

2915



**Residential
Property
TRIBUNAL SERVICE**

**LONDON RENT ASSESSMENT PANEL
LEASEHOLD VALUATION TRIBUNAL**

Case Reference: LON/00AZ/LIS/2006/0111

**DECISION OF THE LEASEHOLD VALUATION TRIBUNAL ON AN
APPLICATION UNDER LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT SECTION 27A
AND 20C**

Applicant: Mr Greg McNeill, Ms Claire Martin and Mr Caspar Murphy

Respondent: Mr Kamlesh Anand

Premises: Ground and First Floor Flats, 47 Elsinore Road, SE23 2SH

Date of Application: 6 September 2006

Date of Paper Determination: 9 November 2006

Leasehold Valuation Tribunal: Mr N K Nicol LLB(Lond)

Date of Tribunal's Decision: 9 November 2006

**LEASEHOLD VALUATION TRIBUNAL for the
LONDON RENT ASSESSMENT PANEL**

DETERMINATION BY LEASEHOLD VALUATION TRIBUNAL

LANDLORD AND TENANT ACT 1985 Section 27A

LON/00AZ/LIS/2006/0111

Address: 47 Elsinore Road
London SE23 2SH

Applicant: Mr Greg McNeill } First Floor
Ms Claire Martin } Flat
Mr Caspar Murphy } Ground Floor Flat

Respondent: Mr Kamlesh Anand

1. The Applicants have applied for a determination as to the payability of service charges levied by the Respondent, namely £2,065.67. Following a pre-trial review on 26th September 2006, the Tribunal made directions for the parties to serve their cases and supporting evidence. Although the directions refer to a hearing, it was also stated that the case had been allocated to the Paper Track and the covering letter to each party stated that the case would be dealt with on paper only. Unfortunately, the Respondent did not attend the pre-trial review and has not complied with any directions or responded to any correspondence. The Tribunal now has the documentation on which the Applicants rely and felt it was appropriate to proceed to determine the matter without a hearing on the basis set out below.
2. The Applicants' case is simple. As far as they are aware, they have been liable for buildings insurance and ground rent and they have met that liability in full. There have been no agents employed for at least seven years in respect of the management of the building, no repairs have been carried out and no services delivered. Therefore, there is nothing else to charge for.
3. The evidence provided supports the Applicant's case. There is no evidence from the Respondent to the contrary. Therefore, the Tribunal is left with only one possible conclusion, namely that no part of the alleged service charges are payable by the Applicants.

Chairman
Mr N.K. Nicol

Date: 9th November 2006