

**ORDER PROHIBITING PUBLICATION OF NAME, ADDRESS,
OCCUPATION OR IDENTIFYING PARTICULARS OF APPLICANT AND
THE VICTIM UNTIL 2 PM ON 16 MARCH 2026.**

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

I TE KŌTI MANA NUI O AOTEAROA

**SC 153/2025
[2026] NZSC 16**

BETWEEN LESLIE RAYMOND PARR
 Applicant

AND THE KING
 Respondent

Court: Ellen France and Kós JJ

Counsel: J H C Waugh for Applicant
 M F Laracy and E P C Duckett for Respondent

Judgment: 12 March 2026

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

- A The application for leave to appeal is dismissed.**
- B We make an order continuing the prohibition on publication of the name, address, occupation or identifying particulars of the applicant and of the victim until 2 pm on 16 March 2026. Suppression will lapse at that time.**
-

REASONS

Introduction

[1] The applicant seeks leave to appeal from the decision of the Court of Appeal.¹ The Court of Appeal dismissed his appeal from the decision of the High Court

¹ *R (CA219/2025) v R* [2025] NZCA 470, [2025] 3 NZLR 336 (French P, Campbell and Collins JJ) [CA judgment].

declining his application to suppress his name and that of his mother.² He wishes to argue tikanga is relevant in determining where the “interests of justice” lie in decisions relating to name suppression under s 200 of the Criminal Procedure Act 2011.

Background

[2] The applicant has killed two people as a result of schizophrenic delusions. The first, his then partner Fiona Maulolo, in 1997 and the second, his mother, Heather Condon, in 2024.³ He was found not guilty by reason of insanity on both occasions.

[3] Ms Maulolo was killed about a year after the applicant was released from care as a compulsory inpatient. The applicant was to remain a compulsory inpatient for six months but, only nine days after being made a compulsory inpatient, he was released by a “Doctor” who it appears had probably forged her qualifications. A coronial inquiry was highly critical of the way the applicant’s case was handled by the mental health system. He was made a special patient after his trial.

[4] By 2012, the applicant’s health had improved to the point that, although still a special patient, he could receive treatment and supervision whilst living in the community. His status changed in 2021 to that of a patient subject to a community treatment order. He was readmitted to a mental health facility in 2024 after an altercation with a whānau member. He was released from the facility on 30 May 2024. It was not long after that when, on 4 June, he killed his mother.

The proposed appeal

[5] The applicant says that tikanga, as the first law of Aotearoa New Zealand, is relevant to when and for what reasons the preference for openness in the criminal justice system should apply. He argues suppression is necessary to prevent wide-scale reporting of his name and identifying details and those of his mother to the general public. That wide-spread publicity is not consistent with tikanga principles because of the lack of relationality. Nor is it consistent with tikanga to allow permanent searchable storage and ongoing publication of intergenerationally-harmful

² *R v [R]* [2025] NZHC 932 (Grau J).

³ Ms Condon is the victim referred to in the non-publication order.

information by the media. It follows that tikanga has not been correctly applied here. The applicant submits the proposed appeal gives rise to a matter of general or public importance, and that the failure of the Court of Appeal to correctly apply tikanga resulted in a substantial miscarriage of justice.

[6] In seeking name suppression for himself and his mother, the applicant says that the tests of undue hardship in s 200 of the Criminal Procedure Act are met. The next step of the inquiry before making a suppression order requires the Court to consider whether that hardship outweighs the principles of open justice. He wishes to argue that tikanga is relevant to that consideration.

[7] The argument based on tikanga principles was not raised in the High Court. Evidence of tikanga from Che Wilson was instead admitted on appeal to the Court of Appeal. In his evidence, Mr Wilson essentially focuses on the two whānau (the Condons and the Parrs), who have through the application of tikanga (tangihanga and karakia) been able to attain some balance following the death of Ms Condon. Mr Wilson says the whānau will be retraumatised if they become the subject of renewed public attention with the shame or whakamā that will inevitably follow. Further steps will need to be taken to again resolve the issue. Mr Wilson wants to avoid that. He accepts if the applicant is released, it would be in accordance with tikanga to lift name suppression at that time.

[8] The Court of Appeal accepted tikanga may assist in deciding whether an applicant or victim has shown the necessary hardship if name suppression is declined, and in assessing that hardship. But, the Court said, for a number of reasons “even assessing the hardship of Mr Parr’s whānau through that tikanga lens, we are not persuaded that that hardship outweighed the strong public interest in open justice in this case”.⁴

[9] The factors identified by the Court were as follows:

- (a) The overwhelming interest in giving supremacy to open justice here. The applicant’s name was known to the public in relation to the first

⁴ CA judgment, above n 1, at [69].

killing and the failings of the system contributing to that. The fact he had killed again whilst suffering from mental illness was “a matter of overwhelming public interest”.⁵

- (b) The way Ms Condon’s death was discussed openly at the tangihanga was consistent with open justice.
- (c) The inability to identify the applicant or his mother will hamper future inquiries and the inquest into her death.
- (d) The public has a right to know these details to be aware of the risks the applicant may pose if he is released into the community.
- (e) The family of Ms Maulolo have an interest in knowing and being free to discuss that the applicant has killed someone else close to him.

[10] Finally, although not a step sought by the applicant, the Court also considered suppression of Ms Condon’s name as a victim under s 202(1)(b) of the Criminal Procedure Act. The Court took the view there was a strong public interest in the public knowing the relationship between the applicant and Ms Condon and how that “sheds light on the effect of [the applicant’s] illness and the failings of mental health services”.⁶

Our assessment

[11] How tikanga affects the interests of justice and how those principles affect the “public interest” in this context is a question of general or public importance.⁷ However, we do not consider this case is an appropriate vehicle to consider the question for two reasons. First, because the impact of tikanga was not raised until the appeal to the Court of Appeal, the evidence that would be before the Court is not extensive and has not been tested.⁸ Second, given the public interest in the matter and the acknowledged need for public protection, the proposed appeal has insufficient

⁵ At [70].

⁶ At [77].

⁷ Senior Courts Act 2016, s 74(2)(a).

⁸ The respondent accepted in the Court of Appeal that the evidence was credible.

prospects of success. Nothing raised by the applicant gives rise to the appearance of a substantial miscarriage of justice.⁹ The criteria for leave to appeal are not met and it is not necessary in the interests of justice to hear and determine the proposed appeal.¹⁰

Result

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

[13] To enable the whānau to be informed of this decision, we make an order continuing the prohibition on publication of the name, address, occupation or identifying particulars of the applicant and of the victim until 2 pm on 16 March 2026. After that time there will be no impediment to the reporting of these details.

Solicitors:

Crowley Waugh, Whanganui for Applicant

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

⁹ Section 74(2)(b).

¹⁰ Section 74(1)–(2).