
FINAL NOTICE

To: **Wayne Mark Robbins** **Griffin Tax Free Limited**

Of: **7 Patcham Grange** **Griffin House**
 Brighton **Fairway Business Centre**
 BN1 8UR **Westergate Road**
 Brighton
 BN2 4JZ

Date: **15 November 2005**

TAKE NOTICE: The Financial Services Authority ("the FSA") of 25 The North Colonnade, Canary Wharf, London E14 5HS gives you final notice about a decision to withdraw the approval granted to Wayne Mark Robbins ("Wayne Robbins"), in relation to Griffin Tax Free Limited ("GTFL").

1. ACTION

The FSA gave you a Decision Notice on 10 October 2005 ("the Decision Notice") which notified you that for the reasons given below and pursuant to section 45 of the Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 ("the Act"), the FSA had decided to withdraw the approval granted to Wayne Robbins in relation to GTFL.

You have not referred the matter to the Financial Services and Markets Tribunal within 28 days of the date on which the Decision Notice was given to you.

Accordingly, for the reasons set out below, the FSA has withdrawn the approval granted to Wayne Robbins in relation to GTFL, pursuant to section 63(1) of the Act.

2. REASONS FOR ACTION

On the basis of the facts and matters and conclusions described in its Warning Notice dated 9 September 2005 ("the Warning Notice"), and in the Decision Notice (an extract from which is attached and forms part of this Final Notice), the FSA has concluded that it is not satisfied that Wayne Robbins is a fit and proper person to perform the functions for which he is approved in relation to GTFL. The reason for this is that he failed to disclose material information in his application for authorisation

and, as a result, the FSA has determined that he has failed to meet the criteria for fitness and propriety set out in the Fit and Proper Test for Approved Persons ("FIT") contained in the High Level Standards block of the FSA Handbook.

3. IMPORTANT

This Final Notice is given to you in accordance with section 390(1) of the Act.

Publicity

Sections 391(4), 391(6) and 391(7) of the Act apply to the publication of information about the matter to which this Final Notice relates. Under those provisions, the FSA must publish such information about the matter to which this Final Notice relates as the FSA considers appropriate. The information may be published in such manner as the FSA considers appropriate. However, the FSA may not publish information if such publication would, in the opinion of the FSA, be unfair to you or prejudicial to the interests of consumers.

The FSA intends to publish such information about the matter to which this Final Notice relates as it considers appropriate.

FSA Contact

For more information concerning this matter generally, you should contact Olukemi Yusuph at the FSA (direct line: 020 7066 9132/fax: 020 7066 9721).

John Kirby
Manager - FSA Enforcement Division

EXTRACT FROM THE DECISION NOTICE DATED 10 OCTOBER 2005

REASON FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

Facts and matters relied on

Mr Robbins was approved by the FSA on 14 January 2005, following the consideration of his application for approval, which disclosed no adverse information. However, Mr Robbins failed to disclose in his application for authorisation, or subsequently, that he had been convicted:

- (a) on 26 May 1989, at Portsmouth Magistrates Court, of theft; and
- (b) on 27 October 1992, at Butte, California, of fraud.

/contd...

Mr Robbins' representations to the FSA indicate that he failed to disclose these convictions because he believed that they were spent. However, when completing his application form Mr Robbins answered "no" to a question asking whether he had ever been convicted of any offence involving fraud, false accounting or other dishonesty.

In addition, on 25 November 2002, Mr Robbins falsified signatures on two documents prepared in the course of his employment as a director of his then employer. Mr Robbins also failed to disclose in his application for authorisation that, in 2002, this conduct was investigated by Sussex Police, to whom he admitted that he had falsified these signatures. *Although the FSA accepts that Mr Robbins was never charged in relation to the forgery of signatures in 2002, the fact remains that he has admitted two acts of falsification. In addition, the application form he completed clearly requires disclosure of any investigation or allegations of misconduct in connection with a business activity.*

Conclusions

The facts and matters described above lead the FSA, having regard to its regulatory objectives, which include the protection of consumers, to conclude that:

- (a) Mr Robbins has been convicted of criminal offences, involving both dishonesty and fraud;
- (b) He has admitted two additional acts of dishonesty;
- (c) By failing to disclose these matters to the FSA in his application for authorisation, despite clear requirements to do so, Mr Robbins prevented the FSA from making a fully informed assessment of his fitness to be approved to perform a function in relation to any regulated activity;
- (d) These matters demonstrate dishonest behaviour over a period of approximately fifteen years;
- (e) The most recent instance of dishonesty, the falsification of signatures, took place less than three years ago;
- (f) Mr Robbins' failure to disclose these matters in his application to the FSA is evidence of a lack of rehabilitation in respect of his past conduct;
- (g) *Whilst the FSA has taken account of the representations made by Mr Robbins which suggest that he believes that he has changed and has learned the lesson of past mistakes, the matters Mr Robbins failed to disclose and his failure to disclose them are serious and are such as to impugn his honesty, integrity and reputation.*