

1983 First Registration: Parcel A Title Basis and Alleged HMLR Mistake

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	The central question	2
2.2	Evidence and records to compare	2
2.3	What the sequence does—and does not—show	2
2.4	Legal and evidential cautions	3
2.5	Questions HMLR should answer	3
2.6	Tests that could weaken or defeat this hypothesis	4
2.7	Judgment and indemnity limitation update — 16 October 2026	4
2.8	Archival research leads added — 16 October 2026	4
2.9	Related analysis and change record / guest book — 18 October 2026	5

Page 3191 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 3191 (last modified 2026-10-21 20:53:53 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/1983-first-registration-parcel-a-title-basis-alleged-hmlr-mistake>.

Page ID: 3191 · **Title:** 1983 First Registration: Parcel A Title Basis and Alleged HMLR Mistake · **Evidence status:** Not yet labelled — see the Editing Protocol · **Version:** 1.0.0 · [Editing Protocol](#)

Names: the elder woman is **Mary (Nancy) Williams, formerly Buckler**; her youngest daughter is **Mary Buckler (later Godfrey)**. When could two women both be “Mary Buckler”? See [Two Mary Bucklers? Name and identity timeline](#).

Assessment updated 15 October 2026. This page isolates a possible first-registration mistake concerning title WA240304, the farmhouse-and-garden parcel associated with Parcel A. It is a forensic issue record: it identifies

the documentary question HMLR should answer, but it does not make a final finding about ownership, fraud, concealment or the legal validity of a court order.

2.1 The central question

Did the first-registration application for WA240304, dated 23 February 1983, include land in Parcel A for which the conveyancing chain submitted or relied upon did not establish that Western Ground Rents Ltd (WGR) held a title capable of being transferred to BP Pension Trust and then BP Properties Ltd? [PENDING: [EV-0066](#)] The investigation must identify both **the land described in each operative deed and plan** and **the evidence HMLR actually examined**.

Parcel distinction: WA231076 is the other, earlier-registration strand associated with the fields/Parcel B in this reconstruction. WA240304 is the later farmhouse-and-garden first-registration strand, relying on the 23 May 1975 conveyance [PENDING: [EV-0052](#)]. Do not merge the two applications or assume that a document establishing title to one parcel necessarily established title to the other.

2.2 Evidence and records to compare

- GHF-E115 — 1877 Bute–Thomas agreement, E116 — Bute counterpart lease and E117 — Bute accounts and receipts: earliest records in the present Parcel-A title enquiry. Mary’s typed 1974 witness statement is evidence of her account of the transaction, not a substitute for an original operative conveyance.
- GHF-E118 — 1916 tenancy and plan, E119 — 1924 drain agreement and plan and E120 — 1928 last-rent receipt /end of quarrying: contextual records requiring interpretation on their actual terms. E119 is catalogued as a drain agreement, not a conveyance [PENDING: [EV-0015](#)].
- GHF-E121 — 1938 Bute/Mountjoy–WGR conveyance and plan: the operative description and plan are central to identifying exactly what proprietary land WGR acquired [PENDING: [EV-0019](#)].
- DBDT123/7 — 1939 WGR–John Williams agricultural tenancy and plan: the plan is currently read as depicting the eastern agricultural fields (Parcel B) only [EV-0023]. That supports a question about the tenancy’s scope; it does not, by itself, decide freehold ownership.
- GHF-E131 — 31 December 1969 WGR–BP Pension Trust conveyance and plan: the original deed is not listed in HMLR’s schedule disclosed on 30 July 2026; later records recite the conveyance. Its operative wording, plan and land extent remain to be verified [PENDING: [EV-0043](#)]. Absence from that schedule does not establish that HMLR never saw or considered it.
- GHF-E132 — 1971 abstract of title: establish what the abstract actually contains, its underlying root and how it was used. It predates the 1975 conveyance and cannot itself record that later transaction, although it may contain earlier title evidence [PENDING: [EV-0045](#)].
- GHF-E138 — 23 May 1975 BP Pension Trust–BP Properties conveyance and plan: the conveyance associated with the WA240304 farmhouse-and-garden first-registration strand. It proves what that deed purported to convey; it does not, standing alone, prove the transferor held every part of the land described.
- GHF-E158 — HMLR’s 30 July 2026 first-registration file schedule and FC-002 — WA240304 first-registration file: use these to identify what was listed, supplied, examined and recorded. The schedule and the complete underlying file are distinct things.
- Land Registry Titles, Parcel A/B distinct-history claim, 1955 possession-order analysis and BP Properties Ltd v Buckler: cross-check title extents against the possession litigation and later register history.

2.3 What the sequence does—and does not—show

Documentary question: what estate and precise land were conveyed to WGR in 1938? Did that conveyance include Parcel A, Parcel B, or both? The 1939 tenancy plan is a relevant comparison, but a tenancy’s extent and a freehold conveyance’s extent are not interchangeable.

Upstream title question: what prior title did WGR have to the land described in the December 1969 deed? If the 1938 conveyance did not include Parcel A and no other effective instrument conveyed Parcel A to WGR, the 1969 deed would raise a material gap in the chain for that land. That remains a conditional inference until the deeds, plans and any relevant legal effects are examined.

Downstream conveyance question: the 1975 deed transferred the land it describes from BP Pension Trust to BP Properties. The deed's existence does not itself resolve whether BP Pension Trust had acquired good title to every part of that land in 1969. The missing 1969 document and the contents of the 1971 abstract are therefore important, but the current evidence does not justify saying that BP had only a possession order or that the conveyance chain has conclusively failed.

Possession/title distinction: the 1955 and 1962 orders and the later litigation are relevant to possession, pleadings, occupation and what a party may have asserted. A possession order is not, merely by being made, a conveyance of the freehold. The precise land covered and legal effect of each order must be assessed separately; neither an order's existence nor the phrase "whole farm" substitutes for checking the proprietary conveyances and plans.

Registration question: if HMLR accepted absolute title to a parcel whose extent was not supported by the applicant's operative deeds and antecedent title evidence, that could raise a question of registration mistake. To determine whether that occurred, HMLR must identify the application plan, deeds, abstract, enquiries, examination record and reasoning actually relied upon. A registration error is not established solely because a deed is now missing from the disclosed schedule.

2.4 Legal and evidential cautions

- The customary 15-year "good root" principle must not be presented as an automatic statutory rule that invalidates every first registration with a shorter documentary history. Ask what root and alternative evidence were relied upon, and the basis on which absolute title was accepted.
- The actual-occupation and notice questions are separate from the chain-of-title question. Ask for the notices, service records and occupier enquiries for the WA240304 application without treating the reported post-death letter as proven until the original is located [PENDING: [EV-0060](#)].
- The Court of Appeal judgment post-dates first registration and dealt with the issues before the court. Do not say it retrospectively validated HMLR's original examination; also do not assume the judgment made no relevant findings. Identify the precise reasoning and procedural effect relied upon.
- The recorded 1987 amalgamation and 1994 correction are later register events. Obtain the application, decision and completion dates, instruments, plans and correction record before asserting a change of extent or a particular mistake.
- Fraud, concealment, deliberate boundary expansion and officer misconduct are not findings on this page. Those are evidence-gated hypotheses; the present task is to locate the first unsupported or incorrect proposition, establish who supplied it, identify what checks occurred and trace subsequent reliance.

2.5 Questions HMLR should answer

1. What land did the 1938 Bute/Mountjoy-WGR conveyance and plan describe, and what evidence established WGR's proprietary title to Parcel A?
2. What did the original 1969 conveyance and plan describe? If HMLR no longer holds it, where did the registration examiner obtain the relevant details and what record remains?
3. What did the 1971 abstract contain, what root did it identify, and how was it reconciled with the 1969 and 1975 conveyances?
4. Which documents and plans were submitted and actually examined for WA240304? How did the examiner verify that the registered land matched the land comprised in the operative deeds?
5. What enquiries were made about the occupied farmhouse parcel, Mary (Nancy) Williams's claimed interest and the 1955/1962 proceedings? Please distinguish the evidence HMLR held at the time from material discovered later.
6. What exact notice was issued for WA240304, to whom, on what date, at what address and with what record of service or delivery?
7. What statutory or administrative basis was relied upon for the class of title granted, including any treatment of defects or missing documents?

2.6 Tests that could weaken or defeat this hypothesis

This is not a one-way case theory. The title-gap hypothesis would be weakened if the original 1938 instrument or another effective instrument demonstrably conveyed Parcel A to WGR; if the 1969 deed and its underlying title evidence establish a valid chain for the same land; if the 1971 abstract contains a sufficient earlier root and the file shows it was examined; or if a parcel-by-parcel comparison shows that the registered extent matches the supported deeds. Each possible answer should be recorded, not filtered out.

Current status: OPEN — specific title-chain and registration examination question, not a finding. The strongest nexus currently to test is the link between the exact land acquired by WGR in 1938, the land purportedly transferred in 1969 and 1975, and the land HMLR entered under WA240304 in 1983. The first point at which a material mismatch occurred has not yet been established.

Related control records: [HMLR Forensic Institutional Review](#) · [1982–83 Registration & Opportunity to Object](#) · [1987 Amalgamation During Appeal](#) · [PRINCE2 Control Registers](#).

2.7 Judgment and indemnity limitation update — 16 October 2026

What the 1987 judgment says about registration. Dillon LJ expressly stated that if Mary had acquired a valid title to the farmhouse and garden, it would have been an overriding interest to which BP's registration was subject, and her personal representatives would be entitled to seek rectification [[EV-0080](#)]. This preserves the relevance of the 1982–83 registration material to the direct title/registration question. It is not a finding that Mary proved ownership, nor does it by itself set aside the judgment.

Statutory correction. The old section 83(11) of the Land Registration Act 1925 contained a special six-year period from registration for certain indemnity claims. Section 2 of the Land Registration Act 1997 substituted a new section 83 and removed that special registration-date proviso; the claim was instead governed by the simple-contract/knowledge wording. The current Land Registration Act 2002, Schedule 8 paragraph 8, similarly ties accrual to when the claimant knows or, but for their own default, might have known of the claim. Do not label indemnity automatically time-barred solely because registration took place in 1983. Equally, do not presume timeliness: identify the claimant, the precise suspected register error, the loss said to result, when the indemnity claim became known or reasonably knowable, any default, and the statutory/transitional regime governing the proposed claim.

Evidence to preserve and request. Obtain the complete WA240304 file and related correspondence, application forms and supporting certificates, requisitions, title plan versions, the record of notice or actual occupation considered, and documents showing what the applicant and HMLR knew. Separately obtain the 1986–87 appeal bundle so the registration issue is not conflated with the material actually before the court. The Court of Appeal report says no grant of representation to Mary's estate had been taken out by July 1987; check the later probate position before relying on an estate-based application.

Legal sources: [BP Properties Ltd v Buckler](#), 31 July 1987 · [Land Registration Act 1997](#), s.2 · [Land Registration Act 2002](#), Sch.8. See also [GHF-E141](#) and [BP v Buckler: Scope, Decided & Undecided](#).

2.8 Archival research leads added — 16 October 2026

A new research page records four additional archival leads and the precise 1983 registration retrieval test: [New Archival Leads — Bute Archive List](#), [1793 Manor Deeds](#), [Tŷ Mawr Plans](#) and [1983 Registration](#).

WA240304 file: rule 29 of the Land Registration Rules 1925 is headed "Certificate by a solicitor as to title on first registration". Section 14 of the Land Registration Act 1925 separately provided for an affidavit or declaration by the applicant and solicitor where the registrar required one. The current file evidence does not establish that a BP Properties declaration was necessarily made or lodged. The targeted request is for the actual Linklaters certificate and any declaration, including signatories, date, wording, exhibits and associated title plans [[PENDING: EV-0063](#)].

New background leads: NLW ex 642 (reported original typed list of the Bute archive); NLW D95/32–6 (reported 1793 Llandough manor deed group); Glamorgan Archives DXJF/61/12 and DMAT/279 (reported 18th-century Tŷ Mawr farm plans); and the D696 coloured OS plan book (whether it covers Llandough remains unconfirmed). These leads may help establish provenance, historic geography and what records were catalogued; none presently proves a missing document, registration error or dishonesty.

Current status: evidence acquisition lead, not a finding. Inspect originals and reconcile catalogue descriptions before

drawing conclusions.

2.9 Related analysis and change record / guest book — 18 October 2026

Added the three-part model as a test of registration extent and title provenance. Any suspected enlargement, omission or mismatch must be demonstrated by comparing the actual applications, certificates, deeds and title plans. See the [Three-part Parcel A: chronology, order scope and later title transfers](#) assessment for the cross-parcel chronology, competing explanations and prioritized document list.

Change record: Added this cross-reference and a dated guest-book entry to connect this page to the new three-part Parcel A analysis. This is an editorial synthesis of existing leads, not a newly discovered primary record or a finding of fraud.

Wider Cedwyn Estate theory cross-reference: This first-registration issue may be more evidence for the wider Cedwyn Estate hypothesis if the original application or plan shows land claimed through a different historic root, a material mismatch or omitted notice of a known interest. Until those files are read, it is a testable possibility, not a finding of fraud or an established ownership result. Read the [Cedwyn Estate Working Theory](#).

Change history is maintained on the [Master Change Log](#); no separate page-local version footer is maintained.