

Appendix - Summary of cases concluding in the 2020- 2021 financial year

The following prosecution cases arising from investigations conducted across the Shared Service, have been concluded recently.

Case	Court date	Offence(s)	Outcome
1	28.5.20	This doorstep crime case involved the two elderly residents affected losing well over £20,000. The defendant did little or no work on the properties other than demolition and made a bad situation even worse for the residents as a result of his fraudulent and deceitful practices which led his customers to believe they had contracted with a bona fide business	The defendant received a 2 year sentence, suspended for 2 year, with 300 hours unpaid work and 10 days Rehabilitation Activity Requirement. It is hoped that the linked Proceeds of Crime case which is still ongoing will enable some compensation to be paid to the victims. <i>Note – further offences have since been committed by the defendant, and again the detriment to the residents involved is significant. Joint Committee will be updated as and when this second case (which is already in the court system), concludes.</i>
2	12.6.20	Another doorstep crime case in which the defendant callously targeted four elderly residents, convincing them that they needed roofing and other work carried out at their properties. In addition to conning four residents out of more than £30,000, the defendant was suspected of stealing approximately £13,000 in cash from the home of one of them, something he denied at first but subsequently admitted to.	The defendant was sentenced to a total of 40 months in custody for respect of the fraud and theft charges. There is a linked Proceeds of Crime case which is being pursued in the hope that it will realise some compensation for those affected by these dreadful crimes.
3	3.7.20	The defendant in this case was breeding bulldogs illegally as a result of not obtaining the necessary licence. A warrant was executed at his property involving SRS officers as well as the Police and RSPCA and the scale of the business was soon established. The defendant was charged with a range	He was sentenced to 32 weeks in custody suspended for 18 months with 20 days rehabilitation activities and a 16 week tagged curfew. Forfeiture and destruction for a number of dog passports was granted and costs of £350 awarded.

		of offences under a number of different pieces of legislation, including the Animal Welfare Act and the Fraud Act.	
4	9.7.20	In this illegal money lending case, the defendant loaned significant sums of money to an individual who unfortunately fell on hard times losing both his job and his home. Nevertheless, even while the victim was in a vulnerable situation and living at a hostel, the defendant pursued him for payment. Adopting the typical loan shark tactics of not giving paperwork, causing confusion over the amount owed, and threats of revenge for non-payment, the defendant was left with nowhere to turn and the matter was investigated by the Wales Illegal Money Lending Unit.	The defendant pleaded guilty to charges under the Consumer Credit Act and was fined £200. In addition, a contribution towards costs of £450 was ordered.
5	10.7.20	This food hygiene case arose after SRS Officers visited a café and takeaway with seating for twenty customers. During the visit, it became apparent that there was a cockroach infestation and the kitchen was found to be unclean. The defendants in the case were husband and wife, one being the legal food business operator (FBO) and the other the natural food business operator. The cockroach infestation was on some longstanding and the FBOs were clearly aware of it as traps had been laid during the previous week. Despite knowing of the infestation they chose to continue preparing and serving food and did not bring in a specialist Pest Control contractor.	The legal FBO was fined £1000 and ordered to pay costs of £300 together with a victim surcharge of £100, while the natural FBO was fined £500 and ordered to pay costs of £150 together with a victim surcharge of £50.
6	27.7.20	The two individual defendants in this case and their	Both individuals were fined £100 for each of the five offences

		company were before the Court for sentencing after the matter was adjourned due to the Covid 19 pandemic. The court was told that the business was no longer operating since lock down and would not be reopening.	making a total of £500, ordered to pay £500 costs and a victim surcharge of £50. In addition, the company was fined £1000 for the first offence £500 for the second offence and £500 for the third offence. There were no separate penalties for offences four and five.
7	6.8.20	Following a complaint that out of date food was on sale at a convenience store, an SRS officer visited and found several items on display after the 'use by' date relating to them. The matter was investigated and two defendants were charged with offences under the General Food Regulations	Each defendant was fined £59.00 for each of the seven charges making a total of £413 each. Both were ordered to pay costs in the amount of £150 and a victim surcharge of £41.99.
8	7.8.20	<p>The defendant, a rogue builder, had previously pleaded guilty to two charges under the Fraud Act 2006. The investigation followed numerous complaints from residents who had contracted with the defendant, parting with significant sums of money for building work to their properties. Each had been lured in by the defendant's web of lies and the promise of excellent craftsmanship.</p> <p>What the victims ended up with was goods such as kitchens paid for but not received and work done to a very poor, even dangerous standard, or not done at all. So grave was the offending in this case that the combined detriment to the residents affected was around half a million pounds coupled with months of worry and misery.</p> <p>The Judge noted that the defendant had used his two businesses fraudulently as vehicles to obtain money.</p>	The defendant was given an immediate custodial sentence at Cardiff Crown Court of 2 years and 3 months. A Proceeds of Crime Act timetable was accepted by the Judge, and this aspect of the case will be concluded in due course.

		<p>He had made false representations throughout his dealings with the victims and that they had all been misled by him. In particular the defendant's business had been a badge of dishonesty right from the very start with the worst aspects of his behaviour being the taking of monies and then moving on leaving the victims in a mess and significantly out of pocket.</p> <p>In sentencing, the Judge took into account the defendant's family circumstances and the fact that he had changed his plea to guilty.</p>	
9	11.8.20	<p>The defendant, a taxi driver, had originally pleaded not guilty to an offence under the Equality Act 2010 arising from his refusal to carry out a booking made by the taxi operator. The couple wishing to travel were blind and were accompanied by two assistance dogs, and the defendant claimed that his refusal to take the fare was a result of his being allergic to dogs.</p> <p>On the morning of the trial, the plea was changed to guilty and the defendant acknowledged that he should have applied for an exemption certificate on the grounds of his allergy and regrets that he had not.</p>	<p>The defendant was fined £190 and ordered to pay costs of £200 together with a victim surcharge of £30. The District Judge told him that he had taken his explanation into account in sentencing, but that refusing to take the couple had an impact and left them feeling discriminated against. The defendant was fined £190, ordered to pay costs of £200 and a victim surcharge of £30.</p>
10	14.8.20	<p>The defendant in this case was charged with offences under the Environmental Protection Act in respect of loud music and shouting. They failed to appear in court and so the case was proved in their absence, with the result that they were found guilty of two offences.</p>	<p>The defendant was fined £440 for the first allegation with no separate penalty on the other. They were ordered to pay costs of £180 and a victim surcharge of £44.</p>

11	14.8.20	<p>The defendant, a property landlord pleaded guilty to failing to comply with two improvement notices served under the Housing Act 2004. The notices had been served following SRS involvement after a tenant was found to be exposed to a number of hazards. Despite attempting to persuade the landlord to complete the necessary work, he failed to do so and the case was commenced when the formal improvement notice was not complied with.</p>	<p>The defendant was fined £292, and ordered to pay costs of £180 together with a victim surcharge of £32.</p>
12	20.8.20	<p>The two defendants in this case pleaded guilty to two offences under the Environmental Protection Act 1990, after they breached two noise abatement notices for loud amplified music and shouting.</p>	<p>Each was given a conditional discharge for 12 months and ordered to pay costs of £180.</p>
13	20.8.20	<p>The defendant in this case had been selling tobacco that was counterfeit or that was not intended for the UK market. He would arrange to meet customers in supermarket car parks to hand over the illegal tobacco and a substantial amount of tobacco was procured by officers following a number of test purchases and the execution of a warrant.</p> <p>The defendant pleaded guilty to seven offences under the Trade Marks Act 1994 and one offence under the Tobacco and Related Products Regulations 2016.</p>	<p>The defendant was sentenced to a 12 month community order, ordered to carry out 50 hours of unpaid work and undertake a 10 day rehabilitation requirement. Costs were ordered for £175 and a Forfeiture Order was granted.</p>
14	27.8.20	<p>Following food hygiene failures at a takeaway premises, the defendant company and its two</p>	<p>The company was fined £2600, and ordered to pay costs of £1843 and victim surcharge of £200. In addition, each director</p>

		<p>directors each pleaded guilty to 5 offences under the Food Hygiene (Wales) Regulations 2006. Among the problems found at the premises was a failure to adequately control pests.</p> <p>In mitigation, the court was told that a Pest Control contractor had been brought in, and that upon re-inspection, the premises was given a Food Hygiene rating Scheme score of 4.</p>	<p>was fined £600, ordered to pay costs of £250 and a victim surcharge of £40.</p>
15	27.8.20	<p>The defendant was charged with carry on a licensing activity without authorisation on three separate occasions where he sold hot food after the hours his takeaway was permitted to trade. He did not attend court and was found guilty in his absence.</p>	<p>The defendant was fined £660 in respect of each of the three charges, making a total fine of £1980. He was ordered to pay £150 prosecution costs together with a £181 Victim Surcharge.</p>
16	2.9.20	<p>The defendant attended court and pleaded guilty to 2 offences under the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 for failing to ensure so far as was reasonably practicable, that the health and safety of persons not in their employment were not exposed to risk associated with falling trees, falling tree limbs and branches between May 2016 and October 2017 whilst trading as an outdoor paintball leisure activity. In October 2017 the SRS were notified of an incident whereby a tree branch had fallen in high winds in the gun rack area of the site, striking two teenagers whilst</p>	<p>The District Judge agreed that this was a case of high culpability. The company was fined £4000 with costs of £10,000.</p>

		they participated in a paintballing day.	
17	2.9.20	The defendant attended court and pleaded guilty to 7 offences under the Trade Marks Act 1994 and 1 offence under the Tobacco and Related Products Regulations 2016. He had been trading on Facebook under a pseudonym and was selling counterfeit and illicit tobacco. He would arrange to meet customers in supermarkets car parks to hand over the tobacco. A substantial amount of tobacco was procured by SRS officers following a number of test purchases and the execution of a warrant.	The defendant was sentenced to a 12 month community order, ordered to carry out 50 hours of unpaid work and a 10 day rehabilitation requirement. Costs were ordered for £175 and a Forfeiture Order was granted.
18	3.9.20	The defendant in this case, a taxi company, did not attend court and was found guilty on 11 counts of failing to produce insurance.	The company was fined £200 per offence making a total of £2,200, they were also ordered to pay £150 Prosecution costs and a £32 Victim Surcharge
19	3.9.20	The defendant did not attend Court and a case of unlawful street trading was proved in his absence.	The Magistrates imposed a fine of £1,000 on the defendant and ordered him to pay £150 prosecution costs together with a £100 Victim Surcharge.
20	7.9.20	The defendant in this rogue builder case had previously pleaded guilty to one count under the Fraud Act 2006 and also to six counts of engaging in misleading commercial practices under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008. The offences related to the properties of multiple complainants tween 2013 and 2018 where the defendant, who trades as a roofer, took substantial deposits from consumers for work that was of a poor standard, or was left incomplete or was never even started. In total, the consumers lost money to the	The defendant was sentenced to 24 months imprisonment, suspended for 24 months. She ordered him to complete a 10 day rehabilitation requirement and to carry out 100 hours of unpaid work as he needed to repay back to the local community. A timetable was set under the Proceeds of Crime act 2002 and directions were given for the respective filing of statements and responses by the prosecution and defence before the end of 2020. Compensation for the complainants will be dealt with as

		<p>value of £16,784.36.</p> <p>In sentencing, the Judge indicated that the case had passed the custody threshold. The defendant had taken monies for work which was not carried out or carried out badly and had sometimes lead to more problems than were there to start with, including in one case, where the property was flooded after works were not completed. However, she accepted that he had never intended to defraud these people but in the cold light of day there was clearly no chance he was going to complete the works. She accepted that he had shown genuine remorse and that imprisonment would have a substantial effect on his children. She considered that he was capable of rehabilitation.</p>	<p>part of these proceedings.</p>
21	18.9.20	<p>The defendant had previously pleaded guilty to one count under the Fraud Act 2006 of participating in a fraudulent business between August 2016 and July 2019 and to 2 counts under the Proceeds of Crime Act 2002 of transferring criminal property between June 2016 and February 2019. On a number of occasions since 2017 officers from the Shared Regulatory Services had conducted checks and test purchases at the defendant's retail premises and discovered on sale both counterfeit tobacco and tobacco which did not carry the required health warnings. The defendant had been given a Simple Caution and later prosecuted but had nonetheless continued with his criminal</p>	<p>The defendant was sentenced to a total of 25 months imprisonment of which he will serve half in custody and the remainder on licence. A forfeiture order was granted for all the items seized.</p>

		<p>activities culminating in the current prosecution. Officers had discovered that since 2016 the defendant had traded in significant quantities of counterfeit and illicit tobacco amounting to approximately £200,000 in trade value and a subsequent financial investigation discovered that the defendant had illegally gained and transferred from his and his wife's bank accounts over £90,000 to bank accounts abroad.</p> <p>In sentencing, the Judge stated that this was intentional and prolonged offending and the defendant had acted in deliberate contravention of the law. It was not highly sophisticated but it was blatant. It was clear from the pre-sentence report and his behaviour to the authorities that he did not appreciate the seriousness of what he had done. By selling illegal tobacco he had made it difficult to control the sale of items which are considered a public health issue, contributed to organised criminal gangs which distribute these products and gained an advantage over reputable traders. She accepted that he did not have a 'high living' and there was a real risk of financial harm to his family as a result of his actions together with a risk of loss of employment to others. She accepted that he had at last accepted reality and had been trading correctly since last year. However, his offending was such that only an immediate custodial sentence was appropriate.</p>	
22	18.09.20	The defendant appeared at Cardiff Crown Court having pleaded guilty to offences under the Consumer	The defendant was sentenced to 16 months custody suspended for 2 years, 200 hours community service and 8

		<p>Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008. The offences had occurred whilst the defendant was trading as a roofer. He had inflated prices for the work he had carried out when he charged a consumer £9500 for work valued at only £1700. He had completed works without consulting the consumer, demanded payment for those unauthorised works and he had contravened the requirements of professional diligence.</p>	<p>days rehabilitation. The victim in this case was also awarded compensation.</p>
23	17.09.20	<p>The defendant failed to attend court and was found guilty in her absence of 5 offences under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 for failing between September 2019 and December 2019 to comply with a noise abatement notice.</p>	<p>The defendant was fined £660 and ordered to pay costs of £200 together a victim surcharge of £32.00</p>
24	2.10.20	<p>The defendant had previously pleaded guilty to three offences under the Health and Safety at Work etc., Act 1974 for failing, without reasonable excuse, to comply with the requirements of a Prohibition Notice.</p> <p>In October 2019 Shared Regulatory Services received a referral from South Wales Fire and Rescue about carbon monoxide fumes emanating from the defendant's commercial food business and into a residential property directly above. The Fire Authority confirmed that they had been called out by one of the residents and they had detected elevated readings of carbon monoxide in the flat, in addition to the adjoining property. In their professional opinion the</p>	<p>The defendant was sentenced to 12 weeks imprisonment to run concurrent on all the charges.</p>

		<p>high readings of carbon monoxide were as a direct result of the use of the charcoal grill which was situated in the rear kitchen of the restaurant.</p> <p>Although the defendant agreed not to use the charcoal grill when speaking to the Fire Authority, when SRS officers attended, the charcoal grill was lit and in use so a Prohibition Notice was served, instructing him not to use the charcoal grill until he could evidence via a suitably competent engineer that the installation was safe to use. Considerable assistance was provided SRS officers to find a competent engineer who could assess the existing extract ventilation system and carry out all necessary modifications. Nevertheless, during subsequent visits the defendant was discovered using the grill, in breach of the Prohibition Notice.</p> <p>In sentencing, the District Judge accepted culpability was very high and harm was a Category 2. The defendant knew what his legal obligations were and deliberately and repeatedly flouted the law. He put profits above the safety of the residents.</p>	
25	01.10.20	<p>The defendant attended Court and entered guilty pleas to both charges in relation to plying for hire and as a result having no Insurance.</p> <p>In mitigation, he claimed that he forgot he was driving a private hire vehicle as he usually drives a hackney</p>	<p>The Magistrates fined the defendant £80 for the plying for hire and £120 for the no insurance charge. His licence was endorsed with 8 penalty points and he was ordered to pay £150 prosecution costs together with a £32 Victim Surcharge.</p>

		carriage.	
26	02.10.20	<p>This case involved a company and its two directors who operated a food business premises. Between April and May 2019 SRS officers inspected the premises and discovered a cockroach infestation and a number of food hygiene breaches.</p> <p>The company pleaded guilty to 10 offences under the Food Hygiene (Wales) Regulations 2006, the first director pleaded guilty to 2 offences and the second director pleaded guilty to 6 offences.</p>	The company was fined £50 with costs of £250 and a victim surcharge of £30.00. Both directors were given a 3 year conditional discharge with costs of £250 and a victim surcharge of £20.
27	05.10.20	This case concerned an application for forfeiture under the Trade Marks Act 1994 in respect of counterfeit tobacco and an application under the Consumer Protection Act 1987 in respect of tobacco which did not carry the required health warnings found at the defendant's premises in February 2020	The magistrates granted both applications and the goods were forfeited.
28	07.10.20	The defendant was found guilty following a trial of an offence under the Food Hygiene Rating (Wales) Act 2013. In August 2019 officers visited the defendant food premises and found that the food hygiene rating sticker awarded to the business namely a rating of 1 – Major Improvement Necessary - was not being displayed.	The defendant was fined £200 with £300 costs and a £32 victim surcharge.
29	16.10.20	The defendant, a taxi driver, pleaded not guilty to plying for hire without a licence or insurance.	He was found guilty and was fined £120 with 6 penalty points for the insurance offence with no separate penalty on the

			plying for hire. He was also ordered to pay £350 in prosecution costs and a £34 Victim Surcharge
30	20.10.20	The defendant was found guilty following a trial for offences under the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 in respect of an incident in December 2019 while driving a taxi when he overcharged passengers and failed to use his meter.	The Magistrates imposed a Universal Credit level Band B fine of £120 in respect of each offence, they also ordered him to pay £600 Prosecution costs and £34 Victim Surcharge
31	20.10.20	Both defendants attended court and pleaded guilty to 11 offences under the Food Hygiene (Wales) Regulations 2006 in respect of breaches occurring at their food business premises between August 2019 and February 2020. Inspections by officers from the SRS discovered a significant infestation of cockroaches which caused the business to close for 37 days.	The District Judge considered committing to the Crown Court for sentence due to the seriousness of the offences. However he kept jurisdiction and he sentenced the first defendant to a fine of £3000 and the second defendant to a fine of £4000. Both defendants were ordered to pay costs of £350 each and a victim surcharge of £181 each. He told them that if it closed their business then “so be it”
32	22.10.20	The defendant attended Court and entered guilty pleas to one offence of plying for hire and one offence of having no insurance. In mitigation, he stated that he was quiet and took the fare even though he knew he shouldn't have.	The Magistrates fined the defendant £120 for the plying for hire and £120 for the no insurance charge. His licence was endorsed with 8 points and he was ordered to pay £150 Prosecution costs and a £32 Victim Surcharge.
33	22.10.20	This case concerned an application for forfeiture under the Trade Marks Act 1994 in respect of counterfeit tobacco and an application under the Consumer Protection Act 1987 in respect of tobacco which did not carry the required health warnings found	Both applications were granted by the Magistrates and the goods were forfeited.

		at the defendant's premises between August 2019 and March 2020.	
34	26.10.20	The defendant failed to appear at court in respect of an application for forfeiture under the Trade Marks Act 1994 for counterfeit tobacco found at the defendant's premises in August 2019.	The application for forfeiture and destruction granted by the court.
35	02.11.20	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to 4 offences under the Food Hygiene (Wales) Regulations 2006 in respect of food hygiene breaches and breaches of Remedial Action Notices at her food business premises.</p> <p>During a visit by SRS officers, a mouse and insect infestation was discovered throughout the ground floor and basement but there was no pest control contractor. No food hygiene safety management system was in place and Remedial Action Notices were served for the repackaging of food in the basement. In May 2019 the defendant admitted in interview to breaching the Remedial Action Notice. A visit in June 2019 discovered more evidence of repackaging of food and an infestation of insects. Further visits discovered more repackaged food.</p> <p>The matter was committed to the Crown Court for sentence and the judge considered the defendant's culpability in respect of each offence was very high. She had intentionally breached/flagrantly disregarded the law. It was considered a Category 1 harm case due to a high risk of having an adverse effect on customers. The judge took into account that the defendant was no longer trading, her age and her previous good character. He stated that it was a shame to see a lady of the defendant's age in court.</p>	The judge ordered that the defendant be sentenced to 6 months imprisonment for the food hygiene offences and 8 months imprisonment for the breaches of the Remedial Action Notices to run concurrently. He then suspended the sentence for 2 years. Costs of £500 were awarded and a victim surcharge was applied of £140.

		He considered that the offences were so serious that they passed the custody threshold.	
36	5.11.20	<p>The defendant is licensed by Rentsmart Wales and is known to manage a total of four rented properties. SRS Officers visited one of the properties, comprising two storeys and six bedrooms, and was occupied by seven people.</p> <p>It was established that amongst other things, the property had:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No adequate fire alarm system • inadequate structural fire protection • rodent and cockroach infestations • unsafe guarding to the stairs and landing • an unprotected electrical consumer unit • an inaccessible emergency gas shut off valve <p>The failures presented significant risks to the health, safety and welfare of the tenants. The defendant pleaded guilty to 18 charges relating to his failure to comply with the Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Wales) Regulations.</p>	The Magistrates fined the defendant a total of £1,440 and ordered him to pay costs of £300 and a victim surcharge of £32.
37	15.11.20	In this case, a local retailer of a variety of household goods sold a craft knife to a 15 year old volunteer	The defendant pleaded guilty to an offence under the Criminal Justice Act 1988 and was fined £2000 and ordered to pay

		during an underage test purchase.	costs of £1290 together with a victim surcharge of £170
38	26.11.20	This case concerned the sale and supply of unsafe squishy toys which were being imported and supplied locally. An inspection in February 2019 by officers of the SRS at the defendant's cash and carry business discovered a number of squishy toys on display for sale which were not labelled in accordance with toy safety legislation. Subsequent testing by the public analyst also confirmed that the toys failed the tension and small parts cylinder tests set out in the British Standard for Toy Safety.	All three defendants pleaded guilty to offences under the Toys (Safety) Regulations 2011. Each was fined £2000 and ordered to pay costs of £250 together with a victim surcharge of £100
39	26.11.20	The defendants in this case took thousands of pounds for building work yet left work unfinished or to a very poor standard using substandard materials, and in one case walking off site leaving the resident's house in a dangerous state. Monies from a business account were also transferred into personal accounts.	The first defendant pleaded guilty to offences under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008, the Fraud Act 2006 and to money laundering charges. He was sentenced to 18 weeks imprisonment, and ordered to pay compensation of £138.50, costs of £2403.50 and a VS of £122. The second defendant pleaded guilty to offences under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations and was fined £480. He was also ordered to pay compensation of £988.50 and a victim surcharge of £48
40	2.12.20	Following a number of complaints about their trading practices officers from the SRS visited the defendant's car sales premises in early 2019 to provide guidance and advice. Subsequently in June 2019 an inspection was carried out by the officers together with a vehicle examiner. A number of breaches were identified with regard to the descriptions applied and material information was omitted from adverts. As a result of	Both defendants pleaded guilty to offences under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 and the General Product Safety Regulations 2005. The first defendant (the company) was fined £2000 and ordered to pay costs of £500; while the second defendant was fined £800 and ordered to pay costs of £500.

		the checks by the vehicle examiner, six vehicles were deemed to have been exposed for sale in an unsafe condition and suspension notices under the General Product Safety Regulations 2005 were issued.	
41	14.11.20	This case concerned complaints received by the SRS with regard to work carried out by a builder, namely removing and rebuilding a back wall and laying a patio, between April and May 2019 at a residence in Cardiff. Investigations discovered that the defendant had failed to disclose his correct address and overcharged for poor standard work	The defendant pleaded guilty to offences under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 and was ordered to pay compensation of £1600 to the consumer and costs of £250.
42	5.1.21	On visiting a restaurant in April 2019, SRS officers found a number of food hygiene breaches including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a failure to ensure that adequate procedures were in place to control pests, • a failure to ensure the premises were kept clean and maintained in good repair and condition, • a failure to ensure the layout and construction of the premises permitted good hygiene practices including protection against contamination and pest control and <p>a failure to ensure that at all stages of production, food was protected against contamination likely to render the food unfit for human consumption.</p>	The company pleaded guilty to offences under the Food Hygiene (Wales) Regulations 2006. They were fined £2000, ordered to pay costs of £1397 and a victim surcharge of £170
43	5.1.21	This case concerned complaints from tenants of a	The defendant pleaded guilty to offences under the Licensing

		<p>ground floor flat. A visit by officers of the SRS discovered a number of failures on behalf of the landlord including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • failures to supply an adequate fire alarm system • a failure to provide adequate structural fire protection and satisfactory means of escape • a failure to provide evidence of maintenance of gas and electrical installations and • a failure to eliminate and prevent damp. <p>The landlord had also failed to provide information requested by officers and failed to obtain the necessary licences for managing and renting property.</p>	<p>and Management of HMOs (Additional Provisions) Regulations 2007 and the Housing (Wales) Act 2014. He was fined £4100, and ordered to pay costs of £1400 together with a victim surcharge of £181.</p>
44	5.1.21	<p>The defendant in this case was the managing agent of a rental property. When SRS officers visited the property in October 2019 and again in February 2020, they discovered a number of failings including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • failure to supply an adequate fire alarm system • a failure to provide adequate structural fire protection and to keep the common escape route clear • a failure to maintain the electrical installation, and 	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to offences under the Housing Act 2004 and the Management of HMO (Wales) Regulations 2006. They were fined £4000, were ordered to pay costs of £350 and a victim surcharge of £181.</p>

		a failure to eliminate and prevent damp.	
45	19.2.21	<p>In November 2019, SRS officers visiting a restaurant discovered a number of food hygiene breaches including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a failure to ensure that adequate procedures were in place to control pests • a failure to ensure the premises were kept clean and maintained in good repair and condition • a failure to keep food in such a way as to prevent the growth of pathogenic micro-organisms • a failure to ensure the layout and construction of the premises permitted good hygiene practices including protection against contamination and pest control • a failure to implement a food safety management based on HACCP principles, and • a failure to ensure that at all stages of production food was protected against contamination likely to render the food unfit for human consumption. 	<p>The defendant company and one of its directors both pleaded guilty to offences under the Food Hygiene (Wales) Regulations 2006. The company was fined £2000 and ordered to pay costs of £1000 with a victim surcharge of £181. In addition, the company director was fined £600 and ordered to pay costs of £500 as well as a victim surcharge of £60.</p>
46	4.3.21	<p>This case concerned a private landlord who owns a portfolio of properties and also manages other properties on behalf of other family members. The defendant applied for a number of his properties to be</p>	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to offences under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 for failing to disclose information when requested to do so. He was fined a total of £5040, ordered to pay costs of £8000 and a victim</p>

		<p>licensed by the SRS as Houses of Multiple Occupation (HMO's) and as such these properties had to be inspected to ensure they complied with current legislation under the Housing Act 2004. To enable officers to conduct the necessary inspections, certain information is required to be provided by the landlords/owners of the properties. The defendant was not voluntarily forthcoming with the required information so a number of formal notices were served on him, requiring him to provide the necessary information for each property within the stipulated time in order that properties could be licensed in a timely manner.</p>	<p>surcharge of £181</p>
47	10.3.21	<p>In June 2019, an inspection by SRS officers of a pizza takeaway business identified a number of food hygiene breaches including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a failure to ensure that adequate procedures were in place to control pests • a failure to maintain the premises in a clean condition • a failure to ensure that materials used for packaging food were not exposed to a risk of contamination, and <p>a failure to implement a food safety management based on HACCP principles</p>	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to offences under the Food Hygiene (Wales) Regulations 2006. He was fined £1665 and ordered to pay costs of £450 together with a victim surcharge of £166</p>