

Upper Tribunal (Immigration and Asylum Chamber) EA/02023/2015

**Appeal Number:** 

### **THE IMMIGRATION ACTS**

Heard at Field House

On 18 April 2018

Decision & Promulgated On 27 April 2018 Reasons

Before

## **UPPER TRIBUNAL JUDGE O'CONNOR**

#### Between

ISHANI LASHIKA DE VASS GUNAWARDANA ANDRAVASS PATABENDI (ANONYMITY DIRECTION NOT MADE)

and

<u>Appellant</u>

## THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT Respondent

# **DECISION AND REASONS**

## Introduction

1. The appellant is a citizen of Sri Lanka, born 10 June 1980. She made an application to the Secretary of State for an EEA residence card. The application was refused in a decision served on 9 October 2015, for reasons that I need not need to set out herein.

## Decision of the First-tier Tribunal

2. The appellant lodged an appeal before the FtT. That appeal came before FtT Judge Grant, who concluded in a decision dated 14 March 2017, that the FtT did not have jurisdiction to determine the appeal. No findings were made in relation to the substance of the appeal. The Judge's conclusion was informed by the guidance given by this Tribunal in <u>Sala</u> [2016] UKUT 00411.

3. The appellant appealed such decision to the Upper Tribunal and FtT Judge Kelly refused permission, decision dated 15 January 2018.

### Directions made by the Upper Tribunal

- 4. Following a further application to appeal to the Upper Tribunal, Upper Tribunal Judge Kebede granted permission, in a decision dated 2 March 2018.
- 5. In the notice of decision, Judge Kebede indicated that the Upper Tribunal was minded to find an error of law, set aside the decision of the First-tier Tribunal and remit the case to the First-tier Tribunal. If either of the parties was opposed to this course they were directed to inform the Tribunal in writing (giving reasons), not later than 7 days from the date the Directions were issued. Following that period, the parties were informed that the Upper Tribunal would issue its decision.
- 6. The Upper Tribunal has not received any correspondence from either party within the stipulated timeframe.

### **Discussion**

- 7. The Court of Appeal has now given consideration to the very issue in play in the instant case - see <u>Khan v Secretary of State for the Home</u> <u>Department</u> [2017] EWCA Civ 1755. The Court concluded that the Upper Tribunal had been wrong in its conclusion and rationale in <u>Sala</u>. It is not in dispute that the effect of the decision in <u>Khan</u>, if applied to this case, is that the First-tier Tribunal was wrong to conclude that it did not have jurisdiction in this appeal.
- 8. For this reason, I set aside the decision of the First-tier Tribunal and remit the appeal back to the First-tier Tribunal to be heard afresh.

#### **Decision**

The decision of the First-tier Tribunal is set aside.

The appeal is remitted to the First-tier Tribunal.

Signed:

len Mito

Dated: 18<sup>th</sup> April 2018

Upper Tribunal Judge O'Connor