IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

I TE KŌTI MANA NUI O AOTEAROA

SC 86/2026
[2026] NZSC 152

BETWEEN	VICTOR SHANE SLACK Applicant
AND	THE KING Respondent

Court: Kós, Cooke and Campbell JJ

Counsel: Applicant in person
B So for Respondent

Judgment: 20 October 2026

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

A The application for leave to file reply submissions is dismissed.

B The application for leave to appeal is dismissed.

REASONS

[1] In 2022, police searched Mr Slack's property and located a considerable quantity of cannabis, some cultivation equipment, three prohibited firearms and some prohibited firearm magazines. The Crown brought six charges against him. A pre-trial challenge against the police search was unsuccessful,[1] as was an application for leave to appeal against that decision.[2]

[2] Mr Slack had until this point been represented by counsel. He now represented himself at the jury trial in 2025. The defence offered was that the laws under which

---

1 *R v Slack* [2023] NZDC 27038 (Judge McDonald).
2 *Slack v R* [2024] NZCA 233 (Thomas, Fitzgerald and Osborne JJ).

he was charged did not apply to him. After giving evidence for himself, he claimed in cross-examination that he was ignorant of the laws, did not recognise them and that they were racist, and admitted the factual propositions the Crown needed to prove its case. The jury found him guilty on all charges, and he was sentenced to five months' community detention and 150 hours' community work.[3]

[3] Before the Court of Appeal, Mr Slack sought to rely on his claimed Rangatira status, adherence to tikanga Māori and identity as an indigenous person. The Court of Appeal dismissed Mr Slack's appeal against conviction and sentence, finding the arguments in relation to conviction "plainly untenable", and the end sentence not manifestly excessive.[4]

Proposed appeal

[4] Mr Slack now seeks leave to appeal, proposing to argue that the trial Judge failed to consider how tikanga Māori, He Whakaputanga, his Rangatira status and related matters were relevant to the common law and the fairness of his trial. In doing so he seeks in effect to reprise jurisdictional arguments made unsuccessfully in the Court of Appeal.

[5] Subsequently, Mr Slack sought leave to file reply submissions to those filed by the Crown.

Assessment

[6] We see no question of general or public importance, nor any appearance of miscarriage, arising here.[5] We accept the Crown's submission that the law regarding parliamentary sovereignty and the universal application of the criminal law is well-settled and does not necessitate further consideration by this Court. Mr Slack has put forward nothing to show he could rely on tikanga Māori, He Whakaputanga or his asserted Rangatira status in this context as providing a defence to ordinary crimes committed under the Misuse of Drugs Act 1975 or the Arms Act 1983. For these same

---

3 *R v Slack* [2025] NZDC 15330 (Judge Rzepecky).
4 *Slack v R* [2026] NZCA 350 at [18] and [22] (Courtney, Andrew and Osborne JJ).
5 See Senior Courts Act 2016, s 74(2)(a) and (b).

reasons, it is unnecessary in the interests of justice to hear or determine the proposed appeal.[6]

[7] Nothing in Mr Slack's proposed reply submissions affects the conclusion we have reached.

Result

[8] The application for leave to file reply submissions is dismissed.

[9] The application for leave to appeal is dismissed.

Solicitors:
Te Tari Ture o te Karauna | Crown Law Office, Wellington for Respondent

6 See s 74(1).