

Appendix 2 - Summary of cases concluding between April 2022 and March 2023

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

Case	Court date	Offence(s)	Outcome
1	1.4.22	<p>Housing Act 2004</p> <p>The property freeholder granted a management lease of a house in multiple occupation to the defendant company in 2014. The effect of the lease was that the defendant company is the landlord of the HMO and responsible for ensuring that the relevant standards are met to protect the health, safety and welfare of the tenants.</p> <p>The company, and its sole director were previously prosecuted in 2020 for failing to comply with management regulations made under the Housing Act 2004. An improvement notice was served on the company in September 2020, requiring works to be carried out so that the required standards could be met. These works included :</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An overhaul of the electrical installation. • Provision of an escape window to one room. • Fire protecting the gas & electricity meter cupboards. • Removal of accumulations in the garage. • Replacement of worn laminate flooring. • Overhaul of all windows. • Overhaul of the heating and hot water system. <p>As the works were not completed, both defendants were again prosecuted, this time for failure to comply with the Improvement Notice. There was no attendance or representation by either defendant, so the matter was heard in their absence.</p>	<p>The Magistrates imposed a fine of £3,740 with costs of £400 and a victim surcharge of £154 for each defendant. (Total £8,588)</p>
2	29.4.22	<p>Food Hygiene (Wales) Regulations</p> <p>In October 2020, April 2021 and November 2021 officers from Shared Regulatory services visited a convenience store premises to</p>	<p>In sentencing, the Judge accepted that the</p>

		2006	<p>carry out food hygiene Inspections. The first of these inspections highlighted a number of food hygiene breaches including an active rodent infestation. The food business operator was advised that if the rodent activity was to return, they must contact the local authority and close the store immediately. However, on 2 further occasions rodent activity did return and the store continued to trade with an active infestation, ignoring the risks to the public. In addition, the store had been trading and preparing open high-risk food with not only a rodent infestation but also no hot water to clean or sanitise the premises, equipment or effectively wash hands, which was unacceptable.</p> <p>The defendant company had pleaded guilty to 9 offences under the Food Hygiene (Wales) Regulations 2006. The prosecution had placed culpability in the very high category due to the continued breaches over a number of months. The defence argued that it was medium culpability and more that the systems that were in place were just not sufficiently adhered to. They also argued that harm was low to medium as there were no reports of actual harm to customers. The prosecution submission was that harm was of the most serious nature, namely a category 1 as the risk of harm to vulnerable customers had to be considered. The defence argued that the defendant had taken steps when the problems were brought to their attention and had changed their pest control company. The defence also produced financial statements indicating a low turn-over and profit.</p>	<p>defendant's culpability was in the high category and the risk of harm was a category 1. He imposed a £1000 fine for the HACCP offence, and a £50 fine for each of seven other offences, resulting in a total fine of £2350. The Judge imposed costs of £2000 and a victim surcharge of £135.</p>
3.	23.5.22	General Food Regulations 2004	<p>The defendant attended court and pleaded guilty to two offences under the General Food Regulations 2004. The defendant runs a convenience store which was visited by officers in March 2021. at</p>	<p>In sentencing the Magistrates gave the defendant credit for his</p>

			<p>89 Bridgend Road, Bridgend and an inspection by officers from the Shared Regulatory Services on the 29th March 2021 discovered a number of food items on sale which were past their 'use by' dates. The court were advised that the defendant had a previous conviction for similar offences at the same store in 2019.</p> <p>The defendant handed in a letter to the court in mitigation which was not read out and the defendant added nothing further.</p>	<p>early guilty plea and he was fined a total of £440, ordered to pay costs of £502 and a victim surcharge of £44.</p>
4.	26.5.22	Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Wales) Regulations 2006	<p>The defendant did not attend court and an application was made to prove the offences in his absence. He was found guilty of 17 offences under The Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Wales) Regulations 2006. The HMO of which the defendant is the landlord was inspected by officers from the Shared Regulatory Service in November 2021 and the following failures were identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to provide an appropriate fire alarm system. • Failure to provide a fire door between the ground floor annex and hall. • Failure to provide solid timber doors to the bedrooms. • Failure to enclose the gas & electricity meters in fire resisting units. • Failure to replace the glazing over the door to the first floor front bedroom to provide a fire resisting partition. • Failure to provide a fire blanket. • Failure to address a trip hazard to the ground floor hallway. • Failure to provide sufficient kitchen sockets. • Failures to submit gas and electrical certificates • Failures to maintain the electrical sockets 	<p>The Magistrates imposed a fine totalling £6,600 and ordered payment of £680 Prosecution costs & £660 Victim Surcharge*</p> <p><i>*This case was later re-opened at the request of the defendant as he was able to show that he had entered guilty pleas at the time. At the subsequent hearing in January 2023, the Magistrates agreed that he should be given credit as if guilty please had been entered. As a result, the penalty was reduced to being a fine totalling £4645, costs of £1080 and a court surcharge of £190</i></p>

5.	31.5.22	Food hygiene	This prosecution was taken in response to a number of food hygiene failures at the premises of a retail butcher. The defendant company and the store manager pleaded guilty to six food hygiene offences as well as an additional charge of not implementing or following a HACCP system. Mitigation was offered as a result of the business having subsequently ceased trading and the premises closed.	The company was fined £50 for each of the six food hygiene offence and a further £500 for the HACCP charge. Likewise, the other defendant was fined £50 for each of the six food hygiene offences and was given a 2 year conditional discharge for the HACCP offence Each defendant was ordered to pay £1500 in costs as well as victim surcharges of £80and £34 respectively.
6.	16.6.22	Licensing	The defendant was found to be driving an unlicensed and uninsured vehicle for a third party in order to fulfil a school transport contract. In mitigation, he claimed to have driven the vehicle for a company previously when it was a Public Service Vehicle and he assumed he was still able to drive it. He was simply doing a favour to help the holder of the school transport contract as he had told him who he would lose the contract otherwise.	The defendant was fined £100 and disqualified from driving for 4 months for the offence of no insurance, with no separate penalty for the private hire offence. He was also ordered to pay £150 Prosecution costs and £34 victim surcharge.
7.	23.6.22	Licensing	In November 2021, the defendant was found to be plying for hire in a controlled district whilst not having the licence to do so. The vehicle insurance did not include plying for hire, only Private Hire by prior arrangement. He pleaded guilty to one offence under Section	The defendant was fined £450 and his licence endorsed with 6 penalty points for the offence of

			<p>45 of the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 (plying for hire) and one offence under Section 143 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 in respect of the lack of insurance.</p> <p>In mitigation, the Court was told the defendant had been driving for 15 years without incident and is the sole provider for his wife and 4 children.</p>	<p>having no insurance. He was also ordered to pay £150 costs and a £45 victim surcharge. No separate penalty was imposed for the plying for hire charge.</p>
8.	19.8.22	Licensing Act (underage sales)	<p>The owner and Designated Premises Supervisor of a convenience store pleaded guilty to 2 offences under the Licensing Act 2003. In July 2021 officers from Shared Regulatory Services, in conjunction with South Wales Police, conducted a test purchase operation with the assistance of a 16-year-old volunteer. On taking three cans of cider to the till, the young volunteer was served by the defendant's 17-year-old son. No checks were carried out to establish whether the volunteer was old enough to purchase alcohol and he was not asked to remove the face covering he was wearing at the time.</p> <p>When interviewed under caution, the defendant made a full admission of the two offences, i.e., the sale of alcohol to someone under the age of 18, and also permitting a minor to sell alcohol without specific authorisation. The investigation demonstrated that there were no training records, no refusals register and no CCTV at the premises and the defendant did not operate a 'Challenge 25' policy.</p>	<p>The defendant was fined £307 per offence giving a total fine of £614. He was also ordered to pay costs of £500 and a victim surcharge of £61.</p>
9.	8.9.22	Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982	<p>On the day of the Six Nations Wales v. Scotland rugby international in February 2022, officers from Shared Regulatory Services were on duty in Cardiff city centre to monitor for street trading. The officers discovered the defendant engaging in street trading on Penarth Road (a street designated as a consent street for the purposes of street trading). He was offering and exposing food for</p>	<p>The defendant was fined £169 and ordered to pay £95 Prosecution costs together with a £34 Victim Surcharge.</p>

			<p>sale from a trolley but did not have the relevant authorisation to do so.</p> <p>He pleaded guilty to the offence under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1982.</p>	
10.	15.9.22	<p>General Food Regulations 2004</p> <p>Food Safety Act 1990</p>	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to 4 offences under the General Food Regulations 2004 and 1 offence under the Food Safety Act 1990. A Shared Regulatory Services officer visited the defendants' convenience store to carry out an inspection of the premises. The visit followed a complaint from a consumer who had purchased some cakes that were passed their 'use by' dates. Despite the inspection taking place on 2nd July 2021, a number of items were found to be on sale despite their use by dates having expired the previous month. These items included a black pudding with a use by date of 4th June 2021 and grated cheese with a use by date of 20th June 2021 which had visible signs of mould. In mitigation the defendant confirmed that changes had been made to prevent the incident happening again and he was truly sorry.</p>	<p>The District Judge fined the defendant £350 for the first offence and £100 for each of the remaining 4 offences giving a total fine of £750. The defendant was also ordered to pay a victim surcharge of £75 and costs in the amount of £2000.</p>
11.	23.9.22	<p>Housing Act 2004</p> <p>Licensing and Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Additional Provisions) (Wales) Regulations 2007.</p> <p>Local Government (Miscellaneous</p>	<p>The defendant is the freeholder of a 3-storey Victorian house split into four self-contained flats. Following a complaint from a tenant, Shared Regulatory Services carried out an inspection in December 2021 during which a number of significant hazards were found. These included</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a defective fire alarm system • insecure front door • lack of fire proofing to the gas and electricity meter cupboards 	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to the 12 offences and was fined a total of £6,350. He was also ordered to pay costs of £1,376 and a victim surcharge of £190.</p>

		Provisions Act) 1976	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> defective flat entrance doors obstructions to the means of escape from fire, and failure to submit gas certificates <p>In addition, it was established that the property is subject to an additional HMO licensing scheme, however no application had been made for the property to be licensed.</p> <p>The defendant also failed to comply with a requisition to provide information served upon him in January 2022.</p>	
12.	7.10.22	Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008	<p>The defendant had masqueraded as a private seller rather than a trader when he sold a Mini Cooper to an unsuspecting purchaser. The car soon developed problems, and this led to the true status of the defendant being established - he was a trader attempting to avoid his legal responsibilities to the purchaser. The defendant had made a number of misleading and unfair commercial practices which included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stating that vehicle had a full service history which was false Stating that it had been used as a second personal vehicle which was false Failing to give his trading name, status and geographical address Advertising it in such a way that he falsely represented himself as a consumer <p>The defendant pleaded guilty to all four charges against him under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008.</p>	<p>The Magistrates stated that there was a high level of culpability but given the defendant's previous clean character, they imposed a fine of £958 for the 4th offence with no separate penalty for the other offences. He was also ordered to pay costs of £1568 and a victim surcharge of £96. A £500 compensation order was made for the victim.</p>
13.	10.10.22	Town Police Clauses	<p>In November 2021, the defendant was seen plying for hire in a controlled district whilst not having the licence to do so. The vehicle</p>	<p>The defendant was given a global fine of £220 for</p>

		Act 1847 Road Traffic Act 1988	insurance did not cover plying for hire (as not a Hackney carriage) and therefore the vehicle he was using was not insured. The charges related to the plying for hire offence and also the offence under the Road Traffic Act of being uninsured.	the two offences, and 6 penalty points were imposed for the no insurance charge. He was also ordered to pay £250 Prosecution costs and £88 Victim Surcharge.
14.	13.10.22	Environmental Protection Act 1990	<p>The defendants in this case, tenants in a privately rented property have a history of complaints made against them by neighbours as a result of their playing loud amplified music. This resulted in them being subject to a noise abatement notice which was served in November 2021. From January 2022 on, further occasions of their playing loud amplified music were witnessed by officers of Shared Regulatory Services.</p> <p>Both defendants were charged with offences under the Environmental Protection Act for failing, without reasonable excuse to comply with the requirements of the noise abatement notice.</p> <p>Neither Defendant attended court and the matter proceeded in their absence. The Magistrates heard the Victim Impact statement of one of the neighbours, explaining the significant issues he and his partner have encountered with the defendants.</p>	Having heard the facts, the Magistrates found the case against both Defendants proved. Each defendant received a fine of £880 (£1760 in total) and ordered to pay costs of £550 (£100 in total), together with a Victim Surcharge of £88 (£176 in total).
15.	17.10.22	Animal Welfare Act 2006	The defendants in this case were a prolific horse breeder, previously banned from keeping animals for life, and his teenage son. The son had pleaded guilty to 25 animal welfare offences, and a matter of days before the trial took place the father also pleaded guilty to the animal welfare charges and also a further offence for breaching his lifetime disqualification order under the Animal	<p>The defendants were sentenced as follows:</p> <p>The son was banned from keeping animals for 5 years except for domestic dogs and cats and a</p>

			<p>Welfare Act.</p> <p>Following the father's ban in April 2021 he transferred ownership of all the animals to the son who was only 16 years old at the time. The animals in question were being kept at two sites to which numerous visits were made by officers from Shared Regulatory Services. A total of 71 Improvement Notices were served as a result of animal welfare concerns including unsuitable environment, overcrowding, not allowing normal behaviours, failure to supply water and a failure to supply food. The improvement notices related to horses, dogs and birds.</p> <p>In sentencing the son, the judge accepted that he was of clean character and had pleaded guilty. It was noted that pressure had been put on him at a very young age, and that he had been manipulated by his father. The judge accepted that his culpability was at the lower end of the range and that he was in college.</p> <p>In sentencing the father, it was noted that he had previously been prosecuted and imprisoned for similar offences.</p>	<p>maximum of 10 chickens. He was also given a Referral Order for 4 months and ordered to pay a victim surcharge of £22. He was given 14 days to make arrangements for his animals</p> <p>The father was given 4 months imprisonment for each of the 26 offences to run concurrently and 2 months imprisonment for the breach of the ban to run consecutively. This gives a total of 6 months imprisonment of which he is expected to serve half.</p>
16.	3.11.22	Building Act 1984	<p>In October 2021 an enforcement notice was served on the defendant under Section 79(1) of the Building Act 1984. This Notice required the owner, to undertake repairs to the front and rear elevations of his neighbouring properties or take steps to demolish them. The notice required completion of the work no later than 13th April 2022. A visit to the properties on 14th April 2022 revealed no compliance and there was no change in the condition of the premises. Written and verbal reminders were given in the months that followed, but the necessary work was not carried out.</p>	<p>The defendant was fined £440 for each of the two offences making a total fine of £880. He was also ordered to pay costs of £433 and a Victim surcharge of £88.00.</p>

			The defendant did not attend court, so the case was heard in his absence. He was found guilty of two offences under the Building Act 1984.	
17.	4.11.22	Children and Families Act 2014 (underage sales)	<p>In April 2022, as a result of intelligence received about premises selling tobacco or nicotine inhaling devices (e-cigarettes) to those under the age of 18, officers conducted an underage sales operation. Two sixteen-year-old female volunteers attempted to purchase the age restricted products at the identified outlets. At one of the premises visited, the volunteers went to the counter and asked for a vape bar. They were handed an 'Elf Bar 600 – Strawberry Ice' which contained 2% nicotine and paid for it. On leaving the premises, the officers accompanying the volunteers placed the product in a tamper proof bag.</p> <p>The defendant did not attend court but pleaded guilty by post to one offence under the Children and Families Act 2014.</p> <p>In mitigation the business owner wrote that the sale had been an error of judgement on his part, and he had taken steps since the sale to educate himself further on the sale of these products but that he welcomed any course that the SRS officers could suggest he take going forward.</p>	Each of the two defendants (the limited company and its sole director) was fined £180 and ordered to pay costs of £250 together with victim surcharge of £34.
18.	10.11.22	Fraud Act 2006	In August 2021 officers from the Shared Service were contacted by a Cardiff resident who had paid a deposit of £5250 by bank transfer for the purchase of goods and fitting of kitchen upgrade/refit. The payment had been made to the bank account of the defendant in 3 transactions on a day in June 2021, but he subsequently failed to provide any goods or services. The consumer had previous landscape work completed by the defendant and it was during this time that she had mentioned that she was going to get her kitchen	The Magistrates made a 12-month community order with 150 hours of unpaid work requirement, and the defendant was ordered to pay costs of £750. A compensation order for the sum of

			<p>upgraded. The defendant said that he also did building work and arrangements were made for him to call round to discuss. He then attended with an unknown male.</p> <p>The court heard through the victim impact statement how the incident had affected the complainant. The money that she had lost was the inheritance she had received from her mother's death during the Covid pandemic. Waiting months for the work to start, the victim had been living out of boxes waiting for the defendant to turn up and she had felt totally humiliated. She had spent years protecting her mum from falling for scams and couldn't believe that she had become a victim herself. She was not sleeping, was stressed and this had triggered her IBS resulting in an emergency hospital admission. She now struggles to trust people and feels like she had let her mum and dad down.</p> <p>The defendant pleaded guilty to one offence under the Fraud Act and sought to blame the unknown male who he had paid the money to. The court heard how the defendant had been a gifted amateur boxer who had won an Olympic Silver medal in 2012 but had later developed mental health issues before starting a landscaping business. The fact that he couldn't resolve this problem had been a blow to his confidence and he had been too ashamed to tell his partner and family. He had buried his head in the sand and was too ashamed to tell the complainant what had happened to the money. His empathy and apology to the complainant was absolutely unreserved.</p>	£5250 was also made for the complainant.
19.	1.12.22	Housing Act 2004 Licensing and Management of	The defendant is the landlord of a property split into four self-contained flats. An inspection by Shared Regulatory Services in November 2021 revealed a number of concerns, including	The Magistrates found the case proved in the absence of the defendant.

		<p>Houses in Multiple Occupation (Additional Provisions) (Wales) Regulations 2007.</p> <p>Housing (Wales) Act 2014</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No fire alarm in the common areas of the property • Broken detectors within the flats • None of the flat entrance doors were complete fire doors • Three of the flats had bedrooms which were inner rooms but were not fitted with fire doors or escape windows • Inadequate and defective bathroom facilities • Security issues • The manager of the property wasn't licensed under the Housing (Wales) Act. 	<p>In delivering their sentence, they gave weight to the immediate risks such as fire, and the longer-term risks to health and welfare, such as damp and mould.</p> <p>The defendant was fined £2,000 for each of the five offences making a total of £10,000. She was also ordered to pay costs of £2,000 and a victim surcharge of £190</p>
20.	7.12.22	<p>Theft Act 1968</p> <p>Fraud Act 2006</p>	<p>The defendant in this rogue builder case had pleaded at an earlier hearing, to one offence under the Theft Act 1968 and to one offence the Fraud Act 2006. The offences related to an incident in July 2021 when the defendant attended at a property and quoted the residents a figure of £1100 for rendering a rear garden wall. He advised that if they paid half immediately to cover the materials, he would be able to complete the work the following weekend. The resident got the defendant to sign a handwritten receipt, but no additional paperwork was provided. He subsequently failed to attend to carry out the works, failed to return the deposit and failed to provide any materials. At one point he even claimed that he had repaid the money which was untrue.</p> <p>The court was advised that the defendant had been prosecuted for similar offences investigated by SRS in 2017 for which he had</p>	<p>The court ordered that the defendant be sentenced to 12 months imprisonment for the theft offence and 6 months imprisonment for the fraud offence, to run concurrently. He also ordered that the defendant pay the required statutory surcharge and he made a Compensation Order for the victims in the case in</p>

			<p>received a prison sentence and had been banned from being a director.</p> <p>In sentencing, the Judge stated that, whilst the defendant might be described as a rogue trader, he was in fact a criminal and a thief who exploited the trust of reasonable people. His offences had caused stress and anxiety to his victims. He accepted the prosecution's characterisation of where the offences fell in the sentencing guidelines but his previous 2017 convictions were an aggravating factor. These were further aggravated as he had been repeatedly given advice which he had ignored and the fact that he had lied about repaying the money.</p>	the sum of £550.
21.	9.12.22	Food Hygiene Rating (Wales) Act 2013	<p>This case was brought against a limited company as the Food Business Operator of a restaurant, as well as against the company's sole director. When an Officer of the Shared Service inspected the restaurant in January 2022, the business had been awarded a food hygiene rating of 1 (Major Improvement Necessary) A visit by officers in May 2022 revealed that the company had failed to display the food hygiene rating sticker in the location and manner prescribed by the legislation. To make matters worse, the company director misled officers by claiming that the business had changed hands when it had not.</p> <p>The director did not attend court for the case hearing and there was no one else present to represent the company. Application was sought to prove the matters in absence as effective service of papers had been achieved.</p> <p>The company was found guilty of two offences under the Food Hygiene Rating (Wales) Act 2013. The first of these was for failing to display the food hygiene rating sticker and the second was for</p>	<p>The company was fined a total of £1500, ordered to pay costs of £1277 and a court surcharge of £150. The company director was fined £750, ordered to pay costs of £796 and a court surcharge of £75.</p>

			obstructing the officers in their enquiries. The company director was found guilty on the one charge against him, that of obstruction.	
22.	6.1.2023	Children and Families Act 2014	In May 2022, a test purchase attempt resulted in the sale of a nicotine inhaling product (e-cigarette) being sold to a 16-year-old volunteer. This was despite SRS having written to the outlet to advise on the law after complaints were received alleging that underage sales were taking place at the premises. The sole director of the business was the seller on this occasion, and he was subsequently interviewed under caution about the offence. Later, in September 2022, a further attempt was made (by the same young volunteer) to purchase a nicotine inhaling product at the premises, and this also resulted in a sale being made, this time by an employee at the store. Both the company and its sole director were prosecuted for the underage sales offences on the two separate occasions, and guilty pleas were entered.	<p>The company director was fined £166 for each of the two offences, and he was ordered to pay costs of £310 together with a Victim Surcharge of £34.</p> <p>In addition, the company was fined £293 for each of the two offences, and ordered to pay costs of £310 and a Victim Surcharge of £48 (<i>Total fine £918, and total costs £620</i>)</p>
23.	6.1.2023	Licensing Act 2003 (underage sales)	Following complaints about under 18s being sold alcohol at a retail premises in Barry, Trading Standards Officers carried out a test purchase attempt with the assistance of two young volunteers, aged 15 and 16 years old. The volunteers picked up a box of Strongbow dark fruit cider priced at £12.99 and took it to the counter. The owner of the business was behind the counter and asked one of the volunteers for their age. On being told that they were 15, the defendant explained that a person had to be 18 years old to purchase alcohol. Despite this, he went on to sell the alcohol to the 15 year old, charging an additional £1.01 for the cans. He then proceeded to decant the cans from the cardboard box and placed them into opaque carrier bags before handing them to the purchaser at the shop door where he's told them to wait.	<p>The defendant was fined £640 for selling alcohol to a person under the age of 18, £640 for not having a Designated Premises Supervisor, and a further £640 for supplying false information.</p> <p>He was also ordered to pay costs of £500 and a victim surcharge of £190.</p>

			<p>This came three months after concerns were first raised about the store, and the defendant received verbal and written guidance from Trading Standards on the sale of alcohol.</p> <p>At the time of the offence, he had claimed to be the Designated Premises Supervisor (DPS) for the store, a role required by law, but this later turned out to be false. During interviews and further investigation, it emerged that the defendant had submitted false personal licence information to the Vale of Glamorgan Council's licensing department.</p>	
24.	27.1.2023	Licensing and Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Additional Provisions) (Wales Regulations 2007	<p>The defendant is the landlord of a 4 storey, Victorian property comprising a basement and ground floor maisonette and a first and second floor maisonette. Upon inspection, a number of offences were identified for failing to comply with the Licensing and Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Additional Provisions) (Wales Regulations 2007. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A defective fire alarm system • Missing or insecure, handrails to stairs • Defective floor coverings • Low level windows which presented a risk of falls • damaged kitchen work surfaces • unsafe kitchen layouts • an insecure WC • accumulations to the rear yard likely to provide harbourage for rodents 	The defendant was fined a total of £23,750 and ordered to pay costs of £450 together with a victim surcharge of £1,200.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • damp • unsafe guarding to landings • unsafe electrical installations and • an insecure entrance door. <p>In addition, the gas central heating and hot water boiler in the upper maisonette was not working and a notice was served on the defendant under s. 80, Environmental Protection Act 1990 requiring the repair or replacement of the boiler within 8 days. When this notice wasn't complied with by the defendant, arrangements were made for the boiler repairs to be carried out as works in default.</p> <p>The case against the defendant included a total of 18 offences for failure to comply with the Licensing and Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Additional Provisions) (Wales Regulations 2007 and also for failure to comply with the Section 80 notice relating to the gas boiler. Neither the defendant nor any representative attended court and the matter was heard in his absence. He was convicted on all 18 offences.</p>	
25.	20.2.23	<p>Fraud Act 2006</p> <p>Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008</p>	<p>The defendants in this doorstep crime case were brothers who travelled to South Wales from Leighton Buzzard at the height of the COVID-19 pandemic. Residents were cold called and persuaded to have roofing works carried out, only to find that when the work was completed, the price had risen to 3 times the amount that had been originally quoted. When the victims queried the escalation in price they were met with threats and intimidation in order to get them to</p>	<p>Both defendants were sentenced to 12 months in prison for each offence to run concurrently. Applying the 20% discount for early plea meant that they will each serve a sentence of 9 months, at least half</p>

			<p>pay the higher price.</p> <p>The men had earlier pleaded guilty to the offences and attended court for sentencing. The Judge told them that their offending had been planned and had a detrimental impact on the finances of the victims as well as their psychological wellbeing. He added that 'the victims in this case were both in their eighties who were cold called for work which was claimed by the defendants as necessary. The approach taken by you has reflected a worrying trend during the period of lockdown in a rural area in the Vale of Glamorgan where you travelled from your home addresses in Leighton Buzzard and set up camp somewhere in Newport and further travelled to dupe the victims in this case. You raised the price in a deliberate and false 3 stage tier process. When challenged by the victims you bullied them and made them feel intimidated, there was genuine fear felt by the victims. You have asked for leniency in this case but you did not think of the effects of your actions in respect of the victims. This case has clearly passed the custody threshold. I have taken into consideration your early guilty pleas but have also taken into consideration the age of the victims in this case.</p>	<p>of that would be served in prison before being released on licence for the remainder.</p> <p>Due to the custodial sentences being received no costs or compensation were awarded.</p>
26.	24.2.23	Housing Act 2004	<p>The defendant did not attend court and the case was proved in his absence. He was found guilty of failing to comply with 2 improvement notices made under the Housing Act 2004.</p> <p>The defendant is the owner of a 3 storey, Victorian, terraced property in Cardiff which has been sub-divided into 4 self-contained flats. In January 2022 formal Improvement Notices were served requiring works to be carried out to the ground floor front flat and the common areas. These notices expired in March and April 2022. No response was received to letters and emails sent to the</p>	<p>The magistrates fined the defendant £1500 for each offence giving a total fine of £3000, costs of £360 and statutory charge of £1200. A collection order was made. Arrangements will be made for payment and consolidation with his previous fine (£6,350</p>

			<p>defendant, including a letter which was hand delivered to his home address. A visit in August 2022 confirmed that the fire alarm system was faulty, the electricity meters had not been properly fire-protected and works inside a ground floor flat remained incomplete.</p> <p>The Court was notified of the defendant's previous conviction in respect of the same property in September 2022 which arose as a result of an earlier SRS investigation into significant hazards at the property.</p>	<p><i>together with costs of £1,376 and a victim surcharge of £190)</i></p>
27.	24.2.23	Town Police Clauses Act 1847	<p>The defendant in this case had previously contact the court to plead guilty to two offences under the Town and Police Clauses Act 1847. The case concerned two incidents, firstly on the 30th of July 2022, between 11.05 hours and 11.35 hours and secondly, on the 10th of September 2022, between 14.05 hours and 14.35 hours, when the defendant left his hackney carriage unattended in a designated taxi rank in Cardiff city centre.</p>	<p>The magistrates fined the defendant £100 for the first offence and £140 for the second offence, giving a total fine of £240. Prosecution costs of £175 and a statutory charge of £96 were also imposed.</p>
28	23.3.23	<p>Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974</p> <p>Food Hygiene (Wales) Regulations 2006</p>	<p>Between August 2019 and January 2020 officers from the Shared Regulatory Service visited a Cardiff restaurant found problems including pest infestation, unsafe food hygiene practices and health and safety violations, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to put in place, implement and maintain a permanent procedure based on HACCP principles • Failure to ensure the design, layout, construction, siting and size of the food premises permitted good food hygiene practices including protection against contamination including pest control • Failure to ensure all fittings, equipment and articles that came into 	<p>The company was fined £12,000 on count 1 and ordered to pay costs of £6500. There was no separate penalty on the other charges.</p> <p>The company Director was fined £1500 on count 2 and ordered to pay £1000 in costs. There was no separate penalty on</p>

			<p>contact with food were kept in good repair and condition to avoid risk of contamination</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to ensure the premises were kept clean and maintained in good repair and condition • Failure to ensure that at all stages of production, processing and distribution food was protected against any contamination likely to render the food unfit for human consumption • Failure to comply with 2 hygiene improvement notices served under the Food Hygiene (Wales) Act 2006 • Failure to comply with an improvement notice served under the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 <p>The three defendants in this case were the legal Food Business Operator (a limited company), the sole Director of the limited company and her father who fulfils the role of the natural Food Business Operator, managing the restaurant's day to day operations. Each had pleaded not guilty to all 9 charges but were found guilty following a to week Crown Court trial in February 2023.</p> <p>In sentencing, the judge stated that the picture when the premises was inspected in 2019 was one of clear evidence of the ingress of rats, disrepair, food handling practices that were nauseating, records that had been falsified by one or more persons, equipment that was missing or broken or which staff did not know how to use, food stored in a manner which rendered it unfit for human consumption, and where there was clearly no appetite of those running the restaurant to do anything other than trade.</p>	<p>the other offences.</p> <p>The natural food business operator was fined £5000 on count 2 and ordered to pay £2500 in costs. There was no separate penalty on the other offences.</p> <p><i>Total £14,500 fines and £10,000 in costs</i></p>
--	--	--	--	--