



**DECISION AND STATEMENT OF REASONS OF JOSEPHINE BONNAR,
LEGAL MEMBER OF THE FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL WITH DELEGATED
POWERS OF THE CHAMBER PRESIDENT**

**Under Rule 8 of the First-tier Tribunal for Scotland Housing and Property
Chamber Rules of Procedure 2017 ("the Procedure Rules")**

in connection with

12 Birch Place, Drumsagard Village, Cambuslang ("the property")

Case Reference: FTS/HPC/EV/22/0605

Thomas McLeod, 85 Inishail Road, Glasgow ("the Applicant")

**Morag White, 12 Birch Place, Drumsagard Village, Cambuslang ("the
Respondent")**

1. The Applicant lodged an application for an order for possession of the property in terms of Rule 66 of the Procedure Rules and Section 33 of the Housing (Scotland) Act 1988 ("the 1988 Act"). Documents lodged in support of the application include a copy short assured tenancy agreement, Notice in terms of Section 33 of the 1988 Act and Notice to Quit. The Notice to Quit stipulates that the Respondent is to vacate the property on 1 March 2022
2. The Tribunal issued a request for further information to the Applicant. The Applicant was asked to explain the basis upon which the Tribunal could entertain the application as the Notice to Quit appeared to be invalid. In particular, the date specified in the Notice to Quit did not appear to coincide with an end of the tenancy. In his response, the Applicant said that he had now taken legal advice and been advised that he might have to re-serve the notices. However, he asked the Tribunal President to exercise her discretion and allow the application to proceed as he had been endeavouring to recover possession

of the property for 11 months and there was some urgency due to personal circumstances. On the 5 April 2022, a further letter was issued to the Applicant advising him that the Tribunal did not have discretion to disregard an invalid notice to quit. He was asked to confirm if he wished to withdraw the application and notified that if he failed to respond by 12 April 2022, the application may be rejected. No response has been received.

DECISION

3. The Legal Member considered the application in terms of Rule 8 of the Chamber Procedural Rules. That Rule provides:-

Rejection of application

8(1) The Chamber President or another member of the First-tier Tribunal under the delegated powers of the Chamber President, must reject an application if—

(a) they consider that the application is frivolous or vexatious;

(b) the dispute to which the application relates has been resolved;

(c) they have good reason to believe that it would not be appropriate to accept the application

(d) they consider that the application is being made for a purpose other than a purpose specified in the application; or

(e) the applicant has previously made an identical or substantially similar application and in the opinion of the Chamber President or another member of the First-tier Tribunal, under the delegated powers of the Chamber President, there has been no significant change in any material considerations since the identical or substantially similar application was determined.

(2) Where the Chamber President, or another member of the First-tier Tribunal, under the delegated powers of the Chamber President, makes a decision under paragraph (1) to reject an application the First-tier Tribunal must notify the applicant and the notification must state the reason for the decision.

4. **After consideration of the application and documents lodged in support of same the Legal Member considers that the application should be rejected on the basis that it is frivolous within the meaning of Rule 8(1)(a) of the Procedural Rules.**

Reasons for Decision

5. 'Frivolous' in the context of legal proceedings is defined by Lord Justice Bingham in R v North West Suffolk (Mildenhall) Magistrates Court, (1998) Env LR9. He indicated at page 16 of the judgment; "What the expression means in this context is, in my view, that the court considers the application to be futile, misconceived, hopeless or academic". It is that definition which the Legal Member has considered as the test in this application, and on consideration of this test, the Legal Member considers that this application is frivolous, misconceived and has no prospect of success.
6. The application lodged with the Tribunal seeks an order for recovery of possession on termination of a short assured tenancy in terms of Section 33 of the 1988 Act (as amended). Section 33 states(1) states " Without prejudice to any right of a landlord under a short assured tenancy to recover possession of the house let on the tenancy in accordance with Sections 12 to 31 of this Act, the First-tier Tribunal may make an order for possession of the house if the Tribunal is satisfied – (a) that the short assured tenancy has reached its ish, (b) that tacit relocation is not operating (d) that the landlord (or, where there are joint landlords, any of them) has given to the tenant notice stating that he requires possession of the house, and (e) that it is reasonable to make an order for possession." In order to comply with subsections (a) and (b) the landlord must serve a Notice to Quit to terminate the tenancy contract. As the landlord cannot call upon the tenant to vacate the property prior to the ish, the date specified in the Notice must coincide with an ish date.
7. The term of the tenancy specified in the tenancy agreement is 27 May 2013 until 27 May 2014 and there is provision for the tenancy to continue thereafter on a month to month basis. The Notice to Quit lodged with the application purports to terminate the tenancy contract on 1 March 2022, which is not an ish.. The Notice is therefore invalid and the tenancy contract has not been terminated. In order to raise proceedings for recovery of the property in terms of Rule 66 of the Rules, the Applicant must first bring the contractual tenancy to an end. The Notice to Quit which has been lodged is invalid and does not terminate the contractual tenancy. As a result, the Applicant cannot comply with the requirements of Section 33 of the 1988 Act

8. The Legal Member therefore concludes that the application is frivolous, misconceived and has no prospect of success. The application is rejected on that basis.

What you should do now

If you accept the Legal Member's decision, there is no need to reply.

If you disagree with this decision –

An applicant aggrieved by the decision of the Chamber President, or any Legal Member acting under delegated powers, may appeal to the Upper Tribunal for Scotland on a point of law only. Before an appeal can be made to the Upper Tribunal, the party must first seek permission to appeal from the First-tier Tribunal. That party must seek permission to appeal within 30 days of the date the decision was sent to them. Information about the appeal procedure can be forwarded to you on request.

Josephine Bonnar
Legal Member
29 April 2022