



The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

The Council of the Inns of Court

Disciplinary Tribunal

Mr Navjot Sidhu KC

Called to the Bar by: Lincoln's Inn, November, 1993

Type of hearing: 5 Person Disciplinary Tribunal

Date of decision: 9 December 2024

In breach of:

Charge 2

Statement of Offence

Professional misconduct contrary to Core Duty 5 of the Code of Conduct of the Bar of England and Wales (9th Edition), contained in Part 2 of the Bar Standards Handbook (Version 3.4)

Particulars of Offence

Mr Navjot Sidhu KC, a barrister, acted in a way likely to diminish the trust and confidence which the public places in him or the profession, in that, on or around 26 November 2018, whilst in a position of trust, he invited Person 2 to stay overnight in his hotel room and in his hotel bed, during a mini-pupillage or work shadowing experience, such conduct being of a sexual nature, and which invitation he knew or ought to have known was inappropriate and/or unwanted, in circumstances:

- (a) He told Person 2 that due to confidentiality they needed the privacy of his hotel bedroom to work on the case;

The Bar Tribunals & Adjudication Service

9 Gray's Inn Square,
London
WC1R 5JD
T: 020 3432 7350
E: info@tbtas.org.uk

The Council of the Inns of Court. Limited by Guarantee
Company Number: 8804708
Charity Number: 1155640
Registered Office:
9 Gray's Inn Square, London WC1R 5JD

- (b) He made the invitation to stay when they were alone together in the bedroom;
- (c) He made the invitation to her late in the evening;
- (d) He was aware that Person 2 was staying away from her home city in order to attend a criminal trial in which he was counsel for one of the parties;
- (e) He was in a position of professional seniority to Person 2;
- (f) He was senior to Person 2 in age;
- (g) There was a power imbalance between him and Person 2 in his favour;
- (h) He had originally initiated contact with Person 2 via the professional social networking website LinkedIn by sending her an unsolicited message;
- (i) He was aware that Person 2:
 - (i) was in her 20's;
 - (ii) was working as a paralegal;
 - (iii) was contemplating and/or had contemplated coming to the Bar;
 - (iv) had sought his professional and career advice;
 - (v) had sought his assistance with her CV;
 - (vi) had sought his assistance with an application for a mini-pupillage;
- (j) He had told and/or encouraged Person 2 to apply for a mini-pupillage
- (k) He had provided Person 2 with assistance with her application for a mini-pupillage;
- (l) He had made communications and arrangements with Person 2 which, wholly or in part, had given Person 2 reasonable cause to believe that Mr Sidhu KC was in charge of her mini-pupillage;
- (m) His professional responsibility was engaged towards Person 2 as a result of the work shadowing arrangement;
- (n) He had arranged for Person 2 to attend court and shadow him in a criminal trial;

- (o) Despite Person 2 stating that she wished to and/or should leave the hotel room, he:
 - (i) encouraged Person 2 to stay in the hotel room;
 - (ii) changed out of his day clothes into pyjamas or bed clothes;
 - (iii) placed pillows on the bed and said, “These will act as a barricade,” or words to that effect;
 - (iv) insisted that Person 2 should sleep on the bed with him rather than on the sofa in the hotel room;
 - (v) He knew or ought to have known that his invitation to Person 2 to stay overnight in the hotel room and in his hotel bed was inappropriate and/or unwanted.

Charge 4

Statement of Offence

Professional misconduct contrary to Core Duty 5 of the Code of Conduct of the Bar of England and Wales (9th Edition), contained in Part 2 of the Bar Standards Handbook (Version 3.4)

Particulars of Offence

Mr Navjot Sidhu KC, a barrister, acted in a way likely to diminish the trust and confidence which the public places in him or the profession, in that, on or around 26 November 2018, whilst in a position of trust, he behaved as follows towards Person 2, who was undertaking a mini-pupillage or work shadowing experience, despite Person 2 stating that she wished to and/or should leave the hotel room, he

- (a) changed out of his day clothes into pyjamas or bed clothes;
- (b) placed pillows on the bed and said, “These will act as a barricade,” or words to that effect;
- (c) insisted that Person 2 should sleep on the bed with him rather than on the sofa in the hotel room which conduct being of a sexual nature and which he knew or ought to have known was inappropriate and/or unwanted in circumstances where:

- (d) He had told Person 2 that due to confidentiality they needed the privacy of his hotel bedroom to work on the case;
- (e) He initiated sexual contact with Person 2 when they were alone together in the bedroom;
- (f) He knew or ought to have known that Person 2 did not wish to engage in sexual activity with him;
- (g) He knew or ought to have known that sexual activity was inappropriate between them;
- (h) He initiated sexual contact with Person 2 late in the evening;
- (i) He was aware that Person 2 was staying away from her home city in order to attend a criminal trial in which he was counsel for one of the parties;
- (j) He was in a position of professional seniority to Person 2;
- (k) He was senior to Person 2 in age;
- (l) There was a power imbalance between him and Person 2 in his favour;
- (m) He had originally initiated contact with Person 2 via the professional social networking website LinkedIn by sending her an unsolicited message;
- (n) He was aware that Person 2:
 - (i) was in her 20's
 - (ii) was working as a paralegal;
 - (iii) was contemplating and/or had contemplated coming to the Bar;
 - (iv) had sought his professional and career advice;
 - (v) had sought his assistance with her CV;
 - (vi) had sought his assistance with an application for a mini-pupillage;
- (o) He had told and/or encouraged Person 2 to apply for a mini-pupillage;
- (p) He had provided Person 2 with assistance with her application for a mini-pupillage;

- (q) He had made communications and arrangements with Person 2 which, wholly or in part, had given Person 2 reasonable cause to believe that Mr Sidhu KC was in charge of her mini-pupillage;
- (r) His professional responsibility was engaged towards Person 2 as a result of the work shadowing arrangement;
- (s) He had arranged for Person 2 to attend court and shadow him in a criminal trial.

Charge 6

Statement of Offence

Professional misconduct contrary to Core Duty 5 of the Code of Conduct of the Bar of England and Wales (9th Edition), contained in Part 2 of the Bar Standards Handbook (Version 3.4)

Particulars of Offence

Mr Navjot Sidhu KC, a barrister and BSB regulated person, acted in a way likely to diminish the trust and confidence which the public places in him or the profession, in that, on or around 26 November 2018, whilst in a position of trust, he initiated sexual contact with Person 2, during a mini-pupillage or work shadowing experience, which initiation of sexual contact he knew or ought to have known was inappropriate and/or unwanted, in circumstances where:

- (a) He told Person 2 that due to confidentiality they needed the privacy of his hotel bedroom to work on the case;
- (b) He initiated sexual contact with Person 2 when they were alone together in the bedroom;
- (c) He knew or ought to have known that Person 2 did not want him to initiate sexual contact with her;
- (d) He knew or ought to have known that Person 2 did not wish to engage in sexual activity with him;
- (e) He knew or ought to have known that sexual activity was inappropriate between them;
- (f) He initiated sexual contact with Person 2 late in the evening;
- (g) He was aware that Person 2 was staying away from her home city in order to attend a criminal trial in which he was counsel for one of the parties;

- (h) He was in a position of professional seniority to Person 2;
- (i) He was senior to Person 2 in age;
- (j) There was a power imbalance between him and Person 2 in his favour;
- (k) He had originally initiated contact with Person 2 via the professional social networking website LinkedIn by sending her an unsolicited message;
- (l) He was aware that Person 2:
 - (i) was in her 20's;
 - (ii) was working as a paralegal;
 - (iii) was contemplating and/or had contemplated coming to the Bar;
 - (iv) had sought his professional and career advice;
 - (v) had sought his assistance with her CV;
 - (vi) had sought his assistance with an application for a mini-pupillage;
- (m) He had told and/or encouraged Person 2 to apply for a mini-pupillage;
- (n) He had provided Person 2 with assistance with her application for a mini-pupillage;
- (o) He had made communications and arrangements with Person 2 which, wholly or in part, had given Person 2 reasonable cause to believe that Mr Sidhu KC was in charge of her mini-pupillage;
- (p) His professional responsibility was engaged towards Person 2 as a result of the work shadowing arrangement;
- (q) He had arranged for Person 2 to attend court and shadow him in a criminal trial;
- (r) Despite Person 2 stating that she wished to and/or should leave the hotel room, he had:
 - (i) encouraged Person 2 to stay in the hotel room;
 - (ii) changed out of his day clothes into pyjamas or bed clothes;

- (iii) placed pillows on the bed and said, “These will act as a barricade,” or words to that effect;
- (iv) insisted that Person 2 should sleep on the bed with him rather than on the sofa in the hotel room.

Findings:

Case no. 2023/0348	
Charge 2	Dismissed
Case no. 2023/0347	
Charge 2	Proved
Charge 4	Proved
Charge 6	Proved
Charge 8	Dismissed
Charge 10	Dismissed
Case no. 2023/0349	
Charge 2	Dismissed
Charge 4	Dismissed
Charge 6	Dismissed
Charge 8	Dismissed
Charge 10	Dismissed
Charge 12	Dismissed
Charge 13	Dismissed
Charge 14	Dismissed
Charge 16	Dismissed

Sanction:

Disbarred and BSB not to issue a practising certificate pending any appeal.

No order for costs.