

IN THE SOUTH EASTERN & METROPOLITAN TRAFFIC AREA



TRAFFIC COMMISSIONER'S DECISION

COACH HIRE SURREY LIMITED

LICENCE NUMBER PK1135165

AND

NOMINATED TRANSPORT MANAGER – MR PAUL JONES

PUBLIC PASSENGER VEHICLES ACT 1981 (as amended)

Decision

1. Pursuant to adverse findings under Section 17(3)(e) of the Public Passenger Vehicles Act 1981, the Operator no longer meets the mandatory requirements under Section 14ZA(2) of the said Act, namely good repute, financial standing and professional competence. Accordingly, the Licence is revoked with effect from 23:45hrs on 28 February 2019.
2. Coach Hire Surrey Limited and Mr Paul Jones are disqualified from holding or obtaining an Operator's Licence or being involved in an entity that holds such a Licence as provided for by Section 28 of the Transport Act 1985 for a period of 10 years from 23:45hrs on 28 February 2019.
3. The operator failed to satisfy me that Mr Paul Jones meets the requirement for good repute as per Section 14ZA(3)(a).

Background

4. At the end of August 2018 David Harriss, who was the director and transport manager of the company, made a number of changes to the licence online including deleting himself as transport manager. Applications have subsequently been received to add Paul Jones (previously known as Adam Smith) as the new transport manager and initially to change operating centres. A further application was received to increase the authorisation to 5 vehicles. The Companies House record shows that David Harriss resigned as a director on 28 August 2018 and Paul Jones was appointed on 29 August 2018.
5. Mr Jones was convicted of possession of counterfeit currency in 2014 and this was not declared on the application forms. Mr Jones' explanation is that 'the previous owner' of the company completed the form and 'not myself'. The conviction was not declared on the transport manager and new director forms either, both of which Mr Jones signed. In respect of the conviction, Mr Jones claimed that he pleaded guilty to 1 offence but not the other 2 and no further action was taken over these. For the 1 offence he pleaded guilty to he was sentenced to 12 months in prison suspended for 18 months, ordered to do 120 hours community service and fined £600. He says that he has not committed any offence since but acknowledged that the Traffic Commissioner '*will take my conviction in a very dim light*'. Further to this he requests a public inquiry as that '*would be the only fair way for my case to be put across and after several instances in the past where she has only heard about me and never met me in person to ask any relevant questions I do feel this is now the only way to move forward.*'
6. On the new director questionnaire under 'Additional Information', Mr. Jones just stated that he worked as a 'manager' for Western Greyhound Ltd in Cornwall but the company went into administration after only 12 weeks of him being there and he stayed on to help the administrators secure the sale of most of the assets.
7. In 2015, Black Velvet Travel Ltd (PH1075733) and Western Greyhound Ltd (PH0006741) appeared at public inquiry and I, as the presiding Traffic Commissioner, decided to revoke the licences and make orders for disqualification. In that decision, I made reference to an Adam Paul Smith, also known as Paul Jones being a director of Black Velvet Travel between 1 August 2014 and 2 September 2014 and that he had been convicted of a serious offence on or around 2 September 2014. I heard evidence that Mr Smith/Jones continued after September 2014 to act as the 'owner of' both Black Velvet and Western Greyhound and I concluded that these entities were '*at the very least a joint enterprise by Mr Bishop and Mr Smith/Jones regardless of whom the named director was*'. Furthermore, I stated that the conviction declared by Mr Smith/Jones, though not meaning a 'mandatory bar to operator licensing... it is a conviction that will be subject to scrutiny by a Traffic Commissioner if Mr Smith/Jones sought to be involved in operator licensing.' If an application was made by Mr Smith/Jones then the Traffic Commissioner directed that this should be referred to her or another (Deputy) Traffic Commissioner.
8. In August 2013, a licence held by BETC Ltd (PK1120600) began and Adam Paul Smith was director up to 13 March 2014. In October 2014, a letter was received from a solicitor on behalf of the company stating that the company '*had become concerned regarding a series of events which have arisen out of the conduct*' of the company's licence and '*actions taken by a former director... both to discredit ...and damage its reputation.*' The solicitor went on to state that Mr. Smith remained as general manager at BETC Ltd after he had resigned as director until 31 July 2014 when he went to Black Velvet Travel. He says that the company had become '*concerned about Mr. Smith's conduct between March 2014 to July 2014 and it is currently investigating a number of allegations relating to the theft of vehicles, parts and money from the company.*'
9. In April 2014, Surrey ETC Ltd (PK1129141) applied for a licence and Adam Smith was 1 of 2 directors and the nominated transport manager. The application was to be considered at a public inquiry but the company subsequently withdrew the application. The company was dissolved in 2016.

10. Meritrule Ltd (PK0002520) and Classic Routemasters Ltd (PK1144925) were both called to a public inquiry in July 2018. At that inquiry, both the licences were revoked and disqualification orders were issued. This included the disqualification of Jane Jones (see above) for 10 years. I heard from the director of Classic Routemasters at the first hearing in April 2018 that Paul Jones was one of her 'colleagues' and that the major shareholder was now Jane Jones. There had also been loans from Hire Your Transport.Com and Meritrule. In respect of Meritrule, Jane Jones had asked that her son Paul Jones be allowed to be the point of contact for the licence and he had been in contact with the Central Licensing Office ("CLO") regarding several matters. The nominated transport manager for Classic Routemasters was Mark Warren. He said that he had been approached by Paul Jones in May 2017 as he was looking for a transport manager for 'a new venture.' He said he met Mrs Jones on 2 or 3 occasions but all future dealings were to be with Paul Jones. In making my decision I found that Mr Jones was the 'de facto and shadow director' and that again any application for a licence he makes etc... must be considered by a Traffic Commissioner and he will have to address these issues.
11. As part of that public inquiry I produced printouts from Hire Your Transport.com's Facebook page which advertises the hiring of drivers, coach hire and shows a coach in that company's livery.
12. In the light of these matters I decided to consider the company's licence and variation application at a public inquiry.

The Hearing

13. The Public Inquiry commenced and concluded on Thursday 13 December 2018 at the Tribunal Room, Office of the Traffic Commissioner, Ivy House, 3 Ivy Terrace, Eastbourne BN21 4QT. Mr Paul Jones attended, unrepresented.
14. I gave Mr Jones until the end of the following day to lodge any additional evidence that he wanted me to take into consideration and confirmed that thereafter I would issue a written decision.

Documents and Evidence

15. Before writing this written decision, I have considered the following.
 - (i) The Public Inquiry bundle.
 - (ii) Evidence of financial standing provided by Mr Jones.
 - (iii) Daily Echo report related to the Crown Court conviction of Adam Smith (now Paul Jones) dated 4 September 2014.
 - (iv) Bank statement received after the conclusion of the hearing
 - (v) South Bucks District Council and another V Porter(FC) (2004) UKHL33, English v Emery Reimbold & Strick Ltd [2002] EWCA Civ 605 and Bradley Fold Travel Limited & Peter Wright v Secretary of State for Transport [2010] EWCA Civ 695 in relation to written decisions generally.
 - (vi) Upper Tribunal Decisions and other guidance I consider relevant to this determination as listed elsewhere in this Decision.
 - (vii) The Senior Traffic Commissioner's Statutory Guidance and Statutory Directions issued January 2016 and 2017 (2017 version as the 2018 version was issued just before this hearing).

The Issues

16. There has been a material change in relation to this Operator since the Licence was granted on 12 February 2015, namely the involvement of Paul Jones. The Operator's good repute and professional competence now falls to be considered as provided for by Section 14ZA(2) and Schedule 3 of the Public Passenger Vehicles Act 1981.

Approach

17. There is clear and consistent case law from the Upper Tribunal that a Traffic Commissioner is entitled to treat the conduct of the Sole Director effectively as the conduct of the Limited Company and repute or fitness is determined accordingly. Such an approach has received approval from the appellate tribunal on a number of occasions, such as 2013/008 Vision Travel International Limited and 2013/61 Alan Michael Knight.
18. I remind myself that the onus is upon me and not the Operator and proposed Transport Manager in terms of adverse findings and regulatory action, if any. The case revolves around the genuineness and honesty of Mr Jones, trust lying at the heart of operator licensing.

CONSIDERATION AND FINDINGS

19. There are some cases where it is only necessary to set out the conduct in question to make it apparent that good repute is lost, a Licence should be revoked and an Operator put out of business, as per 2012/034 Martin Joseph Formby t/a G&G Transport, 2012/020 A+ Logistics Ltd. In the case before me, I set out the material facts and findings in the following paragraphs.
20. The chronology below is highly relevant, as it not only sets out the order of events but also their proximity to each other.

<u>2014</u>	
11 April 2014	Surrey ETC Ltd lodges application for 8 vehicle Licence, including Mr Jones as Director and Transport Manager.
18 June 2014	Application called to Public Inquiry to consider good repute, professional competence and financial standing.
1 August 2014	Adam Paul Smith purchases Black Velvet Travel Limited ("BVTL") and becomes Director. Shareholding never updated on Companies House. CLO not notified.
13 August 2014	Michael John Bishop appointed BVTL Director.
15 August 2014	Paul Thomas Jones pleads guilty on indictment: Count 1 and 2 'Passing a counterfeit currency note' and count 3 'Having custody or control of a counterfeit currency note'. Mr Jones 'spent' three counterfeit notes at the bar and put in a charity tin. In total he had possessed £9,600 in counterfeit currency. The Crown do not proceed with the more serious offence – which was denied – of intending to spend the balance.
26 August 2014	Surrey ETC Limited application withdrawn.
2 September 2014	Paul Thomas Jones (aka Adam Paul Smith) sentenced at Kingston-upon-Thames Crown Court under his "birth name". Sentenced to 16 months custodial suspended for 2 years plus 150 hours unpaid

	work before 2 September 2015 on count 1. There were concurrent suspended custodial sentences of 16 months on count 2 and 12 months on Count 3. Judge's sentencing remarks, as reported on 4 September 2014, include " <i>If I were to send you to prison then a number of people at Black Velvet would have their employment put in jeopardy</i> ". However, Mr Jones resigns as a director of BVTL today. CLO not notified. At the hearing, Mr Jones said that in fact Mr Bishop and a Mr Thomas were always the money behind BVTL and there was a joint decision to remove him as director because of the conviction. This of itself poses the question whether (a) the sentencing Judge in 2014 was materially misled as to the impact of a custodial sentence; and (b) if it was the same 'business associates' that he provided him with references for the sentencing hearing.
9 December 2014	M J Bishop appointed sole Director of Western Greyhound Limited ("WGL")
2015	
31 May 2015	M J Bishop resigns as BVTL Director.
9 November 2015	TC written decision re: BVTL and WGL. Paragraph 39 states: ' <i>If Mr Adam Paul Smith (also known as Paul Jones d.o.b 21 June 1983) applies to be involved in operator licensing in any guise in Great Britain in any guise, the application must be referred to a Traffic Commissioner or Deputy and cannot be determined under delegated authority.</i> '
2016	
26 February 2016	Deed Poll Adam Paul Smith becomes Paul Jones and same date Classic Routemasters Ltd incorporated by Miss Zetterlund (sole Director from 28 April 2016).
12 July 2016	Paul Jones incorporates Hireyourtransport.com and is sole Director.
26 July 2016	Jane Jones appointed sole Director Meritrule Limited. No Company bank account. (Remains sole Director except between 18 January 2018 and 18 April 2018 when Philip Bannister also Director.)
3 September 2016	Paul Jones 2-year custodial suspension concludes and rehabilitation period commences.
2018	
6 February 2018	Yourtransport Group Ltd incorporated. Jane Jones appointed sole Director.
14 March 2018	Original Public Inquiry Call-In Letter to Classic Route Masters Limited ("CRM") listed for 23 April 2018.
6 April 2018	Original Public Inquiry Call-In Letter to Meritrule listed for 22 May 2018.
23 April 2018	CRL Public Inquiry adjourned part-heard <i>inter alia</i> due to

	confirmation Paul Jones is a "colleague" who helped complete the Operator Licence application form. I direct that this Public Inquiry to be conjoined with the Meritrule hearing already listed for 22 May 2018.
1 May 2018	Paul Jones resigns as Hireyourtransport.com Director. Jane Jones appointed as Director.
9 May 2018	"Additional Matters" Letter to Meritrule for Public Inquiry.
22 May 2018	Public Inquiry CRM and Meritrule. Mr Jones in attendance. Adjourned with no evidence heard as the Solicitor withdrew due to potential conflicts of interest.
24 July 2018	Public Inquiry CRM and Meritrule reconvenes. Only the former Transport Manager (Mr Warren) attends. On 13/12/18, Mr Jones told me that he was not 'fussed' about attending as he had 'more important things to do over the summer'.
9 August 2018	I issue the written decision on Meritrule and CRM. Both Licences are revoked with immediate effect. The Companies, Miss Zetterlund and Mrs Jones are disqualified for a number of years. I repeat paragraph 39 of the BVTL/WGL decision. It also stated ' <i>..he will need to address all the concerns set out in this written decision as part of the process</i> '.t
29 August 2018	Paul Jones becomes sole Director of Coach Hire Surrey Limited ('CHSL').
30 August 2018	CLO in Leeds received application for Paul Jones to be the CHSL Transport Manager. The form does not declare "other employment" but the next day he becomes sole Director of Hireyourtransport.com again. He also fails to disclose his conviction but signs the TM1 form as accurate (pages 34 and 36 of the Public Inquiry bundle). Director questionnaire submitted online and again Mr Jones fails to disclose the 2014 conviction.
3 September 2018	VOL online David Harriss removed as Director. Paul Jones added as CHSL Director. VOL change history confirms those changes were made by Paul Jones.
11 November 2018	New Operating Centre granted but for existing authorisation only.
2 September 2020	Rehabilitation period ends.

21. As stated above, the case revolves around the honesty and integrity of Mr Jones, trust lying at the heart of the operator-licensing regime.

22. The letter from Mr Jones to CLO dated 1 November 2018 (page 58/59 of the bundle) is confrontational and more akin to pre action inter-partes correspondence. At the hearing, Mr Jones represented the Licence holder as if the operator licensing regime was on trial and the traffic commissioners a party to that litigation. In the circumstances of the case, I find this was a tactic to try to deflect from dealing properly with the above history. By way of example:

- i) He insisted on putting on the record as soon as the case opened that he had requested the public inquiry. The request was already in the hearing bundle.
- ii) Mr Jones failed to lodge evidence of financial standing in the prescribed manner by the call in deadline. He was intractable when I demonstrated at the hearing why it still did not meet the requirements of the STC's Statutory Document No 2. He presented as if I was being difficult with him rather than abiding by the Statutory Guidance to which I must have regard and the Statutory Directions, which I must follow.
- iii) He 'required' me to state my authority on why there had been a breach of the Licence terms by moving the operating centre without notifying the change to my office. SGSD 4 refers at paragraph 34 to vehicles being normally kept at the authorised operating centre. Further, the requirement is attached, to all PSV Licences as demonstrated by page 3 of the Licence issued to this Operator on 4 September 2018 attached at 'Annex A'.
- iv) He challenged the 2014 sentencing details in the PI Brief and poured scorn on the apparent reliance on media reports in that regard. He brought no evidence to suggest that the journalists court reporting was wrong. At the hearing, he feigned ignorance on the actual details of his sentence due to the passage of time. Yet there is nothing equivocal about the letter dated 11 September 2018 (page 51 of the bundle) where he states he only pleaded to one count and received a 12 month sentence suspended for 18 months and 120 community service. The certificate of conviction demonstrates the accuracy of the media court reporting and the inaccuracy within the written and oral evidence of Mr Jones in this regard. To ensure Mr Jones cannot mislead others, I attach marked Annex B a copy of the certificate of conviction.
- v) He did not bring any evidence in support of his personal rehabilitation measures to date, apart from oral confirmation of completing the community service order. Overall, Mr Jones presented as attaching little importance to the detail of the convictions for 3 counts of dishonesty or his sentence, where he was fortunate to escape immediate custody. This is disingenuous, particularly when he remains un-rehabilitated in the eyes of the law.
- vi) He did not bring any evidence in support of the compliance systems moving forward to ensure road safety. Mr Jones suggested that compliance improved historically when he became involved in a PSV operation. The BVTL/WGL decision directly contradicts that assertion (e.g the wheel loss in December 2014 when it was pure chance no one was injured or worse) and Mr Jones brought no corroborative evidence to support his assertion.
- vii) He did not bring any evidence to demonstrate that previous arrangements between his 'brokerage' and Meritrule and other PSV Operators were legitimate 'arms length' arrangements. By way of example, he said that the financial arrangements with CRM were because Miss Zetterlund tricked him out of the money and he lost a lot of personal funds. Mr Jones produced no corroborative evidence at the hearing.
- viii) In summary, he had done no obvious preparation for the hearing based on the call in letter and papers. It was often a challenge to keep him focused on the actual questions posed and on details. Mr Jones said that he had not read the Meritrule written decision in detail because he is heavily dyslexic. After a few more questions, I offered a break for him to go over the bundle and see if there was anything else he wanted to say to me. Mr Jones said he did not want more time to consider the hearing bundle because he had already read it so many times. The Meritrule decision is at pages 170 to 176 of that bundle.

23. From observing Mr Jones and listening to his evidence, I did not find him a credible or compelling witness

24. On 3 September 2018, CLO required an explanation as to why Mr Jones failed to declare the 2014 conviction. In response, a few days later, Mr Jones blames others '*...the part of the form that was due to be completed in relation to this was in fact completed by the previous owner....*' and continues '*..I would like to request a public inquiry as I feel that would be the only fair way for my case to be put across and after several instances in the past where she has only heard about me and never met me in person.....*' (see page 51 of the PI bundle).
25. I am reminded of the helpful Upper Tribunal case of 2016/074 Christchurch Coaches Limited at paragraph 13 '*That seems to be a pre-emptive strike against any argument that she had deliberately not adopted his surname in order to artificially create an impression of distance between them.*' Similarly, this appears to be a form of pre-emptive strike. The chronology sets out the reality of the situation. On the date that the change of director form and TM1 form were lodged, Mr Jones was aware of the BVTL, WGL and Meritrule Limited decisions; that any application or change identified with him had to be referred to a Traffic Commissioner and the information that would be required. A Public Inquiry was highly likely in any event.
26. As per the then Transport Tribunal in 2000/041 Hi-Kube: 'A traffic commissioner is entitled to conclude that an application form should have been checked by the applicant, a company secretary or by the directors/officers of the company'. Mr Jones has been in the PSV industry for years (whether at the forefront or in the background). He has held driver, management, director and ownership led roles. As per Christchurch Coaches Limited, in those circumstances '*...it is reasonable to expect [the individual] would be able to complete the form with accuracy if [the individual] was simply being honest and straightforward*'. It was imperative that the TM1 form and director questionnaire forms were given a great deal of attention in light of the history. All of this is clearly set out in SGSD 1, 3 and 10 and Mr Jones has deemed knowledge of this advice and guidance even if he chooses not to look at it – 2012/030 MGM Haulage & Recycling Limited.
27. In any event, I am unable to accept his assertion that there was no intentional attempt to mislead. In particular:-
- i) I issued the Meritrule written decision (pages 170 – 183 of the PI bundle) just 3 weeks before Mr Jones's name was added to this Licence. At paragraph 29 it says: '*...Mr Jones is found as a de facto and shadow Director.....if he applies for an Operator's Licence in the future, I again make it clear that that must be considered by a Traffic Commissioner or Deputy and not under any delegated authority. Further, he will need to address all the concerns which are set out in this written [decision] as part of that process*'.
 - ii) Mr Jones attached his wet signature to the TM1 form twice on 29 August 2018 (pages 33 to 36 of the PI bundle), both as Director and proposed Transport Manager. The section headed 'Convictions & Penalties' states 'None added' and this is not amended by Mr Jones'.
 - iii) The 'error' on the TM1 form should have caused him to also review the director questionnaire. He did not.
 - iv) Mr Jones produced his Deed Poll to cover the difference between the name on the TM1 and his CPC Certificate. However, at no time before 3 September 2018 does he link these back to his convictions, the BVTL, WGL or Meritrule decisions.
 - v) The director questionnaire does refer to the financial failing of WGL (page 43 of the bundle) but the answer refers to being a 'manager' and not the formal findings made on his role. This entry is highly selective and would not of itself alert CLO to previous findings. On balance, it is more akin to window dressing to give a semblance of transparency to the form.

28. Mr Jones told me he paid XXXX for CHSL. At the very end, Mr Jones said the price included the domain name but it was no more than an aside. It is clear that effectively Mr Jones paid XXXX for the operator Licence because CHSL had only worked for HYT and the previous director was the only driver. It follows there was no goodwill to purchase and the one vehicle purchased was done separately.
29. There is no mandatory revocation for 'more than one serious offence' pursuant to Schedule 3 of the 1981 Act for a limited company. However, the provision is relevant to Mr Jones good repute as the proposed Transport Manager and his status in the business when considering the good repute of this Operator. I have particularly considered paragraph 10 onwards in Martin Joseph Formy (see above), which is very helpful on how to address similar situations, including the relevance of events since the convictions.
30. In light of the findings above, I see no good reason to depart from my stated views of Mr Jones in the BVTL, WGL and Meritrule decisions. They remain on the record un-amended. By way of positives, Mr Jones put forward that he had no convictions before or after 2014. I give this limited weight in light of the ongoing disingenuous behaviour since his conviction. The conviction relates to 3 serious acts of dishonesty, including the abhorrent action of putting fake cash in the charity tin. Since that time, he has worked in the shadows because he knew his conviction would pose a problem. Once confronted by CLO on 3 September 2018, he has lied, glossed and scorned without a hint of embarrassment or contrition, including at the hearing. Indeed at the hearing his evidence was so fluid it ebbed and flowed like a river, by way of example paragraph 22 (ii), 22 (iv) and 22 (viii) above. Having taken into account the words, demeanour and conduct of Mr Jones it is difficult to find any redeeming features. I gave him a number of adjournments during the day to gather his thoughts. Regrettably, he failed to improve his approach or behaviours right to the end. I gave him 24 hours to lodge any further documentation he wanted to rely on. He sent a current finance balance.
31. The evidence is overwhelming that this entity through the conduct of its current director is no longer of good repute. I cannot trust him and therefore the Operator moving forward – there is no material evidence to suggest otherwise. Indeed the evidence is compelling that the legitimate hard working industry and the public who are impacted by his conduct and lack of honesty need the mendacious Mr Jones removed. To do otherwise would bring the whole regime into disrepute.
32. Finally, the Operator asks me to use my discretion, accept financial standing as met on a final balance with a period of grace. I see no good reason to in the circumstances of this case. The Licence was granted in February 2015. In his haste to take the business over after the loss of Meritrule as a front, Mr Jones failed to ensure there were available records to show financial standing over 3 months. It is just another example of Mr Jones putting his own requirements above all else. Accordingly, I have reached the decision set out in paragraph 1 above.

Disqualification

33. I have reminded myself of the helpful guidance on disqualification from the Upper Tribunal set out starting at paragraph 54 of Statutory Guidance on the Principles of Decision Making (No.10):

Disqualification is a potentially significant infringement of rights and the Upper Tribunal has indicated that whilst there is no 'additional feature' required to order disqualification it is not a direction which should be routinely ordered.⁷⁰ There may be cases in which the seriousness of the operator's conduct is such that a traffic commissioner may properly consider that both revocation and disqualification are necessary for the purposes of enforcing the legislation. The provisions are in general terms, consistent with the concept of deterrence, but assessment of culpability and use of words such as penalty should be avoided. The case law indicates a general principle that at the time

the disqualification order is made that the operator cannot be trusted to comply with the regulatory regime and that the objectives of the system, the protection of the public and fairness to other operators, requires that the operator be disqualified.

34. In T/2010/29 David Finch Haulage the then Transport Tribunal said: "*The principles that derive from these and other cases on the point can be simply stated. The imposition of a period of disqualification following revocation is not a step to be taken routinely, but nor is it a step to be shirked if the circumstances render disqualification necessary in pursuit of the objectives of the operator licensing system.* A lengthy disqualification is entirely appropriate after years where Mr Jones has worked tirelessly to stay in the industry under the radar. It is necessary to send the message that Traffic Commissioners take pride in their role of protecting road safety and fair competition. Let the lengthy disqualification also be a deterrent to anyone foolish enough to work in ways that prevent transparent regulation.

Proposed Transport Manager

35. The findings above make it inevitable that Mr Jones is no longer of good repute under determined under Schedule 3 of the 1981 Act and SGSD no.1. Accordingly, I have reached the decision set out in paragraph 3 above.



**Miss Sarah Bell
Traffic Commissioner
London & South East England
23 January 2019**

Requirements of the Licence Holder – Standard Licence

Under the provisions of Sections 19 and 20 of the Public Passenger Vehicles Act 1981 and the Public Service Vehicle (Operator's Licences) Regulations 1995, the holder of the licence is required to notify the traffic commissioner in writing within 28 days of any of the following change of circumstances or occurrences.

1) Change of circumstances

In the event of changes to the following;

- (a) business address (i.e. the effective address to which correspondence is to be sent);
- (b) the requirement to have an effective and stable establishment in Great Britain, including the address of establishment or the requirement to have access to a vehicle;
- (c) address(es) of operating centre(s);
- (d) the arrangements for the inspection/maintenance of vehicles;
- (e) ownership of the business including partnership arrangements and in the persons holding shares in a company, which cause a change in control of the company.

2) Transport manager

In the event that any person named on the licence as a transport manager ceases to be employed as a transport manager for this licence

3) Bankruptcy or liquidation

In the event of the bankruptcy or liquidation of the holder, or the sequestration of his estate or the entry into administration of the holder or the appointment of a receiver, manager or trustee of his road passenger transport business

4) Relevant convictions

The holder of the licence shall notify the traffic commissioner in writing of

- a) any conviction of the holder of the licence;
- b) where the licence is held by persons in partnership of any conviction of each such person; and
- c) any conviction of any officer, employee or agent of the holder for an offence committed in the course of the holder's road passenger transport business.

For the purposes of section 19 (1) and (2) the issue of a fixed penalty notice or conditional offer under Part 3 of the Road Traffic Offenders Act 1988 is to be treated as a relevant conviction.

5) Occurrences which affect:



HM Courts &
Tribunals Service

The Crown Court at Kingston

Court Location Code 427

Case Number T20130648

Certificate of Conviction

Concerning JONES Paul Thomas

Surname, Family name JONES Paul Thomas

Date of birth 21-June-1983

who on 15-August-2014

in this Crown Court

was upon his own confession, convicted on indictment

COUNTS 1 AND 2: PASSING A COUNTERFEIT CURRENCY NOTE, contrary to section 15(1)(a) of the Forgery and Counterfeiting Act 1981

(Continued on the enclosed Schedule 1 of 1)

The said JONES Paul Thomas

was on 2-September-2014

in this Crown Court

sentenced to

COUNT -1: 16 MONTHS IMPRISONMENT SUSPENDED FOR 24 MONTHS ON SUSPENDED SENTENCE (CJA 2003). SUSPENDED SENTENCE- MUST CARRY OUT UNPAID WORK FOR 150 HOURS BEFORE 2 SEPTEMBER 2015. PROBATION OFFICE WILL SUPERVISE THIS WORK.

(Continued on the enclosed Schedule 2 of 2)

I certify that the details in this Certificate are a true and complete extract from the court record to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signed
An Officer of the Court

Emma Smith
EMMA SMITH

Date

02.01.2019



The Crown Court at Kingston

Court Location Code 427

Case Number T20130648

Schedule 1 of 1 to

Concerning JONES Paul Thomas

Surname, Family name JONES Paul Thomas

Date of birth 21-June-1983

Offences continued COUNT -3: HAVING CUSTODY OR CONTROL OF COUNTERFEIT OF A CURRENCY NOTE, contrary to section 16(2) of the Forgery and Counterfeiting Act 1981.

I certify that the details in this Schedule are a true and complete extract from the court record to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signed
An Officer of the Court



EMMA SMITH

Date

02 01.2019



HM Courts &
Tribunals Service

The Crown Court at Kingston

Court Location Code 427

Case Number T20130648

Schedule 2 of 2 to

Concerning JONES Paul Thomas

Surname, Family name JONES Paul Thomas

Date of birth 21-June-1983


Sentence continued COUNT- 1: TO PAY A VICTIM SURCHARGE OF £100.00

COUNT -2: 16 MONTHS IMPRISONMENT SUSPENDED FOR 24 MONTHS ON SUSPENDED SENTENCE (CJA 2003). concurrent TO COUNT 1. SUSPENDED SENTENCE- MUST CARRY OUT UNPAID WORK FOR 150 HOURS BEFORE 2 SEPTEMBER 2015. PROBATION OFFICER WILL SUPERVISE THIS WORK. concurrent

Count -3 : 12 MONTHS IMPRISONMENT SUSPENDED FOR 24 MONTHS ON SUSPENDED SENTENCE (CJA 2003). concurrent TO COUNTS 1 AND 2 SUSPENDED SENTENCE- MUST CARRY OUT UNPAID WORK FOR 150 HOURS BEFORE 2 SEPTEMBER 2015 PROBATION OFFICER WILL SUPERVISE THIS WORK .concurrent
ORDER UNDER SECTION 24 FORGERY AND COUNTERFEITING ACT 1981 FOR FORFEITURE OF COUNTERFEIT CURRENCY.

I certify that the details in this Schedule are a true and complete extract from the court record to the best of my knowledge and belief.

Signed
An Officer of the Court


EMMA SMITH.

Date 02.01.2019