



IN THE UPPER TRIBUNAL
IMMIGRATION AND ASYLUM CHAMBER

Case No: UI-2022-000161
First-tier Tribunal No:
PA/02716/2020

THE IMMIGRATION ACTS

Decision & Reasons Issued:
On 17 April 2023

Before

UPPER TRIBUNAL JUDGE KAMARA

Between

ST
(ANONYMITY ORDER MADE)

Appellant

and

Secretary of State for the Home Department

Respondent

Representation:

For the Appellant: Ms C Bayati, counsel instructed by S Satha & Co Solicitors
For the Respondent: Ms S Lecointe, Senior Home Office Presenting Officer

Heard at Field House on 16 February 2023

Order Regarding Anonymity

Pursuant to rule 14 of the Tribunal Procedure (Upper Tribunal) Rules 2008, the appellant is granted anonymity. No-one shall publish or reveal any information, including the name or address of the appellant, likely to lead members of the public to identify the appellant. Failure to comply with this order could amount to a contempt of court.

DECISION AND REASONS

Introduction

1. This is the remaking of the decision concerning an appeal against the decision of the Secretary of State dated 20 February 2020, refusing to grant the appellant asylum.
2. This matter was determined by the First-tier Tribunal and the appeal was dismissed in a decision and reasons promulgated on 30 December 2021. That decision was set aside following an error of law hearing which took place on 20 May 2022. The findings of the previous judge as to the appellant's pre-flight activities were preserved as there was no challenge to those findings. The error of law decision is annexed to this remaking decision.

Anonymity

3. An anonymity direction is made in this case given that the appellant fears the authorities of his country of nationality, and he is also vulnerable, on mental health grounds.

The hearing

4. At the outset of the hearing, Ms Lecointe stated that she had been unaware that the hearing was for the purpose of remaking. She required and was given additional time so that she could consider the appellant's three bundles of evidence as well as Ms Bayati's skeleton argument. Thereafter, the appellant gave evidence with the assistance of a Tamil-speaking interpreter. There was also an additional witness, Mr Sockalingam Yogalingam, who is the TGTE's Deputy Minister for the Prime Minister's Office. Both the appellant and Mr Yogalingam were extensively cross-examined by Ms Lecointe.
5. In her submissions, Ms Lecointe made the following points. The issues were whether the appellant had a genuine belief in Tamil separatism, the level of his engagement with the TGTE and whether it would come to the attention of the Sri Lankan authorities. The appellant did not have a prominent profile within the TGTE. The Country Guidance caselaw established that if a person can be recognised and perceived as politically active that person might be in some difficulties. The photographs relied upon by the appellant were downloaded from WhatsApp which is encrypted. There was no evidence that the photographs could be easily obtained by the Sri Lankan authorities from WhatsApp or that the photographs were anywhere else on social media, such as Facebook. Nor was there any evidence that the appellant featured on TGTE TV. If the Sri Lankan authorities searched the appellant's identity online, there was no reason why this would highlight that he was an active member of the TGTE. In response to my queries, Ms Lecointe stated that she did not seek to undermine the

appellant's evidence of attending events and did not challenge his motivation, his oral or written evidence nor the evidence of his witness.

6. Ms Bayati relied upon her detailed skeleton argument. Thereafter she listed the undisturbed positive findings of the First-tier Tribunal and summarised the appellant's activities in the United Kingdom and why this would put him at risk. In response to Ms Lecointe's submissions, Ms Bayati made the following arguments. The Facebook issues were not of any significance as the appellant had not suggested that he was active on this forum, he had merely been told by others that photographs of him were on it.
7. Ms Bayati submitted that the screenshots provided showed that at least two photographs of the appellant had been published on ethiri.com, which was a Sinhalese media organisation. There was also a video showing the appellant protesting against forcible disappearance, evidenced in the appellant's bundle. It was reasonably likely that the Sri Lankan authorities were already aware of the appellant's involvement in the TGTE. That involvement went beyond attending a demonstration and included fundraising, security, chanting slogans, holding banners and the photographs reflected that activity. The evidence of the witness supported that account.
8. Ms Bayati argued that the appellant's involvement with TGTE amounted to a significant profile such that he would be seen as a destabilising presence and would be put at risk on return to Sri Lanka. In the alternative, she argued that the appellant would act on his genuine, longstanding, beliefs and continue his political involvement if returned to Sri Lanka and that this would put him at risk of persecution.
9. At the end of the hearing, I allowed the appeal and I give my reasons below.

The law

10. The burden of proof is on the appellant to show that he has a well-founded fear of persecution if removed to Sri Lanka. The standard of proof is that of a reasonable degree of likelihood or a real risk. The guidance given by the Upper Tribunal in *KK and RS* (Sur place activities, risk) CG [2021] UKUT 130 is of direct relevance to this appeal as the judgment in *HJ* (Iran) UKSC [2010] KSC 31. In addition, in reaching this decision, all the evidence, both oral and written as well as the submissions made have been considered in the round, even where not directly mentioned.

The First-tier Tribunal's preserved findings

11. The decision of the First-tier Tribunal was set aside solely in relation to material errors regarding the findings on the extent of the appellant's post-flight political activities in the United Kingdom. Therefore, all the

findings made in relation to the appellant's pre-flight claim are preserved. The First-tier Tribunal judge rejected the appellant's claim that his activities in Sri Lanka came to the attention of the authorities. In particular, his claim to have been apprehended, detained and ill-treated was not accepted. These findings are summarised in the following paragraphs of the decision and reasons of the First-tier Tribunal, [96-97].

I find that in light of the evidence available to me and taking account of the relevant case law that I am not satisfied the appellant has demonstrated that it is reasonably likely that in relation to activity in Sri Lanka that he would have been of sufficient notice to attract the adverse attention of the authorities.

I find that taking account of all the evidence I am not satisfied even to the lower standard that the appellant was taken away and suffered ill treatment in the manner claimed.

12. Notwithstanding the finding that the appellant did not have a well-founded fear of persecution in relation to his activities in Sri Lanka, the First-tier Tribunal made favourable findings on aspects of that claim. Matters which were accepted include the appellant's identity, that he was born in Kilinochchi in the north of Sri Lanka, that the appellant and his family were refugees in India between 1996 and 2003, following which they returned to Kilinochchi. It was also accepted that the appellant's older brother and sister were forcibly recruited to the LTTE and that in March 2009 the appellant and his family surrendered and lived in an IDP camp until June 2010, with the judge noting that the appellant and his family were not subject to any adverse interest prior to the appellant leaving Sri Lanka.
13. The appellant's activities in Sri Lanka concerned his work as an insurance salesman, through which he met and gave financial support to former LTTE members who were disabled and impoverished. The appellant, owing to his subsequent job as a marketing officer, was able to assist former LTTE members to lease vehicles at low rates and encouraged Tamils in the diaspora to provide financial support.
14. The First-tier tribunal judge accepted the appellant's account of his activities as demonstrated in the following paragraph from the decision and reasons, [95].

I do find that it is reasonably likely that the appellant did give small financial assistance to those he saw around him most in need and the background evidence supports ex LTTE being at most disadvantage at the relevant time and in addition supporting those persons amongst others as customers of a business in which it was his role to provide insurance and small loans. This is a core that has remained consistent

throughout. However, I find that the evidence does not demonstrate that it is reasonably likely that this activity was of such significance that it would have attracted the adverse attention of the authorities.

15. Lastly, at [98] the judge finds that the appellant was able to leave Sri Lanka 'through the assistance of an agent using a false passport' and that he will 'therefore likely need a temporary travel document if he is to return to Sri Lanka' [99]

The evidence of diaspora activity

16. Before the First-tier Tribunal, the appellant relied upon a Tamil Eelam National Card which was issued by the TGTE during July 2020, a letter from the TGTE dated 5 November 2021 and several photographs submitted as evidence of the appellant's diaspora activities.
17. The appellant now relies upon evidence which was not before the First-tier Tribunal. That additional evidence amounts to a supplementary witness statement from the appellant dated 10 February 2023, a letter dated 11 November 2022 from Mr Yogalingam on behalf of the TGTE, a statement from Mr. Yogalingam dated 7 February 2023, and around 36 additional photographs of the appellant undertaking various activities. In addition, the appellant and Mr Yogalingam were cross-examined by Ms Lecointe.
18. During his evidence, Mr Yogalingam relied on his letter and witness statement which confirmed the appellant's account of regularly attending monthly TGTE meetings; attendance at and involvement in demonstrations; attendance and involvement at Heroes Day celebrations and active involvement in fundraising. In his witness statement, Mr Yogalingam gave eight detailed examples of the appellant's activities and described him as 'very committed and dedicated to the Tamil Freedom Struggle.'
19. I place considerable weight on the evidence of Mr Yogalingam for the following reasons. Firstly, his oral and written evidence was not challenged on behalf of the respondent. In addition, he is a senior member of the TGTE in that he is effectively the Deputy Prime Minister. His oral and written evidence contained credible detail and was consistent with the appellant's oral and written evidence. Furthermore, Mr Yogalingam's evidence was supported by photographic evidence showing both the appellant and Mr Yogalingam at the various events referred to in the evidence.
20. I also find the appellant to be a witness of truth in relation to his post-flight political activity. Indeed, there was no challenge to his credibility or to the reliability of the documentary evidence he submitted. I have taken into consideration that the previous judge did not accept the appellant's claim that he was arrested, detained, and ill-treated and

have therefore been cautious in my approach. Nonetheless, I accept that the evidence, considered in the round, provides credible support for the appellant's account of his sur place activities.

21. The activities undertaken by the appellant in the United Kingdom include, but are not limited to, his first attendance at a Tamil Heroes Day Celebration with his cousin in November 2019, his registration as a volunteer member of the TGTE in July 2020 and attendance at a demonstration in Trafalgar Square in August 2022. In addition, the evidence, including photographic, shows the appellant's participation in a fasting protest in front of 10 Downing Street in 2021 and 2022, participation in Black July protest in front of the Sri Lankan High Commission in both 2021 and 2022, subsequent attendance at Heroes Day protest in 2021 and 2022 as well as his participation in protests in front of the Sri Lankan High Commission, during 2022 and 2023 in relation to Sri Lanka's Independence Day. In addition to attending protests, the appellant puts up posters, sells fund-raising raffle tickets and contributed to organising the TGTE parliamentary sitting in December 2022.
22. I have carefully considered Ms Lecointe's submission that the photographs of the appellant circulated on WhatsApp would not have come to the attention of the Sri Lankan authorities. While that is probably the case, the evidence shows that the Sri Lankan authorities are not reliant on social media activity for the acquisition of data relating to diaspora activities in the United Kingdom.

The extent of the appellant's role in diaspora activity

23. Considering the foregoing findings on the extent of the appellant's activity, the photographs and credible supporting evidence from the TGTE as well as the guidance given in *KK and RS*, I consider that the appellant's involvement in diaspora activities is at a significant level, such that he would be at risk of persecution if removed to Sri Lanka because he would be perceived as a destabilising influence on the integrity of Sri Lanka, applying *GJ and others* (post-civil war: returnees) (Sri Lanka) CG [2013] UKUT 00319 (IAC) at headnote (3).
24. It was accepted by the First-tier Tribunal that the appellant provided financial assistance to disabled and disadvantaged former LTTE members when he was living in Sri Lanka, that the appellant's brother and sister were both forcibly recruited by the LTTE and that the appellant left Sri Lanka using a false document. To be removed to Sri Lanka, he needs to be interviewed by the Sri Lankan High Commission emergency in order to obtain an emergency travel document, with reference to [411] of *KK and RS*. The said Guidance confirms, at [412] that the High Commission continue to pose questions regarding the LTTE connections and sympathies of an applicant for a travel document as well as that of their family.

25. At [414] or *KK and RS*, the information likely to be obtained by the Sri Lankan authorities during that questioning is set out. In the appellant's case, the relevant enquiries are likely to include whether the appellant is associated with a particular diaspora organisation; whether he has attended meetings as well as the frequency thereof, whether he has attended demonstrations and if so, how frequently this may have occurred, the nature of involvement in these events, including whether the appellant played a prominent part held flags or banners displaying the LTTE emblem, any organisational or promotional roles undertaken on behalf of a diaspora organisation, attendance at commemorative events such as Heroes Day and meaningful fundraising on behalf of or the provision of such funding to an organisation.
26. In *KK and RS*, the Upper Tribunal concluded that the Sri Lankan government had a single electronic database which stored information from the United Kingdom along with relevant information previously gathered in Sri Lanka relating to such matters as previous actual or suspected links to the LTTE and detentions [426]. At [499] of the said case, it was noted that familial connections is a relevant factor, with regard to the degree of the relationship and the nature of the links to the LTTE.
27. At [105] of the decision of the First-tier Tribunal it was accepted that the Sri Lankan authorities would be aware of the extent of the appellant's sur place activities and that he would be 'suspected of separatist sympathies and (would be) of some interest to the authorities on that basis.'
28. At [349] of *KK and RS* the Tribunal concluded that the core focus of the authorities is to prevent any potential resurgence of a separatist movement within Sri Lanka which has its ultimate goal as the establishment of Tamil Eelam and at [498] the following conclusion was reached.

The cumulative effect of this drives us to the conclusion that a history of links to the LTTE continues to represent a relevant factor in the overall assessment of an individual's profile in so far as it is reasonably likely to inform the perception of GoSL as to the propensity of the individual concerned to engage in separatist activity with a view to threatening the integrity of the Sri Lankan state.

29. Considering all the evidence and guidance from *KK and RS* in the round, I find that the appellant will be interviewed by the Sri Lankan embassy officials regarding documentation in preparation for removal to Sri Lanka as he has no travel document. The authorities will be aware of his history, and he is likely to be on a watch list because the appellant is a volunteer member for the TGTE, a proscribed organisation in Sri Lanka, and is considered to be an activist by the TGTE.

30. The appellant has also been actively involved in many events and demonstrations over a protracted period of time including Heroes' Day celebrations. The appellant is pictured in many photographs where he is shown to be holding banners and flags. He has also been involved in fundraising and regularly attends meetings. As a person who has been consistently politically active in the diaspora on behalf of a proscribed organisation, The TGTE, from shortly after his arrival in the UK, I find that the appellant will be viewed by the Sri Lankan authorities as of sufficiently strong adverse interest and that this is likely to lead to his detention were he to be removed to Sri Lanka. It is uncontroversial that should the appellant be detained on removal, he would face a real risk of persecution.
31. While it is not strictly necessary to consider the alternative argument of whether or not the appellant has a genuine belief in Tamil separatism, applying *HJ (Iran)*, I can briefly state that in view of the appellant's family history, his own support of ex LTTE members in Sri Lanka, and the nature and extent of his involvement in the UK with the diaspora, I accept that it is reasonably likely that he would openly express his views on return to Sri Lanka and that as a consequence he would be at risk of persecution.

Notice of Decision

The appeal is allowed on asylum grounds.

T Kamara

Judge of the Upper Tribunal
Immigration and Asylum Chamber

3 April 2023

TO THE RESPONDENT **FEE AWARD**

No fee is paid or payable and therefore there can be no fee award.

T Kamara

Judge of the Upper Tribunal
Immigration and Asylum Chamber

3 April 2023

NOTIFICATION OF APPEAL RIGHTS

1. A person seeking permission to appeal against this decision must make a written application to the Upper Tribunal. Any such application must be **received** by the Upper Tribunal within the **appropriate period** after this decision was **sent** to the person making the application. The appropriate period varies, as follows, according to the location of the individual and the way in which the Upper Tribunal's decision was sent:
2. Where the person who appealed to the First-tier Tribunal is **in the United Kingdom** at the time that the application for permission to appeal is made, and is not in detention under the Immigration Acts, the appropriate period is **12 working days (10 working days, if the notice of decision is sent electronically)**.
3. Where the person making the application is in detention under the Immigration Acts, **the appropriate period is 7 working days (5 working days, if the notice of decision is sent electronically)**.
4. Where the person who appealed to the First-tier Tribunal is **outside the United Kingdom** at the time that the application for permission to appeal is made, the appropriate period is **38 days (10 working days, if the notice of decision is sent electronically)**.
5. A **“working day”** means any day except a Saturday or a Sunday, Christmas Day, Good Friday or a bank holiday.
6. The date when the decision is **“sent”** is that appearing on the covering letter or covering email.



**Upper Tribunal
(Immigration and Asylum Chamber)**

Appeal Number: PA/02716/2020

THE IMMIGRATION ACTS

**Heard at Field House
On: 20 May 2022**

Decision & Reasons Promulgated
.....

Before

UPPER TRIBUNAL JUDGE KAMARA

Between

ST

(ANONYMITY DIRECTION MADE)

Appellant

and

THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT

Respondent

Representation:

For the Appellant: Ms S Anzani, counsel instructed by Reeves & Co Solicitors
For the Respondent: Mr T Melvin, Senior Home Office Presenting Officer

DECISION AND REASONS

Introduction

1. This is an appeal against the decision of First-tier Tribunal Judge Peer, promulgated on 30 December 2021. Permission to appeal was granted by First-tier Tribunal Judge Hatton on 9 February 2022.

Anonymity

2. An anonymity direction is made in this case given that the appellant fears the authorities of his country of nationality, and he is also particularly vulnerable, on mental health grounds.

Background

3. The appellant left Sri Lanka on 2 September 2019. He arrived in the United Kingdom on 5 September 2019 and applied for asylum at the port. In short, the appellant's protection claim is based on his support for the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) which he says led to his detention and ill-treatment by the Sri Lankan authorities in 2019. The Secretary of State refused that claim, in a letter dated 28 February 2020, principally because of apparent inconsistencies in the appellant's account of his involvement with the LTTE.

The decision of the First-tier Tribunal

4. The First-tier Tribunal judge accepted aspects of the appellant's account including that he had engaged in post-flight political activity, however he concluded that if removed to Sri Lanka, the appellant would not face ill-treatment. The appellant's Article 3 mental health claim, advanced at the hearing, was also dismissed on the basis that there was no evidence to support a real risk of a breach of Article 3.

The grounds of appeal

5. The four grounds of appeal can be summarised as follows.
 - i. A failure to find that the appellant is a refugee in light of the accepted parts of his claim
 - ii. An erroneous application of the *HJ (Iran)* principle in light of the Country Guidance
 - iii. A failure to consider the monitoring process in the context of the appellant's ill-health
 - iv. An erroneous assessment of the country material
6. Permission to appeal was granted on all grounds, with the judge granting permission concluding that he considered it "arguable that the Judge erred in finding the Appellant's *sur place* activities could not bring him to the adverse attention of the Sri Lankan authorities on return."
7. The respondent did not file a Rule 24 response, however a skeleton argument was provided on the day prior to the hearing, in which it suffices to say that the appeal was opposed, on all grounds.

The hearing

8. Both representatives made submissions. Ms Anzani relied upon all four of the grounds which were drafted by previous counsel in this case and expanded upon them. In response, Mr Melvin relied upon his skeleton argument. In the event that a material error of law was detected, both representatives were content for the matter to be retained in the Upper Tribunal.

9. At the end of the hearing, I reserved my decision which I now give below with reasons.

Decision on error of law

10. In reaching my decision, I have taken into consideration the written and oral arguments as well as the material which was before the First-tier Tribunal. I address the grounds in the order in which they were argued.
11. The first ground relates to the arguable failure by the First-tier Tribunal judge to conclude that the appellant ought to have been recognised as a refugee on the basis of his accepted sur place activities. I take into consideration that the judge did not accept that the appellant was taken away and ill-treated by the Sri Lankan authorities as he claimed. Those detailed findings, set out between [75-97] of the decision and reasons have not been challenged.
12. Aspects of the appellant's claim which the judge accepted include that the appellant had been diagnosed with PTSD [64]; that he feared return to Sri Lanka [65]; that it was 'reasonably likely that the appellant did give small financial assistance' to people including former LTTE members [95]; that his siblings were forcibly recruited to the LTTE [102], that the appellant travelled to the UK using a false passport [98] and that he is likely to be questioned by staff from the Sri Lanka High Commission in the context of seeking a temporary travel document[99].
13. As for the appellant's diaspora activities, the judge made the following findings. At [100] she accepted the appellant's evidence '*as to his activity in the UK attending several TGTE events given the photographic evidence of the same.*' She goes on to explicitly find that the appellant was involved with diaspora activities and was a member of the TGTE, albeit she concluded that there was a lack of evidence that he attended meetings frequently, that he was a key visible participant during online meetings or that he had any wider TGTE activities beyond attendance at three specific events. There was also acceptance of the appellant's claim that the Sri Lankan authorities would learn of his involvement with the TGTE owing to their reach and intelligence gathering [101] and that he would be suspected of separatist sympathies when questioned [105]. Nonetheless, the judge considered that the appellant did not have a 'significant role' and that he was likely to be released and monitored wherever he settled, on return to Sri Lanka.
14. The argument in the grounds is that given the judge's acceptance that the appellant's involvement with TGTE would become known, she had failed to properly apply the guidance in *KK and RS (Sur place activities: risk) Sri Lanka* CG [2021] UKUT 130 (IAC).
15. Headnote (6) of *KK and RS* states as follows, in relation to the TGTE.

The Transnational Government of Tamil Eelam (“TGTE”) is an avowedly separatist organisation which is currently proscribed. It is viewed by GoSL with a significant degree of hostility and is perceived as a “front” for the LTTE.

16. In the body of *KK and RS*, at [346] the panel records that the GoSL have an imperative need to ensure that ‘*even sympathies*’ related to separatist ideology within Sri Lanka are firmly suppressed and at [349] the panel speaks of the absence of toleration for actual or even perceived separatist beliefs. The appellant’s involvement with the TGTE is more than passive, in that he is a member, he has attended three major events, including a demonstration, as well as a members’ meetings via Zoom. There are some similarities with the claimant RS whose claim of persecution in Sri Lanka was also rejected on credibility grounds but who, nonetheless, succeeded based on her sur place activities in support of TGTE. I take into consideration that RS was able to provide supporting evidence from the TGTE which the appellant in this case has not. In addition, RS was accepted as having a genuine belief in a Tamil homeland. In this case, the judge made no finding on the appellant’s beliefs, which forms part of the complaint in the second ground.
17. While the judge alludes to considering the indicators set out in *KK and RS*, at [104], she does not make any clear reference to the factors she says she considered. In particular, the judge does not assess the relevance of headnote (21)(i) which states ‘*That an organisation has been proscribed under the 2012 UN Regulations will be relatively significant in terms of the level of adverse interest reasonably likely to be attributed to an individual associated with it;*’ in coming to the conclusion at [104] that the appellant could not be considered as having a significant role in separatism owing to his membership and activities on behalf of the TGTE. The judge’s view of the appellant’s activities set out from [100] onwards give the clear impression that the appellant’s lack of a prominence within the TGTE was considered determinative of the issue of whether he held a significant role. In this she materially erred. It follows that ground one is made out.
18. Dealing with the second ground, as referred to in my findings above, the judge did not express a clear view as to whether it was accepted that the appellant believed in Tamil separatism. The appellant stated in his consolidated witness statement that he would also advocate for a separate Tamil state if returned to Sri Lanka.
19. The reference in *KK and RS*, to the *HJ(Iran)* principle emphasises that ‘*careful findings of fact must be made on the genuineness of a belief in Tamil separatism; the future conduct of an individual on return in relation to the expression of genuinely held separatist beliefs; the consequences of such expression; and, if the beliefs would be concealed, why this is the case.*’ These aspects are absent from the decision in question despite the judge devoting paragraphs [106-107] to *HJ (Iran)*.

20. In paragraphs [106-107], the judge does not address the appellant's claimed beliefs or explore whether he would engage in further activities in Sri Lanka nor what he would say when questioned about his beliefs during the documentation process.
21. Furthermore, in finding that the appellant has failed to satisfy her that he *'is a person with deep and strongly committed views as to political separatism,'* the judge further erred in elevating the test the appellant had to meet. There is no legal basis for demanding that any views be *'deep and strongly committed,'* only that they are genuinely held.
22. Ground three concerned whether the judge erred in not considering the impact of monitoring by the GoSL on the appellant's mental state. This was not an argument which formed part of the case for the appellant before the First-tier Tribunal. Nor was this issue addressed in either of the psychiatric reports before the judge. Evidently, this ground is not made out and I need say no more about it.
23. Lastly, the fourth ground is that the judge erred in placing weight on the Home Office Fact-finding Mission evidence, which was subject to criticism in *KK and RS*. The grounds are silent as to what impact consideration of the FFM had on the judge's findings and in any event, it is trite law that weight is a matter for the judge. There was no error in the approach of the judge here.

Decision

The making of the decision of the First-tier Tribunal did involve the making of an error of on a point of law.

The decision of the First-tier Tribunal is set aside, save for the findings relating to the appellant's pre-flight circumstances.

Listing Instructions

The appeal is to be reheard at the Upper Tribunal, with a time estimate of 3 hours.

A Tamil-speaking interpreter is required.

This appeal is to be listed for the first available date after 1 July 2022.

Direction Regarding Anonymity

Pursuant to rule 14 of the Tribunal Procedure (Upper Tribunal) Rules 2008, the appellant is granted anonymity. No-one shall publish or reveal any information, including the name or address of the appellant, likely to lead members of the public to identify the appellant. Failure to comply with this order could amount to a contempt of court.

Signed: T Kamara

Date 23 May 2022

Upper Tribunal Judge Kamara