

Annex - Summary of prosecution cases concluding during 2017-18

The following prosecution cases arising from investigations conducted across the Shared Service, have been concluded during 2017-18.

Case	Court date	Offence(s)	Outcome
1	6.4.17	<p>A doorstep crime case in which money was taken for work that was not done.</p> <p>The defendant did not attend court voluntarily and had to be arrested and produced before the court</p>	<p>The defendant was fined £700, and ordered to pay costs of £300 together with a victim surcharge of £30. He was also ordered to pay compensation to two residents left out of pocket by his activities, the first of these was in the amount of £1000 and the second being £700.</p>
2	4.5.17	<p>A shopkeeper was found with counterfeit and incorrectly labelled cigarettes in possession for supply. He had received a Simple Caution in 2015 in respect of illegal tobacco being found on the premises on a previous occasion</p>	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to offences under the Trade Marks Act 1994 and offences under the Tobacco and Related Products Regulations 2016 for possessing for use in the course of a business, cigarettes which did not carry the required health warnings..</p> <p>The magistrates ordered the defendant to carry out 180 hours of unpaid work, pay costs of £350 and a victim surcharge of £85. A Forfeiture Order was granted for the tobacco products that were seized.</p>
3	5.5.17	<p>A taxi case in which the driver concerned pleaded guilty to one offence under the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 of plying for hire without a licence and to one offence under the Road Traffic Act 1988 of driving without the required insurance.</p> <p>In mitigation the court was told that the driver had dropped off a pre-booked customer at a club and</p>	<p>The defendant was fined £410 and 6 penalty points were imposed on his licence. He was also ordered to pay costs of £150 and a victim surcharge of £31</p>

		when he heard the back door of the vehicle re-open, he assumed it was the same man getting back in to continue with his journey somewhere else.	
4	5.5.17	<p>This case involved the use of an unlicensed hackney carriage, and both the proprietor of the vehicle and the driver were summonsed to appear in court.</p> <p>The proprietor pleaded guilty to two offences under the Town Police Clauses Act 1847 and a further offence under the Road Traffic Act 1988. He had allowed the driver to drive the vehicle without a current hackney carriage licence, without the required insurance and had failed to keep the required records as per his licence conditions.</p> <p>The driver pleaded guilty to driving the Hackney carriage vehicle without a licence and without the required insurance.</p>	<p>The proprietor of the hackney carriage was fined £696 with 6 penalty points being imposed on his licence. He was also ordered to pay costs of £150 and a victim surcharge of £45.</p> <p>The driver was fined £180 and 6 penalty points were imposed on his licence. He was also ordered to pay costs of £150 and a victim surcharge of £30.</p>
5	8.5.17	<p>The defendant had committed a number of offences under the Housing Act 2004 in respect of his HMO property:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Exceeding the maximum permitted number of occupants at the property • Permitting the first floor rear room to be occupied as a bedroom when it was below the permitted statutory room size 	<p>He was fined £412 for each offence giving a total fine of £1236. He was also ordered to pay costs of £275 and a victim surcharge of £42.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Providing false information in his application form. 	
6	13.5.17	<p>This case under the Housing Act 2004 involved</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Failure to comply with an improvement notice 2. Failure to display the manager's details in the common area 3. Failure to take safety measures 4. Failure to maintain the gas and electricity supplies to the premises 5. Failure to maintain the common parts 6. Failure to maintain the living accommodation 	The company concerned was fined a total of £32134 and ordered to pay costs of £260 and a victim surcharge of £170.
7	1.6.17	<p>Failure to provide information requested under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 in respect of 2 properties. The three defendants failed to attend the Magistrates Court and the case was heard in their absence.</p>	The defendants were each found guilty of the two offences and were each fined £500 per offence giving a total fine of £1000 each. They were also ordered to each pay costs of £100 and a victim surcharge of £50.
8	2.6.17	<p>The defendant had pleaded guilty at a previous court appearance to 14 offences under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008. The offences arose from rogue trading activity that included engaging in misleading and unfair trading practices, failing to give consumers correct documentation, falsely claiming to be a member of trade associations, providing false guarantees for work, repeatedly cold calling when told not to and in one case digging up a driveway without the resident's</p>	<p>Her Honour Judge Eleri Rees made the following orders:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A Confiscation Order in the sum of £7500 to be paid as compensation. A default term of 3 months to be imposed if the order is not complied with. 2. Both the company and its director were fined £3020 each and ordered to pay costs of £5720 each. They will also both pay a victim surcharge of £120. 3. A Criminal Behaviour Order was made against the defendant preventing him from cold calling for any business in the UK or instructing others to do so for a

		consent and within the legal 'cooling off' period.	period of 5 years.
9	5.6.17	The defendant pleaded guilty to 22 offences under the Trade Marks Act 1994 for selling counterfeit goods through his Facebook account.	The magistrates ordered the defendant to pay costs of £200 and a victim surcharge of £85. A Forfeiture Order was made for all the goods and £500 in cash seized. A Community Order was put in place for 12 months with 120 hours of unpaid work and a finally, a 10 day rehabilitation requirement was imposed to address consequential thinking.
10	22.6.17	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to eight offences under the Housing Act 2004 arising from his property ownership as follows:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to ensure manager's details were displayed in the common areas • Failure to provide adequate structural protection between rooms • Failure to provide structural protection to the electricity and gas meters • Failure to provide sufficient electrical sockets • Failure to maintain waste water pipes, gutters and other rainwater goods • The presence of defective electrical sockets • Failure to maintain the conservatory roof • Failure to maintain windows 	The magistrates fined the defendant a total of £4664 and he was ordered to pay costs of £200 and a victim surcharge of £100.
11	3.7.17	The defendant had been found guilty in her absence on the 9 th June 2017 of failing to comply with a noise abatement notice in respect of loud music on ten	The magistrates fined the defendant £220 for each of the ten offences giving a total fine of £2200. She was also ordered to

		occasions, contrary to the Environmental Protection Act 1990.	pay costs of £200 and a victim surcharge of £30.
12	17.7.17	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to three offences under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 relating to his trading practices at a consumers home. These related to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to carry out the work on the agreed timeline • Damage caused to the property (which the resident had to pay another trader to remedy) • Failure to provide notice of the statutory cancellation period. <p>in committing these offences in August 2016 the defendant breached a suspended sentence order imposed by the Crown Court in June 2016 for similar offences investigated by SRS and brought under the Fraud Act 2006.</p>	<p>The Judge activated the 32 week suspended sentence and imposed a further 18 weeks sentence for each of the more recent offences to run concurrently but consecutively to the previous sentence. This resulted in a 50 week sentence in total, for which he should serve at least 25 weeks.</p> <p>The Judge also ordered that the defendant pay compensation to the resident affected in the sum of £850 and £150 in costs.</p>
13	14.8.17	The defendant pleaded guilty to four offences under the Trade Marks Act 1994 and eight offences in respect of safety issues under the General Product Safety Regulations 2005 and the Toys (Safety) Regulations 2011. The Magistrates were advised that 32 other offences under the same legislation were to be taken into account.	The defendant was fined £350 for each of the trade mark offences and £500 for each of the safety offences. This gave a total fine of £5400. He was also ordered to pay costs of £1000 and a victim surcharge of £50
14	21.8.17	The defendant eventually pleaded guilty an offence under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading	He was fined £440, ordered to pay costs of £787.50 and a victim surcharge of £44. He has now become a member of

		Regulations 2008 relating to falsely claiming FENSA membership	FENSA.
15	29.8.17	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to two offences of illegal money lending under the Consumer Credit Act 1974 and the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000. The illegal lending covered the period 2013 to 2017 and involved the lending of money to colleagues at a Nursing Home. When lending money she would impose a fixed charge of £30 for every £100 borrowed, a late payment fee of either £12.50 or £15.00 and if no payment was made there would be a charge of £25.00. In one instance £650 in total was borrowed but the recipient paid back £3320 and was then told by the defendant that they still owed approx. £2000. When interviewed the defendant said that she had provided the loans out of friendship.</p>	<p>The judge sentenced the defendant to 4 months imprisonment for each charge to run concurrently, suspended for 2 years. She was also ordered to undertake 200 hours of unpaid work. In addition, the judge made a Confiscation Order in the sum of £12,302 which the defendant has to pay by 1st December 2017. She was also ordered to pay costs of £4338 within 6 months and a victim surcharge of £80 within 2 months.</p>
16	11.9.17	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to 14 offences under the Licensing and Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Additional Provisions) (Wales) Regulations 2007 in respect of a property he manages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to provide an adequate fire alarm system • Failure to install complete fire doors • Failure to provide adequate fire protection to the basement 	<p>The Magistrates fined the defendant £600 for each of the seven more dangerous offences and gave no separate penalty for the other seven offences. This resulted in a total fine of £4200. He was also ordered to pay costs of £300 and a victim surcharge of £60.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to eliminate risk of falls due to wide opening windows • Failure to obtain gas safety certificates • Failure to obtain Electrical Installation Condition Reports • Dangerous electrical installations 	
17	21.9.17	<p>The defendant was charged with nine offences under the Licensing and Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Additional Provisions) (Wales) Regulations 2007. These related to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to provide an adequate fire alarm. • Failure to maintain the fire alarm. • Failure to provide adequate structural protection. • Dangerous layout to the first floor. • Failure to provide adequate heating & hot water system. • Failure to provide adequately designed and sized kitchens. • Failure to maintain the electrical installations. • Failure to maintain the gas installations. • Failure to provide a handrail to the stairs to the first floor. 	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty and was fined £120 for each of the management offences and a further £80 for the two other offences, making a total of £1240. She was also ordered to pay costs of £578 and a victim surcharge of £30</p>

		<p>A further offence under the Housing Act 2004 for failing to comply with a notice requiring submission of documents.</p> <p>And finally one offence under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 for failing to comply with a notice requiring provision of information.</p>	
18	3.10.17	<p>A company pleaded guilty to one offence under the Health and Safety at Work etc Act 1974 for failing in its duty as an employer to ensure so far as was reasonably practicable the health and safety of persons not in its employment. The prosecution concerned an incident on the 29th October 2015 at the National Museum of Wales site at Cathays Park when a red penny press machine tipped over and struck a 5 year old child causing a head injury and bruising to his arm.</p>	<p>The District Judge fined the company £10,000 and ordered compensation to the injured child in the sum of £1000. They were also ordered to pay expert costs of £10,000, local authority costs of £3544.70 and a victim surcharge of £170.</p>
19	10.10.17	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to fourteen offences under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations. The court heard how the defendant had misled numerous consumers into giving him money for materials that he did not then purchase, failed to give cancellation rights to consumers and in some circumstances even started the work without permission. He contracted the work out to others who performed substandard work and he failed to check the work they had done, if any. In one instance a premises was left in a dangerous condition due to poor workmanship</p>	<p>The defendant was sentenced to 22 months imprisonment and was told that he would serve half of the term and will be released on licence for the remainder but if he breaches the licence he will go back to prison. He was ordered to pay a total of £2000 in victim compensation and £2000 in prosecution costs. A victim surcharge of £140 was also imposed and he was banned from being a director of a company for 5 years.</p> <p>In sentencing, Judge Bidder stated that the experiences of the consumers in this case should be a warning to others to obtain clear written quotations and to be aware that the legislation gives them the right to cancel contracts made at their home.</p>

20	19.10.17	The defendant pleaded guilty to one offence of using a hackney carriage when his licence to apply for hire had previously not been obtained.	The Magistrates imposed a fine of £133. In addition, the defendant was ordered to pay costs of £475 and a victim surcharge of £30.
21	19.10.17	The defendant pleaded guilty to an offence of driving a vehicle used for the collection of scrap metal without having a scrap metal licence contrary to s.1(1) Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013	The Magistrates imposed a fine of £500 and ordered the defendant to pay costs of £160 and a victim surcharge of £50.
22	19.10.17	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to 17 offences under the Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Wales) Regulations 2006 which included failures to provide an appropriate alarm system, a lack of structural fire protection, out of date fire extinguishers, lack of fire protection to the gas and electricity meters, as well as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operating a licensable house in multiple occupation without a licence. • Failure to register as a landlord under the Housing (Wales) Act 2014. • Managing a rented property without a landlord licence under the Housing (Wales) Act 2014. • Failure to comply with a notice under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 requiring the provision of information on ownership, etc. about the property. 	The defendant was fined a total of £11,250 and ordered to pay costs of £250 as well as a victim surcharge of £120.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to comply with a notice under the Housing Act 2004 requiring the submission of documents, e.g. gas & electricity certificates. 	
23	30.10.17	<p>At this trial, the defendant pleaded guilty to two charges relating to the management of a house in multiple occupation, and not guilty to a further twenty two offences related to the property.</p> <p>At the conclusion of the trial, the Magistrates found the defendant guilty of two of the charges for which not guilty pleas had been entered (relating to ripped bathroom flooring and a damaged electrical socket in a ground floor bedroom). He was acquitted of the remainder.</p>	The defendant was fined £175 for each of the 2 offences he had originally pleaded guilty to, and £250 for each of the offences he was found guilty of. The total fine was £850. The Council was awarded only £400 of the £1522.50 costs application because of errors in the charges. A victim surcharge of £30 was imposed.
24	9.11.17	<p>The defendant was the owner of a rental property and pleaded guilty to 16 offences under the the Licensing and Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Additional Provisions) (Wales) Regulations 2007 in relation to his management of the property and 2 offences for failure to register and licence the property under Part 1 of the Housing (Wales) Act 2015. The management failures included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Failure to provide an adequate fire alarm system. Provision of dangerous layouts. Failure to provide adequate structural fire protection. Failure to provide an adequate means of escape 	The defendant was fined £320 in respect of each of the Rentsmart Wales offences and in £480 in respect of each of the ten offences relating to safety, making a total fine of £5440. Costs of £350 and a victim surcharge of £170 were also ordered

		<p>from fire.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to provide adequate kitchen facilities. <p>Failure to provide adequate electrical installations.</p> <p>Failure to provide an adequate heating and hot water system to the first floor flat.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to ensure regular inspection of the gas installations. • Failure to ensure regular inspection of the electrical installations. 	
25	9.11.17	The defendant, a hackney carriage driver, pleaded guilty to one offence of failing to activate the fitted meter on the 30 th March 2017.	The Magistrates imposed a fine of £145, and ordered that costs of £75 be paid together with a victim surcharge of £30.00.
26	16.11.17	<p>The defendants, owners of a rental property, each pleaded guilty to three offences concerning:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to comply with an Improvement Notice • Failure to register with Rent Smart Wales • Failure to obtain a licence with Rent Smart Wales. 	Both defendants were fined £1500 each for failing to comply with the Improvement Notice and £250 each for both of the Rent Smart Wales offences, making a total fine of £2000. They were also both ordered to pay costs of £125 and a victim surcharge of £150.

27	27.11.17	<p>The defendant had previously pleaded guilty to three offences under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 concerning a loft construction which was dangerously substandard and was not carried out with professional diligence.</p> <p>Inspections of the property had shown the works were 'utterly substandard' and 'load bearing beams were woefully insufficient'. An engineer's report highlighted the potential for a 'catastrophic collapse'. The defendant had displayed a 'devil may care attitude' and when interviewed by the local authority he had shown a 'breath-taking lapse of contrition'.</p>	<p>The defendant was sentenced to 4 months imprisonment on each offence to run concurrently. He was told that he would serve half of that sentence and then be released under supervision.</p> <p>A claim for compensation was made for the complainant in the case who had spent more than £27,000 to rectify the work and to ensure that everything complied with building control regulations.</p> <p>The Judge considered that a proceeds of crime application would be appropriate in order to allow the complainant to obtain compensation and a POCA timetable was set.</p>
28	1.12.17	<p>On the 17th October 2017 the defendant pleaded guilty to 2 counts of illegal money lending, 1 count of money laundering, 1 count of possessing with a view to selling counterfeit goods and 1 count of perverting the course of justice. For over 20 years the defendant had traded as an illegal money lender whilst claiming benefits. A search of his premises revealed large amounts of counterfeit tobacco and cigarettes. It was estimated that in just the previous 3 years he had lent in cash loans approximately £61,000 per year. He charged his victims extortionate rates of interest on those loans.</p> <p>In sentencing the Recorder stated that during the 20 years of offending there had been approx. 160 victims and a £ ¼ million in terms of loans offered. He had</p>	<p>He was sentenced as follows:</p> <p>Count 1 (illegal money lending) 12 months imprisonment</p> <p>Count 3 (illegal money lending) 14 months consecutive</p> <p>Count 4 (money laundering) 3years 6 months concurrent</p> <p>Count 5 (Trade Marks) 4 months concurrent</p> <p>Count 6 (Perverting course of justice) 16 months consecutive</p> <p>This gave an overall custodial sentence of 3 years and 6 months. The 23 days that he had been tagged would count towards that figure. He will be realised on licence after he has served half of that sentence.</p>

		<p>brought a catalogue of misery by money lending and preyed on the vulnerable in the community. People who were desperate were tied into repeated indebtedness. He was claiming benefits whilst making a vast income from money lending. He had previous convictions for dishonesty and violence including the harassment of one of the debtors in the case.</p> <p>Furthermore after he was bailed he continued to collect money and attempted to get witnesses to change their evidence or give false evidence. Looking at his reference he was clearly a 'Jekyll and Hyde' character.</p> <p>A Proceeds of Crime application was made and a timetable set.</p>	
29	22.12.17	<p>The defendant was found to have in his possession for supply at a market a quantity of counterfeit branded goods and electrical equipment. In addition to the goods on display, large quantities of counterfeit goods (including hand rolling tobacco) were found in an ISO shipping container at the rear of the market, the contents of which belonged to the defendant.</p>	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to offences under the Trade Marks Act 1994 of possessing with a view to selling counterfeit goods. He was fined £166 by the Magistrates. He was also ordered to pay costs of £280 and a victim surcharge of £30.</p> <p>A forfeiture application had already been granted by the court.</p>
30	22.12.17	<p>The defendant was found to be selling a large quantity of counterfeit designer goods alongside the defendant in case 2 above</p>	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to offences under the Trade Marks Act 1994 of possessing with a view to selling counterfeit goods.. Magistrates imposed a fine of £120 ordered costs of £280 and a victim surcharge of £30 to be paid</p>

			A forfeiture application had already been granted by the court.
31	11.1.18	<p>The defendant, a company director, pleaded guilty to 11 offences under the Food Hygiene (Wales) Regulations 2006 concerning poor standards of food hygiene at her take away business. During two visits in November 2016 and May 2017, the following was established</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The business did not have a documented food safety management system which is required for all food businesses • Pest control measures were ineffective and advice from the company's own pest control officer had not been followed resulting in mouse droppings throughout the premises including the food preparation areas • On both occasions, the company signed a voluntary closure agreement until cleaning works were carried out and pest control measures were implemented. 	<p>The Judge stated that this was an 'horrendously dirty restaurant' despite visits from the local authority and the advice and assistance they had given. However, having reviewed the company accounts it was clear that there were no assets and the director was in her own words surviving on tax credits. The company was fined a total of £3200, ordered to pay costs of £1660 and a victim surcharge of £40. Due to the company's poor finances, payment would be at a rate of £20 per week.</p>
32	11.1.18	<p>The Shared Regulatory Service had received numerous complaints of loud amplified music and shouting arising from a property. An officer witnessed the nuisance on the 2nd December 2015 and subsequently the occupier was served with a Noise Abatement Notice. Following service of the notice further complaints were received and on 3 separate occasions in May 2017, June 2017 and July 2017</p>	<p>The defendant pleaded guilty to all four charges and was fined £120. In addition, they were ordered to pay £150 in costs and a victim surcharge of £30. A forfeiture order was made for the sound equipment.</p>

		<p>officers witnessed breaches of the Notice with amplified music and shouting emanating from the property. On the 30th November 2017 the Notice was again breached and on this occasion a warrant was executed to enter the property and remove noise equipment</p>	
33	12.1.18	<p>Complaints were received from tenants about the conditions at two neighbouring properties that are owned by the defendants. Upon visiting the properties, officers found inadequate heating provision, lack of constant hot running water, poor kitchen facilities placing tenants at risk of excessively cold conditions, damp and mould hazard and food poisoning. They were found guilty of the following offences:</p> <p>Neither defendant attended court and the matters were proved in their absence in relation to eight offences against the first defendant</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Failing to comply with the requirements imposed by an abatement notice under section 80 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 2. Two counts of failing to comply with the requirements of an Improvement Notice served under the Housing Act 2004 3. Two counts of failing to comply with the requirements of a requisition for information under section 16 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 4. Failing to comply with the requirements of a requisition for information under section 16 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous 	<p>The magistrates fined both defendants £660 for their first offence with no separate penalty for the others. They were also ordered to pay cost of £175 each and a victim surcharge of £66 each.</p>

		<p>Provisions) Act</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Failing to obtain a licence for the carrying out of letting activities 6. Failing to obtain a licence for the carrying out of property management activities <p>A further three offences were proved against the second defendant as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 Failing to comply with the requirements of a requisition for information under section 16 of the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 2 Carrying out property management work in respect of that dwelling when they did not have a licence to do so 3 Carrying out property management work in respect of that dwelling when she did not have a licence to do so 	
34	12.1.18	<p>The defendant, a taxi driver, pleaded guilty to one offence under the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976 for failing to return his vehicle licence private hire plate. In December 2016, the vehicle plate expired. In January 2017, the defendant informed the Shared Regulatory Service that he was not working, as a taxi driver anymore and therefore had to find the plate to return it. Following a number of letters requiring the return of the plate, the defendant signed a declaration of loss of the plate in April 2017. However, in June 2017 a vehicle owned by the defendant was seen in Cardiff with the expired plate</p>	<p>The defendant was fined £150, ordered to pay costs of £150 and a victim surcharge of £30.</p>

		secured to the rear of the vehicle.	
35	19.1.18	The defendants failed to control their pet dog and consequently, it ran onto the driveway of a neighbour and bit him on the upper arm. The attack was unprovoked and was witnessed by the neighbour's wife who was 8 months pregnant at the time and their 4 year old son. The dog remained aggressive after the incident and the police were called. Subsequently the dog was signed into the care of SRS during which time it bit a member of kennel staff. The dog had a history of straying and showing aggression and in 2016 advice was given by the Animal Warden.	<p>The first defendant was fined £350, ordered to pay costs of £595 and a victim surcharge of £35. Her partner was fined £225, ordered to pay costs of £595 and a victim surcharge of £30. Both defendants must pay compensation of £250 each to their neighbour for the injury and trauma caused.</p> <p>Based on expert witness evidence, the Magistrates decided against a Destruction Order, a move supported by the Prosecution, and imposed instead a Contingency Destruction Order requiring the dog to be kept under control, muzzled and in the care of a fit and proper person over the age of 16.</p>
36	29.1.18	Work carried out by the defendant at two properties was found to be substandard and incomplete. In one case the property was left in a dangerous condition as a result of a botched loft conversion, and in the case of a bathroom installation that was not completed, the owners were without hot water for a considerable length of time. In both cases, the residents had to spend more money to have the necessary remedial work done by other traders, the combined cost of which amounted to more than £30,000.	<p>The defendant initially pleaded not guilty to all matters and the case was committed to Cardiff Crown Court for a trial. However he subsequently pleaded guilty to 8 offences under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 concerning his misleading and unfair commercial practices. He was later sentenced to 42 weeks imprisonment suspended for 18 months and a curfew was imposed on him between the hours of 7pm and 6am</p> <p>Costs were awarded in the sum of £2500 and a victim surcharge of £140.</p>
37	7.3.18	The offences related to the management of a house in multiple and failure to provide requested documentation. A visit to the property in June 2017 revealed a number of offences of which the more serious concerned:	Both defendants were fined a total of £5880 each, ordered to pay costs of £2050 each and a victim surcharge of £170 each.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Failure to maintain smoke detectors• Failure to provide adequate structural protection• Failure to ensure free access to the emergency gas shut off valve• Failure to ensure regular testing of the electrical installation• Defective electric lighting to the common areas <p>Both defendants pleaded guilty to nine offences under the Management of Houses in Multiple Occupation (Wales) Regulations 2006 and to 1 offence under the Housing Act 2004. The District Judge considered it appropriate, in the absence of specific sentencing guidelines for these type of offences, to take into account relevant health and safety legislation guidelines and to consider the defendants' culpability and the likelihood of harm. He considered that 'cost cutting' was an aggravating feature in this case and that the defendants should have inspected the property when they took it over, identified the issues and remedied them. He considered that they had 'hindered the investigation' by failing to provide safety documentation requested by the officers. However, he accepted both defendants' previous good character, that the works were now completed albeit the property</p>	
--	--	---	--

		is no longer an HMO and their early guilty pleas.	
38	15.3.18	The defendant pleaded guilty to 3 offences under the Gambling Act 2005 for unlawfully making gaming machines available for use in a chip shop on three occasions in March 2017.	He was fined £253 for the one offence with no separate penalty for the others. He was ordered to pay legal costs of £350, investigation costs of £920 and a victim surcharge of £30. A forfeiture and destruction order was granted in relation to the two gaming machines and cash that were seized.
39	15.5.18	In July 2017 the defendant breached an abatement notice by playing loud amplified music at his residential address. He pleaded guilty to the offence under s.80(4) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.	The defendant was given a conditional discharge for 12 months, ordered to pay costs of £100 and a victim surcharge of £20.
40	22.3.18	In August and September 2017 the defendants breached two abatement notices issued against them in respect of loud amplified music emanating from their domestic property and also singing and shouting. Neither defendant attended court and they were both found guilty in their absence of 4 offences under s.80(4) of the Environmental Protection Act 1990.	Tania Pothan was fined £440, ordered to pay costs of £110 and a victim surcharge of £30. Christopher Mellor was fined £220, ordered to pay costs of £110 and a victim surcharge of £30.

In addition, the following Forfeiture Orders were sought:-

Court date	Details	Outcome
9.7.17	An application for forfeiture by way of complaint under the Trade Marks Act 1994 was heard in respect of 375 items of counterfeit clothing, goods and accessories seized from a market stall in December 2016.	The order was granted
14.8.17	An application for forfeiture by way of complaint under the General Product Safety Regulations 2005 in respect of approximately 5000 fancy dress costumes which failed safety requirements (failure to carry the appropriate safety warnings and instructions seized on the 23 rd January 2017	The order was granted
12.1.18	In June 2017 during the UEFA Champions League Cup Final in Cardiff the Shared Regulatory Service discovered that a High Street bookmaker was offering to supply numerous items including footballs, scarves, t-shirts and key rings bearing the various trademarks of Juventus FC, Real Madrid and UEFA. In total, 932 items were seized and later confirmed to be counterfeit. The In interview Ladbroke Coral stated that the goods were intended as a free giveaway to celebrate the Champions League Final being held in Cardiff and that there was no intention for financial gain.	The Forfeiture Order was granted. The defendant subsequently accepted a simple caution.