



---

## Overview

Rupert has a successful property practice allied with a specialist knowledge of costs law. He was appointed Junior Counsel to the Crown (Attorney General's B Panel) in 2020 and is an ADR Accredited Mediator.

He is ranked in both Chambers & Partners 2022 and Who's Who Legal 2021 as a "leading mediator" and described as "a noteworthy mediator with particular expertise and experience in substantial property disputes" (Chambers & Partners – Mediators, 2022). He is also described in the directories as "a fantastic advocate, frighteningly clever and an absolute pleasure to work with. My go to junior for complex or tricky points of law." (Legal 500 – Property Litigation, 2022). "A go-to guru for costs cases at the junior level." (Legal 500 – Costs Litigation, 2022). "A costs wizard who is clearly very able. Clients love him as he is both succinct and confident." (Chambers & Partners – Costs Litigation, 2021) "Direct, commercial and a joy to work with." "He has such a phenomenal way with words and on his feet." (Chambers & Partners – Real Estate Litigation, 2021).

---

## Qualifications

### Qualifications

- ADR Group Accredited Mediator
- First class degree (Christ Church, Oxford) – 2009
- Distinction (GDL) – 2010
- Very Competent (BPTC) – 2011
- Academic scholar at Christ Church, Oxford
- Hardwicke, Denning and Bowen scholarships from Lincoln's Inn

### Professional Associations

- Property Bar Association
  - Chancery Bar Association
  - ADR Group Accredited Civil & Commercial Mediator
  - CADR Mediator
  - CFLA
-

## Mediation

Rupert is a qualified ADR mediator and a panel mediator for: (i) the RICS Boundary Disputes Mediation Service; (ii) Costs Alternative Dispute Resolution (CADR); (iii) Wandsworth Mediation Service (Commercial Mediator); and (iv) the Chancery Bar Association's Pro Bono Mediation Scheme. He is ranked in both Chambers & Partners 2022 and Who's Who Legal 2021 as a "leading mediator" and described as "a noteworthy mediator with particular expertise and experience in substantial property disputes" (Chambers & Partners – Mediators, 2022).

A list of Rupert's recent mediations appears below:

**X v Y (January 2022):** The dispute concerned a Landlord's failure to repair common parts and whether the Tenant had access to a shared roof space. Settlement achieved.

**X v Y (December 2021):** The dispute concerned the costs incurred by a Claimant following a claim for damages arising from personal injury. Settlement achieved.

**X v Y (October 2021):** The dispute concerned the costs incurred by the Claimant following a settlement of claim based on an allegation of clinical negligence. The mediation became unstuck when it became clear that the authority given to the representative of the receiving party to accept a sum was higher than the authority given to the representative of the paying party to offer a given sum. Did not settle.

**X v Y (June 2021):** The dispute concerned the right of a lessee to access his neighbour's garden to effect substantial works to his demise. The fundamental questions involved the scope of the lessee's right, the extent of his demise and issues over the timing and extent of the works. Settlement achieved.

**X v Y (January 2021):** The mediation concerned a niece who claimed to own the entire beneficial interest in a North London flat registered in the names of her Aunt and Uncle. Settlement achieved.

**X v Y (December 2019):** The substance of the dispute was a claim by a former employee for sums owed to him during a contract of employment. The dispute itself was complicated by the fact that the former employee's contract was with a company which had gone into liquidation in respect of which the defendant was previously director. Central to the final settlement was a confidentiality clause. Settlement achieved.

**X v Y (October 2019):** The case concerned a claim of proprietary estoppel made by a sister against her brothers who had inherited property following the death of their mother. The subject property was unregistered and the dispute arose after the sister sought to register her title to the property. Settlement achieved.

**X v Y (August 2019):** The case concerned works which were to be undertaken to a flat owned by a housing association but held by a tenant pursuant to a secure tenancy. The flat itself was badly damaged in a fire which forced the tenant to decant to temporary accommodation. Arrangements were subsequently made to refurbish the flat but differences quickly became apparent between the tenant who had a particular image of how she wanted the flat to look (wooden floors / bright coloured kitchen cupboards) and the housing association who had a different view (lino floor / hard wearing kitchen cupboards). Settlement achieved.

**X v Y (April 2019):** The substantive dispute concerned service charge arrears payment of which the tenant had suspended on the basis that the landlord had unlawfully encroached on to his land/was restricting his access to a shared parking area at the rear of the property. The premises itself was a garage to which the tenant, having operated out of the premises for over 20 years, was emotionally attached. The landlord was a recent purchaser of the reversion and considered his rights over the premises and the shared parking area absolute. Settlement achieved.

**X v Y (March 2019):** The dispute concerned rights of access over a garden owned by the basement flat over which the first floor flat had a (form of) recreational easement. The dispute was complicated by the fact that the basement flat owners had young children and were concerned by some of the actions of the first-floor flat owner. Settlement achieved.