

Permission to Appeal results – July 2014

Case name	Justices	PTA	Reasons given
Taylor (Appellant) <i>v</i> Spencer (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0068	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Refused 23 July 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
AP Racing Limited (Respondent) <i>v</i> Alcon Components Limited (Appellant) UKSC 2014/0066	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Refused 23 July 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time.
O’Cathail (Appellant) <i>v</i> Transport for London (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0080	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Refused 23 July 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Al Shalash (Appellant) <i>v</i> Kroll Associates UK Limited (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0177	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Refused 23 July 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time.
FAGE UK Limited and Another (Respondent) <i>v</i> Chobani UK Limited and Another (Appellants) (Scotland) UKSC 2014/0064	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Refused 23 July 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Core Issues Trust Limited (Appellant) <i>v</i> Transport for London (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0062	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Refused 23 July 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Berezovsky (Deceased) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Joint Stock Company “Aeroflot – Russian Airlines (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0058	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Refused 28 July 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time.
Glushkov (Appellant) <i>v</i> Joint Stock Company “Aeroflot – Russian Airlines (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0057	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Reed	Refused 28 July 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time.
Master CM (a child by his father Mr CM) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0166	Lady Hale Lord Toulson Lord Hodge	Granted 30 July 2014	
Haile (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> London Borough of Waltham Forest	Lady Hale Lord Toulson	Granted 30 July 2014	

(Respondent) UKSC 2014/0185	Lord Hodge		
RB (by his Litigation Friend the Official Solicitor) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Brighton and Hove Council (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0182	Lady Hale Lord Toulson Lord Hodge	Refused 30 July 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise a point of law of general public importance. The issues were fully addressed by the factual findings of the District Judge.
The Manchester College (Appellant) <i>v</i> Hazel and Another (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0077	Lady Hale Lord Toulson Lord Hodge	Refused 30 July 2014	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.
Matthews (Appellant) <i>v</i> Matthews (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0054	Lady Hale Lord Toulson Lord Hodge	Refused 30 July 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law 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.
Mulcahy (Appellant) <i>v</i> Castles Solicitors and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2014/0063	Lady Hale Lord Toulson Lord Hodge	Refused 30 July 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law 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 complaints made about the fairness of the trial are answered by the Court of Appeal. In any event the appellant's undiagnosed condition would have made no difference to the solicitor's liability. Nor could her condition have affected the outcome of the trial.
AO (Nigeria) and others (AP) (Appellants) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0069	Lady Hale Lord Toulson Lord Hodge	Refused 30 July 2014	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.
Aster Communities Limited (formerly Flourish Homes Ltd) (Respondent) <i>v</i> Akerman-Livingstone (Appellant)	Lady Hale Lord Kerr Lord Clarke	Granted 31 July 2014	
In the Matter of an application for Judicial Review by Peel Land Property Investments Plc (Appellant) <i>v</i> Hyndburn Borough Council (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0061	Lord Mance Lord Sumption Lord Carnwath	Refused 30 July 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise a point of law 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 Champion) (Appellant) <i>v</i> North Norfolk District Council and another (Respondent)	Lord Mance Lord Sumption Lord Carnwath	Granted 30 July 2014	

UKSC 2014/0044			
Tallington Lakes Limited and others (Appellants) <i>v</i> Larking Gowen (a firm) (Respondent) UKSC	Lord Mance Lord Sumption Lord Carnwath	Refused 30 July 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 applicants' own grounds of appeal to the Court of Appeal para 33 (iii) state that "the claimant simply pleaded unpaid invoices on the basis of its standard terms and conditions and the claimants' whole strategy and clear presentation to the court was to wholly ignore the fixed price agreement." Once the fixed priced agreement fell out of the picture, it was for the applicants to show that the invoices billed on the standard basis were unreasonable, whereas the claimants' skeleton to the Court of Appeal pages 9 and 12 suggest that no real challenge was made to the hourly rates or work done.
Mohamud (Appellant) <i>v</i> VM Morrison Supermarkets Plc (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0087	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Hodge	Granted 24 July 2014	
Sharland <i>v</i> Sharland UKSC 2014/0074	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Hodge	Granted 24 July 2014	
Barrett (Appellant) and another <i>v</i> Charles and another (Respondents) UKSC 2014/0191	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Hodge	Refused 24 July 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time. This case is hopelessly out of time.
Akhtar (Administratrix of the estate of Hussain (deceased)) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Singh and another (Respondents) UKSC 2014/0082	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Hodge	Refused 24 July 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law 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. No suggestion of point of law of public importance.
In the matter of S (Children) (Northern Ireland) No 5 UKSC 2014/0065	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Hodge	Refused 24 July 2014	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law 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 Downs) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for Justice (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0056	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Hodge	Granted 24 July 2014	
Norman (Appellant) <i>v</i> Norman (Respondent) UKSC 2014/0142	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Hodge	Refused 24 July 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.