

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

I TE KŌTI MANA NUI

SC 101/2020
[2021] NZSC 3

BETWEEN

VINCENT ROSS SIEMER
Applicant

AND

DEPUTY REGISTRAR OF THE
SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND
Respondent

Court: Glazebrook, O'Regan and Ellen France JJ

Counsel: Applicant in person

Judgment: 11 February 2021

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

**The application for recall of this Court's judgment of 27 November 2020
(*Siemer v Deputy Registrar of the Supreme Court of New Zealand* [2020]
NZSC 135) is dismissed.**

REASONS

[1] The applicant has applied for the recall of this Court's judgment of 27 November 2020, in which his application for review of a decision of the Deputy Registrar was dismissed and his application for directions was also dismissed.¹

[2] The position in relation to recall of a judgment was summarised by this Court in *Craig v Williams* as follows:²

The case law has ... identified three categories of case in which a judgment may be recalled. These are an amendment after the hearing to relevant legislation or a new judicial decision of "high authority", where counsel has failed to draw the Court's attention to a relevant legislative provision or

¹ *Siemer v Deputy Registrar of the Supreme Court of New Zealand* [2020] NZSC 135.

² *Craig v Williams* [2019] NZSC 60 at [10].

decision and “where for some other very special reason justice requires that the judgment be recalled”.³

[3] Neither of the first two of the above grounds applies, so the present application appears to be based on the third.

[4] Nothing in the application or the affidavit filed with it discloses any reason that justice requires the judgment to be recalled, let alone a “very special reason”. While the applicant makes it clear that he disagrees with a number of aspects of the decision, there is nothing in the material the applicant has put before the Court that requires reconsideration of the decision. The Court does not therefore intend to engage with the arguments the applicant has put forward.

[5] The application for recall is dismissed.

³ *Saxmere Company Ltd v Wool Board Disestablishment Company Ltd (No 2)* [2009] NZSC 122, [2010] 1 NZLR 76 at [2], citing *Horowhenua County v Nash (No 2)* [1968] NZLR 632 (SC) at 633.