#### IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

[2015] NZSC 151

BETWEEN JOHN KENNETH SLAVICH

**Applicant** 

AND THE JUDGES OF THE SUPREME

COURT Respondent

Court: Elias CJ, William Young, Glazebrook, Arnold and O'Regan JJ

Counsel: Applicant in person

Judgment: 22 October 2015

### JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

The application for recall is dismissed.

#### **REASONS**

# **Background**

- [1] Mr Slavich applies for a recall of this Court's judgment in *Slavich v The Judges of the Supreme Court* delivered on 1 September 2015.<sup>1</sup>
- [2] That judgment dismissed an application for review, pursuant to s 28(3) of the Supreme Court Act 2003, of a decision of William Young J, which in turn dismissed an application for review of a decision of the Supreme Court Registrar under s 28(2) of the Supreme Court Act.<sup>2</sup>

Slavich v The Judges of the Supreme Court [2015] NZSC 130 (Elias CJ, William Young, Glazebrook, Arnold and O'Regan JJ).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Slavich v The Judges of the Supreme Court [2015] NZSC 125.

[3] Mr Slavich submits that the Court's decision dated 1 September 2015 should be recalled because it did not deal with the contention that the High Court decision declaring Mr Slavich a vexatious litigant is, according to Mr Slavich, a legal "nullity".

# **Disposition**

- [4] The submission is not correct. The argument that the High Court judgment declaring Mr Slavich a vexatious litigant under s 88B of the Judicature Act 1908 is a "nullity" was explicitly acknowledged and rejected in our review decision.<sup>3</sup> In any event, it was not relevant to the question of this Court's jurisdiction to deal with Mr Slavich's application for leave to appeal.<sup>4</sup> As William Young J correctly stated, and as we confirmed in our review decision, this Court does not have power to grant leave in "contradiction" of s 88B of the Judicature Act.
- [5] To the extent that the application for recall appears to be part of a continuing attempt by Mr Slavich to subvert the High Court order declaring him a vexatious litigant, it is also an abuse of process.
- [6] The application for recall is therefore dismissed.

Slavich v The Judges of the Supreme Court, above n 1, at [3]–[4].

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> At [4].