



Neutral citation number: [2024] UKFTT 1140 (GRC)

Case Reference: D/2024/0407

**General Regulatory Chamber
Transport**

First-tier Tribunal

**Determined on paper
on 18th December 2024**

Decision given on: 20 December 2024

Before

HHJ DAVID DIXON

Between

MEHMET UMUT TANKISI

and

**THE REGISTRAR OF APPROVED
DRIVING INSTRUCTORS**

Appellant

Respondent

Decision: The appeal is dismissed and the Registrar's decision remains.

REASONS

Background to Appeal

1. This appeal concerns a decision of the Registrar of Approved Driving Instructors (“the Registrar”) made 18th April 2024 to refuse to grant the Appellant a third trainee licence.
2. The Appellant is a trainee driving instructor who was granted a trainee licence under s.129 of the Road Traffic Act 1988¹ (‘the Act’) for a six-month period, and then another, but was refused a further licence at the end of the relevant period.
3. The Registrar’s reasons for refusal, in summary, were that the Appellant had not passed the final part of the ADI qualifying examination within the relevant period and as insufficient evidence of loss of training time was supplied that the Appellant had had long enough to progress, and the application to issue a third trainee licence was therefore refused.
4. The Appellant now appeals the Registrar’s decision.

Appeal to the Tribunal

5. The Appellant’s Notice of Appeal, dated 1st May 2024, indicates that there have difficulties obtaining instruction from Orbit trainers. The lack of such instruction led to him changing his test date a number of times. He asserts that he is ready now to pass his Part 3 he just needs time to take his test booked in June 2024. (*He subsequent to his Appeal failed that test.*)
6. The Respondent submitted a Response indicating that the decision letter sets out their position. The Registrar points out that the Applicant had sufficient time to progress.
7. The Registrar indicates that the Appellant has failed his Part 3 twice, and he has cancelled 5 other attempts.
8. The Registrar indicates the Appellant has been licensed from 24th April 2023 to date, a period so far of 20 months.

Mode of Determination

9. The Tribunal considered the appeal on the papers, the Appellant and Respondent agreeing to such a determination. In accordance with the Tribunal Rules the Tribunal assessed whether it was right and proper to continue on the papers and came to the clear view to do so would be fair to all.
10. The Tribunal considered a bundle of evidence containing 20 pages.

¹ <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/52/part/V/crossheading/licences>

The Law

11. The grant of a trainee licence enables applicants to provide instruction for payment before they are qualified. The circumstances in which trainee licences may be granted are set out in s. 129 of the Act and the Motor Cars (Driving Instruction) Regulations 2005².
12. A licence under section 129(1) of the Act is granted:

‘for the purpose of enabling a person to acquire practical experience in giving instruction in driving motor cars with a view to undergoing such part of the examination... as consists of a practical test of ability and fitness to instruct’.
13. In order to qualify as an Approved Driving Instructor, applicants must pass the Qualifying Examination. This comprises: the written examination (‘Part 1’); the driving ability and fitness test (‘Part 2’); and the instructional ability and fitness test (‘Part 3’). Three attempts are permitted at each part. The whole examination must be completed within 2 years of passing Part 1, failing which the whole examination has to be retaken.
14. If a candidate has passed part 2, they may be granted a trainee licence. However, holding a trainee licence is not a prerequisite to qualification as an Approved Driving Instructor and many people qualify as an Approved Driving Instructor without having held a trainee licence.
15. The powers of the Tribunal in determining this appeal are set out in s. 131 of the Act. The Tribunal may make such order as it thinks fit.
16. When making its Decision, the Tribunal stands in the shoes of the Registrar of approved Driving Instructors and takes a fresh decision on the evidence available to it, giving appropriate weight to the Registrar’s decision³ as the person tasked by Parliament with making such decisions. The burden of proof in satisfying the Tribunal that the Registrar’s decision was wrong rests with the Appellant.

Conclusion

17. The Tribunal considered carefully all the papers before it.
18. In fixing a period of 6 month to allow for trainee instructors to progress Parliament must have had in mind that we are all subject to differing life events that affect our ability to undertake certain tasks. Sometimes those events are so unusual or have such a bearing on an individual that it will be entirely appropriate to find that a longer than normal period of time should be allowed to complete a task. Here the Appellant provided a limited explanation for the Appeal, namely that it was difficult to find an Orbit trainer. He also indicated a lack of tests was an issue, albeit having managed to secure 7 slots the Tribunal firmly rejects that suggestion. The

² http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2005/1902/pdfs/uksi_20051902_en.pdf

³ See *R (Hope and Glory Public House Limited) v City of Westminster Magistrates’ Court* [2011] EWCA Civ 31. <http://www.bailii.org/ew/cases/EWCA/Civ/2011/31.html>. Approved by the Supreme Court in *Hesham Ali (Iraq) v Secretary of State for the Home Department* [2016] UKSC 60 at paragraph 45 – see <https://www.supremecourt.uk/cases/docs/uksc-2015-0126-judgment.pdf>.

lack of a trainer might have allowed a degree of loss of training opportunity, but here the Appellant has held a licence well in excess of the norm. There is no justification for any extra time and the Appeal must fail accordingly.

19. The Appeal is dismissed.
20. The Appellant is still able to attempt his Part 3, if he wishes to, and the Tribunal wishes him well if he so chooses.

(Signed)

HHJ David Dixon

DATE: 18th December 2024