



1 IN CHAMBERS  
2  
3 IN THE GRAND COURT OF THE CAYMAN ISLANDS  
4  
5 CAUSE NO: 66 OF 1998  
6

7  
8 IN THE MATTER OF THE **CONFIDENTIAL RELATIONSHIPS (PRESERVATION)**  
9  
10 LAW (1995 REVISION)  
11  
12 AND IN THE MATTER OF ANSBACHER (CAYMAN) LTD.  
13  
14 AND IN THE MATTER OF AN APPOINTMENT OF AN AUTHORISED OFFICER  
15  
16 PURSUANT TO THE COMPANIES ACT 1990 OF EIRE.  
17

18  
19 **Appearances:**

20  
21 Andrew Jones of Maples & Calder for Ansbacher (Cayman) Ltd.  
22 Stephen Hall-Jones Senior Crown Counsel for the Attorney General as amicus curiae.  
23 Antonio Bueno Q.C. Charles Quin and John Lawless instructed by Quin & Hampson for  
24 the Government of Eire (with them Mr. Gerard Ryan and Mr. Paul Appleby for the  
25 Minister for Enterprise Trade and Employment of Eire).  
26

27  
28 SUMMARY OF RULING  
29

30  
31 This is the application of Ansbacher (Cayman) Ltd.(hereinafter "Ansbacher") for  
32  
33 directions of this Court as to whether it might comply with the directive of the authorised  
34  
35 officer, Mr. Gerard Ryan appointed to it by the Minister for Enterprise , Trade and  
36  
37 Employment of Ireland.

38  
39 That directive purports to command Ansbacher, to deliver over to Mr. Ryan certain  
40  
41 records said to be within the control of Ansbacher in the Cayman Islands and  
42  
43 which have become known as "the Ansbacher files".  
44

45 The decision I now pronounce goes only to the issue of whether this court has jurisdiction

1  
2 to hear Ansbacher's application and to give directions in this matter. The decision I now  
3  
4 pronounce is intended in no manner to reflect upon the merits of Ansbacher's application  
5  
6 or upon the merits of Mr. Ryan's directive.

7  
8 The question is whether Ansbacher has established that Mr. Ryan's directive and the  
9  
10 Ministerial Warrant appointing him in Ireland as authorised officer to Ansbacher are  
11  
12 effective as a requirement to give evidence for the purposes of the Confidential  
13  
14 Relationships (Preservation) Law of the Cayman Islands.

15  
16 In the absence of a clear basis for concluding that those measures operate in that manner  
17  
18 for the purposes of the Cayman Islands legislation, this court cannot regard itself as  
19  
20 vested with jurisdiction to give any directions in response to them.

21  
22 For reasons which will shortly be delivered in full written form the decision which I now  
23  
24 pronounce is that this court does not have jurisdiction to hear Ansbacher's application or  
25  
26 to give any directions upon that application.

27  
28 It follows that the application must be struck out and I so order.  
29

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35 Anthony Snellie  
36 JUDGE OF THE GRAND COURT  
37



38  
39  
40  
41  
42 Dated 13th day of MAY 1998.