

FIRST - TIER TRIBUNAL
PROPERTY CHAMBER
(RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)

Case Reference	**:**	**BIR/00CN/HMJ/2025/0009**
Property	**:**	**Apartment 38, 2 Langley Walk, Birmingham, B15 2EN**
Applicant	**:**	**Rebecca Jeanette Horsley**
Representative	**:**	**Ms Emily McCurrie, Exchange Chambers (instructed by Knights**
Respondent	**:**	**Lik Suen**
Representative	**:**	**Luke Tang**
Type of Application	**:**	**Application under section 41(1) of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 for a Rent Repayment Order**
Tribunal Members	**:**	**Judge C Rhys** **I D Humphries B.Sc. (Est.Man) FRICS**
Date of Hearing	**:**	**5 March 2026**
Date of Deliberation Hearing	**:**	**7 May 2026**
Date of Decision	**:**	**23 October 2026**

DECISION

© CROWN COPYRIGHT 2026

Decision

1. The Tribunal is satisfied to the standard required that Ms Lik Suen (the ***"Respondent"***) is guilty of a housing offence, namely having control or managing a house which is required to be licences pursuant to s95(1) of the Housing Act 2004 (the ***"Housing Act"***).

2. Ms Rebecca Horsley (the ***"Applicant"***) is entitled to a rent repayment order pursuant to s43 and s44 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016.

3. The amount of rent paid in the relevant period for which a repayment order may be made is £10,260.00

4. The Tribunal hereby orders the Respondent to repay the Applicant rent in the sum of £3,864.00

5. The Tribunal also orders, under Rule 13(2) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013, that the Respondent reimburse the Applicant the applicant fee in the sum of £114.00 and the hearing fee in the sum of £227.

6. For the reasons set out below, the Tribunal makes no further order under Rule 13 of the of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013.

Reasons for Decision

Introduction

7. This is an application for a rent repayment order by the Applicant, against the Respondent, under section 41 of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 (the ***"Planning Act"***).

8. The Housing Act introduced licensing for certain categories of residential accommodation. Under part 2 of the Housing Act, licensing is mandatory for all houses in multiple occupation which are occupied by five or more persons forming two or more households and local housing authorities may designate areas in their district as subject to additional licensing in relation to other houses in multiple occupation not otherwise required to be licensed. Under Part 3 of the Housing Act local housing authorities may designate areas in their district as subject to selective licensing in relation to other rented houses not otherwise required to be licensed.

9. Under Part 3 of the Housing Act, Birmingham City Council has designated certain parts of the city as subject to selective licencing. On 5 June 2023, Birmingham City Council introduced a selective licensing scheme, which required properties which fell under part 3 of the Housing Act to obtain a licence.

10. Under section 95 of the Housing Act, a person who has control of or manages a house that is required to be licensed under part 3 but is not so licensed commits an offence.

11. Commission of an offence under section 95 of the Housing Act may lead to criminal prosecution and conviction or to the imposition by the local housing authority of a financial penalty pursuant to section 249 of the Housing Act. Furthermore, as set out in more detail below, under section 43 of the Planning Act the Tribunal may make a rent repayment order in favour of the occupier (or former occupier) if it is satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that the landlord has committed an offence under section 95 of the Housing Act, whether or not the landlord has been convicted of that offence.

Factual Background

12. The subject property, being Apartment 38, 2 Langley Walk, Birmingham, B15 2EN (the *"**Property**"*), was occupied by the Applicant from July 2021 until on or around 30 June 2025.

13. Whilst the initial rent for the Property was £785 pcm, this was increased to £855 pcm on or around 11 July 2023, which was documented by way of a subsequent assured shorthold tenancy agreement.

14. By an application dated 15 October 2025, the Applicant applied to the First-tier tribunal for a rent repayment order (*"**RRO**"*) under section 41(1) of the Housing and Planning Act 2016 (the *"**Planning Act**"*). The Applicant alleges that from 05 June 2023 to 19 July 2025, the Respondent had control of or was managing the subject property, which as a property subject to Birmingham City Council's selective licence scheme, was required to be licence pursuant to Part 3 of the Housing Act but was not so licensed.

15. The RRO sought by the Applicant was in respect of rent that she had paid as the tenant of the Property to the Respondent, who was her landlord of the Property at the commencement of her tenancy. The 'relevant period' for the purpose of the RRO sought is 20 July 2024 to 19 July 2025.

16. On 3 November 2025, the Tribunal issued directions for the determination of the application.

17. The Tribunal did not carry out an inspection, but a hearing was held remotely on 5 March 2026.

18. Due to issues arising during the hearing in respect of contributions towards utilities, the Tribunal issued further directions on 02 April 2026.

19. Neither party provided their written submissions in accordance with the terms of the directions. Whilst the Applicant's submissions were received prior to the tribunal deliberating on 7 May, the Respondent's submissions were received considerably after the deadline set, and after the tribunal deliberated on 7 May 2026.

20. As such, the submissions of the Respondent have not been considered as it would have been disproportionate and contrary to the overriding objective to reconvene the tribunal to consider submissions that had not been submitted in accordance with directions set by the Tribunal.

21. As indicated above, the Tribunal convened again on 7 May 2026 to consider the matter, the parties were not in attendance.

The Law

22. Section 40 of the Planning Act provides that a RRO is an order requiring the landlord under a tenancy of housing in England to repay an amount of rent which has been paid by a tenant. It confers power on the First-tier Tribunal to make such an order in favour of a tenant where the landlord has committed an offence to which Chapter 4 of the Planning Act applies.

23. The relevant offences are detailed in section 40(3) of the Planning Act as follows:

	Act	*section*	*general description of offence*
1	*Criminal Law Act 1977*	*section 6(1)*	*violence for securing entry*
2	*Protection from Eviction Act 1977*	*section 1(2), (3) or (3A)*	*eviction or harassment of occupiers*
3	*Housing Act 2004*	*section 30(1)*	*failure to comply with improvement notice*
4		*section 32(1)*	*failure to comply with prohibition order etc*
5		*section 72(1)*	*control or management of unlicensed HMO*
6		*section 95(1)*	*control or management of unlicensed house*
7	*This Act*	*section 21*	*breach of banning order*

24. Section 41 of the Planning Act details the application process and provides:

> ***41 Application for rent repayment order***
>
> *(1) A tenant … may apply to the First-tier Tribunal for a rent repayment order against a person who has committed an offence to which this Chapter applies.*
>
> *(2) A tenant may apply for a rent repayment order only if —*
>
> *(a) the offence relates to housing that, at the time of the offence, was let to the tenant, and*
> *(b) the offence was committed in the period of 12 months ending with the day on which the application is made.*
>
> …

25. Sections 43 and 44 of the Planning Act detail the power of the tribunal to make an order and the amount of that order and, in respect of an application by a tenant, provide:

43 Making of rent repayment order

(1) The First-tier Tribunal may make a rent repayment order if satisfied, beyond reasonable doubt, that a landlord has committed an offence to which this Chapter applies (whether or not the landlord has been convicted).

(2) A rent repayment order under this section may be made only on an application under section 41.

(3) The amount of a rent repayment order under this section is to be determined in accordance with—
(a) section 44 (where the application is made by a tenant);

…

44 Amount of order: tenants

(1) Where the First-tier Tribunal decides to make a rent repayment order under section 43 in favour of a tenant, the amount is to be determined in accordance with this section.

(2) The amount must relate to rent paid during the period mentioned in the table.

If the order is made on the ground that the landlord has committed	*the amount must relate to rent paid by the tenant in respect of*
an offence mentioned in row 1 or 2 of the table in section 40(3)	*the period of 12 months ending with the date of the offence*
an offence mentioned in row 3, 4, 5, 6 or 7 of the table in section 40(3)	*a period, not exceeding 12 months, during which the landlord was committing the offence*

(3) The amount that the landlord may be required to repay in respect of a period must not exceed—

(a) the rent paid in respect of that period, less

(b) any relevant award of universal credit paid (to any person) in respect of rent under the tenancy during that period.

(4) In determining the amount the tribunal must, in particular, take into account—

(a) the conduct of the landlord and the tenant,

(b) the financial circumstances of the landlord, and

(c) whether the landlord has at any time been convicted of an offence to which this Chapter applies.

Determination of the Tribunal

26. The Tribunal considered the application in four stages:

    (i) Whether the Tribunal was satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that the respondent has committed an offence under section 95(1) of the 2004 Act in that at the relevant time the respondent was a person in control of or managing a house that was required to be licensed under Part 3 of the 2004 Act but was no so licensed.

    (ii) Whether the Applicant was entitled to apply to the Tribunal for a rent repayment order.

    (iii) Whether the Tribunal should exercise its discretion to make a rent repayment order.

    (iv) Determination of the amount of any order.

    Offence under section 95(1) of the Housing Act

    Prima Facie Offence

27. In accordance with section 43(1) of the Planning Act, the Tribunal was satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that, subject to the establishment of a reasonable excuse defence (see paragraphs 32 - 37 below), the Respondent, as landlord of the Property, had committed an offence listed in section 40 of the Planning Act, namely an offence under section 95(1) of the Housing Act, which provides:

    "A person commits an offence if he is a person having control or managing a house which is required to be licenced under [Part 3]…but is not so licensed."

28. As noted above, the Applicant alleges that from 5 June 2023 to 19 July 2025 the Respondent was controlling or managing the Property, which, as a property subject to Birmingham City Council's selective licensing scheme, was required to be licenced pursuant to Part 3 of the Housing act but was not so licensed.

29. As set out in the Respondent's "EXPANDED STATEMENT" (page 1 of the Respondent's Bundle), the Respondent admits the committing of the offence, stating that *"I accept that I should have applied for a licence when the Area Designated licensing scheme was first introduced by Birmingham City Council in June 2023"*.

30. Furthermore, the evidence contained in both the Applicant's Bundle and the Respondent's Bundle is that at all material times, as evidenced by correspondence from Birmingham City Council, is that the Property is one subject to its selective

licencing scheme as evidenced by the fact that the Property was licensed on 11 September 2025.

31. The Tribunal is therefore satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that from 5 June 2023 to 19 July 2025, the Property was a house subject to selective licensing under part 3 of the Housing Act and that the Property was not licensed.

32. The Tribunal is also satisfied that at all material times the Respondent was the landlord of the property and was the person managing the Property within the meaning of section 263(3) of the Housing Act as they were the owner of the head leasehold interest in the Property and received (whether directly or through an agent) rent from persons in occupation of the property.

Reasonable Excuse Defence

33. Although the Respondent did not expressly raise a defence of reasonable excuse under section 95(4) of the Housing Act, the substance of her written and oral representations requires the Tribunal to consider whether the Respondent might have such a defence *(*see *IR Management Services Limited v Salford City Council [2020] UKUT* 81 at paragraph 40*)*.

34. Although the Tribunal must be satisfied beyond reasonable doubt as to the elements of the offence set out in section 95(1) of the Housing Act, the standard of proof in relation to the defence in section 95(4) is the balance of probabilities.

35. In respect of the Respondent's written representations, she stated that "The wording suggests that the licence is retrospective to 05/06/2023" which may raise some sort of defence. However, this is incorrect. The licence document only states that "The Council is satisfied that the property has been eligible for licensing since 05/06/2023", it is not retrospective.

36. In respect of the Respondent's oral submissions, she indicated that she was aware of the selective licencing scheme *"when it was introduced, but I mistakenly believed that the application could be done at any time."* However, ignorance of, or mistaken in respect of, the law does not give rise to a reasonable excuse defence.

37. Taking the above into account, the tribunal is not satisfied on a balance of probabilities that the Respondent had a reasonable excuse for managing an unlicensed house during the period 5 June 2023 to 19 July 2025.

38. In the absence of the defence of reasonable excuse, the Tribunal is satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that the Respondent committed an offence under section 95(1) of the Housing Act during the periods 5 June 2023 to 19 July 2025.

<u>Entitlement of the Applicant to Apply for a Rent Repayment Order</u>

39. The Tribunal is satisfied that the Applicant was entitled to apply for a rent repayment order pursuant to section 41(1) of the Planning Act. In accordance with section 41(2), the property was let to the Applicant throughout the period

the Respondent was committing the relevant offence; and the offence was committed in the period of 12 months ending with the day on which the application was made (being 15 October 2025).

Discretion to Make Rent Repayment Orders

40. Considering the Tribunal is satisfied beyond reasonable doubt that the Respondent committed an offence under section 95(1) of the Housing Act, a ground for making a rent repayment order has been made out.

41. Even if the tribunal finds a relevant offence has been committed, as is the case here, it has a discretion not to make a rent repayment order (see section 43(1) of the Planning Act). However, in the decision of the Upper Tribunal in *London Borough of Newham v John Francis Harris [2017] UKUT 254 (LC) Judge McGarth stated:*

"I should add that it will be a rare case where a Tribunal does exercise its discretion not to make an order. If a person has committed a criminal offence and the consequences of doing so are prescribed by legislation to include an obligation to repay rent… then the Tribunal should be reluctant to refuse an application for rent repayment order."

42. The Tribunal is satisfied that there is no ground on which it could be argued, and none was advanced by the Respondent, that it is not appropriate to make a rent repayment order in the circumstances of the present case.

Amount of Rent Repayment Order

43. In accordance with section 44(2) of the Planning Act, the amount of an order must relate to rent paid in a period, not exceeding 12 months during which the landlord was committing an offence under section 95(1) of the Housing Act (the *"Relevant Period").*

44. In accordance with section 44(2) of the Planning Act, the amount that a landlord is required to repay in respect of the Relevant Period must not exceed the rent paid by the tenant in respect of that period less any relevant award of universal credit paid (to any person) in respect of rent under the tenancy during that period.

45. The Applicant confirmed, and the Respondent agreed, that she was not in receipt of universal credit.

46. For the purpose of this application, the Relevant Period is 18 July 2024 to 19 July 2025 (being the end date of the Applicant's tenancy), during which time the Applicant paid rent in the sum of £10,260 (being £855 pcm x 12 months). The Respondent accepted that the calculations put forward by the Applicant were accurate.

47. Therefore, the maximum amount of a rent repayment order would be £10,260.

48. In accordance with section 44(4) of the Planning Act, in determining the amount of any rent repayment order, the Tribunal must, in particular, take into account the conduct of the parties, the financial circumstances of the landlord and whether the landlord has been convicted of any of the offences listed in section 40 of the Planning Act.

49. The proper approach that the tribunal is required to take at the final stage of the determination of the amount of any rent repayment order has been considered by the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) in a series of decisions, most notably, *Acheampong v Roman [2022] UKUT 239 (LC)* and *Dowd v Martins and others [2022] UKUT 249 (LC)*.

50. In *David v Martins and Others,* the Upper Tribunal endorsed the approach summarised in paragraph 21 of the decision in *Acheampong v Roman*. The FTT should:

    (a) Ascertain the whole of the rent for the relevant period.

    (b) Subtract any element of that sum that represents payment for utilities that only benefited the tenant, for example gas, electricity and internet access. It is for the landlord to supply evidence of these, but if precise figures are not available an experienced tribunal will be able to make an informed estimate.

    (c) Consider how serious this offence was, both compared to other types of offence in respect of which a rent repayment order may be made (and whose relative seriousness can be seen from the relevant maximum sentences on conviction) and compared to other examples of the same type of offence. What proportion of the rent (after deduction) as above) is a air reflection of the seriousness of this offence. That figure is then the starting point (in the sense that the term is used in criminal sentencing); it is the default penalty in the absence of any other factors but it may be higher or lower in light of the final step.

    (d) Consider whether any deduction from, or addition to, that figure should be made in the light of the other factors set out in section 44(4).

51. Applying steps (a) to (d) above to the present case, the Tribunal has already determined step (a): see paragraphs 43 - 47 above.

52. Turning to step (b), as set out above, following the oral hearing, the tribunal issued directions to seek clarity in respect of this issue which was raised by the Respondent during her oral submissions and which, to some extent was addressed in the written evidence of the Applicant. Directions were required as the Respondent had not provided any substantive and/or clear evidence in respect of payment of utilities and the evidence of the Applicant was also unclear in this respect.

53. However, as set out above, whilst written representations were received from the Applicant in advance of the deliberation hearing, nothing was received from the Respondent by that date.

54. As such, applying the approach set out in *David v Martins and Others the* tribunal is entitled to make an informed estimate of any such charges.

55. It is evident from the Applicant's witness statement that "*On 6 July 2022, Luke informed me that the Respondent proposed a new rental price of £850 to cover central heating back-billing by the central management agency before the end of the First AST…"*

56. Furthermore, the written submissions filed on behalf of the Applicant, whilst acknowledging that *"On 4 December 2024, Luke proposed a fixed £65 per month payable quarterly; the Applicant agreed without sight of bills",* raise concerns as to the accuracy of the figure set and the risk of overpayment based on the limited evidence available to it. In addition, despite it being outside of the purview of the Tribunal, the submissions seek relief by way of *"A credit/refund for overpayments evidenced by the disclosed May-October 2024 bills (including July-October 2024, approximately £15-£20 per month subject to calculation."*

57. Whilst the Applicant invited the Tribunal to set further directions to seek clarity on this issue, such a step would be entirely disproportionate and contrary to the overriding objective.

58. Whilst the Tribunal acknowledges the lack of evidence and/or clarity provided by the Respondent, it is the Respondent's evidence that a proportion of the applicable rental figure included a contribution towards utilities, seemingly heating costs, and it is clear that the Applicant agreed to an increase in the rent to take into account utilities that the Respondent was paying for which solely benefited the Applicant.

59. As such, the Tribunal determines that the rental figure of £855 pcm must have included a proportion in respect of utilities. As such, this must be taken into account when determining the amount of any rent repayment order.

60. However, the evidence before the Tribunal is insufficient to determine the exact figure, and as such, the Tribunal deems it appropriate to make an informed estimate. To not include any element for utilities would be contrary to the evidence before the Tribunal.

61. Having considered the submissions of the Applicant and seeking to ensure that the Respondent does not over benefit from her failure to comply with directions, the Tribunal estimates that a reasonable amount to allow for utilities would be £50 pcm.

62. As such, over the Relevant Period, this equates to £600 which reduces the maximum amount of a rent repayment order to £9,660.

63. Turning to step (c), the Upper Tribunal has made it clear that in applying section 44(4)(a) of the Planning Act, the conduct of the Respondent landlord also embraces the seriousness of the offence committed by the Respondent landlord that is the pre-condition for the making of a rent repayment order.

64. The offence of managing an unlicensed house is a serious offence, although it is clear from the scheme and detailed provisions of the Planning Act that it is not normally regarded as the most serious of the offences listed in section 40(3) see *Daff v Gyalui [2023] UKUT 134 (LA)* at paragraphs 48 – 49 and *Irvine v Metcalfe [2023] UKUT 283 (LC) at paragraph 72.*

65. The Tribunal determines that the relatively less serious offence committed by the Respondent should be reflected in a deduction from the maximum amount of the rent repayment order identified in paragraph 62 above. The Tribunal also notes that the Respondent is not a professional landlord and the Property is her only rental property.

66. Turning to step (d), the Applicant raised several issues in relation to the conduct of the Respondent.

67. The Applicant asserted that the respondent was aware of her obligation to obtain a licence from on or around May 2023, following correspondence in respect of a rental increase "for the sake of the landlord licensing fee required by the council as well as the boiler hearing [sic] bill". She also asserted that the "The Respondent also failed to protect the Applicant's deposit or obtain and/or provide a valid Energy Performance Certificate, both of which the Respondent admitted. The Applicant also raised some minor concerns in respect to delays to repairs that were required during the period of the tenant.

68. In response, the Respondent acknowledged that the applicant was a *"good tenant"* save for some minor issues in respect of damage to the carpets due to the Respondent's cat (which was allowed to be at the Property following consent from the Applicant).

69. In the circumstances, the Tribunal determines that it would be appropriate to make an adjustment to the rent repayment order to reflect the conduct of the Respondent and Applicant, but any adjustment would be minor considering the issues complained of.

70. Section 44(4)(b) of the Planning Act requires the tribunal to take into account the financial circumstances of the landlord. The Respondent provided no evidence that would make it appropriate to make any further adjustments of the amount of the rent repayment order.

71. Section 44(4)(c) of the Planning Act requires the Tribunal to take into account whether the landlord has at any time been convicted of any of the offences listed in section 40(3). The Respondent has no such convictions.

72. As Sir Timothy Fancourt stated in *Williams v Parmar* (at paragraph 24), the wording of section 44(4) leaves open the possibility of there being factors other

than those expressly referred to in paragraphs (a) to (c) that, in a particular case, may be taken into account and affect the amount of the rent repayment order. The Tribunal determines that there are no such factors in the present case.

73. Finally, the Tribunal notes (i) the reminder from Sir Timothy Fancourt in *Williams v Parmar* (at paragraph 43) that *"Rent Repayment Orders under the Housing and Planning Act 2016: Guidance for Local Authorities"* identified the factors that a local authority should take into account in deciding whether to seek a rent repayment order as being the need to: punish offending landlords; deter the particular landlord from further offences; dissuade other landlords from breaching the law; and remove from landlord the financial benefit of offend; and (ii) the clear indication (at paragraph 51) that the factors identified in the Guidance will generally justify an order for repayment of at least a substantial part of the rent.

74. The Tribunal determines that, in order to reflect the factors discussed in paragraphs 47 – 72 above, and taking into account that the Applicant has not been prejudiced in any substantial manner by the Respondent's failures, the breaches in that respect are 'technical' and no allegations of consequential fire or gas safety issues were raised, the maximum repayment amount identified in paragraph 62 above (£9,660. – after deduction of utilities) should be discounted by 60%.

75. The Tribunal therefore orders under section 43(1) of the Planning act that the Respondent repay to the applicant the sum of £3,864

Reimbursement of Costs and Fees

76. The Applicant has applied under rule 13 of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property camber) Rules 2013 for the Tribunal to make an order requiring the Respondent to reimburse to the applicant their legal costs, to include application fee (£114) and the Tribunal hearing fee (£227).

77. In this respect, prior to the hearing, the Applicant, by way of her representation, filed a statement of costs detailing that she had incurred legal fees (solicitors and counsel) of £7,862.50 + VAT.

78. Ms McCurrie confirmed that her application was being made pursuant to rule 13(1)(b) which states that the Tribunal may make an order in respect of costs only *"if a person has acted unreasonably in bringing, defending or conducting proceedings."*.

79. In support of the application, Ms McCurrie highlighted the fact that the Respondent had admitted the offence at a relatively early stage, had not advanced any meaningful defence and that attempts have been made by the Applicant to resolve matters which would have negated the need for a hearing and additional cost.

80. The Respondent objected to the application submitting that she had always acted in good faith during the proceedings, complied with directions and was simply exercising her right to defend her position, whether in full or part, to seek to limit

the amount of any order made against her. The Respondent states in closing *"simply defending and attending a hearing does not amount to acting unreasonably"*.

81. Having considered the submissions of the parties and considering the Tribunal's determination in respect of the application, the Tribunal does not find that the Respondent has acted unreasonably in defending proceedings to the extent that would warrant a costs order being made against her.

82. Whilst the defence raised by the Respondent was not ultimately successful, there were other factors that were open to the Tribunal to consider, factors upon which the Respondent provided evidence and submissions. The Respondent electing to attend a hearing to seek to represent herself, noting that she had not had the benefit of any legal advice, does not amount to acting unreasonably.

83. As such, the Applicant's application for costs pursuant to rule 13(1)(b) is refused.

84. In respect of the Applicant's application for the reimbursement of fees, pursuant to rule 13(2), since the Tribunal has made a rent repayment order in favour of the applicant, albeit in a lesser amount than was applied for, it is appropriate that she should have her fees reimbursed.

Summary

85. The Tribunal orders under section 43(1) of the Planning Act that the respondent repay to the applicant the sum of 3,864.00 not later than 28 days from the date of this decision.

86. The Tribunal orders under rule 13 of the tribunal procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013 that the Respondent reimburse to the applicant £114.00 in respect of the application gee and £227.00 in respect of the hearing fee no later than 28 days from the date of this decision.

Appeal Provisions

87. If either party is dissatisfied with this decision they may apply to this Tribunal for permission to appeal to the Upper tribunal (Lands Chamber). Any such application must be received within 28 days after these written reasons have been sent to the parties (Rule 52 of The Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013).

Judge C Rhys
23 October 2026