

Permission to Appeal results – JCPC February 2016

Case name	Justices	PTA	Reasons given
Sumodhee (No 1) (Appellant) <i>v</i> The State of Mauritius (Respondent) (Mauritius) Case No: JCPC 2015/0003	Lord Mance Lord Wilson Lord Hodge	Refused 3 Feb 2016	As to the judgment dated 18 th June 2004 and 18 th March 2005 (applications 2015/0003, 0004, 0006, 0007, 0009 and 0011), Permission to appeal and the applications for extensions of time be REFUSED. No good reason has been shown for the delays, and the matters relied upon do not establish a risk of a serious miscarriage of justice justifying extensions of time (or, the grant of permission to appeal if time were extended). The fact that the National Human Rights Commission concluded that there currently exists no fresh and compelling evidence as defined under the law does not assist the current applications.
Sumodhee (No 2) (Appellant) <i>v</i> The State of Mauritius (Respondent) (Mauritius) Case No: JCPC 2015/0004			
Sumodhee S (No 1) (Appellant) <i>v</i> The State of Mauritius (Respondent) (Mauritius) Case No: JCPC 2015/0006			
Sumodhee S (No 2) (Appellant) <i>v</i> The State of Mauritius (Respondent) (Mauritius) Case No: JCPC 2015/0007			
Keeramuth (No 1) (Appellant) <i>v</i> The State of Mauritius (Respondent) (Mauritius) Case No: JCPC 2015/0009			
Nawoor (Appellant) <i>v</i> The State of Mauritius (Respondent) (Mauritius) Case No: JCPC 2015/0011			
Sumodhee (No 3) (Appellant) <i>v</i> The State of Mauritius (Respondent) (Mauritius) Case No: JCPC 2015/0005		Granted in part 3 Feb 2016	As to the judgment dated 27 th October 2004 (applications 2015/0005, 0008 and 0010), the applications for extensions of time are GRANTED to enable the application to be made for disclosure of the relevant recording, if still available, and permission to appeal be GRANTED on this point.

Sumodhee. S (No 3) (Appellant) v The State of Mauritius (Respondent) (Mauritius) Case No: JCPC 2015/0008			
Keeramuth (No 2) (Appellant) v The State of Mauritius (Respondent) (Mauritius) Case No: JCPC 2015/0010			
Anthony Christopher Mauge (Appellant) v Attorney General of Trinidad and Tobago (Respondent) Case No: JCPC 2015/0087	Lord Mance Lord Sumption Lord Toulson	Refused 25 Feb 2016	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law or point of interpretation of the Constitution or any point of general public importance and would have no real prospect of success in any event.
In the following cases, the advice which the Board proposes to give to Her Majesty is as indicated below			
Gordon (Appellant) v The Queen (Respondent) Case No: JCPC 2015/0053	Lady Hale Lord Hughes Lord Toulson	Refused 15 March 2016	Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case.
Bethel (Appellant) v The Commissioner of Police (Respondent) Case No: JCPC 2016/0072	Lord Mance Lord Sumption Lord Toulson	Refused 15 March 2016	Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case.
Lynch and another (Appellants) v Prosperre and another (Respondents) Case No: JCPC 2014/0030	Lord Mance Lord Sumption Lord Toulson	Refused 15 March 2016	The application 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.
Curry and others (Appellants) v Superintendent of Prisons and others Case No: JCPC 2016/0008	Lord Mance Lord Sumption Lord Toulson	Refused 15 March 2016	The application for permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case, and no real prospect of success in respect of any constitutional complaint.
Phillip (Appellant) v The Director of Public Prosecution JCPC 2015/0089	Lord Kerr Lord Carnwath Lord Hughes	Granted 15 March 2016	