IN THE MATTER OF PART 3 OF THE
***LEGAL PROFESSION ACT*, RSA 2000, c. L-8**

AND

IN THE MATTER OF A HEARING REGARDING
THE CONDUCT OF IVIE IHENSEKHIEN-ERAGA
A STUDENT MEMBER OF THE LAW SOCIETY OF ALBERTA

Hearing Committee

Nathan Whitling – Chair and Bencher
Glen Buick – Former Bencher
Jodi Edmunds – Public Adjudicator

Appearances

Karen Hansen – Counsel for the Law Society of Alberta
Christopher Bataluk – Counsel for Ms. Ihensekhien-Eraga

Hearing Date

May 10, 2019

Hearing Location

LSA office, at 800,10104 - 103 Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta

[Note: An erratum was issued January 30, 2020, to add the citation to the appeal decision in paragraph 15 and refer to the appeal decision in paragraph 27.]

HEARING COMMITTEE REPORT

Overview

1. Ivie Ihensekhien-Eraga is a student-at-law in Alberta. She practiced law in Nigeria from 1995 to September, 2013. She advised the Hearing Committee that it was appropriate to refer to her as "Mrs. Eraga". Mrs. Eraga immigrated to Canada with her family largely because of their need to find treatment for […]. In April, 2017, Mrs. Eraga received her NCA designation and began the process of accreditation as a lawyer in Alberta. In May, 2017, having begun the articling process, she applied to the Law Society of Alberta ("LSA") to abbreviate her term of articles. Encountering some difficulties in that process,

she submitted a Factum to the LSA's membership department as evidence of her ability. Investigation established that the document was not, in fact, her work. During the course of the ensuing investigation, Mrs. Eraga repeatedly lied to LSA staff and investigators, both orally and in writing, about preparation of the document. Compounding those lies, she fabricated what she represented to be earlier drafts of the Factum in an effort to convince the LSA that she was the author. In all, Mrs. Eraga failed to be candid to the LSA on six separate occasions between November 16, 2017, and February 2, 2018, regarding authorship of the Factum. Painstaking and persistent investigation eventually produced undeniable evidence that she had not written the document and, months into the process, she admitted to lying.

2. On May 10, 2019, the Hearing Committee convened a hearing into the conduct of Mrs. Eraga, based on the following citation:

> It is alleged that Ivie Ihensekhien-Eraga failed to be candid with the Law Society and that such conduct is deserving of sanction.

3. After reviewing all of the evidence and exhibits, notably the Admitted Statement of Facts and Admission of Guilt ("ASF"), and hearing the arguments of the LSA and Counsel for Mrs. Eraga, for the reasons set out below, the Committee finds Mrs. Eraga guilty of conduct deserving sanction on the citation, pursuant to section 71 of the *Legal Profession Act* (the *Act*).

4. The Committee also finds that, based on the facts of this case, the appropriate sanction is suspension. Pursuant to ss. 49(5)(*c*) and 72(1)(*b*) of the *Act*, the Hearing Committee orders that Mrs. Eraga's registration be suspended for a period of 12 months from the date of this report. She is also ordered to pay costs of $17,000.

Preliminary Matters

5. There were no objections to the constitution of the Hearing Committee or its jurisdiction, and a private hearing was not requested, so a public hearing into Mrs. Eraga's conduct proceeded.

Admitted Statement of Facts and Admission of Guilt

6. As noted above, an ASF was introduced by Counsel for the LSA, who requested its acceptance by the Hearing Committee. Mr. Bataluk consented to the introduction of this ASF on behalf of Mrs. Eraga.

7. The ASF is attached as Appendix 'A' to this report.

Deemed Finding of Guilt

8. At the hearing of this matter, the Hearing Committee accepted the ASF and found that it complied with the requirements of Section 60 of the *Act*, thereby deeming there to be a finding of guilt on the citation of failing to be candid with the Law Society.

Sanction

Submissions of the LSA

9. Ms. Hansen, counsel for the LSA, noted that for purposes of a conduct hearing, a student-at-law is treated under the *Act* as if he or she were a member of the LSA. She submitted that Mrs. Eraga's conduct justifies de-registration – disbarment, were she already a member – pursuant to ss. 49(5)(*b*) and 72(1)(*a*) of the *Act*.

10. The facts emphasized by Ms. Hansen include the following. In 2017, Mrs. Eraga was attempting to reduce her time of articles and eventually submitted a Factum, which she said was entirely her work, in support of her request. In fact, the Factum had been drafted by another lawyer. Mrs. Eraga then lied to the LSA membership officials and the LSA investigator about authorship of the Factum. She then fabricated evidence in the form of apparent drafts of the Factum, redoubled the lies in writing, and only relented and told the truth when confronted by a skilled, dedicated investigator with incontrovertible evidence that the work was not hers.

11. Ms. Hansen submitted that had it not been for the careful work of the investigator, the deception might never have been uncovered. It was evidence of a deliberate, calculated, shrewd attempt to mislead her regulator.

12. Ms. Hansen indicated that other factors should also be considered. This was not a mistake by a rattled young person. Mrs. Eraga is 47 years old, a lawyer with more than 15 years of practice experience in Nigeria, in responsible positions. She quoted Mrs. Eraga from paragraph 15 of the admitted facts, "I was a crown counsel in Nigeria, I know the implications when you lie to the Law Society of your jurisdiction." The citation arose from an egregious breach of integrity. Her conduct calls into question her trustworthiness in dealing with future clients and her governability, as the Law Society cannot do its job as regulator if it cannot trust its members or its students-at-law.

13. Ms. Hansen provided examples of past cases to support the request for de-registration. These cases included *Law Society of Alberta v. Hammoud*, 2013 ABLS 9, affirmed 2014 ABLS 30, and *Law Society of Alberta v. Zimmerman*, [2006] L.S.D.D. No. 6 (Q.L.). Ms. Hansen also referred to *Law Society of Alberta v. Cattermole*, [2008] L.S.D.D. No. 168 (Q.L.) for comparison purposes.

Submissions of Ivie Ihensekhien-Eraga

14. Mr. Bataluk, counsel for Mrs. Eraga, emphasized the stresses experienced by Mrs. Eraga in having to move to a new country, and to cope with her […]. Additionally, Mrs. Eraga experienced pressures from having to make a living and look after her family, including her three younger children. Mrs. Eraga's husband had been required to move to […] for several years to find appropriate work, leaving her to look after her children on her own. These pressures, it was submitted, had influenced Mrs. Eraga in her attempt to become a full-fledged member of the LSA quickly, which led her into the unhappy situation in which she finds herself. She has apologized sincerely for her conduct and pledged to be an excellent member of the LSA.

15. Mr. Bataluk argued that the cases proffered by the LSA were distinguishable from the circumstances of Mrs. Eraga's case, and that de-registration was not warranted in her circumstances. He also provided a number of cases to support this argument. These cases included *Law Society of Alberta v. Philion*, [1998] L.S.D.D. No. 18 (Q.L.), *Law Society of Alberta v. Rigler*, 2008 LSA 10 (CanLII), *Law Society of Alberta v. Terrigno*, [2008] L.S.D.D. No. 175 (Q.L.) .), rev'd 2010 ABLS 6 (CanLII), and *Law Society of Alberta v. Nguyen*, [2019] L.S.D.D. No. 25 (Q.L.) [2019 ABLS1 (CanLII)].

16. Mr. Bataluk recommended a suspension of six months or less.

Analysis and Decision on Sanction

The Professional Standard of Integrity

17. Of course, integrity is of fundamental importance to the legal profession. It is also a necessary requirement for admission to the bar of Alberta. The very first professional standard listed in the *Code of Professional Conduct* reads:

> Chapter 2 – Standards of the Legal Profession
>
> 2.1 Integrity
>
> 2.1-1 A lawyer has a duty to carry on the practice of law and discharge all responsibilities to clients, tribunals, the public and other members of the profession honourably and with integrity.

18. The *Commentary* accompanying the above standard states:

> [1] Integrity is the fundamental quality of any person who seeks to practise as a member of the legal profession. If a client has any doubt about his or her lawyer's trustworthiness, the essential element in the true lawyer-client

> relationship will be missing. If integrity is lacking, the lawyer's usefulness to the client and reputation within the profession will be destroyed, regardless of how competent the lawyer may be.

19. All applicants for admission to the LSA are required to swear or solemnly affirm in open court that "in all things [I] will conduct myself truly and with integrity" (*Rules of the Law Society of Alberta*, r. 67(7)).

20. Regarding the importance of integrity in the specific context of the articling process, LSA counsel refers us to the following statements in *Hammoud*, with which we agree:

> It is important to send a message to the public that the Law Society's oversight of the integrity of those practicing law starts with students at law. Articles are a training period where unintended mistakes are understood to occur for students and will be forgiven, but lack of integrity is not of that ilk. A message needs to be sent to those who apply for membership with the Law Society that every applicant must be candid with their regulator and with other lawyers and must comply with the Rules of the Law Society from the moment they apply to practice. To enter the profession on the basis of untruthfulness but then argue that one is here now and should be permitted to stay is not consistent with proper regulation of the legal profession.

21. Regarding the particular seriousness of lawyers and students-at-law misleading their provincial law societies, we also agree with the following comments of the Hearing Committee in *Law Society of Saskatchewan v. Kumar*, [2013] L.S.D.D. No. 109 (Q.L.) at para. 18:

> It goes without saying that in situations where the Member has provided false or misleading information to the Law Society, the Society's ability to regulate the profession and to govern its membership in accordance with its statutory mandate is obstructed. Furthermore, regulatory bodies cannot protect the public in any meaningful way if they are not privy to accurate information concerning their Members. From the viewpoint of the Membership in a professional society, the issue is one of integrity. Members must be candid and honest in dealing with their professional society in order to enable the society to function. The importance of integrity in the practice of law cannot be understated [*sic*]… It should be noted that it is not necessarily every false or misleading admission or omission that will automatically lead to severe penalties but serious breaches of integrity should result in serious penalties in order to maintain the integrity of the legal profession and the public's confidence in it.

Existing Precedents

22. Although not binding upon the Hearing Committee, we have reviewed and considered all of the case authorities provided to us by counsel, as well as a number of additional

authorities. We have been able to find very few precedents which would support the sanction of deregistration or disbarment in circumstances similar to those of the present case.

23. In *Hammoud*, the Hearing Committee imposed a sanction of deregistration for a lengthy course of conduct, which included a physical assault that the student had committed against a professor while he was in law school. The member's conduct also included an attempted assault against one of his principals. He had also had harsh and inappropriate conversations with CPLED staff, and with a police officer when he had been searched in a motor vehicle that had been transporting marijuana. To make matters worse, the member failed to be candid with the LSA about these events. He then failed to take responsibility for his conduct before the Hearing Committee, and attempted instead to minimize the significance of what he had done.

24. In the *Zimmerman* case, the member had been convicted of the criminal offence of theft under $5,000.00 as a result of stealing money over a period of time from her employer. She had also been criminally convicted of separate fraud and forgery charges as a result of her attempts to fraudulently obtain two loans of $7,000.00 from a lender. The Hearing Committee was prepared to consider a suspension of at least 12 months, but ultimately concluded that deregistration was necessary.

25. In the great majority of the professional disciplinary cases that we have reviewed, both from within and without Alberta, acts of deceitful or misleading conduct have resulted in sanctions short of deregistration or disbarment.

26. Examples include *Law Society of Alberta v. White*, [1995] L.S.D.D. No. 292 (Q.L.), where the member was found guilty of swearing false affidavits, and was suspended for 30 days. In *Law Society of Alberta v. Rooneem*, [1996] L.S.D.D. No. 282 (Q.L.), the member was suspended for one year for conduct which included altering an affidavit and creating a false Certificate of Independent Legal Advice. In *Law Society of Alberta v. McKay*, [1997] L.S.D.D. No. 152 (Q.L.), the member was suspended for one year for lying to a Hearing Committee about the reasons for her failure to attend a hearing.

27. The subsequent cases cited by Mr. Bataluk continue the above trend. In *Philion*, a suspension of one year was imposed upon a senior lawyer who had executed a false statutory declaration, and then misled the LSA auditor about doing so. In *Terrigno*, a student received a two-month suspension and a reprimand for falsely representing to the LSA that he had entered into a student-principal relationship with a certain lawyer with whom he had no actual relationship. The student's citation was subsequently overturned on appeal, but without consideration of the appropriate sanction. In *Rigler*, a student misled the LSA respecting the circumstances of his impaired driving conviction, and received a suspension of three months.

28. Out of province cases also reflect a usual range of sanctions short of deregistration or disbarment. In *Law Society of British Columbia v. Pham*, [2015] L.S.D.D. No. 70 (Q.L.) at para. 87, the Hearing Committee collected five cases involving the creation of false documents by lawyers, reflecting sanctions ranging from fines to suspensions of up to 18 months. In *Yungwirth v. Law Society of Upper Canada*, [2004] L.S.D.D. No. 11 (Q.L.) [2004 ONLSAP 1 (CanLII)], the member had participated in the swearing of false affidavits and knowingly misleading clients, and was suspended for 12 months. In *Law Society of Saskatchewan v. Tilling*, [2013] L.S.D.D. No. 190 (Q.L.) [2013 SKLSS 12 (CanLII)], the member had lied to multiple clients over a span of numerous years, had a related record, and was suspended for 9 months.

29. In addition to the two cases cited by the LSA, we have found two cases in which acts of misleading the law society have led to deregistration or disbarment. In *Kumar*, a student-at-law used an alias in his application form in order to conceal the fact that he had received numerous disciplinary sanctions while practicing law in other jurisdictions. Similarly, in *Law Society of British Columbia v. Power*, [2009] L.S.D.D. No. 82 (Q.L.), a lawyer had failed to disclose that he had changed his name in order to conceal the fact that he had previously faced serious criminal charges, though he had been acquitted of those charges. He then lied about these facts while testifying before a Hearing Committee. In both of these cases, deregistration/disbarment was necessary since the members might never have been registered to begin with, but for their deceit.

Aggravating, Mitigating and Neutral Factors

30. We agree with the LSA that Mrs. Eraga's conduct is very serious. Although her conduct is encapsulated within a single citation, that citation comprises an escalating series of lies over a number of months, including the creation and submission of false documents. These attempts to deceive the LSA might well have succeeded had it not been for the extensive time and effort expended by the LSA's staff and investigators. Further, we agree with the LSA that although Mrs. Eraga is a student-at-law, her conduct cannot be attributed to a youthful mistake, given her prior years of practice experience in Nigeria. In sum, we find the conduct in this case to be towards the more serious end of the spectrum.

31. Having said that, we respectfully disagree with the LSA that the circumstances of this case are comparable to *Hammoud* or *Zimmerman* so as to warrant the sanction of deregistration.

32. Although Mrs. Eraga attempted to mislead the LSA on six occasions, her conduct may properly be viewed as a single incident comprising a series of related events, all geared towards her attempt to claim authorship of the Factum, and to thereby shorten her term

of articles. This incident, standing alone, does not demonstrate the sort of long-term, intractable conduct exhibited in such cases as *Hammoud*. In other words, this incident does not establish that Mrs. Eraga is ungovernable, or that she has no reasonable prospect of rehabilitation.

33. We emphasize also that Mrs. Eraga's conduct in the present case is not accompanied by other actions which might in and of themselves justify the imposition of deregistration. Mrs. Eraga has not been found to have committed any acts of violence as in *Hammoud*, and has not been convicted of any criminal offences as in *Zimmerman*. Nor has it been established that Mrs. Eraga has a prior history of disciplinary infractions. While the absence of such considerations is not a mitigating factor, it does serve to distinguish the present case from those cases where deregistration or disbarment has been imposed.

34. Thankfully, no member of the public was harmed or placed in danger of direct harm by Mrs. Eraga's deceitful conduct. The absence of such an aggravating consideration also serves to distinguish this case from those where deregistration or disbarment has been imposed. Having said that, Mrs. Eraga did lie to the LSA, and we agree that the LSA must be able to rely upon the integrity of its members in order to perform its core function of protecting the public. Hence, the absence of direct harm to any member of the public is a distinguishing, but not mitigating factor.

35. We do find two circumstances in this case to be mitigating factors.

36. Firstly, Mrs. Eraga did admit responsibility for her conduct at a relatively early stage of these disciplinary proceedings, thereby negating the need for a contested hearing. Although Mrs. Eraga did not admit her deceit to the LSA until presented with irrefutable proof, and although the LSA's evidence against her was very strong, the law is clear that an admission of guilt is always a mitigating factor, even in the face of an overwhelming case for the prosecution: *R. v. S.L.W.*, 2018 ABCA 235 [2018 ABCA 235 (CanLII)] at para. 33; *R. v. Nicholson*, 2008 ABCA 256 [2008 ABCA 256 (CanLII)] at paras. 6-12.

37. Secondly, we find Mrs. Eraga's verbal apology at the hearing of this matter to be a consideration in her favour. While some aspects of that apology consisted of factual matters which were not properly in evidence, it was certainly apparent that she has experienced great shame and embarrassment as a result of these events, and we found her emotional contrition to be sincere. At the end of the day, this apology leaves us with some hope that Mrs. Eraga may be able to learn from her mistakes and avoid the commission of such misconduct in the future.

38. In reaching our decision on sanction, we have also considered the following circumstances, but have not found them to have a material impact upon our analysis.

39. We do not find that the personal circumstances relied upon by Mrs. Eraga amounted to significant mitigation. While we do have considerable sympathy for her family circumstances, particularly the […], as well as the resulting stress of moving her family to Canada, "[t]hese transitions must be managed by us all with a view to fulfilling our obligations of integrity, notwithstanding the sometimes difficult reality of a horrible year" (*Law Society of Alberta v. Beaver*, [2017] L.S.D.D. No. 59 (Q.L.) [2017 ABLS 3 (CanLII)] at para. 19).

40. We have also reviewed Mrs. Eraga's good character references, as well as evidence of her early attempts at rehabilitation through […]. We did not find the content of these materials to be of such significance as to materially affect our analysis.

Disposition

41. In light of the above, the Hearing Committee imposes a sanction upon Mrs. Eraga of a suspension of her registration for 12 months.

42. In addition, pursuant to subsection 72(2) of the *Act*, the Committee orders Mrs. Eraga to pay costs in the amount of $17,000.00. Mrs. Eraga may have time to pay these costs until a date to be agreed upon between the parties. Absent agreement, the parties may seek further directions from the Hearing Committee in writing respecting time to pay.

43. A Notice to the Profession is directed.

44. The exhibits and other hearing materials, transcripts, and this report will be available for public inspection, including providing copies of exhibits for a reasonable copy fee, although redactions will be made to preserve personal information, client confidentiality and solicitor-client privilege (Rule 98(3)).

Dated at Edmonton, Alberta, June 25, 2019.

_____

Nathan Whitling

_____

Glen Buick

_____

Jodi Edmunds

[Note: An erratum was issued on January 30, 2020, to add the citation to an appeal decision in paragraph 15 and refer to the appeal decision in paragraph 27.]

Appendix A

IN THE MATTER OF *THE LEGAL PROFESSION ACT*

AND

IN THE MATTER OF A HEARING REGARDING THE CONDUCT OF

IVIE IHENSEKHIEN-ERAGA

STUDENT-AT-LAW

STATEMENT OF ADMITTED FACTS AND ADMISSION OF GUILT

BACKGROUND

1. I was born in Nigeria on […]. I attended law school in Nigeria and was admitted to the Nigerian Bar on March 23, 1995.

2. I practised law in Nigeria from 1995 to September 2013. During that time, I practiced in various settings, including private practice, civil service, and criminal prosecutor.

3. My present status with the Law Society of Alberta ("the LSA") is student-at-law.

4. I am presently articling with [MJ] in Edmonton, Alberta.

CITATIONS

5. On May 15, 2018, the Conduct Committee Panel referred the following conduct to hearing:

    1. It is alleged that Ivie Ihensekhien-Eraga failed to be candid with the Law Society and that such conduct is deserving of sanction.

FACTS

5. I immigrated to Canada on August 30, 2012 with my four children and my partner. I worked for two years in Ontario as a legal assistant. In August of 2014 I moved with my family to Edmonton where I did a two-year paralegal diploma at CDI college. In June of 2016 I began my NCA examinations.

6. On April 7, 2017 I received my NCA qualification confirming that my legal education and training is comparable to that provided by an approved faculty of law in Canada.

7. I articled with [YZ] from May 23, 2017 to July 23, 2017. I articled with [SF] from August 21, 2017 to November 30, 2017. On March 19, 2018 I began articles with [MJ]. As of October 10, 2018, I will have completed my 12 months of articles.

8. On May 29, 2017 I applied to the Law Society of Alberta ("the LSA") to have my articles reduced to a three-month term based on my experience in Nigeria as a lawyer and my experience in Canada as a legal assistant and paralegal. I later withdrew that application but renewed it on August 9, 2017 before asking that it be suspended on August 17th. On September 22, 2017 I asked that my application for reduced articles be reopened.

9. On November 15, 2017, the Membership department of the LSA ("the Membership department") sent me an email requesting that I provide a letter from my principal [SF] confirming that he supported my request to modify the articling requirement. I replied by email that day indicating that my principal was not prepared to write the letter. I went on to say that I wanted to provide some of my written work to the LSA in support of my application for the reduced articling period.

10. On November 16, 2017 I left a voice message with the Membership department in which I advised that I would be forwarding a Factum I just completed to show the kind of work I do and that I am competent. Later that day, I emailed a Factum ("the Factum") to the Membership department with an email that stated in part:

> *I am emailing you a written Factum, I just completed today to print to the Manager only, just to let her know I am very hard working student with [SF] and I really want to stay with him, if he will allow me to. If not, I want modification to about 6 months articling period. I will request that the document should be shrewd or torn away because of confidentiality. I just want to prove the kind of good work I have been trained at as a student here at [F&S], which will go a long way to help me stand on my own.*

11. I did not prepare the Factum. The Factum was prepared by A.K., a lawyer whom [SF] retained after finding my three attempts to draft a factum unsatisfactory. I obtained a copy of the Factum prepared by A.K. on November 16, 2017 when I was asked by [SF]'s legal assistant to print off the cases listed as Authorities in the Factum.

12. On November 30, 2017 I sent an email to the Membership department indicating that my articles with [SF] were ending on that date. In this email I also stated, "*I am the true writer of the factum I sent the law society."*

13. Also on November 30, 2017, I was asked to respond to a Rule 85 memo from the LSA conduct department ("the Conduct department") outlining concerns regarding the authorship of the Factum. In my response to the Conduct department on that date I stated the following:

> *In [F&S], we as student are given work to do, I do the research on the files, write the first draft to my principal, he vet it and guide me accordingly. I then work on them for submission to the legal assistant. The legal assistant sometimes as in this factum add to it and let me know what I left out. I prepare the trial binder, print out all the relevant cases attached them for filing. Most of the factum was done by me, if the legal assistant did it, the changes was not obvious as the cases I printed out to support the factum was done by me.*

14. On December 8, 2017 I sent an email to the Conduct department in which I stated that I was not the only creator of the Factum as [SF] told me that the legal assistant had made amendments to it which I failed to notice before it was printed. I repeated these comments in a December 11, 2017 email to the LSA.

15. On January 10, 2018 I left a message with an LSA investigator in which I made the following statements:

- *The issue of the Factum, I cannot lie to the Law Society. I am the original maker of the Factum and I know what Factum is about.*
- *It's something I know, it's something I wrote myself.*
- *So I'm not lying, I'm honest, I'm an honest person.*
- *I was a crown counsel in Nigeria, I know the implications when you lie to the Law Society of your jurisdiction*

16. I was interviewed by an LSA investigator on January 11, 2018. During that interview, I continued to insist that I was the author of the Factum and in support I provided him with what I said were three drafts of the Factum created by me and purported to be dated October 13, October 20, and November 1, 2017. In fact, the dates on the drafts were fictitious. I created these drafts after November 1, 2017 and provided them to the investigator in an attempt to mislead him into believing I was the author of the Factum. I created the drafts by taking the Factum created by A.K., redacting some sections and adding some additional comments in the first draft and then in the later drafts adding the redacted portions back in and taking the additional comments out to arrive at A.K.'s final draft.

17. On January 12, 2018 I wrote to the Membership department asking to withdraw the Factum from my application.

18. On February 2, 2018, I was interviewed again by the LSA investigator. In this interview I initially insisted that I was the author of the Factum. The Investigator then showed me proof that I could not have created the October 13, 2017 draft on that date as the transcripts which it quoted had not yet been received by the office. I then admitted that I was not the author of the Factum and that I had failed to be candid with the LSA on the following occasions:

- The November 16, 2017 phone call and email to the Membership department
- The November 30, 2017 email to the Membership department
- The December 8, 2017 email to the Conduct department
- The January 10, 2018 telephone message to the LSA investigator
- The January 11, 2018 interview with the LSA investigator.

19. On February 2, 2018 I sent a letter to the Conduct department in which I stated that I had not been truthful with the Law Society with regards to the Factum.

ADMISSION OF FACTS AND GUILT

20. I admit as facts the statements in this Statement of Admitted Facts and Admission of Guilt for the purposes of these proceedings.

21. I admit that I failed to be candid with the Law Society and that such conduct is deserving of sanction.

22. For the purposes of section 60 of the *Legal Profession Act,* I admit my guilt to the above conduct.

23. I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to consult legal counsel and provide this Statement of Admitted Facts and Admission of Guilt on a voluntary basis.

THIS STATEMENT OF ADMITTED FACTS AND ADMISSION OF GUILT IS MADE THIS 19th DAY OF October, 2018.

"Ivie Ihensekhien-Eraga"
IVIE IHENSEKHIEN-ERAGA