

Permission to Appeal results – JCPC July 2013

Case name	Justices	PTA	Reasons given
Wong Min Fong (Appellant) <i>v</i> Wong Fong Liu Sing Cheun and another (Respondents) JCPC 2013/0006	Lady Hale Lord Sumption Lord Reed	Refused 23 July 2013	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Smith (Appellant) <i>v</i> Bartholomew and another (Respondents) JCPC 2013/0014	Lord Neuberger Lord Wilson Lord Toulson	Refused 31 July 2013	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
Koonjul (Appellant) <i>v</i> The State of Mauritius (Respondent) JCPC 2013/0004	Lord Kerr Lord Carnwath Lord Hughes	Refused 31 July 2013	Permission to appeal is refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case.
Dinrany (Appellant) <i>v</i> The State of Mauritius (Respondent) JCPC 2013/0011	Lord Kerr Lord Carnwath Lord Hughes	Refused 31 July 2013	Permission to appeal be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case. On Count 1 the fine has been paid and the appeal against Count 2 was withdrawn.
In the following cases, the advice which the Board proposes to give to Her Majesty is as indicated below			
Leon Pinnock (Appellant) <i>v</i> The Queen (Respondent) (Jamaica) JCPC 2013/0032		Refused in part Granted in part 10 July 2013	Permission to appeal be refused in respect of conviction because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case. Permission to appeal is granted on sentence.
Maycock (Appellant) <i>v</i> The Attorney General (Respondent) JCPC 2012/0074		Refused 10 July 2013	Permission to appeal be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case.
Hanchell and others (Appellants) <i>v</i> Registrar of the Supreme Court (Respondent) (Turks and Caicos Islands) JCPC 2013/0049		Refused 31 July 2013	Permission to appeal be refused. Even if, contrary to the Panel's view, this were to be treated as a case where the Court of Appeal should have recognised an appeal to the Privy Council as of right, the Privy Council retains a discretion to refuse permission to appeal in a case with no prospect of success which this is.