

## Permission to Appeal results – October to 13 November 2013

| Case name  | Justices                                     | PTA                              | Reasons given   |
|--|--|----------------------------------|---|
| In the Matter of KL (A Child)<br>UKSC 2013/0212  | Lady Hale<br>Lord Wilson<br>Lord Hughes      | Granted (in part)<br>17 Oct 2013 |   |
| In the matter of LC (Children) (AP) UKSC 2013/0221<br><br>In the matter of LC (Children) (No 2) (AP) UKSC 2013/0222                      | Lady Hale<br>Lord Wilson<br>Lord Hughes      | Granted (in part)<br>17 Oct 2013 |   |
| Gaughran (AP) (Appellant) v The Chief Constable of the Police Service of Northern Ireland (Respondent) (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2013/0090 | Lord Kerr<br>Lord Wilson<br>Lord Hughes      | Granted<br>21 Oct 2013           |   |
| In the matter of an application by James Brown for Judicial Review (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2013/0154                                     | Lord Kerr<br>Lord Wilson<br>Lord Hughes      | Refused<br>21 Oct 2013           | 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 bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal. The Appellant has a right to be represented before the Industrial Tribunal and this distinguishes the case from the dissent in G. |
| R v Wong (AP) (Appellant) (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2013/0120  | Lord Kerr<br>Lord Wilson<br>Lord Hughes      | Refused<br>21 Oct 2013           | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an 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 ZH and CN) (Appellants) v London Borough of Newham and London Borough of Lewisham (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0194  | Lord Neuberger<br>Lord Reed<br>Lord Carnwath | Granted<br>22 Oct 2013           |   |
| In the Matter of A (Children) UKSC 2013/0215   | Lady Hale<br>Lord Wilson<br>Lord Hughes      | Refused<br>22 Oct 2013           | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.  |
| In the Matter of an Application by the Northern Ireland Human Rights Commission for Judicial Review (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2013/0216    | Lady Hale<br>Lord Wilson<br>Lord Hughes      | Refused<br>22 Oct 2013           | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. These grounds are unarguable. The decision of the Court of Appeal was right.   |

|   |   |                        |   |
|---|---|------------------------|---|
| In the matter of F (Children)<br>UKSC 2013/0198   | Lady Hale<br>Lord Wilson<br>Lord Hughes         | Refused<br>22 Oct 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused. This application is misconceived. There are no grounds for appealing against the Court of Appeal's decision of 15 November 2012 and matters have now moved on.   |
| Anson (Appellant) v The Commissioners for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0068  | Lord Neuberger<br>Lord Reed<br>Lord Carnwath    | Granted<br>23 Oct 2013 |   |
| JE (Uganda) (Appellant) v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0091   | Lord Neuberger<br>Lord Carnwath<br>Lord Toulson | Refused<br>23 Oct 2013 | 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 bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal. |
| MS (Afghanistan) (Appellant) v The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0176  | Lord Neuberger<br>Lord Carnwath<br>Lord Toulson | Refused<br>23 Oct 2013 | 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 bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal. |
| Devaney (Appellant) v The Mayor and Burgesses of the London Borough of Hounslow (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0084  | Lord Reed<br>Lord Carnwath<br>Lord Toulson      | Refused<br>23 Oct 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance.   |
| Heathrow Airport Holdings Limited (Formerly BAA Limited) (Appellant) v The Commissioners for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0080 | Lord Neuberger<br>Lord Reed<br>Lord Carnwath    | Refused<br>24 Oct 2013 | 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 bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal. |
| The Honourable Nathaniel Phillip Victor James Rothschild (Appellant) v Associated Newspapers (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0097                                   | Lord Neuberger<br>Lord Reed<br>Lord Carnwath    | Refused<br>24 Oct 2013 | 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 bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal. |
| R (on the application of Catt) (AP) (Respondent) v Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis and another (Appellants)<br>UKSC 2013/0114                        | Lady Hale<br>Lord Toulson<br>Lord Hodge         | Granted<br>25 Oct 2013 |   |
| R (on the application of T) (AP) (Respondent) v Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis (Appellant)<br>UKSC 2013/0112  |   |                        |   |
| R (on the application of Lord Carlile of Berriew  | Lord Neuberger                                  | Granted                |   |

|  |  |                        |   |
|--|--|------------------------|---|
| QC and others) (Appellants) v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0098                      | Lord Reed<br>Lord Carnwath                 | 25 Oct 2013            |   |
| Quashie (FC) (Appellant) v. Stringfellow Restaurants Limited (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0085                                  | Lady Hale<br>Lord Toulson<br>Lord Hodge    | Refused<br>28 Oct 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. This was the application of settled law to particular facts  |
| Artola (Appellant) v The 6th Section of the National High Court of Madrid, Spain (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0119              | Lord Mance<br>Lord Clarke<br>Lord Sumption | Refused<br>28 Oct 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law which could lead to a different substantive result.   |
| Erdenet Mining Corporation LLC ( Appellant) v MRI Trading AG (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0087                                  | Lord Mance<br>Lord Clarke<br>Lord Sumption | Refused<br>28 Oct 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance.   |
| R (on the application of Irfan) (AP) (Appellant) v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0093 | Lord Mance<br>Lord Clarke<br>Lord Sumption | Refused<br>28 Oct 2013 | 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 bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal.                 |
| Bank of Scotland Plc (Respondent) v Watson and another (Appellants)<br>UKSC 2013/0078  | Lord Mance<br>Lord Clarke<br>Lord Sumption | Refused<br>29 Oct 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused because there is no arguable point of law and no point of law of general public importance.   |
| Fiona Trust & Holding Corporation and others (Appellants) v Skarga and others (Respondents)<br>UKSC 2013/0101                | Lord Mance<br>Lord Clarke<br>Lord Sumption | Refused<br>29 Oct 2013 | 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 bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal.                 |
| Swift (Appellant) v Secretary of State for Justice (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0095   | Lady Hale<br>Lord Toulson<br>Lord Hodge    | Refused<br>30 Oct 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused. The point of law is of general public importance but the prospects of success are not sufficiently real to justify the grant of permission .   |
| R (on the application of Abdollahi) (Appellant) v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0169  | Lady Hale<br>Lord Toulson<br>Lord Hodge    | Refused<br>30 Oct 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance. The issues of principle have been settled by this Court. Grounds (1)–(4) are basically attempts to revisit decisions on the facts and in the circumstances ground (5) does not arise. |
| Amir Azam (Respondent) v The Serious and Organised Crime Agency (Appellant)<br>UKSC 2013/0207                                | Lord Mance<br>Lord Clarke<br>Lord Sumption | Refused<br>30 Oct 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused because there is no point of law which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time and in the circumstances of this case.  |
| Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) v B2 (Appellant)<br>UKSC 2013/0150                                   | Lord Neuberger<br>Lady Hale<br>Lord Wilson | Granted<br>4 Nov 2013  |   |
| R (on the application of Lutalo) (AP) (Appellant) v. Secretary of State for the Home Department)                             | Lady Hale<br>Lord Toulson                  | Refused<br>11 Nov 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. In relation to the point of European Union law said to be raised by  |

|   |   |                        |   |
|---|---|------------------------|---|
| (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0226  | Lord Hodge                                    |                        | or in response to the application it is not necessary to request the Court of Justice to give any ruling, because the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt.   |
| R (on the application of Negassi) (Appellant) v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0111 | Lady Hale<br>Lord Toulson<br>Lord Hodge       | Refused<br>11 Nov 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. In relation to the point of European Union law said to be 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. |
| McKillen (Appellant) v Misland (Cyprus) Investments Limited and others (Respondents)<br>UKSC 2013/0174                    | Lord Kerr<br>Lord Reed<br>Lord Carnwath       | Refused<br>11 Nov 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise a 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.   |
| Lumos Skincare Limited (Respondent) v Sweet Squared Limited and others (Appellants)<br>UKSC 2013/0148                     | Lord Neuberger<br>Lord Wilson<br>Lord Toulson | Refused<br>13 Nov 2013 | 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 bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal.   |