



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

**Case Reference** : **MAN/00CG/HBA/2024/0600**

**Applicant** : **SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL**

**Respondent** : **JAMA AHMED FARRAH**

**Type of Application** : **Application for a Banning Order  
Section 15, Housing and Planning Act 2016**

**Tribunal** : **Tribunal Judge A M Davies  
Tribunal Member H Lewis, FRICS**

**Date of Hearing** : **28 August 2025**  
**Date of Order** : **10 September 2025**

---

**BANNING ORDER**

---

1. The Respondent Jama Ahmed Farrah is banned for a period of 5 years from engaging in any of the following:
  - (a) letting housing in England
  - (b) engaging in English letting agency work
  - (c) engaging in English property management work.
2. The order shall take effect on termination of the current tenancies of the Respondent's properties. Each such tenancy is to be brought to an end on the first possible date following the date of this order.
3. The Respondent shall appoint a professional firm of managing agents to manage his

properties until this order takes effect, and to arrange for termination of the tenancies. The appointment of the managing agents (1) shall take effect within 28 days after the date of this order (2) shall be approved in writing by the Applicant and (3) shall be subject to the terms of this order.

4. From the date of this order the Respondent may not have face-to-face contact or communication with any of his tenants.

## **REASONS**

### **THE LAW**

1. Chapter 2 of Part 2 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 Act (“the 2016 Act”) provides that a person may be banned for a period of at least 12 months from all or any of
  - (a) letting housing in England
  - (b) engaging in English letting agency work
  - (c) engaging in English property management work.
2. Section 16 of the 2016 Act empowers the Tribunal to make a banning order on an application by a local housing authority. Before it makes a banning order, the Tribunal must be satisfied that the following conditions are met:
  - (1) the local housing authority must have complied with the procedural requirements set out at section 15 of the 2016 Act before applying for the order.
  - (2) the respondent must have been convicted of a ‘banning order offence’.
  - (3) the respondent must also have been a ‘residential landlord’ or a ‘property agent’ at the time the offence was committed.
3. The Schedule to the Housing and Planning Act 2016 (Banning Order Offences) Regulations 2018 lists banning order offences. They include offences under section 1(2), (3) and (3A) of the Protection from Eviction Act 1977.
4. Section 16(4) of the 2016 Act provides that, in deciding whether to make a banning order against a person, and in deciding what order to make, the Tribunal must consider:
  - (a) the seriousness of the offence of which the person has been convicted,
  - (b) any previous convictions that the person has for a banning order offence,

- (c) whether the person is or has at any time been included in the database of rogue landlords and property agents (under section 30 of the 2016 Act), and
- (d) the likely effect of the banning order on the person and anyone else who may be affected by the order.

## THE APPLICATION

5. On 4 December 2024 the Applicant applied to this tribunal for an order banning the Respondent from letting housing or engaging in letting agency or property management. The events leading to the application are as follows:

On 6 March 2024 the Respondent was convicted (following a guilty plea) of two offences under section 1(3A) of the Protection from Eviction Act 1977, the offences having taken place between 5 December 2022 and 21 December 2022 at 33 Brunswick Street, Sheffield.

On 9 August 2024 the Applicant served on the Respondent notice of intent to apply for a banning order. The notice complied with the requirements of section 15(3) of the 2016 Act, and informed the Respondent that any representations in response should be made in writing with 30 days from the date of the notice.

The Respondent made representations in response to the notice of intent by letter dated 8 September 2024 and email dated 9 September 2024. He admitted that he was no longer capable of managing his let properties and told the Applicant that he intended to arrange for his sons Mustafa and Mohammed to let and manage them for him.

The Applicant wrote to the Respondent on 20 September, 1 October, and 21 October 2024 asking for specific information about the Respondent's proposal that his sons would take over the management of his let properties.

In a written response dated 15 October 2024 the Respondent said that neither his son Mustafa nor the Respondent himself would have any further involvement in managing the let properties. He said that his son Mohammed was "in the process of acquiring relevant training to support him in [a management] role".

On 7 November 2024 Mr Hickling, Principal Legal and Policy Officer, and other officers of the Applicant met to consider the Respondent's representations and "found there to be nothing in the representations which steered away from our concerns about the seriousness of the offence and about the future conduct of Mr Farrah, especially in view of there being no plans for the future professional management of the properties." The Applicant decided to apply for a banning order for 5 years "to minimise the likelihood of any repeat offences."

## THE HEARING

6. The Respondent contested the application, and the matter was heard on 28 August 2025. Ms Saad represented the Applicant and Mr Hickling was present to support his witness statements. The Respondent was present and was represented by two of his daughters, Sylvia Farrah and Ayan Farrah. Also present were the Respondent's wife, his third daughter Sagael, his sons Mustafa and Mohammed, and his brother.
7. Ms Sylvia Farrah confirmed that none of the factual evidence was contested. The Respondent admitted all the facts in the witness statements recounting events between August and December 2022 inclusive which were the basis of the offences of which the Respondent was convicted. They were made by Mr A A Shahizam and Mr A Azraai both of whom rented rooms from the Respondent at 33 Brunswick Street, and by Mr H El-Hames, Mr M T Hasnath, friends of the tenants. The hearing bundle also included statements relating to the same events from Mr D Armstrong and Mr N Skinner, Private Housing Standards Officers employed by the Applicant, and two short videos showing the Respondent's interactions at that time with his tenants and the police officers who attended the disturbance and removed the Respondent from the scene in handcuffs.
8. The hearing bundle contained no information about the Respondent's let properties or the tenancies he had granted.

## THE RESPONDENT'S CASE

9. Having accepted all the factual evidence against him, the Respondent's daughters explained that his insistence on entering his tenants' rooms in order to unplug electrical appliances, and his unauthorised removal of Mr Shahizam's room heater,

stemmed from a fire in his family home many years ago, which had left him fearful of a fire starting in his property. No explanation was offered for his verbal and physical intimidation of his tenants, his failure to supply Mr Shahizam with a completed tenancy agreement, or his demand for money in addition to the agreed rent. The Respondent relied instead on his previous good record and high standing in the community, as well as his unblemished record as a landlord over a period, he claimed, of some 60 years. The Respondent opposed the banning order on the ground that his son Mohammed Farrah would manage the let properties on his behalf

10. Admitting that the Respondent was no longer able to manage his let properties, his daughters called Mr Mohammed Farrah as witness. Although the Respondent had told Mr Hickling in October 2024 that his son Mohammed would prepare himself to take over management of the four let properties, Mr Mohammed Farrah was not able to convince the tribunal that he had any knowledge of the relevant law or his duties as a property manager. He had for many years provided minor repairs and maintenance to his father's properties, but he had not attended any management training save for a one day online course with an organisation he described as NRLA. He was unable to say what these initials stood for, or to demonstrate any knowledge of the main provisions of the Housing Act 1988 or the provisions of the Renters Rights Bill. He said that he intended to register for a Landlord Certification course, but was unable to say when this would start.
11. After cross examination Mr Mohammed Farrah eventually admitted that his sisters would be responsible for the paperwork involved in property management, and that he would take care of property maintenance and rent collection when rents were paid in cash. He said that he would pay the income to his father after deducting his expenses. He had not made any formal arrangement with his father regarding this.
12. Ms Sylvia Farrah chose not to ask her father to give evidence in support of his witness statement. Having heard her brother's evidence, she and her sister Ayun told the tribunal that they themselves would take over management of the properties from their father and would rely on their brothers for property maintenance and (cash) rent collection.

13. Asked whether this proposal would be acceptable to the Applicant, Ms Saad said that her client was unable to say, since some research would be needed. She pointed out that this arrangement had not been put forward by the Respondent at any time as a management proposal either before or since the Applicant made the banning order application, despite the repeated invitations sent by Mr Hickling in September and October 2024.
14. The Respondent's representatives repeated his assertion that he needed the rental income in order to maintain his own and his wife's independence. His wife, they said, is suffering from dementia and the Respondent cares for her in their home, 31 Brunswick Street, Sheffield.
15. Ms Sylvia Farrah told the tribunal that if a banning order were made, the Respondent's properties would lie empty. Asked whether the family had considered appointing professional managing agents, she replied that the family could manage the properties themselves.
16. Although the Respondent was not called to give evidence, as the parties left court at the end of the hearing, he sought to address the tribunal. He was repeating points already made in his written representations and by his daughters. The tribunal heard no expression of remorse or sympathy for the tenants who had been forced to leave his property due to his aggressive behaviour. The Respondent had to be persuaded by his family to leave the court room.
17. During the hearing, Ms Sylvia Farrah told the tribunal that her father had 13 tenants in four properties. She said that her father created tenancies for either 12 or 24 months. Mr Mohammed Farrah said that no new tenancies had been created since the beginning of 2025. Prior to making a decision, the tribunal wanted details of the Respondent's properties and copies of the tenancy agreements of the people living in them. In view of the suggestion that four of the five siblings would take over management of the properties on behalf of their father, the tribunal also asked for a list of their names and addresses. Directions were given to this effect, and this decision was made following receipt of the requested information.

## CONCLUSION

18. The Respondent has been convicted of a banning order offence. At the time he was a residential landlord with tenants living in 4 Sheffield properties.
19. In making the application the Applicant has complied with section 15 of the 2016 Act.
20. The Respondent has no previous convictions for a banning order offence and has not been added to the database of rogue landlords.
21. The Respondent has caused two of his tenants to leave their homes as a direct result of repeated and wholly unjustified behaviour on his part, including invasion of privacy and verbal and physical aggression. The circumstances of the offences and the effect of them on the Respondent's tenants are so serious as to justify a banning order of 5 years. The testimonials produced by the Respondent have been considered but do not affect this conclusion. The Respondent and his wife will suffer loss of rental income but this loss does not outweigh the tribunal's decision that it is appropriate for a banning order to be imposed.
22. Six new tenancies have been created in 2025, the latest being dated 29 August 2025. The total rent currently receivable is approximately £5770 per month; in most cases the monthly rent includes utility costs.
23. Mr Mohammed Farrah is not capable of managing rented properties in accordance with current or proposed legislation. The Respondent by his own admission is not capable of managing his rented properties.
24. The suggestion at the hearing that four siblings would coordinate efforts to manage the let properties between them in order to maintain an income for their parents was made too late and is too uninformed a proposal to be acceptable to the tribunal.
25. Pending recovery of possession of the let properties, the Respondent's tenants are to be protected from further contact with him. A firm of professional managing agents is required to manage the lettings and to recover possession on behalf of the Respondent, using the services of a solicitor insofar as it is reasonable to do so.