

Permission to Appeal results – JCPC November and December 2013

Case name	Justices	PTA	Reasons given
The Presidential Insurance Company Ltd (Appellant) <i>v</i> Mohammed and others (Respondents) JCPC 2012/0085	Lord Neuberger Lord Mance Lord Clarke	Granted 5 Nov 2013	
Tota-Maharaj (Appellant) <i>v</i> The Beacon Insurance Company (Respondent) JCPC 2013/0053	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Hughes	Refused 2 Dec 2013	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general importance which ought to be considered by the Judicial Committee at this time. There has been no final decision as to whether the Defendant can raise the contractual limitation point at this very late stage.
Stephen (Appellant) <i>v</i> Harmon (Respondent) JCPC 2012/0081	Lord Mance Lord Wilson Lord Hughes	Refused 4 Dec 2013	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law or any point of general public importance. There was no appeal as of right to the Privy Council. No arguable case is shown on the merits, still less any of general importance. The Court of Appeal held that the appeal to them was frivolous and no reason has been shown why the Privy Council should take any different view.
Rameshwar Maharaj (Appellant) <i>v</i> Johnson and others (Respondents) JCPC 2013/0063	Lady Hale Lord Reed Lord Hughes	Granted 20 Dec 2013	
Liyakat Ali Polin (Appellant) <i>v</i> The State of Mauritius (Respondent) JCPC 2013/0037	Lord Kerr Lord Wilson Lord Hodge	Granted 20 Dec 2013	
In the following cases, the advice which the Board proposes to give to Her Majesty is as indicated below			
Harold Brady (Appellant) <i>v</i> The General Legal Council (Respondent) JCPC 2013/0024		Refused	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
Paulista Limited (Appellant) <i>v</i>		Refused	Permission to appeal should be refused because the application does

Alfredo Neves Penteadó Moraes (Respondent) JCPC 2013/0046			not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance.
Apollon Metaxides (Appellant) <i>v</i> Swart and Others (Respondents) JCPC 2013/0062		Granted	
Silver Point Condominium Apartments (Appellants) <i>v</i> Johann D Swart and others (Respondents) JCPC 2013/0073			
The Federal Republic of Brazil and another (Appellants) <i>v</i> Durant International Corporation and another (Respondents) JCPC 2013/0069		Refused in part Granted in part	Permission to appeal should be refused (except in relation to backward tracking) because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance.
Gold Rock Corp Limited Del Zotto Products of Florida Inc (Appellants) <i>v</i> Nylund Hylton (Respondent) JCPC 2013/0031		Granted	
Hall (Appellant) <i>v</i> Maritek Bahamas Limited (Respondent) JCPC 2013/0013		Granted	
Rami Yiacoub Samuel Yiacoub (Appellants) <i>v</i> The Queen (Respondent) JCPC 2013/0005		Granted	
Lloyd (Appellant) <i>v</i> Roycan International Banking and others (Respondents) JCPC 2013/0010		Refused	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. The Panel considers that the appeal is devoid of merit.
Cassell and another (Appellants) <i>v</i> The Queen (Respondent) JCPC 2013/0056		Granted in part	
Pora (Appellant) <i>v</i> The Queen (Respondent) (New Zealand) JCPC 2013/0081		Granted in part	