

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND

I TE KŌTI MANA NUI O AOTEAROA

SC UR 10/2024
[2024] NZSC 187

RE JOHN KENNETH SLAVICH
Applicant

Counsel: Applicant in person

Judgment: 20 December 2024

JUDGMENT OF WILLIAMS J

- A** The application for recall of this Court’s judgment of 31 May 2024 (*Re Slavich* [2024] NZSC 66) is dismissed.
- B** The Registrar is directed not to accept for filing any further applications for recall relating to this judgment, or the judgment of 31 May 2024 (*Re Slavich* [2024] NZSC 66).
-

REASONS

[1] Mr Slavich has applied to recall my judgment declining his application to review the Deputy Registrar’s refusal to waive the filing fee for his proposed leave application.¹ Mr Slavich says that for some “very special reason justice requires that the judgment be recalled”.² Specifically, he submits that, in three respects, I “misapprehended”³ previous relevant decisions referred to in the judgment: first in relation to an aspect of the reasoning of Judge Mill in the Wellington District Court, second in relation to the relevance of his allegation that Crown counsel had committed contempt in the proceeding, and third in relation to whether a ground in his original

¹ *Re Slavich* [2024] NZSC 66.

² See *Horowhenua County v Nash (No 2)* [1968] NZLR 632 (HC) at 633.

³ Mr Slavich cites *Cynotech Securities Ltd v People Ltd (No 2)* HC Auckland CIV-2008-404-1559, 4 March 2009.

appeal against Heath J's 2006 conviction judgment had, in fact, been fully aired in previous decisions.

[2] As noted in my initial judgment, Mr Slavich's substantive complaint has a long history. Apart from the current proceeding, it has involved multiple proceedings in multiple courts over the last 15 years. In one form or another, the arguments Mr Slavich raises in support of recall have been raised and rejected in prior proceedings. In other words, the grounds advanced in this recall application are in substance, an attempt to reclothe substantive appeal arguments. They do not provide very special reasons for recall in the interests of justice.

[3] Mr Slavich advances a further argument relating to the fact that he resides in the electorate of the Attorney-General, Hon Judith Collins KC. He suggests that I should recall my judgment to allow the Attorney to intervene for the purpose of negotiating a settlement of the proceeding. This is not a very special reason for recall in the interests of justice.

[4] The application for recall of this Court's judgment of 31 May 2024 (*Re Slavich* [2024] NZSC 66) is dismissed.

[5] The Registrar is directed not to accept for filing any further applications for recall relating to this judgment, or the judgment of 31 May 2024 (*Re Slavich* [2024] NZSC 66).