

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

I TE KŌTI MANA NUI

SC 24/2018  
[2018] NZSC 48

BETWEEN RAJENDRA PRASAD  
Applicant

AND INDIANA PUBLICATIONS (NZ)  
LIMITED  
First Respondent

ARIN LAL  
Second Respondent

VENKAT RAM  
Third Respondent

MAHESH PARERA  
Fourth Respondent

SC 25/2018

BETWEEN RAJENDRA PRASAD  
Applicant

AND INDIANA PUBLICATIONS (NZ)  
LIMITED  
Respondent

Court: Elias CJ, William Young and Ellen France JJ

Counsel: Applicant in person  
B Parshotam for Respondents

Judgment: 21 May 2018

---

**JUDGMENT OF THE COURT**

---

**A The applications for recall and for an extension of time for leave to appeal are dismissed.**

**B There is no award of costs.**

---

## REASONS

[1] The applicant has filed various documents in relation to copyright proceedings in which he has been involved and with respect to an order adjudicating him bankrupt. The Registrar initially declined to accept the documents for filing and advised the applicant the Court had no jurisdiction to determine the matter. The applicant requested that this decision be reconsidered and, in light of that request, the Registrar accepted the application for leave for filing and referred it to a panel of Judges for decision.

[2] The documents filed by the applicant refer to a number of earlier decisions of this Court and other Courts dealing with both the copyright and bankruptcy proceedings. The documentation is confused and repetitive. In an endeavour to make sense of this material we treated what has been filed as comprising two applications:

- (a) an application for recall of this Court's earlier decision<sup>1</sup> declining leave to appeal from a decision of the Court of Appeal striking out Mr Prasad's copyright proceedings as an abuse of process;<sup>2</sup> and
- (b) an application for leave to appeal out of time from the judgment of Associate Judge Faire ordering Mr Prasad to be adjudicated bankrupt.<sup>3</sup>

[3] In terms of the application for recall this Court, in a judgment delivered some time ago, declined an application for recall of the decision to decline leave on the basis it was without merit.<sup>4</sup> Nothing raised by the applicant provides any basis for recall. The further application for recall is accordingly dismissed.

[4] In relation to the second application, there is no explanation for the lengthy delay. Further, as this Court said in declining leave to appeal in relation to another proceeding challenging the process of the insolvency proceedings, these issues have

---

<sup>1</sup> *Prasad v Indiana Publications (NZ) Ltd* [2010] NZSC 60.

<sup>2</sup> *Indiana Publications (NZ) Ltd v Prasad* [2010] NZCA 111.

<sup>3</sup> *Indiana Publications (NZ) Ltd v Prasad* HC Auckland CIV-2010-404-3333, 11 November 2010.

<sup>4</sup> *Prasad v Indiana Publications (NZ) Ltd* [2012] NZSC 97. The fact William Young J was on the panel which dealt with the earlier application is not a basis for recusal.

been raised and determined in various proceedings.<sup>5</sup> The issues are confined to the specific facts and raise no questions of public or general importance. There are no exceptional circumstances justifying a direct appeal to this Court.<sup>6</sup> In these circumstances, the application for an extension of time is dismissed.

[5] As the respondents filed no submissions we make no order for costs.

[6] The Registrar is directed not to accept any further documents in relation to these applications from Mr Prasad.

Solicitors:  
Parshotam Lawyers, Auckland for Respondents

---

<sup>5</sup> *Prasad v Indiana Publications (NZ) Ltd* [2012] NZSC 93 at [5]; and see *Prasad v Indiana Publications (NZ) Ltd* [2014] NZSC 78.

<sup>6</sup> Supreme Court Act 2003, s 14; Senior Courts Act 2016, s 75.