

- pages

**ROYAL COURT**

29th November, 1991.

179

Before: The Bailiff assisted by  
Jurats Blampied and Herbert

---

**Attorney General**

- v -

**Taj Mahal Central Limited**

---

**OFFENCE:**

- Charge 1: Infraction of Article 14 (1)(a) of the Housing (Jersey) Law, 1949.
- Charge 2: Infraction of Para (b) of Article 7 of the Lodging Houses (Registration)(Jersey) Law, 1962.

**PLEA:**

Charges admitted.

**DETAILS OF OFFENCE:**

- Charge 1: In breach of a condition so that seven persons were found in occupation of a cottage none of whom fell within the specified categories or had filed an exemption form.
- Charge 2: Allowed three persons to sleep in a room in relation to which the number of persons specified was one.

Crown submitted:-

"A duty rests with those who acquire property, particularly property which is to be used for the housing of others, to ensure that it is administered lawfully, and if they intend to pass the responsibility to another person, they are under a duty to ensure that the person

to whom the responsibility is passed understands it and is capable of discharging it".

**DETAILS MITIGATION:**

Period of offences was very short. Very co-operative at and after interview. Situation rectified.

**PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS:**

None.

**CONCLUSIONS:**

Charge 1 £500 fine  
Charge 2 £ 75 fine  
Costs £300

**SENTENCE AND OBSERVATIONS OF THE COURT:**

Conclusions granted.

---

The Solicitor General  
Advocate L. M. Gould for the Company

---

**JUDGMENT**

BAILIFF: The Court is satisfied that the conditions imposed at the time the lease was obtained were perfectly clear and they were broken. Even accepting that your clients, Mr. Gould, have been co-operative and regret what they did - and we accept all that - we cannot find that the conclusions asked for are wrong or excessive and they are granted and accordingly the company is fined £500 on charge 1, £75 on charge 2 and will pay £300 costs.

No authorities.