

ROYAL COURT

5th July, 1991

92.

Before: The Bailiff, and Jurats  
Blampied and Herbert

---

The Attorney General

- v -

Christine Pearl Hyde

and

Nigel Stuart Munn

---

**OFFENCE:**

Article 14(1)(b) of the Housing (Jersey) Law, 1949, infraction.

**PLEA:**

Guilty.

**DETAILS OF OFFENCE:**

Hyde came to Jersey in February, 1980. She wished to establish residential qualifications, but had missed the deadline by two months. She therefore asked Munn, whom she had known for two years, to provide a reference saying she lived in Jersey from October, 1979, to March, 1980. She knew she did not qualify, as she had made enquiries. Munn provided a reference. It was twice queried by Housing, and he twice insisted it was correct.

**DETAILS OF MITIGATION:**

Hyde was desperate to establish residential qualifications. She and her fiancé lived in one room. She wanted to start a family. She was co-operative throughout. Munn made nothing by it. He only did a favour. He was eventually

co-operative. Both expressed regret and apologised for what they had done.

**PREVIOUS CONVICTIONS:**

None relevant.

**CONCLUSIONS:**

£500 fine or two months and £100 costs against each defendant. Although Hyde the prime mover, no distinction made, because she had been immediately co-operative, but he had not.

**SENTENCE AND OBSERVATIONS OF THE COURT:**

Conclusions granted. Court had sympathy, but the law must be obeyed.

---

Miss S.C. Nicolle, Crown Advocate.  
Advocate F.J. Benest for Miss Hyde.  
Mr. Munn appeared on his own behalf.

---

**JUDGMENT**

BAILIFF: The Court is going to grant the conclusions asked for by the Crown Advocate.

I am sure you now appreciate that if persons mislead the Committee, it makes the Committee's work that much harder. At the same time the Court appreciates the strain which the change in the law, announced some years ago, placed upon a very large number of people and the Court has sympathy with the difficulties in which people find themselves, but nevertheless the Law is clear and it has to be obeyed and I think you both realise that. It gives the Court no great pleasure to impose

finer in cases of this nature, but I think you have now learned your lesson.

You are both fined £500, or in default two months' imprisonment; and £100 costs each.

No authorities cited.