

NOTE: PURSUANT TO S 35A OF THE PROPERTY (RELATIONSHIPS) ACT 1976, ANY REPORT OF THIS PROCEEDING MUST COMPLY WITH SS 11B TO 11D OF THE FAMILY COURTS ACT 1980. FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, PLEASE SEE [HTTP://WWW.JUSTICE.GOVT.NZ/COURTS/FAMILY-COURT/LEGISLATION/RESTRICTIONS-ON-PUBLICATIONS](http://www.justice.govt.nz/courts/family-court/legislation/restrictions-on-publications).

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

**SC67/2013
[2013] NZSC 85**

BETWEEN	GPM Appellant
AND	JHM Respondent

Court: Elias CJ, McGrath and William Young JJ
Counsel: Applicant in Person
E J Hudson for Respondent
Judgment: 12 September 2013

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

The application for recall of the Court's judgment is dismissed.

REASONS

[1] On 27 August 2013 this Court delivered judgment dismissing an application for leave to appeal by the applicant against a judgment of the Court of Appeal in a relationship property dispute.¹ The applicant has now applied to the Court for recall of its judgment contending that it contained many errors of fact, law and procedure.

[2] The applicant has filed a supporting affidavit adding detail to the allegations made earlier of deceit by the respondent, and covering wider ground. Her affidavit

¹ *GPM v JHM* [2013] NZSC 84.

offers further explanations for her delay in the matter but raises no new points of substance.

[3] She also contends that she did not withdraw her judicial review proceeding but rather converted it into an appeal, and contends there were errors concerning the dates in the Court's judgment.

[4] None of these matters, or others raised in the affidavit supporting the present application, were central to the Court's refusal of the applicant's application for leave to appeal. Nor do any of them meet the legal requirements for a recall application. We would not be assisted by an oral hearing in determining the application for a recall. The application for recall is dismissed.

[5] There will be no order for costs in this matter.

Solicitors:
Nielsen Law, Hamilton for Respondent