NOTE: NON-PUBLICATION ORDER IN [2024] NZLCDT 45 PROHIBITING PUBLICATION OF THE COMPLAINANT'S NAME, HIS FIRM'S NAME AND ANY OTHER DETAILS WHICH MIGHT LEAD TO HIS IDENTIFICATION PURSUANT TO S 240 OF THE LAWYERS AND CONVEYANCERS ACT 2006 REMAINS IN FORCE.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

I TE KŌTI MANA NUI O AOTEAROA

SC 62/2026
[2026] NZSC 164

BETWEEN	GAUTAM JINDAL Applicant
AND	AUCKLAND STANDARDS COMMITTEE 1 Respondent

Court:	Kós, Cooke and Campbell JJ
Counsel:	Applicant in person No appearance for Respondent
Judgment:	29 October 2026

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

The application for a stay is dismissed.

REASONS

[1] Last week, we dismissed Mr Jindal's application for leave to appeal from decisions of the High Court and Court of Appeal which had rejected his attempts to overturn decisions of the Lawyers and Conveyancers Disciplinary Tribunal finding him guilty of misconduct under s 7 of the Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006 (LCA) and, among other things, imposing a six-month suspension.[1] Dismissal of his

[1] *Jindal v Auckland Standards Committee 1* [2026] NZSC 156 (Kós, Cooke and Campbell JJ).

application meant an interim stay of the suspension order came to an end. However, to give Mr Jindal time to make appropriate practice arrangements, we granted a further stay of the suspension until 6 pm on 30 October 2026.

[2] Mr Jindal now applies for the stay to be extended until 6 pm on 29 January 2027 to enable him to submit an individual communication to the United Nations Human Rights Committee (UNHRC), pursuant to the First Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and to request urgent interim measures preserving his position pending the UNHRC's consideration of that request.

[3] We do not consider we have jurisdiction to grant or extend a stay in support of a proposed communication to the UNHRC. Even if we did have jurisdiction, Mr Jindal has not persuaded us that we should exercise it. The Tribunal ordered the suspension to commence on 22 May 2025. Since then, the suspension has largely been stayed (Mr Jindal says he has served 22 days of it) pending determination of Mr Jindal's various appeals and applications for leave to appeal. The Standards Committee has prevailed at every level and is entitled to see the penalty imposed by the Tribunal served. Further delaying the suspension would be seriously contrary to the LCA's purpose of maintaining public confidence in the provision of legal services.[2]

[4] The application for a stay is therefore dismissed.

Copy to:
S S McMullan/K D J Robinson, Meredith Connell, Auckland for Respondent

---

2 Lawyers and Conveyancers Act 2006, s 3(1)(a).