

1 **IN THE GRAND COURT OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS**

2 **CAUSE NO: FSD 96 OF 2011 (PCJ)**
3 **(Originally Cause No: 329 of 2008)**

4 **The Hon. Sir Peter Cresswell**
5 **In Chambers**
6 **19th June 2013**

7
8 **BETWEEN:**

9 **CIGNA WORLDWIDE INSURANCE COMPANY (BY AND THROUGH ITS**
10 **COURT APPOINTED RECEIVER, JOSIE SENESIE AND IN RESPECT OF**
11 **THE ASSETS, UNDERTAKINGS AND AFFAIRS OF ITS LICENSED**
12 **LIBERIAN BRANCH AND BUSINESS)**

13 Plaintiff

14 **AND**

15 **ACE LIMITED**



16 Defendant

17 **Appearances:** **Lord Goldsmith PC, QC instructed by and with Mr. Colin McKie**
18 **and Mr. Adam Huckle of Maples and Calder on behalf of the**
19 **Defendant**

20 **Mr. Ben Hubble QC instructed by and with Mr Nicholas Dunne of**
21 **Walkers on behalf of Mr Martin S. Kenney and CC International**
22 **Limited**

23 **Mr. William Jones of Ogier on behalf of Echemus Group L.P. and**
24 **Echemus Investment Management Ltd. and Mr. James Little**

25
26 **RULING**

27 I refer to the Summons dated 27 April 2013 issued by Mr Martin S. Kenney ("Mr Kenney") and
28 CC International Limited ("CCI") seeking leave to appeal against the order dated 26 April 2013
29 and to the written and oral arguments in support of and in response to the application.
30

31 In relation to the jurisdiction to order service out of the Costs Summons, Mr Kenney and CCI
32 are in exactly the same position in relation to the legal principles as to joinder and service, as
33 Echemus Group LP and Echemus Investment Management Ltd. Echemus Group LP and
34 Echemus Investment Management Ltd have accepted that they have been validly joined and
35 served and are subject to the jurisdiction of the court.

1 I refer to the Analysis set out in my judgment without repeating it here. The entirety of the
2 Analysis forms part of this Ruling.

3
4 There may be circumstances in which it is legitimate to assimilate the party A and the non-party
5 B and to treat any means of service available against A, as available against B. I do not read
6 Lord Mance in Masri as confining the use of GCR O.11 r 9(2) to the alter ego of a one ship
7 company. See further para 5 of the Analysis. Further in the Ikarian Reefer there was no issue
8 in the original proceedings as to the right and standing of the one ship plaintiff company to sue
9 (see in this connection the formulation used to describe the Plaintiff and my observations at
10 page 17 of my earlier judgment under Leave to Amend (i)).

11
12 The nature and extent of the jurisdiction is closely related to and dependent on the relevant
13 facts. The history of the litigation in the United States and Liberia is by any standards
14 extraordinary. There are many respects in which there is a serious issue as to whether what has
15 happened is beyond conventional Litigation Funding. (See para 4 (i) of the Analysis and the
16 history of the litigation in the United States, Liberia and the Cayman Islands as set out in the
17 two judgments herein and the totality of the evidence before the court).

18
19 The Defendant's case as to relevant facts as to the nature and extent of Mr Kenney's and CCI's
20 role in and funding and control of the litigation differs markedly from Mr Kenney's and CCI's
21 case. I do not consider that the proposed appeal has a real prospect of success if the relevant
22 facts are as contended for by the Defendant. I repeat that the history of the litigation in the
23 United States and Liberia is by any standards extraordinary.

24
25 In these circumstances I do not consider it appropriate to grant leave to appeal.

26
27 In my opinion any question of leave to appeal should be deferred until after the underlying facts
28 have been determined.

29
30 If contrary to the above I had determined that there should be leave to appeal, this would have
31 been on terms that Mr Kenney and CCI provide security for the costs of the appeal in the sum
32 sought by the Defendant.



1 I repeat what I said in my latest judgment under the heading 'The overriding objective'. For the
2 avoidance of doubt in referring to "the remaining dispute" I was referring to the remaining
3 dispute in the Cayman Islands as to who should pay ACE's costs, and not to any continuing
4 dispute in proceedings in the United States or elsewhere.

5
6 I have delayed this Ruling in an attempt to ascertain when the taxation will be concluded. This
7 should happen without further delay. The taxation will determine the amount at stake.

8
9

10 DATED this 28th day of June 2013

11 
12 The Honourable Justice Crosswell
13 Judge of the Grand Court

