

## When lawyers aren't too sure about law enforcement

Published: January 13, 2026, 10:17 am

---

I [referred yesterday](#) to the press release issued by law firm Pinsent Masons that suggested HMRC had increased its tax recovery from affluent people by 60% but that this still left it at a pitifully low level.

I noticed this morning that some of the tax press had picked up another feature of what Pinsent Masons had to say. As [International Adviser noted](#):

*The London-headquartered law firm said that, while the money raised through compliance should be welcomed, HMRC needs to carefully weigh up the benefits of increased investigations against potentially damaging effects on the economy.*

*[Pinsent Masons spokesperson] Bullock added: "The apparent disappearance of the proposed strict liability offence of offshore tax evasion are hopeful signs that HMRC is getting the message on this front."*

I [have already commented this morning](#) on the FT's concern that action on Greece should not "frighten the market". Here we have another example of the same attitude. A firm of lawyers is quite clearly advocating a light touch approach to law enforcement because, it is implying, making sure that the law is complied with might "have damaging effects on the economy". Or, to put it another way, their clients might have to pay what they owe.

This is another case where it is clear that the financial elite are saying that whatever parliament may decide, and whatever the law might be, the reality is that the interests of wealth must prevail. It's not even subtle in saying so.

When lawyers aren't too sure about law enforcement, preferring instead the interests of a wealthy elite, we need to worry.