

Permission to Appeal results – JCPC May 2016

Case name	Justices	PTA	Reasons given
<p>Devendranath Hurnam (Appellant) <i>v</i> The Attorney General and others (Respondents) (Application 1) JCPC 2016/0037</p> <p>Devendranath Hurnam (Appellant) <i>v</i> Ashley Hurranghee (Respondent) (Application 2) JCPC 2016/0038</p> <p>Devendranath Hurnam (Appellant) <i>v</i> Kumar and others (Respondents) (Application 3) JCPC 2016/0039</p> <p>Devendranath Hurnam (Appellant) <i>v</i> Matadeen and another (Respondents) (Application 4) JCPC 2016/0040</p>	<p>Lord Mance Lord Wilson Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Granted 25 May 2016 on JCPC 2016/0037</p> <p>Stayed in JCPC 2016/0038 JCPC 2016/0039 JCPC 2016/0040</p>	
<p>Chang (Appellant) <i>v</i> Minister for Health and others (Respondents) (Trinidad & Tobago) JCPC 2015/0063</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Wilson Lord Reed</p>	<p>Refused 23 May 2016</p>	<p>Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.</p>
<p>In the following cases, the advice which the Board proposes to give to Her Majesty is as indicated below</p>			
<p>Kenney and another (Appellant) <i>v</i> Chubb Limited (formerly Ace Limited) (Respondent) (Cayman Islands) JCPC 2015/0088</p>	<p>Lord Mance Lord Wilson Lord Hodge</p>	<p>Refused 4 May 2016</p>	<p>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.</p>

Brown (Appellant) <i>v</i> The Queen (Respondent) (Bahamas) JCPC 2015/0103	Lord Mance Lord Wilson Lord Hodge	Refused 4 May 2016	Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case.
Lawrence (Appellant) <i>v</i> The Queen (Respondent) (Jamaica) JCPC 2015/0109	Lord Mance Lord Wilson Lord Hodge	Refused 4 May 2016	Permission to appeal should be refused because there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case.
Hinds (Respondent) <i>v</i> 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.
Bade <i>v</i> The Queen (Solomon Islands) JCPC 2016/0041		Refused 8 June 2016	The application should be REFUSED because no jurisdiction now exists to enable the Judicial Committee to consider the application.
Neymour (Appellant) <i>v</i> The Attorney General (Respondent)(Bahamas) JCPC 2013/0091	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, and there is no risk that a serious miscarriage of justice has occurred in this case.