Subject: L10CL472 – URGENT Please put before judge – re: order of 6th June
From: Tarquin Management Ltd <51dp@davylondon.net>
Date: 18/06/2025, 09:22
To: "Central London County, Enquiries" <enquiries.centrallondon.countycourt@justice.gov.uk>
CC: "jkallis@meralibeedle.com" <jkallis@meralibeedle.com>

Dear Judge,

On Monday 16 June 2025, we received at our registered office a notification of an order made on 6 June, directing that a hearing be listed at the first available date, seven days from the date of the order – i.e., from 12 June. The envelope in which the order was sent bears a postmark of 10 June (photo attached), and we only received it on 16 June.

We are not currently represented, and if we understand the order correctly, it means the hearing could now be listed on any day without further notice.

This appears to be in response to an email by Mr Kallis, solicitor for the Claimants, dated 2 June 2025, which grossly misrepresents the current situation and portrays a picture of urgency that is entirely divorced from reality. It is alarmist and unprofessional in the extreme.

Prejudice Arising from Timing and Service

The vesting order was granted at a hearing of which the Defendants received no adequate notice, and on the basis of serious misrepresentations by Mr Kallis – a position he has not resiled from. On the contrary, he doubled down in his second statement and now again in his request for urgency.

We had been in the process of responding to that email and preparing to rebut the unfounded allegations against us as freeholders when we received notice setting a hearing for 15 August. In light of that earlier notice, we felt it unnecessary to correct Mr Kallis's misleading account or file evidence at that stage.

Now, having received this new notice – very late – of a listing potentially from last week onward, we are faced with an impending hearing at virtually no notice, with both directors out of the country until 25 June.

On the basis of further misleading allegations, unsupported by any evidence from Mr Kallis, we now risk our application to set aside an order made in our absence – and based on untrue statements of fact – being decided again without adequate notice, and again in our absence if listed before 25 June. That would compound the unfairness of the original hearing with further unfairness in the handling of our set-aside application.

We respectfully invite the Court not to list the hearing prior to 25 June and to provide us with adequate notice. We have repeatedly indicated our willingness to accept service by email at 51DP@davylondon.net, but this does not appear to have been updated on the Court file. As a result, the Claimants are served by email the day orders are made, while we receive them only by post, sometimes over a week later – as here, 11 days after the order, and well after the expiry of the supposed 7-day notice.

The Manufactured Sense of Urgency

We strongly invite the Court to reconsider whether this case warrants being prioritised over genuinely urgent matters. The urgency is entirely manufactured, and distracts from the key issue in this dispute: a number of the acquisition

terms remain unresolved, have not been agreed, and were never determined by the Tribunal – making the vesting order inapplicable regardless of any claimed urgency.

Mr Kallis makes dramatic assertions – “children evacuated,” an untrustworthy landlord – but provides no supporting evidence. He purports to conclude, “on the balance of probability,” that drug dealing is taking place, yet gives no indication of the evidential basis for that conclusion, or why such an exercise is even necessary if, as he claims, criminal proceedings are ongoing.

These same allegations have been repeated since 2022, never supported with evidence, and already dismissed by the Tribunal both in its substantive decision and its later ruling on costs. No new material has been offered. No incident has been reported to us that would justify evacuations or render the property unusable.

The tenant alleged to be involved in criminal activity has lived at the property since December 2019. There has never been a single report of anti-social behaviour, noise, confrontation, or safety issue. Still less has there been any suggestion that children, including those in Flat 5 – the source of most complaints – were at risk.

There is absolutely no supporting evidence. Not only is there no conviction, as Mr Kallis admits, but no evidence has been offered at all. Just a few anonymous reports of a smell on the common stairs, which could not be verified later. No evidence of a seizure, arrest, denial of bail, custody, or charges. Nothing but the ongoing campaign of Mr Galani in Flat 5, who has labelled the tenant in Flat 2 a “bad apple.”

The Roof Narrative – Facts Omitted

The Claimants now cite a ceiling collapse to reinforce their narrative. Again, facts are missing.

Since January 2021, leaseholders behind the enfranchisement – including Mr Galani – have refused access to our structural engineers to inspect the roof. They have not paid service charges since 2019, rejected all pre-funding and loan proposals, and insisted works wait until the freehold transfers. This position has been confirmed by their solicitor.

We proposed multiple alternatives, including full delegation of the roof works. All were ignored. Our latest email of 29 May 2025 (enclosed) offered four clear options. The reply? “We do not consider it necessary to answer the other points you make on an open basis.”

It is disingenuous for Mr Kallis to now present a crisis. His clients blocked every effort to remedy it. The portrayal of a negligent landlord is false. We have repeatedly tried to find a reasonable solution; every attempt has been rejected or ignored.

The Real Question Before the Court

The true issue before the Court is narrow: the vesting application was premature, and material acquisition terms remain unresolved. None of Mr Kallis’s evidence addresses these defects. Neither of his witness statements engages with the real issue.

This narrative of urgency appears designed to manipulate listing priorities and apply pressure on litigants in person. We consider it a discreditable use of the process.

We respectfully submit that this hearing has been accelerated not on the basis of evidence or law, but on inflammatory rhetoric: a stream of allegations, unsupported and often previously dismissed. We ask the Court to consider whether this matter truly warrants such prioritisation, and whether a return to the original timetable – allowing for proper

attendance and preparation – would better serve justice.

Yours faithfully,

Davy Thielens

on behalf of Tarquin Management Ltd

Attachments:

attachments email 18 june.pdf 103 kB