

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

I TE KŌTI MANA NUI O AOTEAROA

SC 119/2024
[2025] NZSC 106

BETWEEN

VINCENT ROSS SIEMER
Applicant

AND

ATTORNEY-GENERAL
First Respondent

REGISTRAR OF SUPREME COURT
Second Respondent

Counsel: Applicant in person

Judgment: 19 August 2025

JUDGMENT OF MILLER J

- A** **The application for recall of my judgment of 20 March 2025 (*Siemer v Attorney-General* [2025] NZSC 16) is dismissed.**
- B** **The Registrar is directed not to accept for filing any further recall applications in relation to this matter.**
-

REASONS

[1] Mr Siemer has filed an interlocutory application dated 24 July 2025 for waiver of a filing fee on public interest grounds.

[2] Although intituled as a fresh application, the application of 24 July is appropriately treated as an application for recall of my decision of 20 March 2025 declining to review the Deputy Registrar’s decision not to waive the same filing fee.¹ Mr Siemer points to the fact that I was prepared to assume, without deciding, that there

¹ *Siemer v Attorney-General* [2025] NZSC 16. See *Harrison v R* [2020] NZSC 79 at [2].

was genuine public interest in the case,² and he treats that as a positive finding. He also says that, contrary to the view I took, there was evidence that absent a waiver the proceeding would not continue.

[3] The application raises no new matters.³ It is dismissed for the reasons given in my judgment of 20 March. The Registrar is directed not to accept for filing any further recall applications in relation to this matter.

² *Siemer v Attorney-General*, above n 1, at [6].

³ See *Saxmere Co Ltd v Wool Board Disestablishment Co 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.