

Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber)

Appeal Numbers: OA/05453/2013

OA/05458/2013 OA/05461/2013

THE IMMIGRATION ACTS

Heard at Field House

On 29 July 2014

Determination Promulgated On 1st Aug 2014

Before

DEPUTY UPPER TRIBUNAL JUDGE DAVID TAYLOR

Between

HORACE DORCAS GLENN
OMIEKE OMARIO GLENN
FEMINA GLENN
(ANONYMITY DIRECTION NOT MADE)

Appellants

and

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT

Respondent

Representation:

For the Appellants: Mr B Adekoya, legal representative

For the Respondent: Mr P Deller, Home Office Presenting Officer

DETERMINATION AND REASONS

1. The appellants are all citizens of Jamaica and are now aged respectively 20, 18 and 17. They have appealed against the determination (promulgated 30 April 2014) of First-tier Tribunal Judge Majid who dismissed their respective appeals against the refusal of their applications for entry clearance to the UK. They had all applied for settlement here to

Appeal Numbers: OA/05453/2013 OA/05458/2013 OA/05461/2013

join their mother (and sponsor) Mrs Simone Williams who has been resident in the UK since 2002.

- 2. The first appellant was over the age of 18 at the time of the application. The second and third appellants were under 18 and the Entry Clearance Officer refused their applications on the grounds of lack of sole responsibility by the sponsor.
- 3. At the commencement of the appeal hearing it was acknowledged by both representatives that the determination of Judge Majid contained numerous errors of law and should be set aside. I have read his short determination and I have to say, with regret, that I find it incomprehensible. Nowhere does it set out details of the application or the reasons for refusal. Nowhere does it summarise the evidence on which the determination is apparently made. Nowhere are any reasons given for his dismissal of the claims. Nowhere does the judge consider human rights issues; indeed the "human riahts" appear nowhere in the determination notwithstanding the curious reference in paragraph determination to "the fact that the British economy is not in good shape and it is entitled to control immigration into this country".
- 4. The determination must be regarded as a nullity. It is devoid of reasoning. That is an error of law and I must accordingly set it aside in its entirety.
- 5. In relation to the second and third appellants, Mr Deller helpfully drew my attention to paragraph 197(vi)(a) of the Immigration Rules and indicated that it was probably the case that the question of sole responsibility was in any event irrelevant. There is some evidence that the father of the appellants died in 2009 and if that is so the second and third appellants may be entitled to entry clearance regardless of the question of sole responsibility. As to the first appellant the main issue is likely to be an Article 8 family life claim if he were otherwise to be left alone in Jamaica.
- 6. There must be a full rehearing of the appellants' appeals. Having regard to the overriding objective recorded in the Upper Tribunal Rules, in all the circumstances that is most conveniently achieved by my remitting this appeal for rehearing to the First-tier Tribunal.
- 7. Accordingly my decision is that the determination of the First-tier Judge contains such errors of law that I must and do set it aside in its entirety. I remit the matter for rehearing before the First-tier Tribunal at Taylor House (before any judge other than Judge Majid).

Deputy Upper Tribunal Judge David Taylor 1 August 2014