services

- i. The Complainant submits that the Respondents misrepresented their qualifications and expertise through public statements, marketing materials, and professional titles.
- ii. The Respondents submit that Mr. Evans holds a valid CILEX practicing certificate, confirming his qualifications and in good standing. They state that any perceived inconsistencies in marketing content were unintentional and do not constitute deliberate dishonesty.
- iii. I note that while certain marketing language used by the Respondents may lack precision, there is no evidence of deliberate misrepresentation. Furthermore, the Complaint fails to specify which provisions of the Code these alleged

misrepresentations breach. On the balance of probabilities, I find that the Respondents have not breached the Code.

c. (iii) Miscellaneous Complaints

- i. The Complainant raised additional complaints regarding Mr. Evans' educational qualifications, public appearances, and personal claims. These matters fall outside the jurisdiction of the DIFC Courts and are not addressed in this decision. The Code of Conduct process is not intended to adjudicate general grievances unrelated to the DIFC Courts' regulatory framework.

Decision

19. Having regard to all the materials before the Court, it is determined, on the balance of probabilities, that the Respondents have not breached the DIFC Courts' Mandatory Code of Conduct for Legal Practitioners.
20. The Complaint is dismissed. The purpose of the Code of Conduct process is to address bona fide complaints about breaches of professional standards within the DIFC Courts' jurisdiction. It is not intended as a forum for broader grievances or expressions of dissatisfaction with the actions of legal representatives.
21. In accordance with the Code, there will be no order on costs of the Complaint.



Issued by:
Ayesha Bin Kalban
Registrar
Date of Issue: 17 January 2025
Time: 10am