



**FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL
PROPERTY CHAMBER
(RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)**

Case reference : **CAM/00MD/LSC/2019/0032**

Property : **139 Canterbury Avenue, Slough SL2
1BH**

Applicant : **Navneet Kaur Chahal**

Respondent : **Castle New Tower Holdings
Limited**

Representative : **Stanley Cohen, in-house solicitor**

Type of application : **For the determination of the
reasonableness of and the liability
to pay a service charge**

Tribunal members : **Judge Wayte**

Venue : **Cambridge County Court**

Date of decision : **23 September 2019**

DECISION ON PERMISSION TO APPEAL

DECISION OF THE TRIBUNAL

1. The tribunal has considered the applicant's request for permission to appeal dated 12 September 2019 and determines that:
 - (a) it will not review its decision; and
 - (b) permission be refused.
2. In accordance with section 11 of the Tribunals, Courts and Enforcement Act 2007 and rule 21 of the Tribunal Procedure (Upper Tribunal) (Lands Chamber) Rules 2010, the applicant may make further application for permission to appeal to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber). Such application must be made in writing and received by the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) no later than 14 days after the date on which the First-tier Tribunal sent notice of this refusal to the party applying for permission to appeal.
3. The Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) may be contacted at: 5th Floor, Rolls Building, 7 Rolls Buildings, Fetter Lane, London EC4A 1NL (tel: 020 7612 9710); or by email: lands@justice.gov.uk .

REASONS FOR THE DECISION

4. The letter dated 12 September 2019 from the Applicant stating that "I wanted the honourable Judge to consider the following points in my formal appeal" fails to provide any grounds for appeal in breach of Rule 52(5) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013.
5. The one point which relates to the determination is that the Applicant has requested that the Tribunal ask the Respondent to repay the Applicant the excess over and above £493.16 for 2018/19. The tribunal has determined that only £493.16 is payable in respect of the insurance for that year and therefore the Respondent owes the Applicant a rebate. Enforcement is via the County Court if the monies are not repaid. That is not a ground of appeal in any event.
6. The balance of the letter appears to be further representations or questions in relation to the original application which has now been determined. It is too late to raise them now.
7. In the circumstances the tribunal considers that there is no realistic prospect of a successful appeal in this case.

Name: Judge Wayte

Date: 23 September 2019