

JAMAICA

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL

SUPREME COURT CIVIL APPEAL 5/06

BETWEEN CHANCELLOR & COMPANY – A FIRM APPELLANT

AND DONALD PANTON 1ST RESPONDENT

AND JANET PANTON 2ND RESPONDENT

AND JEFFREY PANTON 3RD RESPONDENT

AND DOJAP INVESTMENT LIMITED 4TH RESPONDENT

AND FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS SERVICES LIMITED 5TH RESPONDENT
(Substituted for Blaise Trust Company and
Merchant Bank Limited and Consolidated
Holdings Limited Pursuant to Order dated
20th day of February 1997 and for Blaise
Building Society pursuant to Order dated
8th day of January, 1998)

AND RAYMOND CLOUGH 6TH RESPONDENT

AND WINSTON DWYER 7TH RESPONDENT

AND ORRETT HUTCHINSON 8TH RESPONDENT

AND RAYMOND GARCIA 9TH RESPONDENT

AND EDWIN DOUGLAS 10TH RESPONDENT

AND UNIJAM LIMITED 11TH RESPONDENT

AND DJNJ INVESTMENTS LIMITED 12TH RESPONDENT

PROCEDURAL APPEAL

IN CHAMBERS

BEFORE: THE HON. MR. JUSTICE PANTON, J.A.

January 27, 2006

This is being treated as a procedural appeal as defined in the Court of Appeal Rules 1.1(8). Leave to appeal is granted and in keeping with Rule 2.4(3), the appeal is being considered by me on paper. The procedural requirements in 2.4 are waived in order that the matter be dealt with now. Having read the relevant documents, it seems that the attorneys and the first, second, third and fourth respondents have come to a parting of ways. A continued relationship between them may not be forced. The learned judge was in error in ordering that they remain together. The question is whether on the date scheduled for the hearing the judge should or should not grant an adjournment to these respondents to allow for new representation.

The order of the learned judge is set aside and the application to remove the name of Chancellor and Co. from the records is granted.