



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

**Case reference** : LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616

**Property** : Flat 33, Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road,  
London SE1 3GG

**Applicants** : Dr. Malay Halder  
Dr. Sreela Halder

**Representative** : In person

**Respondent/Council** : London Borough of Southwark

**Representative** : Debra Allday (Senior Solicitor,  
Regulatory Team)

**Type of application** : An appeal against the decision by the Local  
Housing Authority to refuse to grant a licence  
under **Part 3 of Schedule 5 Para 3(1) of  
the Housing Act**

**Tribunal** : Judge N Carr

**Date of Decision** : 21 July 2025

---

**DECISION AND REASONS**

---

**ORDER:**

1. Dr Sreela Halder is joined as an Applicant pursuant to rule 10 Tribunal Procedure (First Tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013
2. The appeal dated 19 May 2025 is struck out pursuant to rule 9(3)(e) Tribunal Procedure (First Tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013, for having no realistic prospect of success.
3. The appeal dated 19 May 2025 is hereby certified totally without merit.
4. The Parties are referred to the attached Rule 13 Costs Directions attached.

5. The Parties are referred to the amended Order of 26 June 2025 (limit on contact) attached.

## **REASONS**

- (1) By appeal dated 19 May 2025, Dr Malay Halder seeks to appeal the decision made by the London Borough of Southwark to refuse to grant him a selective licence in connection with Flat 33 Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road, SE1 3GG ('the Property'). In that application he named Dr Sreela Halder, his wife, as an 'interested person'.
- (2) The Applicant did not provide Dr Halder's email address. The Tribunal duly notified her that she had been named as an interested person by letter sent on 11 June 2025 to 40 Newlands Road, London, IG8 0RU.
- (3) That letter asked Dr Sreela Halder to "confirm the email address on which the Tribunal can send future directions and correspondence to you, by emailing london.rap@justice.gov.uk under the title "Flat 33, Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road, SE1 3GG – SR/LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616 - CONFIRMING EMAIL ADDRESS".
- (4) No response was received. Nevertheless, Dr Sreela Halder has been copied in numerous communications between the Applicant (her husband) and the Tribunal and other parties, not least by the Applicant himself, and has co-signed a number of emails with him.
- (5) On the same day that the Applicant was forbidden to contact the Tribunal due to his conduct towards staff (by Order dated 26 June 2025), and I gave Directions for this Preliminary Issue hearing, the case officer sent video hearing joining instructions to the Applicant and Dr Malay Halder. The Preliminary Issue I identified is:

**Is there a reasonable prospect of the Applicant establishing that at the time of the Respondent's decision, he was the current owner of the property at Flat 33 Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road, London SE1 3GG, and in control of it?**

### **Conduct of these proceedings since Preliminary Hearing Directions**

- (6) It is worth setting out the conduct of these proceedings leading to the hearing on 21 July 2025 in order to demonstrate the manner in which this litigation has been pursued.
- (7) Despite the Tribunal's clear instructions, and reiteration of my Order limiting contact from the Applicant on 3 July 2025, the Tribunal received numerous further emails and telephone calls from the Applicant. I therefore instructed HMCTS staff to send the Applicant an Order on 11 July 2025, confirming receipt of his documents received by post on 7 July 2025, and forbidding him from contacting the Tribunal further (further contact before the Preliminary Issue hearing being considered unnecessary in light of the fact that the remaining directions simply required Dr Malay Halder to send the Bundle).

- (8) By email dated 16 July 2025, at 12:41 pm, the Applicant emailed the Tribunal and more than 160 other people (including Courts, Government, the Police, Data Protection and so forth) a wholly inchoate stream of other emails, together with copies of the joining instructions dated 26 June 2025, my Orders of 26 June and 11 July 2025, something purporting to be an interim application dated 15 July 2025 (to rely on a witness statement that was not, in fact, attached), an FOI request to the MOJ dated 23 June 2025 seeking disclosure of unclear records, and a proof of delivery of some documents.
- (9) Judge N Carr has those documents, running to 37 pages. However, they have not been provided in accordance with the Directions. None of them is a witness statement. The application was not included in the documents sent by post. Judge N Carr therefore has not read them.
- (10) On 15 July 2025, Dr Sreela Halder emailed the Tribunal in her own name from a gmail account, for the first time. The email was received at 10.18am. Ms Allday was not copied.
- (11) It acknowledged receipt of the Order dated 11 July 2025, stating that she had not been copied into the 26 June 2025 orders and seeking directions to her as and 'Interested Party' for the hearing on 21 July 2025.
- (12) A case officer immediately replied with an invitation to the hearing and a copy of the directions.
- (13) Dr Sreela Halder's response at 3:42pm the same day (again, not copied to Ms Allday) was (bold/highlights etc as sent):

**"FOR AN URGENT ATTENTION OF TRIBUNAL JUDGE N CARR:**

**RE: SR/LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616: Equality Act 2010- Relevant correspondences- how to send signed witness statements and join the hearing on 21 July 2025 must arrive directly from Tribunal Judge copying with [Dr Malay Halder email address] [Southwark email addresses], for legal reasons Ref: 250711 Order 33 Artesian House"-**

I am formally confirming that I have not received any communication from you anytime before and after 11 July 2025 concerning my right as an Interested Party included under 250711 Order 33 Artesian House to date.

This means that you, as the designated Lead person as confirmed by Judge N Carr on 11 July 2025; you have not sent me comprehensive details as to how I can submit my signed witness statements or joining direction at the Video Preliminary Hearing on 21 July 2025.

Under the circumstances I want my application to be dealt with by the Tribunal Judge N.Carr for seriously considering my, as the named Interested Party and Co-Owner of the property having First Named Proprietor in the Official Copy of HM Land Registration Copy rights under the Law.

Additionally, my formal submission is in accordance with Equality Act 2010 and I am reasonably certain that the Tribunal will not deliberately violate the Equality Act 2010.

I look forward to receiving relevant correspondence directly from Tribunal Judge copying with [Dr Malay Halder email address], [Southwark email addresses], for legal reasons Ref: 250711 Order 33 Artesian House"- attached again."

- (14) By reply on 17 July 2025 Judge N Carr instructed the case officer to write to Dr Sreela Halder as follows:

*"Judge N Carr has read an email from Mrs Sreela Halder, the Applicant's wife, in which she asserts that she has not been given an opportunity to participate in these proceedings.*

*It appears Mrs Halder is under a misapprehension: she is an interested person, so named by Dr Halder, and not a party.*

*As such she is entitled to see the directions and the bundle - which has been facilitated by her being cc'd into emails. She is not in fact an Applicant. It was a matter for her husband to obtain any evidence from her should he wish to have relied on it. As Judge N Carr has not yet seen the bundle, it is unclear whether he did so.*

*She is also entitled to attend at the hearing on Monday as an observer. She has also been provided with a video link to do so.*

*Judge N Carr is particularly concerned that the Tribunal has not heard from Mrs Halder from the outset of these proceedings until 2 days before the hearing, given she writes in the terms she does. Mrs Halder should take independent legal advice.*

*The Tribunal will not correspond with Mrs Halder further; she is not a party."*

- (15) At 12.10pm the same day (i.e. 17 July 2025) , Dr Sreela Halder responded (again, failing to copy Ms Allday) as follows:

"Dear Mr Giray Ilik, Delivery Manager and sender of "250711 Order 33 Artesian House"( attached),

**FOR AN URGENT ATTENTION OF TRIBUNAL JUDGE N CARR:**

**RE: SR/LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616: Equality Act 2010- Relevant correspondences- how to send signed witness statements and join the hearing on 21 July 2025 must arrive directly from Tribunal Judge copying with [Dr Malay Halder email address], [Southwark email addresses], for legal reasons Ref: 250711 Order 33 Artesian House"-**

Dr SREELA HALDER Co Owner HM LR Title TGL289727 Application under Equality Act 2010 representation rights under LON 00BE HML 2025 0616 Property Act 2004\_compressed.pdf

---

---

–

Good afternoon.

Please find an attached pdf document seeking URGENT Order from Judge N CARR.

Kindest regards

Dr Sreela Halder

Enclosures:

**Dr SREELA HALDER Co Owner HM LR Title TGL289727 Application under Equality Act 2010 representation rights under LON 00BE HML 2025 0616 Property Act 2004\_compressed.pdf”**

- (16) Judge N Carr has reviewed those documents. They appear to be documents intended to be a witness statement, and an allegation of misconduct against the case officer. The documents attached are largely the same as those provided by her husband. Amongst those documents is also the letter sent to Dr Sreela Halder dated 11 June 2025, notifying her she had been named as an Interested Party and asking her to provide her email address. I informed the parties at the hearing that I had read and considered those documents.

- (17) At 2.12pm on 17 July 2025, Dr Sreela Halder sent a further email as follows:

“Please forward and add my earlier submission with Tribunal Judge N Carr.

While waiting for fair administration of justice; I would like to reiterate that there is no legal requirement of mandatory representation of a legally qualified person to represent Dr Sreela Halder ( Ref: PD 3.1A -further to that Tribunal Judge did consistently maintain Dr Sreela Halder, as the only Interested Party under LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616 and justifying her Order © CROWN COPYRIGHT 2025

Case management – unrepresented parties

### **3.1A**

- (1) This rule applies in any proceedings where at least one party is unrepresented.
- (2) When the court is exercising any powers of case management, it must have regard to the fact that at least one party is unrepresented.

(3) Both the parties and the court must, when drafting case management directions in the multi-track, intermediate track and fast track, take as their starting point any relevant standard directions which can be found online at [www.justice.gov.uk/courts/procedure-rules/civil](http://www.justice.gov.uk/courts/procedure-rules/civil) and adapt them as appropriate to the circumstances of the case.

(4) The court must adopt such procedure at any hearing as it considers appropriate to further the overriding objective.

(5) At any hearing where the court is taking evidence this may include—

(a) ascertaining from an unrepresented party the matters about which the witness may be able to give evidence or on which the witness ought to be cross-examined; and

(b) putting, or causing to be put, to the witness such questions as may appear to the court to be proper.

**"Interested Persons : Dr. Sreela Halder, ~~Joe Hogg, Frank Harris Ltd, Melanie Weir Hyde Housing Group~~**

**© CROWN COPYRIGHT 2025" date 11 July 2025.**

Additionally, please find relevant evidence that SHA, Property Licencing Division considered Dr Sreela Halder as Owner and Interested party to justify legal rights for representation at the preliminary hearing on 21 July 2025ref: LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616 and justifying her Order © CROWN COPYRIGHT 2025

SWK 155471536615 relevant decisions sent to Dr Sreela Halder as Owner and interested party\_compressed

I look forward to receiving substantive determinations/directions that was issued on 16 June 2025 now.

Kindest regards.

Dr Sreela Halder

### **Litigants in person**

A person who brings or defends legal proceedings without legal representation is known as a 'litigant in person', sometimes shortened to LiP. The rules of practice and procedure apply to litigants in person in the same way as represented parties. The provisions of this guide also apply to litigants in person. The Court will have regard to the fact a party is unrepresented (see CPR 3.1A) but it will not usually apply a lower standard of compliance with rules, PDs or orders of the court (see Barton v

Wright Hassall LLP [2018] UKSC 12: <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/uksc-2016-0136.html>)

- (18) At 9.40am on 18 July 2025 Dr Sreela Halder sent a further form order<sup>1</sup>, seeking to be joined as an Applicant in the proceedings. Once again, Ms Allday was not copied. At Judge N Carr's instruction, the case officer replied as follows:

*"Judge N Carr directs that Dr Sreela Halder's application to be joined as an Applicant be dealt with as the first item of business on Monday 21 July 2025. She must attend at the video hearing to make her submissions. She already has the joining instructions."*

- (19) At 10.25, Dr Sreela Halder responded as follows (also not copied to Ms Allday):

Good morning. I have read and reflected content of your email.

I will only accept a Court Order by Tribunal Judge N Carr © CROWN COPYRIGHT 2025 by considering several applications filed over the past few days since formally considered by Judge N Carr sending an email to [Dr Sreela Halder's email address] on 11 July 2025.

Beyond a reasonable doubt, Judge N Carr under the Equality Act 2010 will consider my applications as an Applicant pursuant to rule 10 of the Tribunal Procedure (First Tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013.

I am aware that Tribunal Officers are not legally qualified or can act on behalf of the Tribunal Judge. Hence only a formal order © CROWN COPYRIGHT 2025 will be considered for my future representation.

It is my reasonable decision asking you to send Judge N Carr Order and refrain from providing a legally binding direction. Until that time I will not consider any hearing bundle or communications from LHA, Respondent, EXCLUSIVELY from, [Southwark email addresses not including Debra Allday].

Kindest regards

Dr Sreela Halder

**P.S. I HAVE NOT RECEIVED SUBSTANTIVE DIRECTIONS INCLUDING JOINING INSTRUCTIONS.**

- (20) By order dated 18 July 2025 sent at 2.30pm to the parties, I made a further Order. I found that the last P.S. above was plainly and demonstrably incorrect; the directions and joining instructions were attached to the email **from the business email the Applicant uses and signed by both the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder, in which both his and her gmail accounts were copied**, that was sent to the 160+ people on 16 July 2025 at 12:44.
- (21) In the course of drafting that order, I was also informed that Dr Malay Halder had notified the Tribunal that Dr Sreela Halder has also refused to even open the bundle for Monday's hearing, despite all of the above:

**From:** Sreela Halder [Dr Sreela Halder email address]

**Sent:** Friday, July 18, 2025 11:04 AM

**To:** [email addresses]

**Cc:** [Dr Malay Halder and Dr Sreela Halder email cc'd]

**Subject:** Re: REJECTED -RETURNED back to sender : 33 Artesian House, SE1 3GG - SR/LON00BEHML20250616

Dear Ms Rosanna Carroll,

**REJECTED -RETURNED back to the sender : 33 Artesian House, SE1 3GG - SR/LON00BEHML20250616**

I will consider any correspondence from legally binding exclusively considered 3 sender only after the Tribunal will confirm my Applicant status.

Accordingly, I am rejecting and so, returned back to you a file that you have sent by email.

Please note that I have not attempted to open the file. Hence neither I have read nor stored any content from the file.

You will be updated by the Tribunal when my Applicant Status will be formalised by a Tribunal Order.

Kindest regards.

Dr Sreela Halder

On Fri, Jul 18, 2025 at 9:44 AM Rosanna Carroll via safedrop <...> wrote:

- (22) I directed, by my Order 18 July 2025, that Dr Sreela Halder must attend at the hearing on 21 July 2025 to pursue her application to be joined as an Applicant. I also gave my preliminary indication that it was unclear how joining Dr Sreela Halder as an Applicant would have any effect at that hearing; she has clearly known for some time what the arguments are, has provided a 58 page bundle of documents that is almost exactly the same as her husband's (so Dr Malay Halder will not be prejudiced by it), together with something purporting to be her statement. Oral evidence under oath could be heard from her today. The Tribunal was therefore in a position to proceed.
- (23) I notified my intention to take evidence under oath (given the remote nature of the hearing (for the reasons as set out in my Orders/Reasons 26 June 2025), I did not, in the event, do so, but parties were warned that they remained bound by their statements of truth on their documents).
- (24) In response, both the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder further emailed the Tribunal as follows:

**From Applicant:**

**From:** BMO Security [Dr Malay Halder email address]

**Sent:** Friday, July 18, 2025 3:43 PM

**To:** [email addresses]

**Cc:** [Dr Sreela Halder and Dr Malay Halder email addresses]



**Subject:** Re: Your Ref: SR/LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616 OUTSTANDING AMNDED ORDER BY FORMALLY CANCELING ORDERE ISSUED ON 11 JULY 2025 ( attached)  
Our Ref: RU030/137685/DRA :RESPONDENT Must comply with GDPR and DTPA 2018: Applicant's formal rejection of documents arriv...

Dear Sirs,

I have received an order which did not cancel previously issued order on 11 July 2025.

**Your Ref: SR/LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616 OUTSTANDING AMNDED ORDER BY FORMALLY CANCELING ORDERE ISSUED ON 11 JULY 2025**

I lookforward to receiving an amended Order on 18 July that must confirm that an Order issued on 11 July 2025 has NO LEGAL STATUS.

I will liaise with named Solicitor of LHA as soon as I will receive an amende order and comply with GDPR and DTPA 2018.

Kindest regards.

Dr Malay Halder

On Friday 18 July 2025 at 14:37:12 BST, BMO Security [Dr Malay Halder's email address] wrote:

Dear Ms Dorren Forrester-Brown, [*and other Southwark general email addresses*]

**RE: : SR/LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616:Compliance under Judge N Carr Direction 11 and 12 must be compliant under GDPR and DTPA 2018 by Dr Malay Halder.**

I am obliged to notify you that **I have not received formal acknowledgment of receipt of**

**1. Direction Number 10: Applicant's Compliance email with several attached supporting documents justifying LPP disclosures by accessinfo@justice.gov.uk- email copied with Mr Giray Ilik, can be read in this email chain.**

**10. By 11 July 2025 the Applicant must email to Dr Malay Halder LHA: (a) A witness statement, signed with a statement of truth as set out at the end of these directions, unequivocally confirming that he is now and was at the date of the Final Notice ('the relevant time') the owner of Flat 33 Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road, London SE1 3GG. His witness statement must be supported by any documents on which he intends to rely to establish that ownership.**

**2. Receipt of a Tribunal Order 250711 33 Artesian House with substantive reasons that Judge N Carr considered to formally remove [Debra Allday and the Tribunal General Email] from mailing list.**

Hence, Mr Ilik, from [Giray Ilik] since 11 July 2025 exclusively communicating with 3 of you- compliance with GDPR and DTPA 2018 (250711 Order 33 Artesian House attached again for your ease of reference).

However, you are under a legal obligation to comply with GDPR and DTPA 2018 as Judge N Carr has substantively removed [Debra Allday] and that Ms Dorren Forrester-Brown has accepted Judge N Carr decision and NOT resisted such a determination.

Accordingly, any communication from malaysree@yahoo.co.uk to 3 of you, email addresses must NOT be disclosed to third party including [Debra Allday].

It remains the duty of named signatory of the Form 1 Order, Ms Doreen Forrester-Brown, Respondent's Representative, Assistant Chief Executive - Governance and Assurance to delegate a different Legal Representative and inform the Tribunal of the change of the Solicitor representing for Respondent.

Accordingly, that newly delegated Solicitor for Respondent will have a legal obligation confirmation of receipt of item 1 and item 2 as listed above, This is necessary for comprehensiveness and compliance of all directions as prescribed in an attached Direction- Reasons.

I am reasonably concluding that any communication from [Debra Allday] peratining direction 11 or 12 will be considered as Respondent formally violated GDPR and DTPA 2018.

Reasons:

- a) Ms Doreen Forrester-Brown failed to confirm acknowledgment of receipt of 2 very pertinent legally binding obligation
- b) Name of newly appointed legal representation has not confirmed with Applicant and [Giray Ilik].

Kindest regards.  
Dr Malay Halder  
Applicant

**From Dr Sreela Halder:**

**From:** Sreela Halder [Dr Sreela Halder's email address]

**Sent:** Friday, July 18, 2025 3:34 PM

**To:** ...

**Subject:** Re: OUTSTANDING AMENDED ORDER with a 6-page invite by 3:30 pm 18/7.25: 33 Artesian House, SE1 3GG - SR/LON00BEHML20250616

Dear [email addresses]

I am obliged to write for an amended order by Judge N Carr as deemed urgent for my substantive representation. Please read below by reasons seeking an amended order with an attached legally binding Invite containing 6 pages.

Dr Sreela Halder

Dear Mr Ilik and Ms Juul,

I am concerned about an autoresponse from [*Tribunal general email address*] and potential sanction from Judge N Carr if I will not contact Respondent by 3:30 pm today 18 July 2025.

Please accept my urgent request so that Judge N Carr read my submission and issue an amended order including an attached 6-page Invite.

Dr Sreela Halder

On Fri, Jul 18, 2025 at 3:17 PM Sreela Halder [*Dr Sreela Halder's email address*] wrote:

Dear Tribunal,

**FOR URGENT ATTENTION JUDGE N CARR FOR AMENDING AN ORDER BY 3:30 PM DEADLINE SET FOR MY COMMUNICATION WITH RESPONDENT.**

I have found the below quoted statement in red (16) included in an order by Judge N Carr fundamentally abusive, derogatory, taking the advantage of my ethnic minority status in addition to litigant person.

The quoted red statement under paragraph (16) was factually incorrect and breach under the Equality Act 2010.

Reasons: the relevant invite must contain at least 6 pages and NOT a 2-page document,( attached for your ease of reference), clearly lacking fundamental legally binding remaining 4 pages.

For your ease of reference I must include an attached **250616 Invite Letter for Online Room HMCTS** which was lacking remaining attachment as quoted under page 2:

**Attachment Below: Guidance for video hearings (parties) :  
DELIBERATELY TRUNCATED BY THE SENDER**

Kindest regards Dr Sreela Halder

**P.S. I HAVE NOT RECEIVED SUBSTANTIVE DIRECTIONS INCLUDING JOINING INSTRUCTIONS.**

*(16) That last P.S. is plainly and demonstrably incorrect; the directions and joining instructions were attached to the email from the business email the Applicant uses and signed by both the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder, in which both his and her gmail accounts were copied, that was sent to the 160+ people on 16 July 2025 at 12:44.*

I look forward to receiving an amended Order with an attached comprehensive Invite at least 6-page document that was sent to the Applicant, Respondent and all Interested Persons other than [Dr Sreela Halder's email address] on 26 June 2025.

Kindest regards.

Dr Sreela Halder

- (25) On Monday 21 July 2025, at 7:00am, Dr Malay Halder sent the following email to the Tribunal cc'd to at least 30 people including Ms Allday, various CPS addresses, the High Court (Admin), Mr Justice Chamberlain and the DPO:

Dear London.rap@justice.gov.uk/Team Leaders and Mr Giray Ilik,

**RE:** Submission of Applicants formally completed Order Form1 with substantive evidence along with previously filed hard copies in the post and signed witness statement Applicant's compliance under Direction 10 which was also copied with the Tribunal and debra.allday@southwark.gov.uk( exhibit below)

**21 July 2025 Applicants seeking Order LON 00BE HML 2025 0616 Order Form1 with supporting evidence after Respondent failed to comply with Judge Carr Direction 12 and 13\_compressed- attached**

However, the safe receipt acknowledgment from Ms Allday received with multiple quadruple quotation was confirmation of Ms Allday was not LHA authorised recipient at the time and consequential email was a fraudulent email: Ref ***"the quadruple quotation "" marks are a tactic used by scammers to make their fraudulent emails appear more legitimate, urgent, and trustworthy, thereby increasing the chance of their message being believed and acted upon."***

**Direction 10**

**10. By 11 July 2025 the Applicant must email to the Respondent LHA: (a) A witness statement, signed with a statement of truth as set out at the end of these directions, unequivocally confirming that he is now and was at the date of the Final Notice ("the relevant time") the owner of Flat 33 Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road, London SE1 3GG. His witness statement must be supported by any documents on which he intends to rely to establish that ownership.**

RE: Ref: SR/LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616 Our/Respondent Ref: RU030/137685/DRA :  
NOTICE OF SUBMISSION OF a) Applicant's signed Witness Statement,b)  
Supporting documents and c) INDEX- Compliance under dIRECTION 10: Applicant  
complied with Direction 9. Dr Mala...

Yahoo/Inbox

Allday, Debra

From: [*Debra Allday*]

To:BMO Security

Mon, 14 Jul at 09:49

""Der Dr Halder

""

""I acknowledge safe receipt of your Witness Statement and documents.

""

""Yours sincerely

""

""

""Debra Allday

""Senior Solicitor - Regulatory Team

""London Borough of Southwark - Legal Services

""160 Tooley Street""

""PO Box 64529""

""London SE1P 5LX""

""**DX: 136147 London Bridge 7**""

""Tel: (020)-7525-3266""

""&&&[www.southwark.gov.uk](http://www.southwark.gov.uk)""

"" ""

**""Please note I do not work Wednesdays""**

""

""

""

""

**""From:""** [Dr Malay Halder]

**Sent:** Friday, July 11, 2025 4:55 PM

**To:** [Email addresses including Ms Allday]

**Cc** [Dr Sreela Halder and Dr Malay Halder's email addresses]

**Subject:** Re: Ref: SR/LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616 Our/Respondent Ref: RU030/137685/DRA : NOTICE OF SUBMISSION OF a) Applicant's signed Witness Statement,b) Supporting documents and c) INDEX- Compliance under dIRECTION 10: Applicant complied with Direction 9. Dr Mala...

""Dear Ms Debra Allday, ""

""

""Please find my submission with 3 attached pdf documents compliance with Direction 10.""

""

""I look forward to receiving safe receipt of acknowledgment.""

""

""Kindest regards.""

""Dr Malay Halder ""

---

Good morning.

It is our reasonable assertion by quoting paragraph 6, (18) and (20) that Judge N Carr will not be able to fairly conduct a Preliminary Hearing as Respondent failed to

comply with Directions 12 and 13 of 250626 Reasons for decisions 33 Artesian House ( Attached again for everyone's ease of reference).

Secondly, Tribunal on 18 July 2025 formally confirmed that ***"Tribunal will not be working from any other documents, as it has previously made amply clear"***

***6. The Respondent is directed to send to the Tribunal and to the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder an updated bundle including this order and, if complied with, the email and documents from Dr Sreela Halder sent to it in accordance with paragraph 5 above, by no later than 4pm.***

***(18) The Tribunal has not yet seen the updated bundle, but it has no intention of further engaging with this narrative.***

***(20) The correspondence passing has all the hallmarks of a wish to frustrate the process of the hearing. Judge N Carr cannot force the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder to look at the bundle, but the Tribunal will not be working from any other documents, as it has previously made amply clear.***

We will be obliged to receive formal communication from Judge N Carr of **status of the Video Hearing from 10 am on 21 July 2025** at the earliest opportunity.

Kindest regards.

Dr Malay Halder

Dr Sreela Halder

**P.S Exhibit email from messages@safedrop.com to [Dr Sreela Halder email address] received at 6:17 PM on 18 July 2025 without copying with [Dr Malay Halder email] and london.rap@justice.gov.uk was formal confirmation of Respondent, [Debra Allday email] formally violated direction 12 and direction 13 of 26 June Order.**

On Friday 18 July 2025 at 16:22:52 BST, BMO Security [Dr Malay Holder email address] wrote:

Dear London.rap@justice.gov.uk and concerned Team Leaders,

**RE: Your Ref: SR/LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616: Judge N Carr decision after Respondent BREACHED Directions Numbers: 8, 11, 12 and 13, respectively ahead of a Preliminary Hearing listed at 10:00 on 21 July 2025**

Good afternoon.

I am formally notifying you that Respondent did not comply with either direction Number 11 or Number 12 as depicted below.

**Evidence to justify Respondent's breach of Direction 11 and 12:**

**There was an email communication to London.rap@justice.gov.uk with an attached a single document -schedule of Costs 21.07.25.at 15:33 on 18 July 2025:-exhibit below**

Hence beyond a reasonable doubt Respondent has not copied into malaysree@yahoo.co.uk or sreela.halder@gmail.com with a substantive Hearing Bundle as directed under 12 and 13- exhibit below.

This is further confirmation of Tribunal did not formally cancel an order dated 11 July 2025 as required to justify all directions included under 18 July Order.

I look forward to receiving Judge N Carr Order after Respondent breached Direction 8, 11, 12 and 13 among others despite I complied with direction 9 and 10, respectively.

***Respondent's Reply 11. By 4pm on 18 July 2025, the Respondent may (if so advised) send to the Applicant by email any Reply to new matters raised by the Applicant, not already addressed in the application to strike out dated 23 June 2025. That Reply may be delivered as part of the Bundle for Hearing below.***

***Bundle for the hearing 12. The Respondent must by 4pm on 18 July 2025 email to the Tribunal at London.Rap@justice.gov.uk and to the Applicant a bundle of all relevant documents for use in the determination of the Preliminary Issue, comprised in a single document in Adobe PDF format.***

***The bundle must have an index and must be numbered chronologically page by page (with the Index at page 1).***

***The documents must, so far as possible, be in chronological order. The subject line of the email must read: "BUNDLE FOR PRELIMINARY ISSUE HEARING: [Case reference], [Property address]".***

***13. The bundle must include:***

***(a) The Applicant's Appeal and supporting documents;***

***(b) The Applicant's application for inspection and supporting documents;***

***(c) The Respondent's application for strike out and supporting documents;***

***(d) Any evidence and documents exchanged in accordance with paragraphs 8-***

***Respondent's Reply***



**11. By 4pm on 18 July 2025, the Respondent may (if so advised) send to the Applicant by email any Reply to new matters raised by the Applicant, not already addressed in the application to strike out dated 23 June 2025. That Reply may be delivered as part of the Bundle for Hearing below.**

Kindest regards.

Dr Malay Halder

Allday, Debra

From: [Debra Allday]

To: London RAP

Cc:[Dr Malay Halder, Dr Sreela Halder]

Fri, 18 Jul at 15:33

Dear Tribunal

I am grateful for Judge Carr's Order sent at 14:42 hours today.

I trust that the Updated Hearing Bundle has now been received and downloaded by the Tribunal.

Attached you will find a Schedule of the Respondent's Costs.

The Applicant(s)/Interested Party have been included in this email.

Yours faithfully

Debra Allday

Senior Solicitor - Regulatory Team

London Borough of Southwark - Legal Services

160 Tooley Street

PO Box 64529

London SE1P 5LX

**DX: 136147 London Bridge 7**

Tel: (020)-7525-3266

[www.southwark.gov.uk](http://www.southwark.gov.uk)

***Please note I do not work Wednesdays***

The email you received and any files transmitted with it are confidential, may be covered by legal and/or professional privilege and are intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to whom they are addressed. If you have received this in error please notify us immediately.

If you are not the intended recipient of the email or the person responsible for delivering it to them you may not copy it, forward it or otherwise use it for any purpose or disclose its contents to any other person. To do so may be unlawful.

Where opinions are expressed in the email they are not necessarily those of Southwark Council and Southwark Council is not responsible for any changes made to the message after it has been sent.

Schedule of Costs for 21.07.2025.pdf

119.4 kB

On Friday 18 July 2025 at 15:42:41 BST, BMO Security <malaysree@yahoo.co.uk> wrote:

Dear Sirs,

I have received an order which did not cancel previously issued order on 11 July 2025.

**Your Ref: SR/LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616 OUTSTANDING AMNDED ORDER BY FORMALLY CANCELING ORDERE ISSUED ON 11 JULY 2025**

I lookforward to receiving an amended Order on 18 July that must confirm that an Order issued on 11 July 2025 has NO LEGAL STATUS.

I will liaise with named Solicitor of LHA as soon as I will receive an amende order and comply with GDPR and DTPA 2018.

Kindest regards.

Dr Malay Halder

On Friday 18 July 2025 at 14:37:12 BST, BMO Security <malaysree@yahoo.co.uk> wrote:

Dear Ms Dorren Forrester-Brown, [*Southeark email addresses*]

**RE: : SR/LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616:Compliance under Judge N Carr Direction 11 and 12 must be compliant under GDPR and DTPA 2018 by the Respondent.**

I am obliged to notify you that **I have not received formal acknowledgment of receipt of**

**1. Direction Number 10: Applicant's Compliance email with several attached supporting documents justifying LPP disclosures by accessinfo@justice.gov.uk- email copied with Mr Giray Ilik, can be read in this email chain.**

***10. By 11 July 2025 the Applicant must email to the Respondent LHA: (a) A witness statement, signed with a statement of truth as set out at the end of these directions, unequivocally confirming that he is now and was at the date of the Final Notice ('the relevant time') the owner of Flat 33 Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road, London SE1 3GG. His witness statement must be supported by any documents on which he intends to rely to establish that ownership.***

**2. Receipt of a Tribunal Order 250711 33 Artesian House with substantive reasons that Judge N Carr considered to formally remove [Debra Allday] and [London generic email address] from mailing list.**

**Hence, Mr Ilik, from [email address] since 11 July 2025 exclusively communicating with 3 of you- compliance with GDPR and DTPA 2018 (250711 Order 33 Artesian House attached again for your ease of reference).**

**However, you are under a legal obligation to comply with GDPR and DTPA 2018 as Judge N Carr has substantively removed debra.allday@southwark.gov.uk and that Ms Dorren Forrester-Brown has accepted Judge N Carr decision and NOT resisted such a determination.**

**Accordingly, any communication from [Dr Malay Halder] to 3 of you, email addresses must NOT be disclosed to third party including [Debra Allday].**

**It remains the duty of named signatory of the Form 1 Order, Ms Doreen Forrester-Brown, Respondent's Representative, Assistant Chief Executive - Governance and Assurance to delegate a different Legal Representative and inform the Tribunal of the change of the Solicitor representing for Respondent.**

**Accordingly, that newly delegated Solicitor for Respondent will have a legal obligation confirmation of receipt of item 1 and item 2 as listed above, This is necessary for comprehensiveness and compliance of all directions as prescribed in an attached Direction- Reasons.**

**I am reasonably concluding that any communication from debra.allday@southwark.gov.uk peratining direction 11 or 12 will be considered as Respondent formally violated GDPR and DTPA 2018.**

**Reasons:**

**a) Ms Doreen Forrester-Brown failed to confirm acknowledgment of receipt of 2 very pertinent legally binding obligation**

**b) Name of newly appointed legal representation has not confirmed with Applicant and [Mr Ilik].**

**Kindest regards.**

**Dr Malay Halder**

**Applicant**

- (26) Attached was an application form order<sup>1</sup> seeking the following, to which a further submission amounting to a further 9 pages signed by Drs Malay and Sreela Halder was attached, together with a further 41 pages of email correspondence with any and/or all of the 160 named in the email of 18 July 2025 were attached (and which I have read):

Completed Form Order<sup>1</sup>: An application to vary the Tribunal's Order:

1. Urgent Order of Inspection of the property addressing health and safety
2. Order to the Respondent: Immediate issuing of Property Licence under Selective Licensing Of Other Residential Accommodation (Housing Act 2004 Part 3) Notice of intention to grant a licence (Schedule 5 Part 1) to owners and the named Managing Agent, Frank Harris Limited
3. Order to the Applicants: Licence Holders/Applicants must pay "buy to let mortgage to the Lender, Birmingham Midshires Bank Plc Ref: Account 60921134940900" from rental income (net rental income after payment of management fees and associated costs to the managing agent, group rent and utility bills to Hyde-Housing Group) and supplementing any amount plus clearing the mortgage arrears when the property was let by Frank Harris Limited) following receipt of property licence and legally binding directions from the Tribunal to the Frank Harris, Managing Agent and Hyde-Housing as Freeholder of a leasehold property.
4. Dr Malay Halder under HMRC Ref: CFS-2390862 -agreement with the HMRC Let Property Campaign for making voluntary disclosures of rental income from lawfully renting out 33 Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road, SE1 3GG.
5. Order of substantive financial remedies and proportionate directions including referral to the CPS for criminal prosecutions of Southwark Council, Frank Harris, Hyde-Housing and Birmingham Midshires Plc for abusing the Applicant's vulnerabilities (without seeking applicants representations in any legal proceeding) over the years consequential of Mrs Justice Ellenbogen an independent Judge of the Administrative Court Office; King's Bench Division under CO/4644/2020 and successor, Master Dagnall, under KB-2022-003534, KB-2022-005042 and KB-2024-000065 deliberately confirmed failure and maladministration of justice that led to both Applicant's indefinite period of unemployment and extreme poverty despite both Applicants are eligible for working with mandatory GMC licence to practise and legally binding revalidation.

Applicants will provide a substantive details seeking financial remedies including particulars of claims covering personal injuries, impacts of loss of rental income

over the years on several collateral irreversible damages, coercion and harassment from all interested parties etc. upon receipt of substantive LPPs disclosures from relevant public authorities.

- (27) At 9.26am Dr Malay Halder sent a further email, cc'd to the same people as above, as follows:

Dear Ms Rachel Colsell,

If your email is urgent, kindly contact my SPA **[email address]** or my **[email address]**

Good morning.

We have been reassured from **Mr Idan's email at 07:05 on 21 July 2025. Could you please confirm the named Case Officer assigned to our case?**

We remain concerned before attending at any hearing either in person or virtual hearing owing to experience we have received since **14 September 2017 until 21 December 2022.**

During the 5 years period we have attended at least 25 days of in-person and virtual hearings at the IOT and MPT of the MPTS, Administrative Court, Manchester and High Court of Justice, London.

Without an exception on every occasion in particular at the hands of Mrs J Ellenbogen on 9 June 2021, we have been heavily tortured, abused, coerced, harassed until the time we surrendered to avoid collapse and untoward incident.

**In anticipation of the same and as we are unaware of the status of the hearing we must receive contact Case Officers details before 10:00 am today, please.**

Once again, thank you for your cooperation.

Kindest regards.

Dr Malay Halder

Dr Sreela Halder

Automatic reply: External Email - Re:URGENT: SR/LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616 : Applicants' submission 21 July 2025 Applicants seeking Order LON 00BE HML 2025 0616 Order Form1 with supporting evidence after Respondent failed to comply with Judge Carr Directio...

Yahoo/Inbox

Lionel Idan

From:[email address]

To:BMO Security

Mon, 21 Jul at 07:05

I am out of the office on leave until the 2nd of June. If your email is urgent, kindly contact my SPA [email address] and or my [email address]

Lionel Idan

Chief Crown Prosecutor & National Lead for Hate

CPS London South

On Monday 21 July 2025 at 07:00:12 BST, BMO Security [email address] wrote:  
[email as previous chain]

(28) At 9.39am, Dr Malay Halder sent this, final, email, to the same recipients:

Dear London.rap@justice.gov.uk,

Ahead of a hearing commencing at 10:00 am on 21 July 2025, please consider our submission sent at 07:00 on 21 July 2025 was copied with Respondent in particular, debra.allday@southwark.gov.uk. They have not objected to our submission or did confirm if Respondent complied with directions number 12 and 13.

Hence, please consider our late evidence before Judge N Carr to be admitted as late evidence.

Please confirm safe receipt.

Kindest regards.

Dr Malay Halder

Dr Sreela Halder

### Hearing

- (29) At the hearing, initially Dr Sreela Halder refused to join her husband at their computer on the basis that she had not received the '6 page' general support notes to the joining instructions letter. She joined the hearing at my invitation.
- (30) I explained I had read her application to join as an Applicant, and all the documents she had exhibited thereto (including the Birmingham Midshires account also attached to Dr Malay Halder's own response). The Respondent did not object to Dr Sreela Halder being joined as a party, and therefore I joined her

as an Applicant pursuant to rule 10 of the Tribunal Procedure (First Tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) (Rules) 2013.

- (31) Drs Halder initially submitted that they had not received the bundle on which the Tribunal would rely. On it being observed that the above correspondence demonstrated that they had refused to open the bundle, they maintained that my Preliminary Issue Directions had directed Ms Doreen Forrester-Brown to provide a witness statement. As can be seen from my appended Directions, they did no such thing. I find that to be an argument without merit.
- (32) Drs Halder then asserted that they had not had time to read the bundle, which could no longer be downloaded. I observed that it comprised no more than the Directions, the Strike Out Application, the witness statements and exhibits provided to them by Ms Allday on 4 July 2025 by email, and Dr Malay Halder's own documents provided on 7 July 2025. I gave permission to Dr Sreela Halder to rely on the documents she had also sent on 16 July 2025. Therefore, the evidence had already been seen by them. It was clear that they documents were in front of them as they were able to refer to them in the course of the hearing.
- (33) I permitted the parties to rely on their written evidence as their evidence in chief, and allowed each to ask the other questions in cross-examination. Dr Sreela Halder confirmed that she had nothing to add to what her husband had said.
- (34) Drs Halder were consistently reminded that the only matter for the Tribunal to decide was the question of whether they had any realistic prospect of demonstrating they were the owners of the property as asserted, at the date of the Respondent's decision to refuse the selective licence.

#### Findings – ownership of Flat 33 Artesian House

- (35) Dr Malay Halder's statement dated 11 July 2025 says this on the question of ownership of the property:
  - 6. *The owner, Dr Malay Halder and Dr Sreela Halder are co-owners of the property as depicted under HM Land and Registry Official Copies of register of title: Title Number TGL289727 Edition Date 27.09.2007 on 7 March 2025 at 14:56:31.*
- (36) The digital official copies are the only evidence provided in support of that contention. While council tax and mortgage account statements are provided, they do not cover the date on which the Final Notice was given (i.e. 19 May 2025), save to evidence arrears over the period-prior. Nor does the mortgage account demonstrate that they have been paying the mortgage, despite their evidence to the contrary.
- (37) Taking the most generous approach available on the Applicant's case, in order to establish whether the Drs Halder have a realistic prospect of establishing that they were the owners even at the date of application for a selective license, i.e. 3 March 2025, I make the following findings on the cogent evidence provided by both the Respondent and the Drs Halder themselves:

- (a) A fixed charge receiver (individuals at Savills) was appointed in respect of the property on 9 June 2022 as demonstrated by the document at **[325 – 328]**. The Halders’ evidence was that they had not received the document and therefore “it was not legal”. There is no foundation for that submission, and in any event later in their evidence they confirmed that receivers had been receiving rent for the property and applying it to the mortgage account.
- (b) Those receivers confirm that they became responsible for the property on 9 June 2022, by email dated 22 May 2023 to Dr Malay Halder’s council tax department **[329]**. An earlier email of 9 May 2023 demonstrates that the tenant previously in place (who Dr Malay Halder confirmed was his last tenant) moved out on 4 May 2023 (as notified to Dr Malay Halder’s council tax department) **[330]**. The Halders’ evidence was that they had not received email and there is no mortgage number on it and therefore “*it was not legal*”. There is no foundation for that submission.
- (c) Birmingham Midshires, the mortgage provider for the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder, confirms that the property was repossessed on 26 May 2023 (letter dated 11 June 2025 **[335]**). The Halders’ evidence was that they had not received email and there is no mortgage number on it and therefore “*it was not legal*”. There is no foundation for that submission. Furthermore, they were each given several opportunities to confirm whether the property had or had not been repossessed. Both Drs Halder initially stated “we rely on our mortgage statement”. When pushed for a yes or no answer, Dr Sreela Halder refused to answer. Dr Malay Halder various avoided the question, then ultimately stated that the property had not been repossessed. I am satisfied on the balance of probabilities, on the analysis of the evidence throughout paragraph (36), that was a lie.
- (d) While the Drs Halder remain named on the Land Registry documents, their proprietary rights were effectively extinguished when the property was repossessed on 26 May 2023. The only remaining rights of the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder are to any balance in the equity from the sale, after priority charges have been settled to Birmingham Midshires. The Applicant therefore had no legal basis for asserting that he was the “Legally Binding Owner” and demanding a final “copy” of a licence, whether by 20 April 2025 or otherwise **[212]**.
- (e) That is consistent with the fact that Drs Halder assert that they received no rental income from either July 2022 or April/May 2023 (the evidence given was internally inconsistent on the dates).
- (f) The property was sold at auction on 28 January 2025 (memorandum of sale dated 28 January 2025 **[279]**).
- (g) The completion of the transfer of the property was completed between the new property owner and their mortgagor and the Freeholder on 26 February 2025 (letter from TLT solicitors dated 6 March 2025 **[334]**). The sales profits have not yet been disbursed.
- (h) The new owner has been paying relevant charges for (e.g.) service charges and council tax to the freeholder and to Dr Malay Halder for the period from 26



February 2025 **[287 – 289], 303 – 306]**. The fact that the Respondent did not provide the sensitive personal data of the new owner to the Halders (by redacting it) does not mean that data is unavailable to the Tribunal, and redaction of those details does not prove that the Halders are still the council tax payers. Even if the Halders were still paying council tax, for the current year (and for the avoidance of doubt I find that the council tax demands that have been made are for arrears for previous years), payment of council tax is not of itself proof of ownership.

- (i) The new owner has been registered on the electoral role since 26 February 2025 **[285]**.
- (j) The transfer application and Registration of Charge have been pending at the Land Registry since 7 March 2025 **[283], [307]**. I reject Dr Malay Halder's contention that every single title document at the Land Registry has this kind of entry against it; that is simply not the way land registration works.
- (k) A council tax bill for the current year was sent to the Applicant in error (email Andy Taplin 10 June 2025 **[289]**).
- (l) In correspondence with Dr Malay Halder in the course of his application, the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder represented themselves as "*Mortgage Account Holders*" who were "*unaware of the current status of the property*" (26 February 2025 **[277]**); they were informed that "as leaseholders" they were entitled to make the application (email Emma Trott 3 March 2025 **[275]**).
- (m) Correspondence exhibited between the Applicant and Frank Harris & Co demonstrates that the Applicant was aware that Frank Harris & Co had no involvement with management of the property since July 2022 (letters **[222 - 224], [271- 273]**), despite the Applicant having named them as the managing agents on the selective license application. I reject the Halders' evidence that Frank Harris & Co still have the keys to the property and still manage it; it is clear that Savills acted on behalf of the receivers. I reject the Halders' submission that the email is 'not legal' because it was not sent to them; this is email correspondence between Malay Halder and Frank Harris & Co. I reject the contention that I should not have removed Frank Harris & Co as so-called 'Interested Persons' – they did not confirm their wish to hold that status to the Tribunal. I reject the contention that the Tribunal should have called Frank Harris & CO to give evidence; that is not the Tribunal's role, and in any event it is the clear evidence on the papers that Frank Harris and & Co have not managed the property on anyone's behalf, let alone the Halders' since July 2022.
- (n) The Applicant admitted that he was unaware whether the property was let and did not received income from it, and that Savills was not instructed by him, by email dated 9 April 2025 to Emma Trott **[221]**. By email dated 15 April 2025 to Laura Wilkinson, he confirmed the same: "*I am unable to provide any additional information with my statement of truth and am still unable to confirm whether the property is let*" **[218]**. I reject the Halders' contention that because this information was not added to the online portal it was not

'legal' (by which I assume they mean legally binding). It was Dr Malay Halder's own evidence to the Respondent which he has provided no reason to believe is untrue.

- (o) On 15 April 2025, Ms Wilkinson confirmed that she had concluded that the licence would not be issued without further investigation on the grounds: *"you are not the most appropriate person to hold the licence. I have undertaken council tax checks to determine occupancy and records indicate that the property has been tenanted since February 2025. You did not issue this tenancy, nor are you in receipt of the rent as such, further investigation is now required"* [215].
- (p) Dr Malay Halder immediately raised a complaint regarding the findings of Ms Wilkinson, making unfounded and scurrilous allegations that she had forged Emma Trott's signature, had failed to consult named interested persons including Frank Harris & Co, that there was some kind of obligation on her to confirm the licence at the end of the consultation period despite her clear findings based on his own stark admissions, and that Ms Wilkinson had acted illegally [187 – 190].
- (q) It is against that background, in particular in light of the Applicant's own admissions above that he and Dr Sreela Halder were neither in possession, control, or in receipt of rents in respect of the property, that the Final Notice of refusal was given on 19 May 2025 [125 – 128].
- (r) There is no argument made nor authority cited supporting the Applicant's position that a decision had to be made by 20 April 2025, nor that the decision had to be a positive one granting a licence. In any event, those matters are immaterial when the Applicant's own evidence was that he was not in possession, control or receipt of rents for the property. Those are basic preconditions to the granting a licence; otherwise any member of the public could take a fancy to anyone else's property and unlawfully deprive them of their legal rights in respect of it. Any such decision to grant a licence would of itself be irrational (in a public law sense) and liable to be quashed.
- (s) There is no plausible basis on which the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder could genuinely believe that they continue to have any right to the property, its rents or profits, or any management over it. In particular, their submission that they no longer have the keys, and cannot gain entry, because Frank Harris & Co or Hyde Housing hold the keys did not bear testing. One questioning, Dr Malay Halder stated that the only legal way to obtain entry to the flat was to obtain theselective licence. A selective licence does not have that effect. It cannot give someone a right that they do not already have. The Halders do not know who is in occupation of the property, for which they are receiving no rent, over which they admitted (even if they then rowed back from the admission) that there were receivers appointed who paid monies to the mortgage account, and they appear to be fully aware they are not lawfully entitled to change the locks.
- (t) I therefore find that the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder have attempted to mislead the Tribunal in this application, and actively lied about their

ownership of the property. The Application is dishonest, and an abuse of process.

- (u) I also find that on the balance of probabilities, the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder have brought this application for illegitimate and unlawful purposes. I find that the application for a selective licence, and this appeal, have been brought as a means to regain control over the property despite having no rights remaining in it. When this was put to the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder, no alternative explanation was offered for bringing this application despite the cogent facts above, nor for pushing for an “*immediate inspection*” of the property even though the condition of the property had nothing to do with Dr Malay Halder’s refusal of the licence, nor for obtaining an advantage over other litigants by asserting that this application was ‘urgent’ because they were being put out of an income by the refusal, when on the facts that simply is not true. Dr Malay Halder’s only response was “that’s your interpretation”. That is, in fact, my finding on the balance of probabilities.
- (38) In those circumstances, in light of the cogent contemporaneous evidence, including Dr Malay and Dr Sreela Halder’s own evidence, I find that there is no reasonable prospect of Dr Malay Halder establishing that he was the owner of the property (or indeed in control of it) and so entitled to make an application for a selective licence in respect of it on 3 March 2025. Indeed, the evidence to the contrary is overwhelming.
- (39) Dr Malay Halder asserted that the Halders have been “tortured” in these proceedings, and that any decision made against them will be appealed in the High Court.
- (40) That is not the process. Any appeal must conform with the process set out below.
- (41) Separate directions are provided for the Respondent’s rule 13 costs application.
- (42) Dr Malay Halder has already endeavoured to telephone the Tribunal today, after the hearing took place. For the avoidance of doubt, my Order of 26 June 2025 remains in force, and is hereby varied to include Dr Sreela Halder. The conditions are revised to limit contact by recorded delivery post, for the purpose of submitting any application for permission to appeal in accordance with the appeal rights set out below.

**Name:** Judge N Carr

**Date:** 21 July 2025

### **Rights of appeal**

By rule 36(2) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013, the Tribunal is required to notify the parties about any right of appeal they may have.

If a party wishes to appeal this decision to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber), then a written application for permission must be made to the First-tier Tribunal at the Regional Office which has been dealing with the case. The application should be made on Form RP PTA available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/form-rp-pta>

[pta-application-for-permission-to-appeal-a-decision-to-the-upper-Tribunal-lands-chamber](#)

The application for permission to appeal must arrive at the Regional Office within 28 days after the Tribunal sends written reasons for the decision to the person making the application.

If the application is not made within the 28-day time limit, such application must include a request for an extension of time and the reason for not complying with the 28-day time limit; the Tribunal will then look at such reason(s) and decide whether to allow the application for permission to appeal to proceed, despite not being within the time limit.

The application for permission to appeal must identify the decision of the Tribunal to which it relates (i.e. give the date, the property and the case number), state the grounds of appeal and state the result the party making the application is seeking.

If the Tribunal refuses to grant permission to appeal, a further application for permission may be made to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber).

Attached:

- (1) Preliminary Issue Directions 26 June 2025
- (2) Order regarding Tribunal Contact 26 June 2025
- (3) Reasons 26 June 2025
- (4) Order 11 July 2025
- (5) Order 18 July 2025
- (6) Rule 13 costs directions 21 July 2025
- (7) Amended Directions To The Applicants: Contact With The Tribunal 21 July 2025



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

**Case reference** : **LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616**

**Property** : **Flat 33, Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road,  
London SE1 3GG**

**Applicant** : **Dr. Malay Halder**

**Representative** : **In person**

**Respondent/Council** : **London Borough of Southwark**

**Representative** : **Debra Allday (Senior Solicitor,  
Regulatory Team)**

**Interested Persons** : **Dr. Sreela Halder, Joe Hogg, Frank  
Harris Ltd, Melanie Weir Hyde Housing  
Group**

**Type of application** : **An appeal against the decision by the Local  
Housing Authority to refuse to grant a licence  
under Part 3 of Schedule 5 Para 3(1) of the  
Housing Act**

**Tribunal** : **Judge N Carr**

**Date of Directions** : **26 June 2025**

---

**PRELIMINARY ISSUE DIRECTIONS**

---

1. The directions dated 13 June 2025 are hereby stayed.
2. Unless by **4pm on 4 July 2025** any of the following named interested persons confirm to the Tribunal that they wish to remain interested persons in this case, they will be removed from the directions and no further correspondence or documentation will be sent to them by any party (without prejudice to any party's desire to call them as a witness):

Joe Hogg

Frank Harris Ltd

Melanie Weir

Hyde Housing Group

3. The Tribunal will consider the preliminary issue at a hearing on **21 July 2025, to take place by video conferencing** starting at **10:00 am**, making use of the electronic documents received.
4. The issue that the Tribunal will decide at the preliminary hearing is as follows:  
  
**Is there a reasonable prospect of the Applicant establishing that at the time of the Respondent's decision, he was the current owner of the property at Flat 33 Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road, London SE1 3GG, and in control of it?**
5. Full details of how to take part will be sent nearer the time. No specialist software is needed to access the hearing. However, parties will need to have access to a computer, connected to the Internet, with a webcam and microphone, or a similarly enabled smartphone or tablet device. If a party does not have suitable equipment to attend a video conference, they must notify the Tribunal promptly, and consideration will be given to converting the video hearing into an audio hearing, by way of telephone conferencing.
6. The hearing is estimated to last for **two hours**. The hearing should end in time for the tribunal to deliberate on its decision.

**How the Respondent (LHA) should prepare for the hearing**

7. The Respondent's Strike Out application dated 23 June 2025 will stand as its statement of case.
8. The Respondent must also send to the Applicant **by email** any witness statements, signed with a statement of truth as set out at the end of these directions, setting out evidence in relation to matters that are likely to be in contention e.g. council tax payments, by **4pm on 4 July 2025**.

**How the Applicant should prepare for the hearing**

9. The Applicant must by **4pm on 7 July 2025 send to the Tribunal by post** (in accordance with the instructions in paragraph 2(i) of the **Directions To The Applicant: Contact With The Tribunal** which accompanies these Directions) the **names, email addresses and room/flat numbers of the occupants/tenants** likely to be affected by the application, so that the Tribunal can inform them of this appeal and give them the opportunity to join as a party and make representations. For the avoidance of doubt, no matters included in any letter that are not the required information will be considered.
10. By **11 July 2025** the Applicant must **email** to the Respondent LHA:

- (a) A witness statement, signed with a statement of truth as set out at the end of these directions, unequivocally confirming that **he is now and was at the date of the Final Notice ('the relevant time') the owner of Flat 33 Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road, London SE1 3GG**. His witness statement must be supported by any documents on which he intends to rely to establish that ownership.
- (b) For the avoidance of doubt, any documents predating the date of the relevant decision are less likely to be persuasive than any evidence at the date of the Final Notice.
- (c) Any submissions, also signed with a statement of truth, on which he intends to rely at the Preliminary Issue hearing. Such submissions must be:
  - (i) Limited to the question of ownership at the relevant time;
  - (i) In any event, contained on **no more than two sides of A4 paper**, using font size 12 Arial, taking each point in a numbered paragraph, be spaced at 1.5;
  - (ii) Any authorities on which he relies must be appended to his submissions.

### **Respondent's Reply**

- 11. By **4pm on 18 July 2025**, the Respondent may (if so advised) send to the Applicant by email any Reply to new matters raised by the Applicant, not already addressed in the application to strike out dated 23 June 2025. That Reply may be delivered as part of the Bundle for Hearing below.

### **Bundle for the hearing**

- 12. The Respondent must by **4pm on 18 July 2025** email to the Tribunal at [London.Rap@justice.gov.uk](mailto:London.Rap@justice.gov.uk) and to the Applicant a bundle of all relevant documents for use in the determination of the Preliminary Issue, comprised in a single document in Adobe PDF format. The bundle must have an index and must be numbered chronologically page by page (with the Index at page 1). The documents must, so far as possible, be in chronological order. The subject line of the email must read: "BUNDLE FOR PRELIMINARY ISSUE HEARING: [Case reference], [Property address]".
- 13. **The Tribunal will not consider anything that is not in the bundle.**
- 14. The bundle must include:
  - (a) The Applicant's Appeal and supporting documents;
  - (b) The Applicant's application for inspection and supporting documents;
  - (c) The Respondent's application for strike out and supporting documents;
  - (d) Any evidence and documents exchanged in accordance with paragraphs 8-11 of these directions; including any witness statements of fact to be relied

upon, with numbered paragraphs and ending with a statement of truth and the signature of the witness.

- (e) Any caselaw on which any party relies.
  - (f) Any other documents to be used at the hearing, including any (and only) essential correspondence with the Tribunal.
15. Original witness statements should be brought to the hearing. In addition, witnesses are expected to attend the hearing to be questioned about their evidence, unless their statement has been agreed by the other party. The tribunal may decline to hear evidence from any witness who has not provided a statement in accordance with the above directions

### **Form of statement of truth**

16. All statements of case/witness statements directed in paragraphs 8-11 above must be signed by a statement of truth in the following form, deleting the parts contained in square brackets that are not relevant to the particular person making the statement:

**‘[I believe][the (Respondent or as may be) believes] that the facts stated in this [name document being verified] are true. [I understand] [The (Respondent or as may be) understands] that proceedings for contempt of court may be brought against anyone who makes, or causes to be made, a false statement in a document verified by a statement of truth without an honest belief in its truth.’**

### **Non-Compliance with Directions: Notice to Applicant**

17. If the **Applicant** fails to comply with these directions the Tribunal may **strike out** all or part of his case pursuant to rule 9(3) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013 **without further notice**, on the grounds:
- (a) that the Applicant has failed to cooperate with the Tribunal such that the Tribunal cannot deal with the Application fairly and justly (rule 9(3)(b)), and/or
  - (b) that the manner in which the Applicant is conducting proceedings is vexatious (rule 9(3)(c)).

**Name:** Judge N Carr

**Date:** 26 June 2025





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

**Case reference** : LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616

**Property** : Flat 33, Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road,  
London SE1 3GG

**Applicant** : Dr. Malay Halder

**Representative** : In person

**Respondent/Council** : London Borough of Southwark

**Representative** : Debra Allday (Senior Solicitor,  
Regulatory Team)

**Interested Persons** : Dr. Sreela Halder, Joe Hogg, Frank  
Harris Ltd, Melanie Weir Hyde Housing  
Group

**Type of application** : An appeal against the decision by the Local  
Housing Authority to refuse to grant a licence  
under Part 3 of Schedule 5 Para 3(1) of the  
Housing Act

**Tribunal** : Judge N Carr

**Date of Directions** : 26 June 2025

---

**DIRECTIONS TO THE APPLICANT: CONTACT WITH THE  
TRIBUNAL**

---

1. Due to the conduct of these proceedings and in particular his personal conduct towards the case officer in this case, Dr Halder is directed that he may make contact with the Tribunal **only** in the following **circumstances**:
  - (i) To comply with a Tribunal direction requiring him to send a document to the Tribunal;

- (ii) To attend at the Preliminary Issue hearing taking place by video conferencing on 21 July 2025;
  - (iii) To make any application for variation of directions if necessary; any such application must be by form order<sup>1</sup>, explaining the direction needed to enable compliance with the Tribunal's direction, identifying the particular direction, and why the amendment is needed. Any such application must be supported by evidence.
2. Due to the conduct of these proceedings, in particular the volume and rate of email correspondence and the inappropriate threats being made in emails and in telephone calls, Dr Halder is directed he may make contact with the Tribunal **only by the following methods**:
- (i) In respect of the matters:
    - (a) required by paragraph 9 (name, email address, address of tenant) as set out in the Preliminary Issue Directions; or
    - (b) permitted by paragraph 1(iii) above
- they must be sent by hard copy by recorded delivery post, marked for the attention of The Team Leader, Housing Act Section, First Tier Tribunal (Property Chamber) (Residential Property), 10 Alfred Place, London WC1E 7LR;
- (ii) Dr Halder is prohibited from otherwise contacting the Tribunal, whether by email, telephone, post or any other method.

**Non-Compliance with Directions: Notice to Applicant**

3. If the **Applicant** fails to comply with these directions the Tribunal may **strike out** all or part of his case pursuant to rule 9(3) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013 **without further notice**, on the grounds:
- (c) that the Applicant has failed to cooperate with the Tribunal such that the Tribunal cannot deal with the Application fairly and justly (rule 9(3)(b)), and/or
  - (d) that the manner in which the Applicant is conducting proceedings is vexatious (rule 9(3)(c)).

**Name:** Judge N Carr

**Date:** 26 June 2025



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

**Case reference** : LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616

**Property** : Flat 33, Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road,  
London SE1 3GG

**Applicant** : Dr. Malay Halder

**Representative** : In person

**Respondent/Council** : London Borough of Southwark

**Representative** : Debra Allday (Senior Solicitor,  
Regulatory Team)

**Interested Persons** : Dr. Sreela Halder, Joe Hogg, Frank  
Harris Ltd, Melanie Weir Hyde Housing  
Group

**Type of application** : An appeal against the decision by the Local  
Housing Authority to refuse to grant a licence  
under Part 3 of Schedule 5 Para 3(1) of the  
Housing Act

**Tribunal** : Judge N Carr

**Date of Directions** : 26 June 2025

---

**REASONS FOR DIRECTIONS AND PRELIMINARY ISSUE  
HEARING**

---

**ORDER:**

See attachments:

7. DIRECTIONS TO THE APPLICANT: CONTACT WITH THE TRIBUNAL
8. PRELIMINARY ISSUE DIRECTIONS

## **REASONS**

### **Preliminary Issue**

- (43) By directions dated 13 June 2025, Judge Hamilton Farey gave a timetable to the hearing of this case later this year.
- (44) At its heart, this is not a ‘fit and proper person’ appeal; rather it is a decision to refuse a selective license to the Applicant on grounds that he has no remaining interest in the property and so is not the ‘appropriate person’, pursuant to the procedure set out in Schedule 5, Part 1, paragraphs 1-6 and 8 of Part 1 of Schedule 5 to the Housing Act 2004 (‘the Act’).
- (45) In both the notice of intention to refuse a selective license, and the final notice, the Respondent’s reasons were as follows:
- The proposed licence holder needs to be the most appropriate person, namely the landlord, person in receipt of rent or in control of the property. The proposed licence holder has indicated that they are unaware as to whether or not the property is let and are not in receipt of the rent.*
- The Council are not satisfied that the proposed licence holder is the most appropriate person, and they refuse to provide any further documentation, the licence must therefore be refused.*
- (46) According to the Final Notice, the Applicant made no representations as invited by the Notice of Intention.
- (47) In his application to the Tribunal, Dr Halder sets out no grounds for the appeal. It is therefore unclear how Judge Hamilton Farey was able to say in the directions of 13 June 2025 that the Applicant’s case was clear from the application.
- (48) Since then, the Tribunal has received no fewer than 21 emails, including various applications, from Dr Malay Halder, in which the contents are difficult to follow and it is unclear that they relate to the question the Tribunal is required to answer by the appeal. Included within those papers is an application that the Tribunal immediately inspect the property for ‘health and safety’.
- (49) Dr Halder has joined Joe Hogg, Frank Harris Ltd, Melanie Weir and Hyde Housing Group as interested persons in this application. They are not parties to the application. It is unclear why they have been joined as interested persons, as they do not appear to have requested to be joined. If they are not Respondents, it is not up to the Applicant to decide that they should be interested persons. In light of the fact that the sole issue is Dr Halder’s ownership of the property in question, which is what led to the Respondent’s refusal in the Final Notice, it seems to Judge N Carr they are not appropriate interested persons.
- (50) She therefore determines they should be removed from this litigation unless they confirm in the next 7 days they wish to continue as interested persons.

- (51) The Respondent has now also made an application to strike out the appeal, on the basis that sufficient documentary evidence (including pending registration of a sale of the property to a new individual, and letters from TLT going back to 2022-2023 showing that the property was in receivership at the behest of the buy-to-let mortgagor prior to its sale at auction) exists to demonstrate Dr Halder has no remaining interest in the property and was not in control or management of it.
- (52) In all of those circumstances, it is not appropriate to make an order for immediate inspection of the property as per Dr Halder's application. If he has no interest in the property (and Judge N Carr notes, there is no witness statement from him signed with a statement of truth (with the attached consequences if he makes a false statement) in fact asserting his continued ownership of the property), the Tribunal would be facilitating trespass. It must be certain regarding the Applicant's continuing rights before it can even consider an inspection.
- (53) In any event, an inspection is not necessary in this case, as Judge Hamilton Farey observed, in order to determine the question put before the Tribunal to answer; it boils down to whether Dr Halder is the owner (or otherwise authorised by the owner), who had a right to make an application for a selective license. The physical attributes of the property will not assist answering that question.
- (54) In light of the documents provided with the strike out application, that would be essential to any decision to be made before continuing with these proceedings at cost and time to all parties. Therefore there will be no decision on the Applicant's application for an inspection until the outcome of the Preliminary Issue is known.
- (55) I consider that it is fair and just in accordance with the overriding objective in the circumstances that the strike out application be heard as a preliminary hearing on 21 July 2025 starting at 10am. At that hearing, either Dr Halder will either be able to establish that it is arguable that he is or was the property owner on 20 May 2025, when the decision by the Respondent was made, in which case further directions will be given, or the Tribunal will determine that he does not have an arguable case, in which case the Tribunal will strike out his application pursuant to rule 9(3)(e) of the Tribunal Procedure (First Tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013.

### **Vexatious conduct**

- (56) Very concerning, Dr Halder has been making continual inappropriate and aggressive comments to the case officer over the telephone, escalating yesterday (25 June 2025) to shouting at her, threatening to persecute her personally, get her fired and report her to the police. He used phrases such as: "you are not a human" "you are stupid".
- (57) This was followed at 5pm 25 June 2025 by an email in which he stated: "[the case officer] has obstructed fair processing our submission. This means for unknown reasons [the case officer] refused did not add or forward my submission before an honourable Judge that I made on 24 June 2025."
- (58) That is a grossly unfair allegation with no foundation. The case officer has diligently forwarded each of the emails from Dr Halder. Dr Halder does not

appear to appreciate that his case is one of thousands, and that Judges (and indeed all court staff) are extremely busy. It is not for him to dictate timeframes or responses. The Tribunal cannot give him priority over all of the other litigants simply because he demands it.

- (59) There is a process to follow, and he has been told what the process is. It is set out in the Direction made by Judge Hamilton Farey. The Tribunal should not be receiving any correspondence other than necessary applications for the smooth progression of the case, by form order 1 identifying why the step is needed and the evidence on which it is based.
- (60) Tribunal staff are entitled to be treated respectfully, civilly and professionally to undertake their role free from harassment. The Tribunal will not tolerate its employees being treated in this matter. I therefore set out below the extent of the permission the Applicant has to make contact with the Tribunal.
- (61) That is as true as regards the Respondent in the case. Directions have been given and it is only material in compliance with those Directions that the Tribunal should be receiving. Dr Halder also appears to believe it is appropriate to threaten both the Respondent and persons named only as interested parties for their perceived failures, which have not yet occurred. The Directions have not yet even started, and Dr Halder has not yet even supplied the name and address of the Tenant to whom this appeal must be notified.
- (62) The parties are therefore directed to the attached directions.

**Name:** Judge N Carr

**Date:** 26 June 2025



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

**Case reference** : LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616

**Property** : Flat 33, Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road,  
London SE1 3GG

**Applicant** : Dr. Malay Halder

**Representative** : In person

**Respondent/Council** : London Borough of Southwark

**Representative** : Debra Allday (Senior Solicitor,  
Regulatory Team)

**Interested Persons** : ~~Dr. Sreela Halder, Joe Hogg, Frank~~  
~~Harris Ltd, Melanie Weir Hyde Housing~~  
~~Group~~

**Type of application** : An appeal against the decision by the Local  
Housing Authority to refuse to grant a licence  
under Part 3 of Schedule 5 Para 3(1) of the  
Housing Act

**Tribunal** : Judge N Carr

**Date of Directions** : 11 July 2025

---

**ORDER**

---

**ORDER:**

9. Dr Malay Halder may not contact the Tribunal further in this case, until the preliminary issue hearing on 21 July 2025 commencing at 10am (at which he must attend by the video link provided to him on 26 June 2025).

10. Joe Hogg, Frank Harris Limited, Melanie Weir and Hyde Housing are all formally removed as “Interested Persons” in the proceedings.

## **REASONS**

- (63) By directions and order dated 26 June 2025, Judge N Carr gave an order limiting the way in which the Applicant, Dr Malay Halder, was permitted to contact the Tribunal (ie by recorded delivery post only, and only for the purpose of making any application for a variation of directions necessary to enable his compliance with directions, which application was mandated by use of form order1).
- (64) Dr Halder is very substantially in breach of that order. The Tribunal has received a number of phone-calls to various individuals, and no fewer than 15 further emails in the 15 days since (at the time of writing).
- (65) As those communications with the Tribunal have been provided in flagrant disregard of the Tribunal’s clear conditions, they will be disregarded. This was made clear on 27 June 2025 by email from the Delivery Manager, Mr Ilik.
- (66) The Tribunal has received from Dr Halder, by post received on 7 July 2025, something called “Applicant’s compliance: Direction 4 SR/LON/ooBE/HML/0616”.
- (67) No names, email addresses or room/flat numbers of the occupants/tenants have been provided by Dr Halder. It is therefore assumed, lacking evidence to the contrary, that any occupants of the property are not known to him.
- (68) The document comprises 60 pages. It is therefore assumed that the document is intended to comply with the requirements of direction 10 of Judge N Carr’s preliminary issue directions dated 26 June 2025, rather than direction 4 (which set out solely the issue to be decided). Dr Halder was not directed to send it to the Tribunal, only to the Respondent.
- (69) There is therefore no further need for Dr Halder to contact the Tribunal. His arguments will be heard at the video hearing on 21 July 2025. The Respondent will be preparing the bundle that the Tribunal will consider.
- (70) The Tribunal will therefore open no further emails from Dr Halder. Staff have been instructed to immediately terminate the call when he calls the Tribunal. She should concentrate on putting his arguments on the preliminary issue into any structured oral presentation he wishes to make at the Preliminary Issue hearing.
- (71) I now formally remove the persons listed as ‘interested parties’ in this case, pursuant to rule 10 of the Tribunal Procedure (First Tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013, since they have no interest in this case. The Tribunal will not contact them further.

**Name:** Judge N Carr

**Date:** 11 July 2025





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

**Case reference** : LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616

**Property** : Flat 33, Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road,  
London SE1 3GG

**Applicant** : Dr. Malay Halder

**Representative** : In person

**Respondent/Council** : London Borough of Southwark

**Representative** : Debra Allday (Senior Solicitor,  
Regulatory Team)

**Interested Persons** : Dr. Sreela Halder

**Type of application** : An appeal against the decision by the Local  
Housing Authority to refuse to grant a licence  
under Part 3 of Schedule 5 Para 3(1) of the  
Housing Act

**Tribunal** : Judge N Carr

**Date of Directions** : 18 July 2025

---

**ORDER**

---

**ORDER:**

11. The form order1 application dated 18 July 2025 made by Dr Sreela Halder to be joined as an Applicant in these proceedings, will be heard on 21 July 2025 at the Preliminary Issue hearing taking place by Video Hearing commencing at 10am.
12. Dr Sreela Halder must attend to pursue her application to be joined as an Applicant.

13. The Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder are notified that they **must** copy Debra Allday, solicitor for the Respondent into all their emails; Ms Allday is the Respondent's legal representative and the only person in the Respondent organisation entitled to be included in all correspondence.
14. For the same reason, the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder are directed that **the Tribunal will be using the bundle provided by the Respondent (via Ms Allday)** as directed in the Preliminary Issue directions. It is a matter for them whether they decide to open that Bundle; the Tribunal **will not permit either party to rely anything other than that Bundle without a good explanation why it was not copied to Ms Allday.**
15. **On condition that by 3.30pm today** Dr Sreela Halder forwards to Ms Allday her email and the attachments to it, of 17 July 2025 at 12.10pm, she may make an oral application to rely on those documents at the hearing. For the avoidance of doubt, those are the **only documents that should be provided.**
16. **The Respondent is directed** to send to the Tribunal and to the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder an updated bundle including this order and, if complied with, the email and documents from Dr Sreela Halder sent to it in accordance with paragraph 5 above, by no later than **4pm.**

## **REASONS**

- (72) By appeal dated 19 May 2025, Dr Malay Halder ('the Applicant') seeks to appeal the decision made by the London Borough of Southwark to refuse to grant him a selective licence in connection with Flat 33 Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road, SE1 3GG ('the Property'). In that application he named Dr Sreela Halder, his wife, as an 'interested person'.
- (73) The Applicant did not provide Dr Halder's email address. The Tribunal duly notified her that she had been named as an interested person by **letter sent on 11 June 2025** to 40 Newlands Road, London, IG8 0RU.
- (74) That letter asked Dr Sreela Halder to "**confirm the email address on which the Tribunal can send future directions and correspondence to you, by emailing london.rap@justice.gov.uk under the title "Flat 33, Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road, SE1 3GG – SR/LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616 - CONFIRMING EMAIL ADDRESS".**
- (75) No response was received. Nevertheless, Dr Sreela Halder has been copied in numerous communications between the Applicant (her husband) and the Tribunal and other parties, not least by the Applicant himself.
- (76) On the same day the Applicant was forbidden to contact the Tribunal due to his conduct towards staff by order dated 26 June 2025, the case officer sent video hearing joining instructions to the Applicant and the Respondent.

- (77) Despite the Tribunal's clear instructions, and reiteration on 3 July 2025, the Tribunal received numerous further emails and telephone calls from the Applicant. I therefore instructed HMCTS staff to send the Applicant an Order on 11 July 2025, confirming receipt of his documents received by post on 7 July 2025, and forbidding him from contacting the Tribunal further (it being unnecessary in light of the fact that the remaining directions simply required the Respondent to send the Bundle).
- (78) By email dated 16 July 2025, at 12:41 pm, the Applicant emailed the Tribunal and approximately 150 other people (including Courts, Government, the Police, Data Protection and so forth) a wholly inchoate stream of other emails, together with copies of the joining instructions dated 26 June 2025, my Orders of 26 June and 11 July 2025, something purporting to be an interim application dated 15 July 2025 (to rely on a witness statement that was not, in fact, attached), an FOI request to the MOJ dated 23 June 2025 seeking disclosure of unclear records, and a proof of delivery of some documents.
- (79) Judge N Carr has those documents, running to 37 pages. However, they have not been provided in accordance with the Directions. None of them is a witness statement. Judge N Carr therefore has not read them.
- (80) On the same day, Dr Sreela Halder, for the first time, emailed the Tribunal in her own name. At 10.18am acknowledging receipt of the Order dated 11 July 2025, stating that she had not been copied into the 26 June 2025 orders and seeking directions to her as and 'Interested Party' for the hearing on 21 July 2025. A case officer immediately **replied with an invitation to the hearing and a copy of the directions**. Dr Sreela Halder's response at 3:42pm the same day was:

**"FOR AN URGENT ATTENTION OF TRIBUNAL JUDGE N CARR:**

**RE: SR/LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616: Equality Act 2010- Relevant correspondences- how to send signed witness statements and join the hearing on 21 July 2025 must arrive directly from Tribunal Judge copying with [malaysree@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:malaysree@yahoo.co.uk), [accessinfor@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:accessinfor@southwark.gov.uk), [dpo@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:dpo@southwark.gov.uk) and [dorren.forrester-brown@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:dorren.forrester-brown@southwark.gov.uk), for legal reasons Ref: 250711 Order 33 Artesian House"-**

I am formally confirming that I have not received any communication from you anytime before and after 11 July 2025 concerning my right as an Interested Party included under 250711 Order 33 Artesian House to date.

This means that you, as the designated Lead person as confirmed by Judge N Carr on 11 July 2025; you have not sent me comprehensive details as to how I can submit my signed witness statements or joining direction at the Video Preliminary Hearing on 21 July 2025.

Under the circumstances I want my application to be dealt with by the Tribunal Judge N.Carr for seriously considering my, as the named Interested Party and Co-Owner of the property having First Named Proprietor in the Official Copy of HM Land Registration Copy rights under the Law.

Additionally, my formal submission is in accordance with Equality Act 2010 and I am reasonably certain that the Tribunal will not deliberately violate the Equality Act 2010.

I look forward to receiving relevant correspondence directly from Tribunal Judge copying with [malaysree@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:malaysree@yahoo.co.uk), [accessinfo@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:accessinfo@southwark.gov.uk), [dpo@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:dpo@southwark.gov.uk) and [dorren.forrester-brown@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:dorren.forrester-brown@southwark.gov.uk), for legal reasons Ref: 250711 Order 33 Artesian House"- attached again."

- (81) By reply on 17 July 2025 Judge N Carr instructed the case officer to write to Dr Sreela Halder as follows:

*"Judge N Carr has read an email from Mrs Sreela Halder, the Applicant's wife, in which she asserts that she has not been given an opportunity to participate in these proceedings.*

*It appears Mrs Halder is under a misapprehension: she is an interested person, so named by Dr Halder, and not a party.*

*As such she is entitled to see the directions and the bundle - which has been facilitated by her being cc'd into **all** emails. She is not in fact an Applicant. It was a matter for her husband to obtain any evidence from her should he wish to have relied on it. As Judge N Carr has not yet seen the bundle, it is unclear whether he did so.*

*She is also entitled to attend at the hearing on Monday as an observer. She has also been provided with a video link to do so.*

*Judge N Carr is particularly concerned that the Tribunal has not heard from Mrs Halder from the outset of these proceedings until 2 days before the hearing, given she writes in the terms she does. Mrs Halder should take independent legal advice.*

*The Tribunal will not correspond with Mrs Halder further; she is not a party."*

- (82) At 12.10pm the same day (i.e. 17 July 2025) , Dr Sreela Halder responded as follows:

"Dear Mr Giray Ilik, Delivery Manager and sender of "250711 Order 33 Artesian House"( attached),

**FOR AN URGENT ATTENTION OF TRIBUNAL JUDGE N CARR:**

**RE: SR/LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616: Equality Act 2010- Relevant correspondences- how to send signed witness statements and join the hearing on 21 July 2025 must arrive directly from Tribunal Judge copying**

**with [malaysree@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:malaysree@yahoo.co.uk), [accessinfo@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:accessinfo@southwark.gov.uk), [dpo@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:dpo@southwark.gov.uk) and [dorren.forrester-brown@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:dorren.forrester-brown@southwark.gov.uk), for legal reasons Ref: 250711 Order 33 Artesian House"-**

Dr SREELA HALDER Co Owner HM LR Title TGL289727 Application under Equality Act 2010 representation rights under LON 00BE HML 2025 0616 Property Act 2004\_compressed.pdf

---

---

Good afternoon.

Please find an attached pdf document seeking URGENT Order from Judge N CARR.

Kindest regards

Dr Sreela Halder

Enclosures:

**Dr SREELA HALDER Co Owner HM LR Title TGL289727 Application under Equality Act 2010 representation rights under LON 00BE HML 2025 0616 Property Act 2004\_compressed.pdf**

- (83) Judge N Carr has those documents, save for an application. That appears to be documents intended to be a witness statement, and an allegation of misconduct against the case officer. However, unlike her husband, Dr Sreela Halder did not copy either the email or the documents to Ms Allday. **Until the email and accompanying documents are forwarded to Ms Allday, Dr Sreela Halder may not make an application to rely on them.**

- (84) At 2.12pm on 17 July 2025, Dr Sreela Halder sent a further email as follows:

“Please forward and add my earlier submission with Tribunal Judge N Carr.

While waiting for fair administration of justice; I would like to reiterate that there is no legal requirement of mandatory representation of a legally qualified person to represent Dr Sreela Halder ( Ref: PD 3.1A -further to that Tribunal Judge did consistently maintain Dr Sreela Halder, as the only Interested Party under LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616 and justifying her Order © CROWN COPYRIGHT 2025

Case management – unrepresented parties

### **3.1A**

- (1) This rule applies in any proceedings where at least one party is unrepresented.
- (2) When the court is exercising any powers of case management, it must have regard to the fact that at least one party is unrepresented.
- (3) Both the parties and the court must, when drafting case management directions in the multi-track, intermediate track and fast track, take as their starting point any relevant standard directions which can be found online

at [www.justice.gov.uk/courts/procedure-rules/civil](http://www.justice.gov.uk/courts/procedure-rules/civil) and adapt them as appropriate to the circumstances of the case.

(4) The court must adopt such procedure at any hearing as it considers appropriate to further the overriding objective.

(5) At any hearing where the court is taking evidence this may include—

(a) ascertaining from an unrepresented party the matters about which the witness may be able to give evidence or on which the witness ought to be cross-examined; and

(b) putting, or causing to be put, to the witness such questions as may appear to the court to be proper.

**"Interested Persons : Dr. Sreela Halder, ~~Joe Hogg, Frank Harris Ltd, Melanie Weir Hyde Housing Group~~**

**© CROWN COPYRIGHT 2025" date 11 July 2025.**

Additionally, please find relevant evidence that SHA, Property Licencing Division considered Dr Sreela Halder as Owner and Interested party to justify legal rights for representation at the preliminary hearing on 21 July 2025ref: LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616 and justifying her Order © CROWN COPYRIGHT 2025

SWK 155471536615 relevant decisions sent to Dr Sreela Halder as Owner and interested party\_compressed

I look forward to receiving substantive determinations/directions that was issued on 16 June 2025 now.

Kindest regards.

Dr Sreela Halder

### **Litigants in person**

A person who brings or defends legal proceedings without legal representation is known as a 'litigant in person', sometimes shortened to LiP. The rules of practice and procedure apply to litigants in person in the same way as represented parties. The provisions of this guide also apply to litigants in person. The Court will have regard to the fact a party is unrepresented (see CPR 3.1A) but it will not usually apply a lower standard of compliance with rules, PDs or orders of the court (see *Barton v Wright Hassall LLP* [2018] UKSC 12: <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/uksc-2016-0136.html>)

- (85) At 9.40am this morning (18 July 2025) Dr Sreela Halder sent a further form order<sup>1</sup>, seeking to be joined as an Applicant in the proceedings. Again, Ms Allday was not copied. At Judge N Carr's instruction, the case officer replied as follows:

*"Judge N Carr directs that Dr Sreela Halder's application to be joined as an Applicant be dealt with as the first item of business on Monday 21 July 2025. She must attend at the video hearing to make her submissions. She already has the joining instructions."*

- (86) At 10.25, Dr Sreela Halder responded as follows (also not copied to Ms Allday):

Good morning. I have read and reflected content of your email.

I will only accept a Court Order by Tribunal Judge N Carr © CROWN COPYRIGHT 2025 by considering several applications filed over the past few days since formally considered by Judge N Carr sending an email to [sreela.halder@gmail.com](mailto:sreela.halder@gmail.com) on 11 July 2025.

Beyond a reasonable doubt, Judge N Carr under the Equality Act 2010 will consider my applications as an Applicant pursuant to rule 10 of the Tribunal Procedure (First Tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013.

I am aware that Tribunal Officers are not legally qualified or can act on behalf of the Tribunal Judge. Hence only a formal order © CROWN COPYRIGHT 2025 will be considered for my future representation.

It is my reasonable decision asking you to send Judge N Carr Order and refrain from providing a legally binding direction. Until that time I will not consider any hearing bundle or communications from LHA, Respondent, EXCLUSIVELY from, [accessinfo@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:accessinfo@southwark.gov.uk), [dpo@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:dpo@southwark.gov.uk) and [doreen.forrester-brown@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:doreen.forrester-brown@southwark.gov.uk).

Kindest regards

Dr Sreela Halder

**P.S. I HAVE NOT RECEIVED SUBSTANTIVE DIRECTIONS INCLUDING JOINING INSTRUCTIONS.**

- (87) That last P.S. is **plainly and demonstrably incorrect**; the directions and joining instructions were attached to the email **from the business email the Applicant uses and signed by both the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder, in which both his and her gmail accounts were copied**, that was sent to the 160+ people on 16 July 2025 at 12:44.
- (88) In the course of drafting this order, the Respondent has notified the Tribunal that Dr Sreela Halder has also refused to even open the bundle for Monday's hearing, despite all of the above:

**From:** Sreela Halder <[sreela.halder@gmail.com](mailto:sreela.halder@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Friday, July 18, 2025 11:04 AM

**To:** Carroll, Rosanna <[Rosanna.Carroll@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:Rosanna.Carroll@southwark.gov.uk)>; Forrester-Brown, Doreen <[Doreen.Forrester-Brown@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:Doreen.Forrester-Brown@southwark.gov.uk)>; accessinfo

<[accessinfo@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:accessinfo@southwark.gov.uk)>; [DPO@southwark.gov.uk](mailto:DPO@southwark.gov.uk)

**Cc:** Yahoo <[malaysree@yahoo.co.uk](mailto:malaysree@yahoo.co.uk)>; Sreela Halder <[sreela.halder@gmail.com](mailto:sreela.halder@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: REJECTED -RETURNED back to sender : 33 Artesian House, SE1 3GG - SR/LON00BEHML20250616

Dear Ms Rosanna Carroll,

**REJECTED -RETURNED back to the sender : 33 Artesian House, SE1 3GG - SR/LON00BEHML20250616**

I will consider any correspondence from legally binding exclusively considered 3 sender only after the Tribunal will confirm my Applicant status.

Accordingly, I am rejecting and so, returned back to you a file that you have sent by email.

Please note that I have not attempted to open the file. Hence neither I have read nor stored any content from the file.

You will be updated by the Tribunal when my Applicant Status will be formalised by a Tribunal Order.

Kindest regards.

Dr Sreela Halder

On Fri, Jul 18, 2025 at 9:44 AM Rosanna Carroll via safedrop

<[messages@safedrop.com](mailto:messages@safedrop.com)> wrote:

- (89) The Tribunal has not yet seen the updated bundle, but is has no intention of further engaging with this narrative.
- (90) Dr Sreela Halder has been **directed to attend on Monday**. At that hearing, the Tribunal will consider whether to join her as an Applicant.
- (91) The correspondence passing has all the hallmarks of a wish to frustrate the process of the hearing. Judge N Carr cannot force the Applicant and Dr Sreela Halder to look at the bundle, but the Tribunal will not be working from any other documents, as it has previously made amply clear.
- (92) The primary point is that it unclear how joining Dr Sreela Halder as an Applicant will have any effect; she clearly knows what the arguments are, has provided a 58 page bundle of documents that is almost exactly the same as her husband's (so the Respondent will not be prejudiced by it), and oral evidence under oath can be heard from her on Monday. The Tribunal is therefore in a position to proceed.
- (93) The Tribunal will therefore open no further emails from the Applicant or Dr Sreela Halder. She should concentrate on putting together her evidence for the Preliminary Issue hearing.
- (94) I notify all parties that evidence will be heard under oath. If any party has a holy book on which they wish to swear, they are asked to make their own copy available.

**Name:** Judge N Carr

**Date:** 18 July 2025





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

**Case reference** : LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616

**Property** : Flat 33, Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road,  
London SE1 3GG

**Applicant** : Dr. Malay Halder  
Dr Sreela Halder

**Representative** : In person

**Respondent/Council** : London Borough of Southwark

**Representative** : Debra Allday (Senior Solicitor,  
Regulatory Team)

**Type of application** : For an order for costs under rule 13 of  
the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier  
Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules  
2013

**Tribunal** : Judge N Carr

**Date of Directions** : 18 July 2025

---

**DIRECTIONS  
RULE 13 COSTS APPLICATION**

---

**Communication with the Tribunal**

- The parties' attention is drawn to the Amended Order: Contact with the Tribunal attached to these directions.

**Preliminary**

- (1) By a revised application dated 4 July 2025, the Respondent seeks an order under rule 13(1)(b) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013 ("The Rules"). Rule 13(1)(b) provides that the Tribunal may make an order in respect of costs if a person has acted unreasonably in bringing, defending

or conducting proceedings in a residential property case or a leasehold case (“the Rule”).

- (2) The application was sent to the First Applicant on 4 July 2025. The application was received by The tribunal on 18 July 2025.
- (3) The application is now to be formalised, in light of the decision to which these directions are attached.
- (4) Rule 13(6) provides that the Tribunal may not make an order for costs against a person (“the paying person”) without first giving that person an opportunity to make representations.
- (5) Accordingly, this application will be determined by the Tribunal subject to the directions set out below.
- (6) Documents prepared for the Tribunal should be easy to read. If possible, they should be typed and use a font-size of not less than 12 (see below for the format).

### **Directions**

1. The Tribunal considers that this application may be determined by summary assessment, pursuant to rule 13(7)(a).
2. The application is to be determined without a hearing and on the basis of the written submissions from the parties. However, any party may make a request to the Tribunal that a hearing should be held or the Tribunal may decide that a hearing is necessary for a fair determination of the application. Any such **request for a hearing must be made by 4pm 18 August 2025, and must be accompanied by the person’s dates to avoid for the period 20 October 2025 – 28 November 2025.** The Tribunal will then notify the parties of the hearing date. The hearing will have a time estimate of 90 minutes.

### **The Respondent’s case**

3. By **4pm on 18 August 2025**, the Respondent shall send to the Applicants a statement of case setting out:
  - (a) The reasons why it is said that the Applicants have individually or collectively acted unreasonably in bringing, defending or conducting proceedings and why this behaviour is sufficient to invoke the rule, dealing with the issues identified in the Upper Tribunal decision in *Willow Court Management Company (1985) Ltd v Mrs Ratna Alexander* [2016] UKUT (LC), with particular reference to the three stages that the tribunal will need to go through, before making an order under rule 13;
  - (b) Any further legal submissions;
  - (c) Full details of the costs being sought, including:
    - A schedule of the work undertaken;

- The time spent;
- The grade of fee earner and his/her hourly rate;
- A copy of the terms of engagement with respondent;
- Supporting invoices for solicitor's fees and disbursements;
- Counsel's fee notes with counsel's year of call, details of the work undertaken and time spent by counsel, with his/her hourly rate; and
- Expert witness's invoices, the grade of fee earner, details of the work undertaken and the time spent, with his/her hourly rate.

### **The Applicants' case**

4. By **4pm on 15 September 2025** the Applicants must, jointly or separately, send to the Respondent a statement in response setting out:
  - (a) The reasons for opposing the application, with any legal submissions;
  - (b) Any challenge to the amount of the costs being claimed, with full reasons for such challenge and any alternative costs;
  - (c) Details of any relevant documentation relied on with copies attached.

### **The Respondent's reply**

5. By **29 September 2025**, the Respondent may send to the Applicants a statement in reply to the points raised by the Applicant (if so advised).

### **Documents for the hearing/determination**

6. The **Respondent** must prepare a digital, indexed and paginated hearing bundle, in Adobe PDF format, which must be emailed to all other parties, and to the Tribunal at [London.Rap@justice.gov.uk](mailto:London.Rap@justice.gov.uk) **4pm on 13 October 2025**. The subject line of the email must read: "BUNDLE FOR HEARING" followed by the case reference and the address of the Property.
7. The bundle must be a single PDF document. If the bundle is too large to email, use can be made of a secure file sharing website. Only documents previously exchanged by the parties should be included in the hearing bundle. If there is a dispute between the parties regarding the contents of the hearing bundle, a prompt application must be made to the Tribunal (copied to all other parties), by the party wishing to rely upon those documents, seeking the Tribunal's permission to do so. Any such application must be made using form Order 1 and must be accompanied by copies of the documents in question.
8. Only those documents sent in bundles will be before the Tribunal at the full hearing and parties should not send documents "piecemeal" to the case officer.
9. The bundle shall contain copies of:

- The Tribunal’s determination in the substantive case to which this application relates;
  - These directions and any subsequent directions;
  - The Respondent’s statements with all supporting documents;
  - The Applicants’ statements with all supporting documents.
10. It is essential that the parties include any relevant correspondence to the tribunal within their digital bundle.

### **Determination/hearing arrangements**

11. The Tribunal will determine the matter on the basis of the written representations received in accordance with these directions in the week commencing **20 October 2025**.
12. If a hearing is requested, the Tribunal will notify the parties the details of the hearing.
13. Any letters or emails sent to the Tribunal must be copied to the other party and the letter or email must be endorsed accordingly. Failure to comply with this direction may cause a delay in the determination of this case, as the letter may be returned without any action being taken.

### **Applications**

14. Applications for further directions, interim orders, variations of existing directions, or a postponement of the final hearing/determination must be made using form Order 1<sup>1</sup>.

### **Non-Compliance with Directions**

15. If the **Respondent** fails to comply with these directions the Tribunal may **strike out** all or part of their case pursuant to rule 9(3)(a) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013 (“the 2013 Rules”).
16. If the **Applicants** fail to comply with these directions the Tribunal may bar them from taking any further part in all or part of these proceedings and may determine all issues against them pursuant to rules 9(7) and (8) of the 2013 Rules.

**Name:** Judge N Carr

**Date:** 21 July 2025

---

<sup>1</sup> Form Order 1 is available at <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/ask-the-first-tier-tribunal-property-chamber-for-case-management-or-other-interim-orders>



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

**Case reference** : LON/00BE/HML/2025/0616

**Property** : Flat 33, Artesian House, 98 Alscot Road,  
London SE1 3GG

**Applicant** : Dr. Malay Halder  
**Dr Sreela Halder**

**Representative** : In person

**Respondent/Council** : London Borough of Southwark

**Representative** : Debra Allday (Senior Solicitor,  
Regulatory Team)

**Type of application** : An appeal against the decision by the Local  
Housing Authority to refuse to grant a licence  
under Part 3 of Schedule 5 Para 3(1) of the  
Housing Act  
**For an order for costs under rule 13 of  
the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier  
Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules  
2013**

**Tribunal** : Judge N Carr

**Date of Directions** : 26 June 2025  
**Amended 21 July 2025**

---

**DIRECTIONS TO THE APPLICANTS: CONTACT WITH THE  
TRIBUNAL**

---

4. Due to the conduct of these proceedings and in particular his personal conduct towards the case officer in this case, ~~Dr Halder is~~ **the Applicants are** directed that ~~he~~ **they** may make contact with the Tribunal **only** in the following **circumstances**:

- (iv) To comply with a Tribunal direction requiring ~~him~~ **them** to send a document to the Tribunal;
  - (v) To attend at ~~the Preliminary Issue hearing taking place by video conferencing on 21 July 2025~~ **any hearing listed for consideration of the Respondent's rule 13 costs application;**
  - (vi) To make any application for variation of directions if necessary; any such application must be by form order1, explaining the direction needed to enable compliance with the Tribunal's direction, identifying the particular direction, and why the amendment is needed. Any such application must be supported by evidence.
5. Due to the conduct of these proceedings, in particular the volume and rate of email correspondence and the inappropriate threats being made in emails and in telephone calls, ~~Dr Halder is~~ **the Applicants are** directed ~~he~~ **they** may make contact with the Tribunal **only by the following methods:**
- (iii) In respect of the matters:
    - (c) required by paragraph **1(i) above** ~~9 (name, email address, address of tenant) as set out in the Preliminary Issue Directions;~~ or
    - (d) permitted by paragraph 1(iii) above

they must be sent by hard copy by recorded delivery post, marked for the attention of The Team Leader, Housing Act Section, First Tier Tribunal (Property Chamber) (Residential Property), 10 Alfred Place, London WC1E 7LR;
  - (iv) ~~Dr Halder is~~ **The Applicants are** prohibited from otherwise contacting the Tribunal, whether by email, telephone, post or any other method.

### **Non-Compliance with Directions: Notice to Applicant**

6. If the **Applicants** fail to comply with these directions the Tribunal may **strike out** all or part of ~~his~~ **their** case pursuant to rule 9(3) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013 **without further notice**, on the grounds:
- (e) that the Applicants **have** failed to cooperate with the Tribunal such that the Tribunal cannot deal with the Application fairly and justly (rule 9(3)(b)), and/or
  - (f) that the manner in which the Applicants **are** conducting proceedings is vexatious (rule 9(3)(c)).

**Name:** Judge N Carr

**Date:** 26 June 2025

**Amended 21 July 2025**