

Legal Review — Fraud, Land and Human Rights

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	Later legal review update — 16 October 2026.	1
2.2	The three reviewers' shared view.	2
2.3	8 October 2026 — Reframed reopening and reparations analysis	14
2.4	8 October 2026 — Litigation activation	15
2.5	9 October 2026 — legal question sharpened to the actual loss	15
2.6	Research lead: 1974 survey, Suggett note and the 1988–89 Strasbourg proceedings.	15
2.7	Page version & change log	15

Page 1383 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 1383 (last modified 2026-10-21 19:34:51 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/legal-review-fraud-land-human-rights>.

Page ID: 1383 · **Title:** Legal Review — Fraud, Land and Human Rights · **Evidence status:** Not yet labelled — see the Editing Protocol · **Version:** 1.0.0 · [Editing Protocol](#)

2.1 Later legal review update — 16 October 2026

The full published 1987 Court of Appeal judgment has now been used to tighten two lines of analysis. First, Dillon LJ's statement that Mary's valid title, if established, would have overridden BP's registration is a conditional proposition, not a finding of Mary's ownership and not, on its own, a basis for reopening the judgment. Second, the indemnity limitation analysis must reflect the Land Registration Act 1997, section 2: it removed the 1925 Act's special six-year-from-registration proviso and adopted a knowledge-based accrual rule, as does the current 2002 Act Schedule

8 paragraph 8. Neither point establishes a live remedy without proof of title/registration error, loss, causation, knowledge and the applicable legal regime.

The 1987 report names Loosemores (through Robbins Olivey & Blake Laphorn) on the appellant side and Linklaters & Paines on BP Properties' respondent side. These names provide specific records-tracing targets, not findings of professional misconduct. Masons/Pinsent Masons remains unconfirmed as a separate possible BP file lead. See the [fresh reassessment addendum](#), [GHF-E141](#) and the [solicitors' file preservation and voluntary disclosure track](#).

About this page. This review works through the whole Great House Farm record as three specialist lawyers would: one in fraud, one in land and one in human rights. It sets out the family's routes to reopening the case, every failure of process the family has identified, and the evidence each route still needs. It was prepared for the family by an AI research assistant on 6 October 2026. It has not been written or checked by a solicitor or barrister and is not legal advice. It is the family's brief for qualified counsel. Every point carries one of the Wiki's five truth statuses ([operating rules](#)).

Sources reviewed for this page. [Cadw — Forensic Critique v8.0.0 \(full text\)](#) · [GGAT — Forensic Review and Evidence Schedule v4.0.3 \(full text\)](#) · [Case Analysis — Connections, Patterns and Questions](#) · [Land Registry Titles and the three register PDFs](#) · [Mary \(Nancy\) Williams's statement](#) · [BP Properties Ltd v Buckler](#) · [1974 letters](#) · [Archaeology and Heritage](#), including the Museum's 5 October 2026 Church Farm records · the [press record](#) · the [Master Scrutiny Issue Register](#) (A-001 to A-073, PL-001 to PL-015).

2.2 The three reviewers' shared view

1. **RECONSTRUCTION — corrected parcel scope.** The surviving judgment summaries report findings on limitation and the 1974 licence, but they should not be paraphrased as proof that the whole 1877/1928 Parcel-A title and every part of its physical extent were exhaustively adjudicated. The family's established title case is that Parcel A included the farmhouse/buildings, barns, stable and yard west of the house, garden, forest north of the house and the ground south-east of the house/garden later registered as VG41. [SOURCE PENDING] On 4 July 1955 WGR seized the forest and green along with Parcel B under wording that described the "whole farm". "House and garden" describes the occupied area Mary physically defended, not the limit of the full Parcel-A title she claimed. Mary's c.1974 ownership statement, the 1928 rent/quarry chronology, the failed 1949 permissive-characterisation attempt and the 1950–52 report that the title deed was missing must be read together. The precise issues decided by the 1962 and 1984–87 proceedings must still be stated from the pleadings and judgments, not reduced to the shorthand "ownership was never tried". ?
2. **LEGAL INFERENCE / ISSUE FOR COUNSEL.** Do not state categorically that title was never argued, nor assume the whole Parcel-A boundary was decided. Mary asserted ownership before the 1984 writ; the surviving 1986–87 judicial summaries are understood to focus on limitation and the 1974 licence. The family's case is that those findings were applied to a conflated "whole farm" description that masked the distinction between Parcel A and Parcel B and the earlier seizure of Parcel-A forest and green. Reconstruct the issues, evidence and findings from the complete surviving judgments and pleadings, while preserving the distinction between the underlying 1928 title case and later limitation findings.
3. **PARCEL / LIMITATION DISTINCTION.** The 1987 appeal's adverse-possession analysis from February 1955 concerned the farmhouse and garden that Mary continued to occupy; under the wiki's parcel reconstruction that occupied group is within Parcel A. [SOURCE PENDING] Execution of the "whole farm" order took Parcel B plus Parcel-A forest and green, leaving the house/garden occupied. Do not state that all post-1955 possession related only to Parcel B. Test separately whether the 1955 order lawfully covered each part, whether the earlier 1928–1940 limitation alternative had already matured, and what legal effect the 1962 order had.
4. **LEGAL INFERENCE.** The failures documented in the two forensic reports are real. They support the complaints now under investigation and the correction of the heritage record, independently of the title claim. The reports are aimed at what Cadw and GGAT did and failed to do (Cadw report Part XIX; GGAT report Part VIII.3), while the title case is aimed at the private title chain.
5. **LEGAL INFERENCE.** The family seeks reparations, not possession, for the houses, which matches the law: homeowners who bought in good faith are protected, so the remedy lies against those responsible. The family's other aims are recovery of documents and objects, correction of records, indemnity from HM Land Registry, reparations from the bodies involved, and possession of the woodland and the green, where the route depends on how each was transferred.

1. Fraud lawyer's review

2.2.1 1.1 The law the evidence has to meet

- **Civil fraud.** Deceit, or setting aside a judgment for fraud, requires proof of conscious dishonesty, judged by the ordinary standards of honest people (*Ivey v Genting Casinos* [2017] UKSC 67). Negligence, muddle, lost files and changing explanations are not fraud.
- **Setting aside the 1987 judgment.** A fresh action may set aside a judgment obtained by fraud. The fraud must be material: it must have been an operative cause of the decision (*Royal Bank of Scotland v Highland Financial Partners* [2013] EWCA Civ 328). The claimant need not show it could not have been discovered earlier (*Takhar v Gracefield Developments* [2019] UKSC 13).
- **Limitation Act 1980, s.32.** Time is postponed where the action is based on fraud, or a fact relevant to the right of action has been deliberately concealed. Concealment means a decision to withhold something the defendant knew of; no pre-existing duty to disclose is needed (*Canada Square Operations v Potter* [2023] UKSC 41). Section 32(3) protects a later purchaser for value who was not party to the fraud.
- **Criminal law at the time** (context only; this Wiki brings no prosecutions). Larceny of documents of title to land was an offence under the Larceny Act 1916 (s.7). Fraudulently concealing a document or fact material to title in Land Registry proceedings was an offence under the Land Registration Act 1925 (s.115; the text should be checked). From 1 January 1969, the Theft Act 1968 made knowingly retaining stolen goods for another's benefit a form of handling (s.22).

2.2.2 1.2 The candidate concerns, strongest first

#	Concern	What would prove dishonesty	What the other side will say	Status
F1	The 1950–52 papers. The lodger placed by Mr Knapp, a Penarth estate agent, told Mary he took the papers from the blanket box, “including the agreement relating to the farm”, and gave them to Knapp at his request. Mary’s ownership dispute began c.1949 (“in dispute for 25 years”, Daily Telegraph, April 1974). WGR’s first possession action followed in 1955 (statement).	Evidence that Knapp acted for WGR, the Bute estate office or their solicitors, and that the papers reached them. The lodger’s conviction record (c.1951–52, Penarth petty sessions) would corroborate his presence and character.	Second-hand, from a man Mary describes as of bad character. Mary told no one at the time. No document links Knapp to WGR. ?	TESTIMONY · Mary (Nancy) Williams (c.1974 statement, Mary (Nancy) Williams testimony) / UNRESOLVED ?
F2	The extent of the tenancies. The Court of Appeal started the limitation clock in 1955 because it treated the farmhouse as part of Frederick’s tenancy. WGR’s own May 1939 tenancy plan shows only the eastern fields [EV-0023] (1938–39).	Evidence that WGR or BP held the 1939 counterpart and plan, and described the tenancy to a court as one of “the whole of the farm” while knowing the plan excluded the house.	The 1987 judgment records the 1916 tenancy as of “the whole of the farm”, and the family’s own correspondence accepts that the 1916 tenancy embraced both areas. If the 1949 tenancy reverted to the 1916 extent, the description may be honest.	UNRESOLVED ?

F3	The 1983 registration certificate. Linklaters applied for WA240304, the farmhouse title, on 23 February 1983 and certified that they knew of no question or doubt affecting title. Mary's 1974 plea of ownership had never been decided. File correspondence is dated 8 and 12 April 1983, after her death on 26 March (file schedule).	The April 1983 letters and form D23 showing what HMLR asked about occupation or adverse claims, and what was answered.	A solicitor may honestly have regarded a licence (1974) and an unenforced possession order (1962) as disposing of the doubt. Mary's title claim was recited to the Court of Appeal in 1987, so it was not hidden from that court.	UNRESOLVED — documents orderable now ?
F4	The 1974 sequence. BP Pension Trust sued Mary. She pleaded ownership on 3 July 1974. The action stalled, and BP revived the 1962 order instead. The licence letters of 31 October 1974 followed, one written by BP Properties, which then held only a contract to buy (conveyance May 1975).	Internal BP or Linklaters papers showing a decision to avoid a trial of title because it would fail.	Choosing a cheaper or quicker procedure is normal litigation conduct. The Court of Appeal upheld the licence route.	LEGAL INFERENCE
F5	Public statements. In April 1988 BP said Mr Buckler had "lost the court hearing in Cardiff and did not appeal"; he had appealed to the Court of Appeal and sought leave from the House of Lords. The press reported that Mary had "lost three previous High Court cases claiming she was the rightful owner"; no court decided her ownership (N07 , N15).	Not a fraud route on its own; it shows how "ownership was decided" entered public belief.	Press summaries are often loose; the spokesman may have meant the county court stage.	DOCUMENTED FACT (press)
F6	A pattern of losses around proceedings. See 1.3.	Evidence connecting any two losses to the same person or body.	Old records are lost for ordinary reasons; the Wiki's absence-of-record rule applies.	RECONSTRUCTION

2.2.3 1.3 When records went missing, set against the proceedings

When	Record lost or absent	What was happening at the time	Source
c.1950–52	Family papers from the blanket box, including the Thomas agreement and probably the 1928 receipt	Ownership disputed from c.1949; Frederick's arrears; WGR's first possession action (1955)	Mary's statement
Unknown ?	Mary's "previous statement" on the 1955 and 1962 applications	Referred to in her c.1974 statement	Statement p.3
Not on file	The 31 Dec 1969 WGR→BP conveyance (root of title) and a free-standing 1971 abstract	Recited on the 1982–83 first registrations	HMLR schedule , 30 July 2026

1984	Cardiff Library copy of the Bute-Thomas deed and its index card (SOURCE PENDING)	BP's writ for possession, 22 May 1984	1877 Agreement
"Since 1986 /87"	RCAHMW correspondence between C. N. Johns and Mrs Buckler	High Court trial (10 July 1986) and Court of Appeal (July 1987)	NMR 6048945, quoted by RCAHMW 10 June 2026
1988 onwards (c.1991?)	Cadw's whole listing file except two photographs; no destruction or transfer record	Spot-listing refusal 5 Dec 1988; demolition 6 Dec 1988	Cadw report, Parts VIII and X
1990 onwards	Appendices B-E to the 1989 planning officer's report	Outline permission, 13 March 1990	A-048, PL-004, PL-005
1992 onwards	Page 2 of GGAT's letter of 27 July 1992	Reserved matters approved 38 days later	GGAT report, Test 9

RECONSTRUCTION / UNRESOLVED. Three of these losses fall immediately before, or during, a set of proceedings: c.1950–52 (before 1955), 1984 (the writ) and 1986/87 (trial and appeal). Each time, records that could have helped the family disappeared just when they were needed. The family is asking the bodies concerned to explain how. The Johns–Buckler correspondence is the most important to pursue, because it may have recorded Mary's own account of her title to an independent public body. Ask RCAHMW whether a file-movement record, loan slip or administrative note for 1986/87 survives. [?]

2.2.4 1.4 A route the register has not yet used: stolen documents never time-bar

LEGAL INFERENCE / ISSUE FOR COUNSEL. Under the Limitation Act 1980, title to goods is normally extinguished six years after a conversion (s.3). That does not apply to theft: no limitation period runs in respect of a stolen chattel, except against a later purchaser in good faith (s.4). If the 1950–52 papers were stolen, the family's ownership of those papers survives. A written request can therefore be sent to BP Properties and BP p.l.c. (including the BP Archive), Linklaters, any successor of Western Ground Rents, and any successor of Mr Knapp's firm. It should ask whether their legacy files contain the Williams family's 1877 agreement, rent receipts or other papers, and request their return. The same reasoning applies to any household contents taken in December 1988 that were stolen rather than lawfully removed.

2.2.5 1.5 What the fraud case still needs

- **Proof of who removed or withheld the papers, and when.** The forensic reports on Cadw and GGAT complain of failures of process, not dishonesty. The fraud case is aimed at the private title chain: Western Ground Rents, BP and their advisers.
- **A link from each missing record to a person or body.** Each gap in the record has to be tied to whoever held the document when it went missing. [?]
- **Evidence of a decision behind the government's shareholding in BP.** The shareholding (A-065) is recorded as a line of enquiry. On its own it does not show that the government was involved. [?]

2. Land lawyer's review

2.2.6 2.1 What the 1987 judgment binds

- **DOCUMENTED FACT (court record).** The appeal was "limited to the farmhouse itself and its garden". The court recited that BP "have the paper title to the farm, and indeed since November 1982 they have been the registered proprietors". It found Frederick and Mary jointly in adverse possession from February 1955, but held that title was not extinguished, because of the 1962 order and the 1974 licence.
- **LEGAL INFERENCE.** A judgment binds the parties and those claiming through them, which includes Mary's estate. Points that were not raised but could have been may be barred as an abuse of process (*Henderson v Henderson*; *Johnson v Gore Wood* [2002] 2 AC 1). The recognised exception is special circumstances, typically new material that could not have been produced with reasonable diligence (*Arnold v National Westminster Bank* [1991] 2 AC 93). That is the gateway for any title claim. It explains why the theft of the papers (F1), the 1939 plan (F2) and the 1983 file (F3) are the decisive evidence.
- **What the family must record now.** The new-evidence route depends on showing when and how the family obtained each document, such as the 1939 tenancy and the 1938 conveyance, and that it was not available to the family's lawyers in 1984–87. That history should be written down now while memories are fresh. [?]

2.2.7 2.2 The title chain, period by period

Period	Law then in force	What it means for the evidence	Status
1877	Real Property Act 1845 (a deed is needed to pass the legal estate); rule against perpetuities (<i>London & South Western Railway v Gomm</i> , 1882); Settled Estates Acts	A promise that the freehold “should belong to my grandfather” when quarrying ceased gave at most a contractual or equitable right. If it had no time limit it may have been void against later owners. A Bute sale under a settlement leaves a trail in the estate or Chancery records: check the Bute X.6(12) 1877 receipts for a capital sum from Daniel Thomas.	LEGAL INFERENCE
1928–1940	Real Property Limitation Act 1874 (12 years); Limitation Act 1939 from 1940	ALTERNATIVE LIMITATION CASE, NOT AN ESTABLISHED RESULT. The 12-year recovery-of-land period already existed under s.1 of the Real Property Limitation Act 1874 ; it did not first arise in 1940. If the right to recover Parcel A accrued when possession became adverse by about 1928, and all legal requirements remained satisfied, the former owner’s right of action could have been barred by about 1940. If adverse possession began only in 1940, the 12 years would reach about 1952. Non-payment of rent alone does not prove adverse possession. Identify the correct owner and parcel, factual possession, intention to possess, any tenancy/permission or acknowledgement, disability and relevant proceedings. The 1939 plan and tenancy evidence are central to the scope issue.	LEGAL INFERENCE
1938–39	Unregistered conveyancing	Bute could convey to WGR only what it still owned. The 1938 conveyance plan and the 1939 tenancy plan decide whether WGR ever had the house.	UNRESOLVED — family holds both; upload the scans ?
1955–1974	Limitation Act 1939, ss.4, 10 and 13; <i>St Marylebone Property v Fairweather</i> [1963] AC 510	The court held that the 1962 judgment kept title alive for 12 years and that the 1974 letters made possession permissive. If the house was outside any tenancy from 1939, adverse possession against WGR ran from 1938–39 and completed in about 1951, before the 1955 order. That would undercut the judgment’s premise.	LEGAL INFERENCE / ISSUE FOR COUNSEL

1970	Commons Registration Act 1965	Part of the site was registered as village green VG41 on 16 June 1970. Commons registers had a separate ownership section. Where no owner was proved, the Commons Commissioner could vest the land in the local authority (s.8). The VG41 ownership file shows who claimed to own that land around 1970–80, and on what evidence. It is independent of BP.	UNRESOLVED — request the VG41 register and Commissioner's file?
1982–83	Land Registration Act 1925, s.70(1)(g) (rights of a person in actual occupation override); s.115	Mary was in actual occupation when WA240304 was applied for. If she had a proprietary right, it bound BP on registration (compare <i>Malory Enterprises v Cheshire Homes</i> [2002] EWCA Civ 151). The 1987 judgment now stands in the way of that argument unless it is set aside.	LEGAL INFERENCE
Today	Land Registration Act 2002, Sch 4 (alteration and rectification) and Sch 8 (indemnity)	The register cannot be rectified against a proprietor in possession without consent, unless that proprietor caused the mistake by fraud or lack of proper care, or it would be unjust not to (Sch 4 paras 3 and 6). That protects the homeowners. Land still registered to Persimmon (WA231076, including estate land) and the woodland are different. An indemnity claim is time-barred six years after the claimant knew, or but for their own default might have known, of the claim (Sch 8 para 8). HMLR will argue that runs from the 1980s; the family will rely on what the 2026 file disclosures revealed.	LEGAL INFERENCE / ISSUE FOR COUNSEL

2.2.8 2.3 Land points arising from the two forensic reports

- **The woodland is two strands.** WA735527 contains land tinted blue, which came through the 1975 farmhouse conveyance, and land tinted pink, which came through the 1982 conveyance. Only the blue part follows the farmhouse strand. Whether the Forest of Cardiff paid value in 1994 affects whether it has a purchaser's protection (s.32(3); LRA 2002 s.29). **UNRESOLVED.**?
- **Ownership of finds.** Objects found in or under land belong to the landowner, not the finder (*Waverley Borough Council v Fletcher* [1996] QB 334). The 1994 cemetery assemblage was donated to the Museum by Ideal Homes Wales as landowner (accession 95.56H). Human remains are generally not property in law. If title to Parcel A were ever established, ownership of non-human finds from Parcel A ground would follow it. This is a point for the artefacts project, and it needs the parcel overlay first (GGAT report Part IV.4). **LEGAL INFERENCE.**
- **Church Farm, 1858.** The Museum's 1931 letter says a spur and spearhead were found at "Llandough Church Farm" about 1858, with about six skeletons reburied south of the church ([Archaeology](#)). Where Church Farm stood, and whether it was ever part of the Great House holding, is now a title-mapping question as well as an archaeological one. **UNRESOLVED.**?
- **The development plan said retain.** The East Vale Local Plan (February 1987) said the buildings on the site should be retained. The Council had power to serve a building preservation notice (Town and Country Planning Act

1971, s.58). No notice was served. That does not affect title, but it is part of the reparations case against the Council as a body still in existence (Cadw report Part IX). **DOCUMENTED FACT / UNRESOLVED.** [?]

3. Human-rights lawyer's review

2.2.9 3.1 What Strasbourg already decided

DOCUMENTED FACT. William Buckler applied to the European Commission of Human Rights on 3 May 1988 (No. 14464/88), complaining under Articles 6, 8, 13 and Article 1 of Protocol 1. BP took possession and demolished the house while the application was pending. On 14 April 1989 the Commission declared it inadmissible: the fair-trial complaint was unsubstantiated, the loss of the home was lawful and justified, and he had no “possession” because the courts had held the property belonged to another (*BP v Buckler*).

LEGAL INFERENCE. A second application on the same facts would be rejected as substantially the same unless it contains relevant new information (Article 35(2)(b)). It would also be far outside the time limit, which is now four months from the final domestic decision. Rule 80 revision applies to judgments of the Court, not to a Commission inadmissibility decision. Strasbourg is therefore not a realistic route for the 1955–1988 events unless a new domestic decision is first obtained.

2.2.10 3.2 The Human Rights Act 1998 does not reach back

LEGAL INFERENCE. The Act came into force on 2 October 2000 and is not retrospective: acts before that date cannot found a claim under it (*In re McKerr* [2004] UKHL 12). The 1955–1988 proceedings, the demolition and the 1990–94 planning decisions are outside it. [?]

2.2.11 3.3 Where human rights law may still bite: what public bodies do now

Right	Present-day conduct it could reach	Strength
Article 8 (private and family life), access to records	Records about one's own family history and loss of home can engage Article 8 where the person has a vital interest in them and the authority holds them (<i>Gaskin v United Kingdom</i> (1989)). This applies to how Cadw, the Welsh Ministers (the historic environment record), HMLR (the 1983 file and the unanswered physical-inspection request) and the Council handle the family's requests in 2026.	Moderate — a procedural right of access, not a right to a particular outcome
Article 10 (receiving information)	A right of access can arise where information is instrumental to a public-watchdog role (<i>Magyar Helsinki Bizottság v Hungary</i> , Grand Chamber 2016). The family runs a public archive and campaign; that may qualify, but it is untested.	Weak to moderate
Article 1 of Protocol 1 (property)	Needs an existing “possession”, or a claim with a sufficient basis in domestic law (<i>Kopecký v Slovakia</i> , Grand Chamber 2004). Until a domestic court or HMLR recognises a title or indemnity claim, there is none.	Weak at present; revives if a domestic claim succeeds
Article 6 (fair hearing)	Applies to determination of civil rights, such as an HMLR indemnity claim. Statutory routes to a tribunal or court exist, so a breach is unlikely unless access to them is blocked.	Weak
Environmental Information Regulations 2004 (not a Convention right, but the main access tool)	Historic environment records about built structures and cultural sites can be environmental information (reg 2(1)). Whether Heneb is a public authority under reg 2(2), or holds the record on behalf of the Welsh Ministers (reg 3(2)), is the open question both forensic reports put. The Information Commissioner is the route.	Moderate

2.2.12 3.4 Fairness concerns to record, even though no claim lies

- **DOCUMENTED FACT.** The house was demolished overnight on 5–6 December 1988, within hours of the injunction being refused and the spot-listing being declined, and while a Strasbourg application was pending.
- **DOCUMENTED FACT (court and press record).** The 1955 order was obtained by summary judgment against Frederick alone, although Mary, who was claiming title, lived in the house. She was not a party.
- **DOCUMENTED FACT.** The occupiers were not consulted on listing. Cadw's report accepts this was not then a statutory duty (Cadw report VI.5).

- **DOCUMENTED FACT (press).** In 1974 BP said it allowed Mary to stay rent-free “because of her ill health” (she was a widow and an amputee in a wheelchair). The Court of Appeal held that the letters made her possession permissive although she never accepted them.

4. Every criticism of the case and of due process, in one place

This consolidates the criticisms recorded across the Wiki and the two forensic reports, together with the objections the family will meet and its answers (4.7). The “See” column points to the fuller entry: A- and PL- numbers are [Master Register](#) issues; Roman numerals and Q numbers refer to Parts and Questions of the Cadw report; T numbers are the GGAT report’s eleven tests. Status labels are the Wiki’s.

2.2.13 4.1 Courts and proceedings

Criticism	Status	See
The full 1877/1928 root-title claim may not have been determined as a distinct parcel-by-parcel issue; the pleadings and judgments must establish exactly what was argued and decided. Avoid the absolute assertion that ownership was “never tried” until the record proves it.	RECONSTRUCTION / RECORD REQUIRED	A-018; A-074; Case Analysis §1
The 1955 order was summary judgment against Frederick alone, for “the whole of the farm”, but was enforced on everything except the farmhouse and garden.	DOCUMENTED FACT	A-015
The land covered by the 1962 order, and what Mary pleaded, are unknown; her “previous statement” is missing. [?]	UNRESOLVED [?]	A-014, A-057
Mary’s 3 July 1974 plea of ownership was never decided: the action was adjourned and not relisted.	DOCUMENTED FACT	A-017; 1974 letters
The licence came partly from BP Properties, which held only a contract to buy until May 1975.	DOCUMENTED FACT	Case Analysis §3.4
The appeal’s recorded adverse-possession calculation starts from 1953/1955 and relies on the enforceable 1962 order, but the family’s alternative case is that Parcel-A adverse possession may have accrued by 1928 and completed a 12-year period by about 1940. The published 1987 reasons do not expressly decide that earlier limitation theory as a stand-alone date calculation. Test the parcel, accrual date, tenancy scope and independent legal effect/preclusive consequences of the 1962 order.	UNRESOLVED — LEGAL ANALYSIS REQUIRED	§2.2 above; A-014, A-015, A-032, A-074
The 1987 court recorded that Mary’s title documents were “never produced”, without knowing why. Mary (Nancy) Williams said they were taken in 1950–52 (witness statement c.1974, Mary (Nancy) Williams testimony).	TESTIMONY · Mary (Nancy) Williams	F1; A-058
Alternative limitation from 1928: if the 12-year period completed by about 1940, did the 1955 or 1962 possession proceedings lawfully defeat, bind or preclude the family’s earlier title case? The 1962 claim was against Frederick and Mary for the farmhouse/garden, but its actual pleadings, land plan and issues decided are not yet reconstructed.	UNRESOLVED — LEGAL ISSUE	A-014, A-015, A-074; GHF-E127, E130
1954 tenant-making attempt: is there a separate primary source, and was it before the trial judge or Court of Appeal? The accessible published appellate report does not mention 1954; it does mention the 10 October 1952 agents’ letter and nevertheless recognises Frederick’s periodic tenancy.	FAMILY CHRONOLOGY / SOURCE PENDING	A-075; GHF-E182; [1987] EWCA Civ 2
Title was never argued in 1984–87. Mary’s ownership claim was set aside and the defence was narrowed to adverse possession, leaving the ownership of the house parcel untried.	RECONSTRUCTION	§2.1; A-076
The demolition was carried out while the Strasbourg application was pending, and within hours of the injunction refusal.	DOCUMENTED FACT	§3.4
Police search and removal of documents in 1988, with no inventory traced.	SOURCE PENDING	A-034
Public statements in 1988 misdescribed the court history (“did not appeal”; “lost three High Court cases”).	DOCUMENTED FACT (press)	F5

2.2.14 4.2 HM Land Registry

Criticism	Status	See
The farmhouse title WA240304 was applied for a month before Mary died, while her ownership plea was undecided, on a “no question or doubt” certificate.	DOCUMENTED FACT / UNRESOLVED ?	F3; A-010, A-011
The April 1983 file correspondence (after Mary’s death) has not been obtained.	UNRESOLVED ?	Land Registry Titles, GHF-E026-27
The 1969 root deed and the 1971 abstract are not on the file.	DOCUMENTED FACT	A-072
The titles were amalgamated on 2 February 1987, while the appeal was live.	DOCUMENTED FACT	A-026
The 2026 complaint decisions rely on the 1987 judgment, which post-dates registration, rather than on the 1983 file.	DOCUMENTED FACT	Land Registry Titles, 2026
The physical-inspection and preservation requests of 3 June 2026 are unanswered in substance; a support agent said the title was “closed in 2005”.	DOCUMENTED FACT	A-071
WA240304 item 13 is dated “23 February 1975”; every other record says 23 May 1975.	UNRESOLVED ?	Case Analysis §3.1
The 1924 Bute–Corbett drain agreement is on the file; its plan, and which land it burdens, are unknown. ?	UNRESOLVED ?	Case Analysis §3.2
Possible offence route: LRA 1925 s.115 (fraudulent concealment in registration) has not been tested against the file.	LEGAL INFERENCE	§1.1

2.2.15 4.3 Cadw and the Welsh Office (from the Cadw report)

Criticism	Status	See
A highly compressed assessment of about 48 hours across a weekend (3–5 December 1988), with no access to interiors and no surviving methodology. ?	DOCUMENTED FACT	Cadw report VI.1; A-039
A five-month gap after the 29 July 1988 inspection; what triggered the December assessment is unknown. ?	UNRESOLVED ?	VI.2; A-039
“YYY” coding explained three different ways in 2026 (“marginally below the bar”; “did not meet the criteria”; “not included on the list”).	DOCUMENTED FACT	VI.3, Q43; A-038
Cadw publicly said it was “considering” listing in December after coding it below the bar in July.	DOCUMENTED FACT	VI.3
Cadw cannot say whether the 1974 RCAHMW survey, the SMR, GGAT’s 1978–80 work or the 1982 warning were considered.	DOCUMENTED FACT (Cadw admission)	VII.2–VII.3; A-040
The family was not consulted.	DOCUMENTED FACT	VI.5; A-041
Only two photographs survive: no file, notes, decision record, decision-maker, transfer list or destruction record. ?	DOCUMENTED FACT	X; A-037
The explanation moved from transfer, to no evidence of transfer, to an officer’s recollection of a three-year retention practice. ?	DOCUMENTED FACT	VIII
Cadw said its records were with RCAHMW; RCAHMW said it holds none; neither has been shown the other’s statement.	DOCUMENTED FACT	XIII.1
The Welsh Office paper-file search promised on 21 May 2026 has never been reported.	DOCUMENTED FACT	Q28, Q42
Cadw recorded that GGAT’s 1990 assessment was “commissioned by BP Properties Ltd” but drew no conclusion from it.	DOCUMENTED FACT	XI.2; A-042
The Cadw–Heneb circle: Cadw says the HER is Heneb’s to manage; Heneb said it is a limited company not subject to FOI; the duty rests on the Welsh Ministers.	DOCUMENTED FACT	XIV; A-056

The published address cadw@gov.wales rejected the family's mail at least seven times; the formal complaint reached a visitor-services centre run by Transport for Wales.	DOCUMENTED FACT	XI.4, Q38
Cadw closed correspondence on 4 September 2026, before the 1982 GGAT letter was served on 17 September; that letter is unanswered.	DOCUMENTED FACT	XI.4, Q34
A later planning document calls the house "a listed building"; it was never listed.	UNRESOLVED (source unknown) ?	XIII.5; A-054
"County treasure": the Cadw report attributes the phrase to BP's 1989 redevelopment papers, while the GGAT report quotes GGAT's own 1989 report. The source must be fixed from the page images.	UNRESOLVED ?	Cadw IV.2; GGAT 11.4
<i>Credit where due</i> : Cadw answered within time, volunteered material and engaged at chief-inspector level.	DOCUMENTED FACT	VIII.2

2.2.16 4.4 Vale of Glamorgan and South Glamorgan councils

Criticism	Status	See
The adopted plan (February 1987) said the buildings should be retained; no building preservation notice was served under TCPA 1971 s.58; the 1989 report disposed of the demolition in one clause.	DOCUMENTED FACT	Cadw IX; PL-002, PL-003
The 1972 permission for 13 houses was granted with no archaeological condition while Mary occupied the house and disputed ownership; its ownership certificate has not been seen.	UNRESOLVED ?	PL-011; Case Analysis §5
Appendices B–E to the 1989 report are missing. ?	DOCUMENTED FACT	A-048, PL-004, PL-005
Reserved matters were approved 38 days after GGAT's 27 July 1992 warning, with no new archaeological condition.	DOCUMENTED FACT	PL-008; GGAT T9
Condition 18 was treated as discharged in 1994 on the developer's counsel's opinion, over GGAT's objection; the Council told the MP it was "a difference of opinion".	DOCUMENTED FACT	PL-007; GGAT T9–T10
Environmental-assessment screening and the statutory archaeological consultation route are not recorded.	UNRESOLVED ?	PL-013, PL-015
FOI positions changed between 7 July and 11 September 2026; the Council referred the family to Heneb, which had already said it does not accept statutory requests.	DOCUMENTED FACT	A-055; GGAT 6.5

2.2.17 4.5 GGAT and Heneb (from the GGAT report)

Criticism	Status	See
No institutional trail followed GGAT's own 1 October 1982 warning for 2,258 days.	DOCUMENTED FACT	T3
GGAT is absent from the December 1988 record; whether it had notice is untested.	UNRESOLVED ?	T1–T2
Role collision: in one document GGAT advised the regulator, specified the method, priced the work (£2,000) and disclosed negotiations with BP, and was then commissioned. Separation of functions in 1989–90 has never been shown.	DOCUMENTED FACT / UNRESOLVED ?	T4–T5; A-043
Eight machine trenches; ground that "could not be investigated" was nonetheless zoned low potential, and the 1994 excavation found burials there, many just below the topsoil.	DOCUMENTED FACT	T6–T7; A-045
466 days with no recorded GGAT act after its own warning of 27 July 1992.	DOCUMENTED FACT	T9
The authority for the April 1994 "no further work" instruction and the December 1994 post-excavation demand is unidentified. ?	UNRESOLVED ?	T10
The Home Office burial licence lapsed from 21 April to at least 3 May 1994. What was removed in that window, and under what authority, should be established; removal of remains without a licence was an offence under the Burial Act 1857, s.25.	DOCUMENTED FACT / UNRESOLVED ?	T8; Q.8.5

The 1990 report gives 1983 as the demolition date in one section; the error was never corrected.	DOCUMENTED FACT	T11; PL-010
The c.1880 “ironwork held by the National Museum” sentence rests on a local tradition; the Museum holds no matching accession and points to the 1858 Church Farm finds.	DOCUMENTED FACT	T11.5; Archaeology
The 1990 report was deposited with the national archive only in 2019.	DOCUMENTED FACT	T11.3; A-051
The HER leads with “Post Medieval – Farm”, with the cemetery in a separate linked record, and carries the 1994 figure (858) without the published 1,026.	DOCUMENTED FACT / UNRESOLVED ?	T11.2
<i>Credit where due:</i> GGAT did not demolish, advise demolition or decide listing; in 1990 it recommended protection, watching briefs and legal advice; in 1993–94 it defended the archaeology.	DOCUMENTED FACT	GGAT Part I

2.2.18 4.6 Other record-holders

Criticism	Status	See
RCAHMW: the Johns–Buckler correspondence was lost “since 1986/87”; the house was only partly recorded “because of problems created by an ownership dispute”.	DOCUMENTED FACT	A-035, A-036
The National Archives: early searches covered titles and descriptions, not contents; the House of Lords papers were found only in September 2026.	DOCUMENTED FACT	A-006, A-007
Senedd Culture Committee declined oversight twice.	DOCUMENTED FACT	GGAT 6.4
<i>Credit where due:</i> RCAHMW gave the one described search (named repositories, including closed files) and produced the most significant document.	DOCUMENTED FACT	Cadw X.4

2.2.19 4.7 Objections the family will face, and its answers

These are the points BP, HM Land Registry or a court can be expected to raise. Each has an answer. A fuller version is on [Anticipated Objections and the Family’s Answers](#).

Objection	Status	The family’s answer
The 1916 tenancy is recited as of “the whole of the farm”, and the family accepts it covered both areas. If Bute let the house in 1916, Bute still owned it.	LEGAL INFERENCE (against)	The 1939 revised tenancy superseded the 1916 description and covers the eastern fields only. The 1916 plan, the Bute lease of 6 November 1877 and the Bute X.6(12) receipts are being obtained.
The 1877 terms rest on Mary’s memory of a document she saw as a child, and the papers-taken account is second-hand.	TESTIMONY · Mary (Nancy) Williams (c.1974 statement, Mary (Nancy) Williams testimony)	Mary’s statement was made c.1974, long before the litigation, and the 1974 press record confirms her claim. Further corroboration is being sought from the Knapp and Sutherland records and the Bute estate trail.
Title was not argued in 1984–87.	LEGAL INFERENCE (against)	The title documents were not available to the family in 1984–87. That is the special-circumstances exception in <i>Arnold</i> . [?]
Mary’s claim was recited to the Court of Appeal, so it was not hidden from that court.	DOCUMENTED FACT (against)	The court heard that Mary claimed ownership, but it never saw the plans or the papers that prove it.
The 1994 burials have not been shown to lie on Parcel A.	UNRESOLVED ?	The overlay plan is being built (GGAT report IV.4).
Most limitation periods expired long ago; s.32 needs proof of deliberate concealment, not just loss.	LEGAL INFERENCE (against)	Section 32 runs from discovery. Each discovery is dated in the Records Access Chronology, and many key records surfaced only in 2026.
Strasbourg already rejected the case, and the Human Rights Act cannot reach pre-2000 acts.	LEGAL INFERENCE (against)	Strasbourg ruled without the title documents. The domestic routes remain open, and human-rights arguments apply to how public bodies are handling the records now.

5. New issues added to the Master Scrutiny Issue Register (A-074 to A-087)

Also recorded, with fuller wording, on the register page [Register Additions — 6 October 2026](#).

ID	Issue	Evidence lead	Status
A-074	WA240304 (the farmhouse title) applied for 23 Feb 1983; HMLR /Linklaters correspondence of 8 and 12 April 1983, after Mary's death; "no question or doubt" certificate given while the 1974 ownership plea was undecided	WA240304 items 4, 5, 7, 10, 11 (OC2)	Open — orderable
A-075	Land Registration Act 1925 s.115 (fraudulent concealment in registration) as a test of the 1982–83 applications	Same file; statute text	Open — to be tested against the file
A-076	Issue estoppel and abuse of process against any title claim, and the new-evidence exception (<i>Arnold v NatWest</i>)	When and how the family obtained each title document	Open — counsel
A-077	The 1939 plan and the 1987 limitation premise: adverse possession against WGR from 1938–39 would have completed c.1951	1939 tenancy and plan (family holds); 1938 conveyance	Open
A-078	Losses clustered around proceedings (c.1950–52, 1984, 1986/87)	RCAHMW file-movement records; library records; Knapp and Sutherland	Open — explanation sought from record-holders
A-079	Limitation Act 1980 s.4: no time bar on recovering stolen papers or contents, except from a good-faith purchaser	Requests to BP, BP Archive, Linklaters, WGR and Knapp successors	Open — action available now
A-080	Identity and connections of Mr Knapp (Penarth estate agent, lay preacher) and the conviction of Bruce Sutherland, c.1951–52	Kelly's directories; petty sessions registers; British Newspaper Archive; probate	Open
A-081	The 31 Oct 1974 licence given by BP Properties before it owned the land (conveyance May 1975)	The letters; the 1974–75 contract	Open
A-082	1988 public statements inconsistent with the court record	N07; N15	Documented (press)
A-083	Ownership of finds follows the landowner; the 1994 assemblage was donated by Ideal Homes Wales (95.56H); where the 1858 Church Farm finds were made	Parcel overlay; Church Farm location; Museum accession files	Open
A-084	Whether the Forest of Cardiff paid value for the woodland in 1994, and which strand (blue/pink) each part of WA735527 belongs to	10 Nov 1994 transfer; WA735527 plan	Open
A-085	The VG41 ownership section and any Commons Commissioner decision as independent evidence of who could prove title c.1970–80	Commons register; Commissioner's file	Open
A-086	The 1994 burial-licence lapse (21 Apr to at least 3 May) and the Burial Act 1857 s.25	Home Office licence file; CAT site diary	Open
A-087	"County treasure" attributed to BP's 1989 papers in one report and to GGAT's 1989 report in the other	Page images of both 1989 documents	Open — source conflict

6. Deadlines and next steps

When	What	Who
Now	Scan and upload the 1938 conveyance and plan and the full 1939 tenancy; record when and how the family obtained each	Family
Now	Order WA240304 items 4, 5, 7, 10, 11 and WA231076 item 2 on form OC2 (about £66)	Family
Now	Section 4 return request for any Williams papers in legacy files (BP, BP Archive, Linklaters, WGR successor, Knapp successor)	Family
Now	Ask RCAHMW for any 1986/87 file-movement record for the Johns–Buckler correspondence	Family
3. 3 November 2026	Heneb investigation response due (five-week aim from 29 Sep)	Heneb
By about 25 November 2026	Independent Complaints Reviewer (HMLR): six months from the 25 May 2026 decision	Family
After Cadw’s stage-two answer	Public Services Ombudsman for Wales (Cadw and the Council), normally within 12 months of becoming aware	Family
After the Heneb and ICO stages	Information Commissioner on EIR status (Heneb, the Welsh Ministers, the Council)	Family
Once the documents above are in hand	Instruct a solicitor or direct-access barrister on: (a) setting aside for fraud (Takhar); (b) the Arnold exception; (c) LRA 2002 Schedules 4 and 8; (d) s.32 and s.4	Family

Related: Scrutiny & Accountability · Master Scrutiny Issue Register · Working theory: fraud, concealment and limitation · Anticipated Objections and the Family’s Answers · Where Things Stand

2.3 8 October 2026 — Reframed reopening and reparations analysis

The legal review now adopts a **cascade-of-accepted-premises** model rather than a theory that every institution necessarily acted together. The first question is where a disputed land/title premise entered the documentary chain and how it became accepted by later actors.

2.3.1 Primary new contention to test

The most consequential unresolved issue is not simply whether the family historically owned “Great House Farm”, but **what exact physical land object each document, title, court order and enforcement action referred to**. WA231076 and WA240304, the 13 January 1984 registration activity and the 2 February 1987 amalgamation therefore require plan-by-plan reconciliation.[?]

2.3.2 Potentially material routes

- **Title/extent:** establish the parcel independently of the 1987 narrative.
- **Registration:** test for over-inclusion, double registration or another register mistake, using the historic files and plans.
- **Indemnity:** assess separately from negligence; ask whether a qualifying register mistake caused compensable loss.
- **Fraud-based reopening:** do not plead until an identifiable actor, deliberate dishonesty, materiality and operative causation can be supported.
- **Current remedies:** challenge present refusals/disclosure/correction decisions separately from historic events.

2.3.3 Evidence-before-court test

Before any reopening application is considered, compare the exact 1984–87 court propositions with: the 1939/1949 tenancy documents; 1955/1962/1974 files; WA231076/WA240304 applications and plans; the A13/DL; the 1971 abstract; the 1984 A3; the 1987 amalgamation; and the complete litigation bundle. The question is whether a materially different factual case was known, available or discoverable and whether any nondisclosure was deliberate and outcome-determinative.

Reparations: keep land/title remedies, statutory indemnity, damages against an original wrongdoer, record correction, heritage recognition and voluntary object return as separate heads. Do not double count loss.

2.4 8 October 2026 — Litigation activation

The legal review now moves into execution. The family has created a dedicated [Litigation Activation](#) plan covering Schedule 4 alteration, Schedule 8 indemnity preservation, ICR, CPR 31.16 pre-action disclosure and separate Letters of Claim. The legal team must decide standing, defendants, limitation, relief and proportionality route-by-route.

The strongest new evidential leads are the WGR rental-book/plan collection D696 and catalogue item DBDT123/7 (May 1939 WGR–John Williams tenancy agreement with plan). These are evidence-acquisition tasks, not conclusions about their unseen contents.

2.5 9 October 2026 — legal question sharpened to the actual loss

The principal property-loss question is not the 1939 tenancy. That document is already obtained and establishes Parcel B only. The present issue is whether Parcel-A woodland and the land now comprising VG41 were physically taken in the 1955 enforcement, despite Parcel B being the agricultural tenancy/possession subject.

This creates a distinct legal analysis: scope of the 1955 judgment/order → scope of the warrant/execution → WGR's underlying right to the exact land → present title consequences → current proprietary/registration/compensation remedies. Any historical excess-of-execution cause of action must be analysed separately for limitation and defendant identity.

The 1970 VG41 registration is now a particularly important independent lead because the Vale Council states that its statutory registers record claims to ownership. ?

2.6 Research lead: 1974 survey, Suggett note and the 1988–89 Strasbourg proceedings

The HER entry GGAT02038s cites R. F. Suggett's December 1988 note and describes H. J. Thomas's 1974 survey. The survey reportedly recorded historic architectural features and considered a possible medieval core, subject to access limitations. The survey predates the demolition on 6 December 1988; the Suggett note postdates it. Heneb reportedly stated in October 2026 that the underlying source file had been digitised and uploaded to Archwilio. The fact that Suggett was cited in the public HER entry must be distinguished from when the underlying source-file documents became accessible.

This raises a focused question for the family's Strasbourg application 14464/88, declared inadmissible on 14 April 1989: was the 1974 survey or its findings known to the family and their legal representatives, and was it included in the material submitted to the former European Commission of Human Rights? The evidence currently identified does not answer this. It also does not establish that the Commission would have reached a different outcome.

Historic significance did not automatically make the house Grade II listed, and the survey alone does not prove that demolition was unlawful. The legal assessment should compare the original survey and source-file metadata, the Suggett note, Cadw's listing/spot-listing records, surviving family or counsel papers, the Commission decision, and the planning file. The original Commission case file is reported to have been destroyed, so its contents must not be reconstructed by assumption.

Related records: [GHF-E137](#) — 1974 H. J. Thomas survey; [Heneb forensic review](#); [GHF-E145](#) — application and decision.

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

2.7 Page version & change log

Current version: 1.0.0

2 Record

Version	Date (UTC)	Editor (human or agent name)	Change	Source / evidence
1.0.0	2026-10-18T15:27Z	Sion's Tab agent	Footer standardised; no content change	Editing Protocol, 18 Oct 2026

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