

EASTERN CARIBBEAN SUPREME COURT
COURT OF APPEAL
CHAMBER HEARING

26th May 2026

MATTERS DEALT WITH ON PAPER

Before: The Hon. Mde. Cadie St. Rose-Albertini, Justice of Appeal

Case Name: Harold Mickle

v

The King

**[ANUHCRA2025/0014]
(Antigua and Barbuda)**

Date: Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:

Applicant: Mr. Warren Cassell

Respondent: No appearance

Issue: Application for extension of time, leave to appeal and notice of appeal to be deemed properly filed

Result / Order: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The Registrar of the High Court shall file and serve upon the applicant a copy of the minute of conviction and sentence, within 14 days of the date of this order.
2. The application for extension of time to file the notice of appeal and leave to appeal against sentence is adjourned to the next Chamber Hearing of the Court scheduled for 23rd June 2026.
3. The Registrar of the High Court shall serve a copy of this order on the applicant and the respondent within 7 days of the date of this order and file the requisite affidavit of service.

Reason: The minute of conviction, being a critical document necessary for the Court's consideration of the application, has not been filed.

In the absence of that document, the Court was not placed in a position to properly assess the merits of the application or exercise its discretion in relation to the relief sought.

Accordingly, the application could not be entertained and was adjourned for compliance.

Case Name: Dylan Simon

v

The King

[ANUHCRA2026/0002]
(Antigua and Barbuda)

Date: Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:

Applicant: Warren Cassell

Respondent: No appearance

Issue: Application for leave to appeal against conviction and sentence

Result / Order: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The applicant shall file and serve an affidavit in support which further particularizes and expands upon the grounds of appeal being relied on in support of the application for leave to appeal, within 14 days of the date of this order.
2. The application for leave to appeal against conviction and sentence is adjourned to the next Chamber Hearing of the Court scheduled for 23rd June 2026.
3. The Registrar of the High Court shall serve a copy of this order on the applicant and the Director of Public Prosecutions within 7 days of the date of this order and file the requisite affidavit of service.

Reason: The Court found that the proposed grounds of appeal, as presently drafted, are vague and insufficiently particularised. The Court noted that, where an applicant is represented by counsel, there is an expectation that the grounds of appeal will be properly formulated with sufficient clarity and detail to enable the Court to assess the merits of the intended appeal.

In the absence of such particularisation, the Court is unable to properly evaluate the arguability of the appeal and therefore directed that the applicant should elaborate on the proposed grounds of appeal in order to assist the Court in its determination of the application.

Case Name: Martha Aristizibal

v

ABI Bank Limited
(In Receivership)

[ANUHCVP2026/0005]
(Antigua and Barbuda)

Date: Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:

Applicant: Mr. Kendrickson Kentish

Respondent: No appearance

Issue: Application for leave to appeal

Result / Order: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The leave application is granted.
2. The applicant shall file the notice of appeal within 21 days of the date of this order.
3. Thereafter, the appeal shall proceed in accordance with the Civil Procedure Rules (Revised Edition) 2023.

Reason: The Court found that the applicant had met the threshold for the grant of leave to appeal, being satisfied that the intended appeal discloses a realistic prospect of success. In the circumstances, the Court considered that the

proposed appeal is arguable and warrants determination by the appellate court.

Case Name: Alexander Grant Enterprises Limited

v

Antigua Isle Company Limited

[ANUHCVP2025/0008]
(Antigua and Barbuda)

Date: Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:

Applicant: Mr. Adlai David Dorsett

Respondent: Mr. Hugh C. Marshall Jnr.

Issue: Application to add additional grounds of appeal

Result / Order: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The applicant is at liberty to file reply submissions and authorities in response to the respondent's skeleton argument filed on 20th May 2026, within 14 days of the date of this order.
2. The application seeking leave to add additional grounds of appeal is adjourned for further consideration at the next Chamber Sitting of this Court scheduled for 23rd June 2026.

Reason: The Court was satisfied that the respondent's notice of opposition and skeleton arguments raised substantial matters which the applicant should properly be afforded an opportunity to address.

In the interests of fairness and procedural justice, the Court considered it appropriate that the applicant be given an opportunity to respond to those arguments before a final determination is made. Accordingly, the matter was adjourned for further consideration.

Case Name: [1] Akeem Benjamin
[2] Mark Mansoor

[3] Martin Mansoor

v

[1] Novella Phillip

[2] Wayne Phillip

**[ANUHCVP2023/0014]
(Antigua and Barbuda)**

Date: **Tuesday, 26th May 2026**

On paper:

Applicant: **Ms. C. Debra Burnette**

Respondent: **Mr. George Lake**

Issue: **Application to remove counsel from the record**

Result / Order: **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

- 1. The application is granted.**
- 2. Counsel C. Debra Burnette is removed as the Legal Practitioner on record for and on behalf of the appellants.**
- 3. The applicant shall serve this order on the other parties' legal practitioners and personally on the former clients and shall provide proof of service thereof.**
- 4. Pursuant to rule 63.7(2) of the CPR this order takes effect from the date of service on the parties referenced at paragraph 3.**

Reason: **The Court found that the application for counsel to be removed from the record had been properly filed and was in compliance with the Eastern Caribbean Supreme Court Civil Procedure Rules (Revised Edition) 2023. The Court further noted that no opposition had been filed by the respondents. In the circumstances, the Court was satisfied that the application ought properly to be granted.**

Case Name: **Marvin Marlon Albert**

v

The State

**[DOMHCRAP2024/0002]
(Commonwealth of Dominica)**

Date: Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:

Applicant: In person

Respondent: No appearance

Issue: Application for leave to appeal against conviction and sentence

Result / Order: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The application for leave to appeal against conviction and sentence filed on 5th June 2024 is granted.
2. The notice of application filed on 5th June 2024 is deemed to be the notice of appeal.
3. The applicant shall indicate to the Court of Appeal Registry, in writing, his position as it relates to his legal representation, within 14 days of the date of this order.
4. The Registrar of the High Court shall serve a copy of this order on the applicant and the Director of Public Prosecutions within 7 days of the date of this order and file the requisite affidavit of service.

Reason: The Court was satisfied that it is in the interests of justice that the applicant be afforded the opportunity to pursue his appeal.

In reaching that conclusion, the Court considered the grounds advanced in support of the application and was satisfied that the proposed appeal was not frivolous and raised issues that warrant consideration by the appellate court.

Accordingly, the Court found that the applicant had met the requisite threshold for the grant of leave to appeal and granted the application.

Case Name:

Luchiano Roberts

v

Loanda Laudat

**[DOMMCVAP2026/0001]
(Commonwealth of Dominica)**

Date: **Tuesday, 26th May 2026**

On paper:

Applicant: **Ms. Shanice Henry**

Respondent: **No appearance**

Issue: **Application for service by alternative means and costs**

Result / Order: **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

- 1. The appellant shall enter into recognizance in the requisite form and provide proof thereof within 14 days of the date of this order.**
- 2. The application filed on 9th April 2026 for an order granting permission to serve the notice of appeal and all accompanying documents by specified service is adjourned for further consideration at the next chamber sitting of this Court scheduled for 23rd June 2026.**

Reason: **The Court was of the view that the applicant had failed to satisfy the requisite conditions for prosecuting an appeal from a decision of a Magistrate, as the recognizance duly entered into by the appellant, being a relevant document required to accompany the notice of appeal, had not been served.**

The Court considered that this procedural defect ought to be remedied before the appellant is allowed to proceed further with the appeal.

Case Name: **The Commissioner of Police**

v

Alvin Prospere

Date: Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:

Applicant: Mr. Arthur D. Compass

Respondent: Mr. Horace Renison Fraser

Issue: Application for stay of execution

Result / Order: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The application filed 25th March 2026 seeking a stay of execution of the orders made at paragraphs 92 (3) and 92 (7) of the judgment delivered by Combie Martyr J (Ag.) is granted.

Reason:

The Court was satisfied, having regard to the factual matrix of the matter and the principles articulated in *C-Mobile Services Ltd v Huawei Technologies Co. Ltd* (BVIHCMAP2014/0017), that a stay was warranted. The Court noted that the order under appeal required the Commissioner of Police to reconsider the claimant's/intended appellant's alleged default and to conduct the proceedings afresh in accordance with the requirements of procedural fairness and natural justice.

The Court accepted that, if the proceedings in the court below were permitted to continue pending the determination of the appeal, there was a real risk that the appeal would be rendered academic. In those circumstances, the Court considered it just and appropriate to preserve the status quo until the appeal is determined, thereby ensuring that the appellate process is not undermined and that the intended appeal, if successful, remains capable of providing effective relief.

Case Name:

[1] Joan Briscette

[2] Marie Briscette

v

Bank of Saint Lucia Limited

**[SLUHCVAP2026/0008]
(Saint Lucia)**

Date: **Tuesday, 26th May 2026**

On paper:

Applicant: **Mr. Horace Renison Fraser**

Respondent: **No appearance**

Issue: **Application for extension of time to file the notice of appeal**

Result / Order: **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

- 1. The application filed on 26th March 2026 seeking an extension of time to file a notice of appeal against the decision of Cenac- Phulgence J dated 10th February 2026 is granted.**
- 2. The applicants shall file and serve their notice of appeal within 21 days of the date of this order.**
- 3. The appeal shall thereafter proceed in accordance with the Civil Procedure Rules (Revised Edition) 2023.**

Reason: **The Court was satisfied that the delay, being only one day, was not inordinate; that the applicants had provided cogent reasons for the delay, namely medical hardship supported by evidence; and that any prejudice to the respondent, while entitled to the fruits of its judgment, was outweighed by the prejudice that would be suffered by the applicants if the extension were refused. Accordingly, the Court granted the applicants an extension of time to file their notice of appeal.**

Case Name: **[1] Donald James Scarborough**

[2] Betty Jane Scarborough

v

[1] Oliver Jordan

(Court Appointed Liquidator for Sunset Village Inc. (in Liquidation))

[2] First Caribbean International Bank (Barbados) Limited

**[3] Sunset Village Inc.
(In Liquidation)**

**[SLUHCVAP2026/0005]
(Saint Lucia)**

Date: **Tuesday, 26th May 2026**

On paper:

Applicant: **Mr. Colin Foster**

Respondent: **No appearance**

Issue: **Application for leave to appeal**

Result / Order: **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

- 1. The application for leave to appeal filed on 3rd March 2026 is granted.**
- 2. The applicants shall file the notice of appeal within 21 days of the date of this order.**
- 3. The appeal shall thereafter proceed in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Procedure Rules (Revised Edition) 2023.**

Reason: **The Court was satisfied that, having considered the grounds advanced in the applicants' affidavit and the proposed grounds of appeal, the intended appeal is not frivolous and discloses a realistic prospect of success.**

The Court was therefore of the view that the applicants had demonstrated an arguable case warranting consideration by the appellate court.

Case Name: **Mayers Printing Company Limited**

v

Invest Saint Lucia

Date: **Tuesday, 26th May 2026**

On paper:

Applicant: **Ms. Leslie Prospere**

Respondent: **No appearance**

Issue: **Application for leave to appeal and costs**

Result / Order: **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

- 1. The applicant shall file written submissions and any authorities in support of its application for leave to appeal within 14 days of the date of this order.**
- 2. The application for leave to appeal is set down for further consideration at the next chamber sitting of this Court scheduled for 23rd June 2026.**

Reason:

The Court considered that the applicant had merely asserted in its notice of application that the intended appellant “possesses a realistic prospect of successfully appealing” the decision. The applicant failed to provide sufficient details or supporting material to substantiate that assertion.

As a result, the Court was unable to properly assess the merits of the proposed appeal or determine whether the threshold for granting leave had been met.

In those circumstances, the Court considered it necessary to hear further submissions from the applicant on the prospects of success of the intended appeal before deciding whether leave to appeal should be granted.

Case Name: **Saint Lucia Development Bank**

v

Vincent Boland

**[SLUHCVAP2025/0023]
(Saint Lucia)**

Date: Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:

Applicant: Mr. Leevie Herelle

Respondent: No appearance

Issue: Application for leave to file further affidavit and deem affidavit properly filed

Result / Order: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The application filed on 29th April 2026 is granted.
2. The affidavit of Cornelius Sidonie filed on 29th April 2026 and the accompanying Certificate of Exhibits filed on even date are deemed properly filed.

Reason: The Court was satisfied that the granting of the application would occasion no prejudice to the respondent, particularly as the respondent would have an opportunity to review and, if necessary, respond to the contents of the further affidavit.

The Court further considered that permitting the filing of the affidavit would assist in ensuring that all relevant evidence is before the Court and would facilitate the just determination of the issues in dispute.

Having regard to the overriding objective and the interests of justice, the Court was of the view that the application ought to be granted. The Court also noted that no compelling reason had been advanced by the respondent, or otherwise arose on the evidence, to justify refusing the application.

Case Name: Akim Barlette

v

The Director of Public Prosecutions

Date: Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:

Applicant: In person

Respondent: No appearance

Issue: Application for leave to appeal against conviction and sentence

Result / Order: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The application for leave to appeal filed on 19th May 2025 is granted.
2. The Criminal Form 1- notice of application for leave to appeal filed 19th May 2025 is deemed to be the notice of appeal.
3. The Registrar of the High Court shall serve a copy of this order on the applicant and the Director of Public Prosecutions within 7 days of the date of this order and provide proof of service by filing the requisite affidavit.
4. The parties shall comply with the practice and procedures prescribed by the Court of Appeal Rules as well as the relevant Practice Directions in advancing this appeal.

Reason: The Court was satisfied that it is in the interests of justice that the applicant be afforded the opportunity to pursue his appeal.

In reaching that conclusion, the Court considered the grounds advanced in support of the application and was satisfied that the proposed appeal was not frivolous and raised issues that warrant consideration by the appellate court.

Accordingly, the Court found that the applicant had met the requisite threshold for the grant of leave to appeal and granted the application.

Case Name:

Kimron Lawrence

The Director of Public Prosecutions

**[NEVHCRA2025/0002]
(Saint Kitts and Nevis)**

Date: **Tuesday, 26th May 2026**

On paper:

Applicant: **In person**

Respondent: **No appearance**

Issue: **Application for leave to appeal against conviction and sentence**

Result / Order: **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

- 1. The application for leave to appeal filed on 19th May 2025 is granted.**
- 2. The Criminal Form 1- notice of application for leave to appeal filed 19th May 2025 is deemed to be the notice of appeal.**
- 3. The Registrar of the High Court shall serve a copy of this order on the applicant and the Director of Public Prosecutions within 7 days of the date of this order and provide proof of service by filing the requisite affidavit.**
- 4. The parties shall comply with the practice and procedures prescribed by the Court of Appeal Rules as well as the relevant Practice Directions in advancing this appeal.**

Reason: **The Court was satisfied that it is in the interests of justice that the applicant be afforded the opportunity to pursue his appeal.**

In reaching that conclusion, the Court considered the grounds advanced in support of the application and was satisfied that the proposed appeal was not frivolous and raised issues that warrant consideration by the appellate court.

Accordingly, the Court found that the applicant had met the requisite threshold for the grant of leave to appeal and granted the application.

Case Name:

Brent Edwards

v

The Director of Public Prosecutions

**[NEVHCRA2024/0003]
(Saint Christopher and Nevis)**

Date:

Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:

Applicant: In person

Respondent: No appearance

Issue:

Application for leave to appeal against conviction and sentence

Result / Order:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The application for leave to appeal filed on 19th December 2024 is granted.
2. The Criminal Form 1- notice of application for leave to appeal filed on 19th May 2024 is deemed to be the notice of appeal.
3. The Registrar of the High Court in St. Christopher and Nevis shall assist the applicant with filing, affidavit evidence of his financial means within 14 days of the date of this order.
4. The request for legal aid is adjourned for further consideration at the next chamber hearing of this Court scheduled for 23rd June 2026.
5. The Registrar of the High Court shall serve a copy of this order on the applicant and the Director of Public Prosecutions within 7 days of the date of this order and provide proof of service by filing the requisite affidavit.

Reason: The Court found that it is in the interests of justice to permit the applicant to pursue his appeal and was satisfied that the applicant had met the threshold for the grant of leave to appeal, the intended appeal disclosing a realistic prospect of success.

However, in relation to the application for legal aid, the Court noted that the applicant had failed to adduce cogent evidence of impecuniosity or otherwise demonstrate that he lacked sufficient means to secure legal representation. The Court observed that such information is necessary in order to properly assess and determine the application. In the absence of sufficient supporting evidence, the Court was unable to make a determination on the issue of legal aid at that stage.

Case Name: Dijon Thomas
v
The Director of Public Prosecutions
[SKBHCRA2025/0016]
(Saint Christopher and Nevis)

Date: Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:
Applicant: In person
Respondent: No appearance

Issue: Application for leave to appeal against conviction and sentence

Result / Order: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The application for leave to appeal filed on 19th May 2025 is granted.
2. The Criminal Form 1- notice of application for leave to appeal filed 19th May 2025 is deemed to be the notice of appeal.
3. The Registrar of the High Court shall serve a copy of this order on the applicant and the Director of

Public Prosecutions within 7 days of the date of this order and provide proof of service by filing the requisite affidavit.

- 4. The parties shall comply with the practice and procedures prescribed by the Court of Appeal Rules as well as the relevant Practice Directions in advancing this appeal.**

Reason:

The Court was satisfied that it is in the interests of justice that the applicant be afforded the opportunity to pursue his appeal.

In reaching that conclusion, the Court considered the grounds advanced in support of the application and was satisfied that the proposed appeal was not frivolous and raised issues that warrant consideration by the appellate court.

Accordingly, the Court found that the applicant had met the requisite threshold for the grant of leave to appeal and granted the application..

Case Name:

Divon Thomas

v

The Director of Public Prosecutions

**[SKBHCRAP2025/0017]
(Saint Christopher and Nevis)**

Date:

Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:

Applicant: In person

Respondent: No appearance

Issue:

Application for leave to appeal against conviction and sentence

Result / Order:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1. The application for leave to appeal filed on 19th May 2025 is granted.**

2. The Criminal Form 1- notice of application for leave to appeal filed 19th May 2025 is deemed to be the notice of appeal.
3. The Registrar of the High Court shall serve a copy of this order on the applicant and the Director of Public Prosecutions within 7 days of the date of this order and provide proof of service by filing the requisite affidavit.
4. The parties shall comply with the practice and procedures prescribed by the Court of Appeal Rules as well as the relevant Practice Directions in advancing this appeal.

Reason:

The Court was satisfied that it is in the interests of justice that the applicant be afforded the opportunity to pursue his appeal.

In reaching that conclusion, the Court considered the grounds advanced in support of the application and was satisfied that the proposed appeal was not frivolous and raised issues that warrant consideration by the appellate court.

Accordingly, the Court found that the applicant had met the requisite threshold for the grant of leave to appeal and granted the application.

Case Name:

Shakeem Cranston

v

The Director of Public Prosecutions

**[SKBHCRA2025/0018]
(Saint Christopher and Nevis)**

Date:

Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:

Applicant: In person

Respondent: No appearance

Issue:

Application for leave to appeal against conviction and sentence

Result / Order:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The application for leave to appeal filed on 19th May 2025 is granted.
2. The Criminal Form 1- notice of application for leave to appeal filed 19th May 2025 is deemed to be the notice of appeal.
3. The Registrar of the High Court shall serve a copy of this order on the applicant and the Director of Public Prosecutions within 7 days of the date of this order and provide proof of service by filing the requisite affidavit.
4. The parties shall comply with the practice and procedures prescribed by the Court of Appeal Rules as well as the relevant Practice Directions in advancing this appeal.

Reason:

The Court was satisfied that it is in the interests of justice that the applicant be afforded the opportunity to pursue his appeal.

In reaching that conclusion, the Court considered the grounds advanced in support of the application and was satisfied that the proposed appeal was not frivolous and raised issues that warrant consideration by the appellate court.

Accordingly, the Court found that the applicant had met the requisite threshold for the grant of leave to appeal and granted the application.

Case Name:

[1] Lincoln Pemberton

[2] Troy Douglas

v

St. Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla National Bank Limited

**[SKBHCVP2025/0004]
(Saint Christopher and Nevis)**

Date:

Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:

Applicant: Mr. OGrenville Brown

Respondent: Ms. Natika Rawlin

Issue: Application for extension of time to file notice of appeal

Result / Order: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The application filed on 10th April 2026 for an extension of time to file notice of appeal is refused.
2. The order of 24th June 2025 granting a stay is discharged.
3. Costs is awarded to the respondent to be assessed by a Judge or Master of the High Court.

Reason: The Court found that the applicants had failed to satisfy the threshold for the grant of an extension of time. In particular, the applicants did not adequately address the relevant factors which the Court is required to consider when exercising its discretion to extend time, including the reasons for the delay and the merits of the proposed appeal. The absence of sufficient evidence and submissions on these matters impaired the Court's ability to properly assess and determine the application.

The Court further noted that, in the absence of a pending appeal before it, there was no basis upon which the stay previously granted could continue. The purpose of a stay is to preserve the position of the parties pending the determination of an appeal. As no appeal was properly before the Court, the stay could no longer be justified and was therefore discharged.

Case Name: Fernando Daniel

v

The King

[SVGHCRAP2026/0001]
(Saint Vincent and The Grenadines)

Date: Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:

Applicant: In person
Respondent: No appearance

Issue: Application for leave to appeal

Result / Order: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The application filed on 20th April 2026 for leave to appeal against sentence and conviction is granted and deemed to be the notice of appeal.
2. The Registrar of the High Court shall serve a copy of this order on the applicant and the Director of Public Prosecutions within 7 days of the date of this order and provide proof of service thereof.

Reason: The Court was satisfied that it is in the interests of justice that the applicant be afforded the opportunity to pursue his appeal.

In reaching that conclusion, the Court considered the grounds advanced in support of the application and was satisfied that the proposed appeal was not frivolous and raised issues that warrant consideration by the appellate court.

Accordingly, the Court found that the applicant had met the requisite threshold for the grant of leave to appeal and granted the application.

Case Name: Anwar Jack

v

The King

[SVGHCRA2020/0017]
(Saint Vincent and The Grenadines)

Date: Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:

Applicant: In person
Respondent: No appearance

Issue: Application for legal aid

Result / Order: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The application for legal aid is hereby adjourned for further consideration at the next chamber hearing of this Court scheduled for 23rd June 2026.
2. The High Court of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines shall assist the applicant with filing an affidavit evidencing his financial means within 14 days of the date of this order.
3. The registrar of the High Court shall serve a copy of this order on the applicant within 7 days of the date of this order and provide proof of service by filing the requisite affidavit.

Reason: The Court found that the applicant had not provided sufficient evidence to establish his impecuniosity or that he lacked the means to obtain legal representation. The applicant had merely indicated that he had made a request for legal aid, without providing any supporting material in relation to his financial circumstances.

In the absence of such evidence, the Court was unable to properly assess the merits of the request. The Court therefore indicated that, before a determination could be made, further information and supporting documentation as to the applicant's means would be required.

Case Name: Luc A Despin
(In his capacity as Chapter 11 Trustee of Ho Wan Kwok)

v

[1] K Legacy Limited

[2] Qiang Guo

[BVIHCMAP2026/0006]
(Territory of the Virgin Island)

Date: Tuesday, 26th May 2026

On paper:

Applicant: Mr. Kieran Forsyth

Respondent: No appearance

Issue: Application for leave to appeal

Result / Order: IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

1. The application for leave to appeal filed on 28th April 2026 is granted.
2. The applicant shall file the notice of appeal within 21 days of the date of this order.
3. The appeal shall thereafter proceed in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Procedure Rules (Revised Edition) 2023.

Reason: The Court found that the applicant had met the threshold for the grant of leave to appeal, being satisfied that the intended appeal discloses a realistic prospect of success. In the circumstances, the Court considered that the proposed appeal is arguable and warrants determination by the appellate court.