

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF NEW ZEALAND
WHANGAREI REGISTRY**

**I TE KŌTI MATUA O AOTEAROA
WHANGĀREI-TERENGA-PARĀOA ROHE**

**CRI-2022-088-002331
[2025] NZHC 343**

THE KING

v

**IKE WELLINGTON KINGI
LEONIE FARRELL
STACY ROBERT JAMIESON**

Hearing: 28 February 2025

Appearances: R B Annandale and J P Hamber for Crown
S-L Litt for Ike Kingi
A M M Ives and C S Taylor for Leonie Farrell
J A Young for Stacy Jamieson

Sentence: 28 February 2025

SENTENCES OF JOHNSTONE J

Solicitors:
MWIS, Whangārei

[1] Mr Kingi, Ms Farrell and Mr Jamieson, I am sentencing you now of course for the offences of which a jury on 8 November last year found you guilty, all of them relating to the death of Mr Kleiman.

What happened

[2] In October 2022, Mr Kingi and Ms Farrell, you were renovating a house at 24 Edge Street, Onerahi, so that you might then live in it with your seven-week-old daughter. Mr Kleiman, a house decorator by trade, had been assisting with the renovation.

[3] At around 5.35 pm on Wednesday, 26 October 2022, Mr Kleiman drove to the house where, Mr Kingi, you had been for much of the afternoon. At around 7.18 pm, you were together inside. Ms Farrell, you were in your Nissan Navara ute, parked outside the house. And Mr Jamieson, you were in or near a garage alongside the house.

[4] At this point, Mr Kingi, you shot Mr Kleiman using a high-powered rifle. The projectile passed through the corner of Mr Kleiman's mouth and then across his lower brain cavity before exiting the back of his head. Mr Kleiman died almost instantly. You had murdered him.¹

[5] I will come back to what happened in the moments after, and in the days after, you shot Mr Kleiman. But I will mention now that it was during the morning of the following Monday, 31 October 2022, that you went with your lawyer to the Whangārei Police Station and gave a statement in which you described what happened as an accident. You sought to explain that, although you were holding the gun when it fired, you had not intended to fire it. Instead, you said that the gun simply went off as you went to sit down on a couch. You implied that the gun must have just happened to have been pointing at Mr Kleiman.

[6] Mr Kingi, I understand that, even now, you maintain it was an accident. But the jury who heard your account at your trial were sure it is untrue. The jury decided

¹ Charge 1 of the Crown Charge Notice at the time of verdicts. Crimes Act 1961, s 172. Maximum penalty: life imprisonment.

that when Mr Kleiman was shot you either intended to kill him, or you intended to cause him serious harm and were prepared to take the risk of him dying.

[7] Having heard the same evidence that the jury heard, I am not surprised that they rejected your account. The expert forensic evidence called by the Crown showed that the muzzle of the gun was in contact with Mr Kleiman's face at the time it fired, and that, when he was shot, Mr Kleiman was standing on the other side of a table, opposite the only couch on which you might have been in the course of sitting down. It was not possible for you to have been in the course of sitting down on the couch and at the same time holding the rifle so that its muzzle was up against Mr Kleiman's face. I note that, around two weeks after the shooting, so on 12 November 2022, during an unguarded moment when you were talking about Mr Kleiman while making a recorded telephone call from the remand prison, you said you "should have just whopped him up". I infer that, for some reason, you were upset with Mr Kleiman, and decided simply to shoot him. In fact, given that I regard your explanation of the shooting as something that happened while you were in the process of sitting down on that couch, I consider it to be a lie, made up because you know how it actually happened and you needed to change your truth because in fact you intended to kill Mr Kleiman.

[8] So now I come back to what happened in the moments after the shooting. Within seconds, Mr Kingi, you ran from the house to the ute, taking the rifle with you. And, Mr Jamieson, you ran there too. The ute was quickly driven away.

[9] Around three minutes later, Mr Jamieson you returned to the Edge Street house, walking with the hood of your hoody up and your sunglasses on. You placed a drop sheet over Mr Kleiman's body, where it lay on the floor of the house next to a table, and a bathmat over the large bloodstain which had commenced to pool next to Mr Kleiman's head.² You left the house, having first locked or somehow jammed the front door.³ Your intention in placing the drop sheet and bathmat and securing the front door was to prevent visitors to the house from either entering or looking inside to see Mr Kleiman's body, and in that way to interfere with the criminal prosecution

² Charge 5.

³ Charge 3.

of Mr Kingi that you expected would follow. You wilfully attempted to pervert the course of justice.⁴

[10] Shortly after midnight, Ms Farrell, you drove, without Mr Kingi, to a petrol station in Kamo and put some fuel into the Navara. You went back to the same petrol station around two and a half hours later, at 2.41 am. And then you went in the Navara, with Mr Kingi and your daughter, away from Whangārei to the home of your associate, Shevaun Murray, at Mangōnui in the far north. Your purpose in doing that was to prevent or interfere with the prosecution of Mr Kingi that you expected would follow. You too had wilfully attempted to pervert the course of justice.⁵

[11] Ms Farrell, you left Mr Kingi at Ms Murray's home, before driving to and around Kaitaia, making various phone calls through the course of that day, including for the purpose of seeking legal advice, and considering what to do next. You called your friend Paula MacClure, who owned the house at Edge Street, and you told her someone had died in her house. When Ms MacClure asked what had happened, you said, incorrectly (as it turns out), that there had been an accident. Ms MacClure called the police.

[12] At around 4 pm that day, Thursday, 27 October 2022, you were stopped for speeding by a road policing officer, but you chose at that stage not to alert him to what had happened in Whangārei. It was the next day, Friday, 28 October, when you went to the Whangārei Police Station and made a statement. Again, you said there had been an accident. In my view, the evidence at your trial did not establish that you knew this account of an accident to be untrue. I am prepared to sentence you on the basis that, at least until receiving police disclosure many months later, you might have believed Mr Kingi.

[13] That said, when making your statement to the police, you falsely claimed that you dropped Mr Kingi at an unknown address in the far north, rather than at Ms Murray's home in Mangōnui. I am satisfied that at least a part of the reason you did this was to give Mr Kingi a little more time in which he could calm down and

⁴ Crimes Act, s 117(e). Maximum penalty: seven years' imprisonment.

⁵ Charge 2.

prepare himself better for the moment when he would be face to face with the police, and asked what had happened.

[14] As I have said, that moment did not come until the following Monday. Mr Kingi, you were arrested, charged, and remanded in custody soon thereafter.

[15] The recorded prison phone call that I mentioned earlier was one of a series that took place in the early weeks of your remand in custody, between early November and mid-December 2022. The Crown produced some of those recorded phone calls in evidence during the trial. During those phone calls, Mr Kingi and Ms Farrell, you discussed the written statements that had been made to the police: including by Ms Murray (about your visit to her home in Mangōnui); and by Ms MacClure (about receiving the phone call about what had happened in her house). Ms Farrell, you had misunderstood what Ms Murray and Ms MacClure had said in their statements:

- (a) You thought, wrongly, that Ms Murray spoke about Mr Kingi admitting to shooting Mr Kleiman intentionally. In fact, Ms Murray's statement recorded Mr Kingi telling her that he did so accidentally.
- (b) And you thought, wrongly, that Ms MacClure spoke about being too scared of Mr Kingi to call the police. In fact, Ms MacClure did not say that, and as you know she did call the police.

[16] Be that as it may, you agreed with each other to get Ms MacClure to change her statement. In that way, you conspired together, Mr Kingi and Ms Farrell, to pervert the course of justice.⁶ There is no evidence that you took this agreement relating to Ms MacClure's evidence any further.

[17] Also, Mr Kingi, it so happened that at the time you were being held in custody along with Ms Murray's partner, Talmage Murray. You agreed with Mr Murray, and you agreed with Ms Farrell, that, between you, you would get Ms Murray to change her statement. Again, Mr Kingi and Ms Farrell, you had conspired to pervert the

⁶ Charge 7. Crimes Act 1961, s 116. Maximum penalty: seven years' imprisonment.

course of justice.⁷ In this case, Mr Murray then made a recorded prison call to Ms Murray, and told her she needed to change her statement, adding that she needed to speak to you, Ms Farrell. For his conduct, Mr Murray has been convicted of attempting to pervert the course of justice. I will come back to his sentencing later. But, for the moment, I will say that there is no evidence that the conspiracy was taken any further than this.

[18] Turning back to your conduct, Mr Jamieson, another thing you did after the shooting was to dispose of the rifle. Exactly when you did this is unclear. On 21 December 2022, you admitted in a recorded prison call that you had “got rid of it personally”. The police have been unable to find it.

[19] Mr Jamieson, you disposed of the rifle intending to interfere with Mr Kingi’s prosecution for having shot Mr Kleiman.⁸ In your case, I am satisfied that, when you committed your offending, you believed Mr Kingi had killed Mr Kleiman unlawfully. You went into the house, seeing and covering Mr Kleiman’s dead body, and taking steps to ensure it was not found too early, and you did that within only minutes of the shooting. You did not take a moment to consider the possibility that Mr Kleiman had been shot accidentally, or as a matter of self-defence. While you may not have known Mr Kingi had committed murder, you simply assumed, correctly as it turns out, that Mr Kingi had acted unlawfully.

[20] Those being the circumstances of your offending, I will turn to consider the sentences that need to be applied to you each of you individually.

The structure of this sentencing

[21] I will sentence Ms Farrell first, then Mr Jamieson, and then Mr Kingi. For the offences other than murder, I need to decide the question of what sentence would appropriately respond to the offending itself, and then make adjustments so that the starting point takes account of your own circumstances as an individual. This will take some time, Ms Farrell, so you are free to keep seated until I tell you to stand.

⁷ Charge 8.

⁸ Charge 6.

[22] So, I am going to start the process of considering what sentence will respond to your offending by describing how the Court is required to respond to offending in the nature of wilfully attempting to pervert, or conspiring to pervert, justice.

Wilfully attempting to pervert, or conspiring to pervert, justice

[23] Any attempt to disturb the process of administration of justice is to be deplored. Sentencing courts will respond with “moderately lengthy” sentences of imprisonment, in “all but the most exceptional circumstances”.⁹

[24] In the Court of Appeal case from which I have taken those principles, the offender had tried to get a witness to make a statement saying that her partner had not committed a serious assault. The Court noted that the offender may have believed that such a statement would be the truth, but the Court said that was “not to the point”.¹⁰ It agreed that the starting point for the offender’s sentence should have been in the order of 12 months’ imprisonment.¹¹

[25] Here, I come back to the sentencing of Talmage Murray. In his case, there is no suggestion he had any real insight into whether Shevaun Murray’s police statement was the truth. And the Judge found that Mr Murray implicitly threatened Ms Murray to get her to change her evidence, before deciding upon a starting point of 20 months’ imprisonment.¹²

[26] Turning away from situations where the offending involved an attempt to get someone to change their evidence: there are situations where, like you Ms Farrell, the offender helped someone who was running away from the police, and there are situations where, like you, Mr Jamieson, the offender actually got rid of what might have been important evidence. This Court has said that cases like yours, Mr Jamieson, are at “the top end of the range”, and cases like yours, Ms Farrell, are at “the other end of the scale”.¹³

⁹ *R v Churchward* CA439/05, 2 March 2006 at [14].

¹⁰ At [15].

¹¹ At [19].

¹² *R v Murray* [2023] NZHC 3090.

¹³ *R v Duff* HC Rotorua CRI-2009-063-6473, 9 December 2010 at [11]. *Duff* involved a charge of accessory after the fact to murder, but the principle is the same. The 18-month starting point in that case is comparable with the starting point adopted for Ms Farrell, because the assistance in

[27] In a case where a woman helped her partner to avoid arrest for 11 days, buying him a car under a false name, the Court decided on a starting point of 15 months' imprisonment.¹⁴

Ms Farrell – sentencing for attempting to pervert, and conspiring to pervert, justice

[28] Ms Farrell, in your case I take into account that your attempt to pervert the course of justice consisted of helping Mr Kingi to get out of Whangārei: conduct which happened on the night, conduct which without you Mr Kingi is likely to have been able to accomplish anyway.

[29] That said, you made that offence worse by lying to the police about where you left Mr Kingi in the far north. So, for that offending immediately after Mr Kleiman's death, I consider a starting point of 12 months' imprisonment to be appropriate.

[30] Your conspiracies to pervert the course of justice arose, quite unusually, because you knew what both witnesses had heard and done, but you made a mistake about the way they had described these things in their police statements. As the courts have indicated, any attempt to disturb the proper process of taking and putting forward evidence must be taken seriously. But your conspiracy offences are most unusual. Your role was different to that of Mr Kingi and Mr Murray. You neither organised nor made an approach to Ms Murray to have her change her evidence. To my mind, your culpability for these offences indeed does lie right at the bottom of the scale. On their own, they too would justify a starting point of around 12 months' imprisonment, but since I need to look at all three offences together, and decide their overall culpability, I have come to the view that the overall starting point appropriately adopted is one of 18 months' imprisonment.

[31] From that starting point I need to think about your own circumstances as an individual. At the age of 34, you have no previous convictions. You are currently charged with other matters but on those you are entitled to the presumption of innocence. They are relevant because, at the time you committed the offending I am

¹⁴ *Duff* was sustained, and Ms Farrell may not have known Mr Kingi had committed murder. *R v Scanlon* [2018] NZHC 3376.

sentencing you for today, you were on bail. Overall, I consider an adjustment upwards, because of the fact you were on bail, to be appropriate. It will be an adjustment in the order of two months.

[32] Against that upward adjustment, there are a number of matters relating to you as an individual which justify reductions. I have received a considerable volume of material about your personal circumstances, your upbringing, your life as an adult, your responsibilities to boys aged just over 10 and now to your two-and-a-half-month-old daughter. I do not consider it necessary to go into great depth about the nature of what has involved trauma in your life. We have heard this morning that the father of your two boys passed away and that the circumstances of his death were particularly confronting for both you and your children.

[33] In sentencing any offender, the Court needs to consider the reality of the circumstances in which the individual was placed at the time they elected to commit their offences. In your case I consider your personal circumstances not to excuse, by any means, but considerably to have contributed, to a sense of powerlessness in the way in which you were living your life.

[34] Without being unduly mathematical about these matters, I am aware that you have spent seven months on a 24-hour curfew, 18 months on a nighttime curfew, while on bail awaiting your trial. And those numbers suggest to me that a deduction of around three months in any prison sentence that might be imposed would recognise the way in which you have been confined because of the need to face a trial.

[35] As you know, if your end sentence is less than two years in prison, then I need to consider whether it is appropriate you should be imprisoned or permitted to serve a sentence of home detention. Your responsibilities to your children, alongside the fact that given the numbers I have discussed your end sentence would not be close to 24 months' imprisonment, I am minded to sentence you to a term of home detention rather than imprisonment.

[36] For the sake of determining the length of that sentence of home detention, I can let you know that bearing in mind the figures I have discussed and the deductions

that I consider appropriate to take account of your circumstances as an individual, your sentence of imprisonment would have been one in the order of 12 months' imprisonment. Had it been 24 months, the maximum I could have imposed was 12 months' home detention. Since your sentence would have been 12 months' imprisonment, I intend to sentence you to a period of six months' home detention.

Result (Ms Farrell)

[37] Ms Farrell please stand. For your crimes of wilfully attempting to pervert the course of justice and conspiring to pervert the course of justice, you are sentenced to concurrent terms of six months' home detention. You are to serve your sentence of home detention at the residence identified in the Provision of Advice to Courts (PAC) report dated 21 February 2025. You are to comply with the conditions that are set out at cls 3 and 4 of the PAC report where it refers to home detention conditions.

[38] You may stand down.

Mr Jamieson – sentencing for attempting to pervert justice

[39] Mr Jamieson, your conduct at Edge Street was, as the Crown acknowledges, spontaneous, not particularly sophisticated and was unlikely to be effective for any significant period. But your disposal of the murder weapon is in a different category. That conduct was, and remains, effective. The weapon has never been found, despite what I have no doubt will have been an extensive police search.

[40] Overall, your offending is clearly more culpable than that in a case where the offender tried unsuccessfully to dispose of a knife that had been used in two unsuccessful attempts to commit murder, and a starting point of 15 months' imprisonment was imposed,¹⁵ and again it is clearly more serious than in a case where the offender arranged for a basket of clothes to be removed from a murder scene, and a starting point of 17 months' imprisonment was imposed.¹⁶

¹⁵ *R v Tamihana* [2014] NZHC 89 (sentence indication), and *R v Tamihana* [2014] NZHC 90 (sentencing).

¹⁶ *R v Barriball* [2022] NZHC 1555.

[41] In your case, I will adopt a starting point taking account of your three offences, at Edge Street and later when disposing of the rifle, of 27 months' imprisonment, or in other words, two years and three months.

[42] Turning to your circumstances as an individual, you have a considerable list of previous convictions. In the main, they involve you dealing with controlled drugs and in particular the controlled drug methamphetamine. But there is also some somewhat dated violence and driving related offences there. In fact when you committed the offences in this case, you may recall that you were on release conditions from a series of drug offences and, as you know, you were arrested after the events at Edge Street and charged with drug-dealing conduct spanning that latter part of 2022 when this offending was occurring. I will uplift my starting point of 27 months' imprisonment to take account of the fact that you were on release conditions when you committed these offences. That uplift is one of three months' imprisonment.

[43] On the other hand, I do not intend to uplift that starting point further because of your drug offending. I consider the fact that your offence was aggravated by your refusal to comply with release conditions to be the important factor here. Your drug offending was of a different nature to your offending in this case and does not make it more serious.

[44] In your case I intend to apply a reduction of six months, taking into account that you have now been on electronically monitored bail for a period of around 13 months awaiting this moment. In a sense the sentence you need to serve must take account of the fact that you have been confined, because of your offending, while you have been on bail.

[45] There are elements of disruption and difficulty in your youth and they may have contributed to some considerable extent to your drug offending in particular. But I do not consider they significantly undermine the blameworthiness of what you did to help Mr Kingi. I make no adjustment for your background.

[46] To your considerable credit, however, while your drug offending played no role in what may have motivated you to offend in this case, a person who is seriously

addicted to methamphetamine, as you have been for a considerable period, represents a particular risk when they are in the community and you have recognised that and you have sought to address it by undertaking a number of intensive rehabilitative efforts. As you know, rehabilitating yourself from a methamphetamine addiction will be an ongoing and extremely challenging task for you into the future. But the Court needs to do what it can to encourage and support you in those efforts and should you fail to recognise that support by persisting with your rehabilitation, I expect the Court will see you again.

[47] In light of the need to, in terms of sentencing purposes, support your efforts at rehabilitation I intend to recognise what you have done so far by deducting a further four months from my calculations. This means that the end sentence I would have imposed would have been one of 20 months' imprisonment, but you are within the sentencing limits which entitle you to consideration of a sentence of home detention. In light of the need to give you the opportunity to prove yourself while in the community and undertaking the course you are going to be directed to undertake, I am prepared to allow you to serve your sentence by way of home detention.

Result (Mr Jamieson)

[48] Mr Jamieson could you stand please. For your three offences of wilfully attempting to pervert the course of justice you are sentenced to 10 months' home detention. You are to serve that sentence at the address identified on the last page of your PAC report dated 15 January 2025. As the sentence of home detention implies but in case I am misunderstood, you are not to travel north of Brynderwyn Hills without the prior written approval of a probation officer. You are to meet the special conditions set out at paras (4), (5), (6), (7), (8) and (9) of that report. As a special condition post-detention, you are to continue to undertake and complete appropriate assessment, treatment or counselling as directed to the satisfaction of a probation officer for a further period of six months.

[49] Stand down please.

Mr Kingi – sentencing for murder and conspiring to pervert justice

[50] Mr Kingi, as you likely know, an offender convicted of murder must be sentenced to life imprisonment, unless that would be manifestly unjust.¹⁷ Life imprisonment would mean that, after a minimum period of at least 10 years or more, you might be released on parole.¹⁸ But you could be recalled to prison if certain conditions were met, at any time during the rest of your life.

[51] In your case, as your lawyer recognises, a sentence of life imprisonment would not be unjust. I will impose a sentence of life imprisonment towards the end of this hearing.

[52] The more difficult decision for me is about that minimum period of imprisonment before you might be released on parole. It must be the minimum period necessary to do four things: to hold you accountable for the harm you have done; to denounce your conduct; to deter you and other persons from committing a similar offence; and to protect the community from you.¹⁹

[53] The murder you committed was brutal and callous. But your offending took only a brief moment to commit, and Mr Kleiman would at least have died instantly. I agree with the Crown's lawyer that your offending did not involve the "high level of brutality or callousness" that would require me to consider the imposition of a 17-year minimum period under s 104 of the Sentencing Act 2002.

[54] Instead of that, I need to consider all the circumstances, including in particular the information provided about the impact of your offending on Mr Kleiman's family, about the blameworthiness of your offending, about your own circumstances as an individual, and where the overall culpability of your offending in those circumstances sits in comparison with other cases of murder which would result in the 10-year minimum.²⁰

¹⁷ Sentencing Act 2002, s 102.

¹⁸ Section 103(2).

¹⁹ Section 103(2).

²⁰ *R v Howse* [2003] 3 NZLR 767 (CA) at [61].

[55] As we heard this morning, and as I have read set out in the other statement that was not read out this morning, the impact of your offending on Mr Kleiman's family has been awful. This is a well-bonded, deeply committed family. The living arrangements for Mr Kleiman's daughters and grand-daughters have been disrupted. They view it as a situation where they have been torn apart. Sadly, this is the kind of hurt that a number of families whose loved ones have been taken by violence are bound to face.

[56] Turning to the blameworthiness of your offending, you of course fled, which perhaps is not surprising given what you had done. But months later you resolved to seek to manipulate the evidence that you understood was being put forward against you so that it would be better consistent with the account which I have described as your false account. That conduct amounts to offending in its own right.

[57] Turning to your own circumstances, at the age of 44 you have a considerable list of previous convictions, the relevant ones being some rather dated convictions for general violence, and then, from around four and a half years ago, for family violence in relation to, as I understand it, a different partner than Ms Farrell. Those convictions suggest to me, alongside the additional offending you took part in, that there is a clear need to impose a sentence greater than the 10-year minimum so as to meet the purposes that I have outlined.

[58] So, in short, I am persuaded that a minimum period longer than 10 years is necessary. How much longer? Well, three other cases of murder involve fairly similar circumstances to those of this case:

- (a) In the first case, the offender shot a friend in the head as they sat together in a car.²¹ Little was known of the reason for the shooting. The offender, who had previous convictions for violence, fled from Whangārei to Auckland, and was not apprehended for a month. This Court sentenced the offender to life imprisonment with a minimum period of 11.5 years.²²

²¹ *R v Paewhenua* [2018] NZHC 301.

²² At [41].

- (b) In the second case, an offender who had no previous convictions shot his wife in the throat, again at close range.²³ He claimed the shooting was an accident, but a jury rejected that claim. The reason for the shooting seems to have been nothing more than that the wife said she was leaving the relationship. The Court found there to have been an element of premeditation in the shooting and sentenced the offender to life imprisonment with a minimum period of 11 years.²⁴
- (c) In the third case, the offender shot his friend in the head for no obvious reason, before disposing of his friend's body.²⁵ The Court adopted a notional 11-year minimum period for the shooting itself, before uplifting that figure for the post-murder conduct and making other adjustments.²⁶

[59] Other cases that have been referred to me are not as similar.²⁷

[60] In your case, you did not evade the police for any longer than five days, but there are the additional features of your history of violence, and your post-murder offending in December 2022. I consider that you were the driving force in getting Ms Farrell and Mr Murray to agree to the deal between you to have the Crown witnesses change their statements.

[61] For your offences of conspiring to pervert the course of justice, I would have adopted a starting point of 18 months' imprisonment. In the present context I suggest that they justify an uplift to the otherwise usual 10-year minimum to 11 years. Further, I consider your history of violence and the resulting need to protect the community from you justifies a further substantial uplift.

[62] On the other hand, I have received specialist reporting about your personal circumstances. I put to one side your account of substance abuse as it is not clear to

²³ *R v Meads* HC Hamilton CRI-2009-019-8828, 31 March 2011.

²⁴ At [57].

²⁵ *R v Lyttle* [2019] NZHC 3454.

²⁶ At [53].

²⁷ *R v Fennell* HC Wellington, CRI-2007-085-238, 13 June 2008: prior clean record, remorse and poor physical health; *R v Simpson* [2024] NZHC 623: youth.

me there is any connection in the evidence at trial between what happened and any addiction which you may have been influenced by. But that said, I am prepared to accept that there is an element of deprivation in your upbringing which goes some distance to explain your emotional instability. But does that reduce the need to protect the community from you or, conceivably, does it increase it?

[63] Overall, my view is that your personal background, with its history of violence and emotional instability, justifies a net increase of a further six months.

Result (Mr Kingi)

[64] Mr Kingi, please stand. For your offence of murdering Mr Kleiman, you are sentenced to life imprisonment, with a minimum period of imprisonment of 11.5 years. For your offences of conspiring to pervert the course of justice, you are sentenced to concurrent terms of 12 months' imprisonment. Stand down.

Johnstone J