

Permission to Appeal results – June 2015/July 2015

Case name	Justices	PTA	Reasons given
Youssefi (Appellant) <i>v</i> Mussellwhite (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0026 Neutral Citation No: [2014] EWCA Civ 885	Lord Neuberger Lord Reed Lord Toulson	Refused 3 June 2015	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Rahmatullah (Respondent) <i>v</i> Ministry of Defence and another Case No: UKSC 2015/0002 Neutral Citation No: [2014] EWHC 3846 (QB)	Lord Neuberger Lady Hale Lord Mance	Granted 4 June 2015	
R <i>v</i> Martin and Ryan (Appellants) (Northern Ireland) Case No: UKSC 2015/0031 Neutral Citation No: [2014] NICA 72	Lord Neuberger Lord Reed Lord Toulson	Refused 16 June 2015	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 No Adastral New Town Limited) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Suffolk Coastal District Council and another (Respondents) Case No: UKSC 2015/0066 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 88	Lord Neuberger Lord Mance Lord Carnwath	Refused 25 June 2015	Permission to appeal be refused since the courts below were clearly right, but in any event there is no point of law of general importance.
Hough (Appellant) <i>v</i> Greathall Limited (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0039 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 23	Lord Neuberger Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath	Refused 7 July 2015	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Hodgson and another (Appellants) <i>v</i> Gilks and another (Respondents) Case No: UKSC 2015/0032 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 5	Lord Neuberger Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath	Refused 7 July 2015	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.

<p>Commissioners for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (Appellant) <i>v</i> Investment Trust Companies (In Liquidation) and others (Respondents) Case No: UKSC 2015/0057 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 82</p> <p>Commissioners for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (Respondent) <i>v</i> Investment Trust Companies (In Liquidation) and others (Appellants) Case No: UKSC 2015/0058 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 82</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Reed Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Granted 7 July 2015</p>	
<p>R (on the application of Bright) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for Justice (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0068 Neutral Citation No: [2014] EWCA Civ 1628</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Reed Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Refused 7 July 2015</p>	<p>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. This is not an appropriate case in which to raise the issue as there was a perfectly good reason for separating the appellant and his partner in any event.</p>
<p>FirstGroup Plc (Respondent) <i>v</i> Paulley (Appellant) Case No: UKSC 2015/0025 Neutral Citation No: [2014] EWCA Civ 1573</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Reed Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Granted 7 July 2015</p>	
<p>R (on the application of FI) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department and another (Respondents) Case No: UKSC 2015/0062 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 1272</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Reed Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Refused 7 July 2015</p>	<p>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. The proposed appeal is academic as far as this Appellant is concerned.</p>
<p>Allard and others (Respondents) <i>v</i> Chief Constable of Devon and Cornwall Constabulary (Appellant) Case No: UKSC 2016/0052 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 42</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Reed Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Refused 7 July 2015</p>	<p>Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance.</p>

R (on the application of Ingenious Media Holdings plc and another (Appellants) <i>v</i> Commissioners for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0082 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 173	Lord Kerr Lord Clarke Lord Toulson	Granted 7 July 2015	
Johnston (Appellant) <i>v</i> Department of Regional Development and another (Respondents) (Northern Ireland) Case No: UKSC 2015/0033 Neutral Citation No: GIL 9463	Lord Kerr Lord Clarke Lord Toulson	Refused 7 July 2015	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. This was a decision purely on facts.
Juliet Bellis & Co (a firm) (Respondent) <i>v</i> Challinor and others (Appellants) Case No: UKSC 2015/0078 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 59	Lord Kerr Lord Clarke Lord Toulson	Refused 7 July 2015	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.
In the matter of M (Children) (AP) Case No: UKSC 2015/0132 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 26	Lady Hale Lord Reed Lord Hodge	Refused 9 July 2015	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. We consider that the Court of Appeal was right for the reasons they gave.
R <i>v</i> Thompson (Appellant) Case No: UKSC 2015/0093 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Crim 606	Lord Mance Lord Sumption Lord Hughes	Refused 13 July 2015	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.
Krebs (Appellant) <i>v</i> NHS Commissioning Board (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0056 Neutral Citation No: [2014] EWCA Civ 1540	Lord Mance Lord Sumption Lord Hughes	Refused 13 July 2015	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance.
Ryanair Holdings plc (Appellant) <i>v</i> Competition and Markets Authority and another (Respondents) Case No: UKSC 2015/0070 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 83	Lord Mance Lord Sumption Lord Hughes	Refused 13 July 2015	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.
Integral Petroleum S.A (Appellant) <i>v</i> SCU-Finanz AG (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0070 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 144	Lord Mance Lord Sumption Lord Hughes	Refused 13 July 2015	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. This was not a question of formal validity, which is the only basis on which English law could have applied.

R (on the application of Smith) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State of Work and Pensions (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0088 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 229	Lord Mance Lord Sumption Lord Hughes	Refused 13 July 2015	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.
Newbigin (Valuation Officer) (Respondent) <i>v</i> S J & J Monk (a firm) (Appellant) Case No: UKSC 2015/0069 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 78	Lord Neuberger Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath	Granted 14 July 2015	
Smyth (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and others (Respondents) Case No: UKSC 2015/0081 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 174	Lord Neuberger Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath	Refused 16 July 2015	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. 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.
Lawson Builders Limited and others (Appellants) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and another (Respondents) Case No: UKSC 2015/0072 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 122	Lord Neuberger Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath	Refused 22 July 2015	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.
Edwards (Respondent) <i>v</i> Kumarasamy (Appellant) Case No: UKSC 2015/0095 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 20	Lord Neuberger Lord Sumption Lord Reed	Granted 23 July 2015	
ITV plc and others (Appellants) <i>v</i> The Pensions Regulator and another (Respondents) Case No: UKSC 2015/0094 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 228	Lord Neuberger Lord Sumption Lord Reed	Refused 23 July 2015	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law a point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time.
Deutsche Bank AG, London Branch (Respondent) <i>v</i> Petromena ASA (in bankruptcy) (Appellant) Case No: UKSC 2015/0086 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 226	Lord Neuberger Lord Sumption Lord Reed	Refused 23 July 2015	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law a point of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time.

Google Inc (Appellant) <i>v</i> Vidal-Hall and others (Respondents) Case No: UKSC 2015/0097 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 311	Lord Neuberger Lord Sumption Lord Reed	Granted in part 23 July 2015	Permission to appeal be refused on ground one (the issue whether the claim is in tort) because this ground does not raise an arguable point of law. Permission to appeal be granted on all other grounds.
R (on the application of Foster) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for Justice (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0114 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 281	Lord Neuberger Lord Sumption Lord Reed	Refused 23 July 2015	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Warner-Lambert Company LLC (Appellant) <i>v</i> Actavis Group PTC EHF and others (Respondents) Case No: UKSC 2015/0146 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 556	Lord Neuberger Lord Sumption Lord Reed	Refused 23 July 2015	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Maier and another (Appellants) <i>v</i> Asos plc and another (Respondents) Case No: UKSC 2015/0111 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 377 and [2015] EWCA Civ 220	Lord Neuberger Lord Sumption Lord Reed	Refused 23 July 2015	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law a point of general public importance. The relevant principles are not in issue only their application to the facts of the case. 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.
Elliott (Appellant) <i>v</i> Stobart Group Limited and others (Respondents) Case No: UKSC 2015/0141 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 449	Lord Neuberger Lord Sumption Lord Reed	Refused 23 July 2015	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 Savage) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Mansfield District Council and another (Respondents) [2015] EWCA Civ 4	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath	Refused 23 July 2015	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law 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. 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 answer is so obvious as to leave no scope for any reasonable doubt.

<p>Societe Cooperative De Production SeaFrance S.A. (Respondent) <i>v</i> The Competition and Markets Authority (Appellant) and another Case No: UKSC 2015/0127 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 768</p> <p>Societe Cooperative De Production SeaFrance S.A.and another (Respondents) <i>v</i> DFDS A/S (Appellant) Case No: UKSC 2015/0128 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 487</p>	<p>Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Sumption</p>	<p>Granted 27 July 2015 – UKSC 2015/0127</p> <p>Withdrawn UKSC 2015/0128</p>	
<p>London Borough of Enfield (Respondent) <i>v</i> Najim (Appellant) Case No: 2015/0158 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 319</p>	<p>Lord Neuberger Lord Sumption Lord Reed</p>	<p>Refused 27 July 2015</p>	<p>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. The issue turned mainly on the factual evaluation made by the reviewing officer and the Court of Appeal was plainly right about section 191(2).</p>
<p>Moreno (Respondent) <i>v</i> The Motor Insurers' Bureau (Appellant) Case No: UKSC 2015/0113 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWHC 1002 (QB)</p>	<p>Lord Mance Lord Clarke Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Granted 28 July 2015</p>	
<p>Hayward (Respondent) <i>v</i> Zurich Insurance Company Plc (Appellant) Case No: UKSC 2015/0099 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 327</p>	<p>Lord Mance Lord Clarke Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Granted 28 July 2015</p>	
<p>AMT Futures Limited (Appellant) <i>v</i> Marzillier and others (Respondents) Case No: UKSC 2015/0091 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 143</p>	<p>Lord Mance Lord Clarke Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Granted 28 July 2015</p>	

<p>Financial Conduct Authority (Respondent) <i>v</i> African Land Ltd and others (Appellants) Case No: UKSC 2015/0100 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 284</p> <p>Financial Conduct Authority (Respondent) <i>v</i> Haddow (Appellant) Case No: UKSC 2015/0104 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 284</p>	<p>Lord Mance Lord Clarke Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Refused 28 July 2015</p>	<p>Permission to appeal be refused because the applications do not raise a point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal.</p>
<p>Hin-Pro International Logistics Limited (Appellant) <i>v</i> Campania Sud Americana De Vapores (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0112 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 401</p>	<p>Lord Mance Lord Clarke Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Refused 28 July 2015</p>	<p>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 bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal.</p>
<p>Red October International SA (Appellant) <i>v</i> State Corporation “Rostekhnologii” and another (Respondents) Case No: UKSC 2015/0108 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 379</p>	<p>Lord Mance Lord Clarke Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Refused 28 July 2015</p>	<p>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 bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal.</p>
<p>Makhlouf (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0092 Neutral Citation No: [2014] NICA 86</p> <p>Secretary of State for the Home Department (Appellant) <i>v</i> TH (Bangladesh) (AP) (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0105 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 250</p> <p>HA (Iraq) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0126 Neutral Citation No: [2014] EWCA Civ 1304</p>	<p>Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath</p>	<p>Granted 28 July 2015</p>	

R v Mitchell (Respondent) (Northern Ireland) Case No: UKSC 2015/0122 Neutral Citation No: GIL 9609	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath	Granted 28 July 2015	
In the matter of P (A Child) Case No: UKSC 2015/0118 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 170	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath	Refused 28 July 2015	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.
Leach (Appellant) v Office of Communications (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0144 Neutral Citation No: [2012] EWCA Civ 959	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath	Refused 28 July 2015	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 is plainly correct. We would have extended time.
Smith (Appellant) v Carillion (JM) Limited (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0098 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 209	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath	Refused 28 July 2015	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.
McCracken (a protected party suing by his mother and Litigation Friend, Deborah Norris) (Respondent) v Bell (Appellant) Case No: UKSC 2015/0109 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 380	Lady Hale Lord Hughes Lord Toulson	Refused 30 July 2015	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. While not endorsing the reasoning of the Court of Appeal on the <i>ex turpi causa</i> point, the Panel considers that the result was correct
R v Doran (Appellant) Case No: UKSC 2015/0083 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Crim 384 R v Gray (Appellant) Case No: UKSC 2015/0084 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Crim 384	Lady Hale Lord Hughes Lord Toulson	Refused 30 July 2015	Permission to appeal be refused because the applications do not raise an arguable point of law. In our view, <i>Cadman Smith</i> was rightly decided and (given that the double recovery problem has been addressed by other means) there is no reasonable prospect of this Court departing from it.

<p>AE (Algeria) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0089 Neutral Citation No: [2014] EWCA Civ 653</p> <p>PL (Jamaica) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0117 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 40</p> <p>BA (Ghana) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0120 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 40</p> <p>GS (India) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0121 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 40</p> <p>GM (India) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0124 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 40</p> <p>EO (Ghana) (AP) Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Office (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0123 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 40</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Hughes Lord Toulson</p>	<p>Refused 30 July 2015</p>	<p>Permission to appeal be refused the applications do not raise an arguable point of law. With regret, the Panel can foresee no reasonable prospect of this Court departing from <i>N v SSHD</i>.</p>
---	---	----------------------------------	--

<p>KK (DRC) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0119 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 40</p>			
<p>R (on the application of Islam) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) Case No: UKSC 2015/0107 Neutral Citation No: [2015] EWCA Civ 312</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Hughes Lord Toulson</p>	<p>Refused 30 July 2015</p>	<p>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. On the facts, this is not the right case to raise this challenge.</p>