DAVIES & DAVIES

Davies & Davies Associates Ltd
Solicitors & Chartered Surveyors

31 Pearce Drive Faringdon Oxfordshire SN7 7ND
0800 840 4025 enquiries@dda.law **www.dda.law**

December 27, 2024

Beck Interiors Ltd v Eros Ltd [2024] EWHC 2084 (TCC) 28 June 2024

Beck Interiors Ltd v Eros Ltd [2024] EWHC 2084 (TCC)

Date: 28 June 2024

Key Words:

Adjudication, Injunction, Unreasonable and Oppressive Conduct, Jurisdiction, Natural Justice, Irremediable Prejudice, Multiple Adjudications, Construction Disputes

Summary

This case concerns Beck Interiors Ltd's application for an injunction against Eros Ltd to halt four ongoing adjudications and bar future ones without court permission. Mrs Justice Jefford, in the Technology & Construction Court on June 28, 2024, denied the application after reviewing arguments and case law.

Key Themes:

1. ***Right to Adjudication:*** *The statutory right under the Housing Grants Construction and Regeneration Act 1996 allows disputes to be referred to adjudication "at any time."*
2. ***Court Intervention in Adjudication:*** *Courts intervene in adjudications only in exceptional cases where continuing would be unreasonable and oppressive.*
3. ***Natural Justice in Adjudication:*** *Concerns about natural justice breaches are typically addressed during enforcement, not by halting the adjudication process.*

Background

Beck Interiors Ltd, a design and build contractor for Eros Ltd's development project, faced disputes due to cost overruns and delays. Beck initiated two adjudications, while Eros launched four in quick succession. Beck sought an injunction, claiming the simultaneous adjudications were oppressive and that Eros's claims were weak and financially coercive.

Legal Issues and Analysis

- **Jurisdiction to Grant Injunctions in Adjudication:** The court affirmed its rare use of jurisdiction to restrain adjudications, only in clear-cut cases [48-51].
- **Unreasonable and Oppressive Conduct:** The court found Eros' initiation of four

adjudications was neither unreasonable nor oppressive, noting Eros largely agreed to timetables proposed by the adjudicators or Beck, and that standard procedural negotiations were within normal adjudication practice [64-66].

- **Weakness of Claims and Natural Justice:** The court rejected Beck's arguments regarding claim weakness and procedural fairness, stating these are adjudicator matters and natural justice concerns should be addressed during enforcement [67-71, 91].
- **Irremediable Prejudice:** The court held that adjudication decisions are temporarily binding, allowing Beck to challenge unfavourable outcomes through court proceedings or enforcement defences, negating claims of irremediable prejudice [78].

Conclusion

The court denied Beck's application, finding Eros' conduct reasonable and emphasising limited jurisdiction to intervene in adjudications. Remedies remain available if adjudications result in unfavourable or unjust outcomes. The court also refused to prohibit future adjudications, as this would unjustifiably interfere with the statutory right to adjudicate [81-82].

Key Takeaway:

This judgment reinforces courts' reluctance to interfere with adjudication. Statutory rights to adjudicate are upheld, with intervention limited to exceptional cases involving jurisdictional issues or oppressive conduct. Concerns about claim merits or fairness should be addressed within the adjudication process or during enforcement.

Ratio Decidendi & Obiter Dicta:

Ratio:

- ***Statutory Right to Adjudication:*** *The right to refer disputes to adjudication "at any time" under Section 108 of the Housing Grants Construction and Regeneration Act 1996 was central to the court's reasoning [46, 47, 69(i), 69(ii)].*
- ***Reasonableness of Eros's Conduct:*** *The court found Eros's initiation of four adjudications neither unreasonable nor oppressive, based on a detailed review of the timeline, communication, and conduct of both parties [64-66].*
- ***Beck's Remedies:*** *The court emphasised Beck's ability to challenge adjudication outcomes in court or during enforcement proceedings, countering claims of irremediable prejudice [68-70, 75, 76, 78].*

Obiter*:*

- ***Limited Court Jurisdiction:*** *Courts can intervene in adjudications only in exceptional cases, such as a clear lack of jurisdiction or demonstrably oppressive conduct [48-54, 63, 65, 66, 81].*
- ***Court's Role in Adjudications:*** *The court discouraged oversight of ongoing adjudications, stating procedural fairness and claim merits should be addressed during adjudication or enforcement [65, 66, 88].*
- ***Adjudication vs. Litigation:*** *Adjudication requires disputes to be referred individually, unlike litigation, which allows multiple disputes to be resolved in one action. This distinction informed the court's assessment of Eros's actions.*

Parting Thoughts - Navigating Legal Technicalities: A Matter of Context

This case underscores the balance between swift dispute resolution and fairness in adjudication. Courts recognise the burden of multiple concurrent adjudications but set a high threshold for intervention, reserving it for conduct that is clearly oppressive or abusive. Concerns about procedural fairness or claim merits should be resolved within adjudication or during enforcement. The judgment highlights the importance of using adjudication as a fair and efficient dispute resolution mechanism.

#Adjudication #ConstructionLaw #ConstructionDisputes #Injunction #CourtIntervention #UnreasonableandOppressiveConduct #NaturalJustice #MultipleAdjudications #HousingGrantsConstructionandRegenerationAct1996 #TCC #HGCRA #BeckInteriorsLtd #ErosLtd

Nigel Davies BSc(Hons) (Q.Surv), PGCert.Psych, GDipLaw, PGDipLP, DipArb, MSc (Built Environment), LLM (Construction Law & Practice), MSc (Mechanical & Electrical), MSc (Psychology), FRICS, FCIOB, FCInstCES, FCIArb, CArb, Panel Registered Adjudicator, Mediator, Mediation Advocate, Chartered Builder, Chartered Construction Manager, Chartered Surveyor, Chartered Civil Engineering Surveyor, Chartered Arbitrator, Author, and Solicitor-Advocate

Adjudicator Assessor and Re-Assessor for the ICE and the CIArb
Arbitrator Assessor for the CIArb
ICE DRC Member
ICE DRC CPD Committee Chairman
Adjudicator Exam Question Setter for the ICE
CIArb Adjudication Panel Member since 2006
CIArb Arbitration Panel Member since 2006
CIC Adjudication Panel Member since 2010
Law Society Panel Arbitrator
RIBA Adjudication Panel Member since 2018
RICS Adjudication Panel Member since 2006
TECSA Adjudication Panel Member since 2012
FIDIC Adjudication Panel Member since 2021
ICE Adjudication Panel Member since 2021
RICS Dispute Board Registered since 2013

The information & opinions expressed in this article are not necessarily comprehensive, nor do they represent the trenchant view of the author; in any event, this article does not purport to offer professional advice. This article has been prepared as a summary and is intended for general guidance only. In the case of a specific problem, it is recommended that professional advice be sought.

© 2024 Davies & Davies Associates Ltd

Back to Legal Updates