

Permission to Appeal results – from 14th November 2013 and December 2013

Case name	Justices	PTA	Reasons given
R (on the application of Abdollahi) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0169	Lady Hale Lord Toulson Lord Hodge	Refused 14 Nov 2013	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance. The issues of principle have been settled by this Court. Grounds (1)-(4) are basically attempts to revisit decisions on the facts and in the circumstances ground (5) does not arise.
The Coal Authority (Appellant) <i>v</i> Newbold and others (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0145	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Hodge	Refused 2 Dec 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.
Harbinger Capital Partners (Appellant) <i>v</i> Caldwell (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0130	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Hodge	Refused 2 Dec 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.
BP Shipping Limited and another (Respondents) <i>v</i> Braganza (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0099	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Hodge	Granted 2 Dec 2013	
AstraZeneca AB (Appellant) <i>v</i> Hexal AG and others (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0125	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Hodge	Refused 2 Dec 2013	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
R (on the application of Ismail) (Respondent) <i>v</i> The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0160	Lord Kerr Lord Reed Lord Toulson	Granted 3 Dec 2013	
Lloyd (Appellant) <i>v</i> London Borough of Lewisham and another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0209	Lord Kerr Lord Reed Lord Toulson	Refused 3 Dec 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 (on the application of Western Governors Graduate School (WGGS) Limited) <i>v</i> Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0110	Lord Kerr Lord Reed Lord Toulson	Refused 3 Dec 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.
Willcock and others (Respondents) <i>v</i> Corus UK Limited (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0137	Lord Kerr Lord Reed Lord Toulson	Refused 3 Dec 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.
Armagh City and District Council (Respondent) <i>v</i> Morton (Appellant) (Northern Ireland)	Lord Kerr Lord Reed Lord Toulson	Refused 3 Dec 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.
Walsh (Appellant) <i>v</i> Shanahan and others (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0121	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Hodge	Refused 5 Dec 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.
Burridge (Appellant) <i>v</i> Breckland Council (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0118	Lady Hale Lord Sumption Lord Carnwath	Refused 5 Dec 2013	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 question raised is irrelevant.
Vince (Respondent) <i>v</i> Wyatt (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0186	Lady Hale Lord Sumption Lord Carnwath	Granted 5 Dec 2013	
Osonnaya (Appellant) <i>v</i> Queen Mary University of London (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0113	Lady Hale Lord Sumption Lord Carnwath	Refused 5 Dec 2013	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Iqbal (Appellant) <i>v</i> Mansoor and others (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0088	Lady Hale Lord Sumption Lord Carnwath	Refused 5 Dec 2013	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. The Court of Appeal stated the correct test and applied it to the facts.
Davies (Appellant) <i>v</i> Sandwell Metropolitan Borough Council (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0132	Lady Hale Lord Sumption Lord Carnwath	Refused 5 Dec 2013	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Morgan Stanley & Co International Plc (Respondent) <i>v</i> Tael One Partners Limited (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0127	Lord Mance Lord Wilson Lord Hughes	Granted 5 Dec 2013	
Jones (Respondent) <i>v</i> Onyut (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0228	Lord Mance Lord Wilson Lord Hughes	Refused 5 Dec 2013	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law or a point of law of general public importance in respect of the Court of Appeal judgment dated 6 December 2012 and is (further) inadmissible in so far as it seeks to challenge the refusal in October 2011 of permission to appeal to the Court of Appeal against the order striking out the defence and

			counter claim.
Hide (Respondent) <i>v</i> Jockey Club Racecourses Limited (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0138	Lord Kerr Lord Reed Lord Toulson	Refused 5 Dec 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.
Francis and another (Respondent) <i>v</i> Brent Housing Partnership Limited and another (Appellants) UKSC 2013/0205	Lord Neuberger Lord Kerr Lord Clarke	Refused 9 Dec 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.
R (on the application of Stirling) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i> London Borough of Haringey (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0116	Lord Mance Lord Wilson Lord Hughes	Granted 9 Dec 2013	
Chilab (Appellant) <i>v</i> Kings College London (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0126	Lord Mance Lord Wilson Lord Hughes	Refused 9 Dec 2013	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance. The Panel would have been prepared to extend time. But permission to appeal is refused. A number of the points now suggested would have been entirely new even if open under the preliminary issues; and it is too late now to raise new factual arguments.
R (on the application of Newhaven Port & Properties Limited (Appellant) <i>v</i> East Sussex County Council and another (Respondents) UKSC 2013/0102 R (on the application of Newhaven Port & Properties Limited (Appellant) <i>v</i> The Secretary of State for the Environment Food & Rural Affairs (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0163	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Hodge	Granted in part 17 Dec 2013	
McDonald (Respondent) <i>v</i> National Grid Electricity Plc (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0263 McDonald (Appellant) <i>v</i> National Grid Electricity Plc (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0267	Lady Hale Lord Reed Lord Hughes	Granted 20 Dec 2013	

<p>Areva SA (Appellant) <i>v</i> National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0236</p> <p>Alstom and others (Appellants) <i>v</i> National Grid Electricity Transmission PLC (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0237</p> <p>Secretary of State for Health and others (Respondents) <i>v</i> Servier Laboratories Limited and Others (Appellants) UKSC 2013/0240</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Reed Lord Hughes</p>	<p>Refused 20 Dec 2013</p>	<p>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 applications 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.</p>
<p>R (on the application of Catt (AP) (Respondent) <i>v</i> Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis and another (Appellants) UKSC 2013/0114</p> <p>R (on the application of T) (AP) (Respondent) <i>v</i> Commissioner of Police of the Metropolis (Appellant) UKSC 2013/0112</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Toulson Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Granted on terms 20 Dec 2013</p>	
<p>R (on the application of Hill) (Appellant) <i>v</i> Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0140</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Reed Lord Hughes</p>	<p>Refused 20 Dec 2013</p>	<p>Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise a point of law of general public importance.</p>
<p>Cronin (Appellant) <i>v</i> The Greyhound Board of Great Britain Limited (Respondent) UKSC 2013/0166</p>	<p>Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Refused 20 Dec 2013</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 bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal.</p>
<p>In the matter of S (A Child) (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2-13/0166</p>	<p>Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Refused 20 Dec 2013</p>	<p>Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance.</p>