

Appendix 2 - SRS prosecution cases concluding during 2024-25

Case	Court date	Offence(s)	Outcome
1	14.6.24	<p>The case against the 11 defendants was heard across two Crown Court trials that took place in November/December 2023 and February/March 2024.</p> <p>This was an extremely determined organised criminal group set up and run to sell illegal tobacco and nitrous oxide, predominantly in the Cardiff, Barry and Bridgend areas. It was extremely lucrative, and premises were taking more than £1,000. There were at least 8 shops involved and a number of other premises and locations used to support the illegality. Most of the business was conducted in cash. Those involved, particularly in a senior role, displayed a complete disregard for the law and knowingly continued to trade despite previous advice, intervention, and court proceedings.</p> <p>Searches and test purchases in the case resulted in over £600,000 worth of unlawful tobacco product being recovered. This is a mere fraction of the criminality as this figure does not take into account a single cigarette actually sold to members of the public. More than £1,800,000 was laundered through various bank accounts. Cash was banked only when it had to be, to pay expenses. The Organised Crime Group had a simple modus operandi. It would open small shops which appeared to sell general produce. Most of the premises were linked to corporate entities, the directorship and ownership of which frequently</p>	<p>A number of defendants changed their pleas to 'guilty' during the course of the two trials and the remainder were found guilty by the respective juries.</p> <p>In sentencing, the Judge concluded that the defendants were part of an organised criminal group that established and ran 8 shops selling illegal tobacco and nitrous oxide canisters. The victims of the crime were the state in the form of the Exchequer, the brand holders and other legitimate businesses in competition locally. The public were sold sub-standard products and there were vulnerable victims where individual cigarettes were sold to underage children. The selling of nitrous oxide was potentially dangerous as it could be misused. He gave limited credit where appropriate for those who entered guilty pleas.</p> <p>The sentences imposed were as follows:-</p> <p>Defendant 1: 7 years imprisonment</p> <p>Defendant 2: 6 years imprisonment</p> <p>Defendant 3: 3 years imprisonment</p> <p>Defendant 4: 6 years imprisonment</p> <p>Defendant 5: 2 year sentence, suspended for 18</p>

	<p>changed. False directors would often be inserted in name only and receive a fee for being the apparent 'face' of the business, some of which did not live in the South Wales area at all. On occasion, employees were used as directors but would have no real control over the business. The premises would sell largely long-life ambient goods to masquerade as legitimate stores when in fact the principal trade would be in illegal tobacco products and illegal nitrous oxide canisters.</p> <p>Most of the employees in the shops were failed asylum seekers who were not permitted to work in the UK and received cash for their employment. They were rarely named on any documents. They were also circulated between the shops which made it difficult to identify and trace them. They often used several variations of their names and dates of birth. To some extent these individuals were exploited by those at the top of the organisation.</p> <p>As the criminality continued, increased efforts were made to avoid detection. Most of the shops had large, concealed spaces held shut with powerful electrical magnets, which could only be opened by a remote control. The illicit tobacco products were often hidden in these spaces which could not be accessed without the remote control. The compartments were concealed and could not be seen with the naked eye. The spaces could only be identified by sniffer dogs and/or by breaking down the walls. Other systems such as an electronic winch and tables with hidden compartments were also found.</p>	<p>months with a 20 day rehabilitation requirement</p> <p>Defendant 6: 19 month sentence, suspended for 12 months with 150 hours unpaid work and a 10 day rehabilitation requirement</p> <p>Defendant 7: 2 year sentence, suspended for 12 months with 150 hours unpaid work and a 10 day rehabilitation requirement</p> <p>Defendant 8: 3 years imprisonment</p> <p>Defendant 9: 19 month sentence, suspended for 12 months with 100 hours unpaid work and a 10 day rehabilitation requirement</p> <p>Defendant 10: 2 year sentence, suspended for 12 months with 100 hours unpaid work and a 10 day rehabilitation requirement</p> <p>Defendant 11: 28 months imprisonment</p> <p><u>Making a total of:</u></p> <p>27 years and 4 months in immediate imprisonment, and</p> <p>9 years and 2 months in suspended sentences.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>The defendants were often in control of the flats above the shops and had connected the flats to the shops with large, concealed tubes or electronic winches. The tobacco products were stored in the flats and employees in the flats would be instructed via mobile phones or radios to put the requested tobacco product down the tube. The defendants also hired Safestore units to store large quantities of illicit tobacco products. They accessed the Safestore units in the late in the evening or the middle of the night to transport the illicit products to and from the storage facilities.</p> <p>Some defendants also stored illicit tobacco products at their home addresses with the same type of concealed spaces that were in the shops and held shut with magnets. They also made use of vehicles parked in nearby streets to store the tobacco products to avoid seizure from the shops. The back windows of these vehicles were painted black to make it difficult to see inside.</p> <p>The defendants were charged with knowingly being a party to the carrying on of a business for a fraudulent purpose, namely the sale of unlawful tobacco products and/or psychoactive substances, between September 2013 and February 2022. Some also faced counts under the Proceeds of Crime Act in respect of acquiring, using or possessing criminal property which they knew or suspected constituted or represented benefit from criminal conduct.</p>	
2	16.5.24	In September 2022, a complaint was received about an unregistered food business in Cardiff running an event for which the ticket price included karaoke and food. Officers	The defendant was fined £1,350 for each of the first two offences giving a total fine of £2,700 (there was no separate fine for the other offences).

	<p>had previously been concerned that the business may be engaging activities that would require it to be registered and had given appropriate advice.</p> <p>At the time of the Officers' evening visit to the premises, the kitchen was being used for the commercial preparation of food, despite the business not being registered. Officers found the following</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• No Food Safety Management system in place• Cats roaming freely along the kitchen surfaces• A strong smell of urine and cat faeces in adjacent rooms• A toilet opening directly onto the kitchen• Out of date food• Poor cleanliness throughout <p>As a result of the kitchen being an imminent risk to health and food soon to be served to the public, a Hygiene Emergency Prohibition notice was served, and a Hygiene Emergency Prohibition Order was later granted by the Court.</p> <p>The defendant was subsequently charged with a number of food hygiene offences, and the Judge took the view that case involved very high culpability and harm.</p>	<p>Partial costs of £1000 were ordered and he was also required to pay a victim surcharge of £1080.</p>
--	---	---

3.	12.7.24	<p>This case arose after an employee was seriously injured when a heavy gate fell onto her as she assisted a colleague in opening up one morning as they arrived at the Cardiff premises. The injuries sustained by the employee have been life changing and she has been affected physically, mentally and financially as a result.</p> <p>During the course of the investigation, it became apparent that two linked companies (one being the employer and the other the landlord) shared responsibility for maintenance of the gate. Officers from Shared Regulatory Services attended the premises and discovered that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No risk assessments for the security gates had been completed and hazards associated with employees and non-employees coming into contact with the security gates as part of their day-to-day activities had not been considered. • There had been no routine inspection or maintenance programme in place for the security gates on or before the date of the accident • Staff with health and safety responsibilities had received no instruction or training to be competent to undertake their roles. • Health and safety issues appeared to be dealt with on a reactive basis. • The employer considered the yard and security gates to be the responsibility of the landlord with regards to all repair and maintenance. 	<p>The first defendant company was fined a total of £45,000, and ordered to pay costs of £11397.15 and a court charge of £170.</p> <p>The second defendant company was fined a total of £12,000, ordered to pay costs of £11397.15 and a court charge of £170.</p> <p>Making a total fine £57,000 and total costs of 22,794.30</p>
----	---------	--	--

		<p>When the matter was heard in the Crown Court, the first of the two companies pleaded guilty to two counts as an employer under the Health and Safety at Work etc., Act 1974, as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. contrary to Section 33(1)(a) of the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 failure to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, the health, safety and welfare at work of its employees, as required by Section 2(1) of the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974; and2. contrary to Section 33(1)(c) of the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 failure as employer with control of the premises, to maintain the gate, as required by Regulation 5(1) of the Workplace (Health, Safety and Welfare) Regulations 1992. <p>The second company, as landlord, pleaded guilty to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">3. contrary to section 33(1)(a) of the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974 as landlord as a person (as defined by Schedule 1 of the Interpretation Act 1978) with control of the premises; namely failure to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, that the premises (including means of access) was safe and without risks to health; as required by Section 4(1) and 4(2) of the Health and Safety at Work etc. Act 1974. <p>In sentencing, the Judge stated that he gave appropriate credit for the guilty pleas by both defendants. He considered that culpability was high. He stated that there</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>had been a clear history with the gate and these matters could have been picked up with regular inspections. The company fell far short of the appropriate standard by failing to put any measures in place, by failing to carry out any risk assessments or inspections despite numerous reports of the gates failing and this should have been a red flag. This was an accident waiting to happen and this 180kg gate was likely to fail when a person was near/using it. The victim's injuries were serious. This was a category 3 harm and actual harm was caused. He accepted that both defendants had no previous convictions and there had been no further incidences.</p>	
4.	12.7.24	<p>This case concerned a 2 storey Victorian terraced house in Cathays, Cardiff which was occupied by 4 un-related students. The property was properly licensed to the previous owner, but was purchased by the current owner, a limited company in December 2021.</p> <p>Despite SRS sending several letters to the owner, no application was made to obtain a licence under Part 2 of the Housing Act 2004, nor under the Additional HMO Licensing scheme for Cathays. In addition, the new owner failed to register the property with Rent Smart Wales under the Housing (Wales) Act 2014.</p> <p>Nevertheless, Officers visiting the property in August 2023 were able to establish that it was occupied by four people between 01/07/22 to 30/04/23 and then again from 01/07/23. All attempts to engage with the company and its</p>	<p>The company and its Director were each fined £1550, and each was ordered to pay costs of £320.</p> <p>Both were also required to pay a victim surcharge of £616 each.</p>

		<p>Director were met with silence and a prosecution was commenced against the company and its Director.</p> <p>The defendants failed to attend court and the matter was heard in their absence.</p>	
5.	17.7.24	<p>This case arose as a result of a March 2023 inspection of a food business operating as both a restaurant and a takeaway establishment in Grangetown Cardiff. Despite generally poor compliance over a number of years, the Officers' findings during this visit were extremely concerning and cut across a number of areas of food hygiene including cross contamination, record keeping and cleanliness.</p> <p>In addition, a significant and active rat infestation was evident but there was no pest control contract in place. Given the clear risk to human health, Officers secured a voluntary closure while the problems were addressed, and the premises was given a Zero food hygiene rating.</p> <p>Once a pest control contract was in place, the infestation could be addressed, and as part of this work, the technician made use of a UV light-activated dust to be able to monitor ongoing rodent activity. The dust was laid at night and the Food Business Operator was given strict instructions not to disturb the dust in any way, but rather to meet the Officer and the pest control technician outside the premises at a set time the following morning. It was particularly disappointing that the FBO ignored these instructions and took it upon himself to enter the premises and mop the area where the dust had been laid.</p>	<p>The Judge considered the defendant's early guilty pleas and imposed a total fine of £1400. He was also ordered to pay £696 in costs together with a victim surcharge of £600.</p>

		<p>The FBO's actions were viewed as an aggravating factor, i.e., a bid to convince Officers that there had been no further rat activity, meaning that the restaurant could open sooner, and make money sooner, than would otherwise have been the case. The defendant was charged under the Food Hygiene (Wales) Regulations 2006 (as amended) in respect of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to ensure that adequate procedures were in place to control pests • Failure to permit good food hygiene practices, including protection against contamination and in particular pest control. • Failure to maintain food premises in good repair, and • Failure to maintain permanent procedures based on HACCP principles. 	
6.	28.8.24	<p>In November 2022, SRS received a number of complaints about the defendant's soft play centre in Cardiff. Several inspections followed, culminating in an improvement notice being issued in March 2023, requiring the business owner to produce suitable and sufficient assessments of the risks to the health and safety of both employees and non-employees using, and accessing, the facility. The deadline given in the improvement notice passed without the risk assessments being provided.</p> <p>The court was advised that the business is no longer</p>	<p>Given the defendant's difficult financial circumstances, she was fined £200, ordered to pay costs of £800 and a court surcharge of £80.</p>

		<p>trading, and the defendant now works as a part-time carer She has no intention of ever running a similar business ever again.</p> <p>In sentencing, the District Judge advised the defendant that she could have easily avoided the prosecution by complying with the notice.</p>	
7.	28.8.24	<p>The defendant was selling cosmetic products from his Cardiff premises, that were not intended for the UK market, and which failed to comply with product safety law. Officers initially visited the premises and provided detailed advice on what needed to be done to comply with the law and trade safely.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the advice was ignored and non-compliant product lines continued to be stocked. In June 2023, officers seized a number of products which contained hydroquinone – a substance which is prohibited in cosmetic products. Other products on sale were actually medicinal products which can only be legally sold or supplied to the public through a registered pharmacy premises or by or under the supervision of a pharmacist. In addition, some product lines had no labelling or ingredients list on the packaging.</p> <p>The defendant pleaded guilty to 13 offences under the Cosmetic Products Enforcement Regulations 2013, The Human Medicines Regulations 2012 and the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 in relation to offences committed at the Cardiff premises.</p>	As a result of the defendant's dire financial circumstances, the District Judge fined him a total of £440, ordered him to pay costs of £500 and a court surcharge of £176.

		The court was advised that the business is no longer trading, and the defendant has been struggling with his health and financial circumstances.	
8.	4.9.24	<p>Officers found very poor standards of hygiene at this kebab house / Restaurant in Cardiff. In addition, during one of the revisits to the premises to monitor compliance, a significant and active cockroach infestation of some longstanding was identified which necessitated closure of the premises.</p> <p>While a voluntary closure is often put in place as an agreed means for a food business to resolve food hygiene concerns, Officers were sufficiently concerned by the attitude of the defendants and the extent to which they could be trusted, that they opted instead to issue a Hygiene Emergency Prohibition Notice. This speaks volumes about the response of the defendants to the issues identified. The court later issuing a Hygiene Emergency Prohibition Order as part of this process.</p> <p>The legal food business operator was a limited company (having one Director), while the individual having the role of manager at the premises was clearly the natural food business operator. Each of the three defendants faced 21 charges under the Food Hygiene (Wales) Regulations.</p>	<p>Each of the three defendants was fined £100 and ordered to pay costs of £100 and a victim surcharge of £40, making a total of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fines £ 300 • Costs £300 • Victim surcharge £120
9.	18.9.24	This rogue builder case resulted from an SRS investigation that established how the individual's trading practices resulted in significant financial loss to multiple customers, amounting to over £200,000. As well as the financial loss, the residents suffered months of distress as they fought to get their home improvement projects completed or to get	The defendant was sentenced to an immediate custodial sentence of 5 years, discounted as there were no previous convictions, meaning that he would serve a total of 43 months (3 years and 7 months). Half the sentence to be served in prison and half on licence.

their money refunded.

When the Bridgend county borough-based rogue trader first came to the attention of the Service, attempts were made to engage with him to provide advice, information and to seek an undertaking as to future conduct under the Enterprise Act. As the extent of his wrongdoing became apparent however a full criminal investigation ensued.

Presenting himself as a competent businessman, the truth behind that image was quite different. The builder engaged in misleading and fraudulent trading practices in his dealings with customers, and using classic rogue trader practices, he 'robbed Peter to pay Paul' by continuing to take money from new clients in order to do at least some work for existing customers. Using a string of trading names, he created a web of deceit, including starting a new company when one went into liquidation and later using a completely different trading name to distance himself from the growing number of poor Trustpilot reviews being left by customers.

The witness statements in this case illustrate in detail the misery brought on the residents over many months, through for example jobs started and not finished, goods not ordered despite specific payments having been made to him, poor workmanship, and failure to obtain necessary Planning and Building Control consents. He relied on a façade of stock images from Pinterest and other websites and passed them off as examples of his company's previous work.

		<p>Of particular concern was the fact that he coerced customers and manipulated situations to convince them that they would have their money back if they took down negative reviews and, withdrew their participation in an investigation by BBC X-Ray.</p> <p>The defendant finally pleaded guilty to 11 counts of fraud, 1 count of fraudulent trading and 1 count of unfair commercial practice.</p> <p>In sentencing, the Judge reflected on the Victim Impact Statements and highlighted recurring themes within them, including that the victims initially felt impressed with Mr Atkinson and his work, which was soon followed by feelings of betrayal and detrimental effects to the financial and emotional wellbeing of all victims.</p> <p>Dates have been set for the Proceeds of Crime investigation and it is hoped that the residents affected will receive compensation for their losses through this route.</p>	
10.	30.9.24	<p>The Vale of Glamorgan based defendant contracted with residents to undertake landscaping works. The customers had been taken in by the competitive prices quoted and by the almost immediate start dates offered, but things took a familiar turn when the cost of the jobs spiralled, in one case to more than £20,000. Multiple excuses were given for the increasing price, and for the poor progress of work, including inflation and the cost of materials. The defendant also cited various personal challenges including the death of his own mother (who, it was established, was alive and</p>	<p>The defendant was given an immediate custodial sentence of 9 months.</p>

		<p>well).</p> <p>He pleaded guilty under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Falsely claiming photographs provided to consumers were examples of work done by the business • Failing to provide goods/and or services for which the business had received payment • Undertaking work in respect of which the business did not have the skill or experience to complete • Conducting work to a poor standard • Failing to complete work • Requesting more money than initially quoted • Claiming additional amounts from consumers on a false basis • Coercing consumers to pay further money • Requesting payments to be made into third party bank accounts <p>In sentencing, the Judge considered the early guilty plea entered by the defendant.</p>	
11.	22.10.24	<p>The defendant in this case is the freeholder of a three storey property in Cardiff which had been sub-divided into 4 self-contained flats. When in 2019 she was granted a licence for the property under part 2 of the Housing Act 2004, conditions required certain works to be completed within 3 months of issue, The repairs and improvements were needed in order to protect the health, safety and</p>	<p>The defendant was fined a total of £850 for each of the four offences, giving a total fine of £3,400. She was ordered to pay costs of £2,800 as well as a victim surcharge of £1,350.</p>

	<p>welfare of the tenants.</p> <p>The licence also included restrictions on the number of persons permitted to occupy each of the flats. However, when SRS officers visited the address in 2023, they established that the works required by the conditions of the licence had not been completed. This included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• overhauling fire doors and confirming the structural fire integrity of partitions• adequately fire protecting the electricity meter and consumer unit cupboards• provision of adequate kitchens• repair or replacement of extractor fans• provision of adequate numbers of electrical sockets• adequate security to the property• the presence of damp• eliminating risks of falls. <p>Improvement notices were served requiring the necessary works to be completed by the end of June 2023. Nevertheless, subsequent visits to the property confirmed that the works required by the notices had still not been completed. The defendant was charged with four offences to which she subsequently pleaded guilty.</p> <p>In sentencing, the District Judge said that the defendant's management of the property and her communication with</p>	
--	---	--

		the Council had been wholly unsatisfactory.	
12.	7.11.24	<p>In this case, a Cardiff resident had needed work done to the chimney breast at her home and engaged the trader to carry out the work. Once the work started, the trader advised that the damp problem was far worse than the surveyor had indicated, and the roof would work too. Despite claiming to be a 'general builder', the trader was a carpenter by trade. Very little work was done at the property despite more than £26,000 being taken.</p> <p>The victim never received a contract, or details of her cancellation rights, and wasn't given a breakdown of the tasks and costs involved in the work.</p> <p>After many months, the work still wasn't done, yet the resident was not given a refund by the trader. Instead, when questioned, he sought to shift blame on to her for the lack of progress on the job.</p> <p>During the time that the case progressed through the court process, the trader had said that he would repay the victim, yet at the point of sentencing, he had failed to do so.</p> <p>Powerful victim impact statements were then read out in court to illustrate the impact of the trader's actions on the victim and her family. The aggravating factors of the case were length of time over which the fraudulent behaviour was carried out, the breach of trust that occurred, the sum taken from the victim and the fact that the trader was seen to have targeted the vulnerable.</p>	<p>The Judge concluded that the defendant would be sentenced to 27 months imprisonment. This sentence is one of 3 years, reduced by 25% due to the defendant's early plea.</p> <p>It is hoped that victim compensation will flow from the Proceeds of Crime investigation, linked to the case.</p>

		<p>The Judge summarised the impact of his actions stating that he took victims 'for a ride', 'preyed on their insecurity, talked them down and persuaded them' to give him money for his fraudulent services.</p>	
13.	22.11.24	<p>This case arose as a result of the poor living conditions in which tenants were living in a 2 storey Cardiff property which had been converted into self-contained flats.</p> <p>The landlord of the property had allowed a range of failings to continue in the flats over a period of time, resulting in the tenants of both flats living in squalid and unsafe conditions. These included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to ensure that the means of escape is in good order • Failure to maintain the fire alarm system • Failure to fire protect the electricity meters • Defective elements in the electrical installation • Failure to ensure that the internal structure is maintained in good working repair • Failure to maintain kitchen work surfaces • Failure to maintain the bathroom facilities • Failure to ensure that every window and other means of ventilation are kept in good repair • Failure to ensure sufficient bins are provided. 	<p>The defendant was fined a total of £3,378 and ordered to pay £650 costs together with a surcharge of £1351.</p>

		<p>The landlord was issued with notices under the Housing Act 2004 and the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1976, but he failed to comply, and the required information was not forthcoming. It was a cause of concern that he had been prosecuted for failings at the same property back in 2018. This suggested that he was fully aware of his responsibilities but chose not to honour them.</p> <p>The landlord pleases guilty to all offences which the magistrates separated into 3 categories, namely fire safety related offences, general maintenance/repair offences and failure to provide the required documentation.</p>	
14.	28.11.24	<p>The defendant is a private hire operator who knowingly recruited an unlicensed taxi driver to do airport pick up runs. The driver was stopped during a spot check by Police at Bristol airport, and when questioned by SRS Officers, the private hire operator tried to blame others for the offences, claiming that he had been told this was acceptable. It became clear at interview that the operator was more concerned about how smart and presentable a driver was than whether they were licensed and subject to the DBS check.</p> <p>The defendant pleaded to two offences, namely being a proprietor:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Allowing an unlicensed driver to drive a vehicle, and 2. Operating an uninsured vehicle. 	The defendant was fined £241.00 for each of the two offences to give a total fine of £481, and was ordered to pay costs of £250, together with a victim surcharge of £191.
15.	10.12.24	In April 2024, a sixteen-year-old volunteer was served with a SKE Fizzy Cherry nicotine inhaling product (vape) at this	The Judge ordered each defendant to pay a fine of £320, together with cost of £284 and £128 victim

		<p>Cardiff store. The illegal sale took place as part of a Trading Standards test purchase exercise which was prompted by complaints, or other intelligence, alleging that people under the age of 18 were able to purchase vapes at the store.</p> <p>This was not the first time the store failed a test purchase attempt for vapes – underage sales made previously resulted in an informal warning letter in respect of a December 2022 illegal sale, and in prosecution in respect of the July 2023 underage sale that followed. Throughout this time, SRS officers provided the business with detailed advice on compliance with underage sales law.</p> <p>The case was brought against the limited company running the store, its sole Director, and also her husband who was acting in the capacity of the store manager.</p>	<p>surcharge.</p> <p>It was made clear to the defendants that they must take more care as this was not a mistake but a crime. If they continue to offend, the Judge will have no hesitation in continuing to double each fine they receive.</p>
16.	10.12.24	<p>This case arose as a result of the food hygiene failings identified during a number of inspections of a mobile catering vehicle operating in the Vale of Glamorgan. During the initial visit to the food truck in a popular seaside location, the inspecting Environmental Health Officer issued a Remedial Action Notice (RAN) in respect of food being stored in a broken-down fridge. The items of food, which included meat and fish, were meant to be kept chilled (at a temperature of less than 8°C) but were being stored in the fridge at temperatures between 17.5°C and 19.6°C.</p> <p>A string of other failings was identified during a follow up visit in May 2023, and these cut across multiple aspects of food safety (including cleanliness, unsafe food storage, and lack of training for staff) indicating a disregard for the</p>	<p>The Judge fined the company Director £334, and the company £50 (seemingly on the grounds that it had not been trading for some time). The Director was ordered to pay prosecution costs totalling £2283.75, but no victim surcharge.</p> <p>The prosecution's request for a Food Hygiene Prohibition Notice was declined by the Judge.</p>

		<p>significant responsibilities associated with running a food business. As a result of the Officer's concerns, a second RAN was issued, this time to prohibit the handling and storage of raw foods.</p> <p>Despite extensive advice and support from the Investigating Officer, the Food Business Operator (a limited company) and its sole Director showed a disregard for the safety of customers, and the seriousness of the failings in this case is reflected in the ZERO Food Hygiene Rating Scheme score awarded to the business as a result.</p> <p>Further visits (both announced and unannounced) took place between June and September 2023, during which multiple food hygiene non-compliances continued to be observed. In addition, failure to display the ZERO food hygiene rating sticker resulted in a fixed penalty notice being issued.</p> <p>The defendant had entered guilty pleas for a total of 17 food hygiene charges. In sentencing, the Judge took into consideration the 'glowing references' for the company Director, the lack of previous convictions and certain personal circumstances that weren't disclosed to the court.</p> <p>The Judge made it clear however that had the defendant's personal circumstances been different, he would have been facing a substantial fine, and this should act as a deterrent for any future offending.</p>	
17.	11.12.24	This case catalogued a series of occasions between March and the end of November 2022, when illegal vapes	The Judge imposed fines totalling £2,000 (which took into account the early guilty pleas). In addition, costs

		<p>(electronic cigarettes) were either supplied, or in possession for supply, to customers at a vape outlet in Cardiff. During the various Officer visits, it became clear that the company running the business, and its sole Director, chose to flout the law by trading in illegal vapes, non-compliant with the requirements of the Tobacco and Related Products Regulations. This was despite the business being issued with detailed guidance on the first occasion. The behaviour of the company and its Director accords with the intelligence received by the Shared Service which indicated that illegal stock was being stored on, and supplied from, the premises.</p> <p>The Judge identified the aggravating factor of the case as being the multiple occasions in which non-compliant e-cigarettes were found on the premises. The defence presented the mitigating factors to be that the Director accepts his wrongdoing (evidenced by his early guilty plea), and the fact that he is experiencing poor mental health.</p>	<p>amounted to £1336, and there was a victim surcharge of £500.</p>
18	17.12.24	<p>The defendant was faced with 13 charges for his offences under the Consumer Protection from Unfair Trading Regulations 2008 and the Fraud Act 2006. The court heard how his criminal behaviour involved grossly overcharging for work, exaggerating the severity of the work needing to be done to the victims' properties, advising for work to be done on properties which was not needed in the first place, and any work which was done was of a very poor standard.</p> <p>The defendant's actions also resulted in the victims having to pay high costs for extensive repairs for any work he did</p>	<p>The recorder imposed an immediate custodial sentence of 5 years and one month on the defendant for the offences arising from the residents' properties.</p> <p>In addition, his guilty plea under the Bail Act 1976 for Failure to Surrender also warranted a 1-month concurrent sentence, bringing his overall sentence to 5 years and 2 months, half of which he will serve in prison and half on licence.</p>

		<p>do.</p> <p>The victims were ‘pressured’ and ‘persuaded’ by the defendant, and his seemingly friendly nature meant that they trust him and his advice. However, the victims are now left distressed and with ‘trust issues’ towards any tradespeople. One of the victims, a 93-year-old lady, who had placed her trust in the trader, sadly passed away in 2023. Her son’s Victim Impact Statement told of how she had urged her son not to cancel her agreement with the defendant, or to involve the police as he seemed to be a ‘very nice man’ who would ‘do a good job and give her a fair price’. It is clear that the defendant targeted vulnerable individuals to commit his Fraud, leaving them emotionally, physically and financially burdened.</p> <p>An application for a Criminal Behaviour Order was sought to restrict the defendant’s ability to offer and provide building and home improvement services in the future, and this was granted for a period of 10 years.</p> <p>An application for the Proceeds of Crime Act Inquiry was also introduced to investigate the defendant’s finances, in the hope that recovered monies can be paid to compensate the victims. A timetable for this was set and the mention hearing will be on 29th April 2025.</p>	
19	17.12.24	<p>The investigation in this case arose as a result of a number of complaints received by the Service from neighbours concerned that dog breeding was taking place in ‘inhumane conditions’ at a residential property in Cardiff.</p>	<p>The defendant, who was already serving a prison sentence following another matter, was given a one-month concurrent prison sentence for the Animal Welfare offence and ordered to pay a £154 surcharge</p>

		<p>On arrival at the property, the Investigating Officer was confronted with the dreadful conditions in which dogs were being kept by the unlicensed breeder. A Vet reviewed the wellbeing of the dogs and offences under both section 9 and section 4 of the Animal Welfare Act were established.</p> <p>Sentencing in this case took place at Cardiff Crown Court. The court heard that the defendant had pleaded guilty to causing an animal to suffer contrary to Section 4 of the Animal Welfare Act 2006. All dogs had either been voluntarily handed over to the local authority or were subject to successful section 20 proceedings to give ownership of the animals to the Council.</p> <p>An application for a Disqualification Order under the Animal Welfare Act was successful, and this means that the defendant is unable to keep, or be involved in the keeping, of dogs for a period of 6 years.</p>	
20	18.12.24	<p>This case arose following the sale at a Cardiff convenience store of a bottle of Smirnoff Ice to a 16-year-old volunteer. The sale was made during a Trading Standards test purchase operation. SRS had received complaints about the premises, including the suggestion that a young person was apparent hospitalised after they had purchased alcohol from the store.</p> <p>It is disappointing that the volunteer was sold alcohol despite Officers previously giving written and verbal advice to the business on age restricted products and on how to avoid underage sales.</p>	In sentencing, the Court imposed a fine of £461, together with costs of £400 and a surcharge of £184.

		<p>The defendant entered a guilty plea by post, and the court was told that he will make a number of improvements at his retail premises, this to include hiring only experienced staff in future.</p>	
21	3.1.25	<p>The landlord of two Victorian properties, converted into 5 self-contained flats, faced a total of 28 charges for which he entered guilty pleas.</p> <p>Following a complaint made by one of the tenants in November 2023, SRS officers visits were made to the property where it was established multiple failures to comply with the relevant standards for this type of private rented accommodation, namely</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was no functional fire alarm system of the appropriate type. • Flat entrance doors were defective and/or damaged fire doors. • Gas and electricity meters in the common areas had not been fire protected. • Electrical installations were unsafe. • Kitchen and bathroom facilities were inadequate and/or defective. • The property was not secure against intruders. • There were accumulations likely to harbour rodents in the rear garden and garage. • A drain was missing a cover. • One of the flats included an unacceptable inner room. • Flats did not have adequate heating systems. • There was penetrating damp. 	<p>The defendant was fined a total of £840, and ordered to pay costs of £784, plus a £330 victim surcharge.</p>

		<p>Improvement Notices were served on the defendant in January 2024 under Part 1, Housing Act 2004 were served on Mr. Stewart in January 2024 and required him to carry out the necessary works by 5th April 2024. When Officers returned in May and June to inspect the property it was clear that the Improvement Notices hadn't been complied with.</p> <p>In mitigation, it was claimed that the actions of the tenants had contributed to the awful conditions they were living in.</p>	
22	24.1.25	<p>In this case, a Cardiff Taxi Driver failed to use a hackney carriage taximeter to calculate the fare on a journey. The offence was committed during a 'mystery passenger' exercise organised by SRS Officers with the assistance of Police student volunteers. The statements of the three volunteers describe how the driver agreed to take them to the destination before they entered the vehicle. Once inside the vehicle they observed that the taxi meter wasn't in operation for the fare to be properly calculated, and they describe how during the journey, when asked how much the fare would be, the driver replied 'just a tenner'.</p> <p>The maximum fare that should have been charged (calculated from the Hackney Carriage fare tariff for Cardiff), was £6.34. Comparison of the permitted fare of £6.34 with the £10 fare actually charged by the driver for the 0.91 mile journey equates to a 37% overcharge.</p> <p>In court, the driver pleaded guilty to two charges, taking full</p>	The driver was fined £300 in respect of both charges, £150 prosecution costs and £120 Victim Surcharge.

		responsibility for his actions and explaining in mitigation that it was a momentary lapse in judgement.	
23	28.1.25	<p>Officers found such poor standards of food safety when they inspected a Cardiff restaurant in October 11th 2023, that a Food Hygiene Rating of Zero was awarded, i.e. <i>urgent improvement necessary</i>. In addition to cleanliness issues, dangerously long date markings were being given to prepared food, and a total of three active pest infestations were identified (mice and cockroaches in various locations, and book lice living in the spices). As a result of these findings, the premises were voluntarily closed for cleaning and for both pest elimination and proofing.</p> <p>The defendant company had been the Food Business Operator at the premises since 2019, and since 2021, there was a marked decline in levels of food safety compliance. Despite this deterioration at the premises and despite detailed advice being given on compliance, the food business failed to address the problems. It also became apparent that staff at the premises were aware of at least one live mouse being seen on the premises in the week before the initial Officers' visit, yet this wasn't addressed.</p> <p>Charges were laid against the company as well as its sole Director and the natural Food Business Operator. The defendants told the District Judge that they took full accountability for the offences and had learnt a valuable lesson going forward, they stated they are now compliant with the law when running their business.</p>	<p>For the overarching charge relating to the business not being run safely, the District Judge imposed a fine of £11,000 on the limited company. For the remaining five offences, the company was fined a total of £5500. In addition, it was ordered to pay costs of £462 and a victim surcharge of £2000.</p> <p>The two individuals received equal fines as their income was identical. Each was fined a total of £4180, and ordered to pay a victim surcharge of £1672 together with costs of £462.</p> <p>Fines summary</p> <p>Company: £11,000</p> <p>Defendant 1: £ 4,180</p> <p>Defendant 1: £ 4,180</p> <p>TOTAL: £19,360</p>
24	17.2.2025	This investigation identified persistent failings of a Cardiff	The father was fined £150 and ordered to pay costs of

		<p>company in supplying, and having in possession for supply illegal vapes, as well as soft drinks and snacks containing additives not permitted in the UK. Despite the Investigating Officer on a number of occasions providing the company's Director with detailed advice on compliance in both of these areas of regulatory law, he did nothing to stop the offending.</p> <p>While the company's wholesale outlet is based in Cardiff, the impact of its offending was felt much further afield, and the many referrals from other local authorities and the Food Standards Agency demonstrate the breadth of supply of non-compliant goods to third party outlets, as well as the Director's own retail shop (run by a second company). When interviewed under caution about the non-compliant stock, the company Director was unable to give any plausible explanation for allowing the offending to continue, other than to blame staff.</p>	<p>£350, together with a victim surcharge of £60.</p> <p>The daughter was fined £250 and ordered to pay costs of £350, together with a victim surcharge of £100.</p>
25	18.2.25	<p>SRS received fourteen complaints about the keeping of ducks, chickens, geese and cockerels in the garden of a terraced property in Cardiff. Neighbours complained about the nuisance caused by faeces, odour and noise associated with the keeping of large numbers of birds in a small space.</p> <p>In October 2023 notices under the Environmental Protection Act were served on the occupiers of the property requiring the cleaning and disinfection of the birds' living area on a weekly, or more frequent basis, the clearing away of excess food and bedding on a daily basis, and for waste to be stored appropriately.</p>	<p>The father was fined £150 and ordered to pay costs of £350, together with a victim surcharge of £60.</p> <p>The daughter was fined £250 and ordered to pay costs of £350, together with a victim surcharge of £100.</p>

		<p>When further resident complaints followed, it was established that the notices had been breached. When visiting a neighbour's property to carry out their assessment, officers found that the odour from was so overwhelming in that it could be smelt in every room of the neighbour's home. It was clear that the area was not being adequately cleaned and disinfected. Waste was not being stored in sealed containers and further visits revealed no improvement.</p> <p>Proceedings were brought against a father and daughter, the latter confirming to the Court ahead of sentencing that the birds had finally been removed from the property.</p>	
26	20.2.25	<p>A Cardiff Taxi Driver failed to use a hackney carriage taximeter to calculate the fare on a journey. The offence was committed during a 'mystery passenger' exercise organised by SRS Officers. When the passengers gave the driver the destination they wished to be taken to, he told them that the fare would be £10. The taximeter was not activated, despite this being legally required.</p> <p>The maximum fare that should have been charged (calculated from the Hackney Carriage fare tariff for Cardiff), was £6.95. Comparison of the permitted fare of £6.95 with the £10 fare actually charged by the driver equates to a 31% overcharge.</p> <p>In mitigation, the driver submitted that he had a momentary lapse of judgement that resulted in the offences occurring, that he has learnt from this experience and will not repeat</p>	<p>The Magistrates imposed a fine of £40 for each of the two charges, making a total of £80. The defendant was ordered to pay prosecution costs of £150, together with a £32 Victim Surcharge.</p>

		his actions.	
27	6.3.25	<p>This case concerned the very poor conditions in which tenants were living in a two storey House in multiple occupation in Cardiff. The property is configured as bedsits for 5 tenants with shared kitchen and bathroom facilities.</p> <p>Following a tenant complaint, SRS officers gave advice to the landlord and letting agent on compliance with structural separation, security, falls between levels, electrical safety, defective laminate floors and lack of ventilation in a bedroom. However, in 2023 (when a further tenant complaint was received), it became apparent that that much of the work identified as necessary some four years earlier had not been undertaken. Thus, fire doors were incomplete or defective and were fitted with mortice deadlocks, structural fire separation was inadequate, and the fire alarm was defective. Among the other issues identified at the property on that occasion, were inadequate and unsafe kitchen facilities and a cockroach infestation.</p> <p>The landlord used a letting management agent, and it became clear that culpability for the serious failings at the property (and failures to comply with notices under the Housing Act and the Local Government (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act), rested with not only the landlord but the letting agent company and its two directors. Proceedings were brought against all parties, and while the landlord entered guilty pleas, the case against the letting agent company and its two Directors had to be heard in their absence. They were found guilty.</p>	<p>Sentencing in this case was as follows:</p> <p>Landlord</p> <p>Fined £440 and ordered to pay a victim surcharge of £176.</p> <p>No costs were awarded.</p> <p>First Director of the management company</p> <p>Fined £13,860 (£660 x 21) and ordered to pay a surcharge of £5544 together with cost of £450</p> <p>Total sum payable: £19854</p> <p>Second Director of the management company</p> <p>Fined £13,860 (£660 x 21) and ordered to pay a surcharge of £5544 together with cost of £450</p> <p>Total sum payable: £19854</p>
28	11.3.25	<p>Following complaints made by neighbours, officers attended a residential property in Cardiff and found six Kangol dogs (a large breed) living in extremely poor conditions. This was the second time in a matter of months</p>	

		<p>that SRS officers attended the property in response to intelligence indicating that illegal dog breeding was taking place. On the previous occasion, it had been necessary to seize a total of 38 dogs and puppies.</p> <p>Given the clear links with illegal breeders previously using the property, the concern of the Service was that an unlicensed dog breeding operation was up and running there again. Fortunately, no puppies were at the property at the time of the more recent visit, and on this occasion none of the bitches were found to be pregnant. Nevertheless, a range of section 4 and section 9 animal welfare offences were identified, and a specialist Veterinary Surgeon catalogued the condition of each of the dogs. In addition, there was a lack of care for the dogs and a complete lack of enrichment of any kind.</p> <p>While not all the dogs at the property were microchipped to the defendant, when interviewed under caution he confirmed that he was the keeper of them all, and he was at the property throughout the time the officers attended at the property and carried out the seizure of the animals.</p> <p>A successful application under section 20 of the Animal Welfare Act resulted in legal ownership of the dogs being given to the Council allowing them to be rehomed.</p>	
29	12.3.25	<p>When officers conducted a programmed food hygiene inspection of a Cardiff coffee shop, they found very poor conditions and some of the worst practices they had ever seen. The failings identified at the premises cut across multiple aspects of food safety (including cleanliness, food preparation, pest control, putrid waste to the rear of the</p>	<p>The legal Food Business Operator was fined £166 and ordered to pay costs of £360 together with a £264 Victim Surcharge.</p> <p>Likewise, the other defendant in the case was also fined £166 and ordered to pay costs of £360 together</p>

	<p>property, and lack of a food management system), all of which indicated a poor understanding of the responsibilities associated with running a food business.</p> <p>The legal Food Business Operator had held the role since 2022 when the food business was registered. It would appear that some contractual arrangement existed with another individual who took day to day control of the running of the business, in effect the natural food business operator, and both sought to blame each other for the offences identified by officers.</p> <p>Guilty pleas were entered by each defendant to the following offences under the Food Hygiene (Wales) Regulations 2006:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Failure to keep the food premises clean and maintain it in good repair• Failure to ensure an adequate number of wash basins, suitably located for cleaning hands• Failure to ensure that wash basins were provided with materials for cleaning and hygienically drying hands• Failure to put in place adequate procedure to control pests in that there was a significant fly infestation.• Failure to protect food from contamination as raw	<p>with a £264 Victim Surcharge.</p>
--	---	--------------------------------------

		<p>foods were being prepared and stored on the same surfaces as ready to eat products.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to ensure all equipment that comes into contact with food (including a dirty temperature probe) are effectively cleaned. • Failure to ensure that those working in the food handling area maintain personal cleanliness and where suitable protective clothing. • Failure to implement and maintain a documented Food Safety and Management System based on HACCP principles. <p>In sentencing, the Judge took into consideration the fact that neither defendant had previous convictions and had pleaded guilty however, she considered these to be serious offences. While the Legal Food Business Operator had overall responsibility for the premises, it was clear no food safety practices were in place, that there was poor housekeeping, fly and maggot infestation, and risks of cross contamination with the risk of customers' health being adversely affected.</p>	
30	19.3.25	<p>This investigation arose as a result of a food hygiene inspections of a Cardiff restaurant during which officers found a significant and active rodent (mouse) infestation which was of some longstanding. The Officers' findings were such that the premises were closed by voluntary agreement to allow the necessary cleaning and pest</p>	<p>The limited company was fined a total of £10,000 and ordered to pay costs of £877 together with a victim surcharge of £2000.</p> <p>The company Director was fined a total of £2,000 and ordered to pay costs of £877 together with a victim</p>

	<p>proofing work to be carried out.</p> <p>The legal Food Business Operator at the time of the offences was a limited company, the sole Director of which ran the food business on a day-to-day basis. While Officers took the necessary actions to protect the public from harm, the sole company Director and his staff subjected them to abuse, and it would appear that this was borne of frustration that the voluntary closure agreement meant the business wouldn't be trading / generating income.</p> <p>When interviewed under caution, the Director complained that it was the fault of the Council, in not properly maintaining adjacent land, that had resulted in the mouse infestation at the restaurant. He also explained that his young daughter was unwell at the time in question which necessitated a hospital stay, and he had been unable to give his full attention to the running of the business.</p> <p>The failings identified at the restaurant in September 2023 were not the result of a sudden event at that time however, rather they were the result of a longstanding failure by the business to pest proof the premises. This was clearly documented in the findings of the pest control contractor between November 2022 and August 2023. Time after time, the business was urged to act to pest proof the premises, culminating in the following advice being given in a visit report at the end of August 2023 - <i>'You <u>must</u> block up gaps around outside vents, mice are using this for access, also gaps around inside vents + burrow under upstairs floor'</i></p> <p>In sentencing, the Judge commented on the 'considerable'</p>	surcharge of £500
--	--	-------------------

		<p>extent of the mouse infestation at the premises, and the defendants' limited efforts to resolve it. Much more should have and could have been done, but it was clear that profit was being put before customer safety. The Judge believed that the custody threshold was passed and warned the company Director that he had neglected his responsibility, and should he stand before the court again, an immediate custodial sentence would be appropriate. However, having taken all submissions into account, the Judge fined both the company and its sole Director.</p>	
31	28.3.25	<p>Officers had witnessed repeated breaches of an abatement notice issued under section 80 of the Environmental Protection Act 1990 on a limited company, and its Directors, who run a convenience store in Cardiff. This despite Officers having tried over time to work with the business in a bid to address the noise nuisance being caused at a neighbour's property as a result of refrigeration plant equipment operating 24 hours a day, 7 days a week at the rear of the store.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the business chose repeatedly to ignore the advice that was given. Most notably, they ignored the clear advice that an acoustics consultant needed to be engaged to identify the most appropriate solution, and all the while, the noise nuisance caused to their neighbour has continued. When interviewed under caution, and in dialogue since, the company has pointed out how much the work has cost them to date and how they weren't prepared to cover the cost of an acoustics consultant after their first quote came in at £1900. Their choice not to engage an acoustics</p>	<p>The defendant company was fined £1081 and ordered to pay costs of £700 together with a Victim Surcharge of £432.</p>

		consultant as they were advised, has proved to be false economy.	
--	--	--	--

Closure Orders under the Anti-social Behaviour, Crime and Policing Act 2014

Closure order	Date granted	Details	Outcome
1.	11.6.24	<p>The Closure Order on this premises was originally granted on 21st March 2024 for a period of 3 months. The purpose of this application was to extend the Closure Order for a further three months, on the basis of evidence of continuing / risk of continuing criminal conduct.</p> <p>The court was informed all relevant parties had been notified of the hearing and for the avoidance of doubt, a notice had been placed on the shop front regarding the application for an extension.</p>	The application for an extension was granted for a term of an additional 3 months. This means that the Order would run for the maximum period possible of 6 months, and end on 19 th September 2024 at 23:59.
2.	22.11.24	<p>This corner shop had a long history of supplying illegal tobacco and vapes. Despite the very best efforts of officers to bring the business into compliance, the offending continued. The impact on the community was significant as a result of the public travelling to the area specifically to purchase cheap illegal tobacco products and vapes.</p> <p>Local Councillors and partner agencies provided impact</p>	The Magistrates granted the Closure Order for the maximum period of 3 months. As a result, access by all persons is prohibited at all times until 21 st Feb 2025 at 3pm.

		statements as part of the application for the closure order. No one from the business was present in court when the evidence was presented. The Magistrates said that they were satisfied that the criminality was ongoing and that the Order was necessary to prevent criminality from continuing.	
3.	26.11.24	The premises had a long history of criminality and supplying illegal tobacco and vapes. Despite the very best efforts of officers to bring the business into compliance, the offending continued. The impact on the community was significant as a result of the public travelling to the area specifically to purchase cheap illegal tobacco products and vapes. Local Councillors and partner agencies provided impact statements as part of the application for the closure order.	The Magistrates granted the Closure Order for the maximum period of 3 months.