



**Upper Tribunal  
(Immigration and Asylum Chamber)      Appeal Number: LP/00098/2020**

**THE IMMIGRATION ACTS**

**Heard at Manchester (via Microsoft  
Teams)  
On 28 May 2021**

**Decision & Reasons  
Promulgated  
On 14 June 2021**

**Before**

**UPPER TRIBUNAL JUDGE HANSON**

**Between**

**MMG**

**(Anonymity direction made)**

Appellant

**and**

**THE SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE HOME DEPARTMENT**

Respondent

**Representation:**

For the Appellant: No appearance.

For the Respondent: Mr McVeety Senior Home Office Presenting Officer.

**DECISION AND REASONS**

- 1.** The appellant appeals with permission a decision of a panel of the First-tier Tribunal ('the Panel') promulgated following a hearing on 19 July 2019, in which the Panel found the appellant to have made a disingenuous claim, to not be a genuine Christian convert, and to face no real risk on return sufficient to warrant a grant of international protection.
- 2.** Permission to appeal was refused by a Resident Judge of the First-tier Tribunal but granted on a renewed application by a judge of the Upper Tribunal on 26 August 2020.
- 3.** The appellant was represented at the hearing before the Panel by solicitors who advised the Upper Tribunal on 24 November 2020 that they were no longer acting for him.

4. A notice was sent by first class post on 26 April 2021 to the last known address for the appellant in the following terms:  

‘Your appeal is to be listed for a remote Skype hearing and it is understood that you are currently not represented.

Could you provide your email address which is required in order for you to join the remote Skype hearing.

On receipt of your email address details, the notice of hearing will be sent to you with joining information.

The Tribunal looks forward to hearing from you.’
5. The letter has not been returned to the Upper Tribunal as being marked “gone away” or for any other reasons and nor is there any other evidence provided to show that it was not delivered to the appellant. I find it has.
6. Mr McVeety confirmed the address to which the notice was sent is the same address held by the Home Office for the appellant.
7. The grant of permission was because the judge was “just persuaded” in light of the subsequent decision in PS (Iran) [2020] UKUT 46 that the grounds were arguable, but a reading of that decision does not show that a person in the appellant’s circumstances will face a real risk in light of the findings made by the Panel, and especially in light of [140] of AB (Iran) [2015] UKUT 257 in which it was found that an individual in the appellant’s circumstances would not attract particular attention, meaning there will be no questioning of him during the ‘pinch point’ in relation to his activities in the UK.
8. I find the failure of the appellant to attend to pursue his application warrants the appeal being dismissed on the basis the appellant fails to establish any arguable legal error material to the decision of the Panel to dismiss his appeal. It was found the appellant is disingenuous and that he faces no real risk on return which are findings clearly opened to the Panel on the evidence.

## **Decision**

9. **There is no material error of law in the Panel’s decision. The determination shall stand.**

Anonymity.

10. The First-tier Tribunal made an order pursuant to rule 45(4)(i) of the Asylum and Immigration Tribunal (Procedure) Rules 2005.

I make such order pursuant to rule 14 of the Tribunal Procedure (Upper Tribunal) Rules 2008.

Signed.....  
Upper Tribunal Judge Hanson

Dated 1 June 2021