



Type of Order:	DISCIPLINARY CONSENT ORDER
Date of Order:	10 March 2026
Committee name:	REGULATION AND CONDUCT COMMITTEE (the Committee)
Details of IP:	Myles Jacobson of London, an Insolvency Practitioners Association (IPA) Member and Licensed Insolvency Practitioner (IP).
Summary of complaint:	<p>An Order has been made in relation to an allegation that Myles Jacobson in his role as office holder in corporate and personal insolvency appointments breached the Fundamental Principle of Professional Competence and Due Care of the Insolvency Code of Ethics, when he:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>Failed to send no less than 260 progress reports to creditors, and/or members, in contravention</li><li>on of the Insolvency Rules 2016 18.6(4), 18.7(6), 18.8(5) and 18.8(6).</li><li>Failed to file no less than 260 progress reports at Companies House, in a timely manner or at all, in contravention of the Insolvency Rules 2016 18.6(4), 18.7(6), and 18.8(5).</li></ol> <p>Accordingly, Myles Jacobson was found liable to disciplinary action under the IPA's Articles of Association.</p>
Summary of sanctions:	<p>The Committee concluded that the conduct fell within the "very serious" category of the Common Sanctions Guidance ("CSG") because preparing and filings reports was a fundamental part of an IP's role to keep creditors and interested parties informed of what is happening on a case. The number of cases affected was a substantial percentage of Mr Jacobson's caseload and the failings occurred over several years without being addressed.</p> <p>The CSG provides for potential exclusion and a fine of £7,500 as the starting point for a serious failure to comply with the Fundamental Principle of Professional Competence and Due Care.</p> <p>When considering an appropriate sanction, the Committee agreed that</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>There were no mitigating factors, and</li></ol>

2. The aggravating factors were;
  - a. Mr Jacobson knew that he did not have adequate resources, and
  - b. He continued taking new appointments, despite not having adequate resources to fulfil the fundamental requirements, and
  - c. The failings occurred across two firms, so was not solely a result of setting up a sole practice.

The Committee agreed that exclusion was not an appropriate sanction because Mr Jacobson had promptly accepted responsibility and implemented a plan to address the breach.

The Committee imposed a disciplinary order that Mr Jacobson be Severely Reprimanded and fined £15,000.