

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

I TE KŌTI MANA NUI O AOTEAROA

SC UR 23/2025
[2026] NZSC 90

RE

RAZDAN RAFIQ
Applicant

Counsel: Applicant in person

Judgment: 9 July 2026

JUDGMENT OF MILLER 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] Mr Rafiq has made at least two applications for leave to appeal in the Court of Appeal. In the first of these proceedings, a Deputy Registrar declined Mr Rafiq's fee waiver application. In the second, a separate Deputy Registrar decided not to accept his leave application for filing; Palmer J subsequently upheld that decision.

[2] In this Court, Mr Rafiq applied for leave to appeal against what he describes as Palmer J's decision to uphold the Deputy Registrar's refusal of fee waiver. He has also sought an extension of time and a new waiver of filing fees.

[3] The Registrar declined to accept Mr Rafiq's application for leave to appeal for filing on the basis that it did not comply with the Supreme Court Rules 2004, because:

- (a) Mr Rafiq’s application did not clearly identify which of the two decisions made by deputy registrars of the Court of Appeal it related to; and
- (b) the application did not comply with rr 11–16 of the Supreme Court Rules.

[4] The Registrar did not make a decision about Mr Rafiq’s extension of time or fee waiver applications, as these had been “rendered moot”.

[5] Mr Rafiq has nevertheless applied for review of the Registrar’s decision to decline his fee waiver application.

[6] The immediate problem is that no such decision was made by the Registrar. In any event, the Registrar was correct: Mr Rafiq’s notice of application for leave to appeal is unclear. It conflates the decisions made by deputy registrars of the Court of Appeal.

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