	**FIRST - TIER TRIBUNAL** **PROPERTY CHAMBER** **(RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY)**
Case Reference	**LON/00BE/MNR/2026/0449.**
Property	**4 Achilles Close, London SE1 5HE.**
Tenant	**Ns. Yetunde Omoyemi Pamole-Ogunseye.**
Tenant's Representative	**Mr. Angus King,** **Southwark Law Centre.**
Landlord	**BMR St. James 2 Ltd.**
Landlord's Address	**32 Castlewood Road,** **London N16 6DW.**
Landlord's Representative	**Mr. Isaac Chisel, Freshview Estates.**
Date of Application	**22 July 2026.**
Type of Application	**Determination of a Market Rent sections 13 & 14 of the Housing Act 1988**
Tribunal Members	**Ms. A. Hamilton-Farey** **Mrs. P. Ogunfeibo.**
Date of Decision	**26 October 2026.**
Rent Determined	**-**
Date the new rent takes effect	**-**

© CROWN COPYRIGHT

DECISION

The Tribunal does not have jurisdiction to determine this application for the reasons stated below.

It follows that the application must be struck out under Rule 9(2)(a) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013, because the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction in relation to the proceedings or case or that part of them.

REASONS

The Application

1. The Tribunal received an application from the Tenant, Ms. Pamole-Ogunseye on 29 May 2026.

2. The application referred a Landlord's Notice of Increase in relation to **4 Achilles Close, London SE1 5HE** (the subject property). The Notice of Increase was dated **30 March 2026** and proposed to increase the rent of the subject property from **£1,319.50 per calendar month to £1,600.00 per calendar** with effect from **1 June 2026.**

3. In her reply form to the Tribunal, Ms. Pamole-Ogunseye, alleged that the Notice of Increase was invalid because the date for the start of the new rent was not the start of tenancy date.

4. In their reply form to the Tribunal, Mr. Chisel, accepted that the Notice was invalid and would be withdrawn, and a new Notice served.

5. The Tribunal also received a submission by Mr. King from the Southwark Law Centre confirming that the Notice was invalid for the reasons stated above.

6. The Tribunal convened today, to determine the matter. Given that both parties agree that the Notice is invalid and that has been withdrawn by the Landlord, for the limited purpose of determining our own jurisdiction, we accept the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to proceed.

7. Mr. King informed the Tribunal that he would formally withdraw the application, Mr. Chisel said that he would agree with the withdrawal.

8. When the application to withdraw is received, the Tribunal will make a formal withdrawal decision.

Decision

9. It follows that the application must be struck out under Rule 9(2)(a) of the Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013, because the Tribunal does not have jurisdiction in relation to the proceedings or case or that part of them. The practical effect of the decision is that unless the Landlord seeks the authority of the County Court that the Notice is valid the Tribunal considers that the new rent proposed by the Landlord is not payable by the Tenant. However, this is ultimately a matter for the County Court to determine.

Tribunal: Aileen Hamilton-Farey Date: 26 October 2026.

Mrs. P. Ogunfeibo.

APPEAL PROVISIONS

If either party is dissatisfied with this decision, they may apply for permission to appeal to the Upper Tribunal (Lands Chamber) on any point of law arising from this Decision. Prior to making such an appeal, an application must be made, in writing, to this Tribunal for permission to appeal. Any such application must be made within 28 days of the issue of this statement of reasons (regulation 52 (2) of The Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (Property Chamber) Rules 2013) stating the grounds upon which it is intended to rely in the appeal.