

**In the matter of
Case No. X0056135
Mr James Hartman v Mr Philip Bullman**

**Disciplinary Tribunal Hearing held on
Thursday 7th September 2017**

**Case of
Mr Philip Bullman, a Director,
of Bullman Booth Limited, t/a Bullman Booth, 99 East Hill London, SW18 2QD**

A former Fellow member of NAEA and member of ARLA
at
Propertymark, Arbon House, 6 Tournament Court, Edgehill Drive, Warwick, CV34 6LG

Alleged breaches as set out by the Disciplinary Case Manager:

**Rule 3
Complaint Handling Procedure**

A PPD member's firm must have a written in-house complaints handling procedure. The procedure must advise complainants how to complain to an independent redress scheme and to Propertymark.

A PPD member's firm must supply details of the complaints procedure to a complainant as soon as the firm becomes aware of a complaint, or to a complainant who expresses a wish to make a complaint.

**Rule 12.1.2
General Duty to uphold high standards of ethical and professional behaviour**

No member shall do any act (whether in business or otherwise) which:
Involves other unprofessional practice or practice that is unfair to members of the public.

**Rule 12.1.3
General Duty to uphold high standards of ethical and professional behaviour**

No member shall do any act (whether in business or otherwise) which:
In any other way brings Propertymark or any of its divisions into disrepute.

**Conduct Rule 13.1
Duty to assist in Disciplinary proceedings**

Members shall co-operate with disciplinary proceedings taken against them or other members.

After consideration of the facts and submissions the Tribunal found as follows:

Alleged Breach	Findings	Sanction
Rule 3	Proven	£500
Rule 12.1.2	Proven	£3,000
Rule 12.1.3	Proven	£2,000
Rule 13.1	Proven	£500

The Tribunal made an order for costs in the sum of £120 in favour of Propertymark.

The case falls within the Propertymark Publications Policy.

The Tribunal issued the following statement:

“As a member of a professional organisation, adherence to rules and regulations including membership of the property ombudsman is essential. Mr. Bullman has failed in all regards.

This Tribunal has considered the case as presented, which included the findings of the Property Ombudsman and we concurred with those findings.

We understand that Mr. Bullman failed to honour the directions of the Property Ombudsman even though he was permitted to make staged payments and that £4,485 remains outstanding.

Mr. Bullman’s actions are reprehensible and leaving the National Association of Estate Agents and estate agents more generally into disrepute. Were it not the case that Mr. Bullman had resigned from membership of the National Association of Estate Agents the Tribunal would have had no hesitation in terminating his membership.

The Tribunal have received and read the impact statement from James Hartman. We wholeheartedly support the findings of the Ombudsman. As an Association, we are unable to direct payments of compensation but we hope that the penalties imposed on Mr. Bullman personally and the comments pertaining to his membership will go some way to support Mr Hartman and his sister.

It should be noted that this determination will be published.”