

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.