



Neutral Citation Number: [2025] CICA (Civ) 14

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS
ON APPEAL FROM THE GRAND COURT OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS
FINANCIAL SERVICES DIVISION**

**CICA (CIVIL) APPEAL NO. 27 OF 2024
(CAUSE NO. FSD 36 OF 2022 (RPJ))**

BETWEEN:

**(1) OUSSAMA AMMAR
(2) FABULEO LIMITED
(3) ALETHEIS, THE FIRST LIMITED**

Appellants/Defendants

AND

**THE FAMILY (GLOBAL GODFATHERS) SPC
(on its own behalf and on behalf of THE FAMILY (FREYA) SP,
THE FAMILY (ODIN) SP,
THE FAMILY (HNOSS) SP and
THE FAMILY (VIDHAR) SP)**

Respondents/Plaintiffs

**Before: The Rt Hon Sir John Goldring, President
 The Hon John Martin KC, Justice of Appeal
 The Rt Sir Michael Birt, Justice of Appeal**

Appearances: Appellants did not attend.

Date of Hearing: 02 September 2025

Judgment Delivered: 02 September 2025

CICA (Civil) The Family (Global Godfathers) SPC

EX TEMPORE JUDGMENT**THE PRESIDENT**

1. This case has been listed as a renewed application before the full court for leave to appeal. I had previously refused such leave on paper. The proposed appeal results from the decision of Justice Raj Parker of the 16th of August 2024 and his subsequent judgment.
2. In short for reasons the judge set out in detail, he rejected the Appellants' application to set aside an ex parte order made on the 15th March 2022 and acceded to the Respondents' application to strike out the Appellants' application as an abuse of process. In their grounds of appeal, the Appellants submit the judge was wrong in both respects.
3. The Appellants, who have dispensed with the services of their lawyers, have not responded to contact from the court, have filed no documents and are not present. However, we know they are aware of this hearing. Mr Wingrave, who had acted for the Respondents below, was present (as an observer) in court and indicated that the Appellants have made reference to this hearing in proceedings in France.
4. Some time before this hearing, I made an order that 'documents...be filed [by the Appellants] by 21st August 2025. In the absence of any response by that date, the court would strike out the application.' There was no such response. That alone would justify the court in dismissing this application. Moreover, as I have previously stated, it is my view the judge was entitled to reach the decision he did for the reasons he gave.
5. In the result, I would refuse this renewed application for leave to appeal.

MARTIN JA:

6. I agree.

BIRT JA:

7. And I also agree.