



Supreme Court of New Zealand | Te Kōti Mana Nui o Aotearoa

18 JULY 2025

MEDIA RELEASE

RAYMOND IVEAGH JURY v THE KING

(SC 114/2024)

Hearing in the Supreme Court Tuesday 5 August 2025

CASE HISTORY SYNOPSIS

This synopsis is provided to assist in understanding the history of the case and the issues to be heard by the Court. It does not represent the views of the panel that will hear the appeal in the Supreme Court.

Background

On 30 January 2019, Trevor Rikihana was found dead on a gang associate's driveway. After a jury trial in August 2020, the appellant, Mr Jury, was convicted of his murder.

The Crown case at trial was that the appellant assaulted Mr Rikihana at his home, put him into the back of the appellant's car, drove to the home of an associate, Rex Maney, and then took Mr Rikihana away and left him on the driveway. The appellant's evidence was that he witnessed Mr Maney and Mr Rikihana yelling at one another. The appellant said he was then hit on the head with a hammer. He said he later carried Mr Rikihana to his (the appellant's) car and took Mr Maney and Mr Rikihana to Mr Maney's home. The appellant said he left them both there. The appellant's case was that Mr Maney killed Mr Rikihana after he left.

Mr Maney died before he could give evidence at the appellant's trial.

Section 17 of the Evidence Act 2006 provides that hearsay statements are generally inadmissible. However, section 18 in this case allowed the Crown to seek to admit hearsay statements from Mr Maney where the circumstances relating to the statements provided reasonable assurance that they were reliable. The High Court admitted three such statements:

- (1) Mr Maney's initial police statement, in which he said he had not seen the appellant recently and did not know what had happened to Mr Rikihana.
- (2) A letter written by Mr Maney and later recovered by police, which said that the appellant arrived at his house with Mr Rikihana tied down in his car. Mr Maney heard him kicking Mr Rikihana and then he drove away with Mr Rikihana.
- (3) Mr Maney's second police statement, which said the appellant had visited him twice that night—first to tell him that Mr Rikihana had attacked him with a hammer and he was going to go back and “get” him, and a second time asking for a rope. Mr Maney

heard someone yelling from the appellant's car, who he thought was Mr Rikihana, and the appellant delivering what sounded like kicks.

On 16 July 2024, the Court of Appeal dismissed the appellant's appeal against conviction. It rejected the appellant's argument that Mr Maney's statements were inadmissible. Notably, the appellant had submitted that CCTV evidence was consistent only with one visit to Mr Maney's home, not two as referred to in Mr Maney's second police statement. But the Court found that although aspects of the statements were inconsistent, much of Mr Maney's letter and his second police statement were consistent with other evidence. This confirmed the circumstances provided reasonable assurance that the statements were reliable. It was then for the jury to decide whether to accept or reject any aspects of Mr Maney's statements.

The Court determined that the trial Judge erred by not directing the jury, under section 122 of the Evidence Act, that they should approach Mr Maney's evidence with caution during deliberations. The evidence was hearsay, not the subject of cross-examination, and Mr Maney, as a suspect at the time, had a motive to give false evidence. However, the Court found that the trial Judge's error did not give rise to a miscarriage of justice because the issues relating to Mr Maney's evidence were well explored by counsel to the jury, and the other evidence created a "compelling case" against the appellant. That evidence included eyewitness accounts and forensic and pathology evidence.

This appeal

Mr Jury applied for leave to appeal his conviction to the Supreme Court. On 17 March 2025, the Supreme Court granted Mr Jury leave to appeal in part. The approved questions are:

- (a) whether the High Court erred by admitting the hearsay statements of Mr Maney in evidence, and if so, whether the error occasioned a miscarriage of justice; and
- (b) whether the trial Judge's failure to give a reliability direction under section 122 of the Evidence Act with respect to those statements occasioned a miscarriage of justice.

Counsel for the Crown also seek to support the Court of Appeal's judgment on another ground: that the trial Judge's failure to give a reliability direction in this case was not an error.

Viewing of hearing

The courtroom is open to the public.

The panel

The Hon Justice Kós	The Hon Justice Glazebrook	The Rt Hon Chief Justice Winkelmann	The Hon Justice Ellen France	The Hon Justice Miller
---------------------	----------------------------	-------------------------------------	------------------------------	------------------------

Judges as seen from the public gallery

Counsel

- Raymond Iveagh Jury (Appellant): *C W J Stevenson KC and S J Parry*
- The King (Respondent): *Z R Johnston and Z R Hamill*

Sitting hours

Court will begin at 10:00am and conclude at 1:00pm with an adjournment taken from 11:30am to 11:45am. There is no afternoon adjournment.

Enquiries

Any enquiries about the hearing should be directed via email to supremecourt@justice.govt.nz. While attending the hearing, enquiries can also be directed to the Court Registry, which is located outside the main courtroom in the Supreme Court foyer.

Contact person:

Sue Leaupepe, Supreme Court Registrar (04) 914 3613

Court of Appeal decision: [\[2024\] NZCA 320](#) (16 July 2024)

Court of Appeal recall decision: [\[2024\] NZCA 453](#) (18 September 2024)

Supreme Court leave decision: [\[2025\] NZSC 14](#) (17 March 2025)

