

**NOTE: TENANCY TRIBUNAL ORDER PROHIBITING PUBLICATION OF  
NAMES AND IDENTIFYING DETAILS OF LANDLORD AND TENANT  
REMAINS IN FORCE.**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND**

**I TE KŌTI MANA NUI O AOTEAROA**

**SC UR 17/2026  
[2026] NZSC 62**

RE TT (SC UR 17/2026)  
Applicant

Counsel: Applicant in person

Judgment: 25 May 2026

---

**JUDGMENT OF COOKE J**

---

**The application for review of the decision of the Registrar not to  
accept the application for leave to appeal for filing is dismissed.**

---

**REASONS**

[1] In April 2026 the applicant sought to file an application for leave to bring a civil appeal in this Court. By letter dated 13 April 2026, the Registrar declined to accept the application for filing on the basis that the Court had no jurisdiction to receive it in accordance with r 5A(1)(b)(ii) of the Supreme Court Rules 2004 (the Rules). The applicant has now sought review of that decision under r 5A(3) of the Rules and he has filed submissions in support of this review.

[2] In the application for leave dated 1 April 2026 the applicant identified two decisions that were the subject of the application: a decision of the Tenancy Tribunal dated 2 February 2026, and what is described as “subsequent continuous High Court Registry deletion”.

[3] The decision of the Tenancy Tribunal in issue concerned an attempted application to evict the applicant from certain premises.<sup>1</sup> The Tribunal decided there was no evidence that the relevant premises were residential premises, and for this reason the application was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction. Notwithstanding that the decision appears to be in his favour, the applicant seeks leave to appeal the decision to this Court on the basis that the decision of the Tribunal “actively facilitated state-sanctioned harassment”.

[4] The other matter that the applicant seeks leave to appeal appears to be a complaint that attempted judicial review proceedings challenging the Tribunal’s decision were initially accepted by the Ministry of Justice’s online “file and pay” system, but that the system subsequently deleted the record of that filing. In his submissions the applicant argued that the “deletion” of this filing was part of a wider issue of a coordinated, systemic failure across multiple state agencies to uphold statutory obligations, resulting in a breach of his rights under s 27 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990.

[5] I have reviewed the Registrar’s decision in light of the applicant’s submissions. The Registrar declined to accept the application for leave to appeal the decision of the Tenancy Tribunal on the basis that this Court has no jurisdiction to consider an appeal from the Tribunal under s 70 of the Senior Courts Act 2016. It is clear that the Registrar had the power under r 5A(1)(b)(ii) of the Rules to decline to accept a document for filing if the Court lacks jurisdiction. It is equally clear that there is no right of appeal from the Tenancy Tribunal to this Court. For that reason I uphold this aspect of the Registrar’s decision.

[6] With respect to the Registrar’s decision that the Court had no jurisdiction to consider the complaint concerning the “deletion” of the apparent filing of judicial review proceedings in the High Court, the Registrar concluded that this was not something that could be dealt with by an appeal process. This Court’s jurisdiction to hear appeals from decisions of the High Court arises under s 69 of the Senior Courts Act. I agree with the Registrar that no relevant decision has been made by the

---

<sup>1</sup> [TT] v [CT] [2026] NZTT 5425696.

High Court. If the proceedings were initially filed through the Ministry's "file and pay" system but any record of them has been lost, this would only be an administrative issue. Neither would this prevent the applicant re-filing proceedings if that were necessary. I agree with the Registrar that no decision has been made by the High Court that could be subject to an application for leave to appeal falling within ss 69 and 75 of the Senior Courts Act. I also note that, as recorded above, the applicant's intended judicial review challenge appears to be a challenge to a determination by the Tenancy Tribunal in his favour.

[7] The application for review of the decision of the Registrar not to accept the application for leave to appeal for filing is dismissed.