



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

Appeal Number: IA/18385/2014  
IA/18386/2014

**THE IMMIGRATION ACTS**

**Heard at Field House  
On Wednesday 23  
2015**

**September**

**Decision & Reasons Promulgated  
On Thursday 24 September 2015**

**Before**

**UPPER TRIBUNAL JUDGE SMITH**

**Between**

**MRS KAINAT QAVI  
MISS SHANZAY BAIG**

Appellants

**and**

**SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT**

Respondent

**Representation:**

No attendance

**DECISION AND REASONS**

1. The First Appellant is the wife of Mr Qavi Zaman Baig ("Mr Baig"). The Second Appellant is the daughter of the first Appellant and Mr Baig. By a decision dated 25 March 2014, the Respondent refused Mr Baig's application for variation of leave to remain as a Tier 1 Entrepreneur and gave directions for his removal to Pakistan. The First and Second Appellant were refused leave to remain as Mr Baig's dependents.

2. The appeals of Mr Baig and the Appellants were dismissed by First-Tier Tribunal Judge Woolley by a decision promulgated on 9 December 2014 ("the Decision"). Permission was granted to appeal the Decision on 19 May 2015 by Upper Tribunal Judge Storey. The appeals were listed before me on 23 September 2015 to determine whether the Decision contained a material error of law.
3. By letter dated 15 September 2015, J S Solicitors wrote to the Tribunal indicating that they were no longer instructed by Mr Baig and the Appellants. On 17 September 2015, Lawise Solicitors filed notice of withdrawal in relation to Mr Baig's appeal (IA/18384/2014). The Tribunal consented to the withdrawal on that day but noted that the withdrawal notice did not extend to the appeals of the First and Second Appellants. The Tribunal enquired of Lawise solicitors whether they intended also to withdraw the appeals of the First and Second Appellants but was told that Lawise acted only for Mr Baig and they were not also instructed by the First and Second Appellants.
4. The First and Second Appellants' appeals therefore remained listed before me. There was no attendance by or on behalf of either Appellant. No explanation was received for their non-attendance and no application was made for an adjournment. There was no representation on behalf of the Respondent who appears to have assumed that the withdrawal related to all three Appellants.
5. It appears that the First and Second Appellants do not pursue their appeal. It is difficult to see in any event how their appeals could succeed in the light of the withdrawal of the lead applicant's appeal. Accordingly, I find that there is no material error of law in the Decision and the appeals remain dismissed under the Immigration Rules and under Article 8.

## **DECISION**

**The First-Tier Tribunal's decision contains no material error of law.**

**The Appellants' appeals therefore remain dismissed under the Immigration Rules and on human rights grounds**

Signed



Date 23 September 2015

Upper Tribunal Judge Smith