

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

**SC 60/2012
[2012] NZSC 95**

BETWEEN	VINCENT ROSS SIEMER Applicant
AND	JUDICIAL CONDUCT COMMISSIONER First Respondent
AND	SIAN SEERPOOHI ELIAS Second Respondent
AND	PETER BLANCHARD Third Respondent
AND	JOHN MCGRATH Fourth Respondent
AND	WILLIAM YOUNG Fifth Respondent
AND	ANDREW TIPPING Sixth Respondent

Court: Chambers and Glazebrook JJ

Counsel: Applicant in Person
D J Goddard QC and L Theron for First Respondent

Judgment: 9 November 2012

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

The application to recall the judgment [2012] NZSC 92 is dismissed.

REASONS

[1] The applicant seeks recall on eight grounds. None is made out. The principal ground is that the leave judgment failed to address the grounds for leave. All were considered, even though not all of them were referred to in the reasons.

Section 16(2) of the Supreme Court Act 2003 permits the Court, when refusing leave, to state its reasons “briefly and ... in general terms only”. The applicant’s proposed appeal, like his other applications for leave to appeal against Court of Appeal decisions concerning security for costs, does not meet the statutory criteria in s 13 and, despite the further information now provided, we remain unsatisfied “that it is necessary in the interests of justice for the Court to hear and determine the proposed appeal”.

[2] Accordingly, we dismiss the application to recall the judgment.

Solicitors:
Gault Mitchell Law, Wellington, for First Respondent