Permission to Appeal results – JCPC October and November 2013

Case name	Justices	PTA	Reasons given
JCPC 2013/0050 Sabapathee (Appellant) v The Director of Public Prosecutions (Respondent)	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson	Granted	
(Mauritius)	Lord Hughes	21 Oct 2013	
The Attorney General (Appellants) v Mauge and another (Respondents) (Trinidad & Tobago) JCPC 2012/0084	Lord Neuberger Lord Reed Lord Carnwath	Refused 22 Oct 2013	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Rotiv Enterprises Limited (Appellant) v All Trinidad General Workers' Union (Respondent) JCPC 2013/0009	Lord Mance Lord Clarke Lord Sumption	Refused 28 Oct 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 Judicial Committee at this time.
Beekarry (Appellant) v. Mauritius Revenue Authority and others (Respondents) JCPC 2013/0019	Lord Mance Lord Clarke Lord Sumption	Refused 28 Oct 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 Judicial Committee at this time.
Robinson (Appellant) V The State (Respondent) (Trinidad & Tobago) JCPC 2013/0038	Lord Neuberger Lord Carnwath Lord Toulson	Granted 29 Oct 2013	
Beezadhur (Appellant) v. The Independent Commission against Corruption and another (Respondents) (Mauritius) JCPC 2013/0083	Lord Mance Lord Clarke Lord Sumption	Granted in part Refused in part 29 Oct 2013	GRANTED, limited to the questions (i) on which party does the onus of proof lie regarding the application of section 5(2) of the Financial Intelligence and Money-Laundering Act 2002 and (ii) what is meant by the words "lawful business activities" in the definition of "exempt transaction" in section 2 of that Act.
			Permission is otherwise refused as the application does not raise an arguable point

			of law of general public importance.
Henriksen (Appellant) v. The State (Respondent)(Mauritius) JCPC 2013/0027	Lady Hale Lord Toulson Lord Hodge	Granted 29 Oct 2013	
JCPC 2013/0020 Vitco TT Ltd (Appellant) v. Ramhit and another (Respondents) (Trinidad &	Lord Mance Lord Clarke	Refused 29 Oct 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
Tobago)	Lord Sumption	27 Oct 2013	Judicial Committee at this time.
In the following case	o the advice which	sh the Reard p	roposes to give to Har Majosty is as indicated below
)	es, the advice whic	ch the Board p	roposes to give to Her Majesty is as indicated below
JCPC 2013/0055 Garland Marriott v The Queen	es, the advice whice	Refused	Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious
JCPC 2013/0055 Garland Marriott v The Queen (Jamaica)	es, the advice whic		Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case.
JCPC 2013/0055 Garland Marriott v The Queen (Jamaica) JCPC 2012/0089 Frederick and Others	es, the advice whice	Refused	Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case. Permission to appeal should be refused on the ground that the application did not
JCPC 2013/0055 Garland Marriott v The Queen (Jamaica) JCPC 2012/0089 Frederick and Others (Appellant) v Director of Public Prosecutions and	es, the advice whice	Refused 6 Nov 2013	Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case. Permission to appeal should be refused on the ground that the application did not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be
JCPC 2013/0055 Garland Marriott v The Queen (Jamaica) JCPC 2012/0089 Frederick and Others	es, the advice whice	Refused 6 Nov 2013 Refused	Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case. Permission to appeal should 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 Judicial Committee at this time bearing in mind that the case has
JCPC 2013/0055 Garland Marriott v The Queen (Jamaica) JCPC 2012/0089 Frederick and Others (Appellant) v Director of Public Prosecutions and Another	es, the advice whic	Refused 6 Nov 2013 Refused 6 Nov 2013	Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case. Permission to appeal should 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 Judicial Committee at this time bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal.
JCPC 2013/0055 Garland Marriott v The Queen (Jamaica) JCPC 2012/0089 Frederick and Others (Appellant) v Director of Public Prosecutions and Another Watersports Enterprises Limited (Appellant) v	es, the advice which	Refused 6 Nov 2013 Refused 6 Nov 2013 Refused	Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case. Permission to appeal should 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 Judicial Committee at this time bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal. Permission to appeal should be refused because the application does not raise an
JCPC 2013/0055 Garland Marriott v The Queen (Jamaica) JCPC 2012/0089 Frederick and Others (Appellant) v Director of Public Prosecutions and Another Watersports Enterprises Limited (Appellant) v Jamaica Grande Limited and others	es, the advice whice	Refused 6 Nov 2013 Refused 6 Nov 2013	Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case. Permission to appeal should 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 Judicial Committee at this time bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal. 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
JCPC 2013/0055 Garland Marriott v The Queen (Jamaica) JCPC 2012/0089 Frederick and Others (Appellant) v Director of Public Prosecutions and Another Watersports Enterprises Limited (Appellant) v	es, the advice which	Refused 6 Nov 2013 Refused 6 Nov 2013 Refused	Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case. Permission to appeal should 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 Judicial Committee at this time bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal. Permission to appeal should be refused because the application does not raise an
JCPC 2013/0055 Garland Marriott v The Queen (Jamaica) JCPC 2012/0089 Frederick and Others (Appellant) v Director of Public Prosecutions and Another Watersports Enterprises Limited (Appellant) v Jamaica Grande Limited and others	es, the advice which	Refused 6 Nov 2013 Refused 6 Nov 2013 Refused	Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case. Permission to appeal should 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 Judicial Committee at this time bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal. 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
JCPC 2013/0055 Garland Marriott v The Queen (Jamaica) JCPC 2012/0089 Frederick and Others (Appellant) v Director of Public Prosecutions and Another Watersports Enterprises Limited (Appellant) v Jamaica Grande Limited and others (Respondents) (Jamaica) JCPC 2013/0036	es, the advice which	Refused 6 Nov 2013 Refused 6 Nov 2013 Refused 6 Nov 2013	Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case. Permission to appeal should 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 Judicial Committee at this time bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal. 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.