IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

SC 20/2007 [2007] NZSC 43

BETWEEN JOHN ANTHONY WALLER AND

RICHARD DALE AGNEW

Applicants

AND STEPHEN JOHN DAVIES

First Respondent

AND DAVIES & CO SOLICITORS NOMINEE

COMPANY LTD Second Respondent

AND GEOFFREY ANDREW HITCHINGS

AND TERENCE RICHARD HITCHINGS

Third Respondents

AND DOUGLAS WALTER EDWARDS AND

DENISE ANNE EDWARDS

Fourth Respondents

AND QING SHENG SHI

Fifth Respondent

AND NICOLA LOUISE WADEY AND

JEREMY ALAN MILTON

Sixth Respondents

Court: Tipping, McGrath and Anderson JJ

Counsel: M J Tingey and J C Caird for Applicants

A R Galbraith QC and A R B Barker for First Respondent S R G Judd and J W Appleby for Second to Sixth Respondents

Judgment: 13 June 2007

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

- A. The application for leave to appeal is dismissed.
- B. The applicants are to pay to the first respondent costs in the sum of \$2,000 plus disbursements to be fixed if necessary by the Registrar, and to the second to sixth respondents as a group the sum of \$2,000 plus disbursements to be fixed if necessary by the Registrar.

REASONS

- [1] We do not consider that any of the grounds on which the applicants wish to appeal satisfy the requirements of s 13 of the Supreme Court Act 2003. It is convenient to refer to the principal ones in turn.
- [2] The common law mortgage point turns essentially on the facts as found by the High Court which were without material variation in the Court of Appeal. No matter of sufficient general principle arises.
- [3] We are satisfied the Court of Appeal was correct when it said that the allegation of fraudulent misrepresentation was not pleaded. We have examined each of the paragraphs in the Amended Statement of Claim referred to in para 34 of the applicants' submissions. Neither singly nor cumulatively do they come anywhere near a pleading of fraudulent misrepresentation. The Court of Appeal recorded that counsel did not consider the facts justified such a pleading. There was therefore no basis upon which the alleged concession could properly have related to the case as presented in the High Court.
- [4] It would not be appropriate to give leave against that background. There are, in any event, difficulties in ascribing the "concession" to the respondents represented by Mr Judd. The Court of Appeal's approach to this issue appears to us to be sound. We are not satisfied that a miscarriage of justice may occur if leave is not granted on this ground.

[5] The Court of Appeal's approach to the option point appears sound. We can

see no basis upon which it would be in the interests of justice to give leave on this

issue.

[6] If the decision of the Court of Appeal is unclear as to precisely how the

application for directions has been disposed of, the lack of clarity should be resolved

either in the Court of Appeal or in the High Court. The Court of Appeal has

dismissed the appeal by the applicants and allowed the cross appeal by the first

respondent. The orders made in the High Court have been set aside. It may be that

what appears to have been an effective dismissal of the application in the High Court

provides its own directions. That may depend on how the application was framed.

There is nothing to prevent a further application being made in the High Court for

any necessary clarifying purpose.

[7] We are not prepared to give leave simply in order to refer back to the

High Court the "lack of proper attestation amounting to fraud" point referred to in

paras 6 and 7 of the applicants' supplemental submissions. If the point is otherwise

open to the applicants it must be the subject of a further application or other

proceeding.

[8] There being no qualifying ground, the application for leave must be

dismissed.

[9] The applicants must pay the first respondent, and the second to sixth

respondents as a group, the sum of \$2,000 in each case, together with disbursements

to be fixed if necessary by the Registrar.

Solicitors:

Bell Gully, Auckland for Applicants