



**Appeal number: EA/2019/0198**

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

**LANCAM CARE SERVICES LIMITED**

**Appellant**

**- and -**

**THE INFORMATION COMMISSIONER**

**Respondent**

**Before: JUDGE MOIRA MACMILLAN**

**Determined on the papers, the Tribunal sitting in Chambers on 18 March 2020**

## DECISION

1. The appeal is dismissed.
2. The Penalty Notice dated 10 June 2019 is confirmed.

## REASONS

### *Background to Appeal*

3. The Appellant is a data controller within the meaning of the Data Protection Act 2018<sup>1</sup> (“DPA”). As such, it is required to comply with the Data Protection (Charges and Information) Regulations 2018 (“the Regulations”)<sup>2</sup>. 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 26 November 2018.

5. The Respondent served a Notice of Intent on 25 January 2019 and, in the absence of any representations from the Appellant, served a Penalty Notice of £400 on 10 June 2019.

6. The Appellant has appealed to this Tribunal on the basis that its 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 12 June 2019 relies on grounds that their default was an innocent mistake and asks that the penalty be revoked by the Tribunal. The Appellant states that it did not receive either a reminder sent by letter 5 November 2018 or the Notice of Intent. The 5 November letter was sent to the address the Appellant had registered with the Respondent. The Notice of Intent was sent to the Appellant’s registered address, which is a different address and was obtained from Companies House.

8. The Respondent’s Response dated 11 July 2019 resists the appeal. She submits that the Penalty regime has been established by Parliament and that there is no

---

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

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

requirement to issue reminders (although a reminder was fact been 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 should have had relevant administrative systems in place. It is submitted that the level of penalty is appropriate.

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 47 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*<sup>3</sup>. 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:

---

<sup>3</sup> <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).<sup>4</sup> 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 of some particular difficulty or misfortune and, doubtless, many other facts, may*

---

<sup>4</sup> [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5acf131ee5274a76be66c11a/MISC\\_3112\\_2017-00.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5acf131ee5274a76be66c11a/MISC_3112_2017-00.pdf)

*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 it received the Penalty Notice, but disputes receiving the Notice of Intent, sent to the same address. The Appellant also disputes receiving the reminder letter sent on 5 November 2019.

18. The Appellant submits that the person responsible within the Appellant company wrongly assumed that the fee they had paid the Respondent in a personal capacity also covered the Appellant company. A reminder to pay the fee had been sent by email to a merged email account. This may have been the reminder sent to the Appellant on 15 October 2018. The Appellant contends that the £400 penalty is excessive, disproportionate and unduly punitive.

19. The Respondent has provided the Tribunal with copies of the reminder sent by email on 15 October 2019; the letter sent on 5 November 2018 to the address registered with the Respondent; and the Notice of Intent and Penalty Notice sent to the Appellant company's registered address.

### *Conclusion*

20. I have considered whether the Appellant has advanced a reasonable excuse for its failure to comply with the Regulations. I conclude that it has 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. The Appellant was aware that a fee was due. It appears to have assumed that a fee paid on behalf of another data controller also covered its own fee.

21. Although the Appellant submits that the Notice of Intent was not received, this was sent to the same address as the Penalty Notice which was received. Moreover, the email reminder sent by the Respondent on 15 October 2018 was sent to the email address given by the Appellant in the Notice of Appeal.

22. 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 have decided that there is not.

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

24. I see no reason to depart from the Respondent's assessment of the appropriate penalty.

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

**JUDGE Moira Macmillan**

**DATE: 18 March 2020**

**DATE PROMULGATED: 19 March 2020**