

## Permission to Appeal results – March 2014 | The Supreme Court of the United Kingdom

| Case name   | Justices                                     | PTA                    | Reasons given   |
|---|--|------------------------|---|
| Neumans LLP (A Firm) (Appellant) <i>v</i><br>Andronikou and others (Joint Administrators of<br>the Company) (Respondents)<br>UKSC 2013/0195   | Lord Neuberger<br>Lord Wilson<br>Lord Hughes | Refused<br>10 Mar 2014 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.  |
| Hamed (Appellant) <i>v</i><br>Stevens (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0211  | Lord Neuberger<br>Lord Wilson<br>Lord Hughes | Refused<br>10 Mar 2014 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.  |
| BB (Appellant) <i>v</i><br>The Special Immigrations Appeal Commission<br>and Another (Respondents)<br>UKSC 2013/0171                          | Lord Neuberger<br>Lord Wilson<br>Lord Hughes | Refused<br>10 Mar 2014 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.  |
| Bank of Cyprus UK Limited (Respondent) <i>v</i><br>Menelaou (Appellant)<br>UKSC 2013/0171   | Lord Neuberger<br>Lord Wilson<br>Lord Hughes | Granted<br>10 Mar 2014 |   |
| Societe des Produits Nestle S.A. (Respondent) <i>v</i><br>Cadbury UK Limited (Appellant)<br>UKSC 2013/0233                                    | Lord Neuberger<br>Lord Wilson<br>Lord Hughes | Refused<br>11 Mar 2014 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law. In relation to the point of European Union law said to be raised by or in response to the application it is not necessary to request the Court of Justice to give any ruling, because the question is irrelevant as the Court's existing jurisprudence already provides a sufficient answer. The Judgment of the Court of Appeal turns on the facts of the particular case, namely on certainty: the test is not in dispute. |
| Pine (Appellant) <i>v</i><br>Royds LLP and others (Respondents)<br>UKSC 2013/0167   | Lady Hale<br>Lord Sumption<br>Lord Reed      | Refused<br>17 Mar 2014 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time.   |
| R (on the application of Bourgass and another)<br>(AP) (Appellants) <i>v</i><br>Secretary of State for Justice (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0230 | Lady Hale<br>Lord Sumption<br>Lord Reed      | Granted<br>17 Mar 2014 |   |
| SS (Malaysia) (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i><br>Secretary of State for the Home Department<br>(Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0220                       | Lady Hale<br>Lord Sumption<br>Lord Reed      | Refused<br>17 Mar 2014 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law.  |
| Price and another (Appellants) <i>v</i><br>Nunn (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0232  | Lord Mance<br>Lord Carnwath<br>Lord Hodge    | Refused<br>17 Mar 2014 | Permission to appeal be refused because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance.   |

|  |   |                        |   |
|--|---|------------------------|---|
| R (on the application of the United Road Transport Union “URTU”) (Appellant) v Secretary of State for Transport (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0245 | Lord Mance<br>Lord Carnwath<br>Lord Hodge       | Refused<br>17 Mar 2014 | 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 by the Supreme Court at this time bearing in mind that the case has already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal. |
| The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) v Khatel (Appellant)<br>UKSC 2013/0182   | Lord Kerr<br>Lord Clarke<br>Lord Toulson        | Refused<br>17 Mar 2014 | Permission to appeal be refused because the applications do not raise a point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time bearing in mind that the cases have already been the subject of judicial decision and reviewed on appeal.          |
| The Secretary of State for the Home Department (Respondent) v Raju (Appellant)<br>UKSC 2013/0184   |   |                        |   |
| The Secretary of State Home Department (Respondent) v Adhikari (Appellant)<br>UKSC 2013/0185   |   |                        |   |
| Her Majesty’s Attorney General (Respondent) v Scarth (Appellant)<br>UKSC 2013/0217   | Lord Kerr<br>Lord Clarke<br>Lord Toulson        | Refused<br>17 Mar 2014 | 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 by the Supreme Court at this time.  |
| R (on the application of Minter) (Appellant) v Chief Constable of Hampshire (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0210                                     | Lord Kerr<br>Lord Clarke<br>Lord Toulson        | Refused<br>17 Mar 2014 | 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 by the Supreme Court at this time.  |
| London City Airport (Respondent) v Stuart (Appellant)<br>UKSC 2013/0256  | Lord Kerr<br>Lord Clarke<br>Lord Toulson        | Refused<br>17 Mar 2014 | 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 by the Supreme Court at this time.  |
| R (on the application of Trail Riders Fellowship and another) (Respondents) v Dorset County Council (Appellant)<br>UKSC 2013/0153              | Lord Neuberger<br>Lord Carnwath<br>Lord Toulson | Granted<br>24 Mar 2014 |   |
| Sapporo Breweries Limited (A company incorporated under the laws of Japan) (Respondent) v. Lupofresh Limited (Appellant)<br>UKSC 2013/0200     | Lord Mance<br>Lord Carnwath<br>Lord Hodge       | Granted<br>24 Mar 2014 |   |
| Gabriel (Appellant) v Little and Another (Respondents)<br>UKSC 2014/0025   | Lord Mance<br>Lord Carnwath<br>Lord Hodge       | Refused<br>25 Mar 2014 | Permission to appeal be refused as against the Respondents Little and High Tech (the First set of Respondents) because the application does not raise an arguable point of law of general public importance which ought to be considered by the Supreme Court at this time.                         |

|   |   |                        |  |
|---|---|------------------------|--|
| BPE Solicitors and Another (Respondents) <i>v</i><br>Gabriel (Appellant)<br>UKSC 2014/0026                                |   | Granted<br>25 Mar 2014 |  |
| NS (AP) (Kosovo) (Appellant) <i>v</i><br>The Secretary of State for the Home<br>Department (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0218 | Lord Mance<br>Lord Carnwath<br>Lord Hodge | Refused<br>27 Mar 2014 | 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 by the Supreme Court at this time. |
| In the matter of K(A Child) (Northern Ireland)  | Lord Neuberger<br>Lady Hale<br>Lord Kerr  | Granted<br>25 Mar 2014 |  |
| Mirga (AP) (Appellant) <i>v</i><br>Secretary of State for Work and Pensions<br>UKSC 2013/0161                             | Lady Hale<br>Lord Sumption<br>Lord Reed   | Granted<br>25 Mar 2014 |  |
| Samin (AP) Appellant <i>v</i><br>Westminster City Council (Respondent)<br>UKSC 2013/0225                                  | Lady Hale<br>Lord Sumption<br>Lord Reed   | Granted<br>25 Mar 2014 |  |