Permission to Appeal results – April 2014 | The Supreme Court of the United Kingdom

		l	
Case name	Justices	РТА	Reasons given
R (on the application of SG and Others)(previously JS and Others)(Appellants) v The Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0079	Lord Neuberger Lady Hale Lord Kerr	Granted 2 Apr 2014	
R (on the application of Robinson) (Appellant) <i>v</i> The Governor of HMP Whatton and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2014/0030 R (on the application of Massey) <i>v</i> The Secretary of State for Justice (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0041	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Sumption	Granted 7 Apr 2014	
Starbucks (HK) Limited and another(Appellants) <i>v</i> British Sky Broadcasting Group PLC and others (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0274	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Sumption	Granted 7 Apr 2014	
Deutsche Bank AG (Appellant) v Unitech Limited (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0269	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Sumption	Refused 7 Apr 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the applications do not raise an arguable point of law. It is not normally appropriate for the Supreme Court to entertain appeals on an issue which the Court of Appeal has simply held to be arguable, and this is not an exception .
Force India Formula One Team Limited (Appellant) <i>v</i> Fondmetal Technologies SRL (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0175	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Sumption	Refused 7 Apr 2014	Permission to appeal is refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Sharma and others (Appellants) <i>v</i> Sharma (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0255	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Sumption	Refused 7 Apr 2014	Permission to appeal is refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance.
Walker & anor (Appellants) <i>v</i> Burton anor (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0262	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Sumption	Refused 7 Apr 2014	Permission to appeal is refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance.
Minerva Navigation Inc (Appellant) <i>v</i> Oceana Shipping AG and another (the	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke	Refused 7 Apr 2014	Permission to appeal is refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.

"Athena") (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0254	Lord Sumption		
R (on the application of Gurung and others) (Appellants) v The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0067	Lady Hale Lord Wilson Lord Reed	Refused 7 Apr 2014	Permission to appeal is refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
R (on the application of Bibi and Another) (FC) (Appellants) <i>v</i> The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0270	Lady Hale Lord Wilson Lord Reed	Granted 7 Apr 2014	
R (on the application of Ali) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0266			
Mayor and Burgesses of the London Borough of Lambeth (Respondent) <i>v</i> Loveridge (A.P.) (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0273	Lady Hale Lord Wilson Lord Reed	Granted 7 Apr 2014	
Hotak (Appellant) <i>v</i> London Borough of Southwark (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0234	Lady Hale Lord Wilson Lord Reed	Granted 7 Apr 2014	
ZZ (Respondent) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Appellant) UKSC 2014/0075	Lord Neuberger Lady Hale Lord Kerr	Refused 7 Apr 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise a point which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time. The case has to proceed in SIAC to be dealt with in accordance with the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union.
Sarjantson (by his litigation friend Tracy Alexandra) (AP) (Respondent) v The Chief Constable of Humberside (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0244	Lady Hale Lord Wilson Lord Reed	Refused 9 Apr 2014	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 Court of Appeal's decision was correct for the reasons they gave.
R v Harvey UKSC 2013/0249	Lord Mance Lord Carnwath Lord Toulson	Granted 9 Apr 2014	
Chemistree Homecare Limited (Appellant) <i>v</i> Abbvie Ltd (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0265	Lord Mance Lord Carnwath Lord Toulson	Refused 9 April 2014	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 on appeal.
British America Tobacco Denmark A/S and others (Respondents) <i>v</i> Kazemier Transport B.V. (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0258 British American Tobacco Switzerland S.A (Respondents) <i>v</i>	Lord Mance Lord Carnwath Lord Toulson	Granted 9 April 2014	
H. Essers Security Logistics B.V. and another (Appellants) UKSC 2013/0259			
R v McGeough (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2013/0248	Lord Kerr Lord Hughes Lord Hodge	Granted 9 Apr 2014	Permission to appeal be GRANTED on ground 2 only and in relation to counts 3 and 4
R v GH UKSC 2014/0035	Lord Kerr Lord Hughes Lord Hodge	Granted 9 Apr 2014	
In the matter of an application by JR62 for Judicial Review (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2014/0050	Lady Hale Lord Hughes Lord Hodge	Refused 14 Apr 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
In the matter of an application by TCM (A Minor) (AP) for Judicial Review (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2014/0017	Lady Hale Lord Hughes Lord Hodge	Refused 14 Apr 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
VB (Appellant) v Westminster Magistrates' Court (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0103	Lord Neuberger Lord Hughes Lord Toulson	Granted 15 Apr 2014	
EN (Appellant) v Westminster Magistrates' Court (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0112			
CM (Appellant) <i>v</i> Westminster Magistrates' Court (Respondent) UKSC 2014/118			
CU (Appellant) <i>v</i> Westminster Magistrates' Court (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0119			

(Appellant) v Tolley (Deceased acting by her personal representative) (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0252 Commissions for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (Respondent) v The Rank Group PLC (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0257 Rowley and another (Appellant) v The Royal Bank of Scotland (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0259 R (on the application of Peter Evans) (Appellant) v Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Commissions for Her Majesty's Revenue and Cord Carnwath Lord Reed Lord Wilson Lord Reed Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath Lord Toulson R (on the application of Peter Evans) (Appellant) v Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Commissions to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. Permission to appeal be refused because 16 Apr 2014 17 In relation to any points other than those falling within paragraph (2) below, 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. (2) In relation to the points 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 a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including at time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate.	Connetous of State for Work and Dong's as	Lord Mance	Cuantad]
Tolley (Deceased acting by her personal representative) (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0252 Commissions for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0257 Rowley and another (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0259 R (on the application of Peter Evans) Cappellant) V Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Rowley and another (Respondent) USSC 2013/0239 R (on the application of Peter Evans) Cappellant) V Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Rowley and another (Respondent) USSC 2013/0239 R (on the application of Peter Evans) Cappellant) V Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Rowley and another (Respondent) USSC 2013/0239 R (on the application of Peter Evans) Cappellant) V Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Rowley and another (Respondent) USSC 2013/0239 R (on the application of Peter Evans) Cappellant) V Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Rowley and another (Respondent) USSC 2013/0239 R (on the application of Peter Evans) Cappellant) V Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) USSC 2013/0277 Rowley and another (Appellant) V Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) USSC 2013/0277 Rowley and another (Appellant) V Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) USSC 2013/0277 Rowley and another (Appellant) V Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) Usor Carmwath Lord Toulson Refused 16 Apr 2014 10 In relation to any points other than those falling within paragraph (2) below, 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. (2) In relation to the points of European Union law said to be raised by or in response to the a				
representative) (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0252 Commissions for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (Respondent) ** Rowley and another (Appellant) ** Rowley and another (Appellant) ** Royal Bank of Scotland (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0239 R (on the application of Peter Evans) (Appellant) V Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Rowley and another (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0239 R (on the application of Peter Evans) (Appellant) V Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Rowley and another (Respondent) V Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Refused 16 Apr 2014 Lord Toulson Refused 16 Apr 2014 Lord Toul			15 Apr 2014	
Commissions for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (Respondent) p The Rank Group PLC (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0257 The Rank Group PLC (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0257 The Rowley and another (Appellant) p The Royal Bank of Scotland (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0239 The Royal Bank of Scotland (Respondent) The Royal Bank of Scotland (Responden		Lord Hodge		
Commissions for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (Respondent) r The Rank Group PLC (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0257 Rowley and another (Appellant) r The Rank of Scotland (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0239 R (on the application of Peter Evans) (Appellant) v Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Lord Mance Lord Carnwath Lord Toulson Refused 16 Apr 2014 16 Apr 2014 16 Apr 2014 16 Apr 2014 17 In relation to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. 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. 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 subjec				
Customs (Respondent) # Cord Wilson Lord Reed Lord Reed Lord Wilson Lord Reed Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0239 Rowley and another (Appellant) # Lord Toulson R (on the application of Peter Evans) (Appellant) v Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Refused Lord Toulson Refused Lord Toulson Refused Lord Toulson Refused Lord Toulson Visc 2013/0277 Rowley and another (Appellant) provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiring of a legitimate concomitant of the expiring of the control of the c				
The Rank Group PLC (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0257 Rowley and another (Appellant) The Royal Bank of Scotland (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0239 R (on the application of Peter Evans) (Appellant) Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Refused 16 Apr 2014				
UKSC 2013/0257 Rowley and another (Appellant) v The Royal Bank of Scotland (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0239 R (on the application of Peter Evans) (Appellant) v Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Lord Mance Lord Mance Lord Carnwath Lord Toulson Refused 16 Apr 2014 In relation to any points other than those falling within paragraph (2) below, the application does not raise an arguable point of law (1) In relation to any points other than those falling within paragraph (2) below, the application does not raise an arguable point of law (2) In relation to the points 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 (3) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; (4) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; (5) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate	\ 1 /		16 Apr 2014	
Rowley and another (Appellant) r The Royal Bank of Scotland (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0239 R (on the application of Peter Evans) (Appellant) v Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Refused 16 Apr 2014 Lord Toulson Refused 16 Apr 2014 It ord Toulson Refused 16 Apr 2014 It netation to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. (1) In relation to any points other than those falling within paragraph (2) below, 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. (2) In relation to the points 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 a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate	The Rank Group PLC (Appellant)	Lord Reed		
The Royal Bank of Scotland (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0239 R (on the application of Peter Evans) (Appellant) v Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Lord Toulson Refused Lord Carnwath Lord Toulson Refused Lord Carnwath Lord Toulson Refused Lord Toulson I (Apr 2014) Lord Toulson Refused Lord Carnwath Lord Toulson Refused Lord Carnwath Lord Toulson I (Apr 2014) In relation to appeal be refused because (1) In relation to appeal be 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. (2) In relation to the points 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 a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate	UKSC 2013/0257			
The Royal Bank of Scotland (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0239 R (on the application of Peter Evans) (Appellant) v Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Lord Toulson Refused Lord Carnwath Lord Toulson Refused Lord Toulson Refused Lord Toulson I (Apr 2014) Lord Toulson Refused Lord Carnwath Lord Toulson Refused Lord Carnwath Lord Toulson I (Apr 2014) I In relation to appeal be refused because (1) In relation to appeal be refused because (2) In relation to the points 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 a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate	Rowley and another (Appellant) v	Lord Wilson	Refused	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable
UKSC 2013/0239 R (on the application of Peter Evans) (Appellant) v Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Lord Mance Lord Toulson Refused 16 Apr 2014 (1) In relation to any points other than those falling within paragraph (2) below, 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. (2) In relation to the points 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 a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate		Lord Carnwath	16 Apr 2014	11
R (on the application of Peter Evans) (Appellant) v Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Lord Toulson Refused 16 Apr 2014 (1) In relation to any points other than those falling within paragraph (2) below, 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. (2) In relation to the points 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 a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate	\ 1	Lord Toulson	1	
(Appellant) v Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 Lord Toulson 16 Apr 2014 Lord Toulson 17 In relation to any points other than those falling within paragraph (2) below, 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. (2) In relation to the points 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 a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate	·	Lord Mance	Refused	Permission to appeal be refused because
Council and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0277 (1) In relation to any points other than those falling within paragraph (2) below, 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. (2) In relation to the points 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 a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate				
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. (2) In relation to the points 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 a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate				(1) In relation to any points other than those falling within paragraph (2) below the
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. (2) In relation to the points 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 a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate		2014 10415011		
mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal. (2) In relation to the points 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 a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate				
on appeal. (2) In relation to the points 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 a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate				
(2) In relation to the points 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 a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate				
response to the application it is not necessary to request the Court of Justice to give any ruling, because a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate				оп аррсаі.
response to the application it is not necessary to request the Court of Justice to give any ruling, because a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate				(2) In relation to the points of European Union law said to be raised by or in
give any ruling, because a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate				1 1
a) the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer; b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate				
b) the answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt; c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate				
c) procedure, including a time limit for enforcement, is a matter for national law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate				
law subject to the principles of effectiveness and equivalence, both here clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate				
clearly satisfied; section 191(2) of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 ("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate				
("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate				
				("the 1990 Act") is the legitimate concomitant of the expiry of a legitimate
time limit (see Case C-98/04 Commission v United Kingdom, paragraph 20); and,				time limit (see Case C-98/04 Commission v United Kingdom, paragraph 20); and,
on that basis, there can be no obligation on the Respondent to take action				
under section 102 of the 1990 Act.				