

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT
AT WELLINGTON**

**I TE KŌTI-Ā-ROHE
KI TE WHANGANUI-A-TARA**

[2022] NZACC 62

ACR 051/22

UNDER	THE ACCIDENT COMPENSATION ACT 2001
IN THE MATTER OF	AN APPEAL UNDER SECTION 149 OF THE ACT
BETWEEN	MARJAN HRISTOVSKI Appellant
AND	ACCIDENT COMPENSATION CORPORATION Respondent

Judgment on the papers.

Submissions: The Appellant is self-represented
R Wanigasekera for the Respondent

Date of Judgment: 13 April 2022

**JUDGMENT OF JUDGE P R SPILLER
[Late filing of an appeal to the District Court –
s 151, Accident Compensation Act 2001]**

Introduction

[1] The appeal in the above matter was lodged by Mr Hristovski on 25 March 2022. The appeal is from the decision of a Reviewer dated 17 February 2022. The Reviewer dismissed an application for review on the basis of lack of jurisdiction.

[2] On 29 March 2022, Judge Henare issued an Initial Minute which directed that Mr Hristovski formally apply for leave to file the appeal out of time and set out the reasons why the appeal was filed late.

[3] On 30 March 2022, Mr Hristovski submitted that the appeal was filed late because the person who filed the appeal was infected with Covid-19, and he himself has medical problems.

[4] On 12 April 2022, Mr Wanigasekera for the Corporation submitted that the delay was short and did not prejudice the Corporation, but observed that the Reviewer had noted that there was no reviewable decision, and also that there were other avenues for appeal.

Relevant law

[5] Section 151 of the Accident Compensation Act 2001 (the Act) provides:

(1) An appellant brings an appeal by sending a notice of appeal to, or filing a notice of appeal in, a specified registry. ...

(3) The notice must be received by the specified registry—

- (a) within 28 days after the date on which the reviewer gives a copy of the review decision to the appellant; or
- (b) ...
- (c) within any longer time allowed by the District Court.

[6] In *Almond v Read*,¹ Arnold J (for the Supreme Court) outlined the following principles to guide the exercise of the discretion to grant or deny an extension of time to lodge an appeal:

[38] The ultimate question when considering the exercise of the discretion to extend time under r 29A is what the interests of justice require. That necessitates an assessment of the particular circumstances of the case. Factors which are likely to require consideration include:

- (a) *The length of the delay.* Clearly, the time period between the expiry of the appeal date and the filing of the application to extend time is relevant. But in a case where there has been a slip-up and the appeal date has been inadvertently missed, how quickly the applicant sought to rectify the mistake after learning of it will also be relevant. Obviously, the longer the delay, the more the applicant will be seeking an “indulgence” from the court and the stronger the case for an extension will need to be.

¹ *Almond v Read* [2017] NZSC 80, [2017] 1 NZLR 801, (2017) 23 PRNZ 533.

- (b) *The reasons for the delay.* It will be particularly relevant to know whether the delay resulted from a deliberate decision not to proceed followed by a change of mind, from indecision, or from error or inadvertence. If from a change of mind or from indecision, there is less justification for an extension than where the delay results from error or inadvertence, particularly if understandable.
- (c) *The conduct of the parties, particularly of the applicant.* For example, a history of non-cooperation and/or delay by an applicant may be relevant.
- (d) *Any prejudice or hardship to the respondent or to others with a legitimate interest in the outcome.* Again, the greater the prejudice, the stronger the case will have to be to justify the grant of an extension of time. Where there is significant delay coupled with significant prejudice, then it may well be appropriate to refuse leave even though the appeal appears to be strongly arguable.
- (e) *The significance of the issues raised by the proposed appeal, both to the parties and more generally.* If there is a public interest in the issues, the case for an extension is likely to be stronger than if there is no such interest.

Discussion

[7] In terms of section 151(3)(a) of the Act, Mr Hristovski was required to file a Notice of Appeal against the Reviewer's decision within 28 days after the date on which the Reviewer provided a copy of the review decision to him. The Reviewer's decision was dated 17 February 2022, which left a date of around 17 March 2022 for the filing of the Notice of Appeal. In the event, the Notice of Appeal was filed on 25 March 2022. This Court is now being asked to exercise its discretion to allow a longer time for filing the Notice of Appeal (in terms of section 151(3)(c)). In deciding whether to exercise its discretion, this Court will follow the guidelines provided by the Supreme Court in *Almond v Read*.²

(a) The length of the delay

[8] The Supreme Court noted that the longer the delay, the more the applicant will be seeking an indulgence from the Court and the stronger the case for an extension would need to be; and that, in a case where there had been a slip-up and the appeal date had been inadvertently missed, how quickly the applicant sought to rectify the mistake after learning of it would also be relevant.

² Above, note 7.

[9] This Court notes that the delay in this case is only eight days, which is not an excessive delay. The Court accepts that there has been a slip-up, and notes that Mr Hristovski appears to have acted reasonably quickly to rectify the situation.

(b) The reasons for the delay

[10] The Supreme Court noted that, if the delay arose from a change of mind or from indecision, there was less justification for an extension than where the delay resulted from error or inadvertence, particularly if understandable.

[11] Mr Hristovski stated that the reasons for the delay were that the person who filed the appeal was infected with Covid-19, and he himself has medical problems.

[12] This Court is satisfied that Mr Hristovski's delay arose out of understandable error or inadvertence.

(c) The conduct of the parties

[13] The Supreme Court observed that a history of non-cooperation and/or delay by an applicant might be relevant.

[14] This Court notes that Mr Hristovski acted promptly in providing a reason for the late filing of the appeal. The Court is not aware of any history of non-cooperation and/or delay by Mr Hristovski.

(d) Prejudice or hardship to the respondent or to others with a legitimate interest in the outcome

[15] The Supreme Court noted that, where there is significant delay coupled with significant prejudice, then it might well be appropriate to refuse leave even though the appeal appeared to be strongly arguable.

[16] This Court notes that the delay in this case is not significant and that the Corporation has accepted that the delay does not prejudice the Corporation.

(e) The significance of the issues raised by the proposed appeal, both to the parties and more generally

[17] The Supreme Court observed that, if there is a public interest in the issues, the case for an extension is likely to be stronger than if there is no such interest.

[18] This Court accepts that the proposed appeal is significant to Mr Hristovski. The Court is not in a position to assess the significance of the issues raised by the proposed appeal more generally.

The Decision

[19] In light of the above considerations, this Court finds that Mr Hristovski has established that the interests of justice require the exercise of the Court's discretion to sustain his application for leave to file his appeal out of time, which is accordingly granted.

[20] There are no issues as to costs.



P R Spiller
District Court Judge