

## Permission to Appeal results - May 2012

Case name	Justices	PTA	Reasons given
Spaceright Europe Limited (Appellant) <i>v</i> Baillavoine and another (Respondents) UKSC 2012/0028	Lord Hope Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath	Granted 2 May 2012	
Delaney (Appellant) <i>v</i> Tradewise Insurance Services Limited (Respondent) UKSC 2011/0015	Lord Hope Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath	Refused 8 May 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 in the light of the judge's findings of fact with which this Court cannot interfere and the plain wording of clause 6(1)(e) of the Agreement.
Hankinson (Appellant) <i>v</i> The Commissioner for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (Respondent) UKSC 2012/0018	Lord Hope Lord Wilson Lord Carnwath	Refused 8 May 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, because the reasoning of the Court of Appeal on the point at issue was plainly right.
R <i>v</i> Hughes (Appellant) UKSC 2011/0240	Lord Phillips Lord Clarke Lord Dyson	Granted 15 May 2012	
Key2Law (Surrey) (LLP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> De'Antiquis (Respondent) UKSC 2012/0022	Lord Walker Lord Kerr Lord Sumption	Granted 15 May 2012	
The President of the Methodist Conference (Appellant) <i>v</i> Preston (Respondent) UKSC 2012/0015	Lady Hale Lord Mance Lord Reed	Granted 15 May 2012	
In the matter of Arturas Toams Statkevicius (Appellant) <i>v</i> Metropolitan Police and another (Respondents) UKSC 2012/0059	Lord Phillips Lord Clarke Lord Dyson	Refused 16 May 2012	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Lanes Group Plc (Appellant) <i>v</i> Galliford Try Infrastructure Limited t/a Galliford Try Rail (Respondent) UKSC 2012/0019	Lord Phillips Lord Clarke Lord Dyson	Refused 17 May 2012	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time. The question of whether there is an 'abuse of process' remedy is one of general public importance, but it does not arise on the facts of this case.
Leeds Group Plc (Appellant) <i>v</i> Leeds City Council (Respondent) UKSC 2012/0013	Lord Walker Lord Kerr Lord Sumption	Refused 17 May 2012	Permission to appeal be 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 and because on "neighbourhood", retrospectivity and the Human Rights Act it is not seriously arguable that the Court of Appeal was wrong. The quality of user point has been exhaustively

			considered already by the final appeal court.
R (on the application of FM) (FC) (Appellant) v Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) UKSC 2012/0031	Lady Hale Lord Mance Lord Reed	Refused 17 May 2012	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise a point of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time especially when the guidance relating to families has since changed so that the Supreme Court would not be able to consider the current situation.
Burke (Appellant) v The College of Law and Another (Respondents) UKSC 2012/0064	Lady Hale Lord Mance Lord Reed	Refused 17 May 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, having regard to clear decisions in courts/tribunals below and the very fact-specific nature of the issues.
Essex County Council (Respondent) v Williams (FC) (Appellant) UKSC 2012/0026	Lady Hale Lord Mance Lord Reed	Refused 17 May 2012	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance and because the Panel considers the decision of the Court of Appeal to be correct and there is other provision made for this age group.
Johnstone (Appellant) v Her Majesty's Advocate (Respondent) (Scotland) UKSC 2012/0061	Lord Phillips Lord Hope Lord Reed	Refused 23 May 2012	Permission to appeal be refused on the ground that the application did not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court as the decision of the Appeal Court is consistent with the unanimous decision of the House of Lords in <i>R (Walker)</i> and nothing is said in the application which casts doubt on the soundness of that decision.
Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs and another (Respondents) v Yunus Rahmatullah (Appellant) UKSC 2012/0033	Lord Phillips Lady Hale Lord Kerr	Granted 31 May 2012	
Bubb (FC) (Appellant) v London Borough of Wandsworth (Respondent) UKSC 2012/0037	Lord Walker Lord Reed Lord Carnwath	Refused 31 May 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 bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal; the only appeal is on a point of law and there is no arguable point of law here.
Ryanair Holdings Plc (Appellant) v Office of Fair Trading and another (Respondents) UKSC 2012/0139	Lord Phillips Lord Clarke Lord Sumption	Refused 31 May 2012	Permission to appeal be 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; this case was not decided on an issue of European law and the prospects of success are not sufficient to justify a further lengthy delay in these proceedings.