Permission to Appeal results - March 2012

Case name	Justices	РТА	Reasons given
R v Brown (Appellant) (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2011/0233	Lady Hale Lord Kerr Lord Dyson	Granted 6 March 2012	
Szepietowski (Nee Seery) (Appellant) <i>v</i> The Serious Organised Crime Agency (Respondent) UKSC 2011/0196	Lord Phillips Lord Brown Lord Wilson	Granted 6 March 2012	
SP (India) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) UKSC 2011/0250	Lady Hale Lord Kerr Lord Dyson	Refused 6 March 2012	Permission to appeal refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal.
Copple and others (Appellants) <i>v</i> Littlewoods Plc (Respondent) UKSC 2011/0254	Lady Hale Lord Kerr Lord Dyson	Refused 6 March 2012	Permission to appeal refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal and, in relation to the point of European Union law raised by or in response to the application, it is not necessary to request the Court of Justice to give any ruling because the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer.
Brough (Appellant) <i>v</i> Law and another (Respondent) UKSC 2011/0245	Lady Hale Lord Kerr Lord Dyson	Refused 6 March 2012	Permission to appeal refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal.
In the Matter of S (Children) (Northern Ireland) In the Matter of S (Children) (Northern Ireland) No. 2 UKSC 2011/0243 UKSC 2011/0242	Lady Hale Lord Kerr Lord Dyson	Refused 6 March 2012	Permission to appeal refused because the applications do not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time, bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal.
R (on the application of MD) (Gambia) (FC) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) UKSC 2012/0002	Lord Phillips Lord Brown Lord Wilson	Refused 7 March 2012	Permission to appeal refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time, bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal and because the issue raised has no relevance.
MS (Algeria) (FC) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) UKSC 2011/0231	Lord Phillips Lord Brown Lord Wilson	Refused 7 March 2012	Permission to appeal refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time, bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal and is an attempt to turn fact

			specific decisions of the Strasbourg Court into legal principles.
Her Majesty's Attorney General (Respondent) <i>v</i> MGN Limited (Appellant) and another UKSC 2011/0214	Lord Phillips Lord Brown Lord Wilson	Refused 7 March 2012	Permission to appeal refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time, bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and this was a very clear case of contempt of court.
Birmingham City Council (Appellant) <i>v</i> Abdulla and others (Respondents) UKSC 2012/0008	Lady Hale Lord Wilson Lord Sumption	Granted 14 March 2012	
SL (FC) (Respondent) <i>v</i> Westminster City Council (Appellant) UKSC 2011/0229	Lady Hale Lord Wilson Lord Sumption	Granted 14 March 2012	
Barts and the London NHS Trust (Respondent) <i>v</i> Verma (Appellant) UKSC 2011/0246	Lady Hale Lord Wilson Lord Sumption	Granted 14 March 2012	
Beggs No 2 (Appellant) v Her Majesty's Advocate (Respondent) (Scotland) UKSC 2011/0263	Lord Phillips Lord Hope Lord Kerr	Refused 21 March 2012	Permission to appeal refused because the Supreme Court does not have jurisdiction to hear an appeal against a decision of the High Court of Justiciary refusing to give the appellant a remedy under the Human Rights Act 1998 and because it does not have an original jurisdiction to deal with devolution issues which have not been the subject of decision by the High Court of Justiciary.
In the matter of Digital Satellite Warranty Cover Limited (Appellant) <i>v</i> Financial Services Authority (Respondent) UKSC 2012/0003	Lord Phillips Lord Mance Lord Dyson	Granted 28 March 2012	
Teal Assurance Company Limited (Appellant) <i>v</i> W R Berkley Insurance (Europe) Limited and another (Respondents) UKSC 2012/0014	Lord Phillips Lord Mance Lord Dyson	Granted 28 March 2012	
Hayes (FC) (Respondent) <i>v</i> Willoughby (Appellant) UKSC 2012/0010	Lord Phillips Lord Mance Lord Dyson	Granted 28 March 2012	
London Tara Hotel Ltd (Appellant) <i>v</i> Kensington Close Hotel Ltd (Respondent) UKSC 2011/0267	Lord Walker Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Refused 28 March 2012	Permission to appeal refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time and because this area has been reviewed by the House of Lords and the Supreme Court three times in the last 12 years. The Court of Appeal was unanimous and there are two full and clear judgments.
Commissioner for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (Respondent) <i>v</i> PA Holdings Limited (Appellant) UKSC 2012/0005	Lord Walker Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Granted 28 March 2012	

Cusack (Respondent) <i>v</i> London Borough of Harrow (Appellant) UKSC 2012/0006	Lord Walker Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Granted 28 March 2012	
Withers LLP (Appellant) <i>v</i> Langbar International Limited (Respondent)	Lord Walker Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Refused 28 March 2012	Permission to appeal refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time and because this is ultimately a one-off point of construction on which the Court of Appeal were correct.
 Public Prosecution Service (Respondent) v McKee (AP) (Appellant) (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2012/0007 Public Prosecution Service of Northern Ireland (Respondent) v Elliott (AP) (Appellant) (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2012/0017 	Lord Walker Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Granted 28 March 2012	
Terluk (Appellant) <i>v</i> Berezovsky and another (Respondents) UKSC 2012/0035	Lord Walker Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Refused 28 March 2012	Permission to appeal refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time and because on the facts the appeal is unarguable.
GT (Libya) (FC) (Appellant) v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) UKSC 2011/0230	Lord Walker Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Refused 28 March 2012	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time and because the case is indistinguishable from <i>IR (Sri Lanka) (FC) (Appellant) v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent)</i> in which permission to appeal was refused in November 2011.
R (on the application of Friends of the Earth and others (Respondents) and others <i>v</i> Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change (Appellant) UKSC 2012/0052	Lord Walker Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Refused 28 March 2012	Permission to appeal refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time, bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal and because paragraph 16 of the Court of Appeal's judgment disposes of the proposed argument based on the subject of the challenge being only a proposal.
T (a child) UKSC 2012/0075	Lady Hale Lord Kerr Lord Wilson	Refused 29 March 2012	Permission to appeal refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance and because it is clear from the careful judgment of the Judge that she had reached her own independent assessment on the basis of all the evidence and that the case was not decided solely on the evidence of the experts.