

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND**

**SC 47/2014  
[2014] NZSC 78**

BETWEEN                      RAJENDRA PRASAD  
   Applicant

AND                              INDIANA PUBLICATIONS (NZ)  
   LIMITED  
   Respondent

**SC 48/2014**

BETWEEN                      RAJENDRA PRASAD  
   Applicant

AND                              INDIANA PUBLICATIONS (NZ)  
   LIMITED  
   Respondent

Court:                          McGrath, William Young and Arnold JJ  
Counsel:                      Applicant in Person  
Judgment:                    20 June 2014

---

**JUDGMENT OF THE COURT**

---

**The applications for leave to appeal are dismissed.**

---

**REASONS**

[1]     This judgment deals with applications by Mr Prasad to appeal against one decision of the High Court and two decisions of the Court of Appeal.

[2]     First, he seeks leave to appeal against a judgment of Venning J in the High Court which upheld a judgment of an Associate Judge striking out as an abuse of process a claim by Mr Prasad seeking to re-litigate issues already determined by the

courts.<sup>1</sup> Venning J also directed the Registrar not to accept for filing any further purported proceedings from the applicant relating to the issues of breach of copyright or costs that had led to the applicant's bankruptcy.

[3] Mr Prasad also applies for leave to appeal against two decisions of Wild J in the Court of Appeal directing the Registrar not to accept documents that the applicant had endeavoured to file. In both decisions, Wild J ordered that the Registrar not accept any further papers from the applicant without prior leave of a Judge.

[4] The background to these matters is the applicant's desire to challenge a District Court judgment in copyright litigation which was adverse to him, the propriety of subsequent costs orders in that proceeding, and the appellate courts' eventual refusal to entertain the applicant's attempts to re-litigate final judgments on these matters. He also seeks to challenge earlier decisions of this Court refusing leave to appeal against the original judgments entered against him.<sup>2</sup>

[5] None of the applications raises a question of general or public importance or other ground making it necessary in the interests of justice to hear and determine the proposed appeal. In particular, although the outcome of the copyright and bankruptcy proceedings has been frustrating and burdensome for the applicant, there is no indication that a substantial miscarriage of justice will occur if the appeal is not heard.

[6] As well, in relation to the application against the judgment of Venning J, there are no exceptional circumstances that would justify a direct appeal to the Supreme Court.

[7] Accordingly each of the applications for leave to appeal is dismissed.

---

<sup>1</sup> *Prasad v Attorney-General* [2013] NZHC 2721.

<sup>2</sup> *Prasad v Indiana Publications (NZ) Ltd* [2010] NZSC 60; and *Prasad v Indiana Publications (NZ) Ltd* [2012] NZSC 43.