

**JAMAICA**

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL**

**SUPREME COURT CIVIL APPEAL 5/06**

**BETWEEN                      CHANCELLOR & COMPANY – A FIRM                      APPELLANT**

**AND                              DONALD PANTON    1<sup>ST</sup> RESPONDENT**

**AND                              JANET PANTON    2<sup>ND</sup> RESPONDENT**

**AND                              JEFFREY PANTON    3<sup>RD</sup> RESPONDENT**

**AND                              DOJAP INVESTMENT LIMITED    4<sup>TH</sup> RESPONDENT**

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

**AND                              RAYMOND CLOUGH    6<sup>TH</sup> RESPONDENT**

**AND                              WINSTON DWYER    7<sup>TH</sup> RESPONDENT**

**AND                              ORRETT HUTCHINSON    8<sup>TH</sup> RESPONDENT**

**AND                              RAYMOND GARCIA    9<sup>TH</sup> RESPONDENT**

**AND                              EDWIN DOUGLAS    10<sup>TH</sup> RESPONDENT**

**AND                              UNIJAM LIMITED    11<sup>TH</sup> RESPONDENT**

**AND                              DJNJ INVESTMENTS LIMITED    12<sup>TH</sup> 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.