

Insights

BRIEFCASE 2023 QUARTER 1: KEY REAL ESTATE CASES AND UPDATES

SPECIAL SUPREME COURT EDITION

Mar 30, 2023




BARTON V MORRIS

SUPREME COURT REFUSES TO AWARD COMMISSION FOR £6M RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY SALE

“I am therefore satisfied that it is not possible to imply a term into this agreement to the effect that Mr Barton will be paid a reasonable fee if the sale was for less than £6.5m. It is not possible to say that there is any particular fee to which the parties would clearly have agreed, or which is so obvious that it goes without saying and it is not necessary to imply such a term to give the agreement business efficacy or coherence.”

[Read about why this case is important >](#)



AVIVA V WILLIAMS

CONTRACTUAL FREEDOM FOR LANDLORDS TO DETERMINE SERVICE CHARGES IS PRESERVED...TO A POINT

“In my judgment it was not the purpose or effect of section 27A(6) to deprive that form of managerial decision making by landlords of its ordinary contractual effect, save only to the extent that the contractual provision seeks to make the decision of the landlord or other specified person final and binding, so as to oust the ordinary jurisdiction of the FtT to review its contractual and statutory legitimacy.”

[Read about what the court said >](#)



FEARN V TATE GALLERY

NOTHING OVERLOOKED! NO CHANGE TO THE LAW OF PRIVATE NUISANCE IN TATE VIEWING PLATFORM CASE

“... as well as being contrary to principle, the notion that visual intrusion cannot constitute a nuisance is not supported by precedent and indeed that such direct authority as there is positively supports the opposite conclusion.”

[Read about Fearn v Tate Gallery >](#)



SARA & HOSSEIN ASSET HOLDINGS V BLACKS

PAY NOW, ARGUE LATER!

“Such an interpretation provides real benefit to the landlord not only in terms of cashflow but also because, from the landlord’s perspective, there is a world of difference between the tenant being able to hold up payment whenever charges are disputed and the tenant being required to pay first and then to have to take the initiative to initiate and establish a claim.”

[Read about Sara & Hossein Asset Holdings V Blacks >](#)



RAKUSEN V JEPSEN

SUPREME COURT DECIDES THAT A RENT REPAYMENT ORDER CANNOT BE MADE AGAINST A SUPERIOR LANDLORD

“We accept that the interpretation we take renders RROs less effective than they perhaps could be if they were to be made available against superior landlords. But in our view that development would undermine the clear definition of an RRO, as set out in section 40(2) of the 2016 Act, and would therefore require new legislation.”

[Read about why Rakusen V Jepsen is important >](#)

RELATED CAPABILITIES

- Real Estate
- Real Estate Disputes

MEET THE TEAM



Rebecca Campbell

London

rebecca.campbell@bclplaw.com

[+44 \(0\) 20 3400 4791](tel:+442034004791)



Akhil Markanday

London

akhil.markanday@bclplaw.com

[+44 \(0\) 20 3400 4344](tel:+442034004344)



Robert Hodgson

London

robert.hodgson@bclplaw.com

[+44 \(0\) 20 3400 3711](tel:+442034003711)

This material is not comprehensive, is for informational purposes only, and is not legal advice. Your use or receipt of this material does not create an attorney-client relationship between us. If you require legal advice, you should consult an attorney regarding your particular circumstances. The choice of a lawyer is an important decision and should not be based solely upon advertisements. This material may be “Attorney Advertising” under the ethics and professional rules of certain jurisdictions. For advertising purposes, St. Louis, Missouri, is designated BCLP’s principal office and Kathrine Dixon (kathrine.dixon@bclplaw.com) as the responsible attorney.