

Permission to Appeal results – April 2019

Case name	Justices	PTA	Reasons given
Evergreen Marine (UK) Ltd (Appellant) v Nautical Challenge Ltd (Respondent) UKSC 2018/0216 Neutral Citation No: [2018] EWCA Civ 2173	Lord Kerr Lord Briggs Lord Sales	Granted 3 April 2019	
R (on the application of Price) (AP) (Appellant) v Secretary of State for Justice (Respondent) UKSC 2018/0019 Neutral Citation No: [2017] EWCA Civ 331	Lord Reed Lord Carnwath Lord Kitchin	Refused 8 April 2019	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise a point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered at this time bearing in mind that the Appellant had been re-categorised as Category B before the present application was filed.
Commissioners for Her Majesty's Revenue & Customs (Respondent) v Parry and others (Appellants) UKSC 2018/0208 Neutral Citation No: [2018] EWCA Civ 2266	Lord Reed Lord Carnwath Lord Kitchin	Granted 8 April 2019	
Putney Bridge Approach Ltd (Appellant) v Secretary of State for Communities & Local Government and others (Respondents) UKSC 2018/0212 Neutral Citation No: [2018] EWCA Civ 2268	Lord Reed Lord Carnwath Lord Kitchin	Refused 8 April 2019	Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.
R (on the application of KBR, Inc) (Appellant) v Director of the Serious Fraud Office (Respondent) UKSC 2018/0215 Neutral Citation No: [2018] EWHC 2368	Lord Kerr Lord Briggs Lord Sales	Granted 8 April 2019	

<p>R v Hilton (Respondent) (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2018/0075 Neutral Citation No: [2017] NICA 73</p> <p>R v McLaughlin (Respondent) (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2018/0076 Neutral Citation No: [2018] NICA 5</p> <p>R v Grew (Appellant) (Northern Ireland) UKSC 2018/0220 Neutral Citation No: [2018] NICA 5</p>	<p>Lord Kerr Lord Briggs Lord Sales</p>	<p>Granted 8 April 2019</p> <p>Refused 8 April 2019</p>	<p>Permission to appeal be refused because the applications do not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered at this time.</p>
<p>Haven Insurance Company Ltd (Appellant) v EUI Ltd (T/A Elephant Insurance) (Respondent) UKSC 2018/0221 Neutral Citation No: [2018] EWCA Civ 2494</p>	<p>Lord Kerr Lord Briggs Lord Sales</p>	<p>Refused 8 April 2019</p>	<p>Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered at this time.</p>
<p>JLT Speciality Ltd (Respondent) v Craven (Appellant) UKSC 2018/0223 Neutral Citation No: [2018] EWCA Civ 2487</p>	<p>Lord Kerr Lord Briggs Lord Sales</p>	<p>Refused 8 April 2019</p>	<p>Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered at this time.</p>
<p>Micula and others (Respondents/Cross-Appellants) v Romania (Appellant/Cross-Respondent) UKSC 2018/0177 Neutral Citation No: [2018] EWCA Civ 1801</p>	<p>Lord Reed Lord Carnwath Lord Kitchin</p>	<p>Granted on grounds 1 and 2 11 April 2019</p>	<p>Permission to cross-appeal be granted on Grounds 1 and 2 (power to stay execution and length of stay) with permission in relation to Grounds 3 and 4 (section 2(1) of the European Communities Act and Article 351 (TFEU)) being reserved to the hearing.</p>

<p>Unwired Planet International Ltd and another (Respondents) v Huawei Technologies (UK) Co Ltd and another (Appellants) UKSC 2018/0214 Neutral Citation No: [2018] EWCA Civ 2344</p> <p>Huawei Technologies Co Ltd and another (Appellants) v Conversant Wireless Licensing SARL (Respondent) UKSC 2019/0041 Neutral Citation No: [2019] EWCA Civ 38</p> <p>ZTE Corporation and another (Appellants) v Conversant Wireless Licensing SARL (Respondent) UKSC 2019/0042 Neutral Citation No: [2019] EWCA Civ 38</p>	<p>Lord Wilson Lord Hodge Lady Black</p>	<p>Granted 11 April 2019</p> <p>Granted 11 April 2019</p> <p>Granted 11 April 2019</p>	
<p>WM Morrisons Supermarkets plc (Appellant) v Various Claimants (Respondent) UKSC 2018/0213 Neutral Citation No: [2018] EWCA Civ 2339</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Lloyd-Jones Lady Arden</p>	<p>Granted 15 April 2019</p>	
<p>FMX Foods Merchants Import Export Co Ltd (Respondent) v Commissioners for Her Majesty's Revenue & Customs (Appellant) UKSC 2018/0218 Neutral Citation No: [2018] EWCA Civ 2401</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Lloyd-Jones Lady Arden</p>	<p>Granted 15 April 2019</p>	

<p>Aspen Underwriting Ltd and others (Appellants) v Credit Europe Bank NV (Respondent) UKSC 2018/0229 Neutral Citation No: [2018] EWCA Civ 2590</p> <p>Aspen Underwriting Ltd and others (Respondents) v Credit Europe Bank NV (Appellant) UKSC 2018/0230 Neutral Citation No: [2018] EWCA Civ 2590</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Lloyd-Jones Lady Arden</p>	<p>Granted 15 April 2019</p>	
<p>R (on the application of Sky Blue Sports & Leisure Ltd and others) (Appellants) v Coventry City Council and others (Respondents) UKSC 2018/0217 Neutral Citation No: [2018] EWCA Civ 2252</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Lloyd-Jones Lady Arden</p>	<p>Refused 16 April 2019</p>	<p>Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.</p>
<p>R (on the application of Knights) (Appellant) v Secretary of State for Justice (Respondent) UKSC 2018/0219 Neutral Citation No: [2017] EWCA Civ 1053</p>	<p>Lord Wilson Lord Hodge Lady Black</p>	<p>Refused 16 April 2019</p>	<p>Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.</p>
<p>Ice-World International BV & another (Appellants) v Icescape Ltd (Respondent) UKSC 2018/0207 Neutral Citation No: [2018] EWCA Civ 2219</p>	<p>Lord Wilson Lord Hodge Lady Black</p>	<p>Refused 16 April 2019</p>	<p>Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.</p>
<p>R (on the application of Shepherd (on behalf of 999 call for the NHS)) (Appellant) v National Health Service Commissioning Board and another (Respondents) UKSC 2019/0019 Neutral Citation No: [2018] EWCA Civ 2849</p>	<p>Lady Hale Lord Lloyd-Jones Lady Arden</p>	<p>Refused 30 April 2019</p>	<p>Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.</p>