

## Permission to Appeal results – May and June 2019

Case name	Justices	PTA	Reasons given
Babooa (Appellant) <i>v</i> University of Technology, Mauritius (Respondent) (Mauritius) JCPC 2018/0079	Lord Reed Lady Black Lord Briggs	Refused 22 May 2019	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance.
Seepersad (Appellant) <i>v</i> Seepersad (Respondent) (Trinidad and Tobago) JCPC 2019/0001	Lord Wilson Lord Lloyd-Jones Lord Sales	Refused 22 May 2019	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance and the application is well out of time.
<b>In the following cases, the advice which the Board proposes to give to Her Majesty is as indicated below</b>			
The Queen <i>v</i> Vasyli (Appellant) (Bahamas) JCPC 2018/0018	Lady Hale Lord Hodge Lord Kitchin	Allowed 12 June 2019  Cross-appeal Refused 12 June 2019	1) the appeal should be allowed to proceed since, on the material provided, the case does not fall within the strict criteria for setting leave aside  2) permission to cross-appeal should be refused because the grounds for cross-appealing have not been made out".
Gulf View Medical Centre Ltd (Appellant) <i>v</i> Goetz (Respondent) (Trinidad and Tobago) JCPC 2019/0011	Lady Hale Lord Hodge Lord Kitchin	Refused 12 June 2019	Permission to appeal be refused. Whether the application or order approach applies to appeals as of right to the Judicial Committee is as yet unresolved. However, even if there is an appeal as of right in this case, the proposed appeal is so lacking in merit that the Board declines to give permission.

<p>Magner and another (Appellants) <i>v</i>  Royal Bank of Scotland International Ltd  (Respondent) (Gibraltar)  JCPC 2018/0074  Royal Bank of Scotland International Ltd  (Respondent) <i>v</i> Magner and another (Appellants)  (Gibraltar)  JCPC 2018/0094</p>	<p>Lord Reed  Lady Black  Lord Briggs</p>	<p>Refused  12 June 2019</p>	<p>Permission to appeal should be refused because the applications do not raise an arguable point of law. The Court of Appeal's decision as to costs will, of course, be reviewable in the event that the main appeal succeeds, but not otherwise.</p>
<p>Pearman-DeSilva (Appellant) <i>v</i>  The Queen (Respondent) (Bermuda)  JCPC 2018/0111  The Queen (Respondent) <i>v</i>  Gardner (Appellant) (Bermuda)  JCPC 2017/0079</p>	<p>Lord Wilson  Lord Lloyd-Jones  Lord Sales</p>	<p>Refused  12 June 2019</p>	<p>Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in these cases.</p>
<p>Stanford (Appellant) <i>v</i>  Akers and another (Respondents) (British Virgin Islands)  JCPC 2019/0002</p>	<p>Lord Wilson  Lord Lloyd-Jones  Lord Sales</p>	<p>Refused  12 June 2019</p>	<p>The application for permission to appeal should be refused because on the assumption that the Appellant has an appeal as of right, denied by the local court, we nevertheless refuse permission because the appeal has no prospect of success.</p>
<p>JS (Appellant) <i>v</i>  RS and others (Respondents) (Isle of Man)  JCPC 2019/0032</p>	<p>Lord Wilson  Lord Lloyd-Jones  Lord Sales</p>	<p>Refused  12 June 2019</p>	<p>Permission to appeal should be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance.</p>