

## Permission to Appeal results – JCPC February to March 2017

Case name	Justices	PTA	Reasons given
Hurloll (Appellant) <i>v</i> The State (Respondent) (Mauritius) JCPC 2016/0055	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Hughes	Refused 25 Jan 2017	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Marthe (Appellant) <i>v</i> The State of Mauritius (Respondent) (Mauritius) JCPC 2016/0099	Lady Hale Lord Wilson Lord Hughes	Refused 16 Feb 2017	Permission to appeal be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case.
Patterson (Appellant) <i>v</i> Jagdeo-Gadar and another (Respondents) (Trinidad & Tobago) JCPC 2016/0076	Lord Neuberger Lord Carnwath Lord Hodge	Refused 23 Feb 2017	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
First Global Funds Ltd PCC and another (Appellants) <i>v</i> The Financial Services Commission of Mauritius and another (Respondents) (Mauritius) JCPC 2016/0082	Lord Mance Lord Clarke Lord Toulson	Refused 1 March 2017	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law and it is clearly inappropriate to pursue proceedings in Mauritius in the light of the Hong Kong proceedings.
<b>In the following cases, the advice which the Board proposes to give to Her Majesty is as indicated below</b>			
Borden (Appellant) <i>v</i> The Queen (Respondent) (Cayman Islands) JCPC 2016/0058	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Hughes	Refused 15 Feb 2017	Permission to appeal should be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
The Queen (Appellant) <i>v</i> Gardner (Respondent) (Bermuda) JCPC 2016/0068	Lord Neuberger Lord Clarke Lord Hughes	Refused 15 Feb 2017	Permission to appeal should be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Edgecombe and another (Appellant) <i>v</i> Antigua Flight Training Centre (Respondent) (Antigua and Barbuda) JCPC 2016/0011	Lord Mance Lord Reed Lord Sumption	Refused 15 Feb 2017	Permission to appeal should be refused because the application, even assuming the order below to constitute in law a final decision, does not disclose any arguable case on the merits that the debt was not due.

Wildgoose (Appellant) v Commonwealth Bank Limited (Respondent) (Bahamas) JCPC 2016/0061	Lord Mance Lord Reed Lord Sumption	Refused 15 Feb 2017	Permission to appeal should be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Judicial Committee at this time. The Appellant appears to have been treated harshly by the Court of Appeal's decisions on 18 May 2015 and 16th February 2016, but, in the absence of any demonstrated merits for an appeal against the original judgment dated 6th October 2014 (though no transcript of this or of the hearing leading to it has been provided) and in the light of the possibility of applying to the Court of Appeal to restore the appeal under rules 14 (4) and (5) of the Court of Appeal Rules as well as in the absence of any point of general importance, permission is not appropriate.
Nugent and another (Appellants) v Willers (Respondent) (Isle of Man) JCPC 2016/0079	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Toulson	Granted 15 Feb 2017	
Gittins and others (Appellants) v Simpson (Respondent) (Isle of Man) JCPC 2016/0087	Lord Neuberger Lord Carnwath Lord Hodge	Refused 8 March 2017	Permission to appeal should be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Almazeedi (Appellant) v Penner and another (Respondent) (Cayman Island) JCPC 2016/0054	Lady Hale Lord Wilson Lord Hughes	Granted 8 March 2017	
Murphy (Appellant) v Murphy (Respondent) (Isle of Man) JCPC 2016/0089	Lady Hale Lord Wilson Lord Hughes	Refused 8 March 2017	Permission to appeal should be refused for the following reasons (1) The Staff of Government Division should not have disturbed the exercise of the discretion but this is not a point of law of general public importance, the law being well-settled in <i>Piglomska</i> (2) The treatment of the interests of the children following their majority may raise an arguable point of law of general public importance but (3) The amount at stake does not justify a further appeal.
C (Appellant) v C (Respondent) (Jersey) JCPC 2016/0084	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Toulson	Granted 8 March 2017	