TION		
IN THE HIGH COURT OF	NEW ZEALAND	
AUCKLAND REGISTRY		2 2 01011
→ MI.O. & Co. (5)	<u>AP.1</u>	28/92
CETTELLEY	BETWEEN	CLARE SWINNEY
		Appellant
	AND	MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

<u>Hearing:</u>	30 June 1992	
<u>Counsel:</u>	Appellant in Person Mrs S. McAuslan for respondent	
Judgment:	30 June 1992	

(ORAL) JUDGMENT OF BARKER J

Respondent

The appellant appeals against conviction in the District Court at Auckland on 13 April 1992 on a charge of proceeding through a red light. There was a defended hearing before two Justices of the Peace but there is no record of the evidence given at that hearing or of the detailed reasons of the Justices for convicting the appellant.

Some five weeks later the Justices filed a memorandum of a few lines; this recorded in summary form the conflicting versions of the traffic officer and of the appellant with a statement that the Bench accepted the evidence of the prosecution and rejected that of the defendant.

However, I cannot accept that memorandum as sufficient record of the evidence as required by the Act. The appellant is entitled to have this Court consider her appeal based on the notes of the actual evidence given to have a proper statement of reasons for her conviction.

Therefore, I think the only order is that the appeal be allowed and a rehearing ordered in the District Court. I direct that, at the rehearing, a proper record of the proceedings be kept and that the rehearing proceed before Justices of the Peace, other than those who convicted the appellant.

R. J. Barken?)

Solicitors: Crown Solicitor, Auckland, for respondent

2.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF NEW ZEALAND AUCKLAND REGISTRY

4

<u>AP.128/92</u>

BETWEEN

AND

CLARE SWINNEY

<u>Appellant</u>

. .

MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT

<u>Respondent</u>

(ORAL) JUDGMENT OF BARKER J