

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

I TE KŌTI MANA NUI O AOTEAROA

**SC 175/2025
SC 2/2026
[2026] NZSC 54**

BETWEEN

LIYUN CHEN
First Applicant

LC1521319 DEVELOPMENT CO
LIMITED
Second Applicant

RHC PROPERTY INVESTMENT
LIMITED
Third Applicant

LIYUN CHEN AS TRUSTEE OF THE
ROYALL FAMILY TRUST
Fourth Applicant

AND

GOODMORE INVESTMENTS (NEW
ZEALAND) LIMITED
Respondent

**SC 176/2025
SC 1/2026**

BETWEEN

LIYUN CHEN
First Applicant

LC1521319 DEVELOPMENT CO
LIMITED
Second Applicant

AND

TAWA TRADE FINANCE LIMITED
Respondent

Court: Ellen France, Kós and Miller JJ

Counsel: First Applicant in Person
J Ding for Respondent in SC 175/2025 and SC 2/2026
D J Chisholm KC for Respondent in SC 176/2025 and SC 1/2026

Judgment: 8 May 2026

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

**The application for recall of this Court’s judgment of 1 May 2026
(*Chen v Goodmore Investments (New Zealand) Ltd*
[2026] NZSC 40) is dismissed.**

REASONS

[1] The details of this matter are set out in this Court’s prior judgment.¹ The applicant now seeks recall of that judgment. She seeks to rely on the third category for recall—i.e., the existence of exceptional reasons why justice requires the judgment be recalled.² She refers to the fact that she is not a lawyer, that her lawyer of choice was overseas when the leave application was prepared and that her use of hallucinated AI authorities in submissions occurred in good faith.

[2] All this is beside the point. Nothing has been advanced to warrant recall. In particular, nothing in the application raises any question about this Court’s primary conclusions that the proposed appeals raise essentially factual questions, lack any realistic prospects of success, raise no matter of general or public importance and do not indicate any appearance of a substantial miscarriage of justice as that term is understood in the civil context.³

[3] The application for recall is therefore dismissed.

Solicitors:

Neilsons Lawyers, Auckland for Respondent in SC 175/2025 and SC 2/2026.

Claymore Partners, Auckland for Respondent in SC 176/2025 and SC 1/2026.

¹ *Chen v Goodmore Investments (New Zealand) Ltd* [2026] NZSC 40 [Leave judgment].

² *Horowhenua County v Nash (No 2)* [1968] NZLR 632 (SC) at 633, approved in *Saxmere Co Ltd v Wool Board Disestablishment Co Ltd (No 2)* [2009] NZSC 122, [2010] 1 NZLR 76 at [2].

³ Leave judgment, above n 1, at [13]–[15].