

**NOTE: ORDER OF THE HIGH COURT PROHIBITING PUBLICATION OF  
NAME, ADDRESS, OCCUPATION OR IDENTIFYING PARTICULARS OF  
THIRD PARTY REMAINS IN FORCE.**

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND**

**SC 2/2016  
[2016] NZSC 35**

BETWEEN

PETER GERARD STOCKMAN  
Applicant

AND

NEW ZEALAND ASSOCIATION OF  
COUNSELLORS INCORPORATED  
Respondent

Court: William Young, Glazebrook and Arnold JJ

Counsel: Applicant in person  
C Heaton for Respondent

Judgment: 7 April 2016

---

**JUDGMENT OF THE COURT**

---

- A** The application for recall of the Court's judgment in *Stockman v New Zealand Association of Counsellors Inc* [2016] NZSC 18 is dismissed.
- B** There is no order for costs.
- 

**REASONS**

[1] The applicant, Mr Stockman, asks the Court to recall its judgment in *Stockman v New Zealand Association of Counsellors Inc*,<sup>1</sup> in which the Court declined Mr Stockman's application for leave to appeal. The ground of the recall application is that the Court failed to give reasons for its refusal, as required by s 16 of the Supreme Court Act 2003.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Stockman v New Zealand Association of Counsellors Inc* [2016] NZSC 18.

[2] Section 16 provides:

**Court to state reasons for refusal to give leave**

- (1) The Supreme Court must state its reasons for refusing to give leave to appeal to it.
- (2) The reasons may be stated briefly, and may be stated in general terms only.

[3] In refusing leave, the Court stated that it was not satisfied that it was necessary in the interests of justice that it hear and determine the appeal because it did not consider that any issue of public or general importance was raised, or that there was any appearance of a miscarriage of justice. Those were its reasons for declining leave, and they meet the requirements of s 16.

[4] Mr Stockman has raised nothing which justifies recall of the Court's judgment. Accordingly the application for recall is dismissed. There is no order for costs.

Solicitors:  
Morrison Kent, Wellington for Respondent