



Appeal number: EA/2019/0192

**FIRST-TIER TRIBUNAL
GENERAL REGULATORY CHAMBER
INFORMATION RIGHTS**

DR BEJAL PANDYA

Appellant

- and -

THE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER

Respondent

TRIBUNAL: JUDGE MOIRA MACMILLAN

Determined on the papers, the Tribunal sitting in Chambers on 12 February 2020

DECISION

1. The appeal is dismissed.
2. The Penalty Notice dated 28 May 2019 is confirmed.

REASONS

Background to Appeal

3. The Appellant is a data controller within the meaning of the Data Protection Act 2018¹ (“DPA”). As such, they are required to comply with the Data Protection (Charges and Information) Regulations 2018 (“the Regulations”)². As a “tier 1” organisation, the Appellant’s fee was £40 .

4. The Appellant failed to provide the Respondent with the information required by regulation 2 (3) of the Regulations or to pay to the Respondent the Data Protection Fee required by regulation 2 (2) of the Regulations by the compliance date of 14 June 2018.

5. The Respondent served a Notice of Intent on 5 February 2019 and, in the absence of any representations from the Appellant, served a Penalty Notice of £400 on 28 May 2019.

6. The Appellant has appealed to this Tribunal on the basis that their default was an innocent mistake and asks that the penalty be revoked by the Tribunal.

Appeal to the Tribunal

7. The Appellant’s Notice of Appeal dated 29 May 2019 relies on grounds that they received the Respondent’s 3 June 2018 reminder but then forgot to pay the fee as their premises were being renovated at the time and they had no access to a computer. The Appellant does not state whether they received the Respondent’s subsequent written reminder, sent by letter dated 10 August 2018. The Appellant states that they did not receive the Notice of Intent sent by letter on 5 February 2019, but did receive the Fixed Penalty Notice sent on 28 May 2019. The Appellant submits that they would have complied with the Notice of Intent if received. Finally, the Appellant submits that the amount of the Penalty is disproportionate to the overdue fee.

¹ <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/2018/12/contents>

²The Regulations were made under s. 137 DPA. See <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2018/480/contents/made>

8. The Respondent's Response dated 1 July 2019 resists the appeal. She submits that the Penalty regime has been established by Parliament and that there is no requirement to issue reminders (although a reminder was fact sent in this case). It is accepted that the Appellant's failure to comply with the Regulations was due to an oversight, but it is submitted that the imposition of a Penalty was appropriate in all the circumstances. The Respondent notes that the Appellant had been a data controller prior to the commencement of the Regulations and had paid the relevant fees under the earlier legislation so the fee should not come as a surprise.

9. The parties and the Tribunal agreed that this matter was suitable for determination on the papers in accordance with rule 32 of The Tribunal Procedure (First-tier Tribunal) (General Regulatory Chamber) Rules 2009, as amended. The Tribunal considered an agreed open bundle of evidence comprising 43 pages.

The Law

10. The Regulations came into force on 25 May 2018. They replace the previously applicable regulations, made in 2000. Regulation 2 requires a data controller to pay an annual charge to the Information Commissioner (unless their data processing is exempt). It also requires the data controller to supply the Information Commissioner with specified information so that she can determine the relevant charge, based on turnover and staff numbers.

11. A breach of the Regulations is a matter falling under s. 149 (5) of the DPA. Section 155 (1) of the DPA provides that the Information Commissioner may serve a Penalty Notice on a person who breaches their duties under the Regulations. S. 158 of the DPA requires the Information Commissioner to set a fixed penalty for such a breach, which she has done in her publicly-available *Regulatory Action Policy*³. The specified penalty for a tier 1 organisation which breached regulation 2(2) is £400. The statutory maximum penalty is £4,350, which will be appropriate where there are aggravating factors.

12. Schedule 16 to the DPA makes provision as to the procedure for serving Penalty Notices, which includes the service of a Notice of Intent written inviting representations.

13. An appeal against a Penalty Notice is brought under s. 162(1)(d) DPA. S.162(3) DPA provides that "*A person who is given a penalty notice or a penalty variation notice may appeal to the Tribunal against the amount of the penalty specified in the notice, whether or not the person appeals against the notice.*"

14. The jurisdiction of the Tribunal is established by s. 163 DPA, as follows:

³ <https://ico.org.uk/media/about-the-ico/documents/2259467/regulatory-action-policy.pdf>

163 Determination of appeals

(1) Subsections (2) to (4) apply where a person appeals to the Tribunal under section 162(1) or (3).

(2) The Tribunal may review any determination of fact on which the notice or decision against which the appeal is brought was based.

(3) If the Tribunal considers—

(a) that the notice or decision against which the appeal is brought is not in accordance with the law, or

(b) to the extent that the notice or decision involved an exercise of discretion by the Commissioner, that the Commissioner ought to have exercised the discretion differently,

the Tribunal must allow the appeal or substitute another notice or decision which the Commissioner could have given or made.

(4) Otherwise, the Tribunal must dismiss the appeal.

...

15. We note that the burden of proof in satisfying the Tribunal that the Commissioner's decision was wrong in law or involved an inappropriate exercise of discretion rests with the Appellant.

16. It is increasingly common for the General Regulatory Chamber to determine appeals against financial penalties imposed by civil regulators. In appeals against Fixed Penalty Notices issued by the Pensions Regulator, tribunal judges have frequently adopted the approach of asking whether a defaulting Appellant has a "reasonable excuse" for their default, notwithstanding the fact that this concept is not expressly referred to in the legislation. This approach was approved by the *Upper Tribunal in The Pensions Regulator v Strathmore Medical Practice* [2018] UKUT 104 (AAC).⁴ There is much case law concerning what is an is not a "reasonable excuse" and it is inevitably fact-specific. An oft-cited definition is the one used by the VAT Tribunal (as it then was) in *The Clean Car Company v HMRC* (LON/90/1381X) as follows:

"...the question of whether a particular trader had a reasonable excuse should be judged by the standards of reasonableness which one would expect to be exhibited by a taxpayer who had a responsible attitude to his duties as a taxpayer, but who in other respects shared such attributes of the particular appellant as the tribunal considered relevant to the situation being considered. Thus though such a taxpayer would give a reasonable priority to complying with his duties in regard to tax and would conscientiously seek to ensure that his returns were accurate and made timeously, his age and experience, his health or the incidence

⁴ https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5ac131ee5274a76be66c11a/MISC_3112_2017-00.pdf

of some particular difficulty or misfortune and, doubtless, many other facts, may all have a bearing on whether, in acting as he did, he acted reasonably and so had a reasonable excuse....”

The Facts

17. There appears to be no dispute between the parties as to the facts in this case. The Appellant accepts that they a data controller and liable to pay the appropriate fee. The Appellant implicitly accepts that they received the Fixed Penalty Notice but says that the Notice of Intent dated 5 February 2019 was not received.

18. Appellant accepts that they received a reminder of the obligation to pay the fee by email on 3 June 2018. They do not say whether they received the second reminder, sent on 10 August 2018 reminder sent by post. The Appellant submits that the Notice of Intent was not received.

19. The Appellant accepts that they were in breach of their legal obligations as a data controller under the Regulations on the relevant date, and that they failed to pay the £40 fee by 14 June 2018.

20. The Appellant has not provided any corroborating evidence of any difficulty or other circumstance in June 2018 that led to the fee being overlooked.

21. The Respondent has provided the Tribunal with copies of the 3 June 2018 email, 10 August 2018 letter and of both Notices. The letter and both Notices were sent to the postal address stated on the Notice of Appeal.

22. *Conclusion*

23. I have considered whether the Appellant has advanced a reasonable excuse for their failure to comply with the Regulations. I conclude that they have not. I conclude that a reasonable data controller would have systems in place to comply with the Regulations and that the Appellant has pointed to no particular difficulty or misfortune which explains their departure from the expected standards of a reasonable data controller.

24. I have considered whether there is any basis for departing from the Respondent’s policy as to the imposition of a £400 fixed fee in the circumstances of this case. I conclude that there is not. The Appellant accepts that they received an email reminder, 11 days before the fee was due. Although they have suggested some temporary disruption caused by renovations, this is not a good reason for the Appellant’s failure to comply with their obligations as a data controller. In reaching this conclusion I have taken into consideration the fact that the reminder was received very shortly before the payment is due, and that the Respondent was not obliged to issue a reminder.

25. Having regard to the relevant principles, I note that the Appellant has not presented any evidence of financial hardship which could affect the penalty. The

Appellant describes the penalty as being excessive relative to the fee that was overdue. The Respondent submits that penalty regime is designed to encourage compliance with the law.

26. The penalty imposed is the fixed penalty published by the Respondent as part of her Regulatory Action Policy in relation to non-payment of fees. I see no reason to depart from her assessment of the appropriate penalty in this case.

27. For all these reasons, the appeal is now dismissed and the Penalty Notice is confirmed.

JUDGE MOIRA MACMILLAN

DATE: 12 FEBRUARY 2020

DATE PROMULGATED: 13 FEBRUARY 2020