

### Appendix 3 - Summary of cases concluding between April 2021 and March 2022

The following prosecution cases arising from investigations conducted across the Shared Service, concluded in court during 2021-2022.

Case	Court date	Offence(s)	Outcome
1	6.4.21	Visits by SRS officers to this food business on 14 <sup>th</sup> January and 13 <sup>th</sup> February 2021 highlighted a number of food hygiene offences including a failure to adequately control pests on the premises. Both the company and its Director were charged with offences,	Both defendants pleaded guilty and sentenced as follows. The company was fined £3666 and ordered to pay costs of £250 together with a victim surcharge of £190; while the Director was fined £1066 and ordered to pay costs of £250 together with a victim surcharge of £106
2	22.4.21	A local horse breeder stood trial after pleading not guilty to 31 animal cruelty offences and one offences of obstruction under the Animal Welfare Act 2006. The charges related cruelty against a flock of Jacob sheep in August 2019, and also cruelty to horses kept on three different sites in January 2020. The suffering caused to the animals and the conditions in which they were being kept meant that all the sheep and a total of 240 horses had to be seized under the Animal Welfare Act.  His partner was the co-defendant in the case, and had previously pleaded guilty to the same 31 animal cruelty offences.	The first defendant was sentenced to 6 months imprisonment and was given a lifetime disqualification from keeping any animals. At a subsequent hearing, the matter of costs was resolved with the defendant being ordered to pay costs amounting to £450,000.  His co-defendant was sentenced to a 12 week custodial sentence, suspended for 12 months, with a requirement to wear an electronic tag for the duration of the 12 weeks, and be subject to a night time (9pm – 6am curfew) during that time. She was also given a lifetime disqualification from keeping any animals (other than some existing, specified pets).
3	4.5.21	This case arises from an inspection of a food takeaway business in August 2019 at which SRS officers highlighted a number of food hygiene offences including a failure to adequately control pests. The defendant pleaded guilty to all the four charges against him, and it was noted that he had been warned more than once and his offending had posed	The defendant was sentenced to 4 months imprisonment, concurrent on all matters, suspended for 18 months. He was ordered to complete 80 hours unpaid work and to pay costs of £750 together with a victim surcharge of £122

		a serious risk to public health.	
4	19.5.21	In this case, the owner of a convenience store was charged with a string food hygiene offences after SRS Officers found dreadful conditions on the premises. The company of which the store owner is the director was also charged with the same offences. The court heard that officers had found a dead mouse and a cockroach infestation, unwrapped raw meat being stored next to fresh herbs and vegetables and out of date and mouldy foods. The defendant had been previously prosecuted for food hygiene matters and also for the supply of illegal tobacco; as a result he knew the serious nature of the offences. The District Judge took the view that culpability was very high and there had been a flagrant disregard for the law. His food hygiene practices were very poor. There was a high risk of an adverse effect and serious risk to public health. The defendant's position was aggravated by the previous convictions and breach of a conditional discharge.	The Company was given a total fine of £20,000 The individual was sentenced to a total of 13 months imprisonment to begin immediately. The court also made him subject to a Hygiene Prohibition Order preventing him from participating in the management of any food business.
5	21.5.21	The case concerns a beauty and cosmetics outlet that remained open during the initial COVID19 lockdown in 2020, when it was not permitted to be open. The owner of the business was prosecuted under the Health Protection (Coronavirus Restrictions) (Wales) Regulations.	The defendant did not attend court and the case against him was proved in his absence. He was fined a total of £1320 and ordered to pay costs of £300 together with a victim surcharge of £132

6	21.5.21	<p>This case involved a rogue trader who took £900 from for a resident in return for carrying out repairs to a paved area in the garden. The defendant carried out no work and when later questioned about the matter disputed the amount of money involved. He had previously been warned by SRS about his trading practices yet in this case he still omitted his name, address and work details on paperwork, failed to advise consumers of their right to cancel the contract and he gave an incorrect address.</p>	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to offences under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations. He was fined a total of £420 and ordered to pay costs of £325 together with a victim surcharge of £42.</p> <p>He was also ordered to pay £900 compensation to the resident within 7 days. He had already deposited the money with his solicitor so that it could be paid directly to the court.</p>
7	4.6.21	<p>The defendant was the Premises Licence Holder at a retail outlet. He pleaded guilty to two offences under the Licensing Act 2003 in respect of the sale of alcohol to a person under the age of 18 years in December 2019.</p>	<p>He was fined £420 and ordered to pay costs of £220 together with a victim surcharge of £40.</p>
8	4.6.21	<p>The defendant company and its Director were charged with 5 offences under the Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Wales) Regulations 2006 and the Housing Act 2004. There was a failure to attend court and the defendants were found guilty in their absence.</p>	<p>Both defendants were fined £2200 and each ordered to pay £225 in costs together with a victim surcharge of £190.</p>
9	2.7.21	<p>In March 2020 officers from the Shared Regulatory Services visited the defendant's mobile food vehicle to carry out a food hygiene inspection. Following the inspection, the defendant's food business was issued with a food hygiene rating of 1, indicating that improvement was necessary. On a return visit in May 2020, officers discovered that the defendant had failed</p>	<p>The defendant was fined £400 for failing to display the correct Food Hygiene rating of 1 and a further £500 fine was imposed for displaying the invalid Food Hygiene rating of 3. He was also ordered to pay costs of £650 and a victim surcharge of £90.</p>

		<p>to display the food hygiene rating of 1 and was in fact displaying an invalid food hygiene rating of 3. The defendant was given the opportunity to discharge his liability for the offence by being offered a fixed penalty notice, but he declined.</p> <p>The defendant failed to attend court for the trial so the case was proved in his absence, with him being found guilty of both offences under the Food Hygiene Rating (Wales) Act 2013.</p>	
10	2.7.21	<p>In February 2020, officers from the Shared Regulatory Services attended a self-storage premises and discovered 9760 packets of counterfeit cigarettes in the defendant's storage unit. The cigarettes also failed to comply with the labelling requirements for cigarettes. The defendant attended court and pleaded guilty to two offences under the Trade Marks Act 1994 and to one offence under the Tobacco and Related Products Regulations 2016.</p> <p>The defendant runs his own shop, but the Probation Officer advised the court that the defendant had indicated that he had been storing the boxes for a friend who had given him £200 and he had not known that he was doing anything illegal. He had subsequently not been able to get hold of the friend.</p>	<p>In sentencing, the Magistrates advised the defendant that these were very serious offences and imprisonment was an option. However, given his previous clean character and his early guilty plea, they issued him with a 12-month Community Order requiring him to carry out 120 hours of unpaid work. They also imposed costs of £375 and a victim surcharge of £95. The seized goods had previously been made the subject of a Forfeiture Order.</p>

11	22.7.21	<p>The defendant had been investigated by SRS after being found to be an unlicensed dog breeder. The charges against him included the unnecessary suffering and mutilation (ear cropping) that he caused or allowed to be caused to the bulldogs he bred.</p> <p>The District Judge was of the view that the defendant had been motivated by greed and money and didn't care about the dogs save for what they could give him in profit. He had consistently given 'no comment' responses at interview and refused to provide SRS investigators with any details of purchasers and sellers. He had been evasive and uncooperative all the way through the investigation and to the probation service. The District Judge took the view that the defendant's comment to the investigating officers that by providing details of individuals involved in the dog world he would be labelled a grass, implies that had been dealing with unsavoury characters. He went on to say that he presents a risk to dogs and that in his opinion this individual doesn't need to be rehabilitated, he just needs to be kept away from animals.</p>	<p>The defendant was sentenced to 16 weeks in custody and a fine of £1,200 fine. He was also ordered to pay costs of £9,775 which must be paid with 14 days of his release. The District Judge disqualified him from keeping animals for a period of 8 years, and also prohibited him from applying for a revocation of the disqualification for 5 years.</p> <p>An order was made to deprive the defendant of the 8 puppies that were seized on the day of the warrant and in addition the 8 adult dogs that were present. These are to be released into the care of the Local Authority within 28 days of his release from custody. A £120 victim surcharge was also imposed.</p>
12	23.7.21	<p>During routine food hygiene visits to a smallholder in February and March 2020, officers from Shared Regulatory Services found live poultry intended for slaughter were housed in filthy conditions; the food processing room, slaughter room and equipment were dirty and covered in blood; foods were not protected from contamination; and animal carcasses and waste</p>	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to a range of offences under legislation covering both the poor hygiene and misdescription aspects of the case. He was fined £3500, ordered to pay £2000 costs and a victim surcharge of £190. He was prohibited from producing poultry on a commercial basis for five years.</p>

		<p>was not being appropriately stored or disposed of.</p> <p>Immediate intervention was necessary at the business when it was voluntarily closed, and the owner had worked with officers to ensure improvements. However later that same year, in October 2020, standards had lapsed, with poor practices reoccurring. Although a documented Food Safety Management System and cleaning schedules had been put in place, they were not being implemented.</p> <p>When asked, information was not available in relation to the traceability of foods, including where foods came from, and who they were supplied to. Between May and November 2020, chicken was purported to be locally sourced from the defendant's own farm and slaughtered and processed at his on-farm facility when it was not. In October 2020, he sold chicken to a retailer which contained a label that falsely described the poultry as being 'free range' when it was not.</p>	
13	6.8.21	<p>This case arose as a result of the anti-social behaviour caused to neighbours by a resident feeding wild birds. In October 2020, the defendant was served with a Community Protection Notice, requiring her to stop all feeding of birds on the land. However, in March 2021, the defendant was found to be feeding birds again. She was charged with offences under the Prevention of Damage by Pests Act 1949, and <b>also</b> under the Anti-Social Behaviour Crime and Policing Act 2014 for failing to comply with the CPN</p>	<p>The defendant was fined a total of £1000 and was ordered to pay costs of £3,583.38 together with a victim surcharge of £100.</p>

14	7.9.21	<p>In July 2020, officers from the Shared Regulatory Services were alerted to a substantial number of products being placed on the market for sale with prohibited health claims and that provided misleading food information. The defendant company (which has a retail outlet as well as an online platform), and its Managing Director pleaded guilty to 9 specimen offences under the Nutrition and Health Claims (Wales) Regulations 2007 and the General Food Regulations 2004.</p>	<p>Both defendants were fined £1800 each and ordered to pay costs of £4000 each.</p>
15	24.9.21	<p>At the end of 2018, SRS officers became aware of reports that residents were being told that they had a problem with rats. In total, some 29 complaints were received. The defendant was charged in relation to apparent pest control work he claimed to have undertaken at the home of two elderly and vulnerable victims. Both victims had been cold called by the defendant. In one case, the defendant told the victim she had rats in the loft. She paid him £11,400 over the course of 8 days to 'rectify' the alleged rat infestation and replace a roof tile. When officers investigated the matter, they discovered that the roof tile was still loose and there was no indication there had ever been rats.</p> <p>In the case of another victim, the defendant claimed to be from Environmental Health and said that he had found rats in the rear garden. This resident subsequently paid the defendant £10,400 over the course of 3 months, and described how he would 'get nasty' if she did not agree to pay him.</p>	<p>The defendant was sentenced on both counts to 12 months imprisonment to run concurrent but consecutive to his current prison sentence.</p>

		<p>The defendant had a number of previous convictions for dishonestly offences and has been serving a prison sentence since October 2019 when he was convicted of three burglaries.</p> <p>In sentencing, the Recorder told the defendant that he had taken advantage of two elderly and vulnerable women living alone who were clearly targeted. These were 'serious and mean' offences where he asked for money in circumstances that would have made the victims scared and in a panic. The amounts that the defendant took were substantial and the court would not tolerate this predatory behaviour. The offences were so serious that only imprisonment would be appropriate.</p>	
16	30.9.21	<p>The defendant in this case was the landlord of a 3-storey property which was being let to 5 un-related people who shared kitchen and bathroom facilities. SRS officers visited the property after a complaint was made by one of the tenants.</p> <p>The visit revealed that the property lacked an adequate fire alarm system, had a defective electrical installation and an insecure carpet to the first floor. The defendant subsequently failed to provide electrical reports when requested to do so and was found to be operating a licensable house in multiple occupation without a licence.</p> <p>He pleaded guilty to 5 charges under the Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Wales) Regulations</p>	<p>The defendant was fined £834 and ordered to pay costs of £350 together with a victim surcharge of £83.</p>



		2006.	
17	21.10.21	<p>The defendant in this case was just 19 years old when he travelled from England to South Wales and told a resident that roof repairs were needed to their home. He claimed that there was a problem with the ridge tiles and that the roof membrane was full of tears (he showed the resident video clips apparently of the membrane, to illustrate this). The resident paid £1580 for the work, only to find later that bits of membrane had simply been stapled to the roof joists. A chartered surveyor later confirmed that the work was of exceptionally poor standard and that it appeared that the tears had been <i>deliberately made</i> in the underfelt. It cost the resident a further £600 to rectify the problems.</p> <p>The defendant pleaded guilty to one offence under the Fraud Act 2006, and in mitigation claimed that the crime had been led by the two older men who accompanied him to the property. He had travelled a long way from home and was concerned that he wouldn't get paid if he didn't do as they told him.</p>	<p>In sentencing, the Magistrates took into account the defendant's early guilty plea, the fact that he had no previous convictions and his co-operation with the probation service. He was given a 1 year community order with a 15 days rehabilitation requirement and was ordered to carry out 80 hours of unpaid work. Costs of £1219 were awarded to the prosecution and the defendant was ordered to pay compensation of £2180.</p>
18	26.10.21	<p>The defendant in this case is the owner of a caravan site, and he was charged under the Mobile Homes (Wales) Act 2013 for knowingly or recklessly providing information which was false and which would cause a potential purchaser of a residential mobile home to decide not to do so. The offence is more commonly</p>	<p>The defendant was fined £1400 and ordered to pay costs of £600. In addition, £10,000 was awarded to the complainant to compensate him for the loss in sale price.</p>

	<p>known as 'sales blocking'.</p> <p>In October 2019 SRS received a complaint from the owner of a residential mobile home at the site owned by the defendant. The complainant had inherited the property following the death of his parents. The complainant advertised the property for sale and secured a purchaser who then completed the obligatory Proposed Sale Form which was submitted to the defendant. The purchaser had indicated on the form that he intended to park a Mitsubishi car on the site. The site rules precluded the parking of any commercial vehicles, touring caravans or camper vehicles on the site. The defendant applied to the Residential Property Tribunal for a Refusal Order in an attempt to stop the sale as he claimed he had received a telephone call from the purchaser claiming he wanted to park a campervan on the site next to the mobile home. This was vehemently denied by the purchaser who confirmed that he did not and had never owned a campervan and had not made any calls to the park. The Refusal Order was not granted by the Tribunal and the sale was eventually completed, albeit at a substantially lower price as the complainant had felt the need to reduce the sale price given the delay caused to the purchaser.</p> <p>In giving his decision, the District Judge confirmed that the evidence given by the prosecution was consistent and clear whilst the evidence given by the defendant was evasive and inconsistent. The defendant had clearly made the false statement thinking that nobody</p>	
--	--	--

		would do anything about it, and it was clear that he had done this before.	
19	28.10.21	<p>A landlord and a lettings agency were charged with offences under the Housing Act 2004 for letting a property, licensed under Part 2 of the Act, to be occupied in excess of the permitted number of persons. Charges also related to their permitting a part of the property which was prohibited from use by the terms of the licence, to be used as habitable accommodation.</p> <p>Advice had previously been given by officers of Shared Regulatory Services to the effect that the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor room was not to be used as a bedroom due to fire safety / means of escape issues, and a licence under Part 2 of the Housing Act 2004 was granted for the property to be occupied by a maximum of 3 persons.</p> <p>However, a visit by SRS September 2019 revealed that the house, including the 2<sup>nd</sup> floor room, were occupied by 4 persons in contravention of the conditions of the licence.</p>	Each Defendant received a fine of £1400, costs of £200 and a victim surcharge of £140.00.
20	24.11.21	This doorstep crime case against two defendants arose from complaints being made by a number of local residents. The men made false representations that roofing work was needed when it wasn't, with scare tactics being used to suggest that there were major problems and a danger of roof collapse. The court heard how the defendants would quote excessive sums for work that did not need doing and	One of the defendants was sentenced to 3 years in prison, while the other received a prison sentence of 22 months.

		<p>then, when consumers were at their most vulnerable as their roof was exposed, they would 'find' other urgent work which required a significant escalation in the already extortionate cost. One of the residents was in poor health and unfortunately passed away while the roofing work was ongoing at his home, and so callous were the defendants that the morning after the gentleman's passing, they visited the his widow to demand payment.</p> <p>Both defendants pleaded guilty to 3 offences under the Fraud Act 2006. In sentencing, the District Judge referred to the defendants as contractors who were consistently dishonest and had adopted a greedy and callous approach which caused distress to consumers. He considered that the defendants' behaviour had been a contributing factor to the distress caused to the deceased resident in his final days. The defendants were determined to hit people when they were financially vulnerable and felt that they had no choice but to agree to having work carried out.</p> <p>While giving the 25% discount for early guilty pleas, the District Judge stated that the defendants were highly culpable and had abused their power in offences that were pre planned.</p>	
21	6.1.22	<p>The defendants in this case were a husband and wife who ran a profitable dog breeding business. Despite being advised repeatedly by Shared Regulatory Services that the business needed to be licensed for</p>	<p>Both defendants were sentenced on the first count to a fine of £10,000 and on each subsequent count a fine of £1,000, making a total of £19,000 each and therefore a total fine of</p>

	<p>dog breeding, the couple chose not to apply to become licensed. In December 2019, following the execution of a warrant at the couple's home, a number of animal welfare offences were identified.</p> <p>Prior to the court appearance on 6<sup>th</sup> January 2022, the defendants had previously pleaded guilty to one charge under section 13 of the Animal Welfare Act (unlicensed breeding) and a further nine charges under section 9 of the same legislation (duty to ensure welfare).</p> <p>The court heard how the couple had been registered with 5 different veterinary practices and litters were registered with different names and different addresses to avoid detection by both the local authority and the Kennel Club. Evidence was presented of the number of litters born to individual dogs in a short space of time – each one being artificially inseminated soon after the last litter, failing to give the mother sufficient time to recover.</p> <p>On sentencing, the Judge commented that the couple had chosen not to get a dog breeding licence and the reasons that they gave for doing so were wholly inadequate. What the defendants had done with regard to the breeding of the bitches flies in the face of veterinary advice which they chose to ignore. While the conditions at the home address do not compare to a puppy farm, this was what was being run to make money. The fines imposed reflect both the defendants' means and the money that has been made.</p>	<p>£38,0000.</p> <p>The Judge also ordered the defendants to pay the prosecution costs of £43,775.50, together with a victim surcharge of £175 each.</p> <p>With regard to the Proceeds of Crime hearing, the amount of benefit agreed by the Court was £372,531.54. The defendants have assets to realise this amount and were ordered to pay within 3 months or each face a custodial sentence of 2 years.</p>
--	--	--

22	11.2.22	<p>The defendant in this rogue trader case had previously pleaded guilty to 21 Charges; 11 under the Fraud Act 2006 and 10 further charges under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008. The case involved multiple victims who had lost a significant amount of money for building work not completed or in some cases work that was never started.</p> <p>The court heard that customers were taken in by a professional looking business Facebook page. They were told by him to pay an upfront deposit to 'secure a slot' for the work to be done, and the defendant would tell them how busy he was to get them to pay. Attendance of the defendant at the residents' homes was sporadic, and he would often say he was leaving to collect materials or to deal with a family emergency. When victims had had enough of the excuses and contacted the defendant for a refund (to enable them to engage another trader to get the work completed), he would often get aggressive and abusive.</p> <p>Several Victim impact statements provided by victims as to how dealing with the defendant had impacted their life were read out to the court.</p> <p>On sentencing, the Judge described the defendant as being calculated, manipulative and sometimes aggressive. He had been paid to complete work that</p>	<p>The defendant was sentenced to 16 months imprisonment and a Proceeds of Crime investigation continues.</p>

		<p>at best, was substandard or faulty but mostly that money had been taken and no work done at all. He had defrauded unconnected people including single mothers, NHS workers and a widow causing a loss of approximately £50,000. These people had not just lost money to him but then had had to pay more money to get the work rectified or completed. had provided numerous excuses as to why he hadn't attended or completed the work. He had screamed at a single mother taunting her that 'he would burn her money in her face' and had made a malicious and false complaint about a member of the police force hoping that this would deter her from continuing her complaint with Trading Standards. He had had plenty of time to repay the monies back in light of the early incident that was highlighted by the defence. He has not repaid any of the victims and as a direct result of his actions, people have been left in debt, lost money that was part of an inheritance or had taken from their pension funds.</p>	
23	3.3.22	<p>This case followed a visit by Shared Regulatory Services to a take-away food business in September 2020. The officers' inspection identified a number of food hygiene offences including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a failure to ensure the premises were kept clean</li> <li>• failure to implement and maintain procedures</li> </ul>	<p>In sentencing, the Magistrates confirmed that they gave the defendant full credit for the early guilty plea, accepted that the premises had been improved and that the defendant had no previous convictions. However, they were clear that these were very serious incidents and presented a serious risk to people's lives and health. The defendant was fined a total of £1760 and ordered to pay costs of £1100 as well as a victim surcharge of £176.</p>

		<p>based on HACCP principles</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• failure to provide sufficient washbasins and</li> <li>• failure to ensure that food, cooking utensils and raw materials were kept clean to avoid cross contamination.</li> </ul> <p>The defendant subsequently pleaded guilty to 8 offences under the Food Hygiene (Wales) Regulations 2006.</p> <p>In mitigation the defendant's solicitor told the court that the business consists of the defendant and their spouse who is the chef. Improvements had been made at the premises - a new floor has been laid and a whole new fridge system has been put in. A further visit by SRS in November 2020 acknowledged the improvements made.</p>	
24	25.3.22	<p>The defendant in this rogue trading case had pleaded guilty to 4 counts of theft and one count of fraud earlier in March 2022. The hearing followed a series of delays caused by the defendant failing to appear as required in court and as a result, he faced an additional charge under the Bail Act. The trader had engaged with residents to carry out work at their homes, and each paid a substantial deposit upfront on the basis they were paying for materials and labour. In each case, some work was carried out but then ceased. As a result, consumers were forced to employ</p>	<p>The defendant was sentenced to 33 months imprisonment on each count of theft and fraud to run concurrently and 3 months imprisonment for the Bail Act offence to run consecutively to the others. That gave a total imprisonment of 3 years. No compensation orders were made due to the defendant's lack of funds, and there was no order for costs.</p>



		<p>other traders to complete the work at further cost. In each case, the prices quoted by the defendant appeared very reasonable, even unrealistic, suggesting that there was never any intention to carry out the work. Of particular concern was the fact that the defendant claimed to be a certified electrician when he had no such qualification and some of the jobs were left in a dangerous state.</p> <p>In mitigation, a number of health issues were cited, including a heart condition which had caused the defendant to cease building work. He had also been forced to declare bankruptcy.</p> <p>In sentencing, the Judge told the defendant that he had quoted competitively to get people to hire him and then lied about his qualifications and experience. The work carried out was sub-standard or not carried out at all. He went on to describe the defendant as the epitome of the 'cowboy builder' who had caused significant harm and inconvenience to his victims. These were serious offences and the defendant also had previous convictions, which was an aggravating factor.</p>	
--	--	---	--