

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

I TE KŌTI MANA NUI O AOTEAROA

SC UR 58/2025
[2025] NZSC 184

RE

CHRISTOPHER RUSSELL HOOK
Applicant

Counsel: Applicant in person

Judgment: 2 December 2025

JUDGMENT OF MILLER J

The application for review of the decision of the Registrar not to accept the application for leave to appeal for filing is dismissed.

REASONS

[1] Mr Hook has sought a review of the Registrar's decision to refuse to accept a proposed appeal for filing on the ground that the Court has no jurisdiction to entertain it.¹

[2] The decision from which Mr Hook wishes to appeal is a judgment of the Court of Appeal declining leave to appeal to that Court.² Leave was required because under s 60 of the Senior Courts Act 2016 it would have been a second appeal. The original decision was given in the District Court and a first appeal had been heard in the High Court.³

[3] The Registrar reasoned that the proposed appeal is barred by s 68(b) of the Senior Courts Act, which provides that this Court may hear an appeal against a

¹ Supreme Court Rules 2004, r 5A(1)(b)(ii).

² *Hook v Callaghan Innovation* [2025] NZCA 148 (French P and Cooke J).

³ *Surface Micro-Guard Ltd v Callaghan Innovation* [2024] NZDC 7314 (Judge Kelly); and *Hook v Callaghan Innovation* [2024] NZHC 2240 (La Hood J). The High Court declined leave to appeal to the Court of Appeal: *Hook v Callaghan Innovation* [2024] NZHC 3432 (La Hood J).

decision made by the Court of Appeal in a civil proceeding *unless*, relevantly, the decision is a refusal to give leave.

[4] Mr Hook has tendered a Case Study in which he explains why he says an injustice has been done. I need not summarise it, because what matters is that it is plain the proposed appeal to this Court is from a decision of the Court of Appeal refusing to give him leave to appeal to that Court. It is barred by s 68(b), which provides for no exceptions. This Court does not have jurisdiction to entertain the proposed appeal.

[5] The Court can treat such an application as if it sought leave to appeal direct from the High Court.⁴ But the circumstances must be exceptional and extremely compelling to justify a so-called “leapfrog” appeal.⁵ Nothing in the application suggests that the Registrar would have been justified in treating this as a direct appeal from the High Court.

[6] Mr Hook has subsequently advised that he has filed an application to recall the Court of Appeal judgment, but this does not affect my review of the Registrar’s decision.

[7] The application for review is dismissed.

⁴ See, for example, *Cook v Housing New Zealand Corp* [2018] NZSC 42 at [7]. Section 70 of the Senior Courts Act 2016 prevents a direct appeal from the decision of the District Court in this case.

⁵ Section 75(b); and *Burke v Western Bay of Plenty District Council* [2005] NZSC 46, (2005) 18 PRNZ 560 at [4].