

COVENTRY COUNTY COURT

No. 7QZ80996

140 Much Park Street,  
Coventry.

31<sup>st</sup> October 2007

Before:-

DEPUTY DISTRICT JUDGE DYTE

COMBINED PARKING SOLUTIONS

Claimant

v

REES

Defendant

=====  
**JUDGMENT**  
(As Approved by the Judge)  
=====

-----  
MR. M. PERKINS appeared in person on behalf of the Claimant.

MR REES appeared in Person.  
-----

Transcription by:

*Audio and Verbatim Transcription Services*  
25 South Park Road, Wimbledon, London, SW19 8RR  
Telephone: 020 8540 0766 : Facsimile: 020 8543 2227  
and at

10 Herondale, Haslemere, Surrey, GU27 1RQ : Telephone: 01428 643408 : Facsimile: 01428 654059  
Members of the Department of Constitutional Affairs Official Tape Transcription Panel  
Members of the British Institute of Verbatim Reporters

N° of words: 475  
N° of folios: 7

**Deputy District Judge Dyte:**

1. Mr. Rees, your defence is on the basis that you did not see the signs. You have slightly shifted ground today because you are now saying that the signs were not large enough, were not easily visible and the lettering was not large enough, etcetera, none of which you have actually mentioned in your defence. There are various points made in your witness statement.
2. So far as I am concerned, the key test in these cases is: did the Claimant make reasonable efforts to bring these signs to the attention of any drivers entering the car park?
3. I have no doubt at all that they did in this case.
4. These are obviously not Regus' premises. It is absolutely clear that they were not Regus' premises. You had driven around Regus. You then entered into another entrance which had a sign for Trigen.
5. The fact that people were parking all over the walkways and pavements in Regus, and that there was hardly anybody in the Trigen building, would, I would have thought, in itself make it fairly obvious that it is not permissible for Regus visitors to park in the Trigen building.
6. I am satisfied, from the photographic evidence, that you drove past the sign in photograph 5. I am also satisfied that, in the area where you parked, there were signs on the lamp-posts. I am satisfied that that is a picture of your car. Although there is no sign on the lamp-post nearest to your car, there is a sign on the post to the left.
7. You ought to have been aware that this was a private area and you ought to have been aware that it was likely that there would be parking restrictions. It is a fact of 21<sup>st</sup> century life. There are more and more parking restrictions throughout towns and throughout industrial estates.
8. I am not satisfied that the Claimant should have done more to direct your attention to the parking restrictions.
9. Accordingly, I give judgment for the Claimant.

