the four petitions at the same hearing as 'eminently sensible'. He rejected the argument that the chancellor's decision breached Article 8 of the ECHR and, in referring to Chapman v UK (2001) 3 EHRR 18, he held that the use of a particular design of memorial was not required to 'facilitate the gypsy way of life'. The Dean further rejected the submission that the imposition of conditions in relation to the leaving of unauthorised items was discriminatory or draconian. He refused leave to appeal on the basis that there was no real prospect of success and no other compelling reason for the appeal to be heard. [RA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X10000694

His Holiness Sant Baba Jeet Singh Ji Maharaj v Eastern Media Group and Singh²

High Court, Queen's Bench Division: Eady J, May 2010 Defamation - justiciability - Sikh doctrine and practice

The claimant, who was based in India and claimed to be a Sikh leader, brought a defamation action against the author and publisher of an article in the Sikh Times which was said to be damaging to the claimant's reputation. The article alleged, inter alia, that the claimant was the leader of a cult who acted contrary to true Sikh teachings and that he falsely sought to pass himself off as a true heir to a Sikh saint and to profit personally from his position. The author sought a stay of the claim on the basis that it was non-justiciable as it required the court to rule upon matters of Sikh doctrine and practice, contrary to a consistent line of legal authority. In granting a stay, Eady J relied upon the decision of Blake v Associated Newspapers [2003] EWHC 1960 (QB). He rejected the argument that the allegation that the claimant was an 'impostor' was justiciable independently of any matters of Sikh doctrine or practice. He held that the issue of whether the claimant could fairly be described as an impostor could not be isolated and resolved without reference to such matters into which the civil courts should not trespass. [RA]

doi:10.1017/S0956618X10000700