

Permission to Appeal results – May 2013

| Case name | Justices | PTA | Reasons given |
|--|--|-----------------------|--|
| In the matter of an application by Martin Corey (AP) for Judicial Review (No 2) (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2013/0037 | Lord Hope Lord Kerr Lord Carnwath | Refused 2 May 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, as to ground one, that the decision that the test in <i>AF (No 3)</i> was correctly applied was related specifically to the facts of this case and, as to ground two, that neither the Judge nor the Court of Appeal were asked to look at the closed material. |
| In the matter of B (A Child) UKSC 2013/0109 | Lady Hale Lord Kerr Lord Hughes | Refused 2 May 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. The questions raised by McFarlane LJ when granting permission to appeal to the Court of Appeal have been amply and correctly answered in the Court of Appeal's judgment. |
| R (on the application of Barkas) (FC) (Appellant) <i>v</i> North Yorkshire County Council and another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0035 | Lord Neuberger Lord Reed Lord Carnwath | Granted 3 May 2013 | |
| Eli Lilly and Company (Appellant) <i>v</i> Human Genome Sciences, Inc (Respondent) UKSC 2012/0220 | Lord Neuberger Lord Reed Lord Carnwath | Refused 3 May 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 <i>v</i> Ezeemo (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0013 R <i>v</i> BJ Electronics (UK) Ltd (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0011 R <i>v</i> Ezechukwu (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0017 R <i>v</i> Orient Export Ltd (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0015 R <i>v</i> Ezeemo No 2 (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0014 R <i>v</i> Reliance Export Ltd (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0019 R <i>v</i> Benson (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0018 | Lord Neuberger Lord Reed Lord Carnwath | Refused 3 May 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused because the applications do not raise an arguable point of law. |
| Peverel Freeholds Limited (Appellant) <i>v</i> StoneyField Management Limited (Respondent) UKSC 2012/0264 | Lord Neuberger Lord Reed Lord Carnwath | Refused 3 May 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. |

| | | | |
|--|--|------------------------|---|
| Powierza (Appellant) v District Court, Warszawa, Poland (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0065 | Lady Hale Lord Kerr Lord Toulson | Refused 3 May 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. None of the three grounds of appeal raises an arguable point of law however important the context might be. |
| R (Appellant) v Sumal and Sons (Properties) Limited (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0020 | Lord Hope Lord Wilson Lord Hughes | Refused 7 May 2013 | 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 bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal. |
| Barnes (as former Court Appointed Receiver) (Appellant) v The Eastenders Group and another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0006 | Lord Hope Lord Wilson Lord Hughes | Granted 7 May 2013 | |
| Turner (Appellant) v East Midlands Trains Limited (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0010 | Lady Hale Lord Kerr Lord Toulson | Refused 9 May 2013 | 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. Whatever the merits of re-examining the <i>Burchell</i> Test in this Court, this is not an appropriate case in which to do so. |
| Media Protection Services Limited (Appellant) v Crawford and another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0034 | Lord Mance Lord Clarke Lord Sumption | Granted 13 May 2013 | |
| Robertson (Appellant) v Swift (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0033 | Lord Mance Lord Clarke Lord Sumption | Granted 13 May 2013 | |
| Devine (Respondent) v McAteer (Appellant) (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2013/0029 | Lord Mance Lord Clarke Lord Sumption | Refused 13 May 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 and the application is out of time without explanation. |
| Linuzs and others (Appellants) v Latmar Holdings Corporation (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0042 | Lord Mance Lord Clarke Lord Sumption | Refused 14 May 2013 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise in relation to domestic law an arguable point of law, and certainly not a point of law of general public importance. 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 as to the test to be applied, and the Courts below were simply applying established EU law. |
| R (on the application of Bailey and others) (FC) (Appellants) v London Borough of Brent Council (Respondent) UKSC 2011/0268 | Lord Hope Lord Mance Lord Sumption | Refused 16 May 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 and in the light of the particular facts of the case. |

| | | | |
|---|--|------------------------|---|
| R (on the application of Hodkin and another) (Appellants) v Registrar-General of Births, Deaths and Marriages (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0030 | Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Wilson | Granted 24 May 2013 | |
| R (on the application of T and another) (FC) (Respondents) v Secretary of State for the Home Department and another (Appellants) UKSC 2013/0048 | Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Wilson | Granted 24 May 2013 | |
| R (on the application of Wilson and another) Respondents) v Secretary of State for Work and Pensions (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0064 | Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Wilson | Granted 24 May 2013 | |
| Omnipharm Limited (Respondent) v Merial (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0039 | Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Wilson | Refused 24 May 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 Commissioners for Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs (Respondent) v Secret Hotels2 Limited (formerly Med Hotels Limited) (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0036 | Lord Hope Lord Reed Lord Carnwath | Granted 24 May 2013 | |