

Defendant's Exhibit Number 11



JUDICIAL OFFICE
HOUSE OF LORDS
LONDON SW1A 0PW

Telephone: 020-7219 3111
Facsimile: 020-7219 2476
www.parliament.uk
HOLJUDICIALOFFICE@parliament.uk

27 July 2006

Dear Mr Tropp,

Society of Lloyd's (Respondents) v Tropp (Petitioner)

I am writing in response to your email of 20 July 2006 in relation to the above case that was dismissed as inadmissible on 18 July 2006.

If you wish to take the matter further, by seeking permission from the European Court of Human Rights to appeal to it, the appeal committee report dated 18 July 2006 will be enough to satisfy that Court that you have met the requirement laid down by Article 35 of the European Convention on Human Rights that all domestic legal remedies must be exhausted before you can seek permission to apply to that Court.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "K. Affleck".

Kate Affleck
Judicial Office

Mr R A Tropp
907 6th Street
SW #104C
Washington DC 20024
United States of America

REPORT
FROM THE
APPEAL COMMITTEE

18 July 2006

ORDERED TO REPORT

1. We have met and have considered the application for permission to appeal in the cause

Society of Lloyd's (Respondents) v Tropp (Petitioner)

DECISION

2. Permission is refused because the application is inadmissible: practice direction 1.14(a) and section 54 of the Access to Justice Act 1999

The Committee was attended by:

Lord Hoffmann
Lord Scott of Foscote
Lord Walker of Gestingthorpe

HOUSE OF LORDS

MINUTES OF PROCEEDINGS

Tuesday 18th July 2006

1. Smithkline Beecham plc and others (Respondents) v. Apotex Europe Limited and others and others (Petitioners)—The petition of Apotex Inc and Apotex Pharmachem Inc praying for leave to appeal was presented and referred to an Appeal Committee.
2. Carter (sued on his own on behalf of the other members of the Labour Party) (Respondent) v. Ahsan (Appellant)—The petition of the appellant praying that the time for lodging the statement and appendix and setting down the cause for hearing might be extended to 27th July (the agents for the respondent consenting thereto) was presented; and it was ordered as prayed.
3. Appeal Committee—The 118th Report from the Appeal Committee was agreed to and the following Orders were made—
 - El Ajou (Respondent) v. Stern and others (Petitioners) and others—That leave to appeal be refused; that the respondents be at liberty to apply for their costs in accordance with direction 5.1(d); and, if the application is granted, that the amount thereof be certified by the Clerk of the Parliaments if not agreed between the parties.
 - Cook (Petitioner) v. J D Wetherspoon plc (Respondents)—That leave to appeal be refused; that the respondents be at liberty to apply for their costs in accordance with direction 5.1(d); and, if the application is granted, that the amount thereof be certified by the Clerk of the Parliaments if not agreed between the parties.
 - Society of Lloyd's (Respondents) v. Tropp (Petitioner)—That the petition be dismissed as inadmissible.
 - Mallett & Son (Antiques) Limited (Petitioners) v. Grosvenor West End Properties and others (Respondents)—That leave to appeal be given; and that the petition of appeal be lodged by 1st August next.
 - Prazic (Petitioner) v. Prazic (Respondent)—That leave to appeal be refused; that the respondents be at liberty to apply for their costs in accordance with direction 5.1(d); and, if the application is granted, that the amount thereof be certified by the Clerk of the Parliaments if not agreed between the parties.
 - London Borough of Redbridge (Respondent) v. Low (Petitioner)—That the petition be dismissed as inadmissible.