HEARING

ADMISSIONS AND LICENSING COMMITTEE OF THE ASSOCIATION OF CHARTERED CERTIFIED ACCOUNTANTS

REASONS FOR DECISION

In the matter of:	**Mr David Ronald Sloggett & Sloggetts Limited**
Heard on:	**Thursday, 23 July 2026**
Location:	**Microsoft Teams**
Committee:	**Ms Valerie Paterson (Chair)** **Mr Ryan Moore (Accountant – Preliminary Hearing)** **Mr Martin Ellis (Accountant – Substantive Hearing)** **Ms Victoria Smith (Lay)**
Legal Adviser:	**Mr Elliott Kenton**
Persons present and capacity:	**Mr David Ronald Sloggett (ACCA** **Ms Joanna La Roche (ACCA Case Presenter)** **Miss Nicole Boateng (Hearings Officer)**
Summary	**Withdrawal of audit certificates with immediate effect for: (1) Mr David Ronald Sloggett (2) Sloggetts Limited**

INTRODUCTION

1. The Admissions and Licensing Committee of ACCA (the “Committee”) convened to consider a Report relating to David Ronald Sloggett and Sloggetts Limited.

2. The Committee had before it a Bundle of documents (36 pages) and a Service Bundle (13 pages).

3. At the outset of the hearing, it was identified that there was a potential for a conflict of interest with Mr Ryan Moore, the accountant member of the Committee. The conflict of interest was determined by way of a preliminary matter.

4. Mr Sloggett identified that both he and Mr Moore were the sole two accountant members of the Audit Monitoring Committee (AMC) of ACCA. The AMC constituted one accountant member and one lay member who would review audit files with "unsatisfactory" gradings. Mr Sloggett stated that he and Mr Moore had undertaken online training together.

5. Mr Moore confirmed to other members of the Committee that both he and Mr Sloggett were accountant members of the AMC and he recalled that they had performed online training together on two occasions, which was in November 2020 and April 2025. Mr Moore stated that aside from being appointed onto the same ACCA committee, he was not aware of any contact with Mr Sloggett on any other professional basis.

6. Mr Sloggett also identified that when Mr Moore first joined the AMC, he was a lay observer to Mr Sloggett's AMC meeting. Mr Sloggett confirmed he did not have concerns relating to the independence of the hearing or the integrity of Mr Moore.

7. Ms La Roche on behalf of ACCA submitted to the Committee that a mere professional knowledge of an individual does not amount to a conflict of interest.

8. Further questions were asked by the Committee in relation to the AMC function. Mr Moore outlined that within the AMC, two committee members meet (one accountant and one lay member) and usually conduct a review of an audit inspection prepared by ACCA staff. The AMC does not have powers to suspend / withdraw or impose conditions on an auditing certificate.

9. Due to the anonymous selection criteria, Mr Moore could not say definitively whether Mr Sloggett's or his firm's review, which are the subject to the hearing would have been put before the AMC. Mr Moore confirmed that neither Mr Sloggett nor Mr Sloggett's firm had been selected for review in a committee which he had sat on. ACCA's detailed findings on Mr Sloggett and Sloggetts Limited, within the substantive Bundle had only been seen by Mr Moore prior to the hearing, with Mr Moore substituting for another accountant member originally listed.

DETERMINATION OF PRELIMINARY MATTERS

10. The Committee considered the submissions of the parties and accepted the advice provided by the Legal Adviser.

11. The Committee was satisfied that there was no actual conflict of interest in this case. It did not consider that Mr Moore had an interest which might influence his judgement in the hearing where he could be biased. It was clear from the submissions, that whilst Mr Moore and Mr Sloggett were members of the AMC critically they did not work together within this Committee. The Committee accepted that they had been together on two occasions in training, but this was not proximate enough to influence Mr Moore's decision making.

12. Having determined that there was no actual conflict, the Committee next considered whether there could be a perception of a conflict of interest and / or perception of bias The Committee was satisfied that there was a perception of a conflict of interest and / or perception of bias in this case. Notwithstanding that they did not work together, Mr Moore and Mr Sloggett were the only two accountant members of the AMC. Therefore, they were discharging their regulatory functions together. The AMC role that Mr Moore and Mr Sloggett perform is directly involved in the substantive matters to be decided by the Committee at this hearing.

13. Therefore, the Committee considered that objectively, a well-informed member of the public would question whether Mr Moore's integrity in hearing Mr Sloggett's case could be compromised and would consider Mr Moore was not sufficiently independent. It followed that the Committee was satisfied that there was a perception of a conflict of interest and / or perception of bias.

ADJOURNMENT AND RESUMPTION OF HEARING

14. Having considered that there was a perception of a conflict of interest and / or a perception of bias, the Committee determined that it would not continue to sit as presently constituted and directed that the hearing would be adjourned.

15. Following the adjournment, it was identified by ACCA that they had an accountant member available in order for the hearing to resume. It was decided that the hearing would resume with Mr Martin Ellis as the new accountant member.

APPLICATION/BRIEF BACKGROUND

16. The case as set out in the papers is as follows:

    a. Sloggetts Limited (the firm) is the incorporated practice of ACCA member, Mr David Ronald Sloggett. A firm's audit review took place on 9 May 2024. The firm has one charity audit client, which was the only audit file that was inspected.

    b. At the first audit monitoring review on 9 May 2024, there were some significant deficiencies identified in the firm's audit work and so the Compliance Officer concluded that the files reviewed did not show that the firm had obtained sufficient audit evidence to support the audit opinions. The firm was sent details of the findings and put on a 2-year review cycle.

    c. At the second audit monitoring review on 19 March 2026, the compliance officer found that the firm had not maintained effective audit procedures, and that the standard of audit work had deteriorated significantly. The firm had failed to implement the action plan it had previously committed to and did not have adequate procedures in place to ensure compliance with the International Standards on Auditing (UK & Ireland). Significant deficiencies were identified in the audit file inspected, with the result that the audit opinion issued was not adequately supported by the work performed and recorded. As a result, the overall outcome of the monitoring review was unsatisfactory.

d. ACCA has referred the standard of Mr Sloggett's audit work for the Committee's consideration. This follows the approach set out in PS9.5 of the Regulatory Board Policy Statement ('PS') and paragraphs 6.3.3 and 6.3.4 of the Regulatory Guidance, based on the following relevant facts:

   i. Mr Sloggett has had two audit monitoring reviews.

   ii. The previous review had an 'unsatisfactory' outcome.

   iii. There was no improvement to the standard of audit work after the 'unsatisfactory' review (firm's first review), and it appears that since the last review there has been a deterioration in audit quality which led to significant deficiencies in the audit work documented at the firm's second review.

e. In its written submissions, ACCA considered that the Committee should impose conditions on Mr Sloggett's practising certificate which was for there to be an early re-review at his firm's cost which should take place within one year to 18 months of the previous monitoring reviewing order to assess the improvement in Mr Sloggett's work.

f. The Committee should also note that ACCA had requested that the firm produce an 'action plan' to explain how it intended to improve the standard of its audit work. Mr Sloggett had written to ACCA asking that he retain his audit licence but had suggested resigning from his one audit client and not taking on any further audit clients. Mr Sloggett had stated that in these circumstances, without any audit clients, an action plan was 'superfluous'.

SUBMISSIONS AND EVIDENCE

Member's submissions

17. At the outset of the hearing, Mr Sloggett identified that he had resigned from his single audit client and had declined an offer to work for another audit client. However, he stated that he wanted to keep his audit certificate to continue his

role as a Regulatory Assessor for ACCA. Mr Sloggett confirmed that he would comply with any request for an action plan to be prepared by him.

ACCA's Submissions

18. Ms La Roche opened the case on behalf of ACCA. She referred the Committee to the background of the case, including the two audit monitoring reviews and the deficiencies identified in the second audit monitoring review on 19 March 2026. Ms La Roche submitted that Mr Sloggett and his firm had failed to comply with Regulation 13(c) of the Global Practising Regulations 2003 to apply all relevant assignments to the International Standards of Auditing, the International Standards on Quality Management and other applicable auditing standards.

19. Ms La Roche outlined that within each monitoring review, the firm should have produced an action plan. That action plan underpins the audit monitoring approach. Mr Sloggett has not provided an action plan and has resigned from his single audit client and therefore there is no indication of an improvement in his standards of practice. Ms La Roche submitted that this position is at odds with holding an audit certificate.

20. Ms La Roche referred the Committee to provisions of ACCA Regulatory Board Policy Statement and Regulatory Guidance – Audit Monitoring and ACCA's approach to non-compliance with auditing standards which provides guidance on the Committee's powers as set out in the Authorisation Regulations 2014 (as amended on 1 January 2025) (the "ARs").

21. Ms La Roche reminded the Committee of the presumption of competence and outlined that pursuant to PS3 3.2, ACCA adopts the position that the public is entitled to expect that an individual with an audit qualification who holds themselves out as available to provide audit services is competent to undertake that work. If a person falls significantly short of complying with the requirements of auditing standards, permitting them to continue auditing does not adequately protect the public.

22. Ms La Roche submitted that ACCA's primary position is that Mr Sloggett's and Sloggett Limited's audit certificates are withdrawn with immediate effect. Ms La

Roche submitted that in the alternative, conditions are imposed at Mr Sloggett's cost, which will take place within a year to 18 months. She further submitted that if conditions are imposed, the Committee would need to provide detailed reasons as to the conditions they consider proportionate.

23. Ms La Roche submitted that in relation to publicity, ACCA's position is that the order is published, along with the reasons for the Committee's decision. Ms La Roche outlined that there were limited exceptions in place to this general rule in relation to statutory auditors. Those limited exceptions related to adverse impact on the interests of third parties, adverse impact on health or safety of the member, or public interest considerations. Ms La Roche submitted that none of these limited exceptions were present in this case.

Mr Sloggett's Evidence

24. Mr Sloggett elected to give evidence at the hearing. He told the Committee that he was a very experienced auditor and had had up to five monitoring visits whilst at other firms. All of these previous visits were satisfactory. Mr Sloggett gave evidence that he did not refuse to provide an action plan but had previously said in correspondence that it was "superfluous" as he wanted to resign from his audit client.

25. Mr Sloggett said that he should have been more forthcoming with the SEO during the previous monitoring review as Mr Sloggett did not agree with his findings. He referred the Committee to the grading system which had recently changed which makes it easier to receive a lower grade.

26. Mr Sloggett outlined that he does not intend to retain audit clients, but he wants to keep his audit registration, as he wants to continue to practise as a Regulatory Assessor. He explained to the Committee that he has been involved in various panels, committees and groups within ACCA since 2001. Mr Sloggett said that he could still have conditions imposed against him notwithstanding his resignation from his audit client as ACCA could still have a monitoring function.

27. Mr Sloggett said that he still undertook Continuing Professional Development ("CPD") training and had undertaken two audit related CPD courses since April 2026.

28. Mr Sloggett challenged ACCA's submissions in relation to publicity. He told the Committee that there could be an impact on his former charity client and this could also put ACCA in a conflict position given his role as a Regulatory Assessor.

DECISION ON APPLICATION AND REASONS

29. The Committee considered the written submissions within the bundle, the oral submissions from Ms La Roche, the evidence from Mr Sloggett and the advice from the Legal Adviser. It took account of ACCA's 'Guidance for Admissions and Licensing Committee' and 'Guidance for Regulatory Orders'.

30. The Committee noted Mr Sloggett's evidence that he was an extremely experienced member with an audit qualification. It noted that he held separate regulatory functions with ACCA relating to audit quality control including as a Regulatory Assessor and as an accountant member of AMC. It considered this made Mr Sloggett's own auditing failures very significant. It also found that Mr Sloggett had had a previous opportunity in his first auditing monitoring review to make improvements, but the second auditing monitoring review report demonstrated that there were systemic failures in his audit, with a deterioration of audit quality.

31. The Committee noted Mr Sloggett's submission that he had resigned from his audit client, and conditions on his audit practice could be appropriate. However, the Committee having considered whether to impose conditions did not consider that there were any conditions that would be practical, workable, measurable and proportionate. In these circumstances ACCA would be unable to perform a monitoring function with conditions that would adequately protect the public.

32. The Committee considered their powers of suspension in connection with Mr Sloggett and Sloggett Limited's audit practice certificates. It took into account Mr Sloggett's repeated failure to undertake an action plan and noted that there was no evidence on what he had undertaken to remedy deficiencies identified in previous monitoring reviews. The Committee had regard to Mr Sloggett's failure to engage adequately with ACCA up until the date of the hearing. The

Committee took account of the absence of an action plan as requested by ACCA, two 'unsatisfactory' monitoring reviews with deterioration in audit quality being identified, demonstrating a lack of Mr Sloggett's engagement. The Committee determined that Mr Sloggett could not demonstrate the requisite competence therefore, a suspension of audit practice certificates was not appropriate as permitting Mr Sloggett to continue auditing after a period of suspension would not protect the public.

33. The Committee considered the only option available to them that would adequately address public protection was for withdrawal of the audit certificates. In respect of the effective date of the order, the Committee found that it would be in the interests of the public for the order to have immediate effect.

PUBLICITY

34. The Committee considered the written submissions within the bundle, and the submissions from Ms La Roche and Mr Sloggett. It accepted the advice from the Legal Adviser and took account of ACCA's 'Guidance on Publicity'.

35. The Committee noted that the general position was that the decision would be made public. The Committee did not consider that any of the exceptions were present in this particular case and considered it was in the public interest that the decision should be published. Therefore, they held that the decision should be published within the meaning of the ARs.

ORDER AND EFFECTIVE DATE OF ORDER

36. It is ordered as follows:

The audit certificates are withdrawn with immediate effect relating to:

1) Mr David Ronald Sloggett;
2) Sloggetts Limited

Ms Valerie Paterson
Chair
3 August 2026