

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

I TE KŌTI MANA NUI O AOTEAROA

SC 63/2025  
[2025] NZSC 132

BETWEEN                      DEBORAH JANE BRIDGE  
Applicant

AND                              THE CROWN  
Respondent

Court:                          Williams, Kós and Miller JJ

Counsel:                      Applicant in person  
No appearance for Respondent

Judgment:                    2 October 2025

---

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

---

**A        The application for recall of this Court’s judgment of 8 September 2025 (*Bridge v The Crown* [2025] NZSC 113) is dismissed.**

**B        There is no order as to costs.**

---

REASONS

[1]        The applicant seeks recall of this Court’s judgment of 8 September 2025 (declining leave to appeal).<sup>1</sup> She argues that the judgment notes but omits to engage with fundamental constitutional issues (the applicant’s right to invoke habeas corpus and her reliance on “de jure principles and [m]axims”). She argues that this omission justifies recall in terms of *Horowhenua County v Nash (No 2)*.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>        *Bridge v The Crown* [2025] NZSC 113.

<sup>2</sup>        *Horowhenua County v Nash (No 2)* [1968] NZLR 632 (SC) at 633.

[2] These arguments repackage and represent arguments already rejected as untenable in the leave judgment. There is no exceptional circumstance justifying recall in terms of the grounds articulated in *Horowhenua County v Nash (No 2)* and approved by this Court in *Saxmere Co Ltd v Wool Board Disestablishment Co Ltd (No 2)*.<sup>3</sup>

[3] The application for recall is dismissed.

[4] As the respondent has not been called upon, there is no order as to costs.

---

<sup>3</sup> At 633; *Saxmere Co Ltd v Wool Board Disestablishment Co Ltd (No 2)* [2009] NZSC 122, [2010] 1 NZLR 76 at [2]; and *Green Growth No 2 Ltd v Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust* [2018] NZSC 115 at [20].