



IN THE UPPER TRIBUNAL
IMMIGRATION AND ASYLUM CHAMBER

Case No: UI-2024-004864

First-tier Tribunal No: PA/50211/2024

THE IMMIGRATION ACTS

**Decision & Reasons Issued:
On the 12 February 2025**

Before

**UPPER TRIBUNAL JUDGE RUDDICK
UPPER TRIBUNAL JUDGE PICKUP SITTING IN RETIREMENT**

Between

**GKS
(ANONYMITY ORDER MADE)**

Appellant

and

Secretary of State for the Home Department

Respondent

Representation:

For the Appellant: Mr J Wilson, instructed by the Refugee and Migrant Centre

For the Respondent: Ms Newton, Senior Home Office Presenting Officer

Heard Remotely by CVP at Field House on 30 January 2025

Order Regarding Anonymity

Pursuant to rule 14 of the Tribunal Procedure (Upper Tribunal) Rules 2008, [the appellant] (and/or any member of his family, expert, witness or other person the Tribunal considers should not be identified) is granted anonymity.

No-one shall publish or reveal any information, including the name or address of the appellant, likely to lead members of the public to identify the appellant (and/or other person). Failure to comply with this order could amount to a contempt of court.

DECISION AND REASONS

1. Following the helpful submissions of both parties, the Tribunal gave a short *ex tempore* decision, dismissing the appeal, but indicating that the full reasons would be provided in writing, which we now do.
2. The appellant, a citizen of Cameroon, appeals against the decision of the First-tier Tribunal (Judge Dixon) dismissing his appeal against the respondent's decision of 27 December 2023 to refuse his claim for international protection.
3. The claim was based on an alleged risk on return to Cameroon because of adverse interest of the authorities who considered the appellant to have been an 'Amba Boy' or one of the 'Ambazonian Boys,' for which he was imprisoned. It is alleged that his father contrived his release by payment of a bribe, following which the appellant fled the country. He also asserts that he will be considered as a traitor by the Ambazonian Boys and be at additional at risk of serious harm for that reason.
4. In summary, the First-tier Tribunal disbelieved the appellant's factual account, finding the account given not credible, for the several reasons set out from [7] onwards of the decision, including a number of discrepancies in the account.
5. Permission to appeal was refused by the First-tier Tribunal but when the application was renewed to the Upper Tribunal, Upper Tribunal Judge Neville granted permission in the decision issued on 11 November 2024.
6. In granting permission, Judge Neville considered it arguable that *"Notwithstanding the appellate caution before interfering with findings of fact, it is arguable that Judge Dixon was not rationally entitled to afford the newspaper articles nil evidential weight for the reasons he gave. Such an error, if established, would arguably be material; it clearly played a part in the Judge's overall assessment of credibility."*
7. We have carefully considered the impugned decision in the light of the grounds, the grant of permission, and the oral submissions made to us.
8. At [10] and [11], no weight was given to an alleged summons and arrest warrant, for the reasons there set out. At [12], the judge stated that:

"As to the purported newspaper articles, again I am not persuaded that any relevant weight can properly attached to them. The same lack of corroborative evidence attaches to them as to the above documentary evidence. Although the objective information does not specifically refer to fraudulent production of newspaper articles, it is clear that in the context of corruption information can be fraudulently obtained in Cameroon and there is no reason in principle why this would not extend to the production of newspaper articles."
9. The primary ground of appeal and the thrust of Mr Wilson's submissions was that the judge accorded no weight to two newspaper articles produced in support of the appellant's factual claim. Mr Wilson took us to both articles in the bundle lodged for the hearing. Mr Wilson submitted that the alleged error is material as the judge's other criticisms were "weak" and we note that the grounds offer alternative explanations for the discrepancies identified by the judge.
10. At [5] of the decision, the judge made clear that all of the evidence, together with the submissions made to the First-tier Tribunal, had been taken into account before any findings of fact were made. The judge also made a correct self-direction at [5] of the decision, stating *"I remind myself that there is no requirement for corroboration in a protection case but I can take into account the absence of reasonably available corroborative evidence where appropriate."*

11. In his submissions, Mr Wilson described the two newspapers as 'public documents' which therefore did not require any explanation of their provenance. We consider that this was something of an exaggeration given that they purport to be hard copy originals sent to the appellant from abroad. He further relied on the assertion that two whole newspapers had been produced, not just the articles in question. He explained that he had not seen the originals of these newspapers. In her submissions Ms Newton pointed to a discrepancy in the dates at the foot of the pages of the first newspaper, '*The Horizon*,' and to the respondent's Review which suggested that this first article appears to have been specifically written to support the appellant's claim. The Review had also pointed to the apparently disproportionately sized head in the photograph accompanying the article. Ms Newton made some further submissions about the grammar used in the second article. Whilst it is not clear to us which or whether any of these criticisms were advanced in oral submissions at the First-tier Tribunal appeal hearing, as they are not specifically addressed in the impugned decision, we are satisfied that the respondent's Review was before the Tribunal, as the judge mentioned it at [11] of the decision, and the judge must be taken to have read and considered the points made about the articles. There was no obligation on the part of the judge to identify each piece of evidence or to address and resolve every issue, provided the evidence has been considered as a whole, which the judge asserted had been done. For the purpose of the appeal to the Upper Tribunal we disregard those criticisms of the articles made in Ms Newton's submission which were not within the Review and note Mr Wilson's point that even British newspapers contain frequent grammatical errors.
12. However, we are satisfied that in light of the criticisms of the newspaper articles which were within the Review and in light of the general evidence within the country background information as to corruption and forgery in Cameroon the judge was fully entitled to treat the articles with extreme caution and to accord them little or no weight.
13. In any event, we are satisfied that the several other adverse credibility findings were entirely open to the First-tier Tribunal and justify the judge's rejection of the appellant's factual claim as not credible, leading to the dismissal of the appeal. It cannot be said that the challenged decision was one which no reasonable judge properly directed could have reached. We have also reminded ourselves of the appellate guidance to exercise caution before interfering with findings of fact by a Tribunal which examined the evidence and considered the submissions before making the impugned decision. In any event, we are also satisfied that even if some limited weight had been accorded to the newspaper articles, the overall conclusion on credibility would necessarily have been the same. In the circumstances, we are satisfied that even if there was an error in relation to the treatment of the newspaper articles, any such error was not material to the outcome of the appeal by its dismissal. In the circumstances this appeal cannot succeed.

Notice of Decision

The appellant's appeal to the Upper Tribunal is dismissed.

The decision of the First-tier Tribunal stands and the appeal remains dismissed.

We make no order as to costs.

DMW Pickup

Judge of the Upper Tribunal
Immigration and Asylum Chamber
Sitting in Retirement
30 January 2025