

The decision and reasons of the Regulatory Assessor for the case of Mr Tim John Newman FCCA and SRG Newmans Limited and SRG Newmans Holdings Limited referred to him by ACCA on 15 October 2025.

Introduction

1. SRG Newmans Limited and SRG Newmans Holdings Limited are sole incorporated practices of ACCA audit-qualified member, Mr Tim John Newman FCCA, and are herein together referred to as “the firm.” SRG Holdings Limited owns 100% of the shareholding in SRG Newmans Limited and is audit-registered; however, it does not hold any audit appointments. I have considered a report, including ACCA’s recommendation, together with related correspondence, concerning Mr Newman’s conduct of audit work.

Basis and reasons for the decision

2. I have considered all of the evidence in the booklet sent to me, including related correspondence and the action plan prepared and submitted by the firm since the monitoring visit.
3. In reaching my decision, I have made the following findings of fact:
 - a Mr Newman has been the subject of seven audit quality monitoring reviews;
 - b At his first monitoring review held during January 1996, on the file inspected the firm’s work appeared to be of a reasonable standard and the firm’s procedures to be appropriate to its circumstances and to the nature and size of its audit clients. Some deficiencies were found, and these were included in a report sent to the firm in February 1996. The firm acknowledged receipt of the report in a letter dated February 1996;
 - c At the second review held during March 2002 the compliance officer found that the firm’s work had deteriorated. There were serious deficiencies in the audit work on one of the three audit files inspected. The compliance officer also informed the firm of some significant deficiencies found in its work on the report to the Law Society on its solicitor client. As a result, the overall outcome of this review was unsatisfactory. The report was sent to the firm in March 2002 and set out the

deficiencies and contained guidance on how the firm might remedy the deficiencies found. The compliance officer warned the firm that failure to make the necessary improvements may jeopardise the firm's continuing audit registration. Mr Newman acknowledged receipt of this report in a letter dated April 2002 and confirmed that he will be dealing with issues raised in the report;

- d At the third review held during July 2005, the compliance officer found that the standard of the firm's audit work had improved, and the outcome of the review was satisfactory. There were some deficiencies however, and these were included in the report sent to the firm in October 2005. Mr Newman acknowledged receipt of this report in a letter in November 2005 and confirmed that he will be dealing with issues raised in the report;
- e The fourth and fifth reviews took place during October 2011 and October 2017. At each review, the compliance officer concluded that while the overall outcome of the audit work was satisfactory, there were weaknesses in both the performance and the documentation of the work. Reports were sent to Mr. Newman in November 2011 and October 2017, respectively. Mr. Newman acknowledged receipt of the fourth review report in a letter dated November 2011, confirming that he would address the issues raised. For the fifth review, Mr. Newman provided an action plan in November 2017, setting out the remedial action the firm was taking;
- f At the sixth review, conducted during October 2021, the compliance officer found that the firm's audit work was not of a consistent standard. Although the overall outcome of the review was deemed satisfactory, one of the two audit files inspected contained an audit opinion that was not adequately supported by the work performed and documented. A report outlining the deficiencies was issued to the firm in October 2021. The firm was warned that improvements in audit quality would be required at the next monitoring review and that failure to achieve this could jeopardise its continued audit registration. The firm acknowledged receipt of the report and submitted a detailed action plan in November 2021;
- g At the seventh review, conducted during September 2025, the compliance officer found that the firm had not made significant improvements in its audit work. Two of the firm's audit clients were selected for inspection, including one that had

previously been assessed as unsatisfactory. While one audit file was of a reasonable standard, no meaningful improvement was evident in the file previously identified as deficient. As a result, the overall outcome of the review was deemed unsatisfactory;

- h Although the firm had documented quality control policies, these were not fully effective, particularly in the areas of engagement performance and monitoring, in ensuring that audit work was performed in accordance with ISAs and that reports issued by the firm were appropriate in the circumstances, as reflected in the file inspection findings noted above;
- i Two of the seven audit monitoring reviews had unsatisfactory outcomes;
- j The firm provided an action plan following the fourth, fifth and sixth reviews: these action plans have not proven effective in the firm attaining and sustaining a satisfactory standard of audit work;
- k The firm has failed to achieve a consistently satisfactory outcome in spite of the advice and warnings given at the previous reviews.

The decision

- 4. On the basis of the above I have decided pursuant to Authorisation Regulations 7(2)(f) and 7(3)(b) that Mr Newman should be required to:
 - i. be subject to an accelerated monitoring visit before 31 December 2026 at a cost to the firm of £1,500 and £650 (plus VAT at the prevailing rate) for each additional audit qualified principal; and
 - ii. note that failure to make the necessary improvements in the level of compliance with auditing standards by that time will jeopardise his and his firm's continuing audit registration.

Publicity

- 5. Authorisation Regulation 7(6) indicates that all conditions relating to the certificates of Mr Newman and his firm made under Regulation 7(2) may be published as soon as practicable, subject to any directions given by me.

4. I have considered the submissions, if any, made by Mr Newman regarding publicity of any decision I may make pursuant to Authorisation Regulation 7(2). I do not find that there are exceptional circumstances in this case that would justify non-publication of my decision to impose conditions and/or the omission of the names of Mr Newman and his firm from that publicity.

5. I therefore direct pursuant to Authorisation Regulation 7(6)(a), that a news release be issued to ACCA's website referring to Mr Newman and his firm by name.

**David Sloggett FCCA
Regulatory Assessor
22 December 2025**