

1 Grand Cayman, without lawful excuse, damaged by fire property belonging
2 to Plantation Village, intending to damage or being reckless as to whether the
3 property would be damaged, and intending by the said damage to endanger
4 the life of Mrs. Evans. The Defendant has pleaded not guilty to Counts 1 and
5 2.

6 *Case for the Prosecution*

7 3. The Crown relied on six witnesses, four exhibits and formal admissions read
8 in, pursuant to s.34 of the Evidence Law (2007 Revision).

9 *Mrs. Maritza Evans ("Mrs. Evans") – the Complainant*

10 4. Mrs. Evans is the wife of the Defendant by whom she has one child, who is
11 now 10 years old. Mrs. Evans and the Defendant were married on the 26th
12 June 2007 and lived together at Bush Street in West Bay.

13 5. Mrs. Evans said that on the 15th November 2010 she rented an apartment in
14 the area of Pappagallo (the "Pappagallo apartment"). She said she rented the
15 apartment because her husband was drinking a lot and she would get scared
16 when he drinks, because he would become violent.

17 6. It was clear from Mrs. Evans's evidence that the Defendant was also very
18 jealous as she said the Defendant would torment her – accusing her of
19 infidelity. Mrs. Evans said the Defendant said:

20 *"People like [you] shouldn't be alive, you know."*

21 7. However, Mrs. Evans said she tried to keep living at the matrimonial home
22 because their little boy wanted to be with his Daddy. Mrs. Evans also tried to

1 maintain a presence at the matrimonial home because she loved the
2 Defendant and hoped that he would change his lifestyle.

3 8. On the evening of the 11th December 2010 Mrs. Evans said that she had been
4 off work and her husband was constantly calling her. She said she went out
5 to bring him home some food. She said that whilst at the matrimonial home
6 with him she saw him go into a kitchen for a fork and he picked up a knife
7 which he then put down. Although he did not do anything she got scared. She
8 recalls that when he sat down at the table and he:

9 *“Start telling me things. He even say [that] If it is the last thing he do he*
10 *will close down Plantation Village.”*

11 9. Mrs. Evans told to the Court:

12 *“I know he was going wild bad. He was like outraged then. I know the*
13 *type of person he is when he gets outraged. His eyes get flaky, like when*
14 *he’s vexed, so I get scared...”*

15 10. Because of this, Mrs. Evans said she told the Defendant that she needed to
16 get some “*dish liquid*” and she managed to get out of the Bush Street
17 residence with her little boy.

18 11. Mrs. Evans said she went to the Pappagallo apartment and her husband kept
19 calling her through the night and telling her to bring the keys for the Bush
20 Street house to him. Mrs. Evans said she eventually left the keys at the police
21 station.

22 12. Mrs. Evans said that on the morning of the 12th December 2010 she reported
23 for work at Plantation Village at around 9 a.m. Whilst in the laundry area she

1 kept receiving calls from the office reception area, so she went to that area
2 where she saw the Defendant standing in front of the counter. She said that
3 the Defendant said to her:

4 *“Come here I have something good for you.”*

5 Mrs. Evans said that Mrs. Lisa Claudette Seymour (“Mrs. Seymour”) and
6 Ms. Chiara Ordones (“Ms. Ordones”) were present when the Defendant said
7 this.

8 13. Mrs. Evans said she followed the Defendant to the front door of the reception
9 area that led outside. She said the Defendant went to his truck, which was
10 parked in the portico area outside, and he took a bottle of H7 out of it. Mrs.
11 Evans said she was just about to open the door to go outside when she saw
12 him coming towards the door with the H7 bottle, so she decided to step back
13 into the building. When asked why she did that, she said because she didn’t
14 know what was in the bottle. She said after she closed the door the
15 Defendant:

16 *“...just grabbed the door quickly and he keep shoving his hand through*
17 *the door and spraying it [the contents of the bottle] on me.”*

18 14. Mrs. Evans said the liquid he was spraying on her smelled like gasoline,
19 although it smelled like it had something else in it. Mrs. Evans said the
20 liquid:

21 *“It ... hit my face [and] it ...were burning my face and my eyes too were*
22 *burning.”*

1 15. Mrs. Evans said she then struggled to try and close the door while the
2 Defendant was trying to open the door and she called for help from Mrs.
3 Seymour. Mrs. Evans said,

4 *“I keep saying to Lisa, Lisa, please, come help me close this door ‘cause*
5 *I don’t know what he’s spraying on me.”*

6 16. Mrs. Evans said that when she, with Mrs. Seymour’s assistance, was able to
7 close the door, she saw the Defendant spray the liquid on the door and then
8 he lit it and it went into a flame.

9 17. Mrs. Evans said the next thing she knew was that the Defendant went to his
10 truck and drove the truck into the glass door of the reception area. Mrs.
11 Evans said the truck went flying into the glass and bored a hole in the glass.

12 18. Mrs. Evans said the Defendant got out of the truck and got a bottle from the
13 back of the truck. The bottle used to be red, but was burned brown by the
14 sun, and it was about a foot in height, and it contained gasoline. Mrs. Evans
15 said the Defendant threw the gasoline through the hole in the door – the hole
16 that the truck had bored –:

17 *“and he let all the gas out from there [and] the gas all was coming out*
18 *inside the building.”*

19 She described this by using a pouring motion. She said she next saw him
20 throw something, even though she could not see exactly what it was, and
21 then

22 *“..all of a sudden I see like fire, you know, the blaze.”*

1 19. Mrs. Evans said she did not recall how the Defendant lit the place afire, and
2 she did not know whether it was a lighter, but the place just started to burn
3 just after he poured the gas. She said the counter was the first place to be set
4 ablaze.

5 20. Mrs. Evans said she felt her life was in danger and indeed the lives of others.
6 Mrs. Evans said she tried to get the fire extinguisher to put out the fire but the
7 fire extinguisher would not work. Mrs. Evans said she went to the back door
8 and pulled down a fire alarm and then she ran into a guest unit because she
9 was so scared.

10 21. In cross examination Mrs. Evans said the Defendant was pulling the bar of
11 the door from the outside, and she was trying to close the door on the inside.
12 She said she did not have enough strength so she called Mrs. Seymour to
13 help her close the door. She said the Defendant was stronger than her and he
14 had enough power to keep putting the nozzle of the bottle at the door and
15 spraying the bottle, while at the same time trying to open the door to spray
16 the bottle.

17 22. In cross examination Mrs. Evans told the Court that she felt that the
18 Defendant had been drinking. She said he did not ask her to come outside to
19 talk, he said, "*Come I got something good for you.*"

20 23. Under cross examination she also said that he did not say anything when he
21 was pulling the door and spraying the gasoline on her.

22 24. Under cross examination Mrs. Evans recalled that when they were both
23 going towards the front door of the reception area she said,

1 “Georgie, please this is my workplace. Just leave the workplace. This is
2 my workplace. Don’t come here ...”

3 Mrs. Lisa Claudette Seymour (“Mr. Seymour”)

4 25. Mrs. Seymour is the office manager for Plantation Village. She recalled the
5 12th December 2010 when she came to work at around 9:30 a.m. She said she
6 walked the premises and came back into her office whereupon she saw the
7 Defendant entering Plantation Village. She said the Defendant came to the
8 front office and she noticed that he was carrying a machete in his hand. She
9 said that she advised the Defendant to leave the premises and he left the
10 premises in his red Ford Ranger truck.

11 26. She said the Defendant returned to the premises sometime after 10 a.m. in a
12 calm state. Mrs. Seymour said she tried to call the Defendant’s wife, Mrs.
13 Evans, who then came into the reception area. She next heard the Defendant
14 say to Mrs. Evans,

15 “Come here I got something for you.”

16 27. The next thing the witness saw was Mrs. Evans and the Defendant tugging at
17 the door and she heard Mrs. Evans scream,

18 “Georgie just throwing H7 on me.”

19 28. Mrs. Seymour said Mrs. Evans was on the inside and he, the Defendant, was
20 trying to spray the gasoline at her through the seam of the door and she
21 noticed that he was spraying from an H7 bottle.

1 29. Mrs. Seymour said after she and Mrs. Evans got the door closed the
2 Defendant continued to spray the glass of the door and he lit it with a green
3 cigarette lighter.

4 30. Mrs. Seymour then saw the Defendant get into his red Ford Ranger truck,
5 reverse to towards the back of the building, rev it up and then drive it into the
6 front of Mrs. Evans's car.

7 31. Mrs. Seymour then saw the Defendant get a red gasoline can out. Mrs.
8 Seymour said,

9 *"George, what are you doing this blessed Sunday morning?"*

10 32. Mrs. Seymour said *"he looked at me"* and she jumped back inside and the
11 Defendant got out of the truck with a red gasoline bottle and she said:

12 *"He started to like pelt gasoline over the place. He light the tip of the*
13 *gasoline bottle and threwed it into the front door of the premises and the*
14 *nightmare started then."*

15 Mrs. Seymour said the *"black huge smoke just blaired (sic) up."*

16 33. Mrs. Seymour said she managed to get a fire extinguisher working. It emitted
17 some foam but not enough, so she went around the building to try and get the
18 guests to bring fire extinguishers.

19 34. She then saw the Defendant standing outside and she said,

20 *"Georgie, this is what you want. This is what you gonna get. You gonna*
21 *rotten in hell for this one."*

1 35. The witness said the Defendant was shouting with his hands up in the air and
2 still in a rage,

3 *“I am George Evans. I did it. I did it.”*

4 36. Mrs. Seymour said she was very concerned because there were two propane
5 cylinders on the premises and the truck was still there and she thought
6 something very devastating would happen if the truck exploded. She said that
7 fortunately six guys came and pulled the truck away from the building. She
8 said with the fire extinguishers and the assistance of guests and workers, they
9 got the fire under control.

10 37. Under cross examination Mrs. Seymour said that when she and Mrs. Evans
11 were trying to close the door the Defendant was tugging from outside to
12 spray Mrs. Evans on the inside, and he kept trying to use the nozzle of the H7
13 bottle to continue spraying.

14 38. Under cross examination it was put to Mrs. Seymour that the Defendant
15 never had a machete and she replied clearly that he did come to the premises
16 with a machete. She added that when he returned the second time he was
17 calm with a smile on his face and she, Mrs. Seymour, thought that the
18 Defendant had been upset but that he had calmed down.

19 39. Mrs. Seymour said that she thought it was gasoline coming out of the H7
20 bottle and not H7.

21 40. Mrs. Seymour said that after the Defendant had hit Mrs. Evans’s car, he kept
22 looking at Mrs. Seymour. She said she, Mrs. Seymour, told him to leave the
23 premises, but he just kept looking at her:

1 “...with that evil look and he got back into the truck and this is when I
2 jumped back in the door again when I see him driving towards the
3 building, that he was in such a rage.”

4 Ms. Chiara Ordones (“Ms. Ordones”)

5 41. Ms. Ordones gave a statement on the 12th December 2010. She said that she
6 heard the Defendant saying “*Is Maritza here*” and then Mrs. Evans came
7 from the laundry area to him. Ms. Ordones then saw the Defendant take a
8 bottle of H7 from his truck outside and use it to begin spraying the front door
9 of the office when Mrs. Evans was “*desperately*” trying to keep the door
10 shut.

11 42. Ms. Ordones said she rang 911. She said she saw the door “catch fire” after
12 the Defendant sprayed the door. She then saw the Defendant crash his truck
13 into the office door and he went to the back of the truck and brought a red
14 petrol can which he poured all around the front door, and then she saw it
15 burst into flames.

16 43. Ms. Ordones said she was absolutely terrified and felt that her life was in
17 great danger.

18 Mr. Philip Coley (“Mr. Coley”)

19 44. Mr. Coley gave a statement on the 13th December 2010. He saw a red truck
20 being driven deliberately into the front doors of the office at Plantation
21 Village. He then saw a male get out of the vehicle and he saw the male throw
22 something into the office and then, immediately, there were flames inside the

1 building. Mr. Coley then said he saw the male walk to the rear of the truck
2 and then he just stood around.

3 Mr. Lasse Tuononen

4 45. Mr. Tuononen was a guest at Plantation Village at the time of the incident.
5 At about 10 a.m. he “*heard a loud bang*” and then another, and then he saw
6 the red Ford truck with its front corner “*buried into the front doors of the*
7 *reception*” area at Plantation Village. He then saw a male standing by the
8 doors of the reception area. The male next made his way to the driver’s door
9 of the truck and leaned into the truck. After this, he stepped back and went to
10 the door of the reception area, stooped down, leaned forward “*with one hand*
11 *then the whole front of reception burst into flame.*” Mr. Tuononen said that
12 after this the male just “*aimlessly stood around with his hands on his hips.*”

13 Detective Constable Daniel Spence

14 46. Detective Constable Spence received a report via 911 at approximately 10:15
15 a.m. He went to Plantation Village and on approaching he could see “*there*
16 *was much smoke.*” At the scene he said he saw “*a large fire coming from the*
17 *doorway of the sales office doors*” and he also saw the Defendant George
18 Evans in the car park.

19 47. Detective Spence said the Defendant seemed to be under the influence of
20 alcohol because his speech was slurred, his eyes were glazed and he appeared
21 to be unsteady on his feet.

1 48. Detective Spence arrested the Defendant and cautioned him. He recalled that
2 the Defendant said that he had been drinking alcohol and that he was guilty
3 of that.

4 49. Detective Spence recalled seeing the red XLT Ford Ranger truck. Inside the
5 truck he saw an H7 bottle, a can of WD40 and some beer and liquor bottles.

6 Exhibits

7 50. The Crown introduced Exhibit 4 which was a Laboratory Report dated the
8 22nd December 2010 from Forensic and Scientific Testing Inc. in
9 Lawrenceville, Georgia, U.S.A. A forensic chemist, namely Douglas Baron,
10 certified that the sample of the substance taken from the H7 bottle contained
11 gasoline.

12 51. The Crown closed its case with formal agreed admissions affirming that the
13 report of the Cayman Islands Fire Service was admitted and further that the
14 damage caused to the Plantation Village property as a result of the fire
15 amounted to US\$200,000.00.

16 ***Summary of the Case for the Prosecution***

17 52. The Crown submits that the Defendant demonstrated an intention to kill his
18 wife, Mrs. Evans. The Crown relies on the fact that as far back as November
19 2010 he said, "*Women like you should not be alive,*" when accusing her of
20 infidelity. The Crown further submits that the Complainant did not view this
21 as an idle threat and actually rented an apartment to which she could retreat
22 with her young child. The Crown also relies on the fact that these accusations
23 of infidelity continued, and on the night before the incident the Defendant

1 threatened to “close down Plantation Village”, both at dinner and during a
2 telephone call.

3 53. On the morning of the 12th December 2010 the Defendant came to Plantation
4 Village with a machete and the Crown submits that he was not on a peaceful
5 mission, given his threats and statements from the previous night. When told
6 to leave by Mrs. Seymour, the Defendant adopted a deceptive ploy and
7 returned to lure his wife outside the premises, not because he had something
8 good for her, but because he wanted to spray her with gasoline.

9 54. The Crown submits that the struggle between the wife and the Defendant, in
10 which the Defendant tried to keep the door open in order to spray his wife
11 with gasoline from the H7 bottle, together with the pouring of gasoline onto
12 the floor of the area in which the wife was standing, and the lighting of that
13 gasoline, demonstrates an intent to kill the wife, Mrs. Evans.

14 55. The Crown submits that this intention was not limited to causing Mrs. Evans
15 grievous bodily harm, but it demonstrates a clear intention to kill.

16 56. The Crown relies on s.318(1) of the Penal Code Law which reads:

17 *“When a person intending to commit an offence begins to put his*
18 *intention into execution by means adapted to its fulfillment, and*
19 *manifests his intention by some overt act but does not fulfill his intention*
20 *to such an extent as to commit the offence, he is deemed to attempt to*
21 *commit the offence.”*

22 57. The Crown submits that the Defendant first arrived at Plantation Village on
23 the 12th December 2010 with a machete. As result of Mrs. Seymour’s prompt
24 and firm action he left the scene. However he returned some 30 minutes later
25 in a cool and calm manner. He invited the Mrs. Evans outside because he had

1 “something good” to show her. The “something good” was the spraying of
2 gasoline from the H7 bottle on the Complainant – hitting her face and her
3 eyes. The Crown submits that this shows an intention to kill Mrs. Evans. The
4 Crown submits that the Defendant manifested his intention by these acts,
5 even though he was not able to fulfill his intention to commit the offence of
6 murder because of the alertness and quick action of Mrs. Evans, and the
7 responsiveness and equally quick action of Mrs. Seymour.

8 58. The Crown submits that it was only when the effort to continue spraying his
9 wife with gasoline was thwarted that the Defendant then returned to his
10 vehicle, crashed into his wife’s car to render her vehicle inoperable, then
11 proceeded to crash his truck into the reception area, and, in pouring the
12 gasoline into the reception area and lighting it, the Crown submits that the
13 Defendant, again, tried to carry out his intention to kill by burning the
14 premises with his wife inside.

15 59. In addition, the Crown submits that even if the Defendant were intoxicated,
16 the intoxication was voluntary, and it would still be possible to intend to kill
17 even whilst under the influence of alcohol. The Crown submits that the issue
18 of intoxication does not negate the specific intent to kill the Complainant.

19 60. In addition the Crown submits that the Defendant caused damage to
20 Plantation Village, and intended by the said damage to endanger the life of
21 Mrs. Evans. The Crown submits that the *actus reus* is the Defendant pouring
22 the petrol into the premises and setting it alight – having earlier tried to spray
23 the Defendant with gasoline from the H7 bottle. Again, the Crown submits

1 “While on the subject I might say a word on the duty of the judge when
2 giving judgment in a trial under the 1973 Act. He has no jury to charge
3 and therefore will not err if he does not state every legal proposition and
4 review every fact and argument on either side. His duty is not as in a jury
5 trial to instruct laymen as to every relevant aspect of the law or to give a
6 full and balanced picture of the facts for decision by others. His task is to
7 reach conclusions and to give reasons to support his view and,
8 preferably, to notice any difficult or unusual points of law in order that if
9 there is an Appeal, it may be seen how his view of the law informed his
10 approach to the facts.”

11

12 70. More recently our Court of Appeal in **Randy Martin v. R** Crim. App. R. 2 of
13 2010 delivered their reasons for dismissing the Appeal on the 7th December
14 2010. Mottley J.A. again adopting **R v. Thompson** [1977] NI 24 also adopted
15 **R v. Thain** [1985] NI 457 where Lowry LCJ said at page 478:

16 “Where the trial is conducted and the factual conclusions are reached by
17 the same person, one need not expect every step in the reasoning to be
18 spelled out expressly, nor is the reasoning carried out in sealed
19 compartments with no inter-communication or overlapping, even if the
20 need to arrange a judgment in a logical order may give that impression.
21 It can safely be inferred that, when deliberating on a question of fact
22 with many aspects, even more certainly than when tackling a series of
23 connected legal points, a judge who is himself the tribunal of fact will (a)
24 recognize the issues and (b) view in its entirety a case where one issue is
25 interwoven with another.”

26

27 71. Following Lowry LCJ in **R v. Thompson** and **R v. Thain**, Mottley J.A. said
28 in **Randy Martin v. R** at paragraph 31:

29 “From these cases the following guidance may be discerned. A judge
30 sitting in a criminal case without a jury, in rendering his decision and
31 giving his reasons for so concluding, is not required to review every fact
32 and to detail each argument on which the prosecution and defence rely
33 as if he were summing up to a jury. The judge must set out the conclusion
34 reached and make clear the reasons for arriving at that conclusion. He is
35 required to have regard to any difficult or unusual points of law and to
36 show how those points of law have in anyway impacted the conclusion
37 that he has reached.”

38

1 72. The issue of drunkenness has been raised in both Counts 1 and 2.

2 73. It is correct to say that the Defendant's wife was more scared of the
3 Defendant when he was drinking because he became violent. I do note that
4 Constable Spence felt that the Defendant was under the influence of alcohol
5 by observing the Defendant's unsteadiness, slurred speech and glazed eyes.

6 74. Mrs. Seymour did not say that the Defendant was in a drunken state, or that
7 he did not know what he was doing. In fact, Mrs. Seymour pointed out that
8 the Defendant returned in a calm and reasonable manner. He was in control
9 of himself and was able to invite Mrs. Evans outside because "*he had*
10 *something good for her.*"

11 75. As was stated by Lord Justice Geoffrey Lane in ***R v. Michael Sheehan***
12 (1974) 60 Cr. App. R. 308 at page 312 where he states:

13 "*We think that the proper direction to a jury is, first, to warn them that*
14 *the mere fact that the defendant's mind was affected by drink so that he*
15 *acted in a way in which he would not have done had he been sober does*
16 *not assist him at all, provided that the necessary intention was there. A*
17 *drunken intent is nevertheless an intent. Secondly, and subject to this, the*
18 *jury should merely be instructed to have regard to all the evidence,*
19 *including that relating to drink, to draw such inference as they think*
20 *proper from the evidence, and on that basis to ask themselves whether*
21 *they feel sure that at the material time the defendant had the requisite*
22 *intent.*"

23
24 76. It is my duty to consider any evidence of intoxication. I must warn myself
25 that the mere fact that the Defendant's mind was affected by drink so that he
26 might have acted in a way in which he would not have done, had he been
27 sober does not assist the Defendant at all, provided that the necessary
28 intention to commit the two offences set out in Counts 1 and 2 was there.

1 clearly so alarmed by this threat that some three and a half weeks before the
2 incident on the 12th December 2010 she arranged to live in the Pappagallo
3 apartment away from the matrimonial home.

4 82. There is evidence that the Defendant's threats to his wife continued. On the
5 night prior to the 12th December 2010 Mrs. Evans was so disturbed by the
6 manner in which the Defendant picked up the knife that she made an excuse
7 about needing "*dish liquid*" and left the matrimonial home to go to the
8 Pappagallo apartment. Mrs. Evans did not return to the matrimonial home.

9 83. On the following morning the Defendant arrived at Plantation Village with a
10 machete and, as Senior Crown counsel submitted, this was not a peaceful
11 mission. As a result of Mrs. Seymour's firm action the Defendant left the
12 premises. However, the Defendant returned some 30 minutes later.

13 84. What this Court finds particularly disturbing is that it was gasoline and not
14 H7 liquid which was in the H7 bottle which the Defendant had in his
15 custody. The Defendant had the gasoline, together with a cigarette lighter
16 when he, in a cool and calm manner, invited Mrs. Evans out of Plantation
17 Village because he had "*something good*" to give her. The "*something good*"
18 proceeded to be the gasoline which the Defendant sprayed on Mrs. Evans's
19 face and into her eyes from the H7 bottle.

20 85. The Court asks itself three questions:

21 A. How did the gasoline get into the H7 bottle? – The Court finds
22 that the Defendant knew that there was gasoline in the H7 bottle.
23 Why else was he so quick to use the lighter to start the blaze on

1 the door of the Plantation Village reception office. The logical
2 and compelling inference is that before he arrived and invited
3 Mrs. Evans outside, the Defendant had poured gasoline into the
4 H7 bottle.

5 B. The second question the Court asks itself is: Why did the
6 Defendant spray the gasoline into Mrs. Evans's face and eyes?

7 C. And the third question is: Why did the Defendant continue to try
8 to spray Mrs. Evans until she and Mrs. Seymour managed to get
9 the door closed?

10 86. The Court finds that the Defendant returned to Plantation Village prepared
11 with gasoline and the lighter to carry out his intention to kill Mrs. Evans.

12 87. The Court notes that the Defendant was only prevented from spraying more
13 of Mrs. Evans's body with gasoline by the quick action and assistance from
14 Mrs. Seymour. The Defendant sprayed the crack in the door, and the door
15 itself, and immediately lit the gasoline he had sprayed on the door when Mrs.
16 Evans just managed to close it with Mrs. Seymour's assistance.

17 88. Not content with that, the Defendant then drove his truck into Mrs. Evans's
18 vehicle to disable it. He then drove his truck into the door of the reception
19 area, which made a hole in the door, and then he proceeded to pour more
20 gasoline from a larger container into the reception area, and immediately set
21 it on fire.

22 89. I find that all these actions on the part of the Defendant, when taken as a
23 whole, demonstrate an intention to kill Mrs. Evans, and only the quick action

1 of stopping the Defendant from spraying more gasoline over Mrs. Evans,
2 prevented the Defendant from killing her.

3 90. Accordingly, I am satisfied beyond all reasonable doubt that the Defendant is
4 guilty of attempted murder. I am also satisfied beyond all reasonable doubt
5 that the Defendant is guilty of Arson, in that, without lawful excuse, he
6 damaged by fire, property belonging to Plantation Village, intending to
7 damage the property and intending, by the said damage to endanger the life
8 of Mrs. Evans.

9 91. Accordingly I return a verdict of guilty on Counts 1 and 2.

10

11

12 **Dated this the 12th day of August 2011**

13

14

15

16 **Honourable Mr. Justice Charles Quin**
17 **Judge of the Grand Court**

