



**Five Pump
Court Chambers**

5 Pump Court
Temple, London
EC4Y 7AP, UK
clerks@5pumpcourt.com
Tel: 020 7353 2532

Joseph Meethan

Barrister

Call: 2018

josephmeethan@5pumpcourt.com

Please call 020 7353 2532 to instruct



Practice overview

Joseph specialises in chancery cases, with a particular interest in property litigation and trusts. He regularly advises on and appears in possession matters, including forfeiture of leases and claims involving public sector tenancies. He enjoys dealing with unusual points of law and making sure that his clients receive pragmatic advice.

Joseph is clear and compassionate in his advice, and fights hard for his clients. A recent client commented: "A sincere thank you for your attendance yesterday. You did a stellar job. It was great to watch you in action."

Landlord and tenant

Joseph accepts instructions across landlord and tenant law. He has significant experience of possession claims against tenants under the Housing Acts and following notices to quit. Joseph also acts in commercial landlord and tenant matters, including tenancy renewal claims.

Joseph has experience of forfeiture actions including for long residential and commercial leases. He has settled pleadings, defended the validity of forfeiture, and provided ongoing advice on these matters in addition to appearing in court. He has appeared in the High Court to defend the validity of a business tenancy's forfeiture.

He is particularly interested in cases which involve the law of trusts, and has acted for landlords and tenants where serious disputes about beneficial interests arise in possession proceedings.

He has acted in service charge proceedings in the First Tier Tribunal and has appeared in cases relating to houses of multiple occupation. Joseph also has experience of the tenancy deposit regime and housing disrepair cases, including under the Environmental Protection Act 1990. He has advised on leasehold enfranchisement cases and the interpretation of leases.

Real property

Joseph accepts instructions in relation to easements, covenants, and boundaries. He has experience of boundary disputes and adverse possession claims in both the First Tier Tribunal and the County Court. He regularly advises on the extent of property rights, especially where there are allegations of trespass or where there is a leasehold element.

Joseph has represented clients in possession proceedings relating to mortgages and orders for sale. He regularly accepts instructions on trespass cases.

Joseph also acts in cases of nuisance and disturbance of easements.

Committal proceedings and anti-social behaviour

Joseph has experience of anti-social behaviour cases, securing injunctions, and enforcing them through committal proceedings. Joseph has acted for public sector landlords in Part 65 urgent breaches and in the resulting committal trials. He has acted in Part 81 committal proceedings and has previously secured 36 findings of breach in a contested trial.

In a recent case Joseph represented the Claimant in a four-day committal trial involving discrimination and the public sector equality duty defences.

TOLATA, wills and trusts

Joseph undertakes TOLATA work. He has acted on cases involving proprietary estoppel and alleging common intention constructive trusts. He has defended on the basis of whether constructive trust principles can apply at all.

Recently Joseph successfully represented the intervenors in matrimonial finance proceedings who had been accused of hiding matrimonial assets and holding them on trust for the husband. In a five-day trial the trust claims were defeated.

Joseph accepts instructions in contentious and non-contentious probate. He has advised on the construction of wills and on the misuse of trust and estate property.

He has experience of the link between housing possession cases and trusts, having been instructed on several cases where possession actions have trust-based defences and counterclaims.

Business and commercial

Joseph accepts instructions across commercial law. He has particular experience in a variety of disputes where businesses and property interact, such as forfeiture proceedings and matters relating to the Landlord and Tenant Act 1954.

Joseph acts in relation to company and partnership disputes. He is currently instructed in an ongoing high court unfair prejudice and civil fraud matter.

Joseph has appeared in the County Courts and the Insolvency and Companies Court in insolvency matters. He recently defeated attempts to extort a client and their associates for £1,225,000 and £1,950,000 respectively.

Education

- BA Hons First Class, University of Nottingham, 2016
- Graduate Diploma in Law, City, University of London, 2017
- LLM Bar Professional Training, City, University of London, 2018

Memberships

- Property Bar Association
- Chancery Bar Association

Prizes

- Inner Temple BPTC Exhibition Award
- Winner of the Inner Temple Rawlinson Cup Debating Competition, 2019
- Winner of the UKELA Lord Slynn of Hadley Moot, 2018
- Highly Commended, Andrew Lees Essay Prize, 2017

Notable Cases

Pincus v Singh [2024] EWHC 502 (Ch): represented the successful Defendant in a Chancery Division case concerning the remedies available following default judgment – the first to consider the effect of what is now CPR12.4 since 2011.

Sheppey Beach Villas Ltd v McCloughey: a forfeiture trial where the property was a burnt-out ruin. The case involved consideration of the meanings of house and of dwelling in the Leasehold Reform Act 1967 and the Commonhold and Leasehold Reform Act 2002, as well as interpretation of the relevant covenants and whether the tenant had acted in bad faith.

Iniodu v Wandle Housing Association Ltd: Joseph successfully challenged the validity of a conditional fee agreement in statutory nuisance proceedings on the basis of a genuine concern that the agreement contained an unlawful success fee.

Re a Debtor: Joseph represented clients in the Insolvency and Companies Court, obtaining injunctions restraining vexatious claims said to be valued at £1,225,000 and £1,950,000 respectively. The case involved issues of inherent jurisdiction and attempts to use the insolvency procedures to extort and harass Joseph's clients. As part of this, Joseph obtained final injunctions against persons unknown pursuing the alleged debts to prevent the use of sham assignments.

Newman v Hertfordshire County Council: Joseph represented the Defendant in a one-day hearing before HHJ Pearce sitting as a deputy judge of the High Court. He successfully had twelve of the Claimants' thirteen arguments struck out or had summary judgment entered against them.

Re D: advising on the merits of relief from forfeiture in a case where the bailiffs discovered that the tenant had died during execution of the possession order and there was no person capable of applying for relief for a considerable time.

Southern Housing v Watts: four-day trial for contempt of court featuring discrimination and public sector equality duty defences. The matter also dealt with the consequences of a contemnor's death on proceedings after trial but before judgment.

The Geek Taverna Limited and Penge v Khan: Application for permission to appeal in the Chancery Division of the High Court. The Appellant alleged that the right to forfeit had been waived by various acts, including commercial rent arrears recovery. Joseph successfully argued for the Respondent that there was no real prospect of success and that the forfeiture was valid. He also defeated other criticisms of the Defendant's money judgment in a dilapidation counterclaim.

S v J: Joseph acted for the tenant in a multi-track claim listed for 3½ days. The landlord

sought possession under section 21, and the tenant sought specific performance of a poorly drafted deed of trust containing a time-limited option to purchase. The case settled days before trial on better terms for the client than the court could have awarded.

[Uddin v Uddin \[2022\] EWFC 75](#): Joseph acted for the intervenors in matrimonial finance proceedings, successfully defending the trust claims brought against them in a five-day trial.

T v H: a possession claim following succession to a secure tenancy. Defended on reasonableness and public law grounds for unlawful interference with the right to buy; disability discrimination; and convention rights in article 8 and protocol 1 article 1. The case settled with the client successfully exercising the right to buy.

O v B: a 1-day committal trial in the County Court successfully proving 36 breaches of an injunction.

O v R: In a hearing listed for 1 ½ days Joseph secured and extended an anti-social behaviour injunction against a Defendant accused of threats to kill who contested the facts and alleged discrimination and anti-social behaviour by other tenants.