IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

SC 35/2010 [2010] NZSC 80

BETWEEN DAVID PAUL HALFORD AND BLUE

SKY HOLDINGS LTD (IN

LIQUIDATION) AS TRUSTEE OF THE

AUCKLAND RESIDENTIAL

PROPERTY TRUST

Applicants

AND R F COUGHLAN & ASSOCIATES

First Respondent

AND NORTH SHORE CITY COUNCIL

Second Respondent

AND ROBERT HENRY GRAHAM BARTON

AND KAY BARTON Third Respondents

Court: Elias CJ, Blanchard and McGrath JJ

Counsel: M C Josephson for Applicants

A Maclean for First Respondent

D Goddard QC for Second Respondent

Judgment: 13 July 2010

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

The application for leave to appeal is dismissed with costs of \$2,500 to the First Respondent.

REASONS

[1] The first ground which the applicants propose to argue is that the designer of the building, the first respondent, should have been found liable for inadequate details in the plans, regardless of whether the details might have been available to the applicants from other sources. However, there are concurrent findings of fact below

DAVID PAUL HALFORD AND BLUE SKY HOLDINGS LTD (IN LIQUIDATION) AS TRUSTEE OF THE AUCKLAND RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TRUST v R F COUGHLAN & ASSOCIATES And Anor SC 35/2010 [13 July 2010]

that in the circumstances of the case the plans and specifications were not

negligently prepared by the first respondent. The decision turned on the particular

facts of the case and gives rise to no wider principle. The criteria for leave are not

met.

[2] The second proposed ground of appeal is that practical completion

certificates were negligently issued by the first respondent. However, in

circumstances where, as has been held below, it has not been shown that the

certificates were relied upon by the applicants, we do not consider that this ground is

arguable. It has not been shown that the certificates were causative of any loss to the

applicants.

Solicitors:

Grimshaw & Co, Auckland for Applicants A Maclean, Auckland for First Respondents

Heaney & Co, Auckland for Second Respondent