

NOTE: NEW ZEALAND LAWYERS AND CONVEYANCERS DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL ORDER 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 83**

BETWEEN GAUTAM JINDAL
Applicant

AND AUCKLAND STANDARDS
COMMITTEE 1
Respondent

Counsel: S A Keall and M S Timmins for Applicant
S S McMullan and K D J Robinson for Respondent

Judgment: 24 June 2026

JUDGMENT OF COOKE J

The application for a stay of the suspension order is granted pending the Court's decision on the application for leave to appeal.

REASONS

[1] By application dated 9 June 2026, Mr Jindal seeks a stay of the commencement of the six-month suspension from practice imposed as a penalty by the New Zealand Lawyers and Conveyancers Disciplinary Tribunal following its finding that he was guilty of one charge of misconduct.¹ Given that orders have earlier been granted by

¹ *Auckland Standards Committee 1 v Jindal* [2024] NZLCDT 45; and *Auckland Standards Committee 1 v Jindal* [2025] NZLCDT 26.

the High Court,² and then the Court of Appeal,³ staying the suspension while appeal rights have been exercised, the application is effectively to extend the stay that has earlier been granted.

[2] The application is supported by an affidavit from Mr Jindal sworn on 15 June 2026. He deposes that if he is not granted a stay he will be required to resign from his employment. The application is opposed by the respondent.

[3] Notwithstanding the public interest in decisions of the Tribunal being implemented in a timely way,⁴ I accept that a temporary stay should be granted in the particular circumstances of this case. As a consequence of the earlier decisions of the High Court and Court of Appeal, a stay of the suspension was in place until 2 June 2026,⁵ and it will only be a reasonably short period of time until the Court decides the application for leave to appeal. If the Court grants leave it can consider whether a continuation of the stay is appropriate. Whilst the applicant has not explained why the application to continue the stay was not made until more than a week after it had expired, given the above background, a short further continuation of the stay is appropriate.

[4] For these reasons, the suspension order of the Tribunal is stayed until the Court determines the application for leave to appeal.

Result

[5] The application for a stay of the suspension order is granted pending the Court's decision on the application for leave to appeal.

Solicitors:

Parshotam Lawyers, Auckland for Applicant
Meredith Connell, Auckland for Respondent

² See *Jindal v Auckland Standards Committee I* [2026] NZHC 454 (MacGillivray J) at [2] and [27].

³ See *Jindal v Auckland Standards Committee I* [2026] NZCA 192 (Whata, Grice and Walker JJ) [CA judgment] at [21]–[22] and [36]–[37].

⁴ See *Mason v Wellington Standards Committee (No 1)* [2025] NZCA 395 at [21].

⁵ See CA judgment, above n 3, at [37].