

Case Analysis — Connections, Patterns and Questions (October 2026)

Version 1.0.0 · 2026-10-23

Editors of the Great House Farm Legal Wiki

Table of Contents

1	Release notes	1
1.1	This release (version 1.0.0).	1
1.2	Older versions	1
2	Record	1
2.1	1. The core pattern: four sets of proceedings, no trial of title	2
2.2	2. One interpretive move carries the whole chain.	2
2.3	3. New connections found in the Land Registry documents.	2
2.4	4. The 1949–1955 sequence and the missing papers	3
2.5	5. The law at each stage, and what it means for the evidence	4
2.6	6. What “reopening” actually requires.	5
2.7	7. The public narrative versus the court record	6
2.8	8. Public bodies: concerns to put on record	6
2.9	9. The ten documents that would settle most of this	6
2.10	10. What would weaken the family’s case	7
2.11	October 2026 correction — from parcel theory to the actual loss event	7
2.12	Page version & change log.	7

Page 1191 of the Great House Farm Legal Wiki, carried over from the version last modified on 2026-10-21. The same page is published at research.bucklerfamily.estate, and this version is also a [PDF](#) in the wayback archive.

1 Release notes

1.1 This release (version 1.0.0)

- **2026-Oct-23** - Carried over to the docs library from Legal Wiki page 1191 (last modified 2026-10-21 19:28:59 UTC). The page text, dates and references are as on the wiki. Links to wiki pages lead to the same page on research.bucklerfamily.estate; images are links to their files on the wiki.

1.2 Older versions

None yet.

2 Record

This material now lives at <https://fcg.bucklerfamily.estate/case/case-analysis-connections-patterns-questions>.

Page ID: 1191 · **Title:** Case Analysis — Connections, Patterns and Questions (October 2026) · **Evidence status:** Not yet labelled — see the Editing Protocol · **Version:** 0.1.1 · [Editing Protocol](#)

What this page is. A cross-reading of the evidence already on this Wiki, looking for connections, patterns and contradictions that the individual pages do not show on their own, and testing each against the law in force when it happened. Every point is labelled with the Wiki’s truth statuses ([operating rules](#)). It raises questions and concerns; it

makes **no finding of fraud** against any person or body. Where a point cuts against the family's case, it is stated plainly, because a reopening application will fail if it ignores the evidence against it. Prepared 5 October 2026.

2.1 1. The core pattern: four sets of proceedings, no trial of title

RECONSTRUCTION — scope corrected. The family's title case concerns the full Parcel A under the 1877 arrangement taking effect in 1928, not merely the farmhouse and garden. Parcel A includes the farmhouse/buildings, barn, stable and west-side yard, garden, forest north of the house, and ground south-east later registered as VG41. The family's established account is that WGR seized the north forest and south-east green on 4 July 1955 while enforcing possession of Parcel B under "whole farm" wording. The later 1962 proceedings concerned the farmhouse/buildings/garden group Mary still occupied; that narrower practical defence should not be mistaken for the limit of her title claim.

- **1955** — WGR sued *Frederick alone*, in the High Court, by summary judgment (Order 14), on his tenancy, using the words "the whole of the farm". Mary was not a party to that 1955 action. The working reconstruction (SOURCE PENDING) is that execution extended beyond Parcel B onto Parcel-A forest and green. The order, plan, warrant and return remain important to define the formal authority and downstream description, not to re-open whether those areas were taken (1955 order).
- **1962** — county court order for the farmhouse and garden against Frederick and Mary. This was the remaining occupied house group within Parcel A, not the full extent of Parcel A. Mary's referenced "previous statement" on the 1955 and 1962 applications remains a source to locate if possible (1962 order).
- **1974** — Mary pleaded ownership on 3 July 1974. The action was part-heard and adjourned and never relisted. BP instead revived the 1962 order and then sent the licence letters (1974).
- **1984–87** — the defence argued adverse possession only. The Court of Appeal recited BP's "paper title" as background and recorded that Mary's title documents were "never produced" (BP v Buckler).

Why it matters. The 1987 judgment decided *limitation and licence*, not who owned Parcel A. Every later decision, including HM Land Registry's 2026 complaint decisions, leans on that judgment as if it settled title. It did not try title. The family's case therefore turns on evidence that title was never examined because the family had been deprived of the means to contest it.

2.2 2. One interpretive move carries the whole chain

RECONSTRUCTION. Each adverse step relies on the step before it describing the land as "the farm" or "the whole farm": the 1916 tenancy (as recited in 1987) → the 1955 order → the 1962 order → the 1969 WGR→BP Pension Trust conveyance (as recited) → the 1975 conveyance → the 1982–83 registration → the 1987 judgment → HMLR in 2026. No document yet seen on the Wiki is an *independent* conveyance of the house parcel into the WGR/BP chain. If the first link is wrong, every later link inherits the error; none of them independently cures it. ?

The downstream title documents are now the priority. The 1938 conveyance and the 1939 tenancy/plan are already family-held. The 1939 plan has already been analysed and is established as Parcel B only; do not treat it as an open retrieval question. Check the 1938 instrument's exact scope and record custody/provenance, including whether it was available to the family or advisers during the 1986–87 litigation. Parallel downstream tests are the 1905 conveyance, 15 May 1924 agreement, 29 March 1961 deed, 31 December 1969 conveyance, 1971 abstract, 23 May 1975 conveyance plan, and 1982–83 first-registration/WA240304 records. The task is to establish how the north forest and south-east green of Parcel A became described, registered and transferred after the 1955 seizure.

2.3 3. New connections found in the Land Registry documents

3.1 WA240304 is the farmhouse title, and it was applied for in Mary's last weeks

DOCUMENTED FACT. The Court of Appeal recorded that "the actual conveyance of the farmhouse and garden" from BP Pension Trust to BP Properties was in May 1975. HMLR's history (23 March 2026) shows WA240304 was registered on the 23 May 1975 conveyance. WA240304 is therefore the farmhouse-and-garden title. Linklaters applied for it on **23 February 1983**. Mary died on **26 March 1983**. The WA240304 file holds a form D23 marked "inside exam" with a Linklaters letter of **8 April 1983**, and correspondence of **12 April 1983**: thirteen and seventeen days after her death (schedule, items 4, 5 and 7).

UNRESOLVED. What did HMLR ask, and what did Linklaters answer, about who was in occupation and whether

anyone claimed the land? Linklaters certified that they knew of “no question or doubt affecting the title”. Mary had pleaded ownership and the Limitation Act in court in 1974, and that plea was never withdrawn or decided. If BP’s solicitors knew of a live pleaded ownership claim and certified there was no doubt, that is a concrete, testable non-disclosure point. These WA240304 items can be ordered on form OC2 at £11 each: **4, 5, 7, 10 (the register as first made, which shows the class of title) and 11 (the form 1C application).** [?]

Discrepancy. WA240304 item 13 is described as a “Plan to conveyance dated 23 February 1975”; item 1 and every other record say 23 May 1975. It may be a typing slip, or a second instrument. Ask HMLR which.

3.2 The 1924 record and Mary’s 1928

DOCUMENTED FACT. HM Land Registry holds a record dated 15 May 1924 on the WA231076 first-registration file (item 2). The woodland register WA735527 (charges entry 2) describes it: it was made between **John, Marquis of Bute** and **James Pelham Stuart Corbett**, and “relates to the construction and maintenance of a drain”. It is recorded as an agreement, not a conveyance. **FAMILY EVIDENCE.** Mary recalls 1928 as the year the quarry machinery left and the last rent was paid ([statement](#)). **UNRESOLVED.** Whether the 1924 record and Mary’s 1928 are connected is unknown until the agreement and its plan are read. [?]

Why the 1924 record matters either way. The agreement burdens land now in the woodland title. Which part? If it affects the blue (1975, farmhouse-strand) land, then Bute was making agreements about land in Parcel A in 1924, which would be hard to reconcile with Bute having sold that land to Daniel Thomas in 1877. If it affects only the pink (Bute–WGR strand) land, it is neutral. The Corbetts were closely tied to the Bute estate in Cardiff (a J. S. Corbett also sits as magistrate in the 1891 Great House Farm theft report, [GHF-E090-N01](#)), so Corbett papers are a fresh place to look for estate dealings at Llandough. Order the 1924 agreement (WA231076 item 2) with its plan.

3.3 The woodland is two strands of title, not one

DOCUMENTED FACT. WA735527 contains land *tinted blue* (from the 1975 conveyance: the farmhouse strand) and land *tinted pink* (from the 1982 conveyance, subject to Bute’s 1905 deed with Cardiff Corporation and WGR’s 1961 deed: the Bute–WGR strand). The Wiki currently calls the woodland “Parcel A land”. On the register, only the blue part follows the farmhouse strand. Overlaying the WA735527 plan colours on the 1939 tenancy plan and the Williams-parcel plan would show exactly which woodland is Parcel A.

LEGAL INFERENCE / ISSUE FOR COUNSEL. This matters for the woodland goal. Limitation Act 1980 s.32(3) protects a later *purchaser for valuable consideration* who was not party to any fraud, and so does the priority rule for registered land (LRA 2002 s.29). The Forest of Cardiff says it “bought” the woodland in 1994. If in fact it received it as a gift or for a nominal sum under a planning obligation, those protections may not apply to it as they would to a buyer. The 10 November 1994 transfer and the price paid should be obtained.

3.4 The 1975 transfer followed straight after the licence letters

DOCUMENTED FACT (court record). The first 31 October 1974 letter, from BP Pension Trust, recorded an agreed sale to BP Properties, and the second, from BP Properties, offered the licence. BP Properties did not take a conveyance until May 1975. BP Pension Trust started the 1974 county court action; when Mary pleaded ownership, the action stalled. The licence was given by a company that, on that date, held only a contract to buy.

LEGAL INFERENCE / ISSUE FOR COUNSEL. Whether a contracting purchaser could give a licence that stopped time running against the vendor’s title was decided against the family in 1987. Its value now is as part of the sequence: an undecided ownership plea, a licence from a not-yet-owner, a transfer of the disputed land into a new group company, and then registration in 1983. Each step is lawful on its own; the question is what each party knew about the ownership plea at each step.

2.4 4. The 1949–1955 sequence and the missing papers

RECONSTRUCTION from [Mary’s statement](#), the 1987 judgment and the 1974 press:

- **1949** — Frederick’s new tenancy (never written). Mary refuses a tenancy of the farmhouse, asserting ownership. In April 1974 she told the Daily Telegraph that ownership had been “in dispute for 25 years”, which dates the dispute to 1949.
- **June 1950** — Mr Knapp, a Penarth estate agent, places a lodger at the farmhouse.
- **c. 1950–52** — the lodger later tells Mary he took the papers from the blanket box “including the agreement relating to the farm” and gave them to Knapp, at Knapp’s request.
- **1953** — last rent paid by Frederick, under a judgment for arrears.
- **1955** — WGR’s Order 14 judgment against Frederick alone.

- **1959 onwards** — Mary says documents prove her title; none can be produced.

FAMILY EVIDENCE / CONTENTION. The papers went missing in the gap between the dispute starting and the first possession proceedings. If the lodger's account is true, and if Knapp was connected to WGR, the Bute estate office or their agents, this is the factual core of any concealment case: the family were deprived of their title evidence before every hearing that followed. [?]

LEGAL INFERENCE. Taking documents of title to land was a felony under the Larceny Act 1916 (s.7), and receiving them knowingly was a separate offence. The Limitation Act 1939 (s.26) already postponed limitation where a right of action was concealed by fraud, so this was not a new idea in 1955.

What would corroborate it (all are searchable records):

- Who Knapp was: trade directories (Kelly's Glamorgan, 1940s–50s), newspaper advertisements, and whether he or his firm acted for WGR or the Bute estate.
- The lodger, Bruce Sutherland: his theft conviction c. 1951–52 in the Penarth petty sessions registers at Glamorgan Archives, and press reports in the British Newspaper Archive.
- Knapp's probate record, which shows whether his firm's papers survive and with whom.

2.5 5. The law at each stage, and what it means for the evidence

1877: the Thomas arrangement

LEGAL INFERENCE / ISSUE FOR COUNSEL. The law in 1877 creates three difficulties and one opening:

- A promise that "the freehold should belong to my grandfather" when quarrying ceased could not by itself pass the legal estate. That needed a deed (Real Property Act 1845, s.3). At most it gave a contractual or equitable right.
- A right to land arising on an uncertain future event with no time limit was vulnerable to the rule against perpetuities as against later owners (*London & South Western Railway v Gomm* (1882)).
- If the Bute estates were held under a settlement, a sale in 1877 needed a power in the settlement or a court order under the Settled Estates Acts. Either would leave a paper trail in the Bute estate records or the Chancery records.
- **The opening:** whatever the 1877 paper said, rent-free occupation of the house parcel from 1928 with no acknowledgment of any owner would, after 12 years (Real Property Limitation Act 1874; Limitation Act 1939 from 1940), have extinguished the Thomas family's title by about 1940. That does not depend on the 1877 document surviving.

The strongest point against the title case must be faced directly. The 1987 judgment recites that in 1916 the Marquis let "the whole of the farm" to John Williams, and the family's own correspondence accepts that the 1916 tenancy "embraced both areas". If Bute let the farmhouse in 1916, either Bute still owned it, which contradicts a freehold sale to Thomas in 1877, or the 1916 "whole farm" meant only Bute's part of the holding.

Tests that decide it:

- Locate and authenticate the lease to John Williams dated 6 November 1877 as reported in Mary (Nancy) Williams's account, if it survives. The matching Llandough instrument and plan have not been identified; the examined DBDT/79/1 is a different Cardiff lease (see [SC-20](#)).
- Bute X.6(12), the trustees' abstract of receipts and payments for 1877: a capital receipt from Daniel Thomas means a sale; rent means a quarry lease.
- The 1916 tenancy and its plan.

1926 onwards: notice through occupation

LEGAL INFERENCE. Under the doctrine of notice (*Hunt v Luck* [1902]), anyone acquiring the land was fixed with notice of the rights of the person in actual occupation. From 1926, Land Registration Act 1925 s.70(1)(g) made the rights of a person in actual occupation of registered land an overriding interest. Mary was in actual occupation when BP applied for first registration in 1982–83. Under that Act, a registered proprietor without title could hold the legal estate subject to the true owner's rights (*Malory Enterprises v Cheshire Homes* [2002] EWCA Civ 151). This is the legal reason the 1983 WA240304 file matters so much. **Caveat:** after 1987 the courts will treat BP's right to possession as decided, so this point only bites if the 1987 judgment is set aside.

1938–1955: what the 1939 plan does to the 1987 arithmetic

LEGAL INFERENCE / ISSUE FOR COUNSEL. The Court of Appeal started the 12-year clock on 2 February 1955, the end of Frederick's tenancy, because it treated the farmhouse as part of that tenancy. If WGR's own May 1939 tenancy plan shows only the fields, then:

- the house was outside any tenancy from 1939 at the latest;
- a tenant's estoppel from denying the landlord's title could not attach to the house after 1939;
- any adverse possession of the house against WGR would run from 1938–39, not 1955. That completes about 1951, before the 1955 order and long before 1962.

The landlord's counterpart of that tenancy would have passed from WGR to BP. Whether it was shown to the courts in 1955, 1962 or 1984–87 is a key question. Presenting the tenancy as one of "the whole farm" while holding a plan showing otherwise would be a misstatement of fact, not merely of law.

1969–1983: conveyances, planning and registration

DOCUMENTED FACT / UNRESOLVED. ?

- BP Pension Trust obtained planning permission for about 13 houses in 1972 (3/8996/3337) while Mary occupied the house and disputed ownership. Planning applications then needed an ownership certificate naming every owner (Town and Country Planning Act 1962 s.16, then 1971 s.27). A knowingly false certificate was an offence. The 1972 file and its certificate should be obtained.
- Part of the site was registered as village green VG41 on 16 June 1970 under the Commons Registration Act 1965. That Act had a separate ownership section. Where no owner was proved, the Commons Commissioner could vest the land in the local authority. Who claimed ownership of VG41, and what evidence they gave, is independent evidence of who could prove title to that land around 1970–80.
- If the area was then subject to compulsory registration, LRA 1925 s.123 required registration within two months of a conveyance on sale, failing which the conveyance became void as to the legal estate. Check the compulsory-registration date for the Penarth / Llandough area against the 1969 and 1975 conveyances.
- **Fair caveat:** HMLR normally returned original deeds and abstracts to applicants after first registration. The absence of the 1969 conveyance and the 1971 abstract from the file is *not by itself* evidence of concealment. The question is what those documents said, and BP or Linklaters, or their successors, are the likely holders.

2.6 6. What "reopening" actually requires

LEGAL INFERENCE / ISSUE FOR COUNSEL. The Limitation Act clause and the reopening route are related but different:

- **Setting aside the 1987 judgment for fraud.** A fresh action can set aside a judgment obtained by fraud. The Supreme Court held in *Takhar v Gracefield Developments* [2019] UKSC 13 that the claimant need not show the fraud could not have been found earlier with reasonable diligence. The claimant must prove conscious and deliberate dishonesty that was material to the judgment (*Royal Bank of Scotland v Highland Financial Partners* [2013] EWCA Civ 328). Because title was conceded rather than argued in 1984–87, the fraud has to be one that *caused* the concession or the court's premises. The strongest candidates are:
 - the taking of the title papers (section 4);
 - misdescription of the extent of the 1939 and 1949 tenancies (section 5);
 - non-disclosure of the pleaded ownership claim on first registration (section 3.1).
- **Limitation Act 1980 s.32.** This postpones limitation for claims based on fraud, or where a relevant fact was deliberately concealed, until discovery. It applies to damages and accounting claims against those involved, such as BP or its successors. It does *not* allow recovery of property from a later purchaser for value who was not party to the fraud (s.32(3)). That is why recovering the houses themselves is unrealistic, and why the family's stated aim of reparations rather than possession for the housing is the legally coherent one.
- **HM Land Registry indemnity.** Under LRA 2002 Sch 8 para 8, time runs from when the claimant knew, or but for their own default might have known, of the claim. The April 1983 correspondence was first identified in July 2026, which is relevant to that question.
- **Live deadline.** The Independent Complaints Reviewer must receive a complaint within six months of HMLR's 25 May 2026 decision, so by about **25 November 2026**. The three-month judicial review window from that decision

has already passed.

2.7 7. The public narrative versus the court record

DOCUMENTED FACT (press) against DOCUMENTED FACT (court record).

- The South Wales Echo (29 April 1988) reported that Mary “fought and lost three previous High Court cases claiming she was the rightful owner”. The court record shows no case in which her ownership was decided: 1955 was against Frederick alone, 1962 was in the county court, and 1974 was adjourned.
- A BP spokesman said in April 1988 that Mr Buckler “lost the court hearing in Cardiff and did not appeal”, but he had appealed to the Court of Appeal and sought leave from the House of Lords.
- The same spokesman said Mary was allowed to live there rent-free “because of her ill health”. The 1974 letters followed directly on an undecided ownership plea and a revived possession order (N07, N15).

These are not court findings. They show how “ownership was decided” entered public belief without any court having decided it.

2.8 8. Public bodies: concerns to put on record

- **HM Land Registry (UNRESOLVED).** Its 2026 decisions rely on the 1987 judgment, which post-dates the registration, rather than on the 1983 file. A support agent’s statement that the title was “closed in 2005” conflicts with HMLR’s own history. Requests for physical inspection and for preservation remain unanswered in substance (2026 chronology).[?]
- **Cadw / Welsh Office, December 1988 (DOCUMENTED FACT against later DOCUMENTED FACT).** Cadw said the land was not of sufficient archaeological interest. Before 1988 the site was publicly identified with the early monastery of St Dochdwy (William Rees, N04) and the area had been excavated in 1977–80 (N05). In 1994 the site yielded 1,026 early-medieval burials. That decision did not decide title, but it bears on heritage remedy and on whether the evidence then available was properly weighed. The 1983 fire at GGAT’s Swansea store destroyed the Llandough Roman villa finds (N06), part of the separate Heneb/GGAT complaint.
- **Glamorgan County Council, 1972, and Vale of Glamorgan (UNRESOLVED).** The ownership certificate on the 1972 permission, and the council’s acquisition and record of VG41.[?]

2.9 9. The ten documents that would settle most of this

1. The 1938 Bute→WGR conveyance and plan (**held by the family**): upload a full scan.
2. The 1939 WGR tenancy, full text and plan (**seen by the family**; plan on the Wiki): upload the agreement text.
3. WA240304 file items 4, 5, 7, 10 and 11: the April 1983 Linklaters/HMLR correspondence and the class of title granted (OC2, about £55).
4. The 23 May 1975 conveyance and plan (WA240304 items 1 and 12), and the “23 February 1975” plan (item 13).
5. The 15 May 1924 Bute–Corbett agreement and its plan (WA231076 item 2).
6. Locate/authenticate the reported 6 November 1877 Llandough lease, if it survives, and examine Bute X.6(12), the 1877 trustees’ receipts. The known DBDT/79/1 lease is a different Cardiff property, and the Bute–Thomas deed is also unlocated (SC-20; SC-23).
7. The 1916 tenancy and plan.
8. The 31 December 1969 conveyance and the 1971 abstract: ask BP Properties, Linklaters and the BP Archive at Warwick.
9. Penarth petty sessions and press records for Bruce Sutherland (c. 1951–52), and directory and probate records for Mr Knapp.
10. The 1972 planning file (3/8996/3337) with its ownership certificate, and the Commons Registration file for VG41.

2.10 10. What would weaken the family’s case

- For balance (see also [Constructive Criticism & Counterarguments](#)), the following would count against the family:
- a 1916 tenancy plan that includes the farmhouse;
 - a 1938 conveyance that includes it;
 - an 1877 Bute record showing a quarry lease rather than a freehold sale;
 - evidence that the family had the 1939 tenancy at the time of the 1984–87 proceedings and chose not to use it, which would make a fraud case very hard because fraud must be what caused the outcome.

Each of these is a reason to obtain the documents, not to avoid them.

Related: [Working theory: fraud, concealment and limitation](#) · [The Two Parcels](#) · [Land Registry Titles](#) · [Missing Records Register](#) · [Anomalies Register](#) · [Master Timeline](#) [?]

2.11 October 2026 correction — from parcel theory to the actual loss event

Correction: the 1939 WGR/John Williams agreement and plan have already been obtained and establish the agricultural tenancy as Parcel B only. They are no longer a “decisive document to obtain”. D696 rental books are background corroboration only unless they contain a direct Parcel-A/woodland/VG41 reference.

The cross-reading now concentrates on the **4 July 1955 physical taking of Parcel-A woodland and land now comprising VG41**. That event must be tested against the judicial order, writ/warrant, return of execution, physical evidence and WGR’s underlying right to the exact land.

A major legal caution is now explicit: the 1955 taking could be both the evidence of a wrongful/excess possession event and the start of the historic limitation clock. The case therefore requires a separate limitation analysis rather than assuming that a wrong in 1955 automatically leaves a recoverable present title.

The 1970 VG41 registration is elevated because the Vale Council states that its statutory registers contain claims to ownership. The original VG41 file could therefore identify the post-1955 claimant/source of ownership and the exact land registered.

Current action entry point: [1955 Parcel-A Loss Dossier — Woodland + VG41 Green](#).

For the wider Cedwyn Estate working hypothesis, see [Cedwyn Estate Working Theory](#). This page is not, by itself, proof of that hypothesis.

2.12 Page version & change log

Current version: 0.1.1

Version	Date (UTC)	Editor (human or agent name)	Change	Source / evidence
0.1.1	2026-10-18T15:24Z	Sion’s Tab agent	Footer standardised; earlier log rows carried into this table; no content change	Editing Protocol, 18 Oct 2026
0.1.0	2026-10-18T14:27:00+01:00	OpenAI-assisted maintenance agent (GPT-6)	Installed footer log; tracking begins at 0.1.0 and does not reconstruct older revisions. CURRENT VERSION: 0.1.0.	Saved through Word-Press API; public rendering not individually checked.

Agents and editors: follow the [Editing Protocol](#).