

NOTE: PUBLICATION OF NAME, ADDRESS, OCCUPATION OR IDENTIFYING PARTICULARS OF COMPLAINANT PROHIBITED BY S 203 OF THE CRIMINAL PROCEDURE ACT 2011. SEE <http://www.legislation.govt.nz/act/public/2011/0081/latest/DLM3360350.html>

NOTE: DISTRICT COURT ORDER PROHIBITING PUBLICATION OF COMPLAINANT'S PARENTS' NAMES REMAINS IN FORCE.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

I TE KŌTI MANA NUI

**SC 78/2018
[2021] NZSC 160**

BETWEEN	GORDON JOHN RIPPEY Applicant
AND	THE QUEEN Respondent

Court: William Young, Glazebrook and Ellen France JJ

Counsel: A Shaw for Applicant
M J Lillico for Respondent

Judgment: 23 November 2021

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

- A Leave to appeal is granted (*Riphey v R* [2018] NZCA 306).**
 - B The approved question is whether the trial judge should have given a warning under s 122 of the Evidence Act 2006.**
-

REASONS

[1] The Court is open to arguments about the general approach to warnings under s 122 of the Evidence Act 2006. This means it is open to hearing submissions on *CT v R*.¹

¹ *CT (SC 88/2013) v R* [2014] NZSC 155, [2015] 1 NZLR 465.

[2] The Registry is to provide a copy of this judgment to the Criminal Bar Association and we invite the Association to intervene in this appeal. If it wishes to do so, it is to alert the Registry as soon as possible.

Solicitors:
Crown Law Office, Wellington for Respondent