Permission to Appeal results – JCPC June and July 2016			
Case name	Justices	PTA	Reasons given
Hinds (Respondent) v Hinds (Administrator of the Estate of Esther Rosalind Hinds) (Appellant) (Cayman Islands) JCPC 2016/0005	Lord Neuberger Lord Hughes Lord Toulson	Refused 8 June 2016	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. If the Respondent exercises its right to appeal, the Appellant should have permission to renew this application, if so advised.
Chandler (Appellant) <i>v</i> The State (Respondent) (Trinidad and Tobago) JCPC 2016/0025	Lady Hale Lord Reed Lord Toulson	Granted 2 August 2016	
In the following cases, the advice which the Bo	ard proposes to gi	ve to Her Majesty	y is as indicated below
Holmes (Appellant) <i>v</i> Carter t/a Carters (Respondent) (Isle of Man) JCPC 2015/0106	Lord Neuberger Lord Carnwath Lord Hodge	Refused 13 July 2016	Permission to appeal should be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance.
Peace Holdings Limited (Appellant) v First Caribbean International Bank (Bahamas) Ltd (Respondents) (Bahamas) JCPC 2016/0023	Lord Neuberger Lord Carnwath Lord Hodge	Refused 13 July 2016	Permission to appeal should be refused because the application does not raise a point of law of general public importance and is in any event too late.
Oakley (Appellant) <i>v</i> Osiris Trustees Limited and another (Respondent) (Isle of Man) JCPC 2016/0009	Lord Kerr Lord Sumption Lord Toulson	Refused 13 July 2016	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.
Doyle (Appellant) <i>v</i> Law Officers of the Crown (Respondent) (Guernsey) JCPC 2016/0019	Lord Kerr Lord Sumption Lord Toulson	Refused 13 July 2016	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.