



Neutral citation number: [2024] UKFTT 001149 (GRC)

Case Reference: D/2024/61

**First-tier Tribunal
General Regulatory Chamber
Transport**

**Determined at an oral hearing
on 19th December 2024**

Decision given on: 02 January 2025

Before

**HHJ DAVID DIXON
RICHARD FRY
MARTIN SMITH**

Between

ABDULLAH SHOKAT RAVAT

Appellant

and

**THE REGISTRAR OF APPROVED
DRIVING INSTRUCTORS**

Respondent

Decision: The appeal is adjourned to a date to be fixed.

REASONS

Background to Appeal

1. This appeal concerns a decision of the Registrar of Approved Driving Instructors (“the Registrar”) made on 20th December 2023 to refuse to add his name to the Register.
2. The Registrar’s reasons for refusal, in summary, were that the Appellant had accrued penalty points for failing to provide details about a driver. The Registrar took the view the offending was serious and allowing him to remain on the Register would undermine confidence in it, so determined the Appellant must be removed.
3. The Appellant now appeals the Registrar’s decision.

Appeal to the Tribunal

4. The Appellant’s Notice of Appeal, dated 1st October 2024, indicates that having moved address he did not receive the notice of intended prosecution to reply to and therefore the “failing to provide details” offence followed without his knowledge. He indicates he was to receive notification of a fine in due course. He suggests that he is going to go back to Court to clear his name.
5. In correspondence to the Registrar he averred that he was not driving the relevant vehicle (registration BD10XJA). He denied he was driving or involved in the offence, but said he was the sole key holder for the car. He said he paid the fine and assumed that would be the end of matters.
6. The Respondent submitted a Response indicating that upon carrying out checks upon the Appellant the Registrar learnt of the MS90 offence. The conviction was recorded on 12th September 2023. The conviction was never reported to the Registrar. The Registrar took the view the offending and failing to notify was serious and therefore determined that to ensure the integrity of the Register that the Appellant’s name could not be added to the same.

Mode of Determination

7. The case was listed for oral hearing, and heard via the CVP system.
8. The Appellant was unrepresented, but indicated he had arranged a solicitor to attend for him. He claimed his solicitor had applied for the date to be varied as she was unable to attend this date.
9. The Respondent was represented by Mr Davis of the DVSA Appeals team.

10. The Tribunal considered a bundle consisting of 18 pages.

Hearing

11. The Appellant indicated that he did not know about the hearing until shortly before the time arranged and was not really ready to proceed. He indicated he would rather his representation as present as he felt they would assist him better than he would manage on his own.

12. The Tribunal after a brief adjournment agreed that a fresh hearing should be convened. Accordingly this hearing is adjourned to the first available date after 1st January 2025 when the parties can attend. Time estimate 1 hour.

13. The Parties to supply availability dates by 4pm 31/12/24.

14. No further directions are required.

(Signed)

HHJ David Dixon
Richard Fry
Martin Smith

DATE: 19th December 2024