## Annex F – Ombudsman Determinations made during 2024-25

Abbreviations:

**HOS – Housing Ombudsman** 

**LGSCO – Local Government & Social Care Ombudsman** 

# MDCMS-5988 (HOS case)

- There was no maladministration in the landlord's decision to recharge the tenant for repairs to the toilet in her home.
- There was no maladministration in the landlord's handling of repairs to the toilet.
- There was service failure in the landlord's complaint handling and communication with the tenant.
- MDH were ordered to pay £100.00 compensation in recognition of the failings in communication identified and a written apology to the tenant.

# MDCMS-5962 (HOS case)

- There was no maladministration in the landlord's handling of reports of damp and mould at the tenant's property and her damaged belongings.
- There was maladministration in the landlord's handling of a leak at the tenant's property.
- MDH were ordered to pay £300.00 compensation for its handling of a leak at the residents property and a written apology to the tenant.

### MDCMS 5730 and 5900 (HOS case)

- There was no maladministration by the landlord in its decision to issue the tenant with a notice to guit.
- The tenant's complaint about the landlord's handling of her personal data is outside of the Ombudsman's jurisdiction to investigate.
- There was service failure by the landlord in its complaints handling.
- MDH were ordered to pay the tenant £90.00 in compensation for the distress and inconvenience caused to her on account of its complaint handling failure.

### MDCMS - 6165 (HOS case)

- There was maladministration in the landlord's handling of the tenant's concerns about the position of a fence at the bottom of their garden.
- There was no maladministration in the landlord's handling of the tenant's concerns about the height of a fence on the left-hand boundary of their property.
- There was maladministration in the landlord's complaint handling.
- MDH were ordered to pay £650.00 in compensation for the distress, inconvenience, time and trouble in pursuing the fence location and alleged encroachment to completion as well for complaint handling failures and delays. MDH were also ordered to provide a written apology to the tenant.

- MDH were ordered to take legal advice regarding the alleged encroachment of the fence onto the public right of way.
- The HOS also made a number of recommendations to review its processes and templates for providing permission for improvements and processes for completing post-inspection surveys. As a result of the recommendation made a working group was set up to review MDH's processes and policy.

## MDCMS- 6359 (HOS case)

- There was no maladministration in the landlord's handling of the tenant's request for a fence to be installed around her garden.
- There was no maladministration in the landlord's handling of the condition of the tenant's garden and an overgrown tree.

# MDCMS - 6349 (HOS case)

- There was no maladministration in relation to the landlord's decision with regards to the tenant's requests for replacement of the front door.
- The HOS recommended that we wrote to the tenant to confirm that we could either replace the door subject to a recharge or the tenant could replace the door himself subject to conditions set out by MDH. Also, for MDH to repeat our offer of installing a key safe. The tenant was written to in response to this recommendation.

## MDCMS 7156 - (HOS Case)

- There was no maladministration in the landlord's handling of the resident's:
  - a. Reports of antisocial behaviour (ASB) and hate crimes.
  - b. Concerns about its failure to safeguard him and breach of his human rights and the Equality Act 2010.
  - c. Concerns about staff conduct.
  - d. Associated complaint.

### MDCMS - 6934 (LGSCO case)

• The LGSCO would not investigate this case as there was not enough evidence of fault to justify an investigation.

### MDCMS - 6318 (LGSCO case)

• The LGSCO would not investigate this case due to the owner occupier not bringing the complaint to the LGSCO within a year.

#### FS-671902515 (LGSCO case)

 The LGSCO would not investigate this case because it is about the management of social housing by the Council as a social landlord.