

ROYAL COURT  
(Poursuites Criminelles)

11th August, 1989

Before: The Bailiff and  
Jurats Myles and Le Ruez

---

Attorney General

- v -

Le Hameau Holdings, Ltd.

---

Two infractions of Articles 14(1)(a)  
of the Housing (Jersey) Law, 1949

---

The Attorney General  
Advocate S.J. Habin for the company.

---

**JUDGMENT**

THE BAILIFF: As long as there is a shortage of accommodation to let. As long as there will be therefore inequality of bargaining powers between would-be tenants and landlords, the State intervenes to assist the tenant as far as it can. Therefore whatever one may feel about Mrs. Bouché having obtained accommodation and almost immediately going to complain about it, in the circumstances of the present market one can understand it. In the circumstances of a market where there is equilibrium of supply and demand one would condemn it, but we refrain from doing that because of the housing shortage and the pressures and strains it places on people.

We do not think, however, in this particular case that this is one where greed was the motivation as counsel has pointed out, nevertheless as the Attorney General has said, it is part of the common belief that as long as you have a qualified person there all would be well. In this particular case it was not correct and under the circumstances, Mr. Habin, we cannot reduce the fines very much. We think, however, we can reduce them slightly to £500 on each charge and £300 costs.

no authority.