

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

I TE KŌTI MANA NUI O AOTEAROA

SC UR 52/2025
[2025] NZSC 199

RE

RAJENDRA PRASAD
Applicant

Court: Ellen France, Kós and Miller JJ

Counsel: Applicant in person

Judgment: 18 December 2025

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

**The application for review of the judgment of Williams J of
27 November 2025 (*Re Prasad* [2025] NZSC 178) is dismissed.**

REASONS

[1] On 14 October 2025, the Registrar declined to accept for filing an application by the applicant for leave to “reopen file SC 034 /2010 [2010] NZSC 60, 28/05/10, that stems from Court of Appeal decision CA 515 /2009 [2010] NZCA 111, 30/03/10 ...”.¹

[2] The applicant sought a review of the decision declining to accept the document for filing. The review application was dismissed by Williams J in a judgment delivered on 27 November 2025.² The applicant now seeks a review of the latter judgment. That application has been referred to a panel of three judges.

[3] The applicant says his initial application for review should have been referred to a panel of two or three judges. Further, amongst other matters, he says that his

¹ Emphasis omitted.

² *Re Prasad* [2025] NZSC 178.

application for leave is a new matter as there has never been a previous application in relation to the relevant aspect of the judgment of the Court of Appeal in *Indiana Publications (NZ) Ltd v Prasad*.³ The result in *Indiana Publications* was that the applicant's claim of breach of copyright was struck out as an abuse of process. The applicant also argues that the judgment in *Indiana Publications* is void ab initio so his latest leave application must be something new.

[4] Williams J, in upholding the Registrar's decision not to accept the document for filing, noted that this Court in a judgment of 21 May 2018 (the 2018 judgment) had directed the Registrar not to accept further documents for filing in relation to applications on the matters raised in that judgment.⁴ Williams J considered the application for leave rejected for filing by the Registrar on 14 October 2025 was caught by that direction.

[5] We agree with Williams J. That outcome is supported by the history of these proceedings in this Court as we now explain.

[6] In a judgment delivered on 28 May 2010, this Court dismissed the applicant's application for leave to appeal from the decision of the Court of Appeal in *Indiana Publications*.⁵ In a subsequent judgment, this Court dismissed as "wholly without merit" the applicant's application for recall of the 28 May 2010 judgment (and another judgment declining leave in a related proceeding).⁶ A further application for recall was dismissed in the 2018 judgment. As we have said, the Court in that judgment made the direction the Registrar was "not to accept any further documents in relation to these applications".⁷

[7] The current application for leave is simply another attempt to re-litigate matters already determined and is properly caught by the Court's earlier direction.

³ *Indiana Publications (NZ) Ltd v Prasad* [2010] NZCA 111 (Arnold, Panckhurst and Harrison JJ).

⁴ *Prasad v Indiana Publications (NZ) Ltd* [2018] NZSC 48 (Elias CJ, William Young and Ellen France JJ) [2018 judgment].

⁵ *Prasad v Indiana Publications (NZ) Ltd* [2010] NZSC 60 (Blanchard, Tipping and Wilson JJ).

⁶ *Prasad v Indiana Publications (NZ) Ltd* [2012] NZSC 97 at [4] (McGrath, William Young and Glazebrook JJ).

⁷ 2018 judgment, above n 4, at [6].

[8] The application for review is dismissed.