

## Press release: £7,195 fine for fisheries offences in case brought by MMO

On 2 May 2017 S & P Trawlers (JACABEN) Limited, owner of the stern trawler Cerulean NN722, and its master Marcus White pleaded guilty to breaches of the Sea Fish (Conservation) Act 1967 and the Fisheries Act 1981 at Barnstaple Magistrates Court.

The court heard how, during investigations including inspections of local fish merchants carried out by the MMO in 2015, it was identified that in July the Cerulean declared squid catches in their fishing vessel logbook when in fact no squid had been landed. Instead the actual catch for July was 2448.7kg of bass, some 648.7kg over the monthly limit of 1800kg. Two days following discovery of the error the vessel master contacted MMO to attempt to correct the error.

In August the Cerulean's logbook recorded a catch of 230kg of bass but on inspection by Marine Officers, the actual weight of bass landed was 367.5kg. This was an under-recording of 59.7%

The vessel owner S and P Trawlers (JACABEN) Limited were fined £3,200, with additional costs of £1,175 and a victim surcharge of £170.

The vessel master Marcus White was fined £1,500 with additional costs of £1,000 and a victim surcharge of £150.

A spokesman for the MMO said:

"In this case Marine Officers' inspections of local fish merchants and of the vessel itself revealed clear misreporting of the species and quantities of fish landed.

"The fact that the fish in question was sea bass, a species which not only commands a high market value but is also under severe pressure from potential overfishing and is, therefore, subject to increasing levels of regulation, was clearly an aggravating feature of these offences.

"The MMO recognises that the vast majority of fishermen operate lawfully and in compliance with regulations which exist to protect fisheries from overfishing and are in place to ensure healthy, sustainable fisheries for this and future generations of fishermen. In the rare instances that non-compliance is detected, we use a risk-based enforcement strategy and operate a graduated and proportionate system of sanctions, with prosecution reserved for the most serious offences."

---

## [Press release: £7,195 fine for fisheries offences in case brought by MMO](#)

On 2 May 2017 S & P Trawlers (JACABEN) Limited, owner of the stern trawler Cerulean NN722, and its master Marcus White pleaded guilty to breaches of the Sea Fish (Conservation) Act 1967 and the Fisheries Act 1981 at Barnstaple Magistrates Court.

The court heard how, during investigations including inspections of local fish merchants carried out by the MMO in 2015, it was identified that in July the Cerulean declared squid catches in their fishing vessel logbook when in fact no squid had been landed. Instead the actual catch for July was 2448.7kg of bass, some 648.7kg over the monthly limit of 1800kg. Two days following discovery of the error the vessel master contacted MMO to attempt to correct the error.

In August the Cerulean's logbook recorded a catch of 230kg of bass but on inspection by Marine Officers, the actual weight of bass landed was 367.5kg. This was an under-recording of 59.7%

The vessel owner S and P Trawlers (JACABEN) Limited were fined £3,200, with additional costs of £1,175 and a victim surcharge of £170.

The vessel master Marcus White was fined £1,500 with additional costs of £1,000 and a victim surcharge of £150.

A spokesman for the MMO said:

"In this case Marine Officers' inspections of local fish merchants and of the vessel itself revealed clear misreporting of the species and quantities of fish landed.

"The fact that the fish in question was sea bass, a species which not only commands a high market value but is also under severe pressure from potential overfishing and is, therefore, subject to increasing levels of regulation, was clearly an aggravating feature of these offences.

"The MMO recognises that the vast majority of fishermen operate lawfully and in compliance with regulations which exist to protect fisheries from overfishing and are in place to ensure healthy, sustainable fisheries for this and future generations of fishermen. In the rare instances that non-compliance is detected, we use a risk-based enforcement strategy and operate a graduated and proportionate system of sanctions, with prosecution reserved for the most serious offences."

---

## [Press release: Commission publishes Accounts monitoring report: double default class inquiry](#)

Commission looked at accounts from charities that were in the class inquiry.

In a report published today (10 May) the Charity Commission has published its findings from [its accounts review](#) conducted on accounts filed by charities in the Commission's ongoing class inquiry ([see Endnotes](#)).

The [accounts review](#) looked at accounts filed by 27 charities in the inquiry and found:

- 6 charities closed and failed to tell the Commission
- 6 had filed their accounts with Companies House but failed to submit them to the Commission
- 2 charities submitted accounts without the correct external scrutiny and the Commission instructed them to re-submit their accounts

In the 2015-16 class inquiry, evidence was uncovered of poor financial management and misuse of charity funds in 3 charities and as a result 3 standalone investigations were opened.

The accounts review found that of the majority of the accounts submitted were found to be of good and acceptable quality and those who used the Commission's accounts templates were more likely to have good quality accounts. However it was clear that not all trustees understood the external scrutiny requirements.

Fourteen of the 32 charities that were placed into the class inquiry by the Commission in 2015-16 submitted their accounts to the Commission during the year, as did 13 from the 2014-15 class inquiry. The Commission's accountants closely scrutinised 69 copies of accounts from these 27 charities. The filing of these accounts led to £15.5 million of charity income being accounted for to the general public through the Commission's register and this brings the total amount reported during the course of the class inquiry to just over £75 million since September 2013.

**Nigel Davies, Head of Accountancy Services at the Charity Commission for England and Wales, said:**

Our class inquiry has ensured compliance in the charity sector by holding trustees to account for failing to abide by their legal duty to file accounts and be transparent, a key driver of public trust in charities.

It is disappointing that it required our regulatory action to ensure these charities complied. They showed the ability to report well when they put the effort in as the majority of the charities involved in the class inquiry eventually filed good quality accounts. However, it is concerning that the underlying attitude to compliance on basic duties and accountability to donors and the public remains poor.

This report sends a clear message to trustees that we will take robust action to tackle non-compliance so that charity funds are declared and accounted for on the register of charities.

Ends

PR 37/17

---

#### **Notes to editors**

1. [The Charity Commission](#) is the independent regulator of charities in England and Wales. To find out more about our work, see our [annual report](#).
2. Search for charities on our [online register](#).
3. Details of how the Commission reports on its regulatory work can be found on [GOV.UK](#).

#### **Endnotes**

1. Class inquiry into those charities who fail to file accounts properly in 2 consecutive years, so-called 'double defaulters'.
- 

## **[News story: Pagers merger may face in-depth investigation](#)**

Capita and Vodafone face an in-depth merger investigation, unless the companies offer acceptable ways of addressing competition concerns.

Capita and Vodafone both supply wide-area paging services to customers, including emergency services and hospitals. Customers rely on pagers because issues such as coverage, reliability and battery life mean that alternative technologies, like mobile phones, are not suitable.

The Competition and Markets Authority's (CMA) initial investigation into the merger has found that it could lead to a substantial lessening of competition as the 2 companies are the only suppliers of wide-area paging services in the UK.

It found that, after the merger, customers could face price rises and reduced quality of coverage.

Capita has until 17 May 2017 to offer proposals to resolve the competition concerns. If it does not offer undertakings, or if the CMA is unable to accept undertakings offered, the merger will be referred for an in-depth phase 2 investigation.

---

## **News story: Just Eat/Hungryhouse merger faces in-depth investigation**

Both companies provide online takeaway ordering services. These give restaurants the opportunity to reach a wide pool of consumers and offer them the convenience of choosing from a large range of takeaway providers in one place.

Following its initial investigation into the merger, the Competition and Markets Authority (CMA) has found that the companies are close competitors because of the similarity of their service and their broad geographical coverage.

The CMA also believes that more recent entrants to this market offering delivery services – such as Deliveroo, UberEATS and Amazon Restaurants – represent less direct competition to the companies as these tend to target different types of restaurant (primarily dine-in restaurants without their own delivery services). These recent entrants also offer less extensive geographic coverage than Just Eat and Hungryhouse.

The CMA is therefore concerned that the loss of competition resulting from the Just Eat/Hungryhouse merger may result in worse terms for restaurants using either of the 2 companies.

The merger will now be referred for an in-depth phase 2 investigation by an independent group of CMA panel members – unless Just Eat is able to offer undertakings which sufficiently address the CMA's competition concerns.

Just Eat has until 17 May 2017 to offer proposals to resolve the competition concerns. If it does not offer undertakings, or if the CMA is unable to accept undertakings offered, the merger will be referred for an in-depth phase 2 investigation.