IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

SC 98/2017 [2017] NZSC 174

BETWEEN STUART WALTON HERRON

Applicant

AND WAYNE ANDREW WALLACE

First Respondent

BELMONT LIFESTYLE VILLAGE

LIMITED

Second Respondent

Court: William Young, Glazebrook and Ellen France JJ

Counsel: J A Farmer QC and C T Patterson for Applicant

M A Corlett QC, A I C Denton and E F Armstrong for

Respondents

Judgment: 22 November 2017

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

- A The application for leave to appeal is dismissed.
- B Costs of \$2,500 are awarded to the respondents.

REASONS

Background

[1] Mr Herron applies for leave to appeal against a decision of the Court of Appeal.¹

Wallace v Herron [2017] NZCA 346 (Kós P, Harrison and Winkelmann JJ).

[2] The background is complicated and fully explored in the Court of Appeal

judgment.² For these purposes, it is only necessary to record that in contention is a

clause in a settlement document that gave a credit of \$675,000 if a contract relating to

a Queenstown apartment to be developed by interests associated with Mr Bryers

became unconditional.

[3] The Court of Appeal held that Mr Herron had released the Bryers' interests

from their obligations with regard to that contract and had caused the condition not to

be fulfilled. He therefore could not recover the \$675,000.³

Decision

[4] The judgment of the Court of Appeal related to the very particular facts and

documentation in this case. This means that no point of general public or commercial

significance arises. Further, nothing raised by Mr Herron suggests a miscarriage of

justice.4

[5] The application for leave to appeal is dismissed. Costs of \$2,500 are awarded

to the respondents.

Solicitors:

Skeates Law Limited, Auckland, for Applicant Wilson Harle, Auckland, for Perpendents

Wilson Harle, Auckland, for Respondents

² At [4]–[24].

³ At [40]–[54].

In the sense required in civil cases: see *Junior Farms Ltd v Hampton Securities (in liq)* [2006]

NZSC 60, (2006) 18 PRNZ 369.