

Mr Warren became very disruptive and ran around the unit, delivering CDs and other items to other prisoners. He was directed to get on the call with the Court.

Then, he ran to the upper landing of the unit, and continued to deliver items to other prisoners. He was abusive towards staff. He was given a final direction to get on the call with the Court, but continued to be abusive and disruptive.

Rather than implement a control and restraint procedure either to force Mr Warren to take the Court's call or to stop conducting himself in an abusive and difficult way, the decision was instead made to re-lock him in his cell (for his own safety and that of staff).

[4] In my minute of 30 October, I gave Mr Warren until the end of the following day to file written submissions. He did not meet that deadline but on 16 November, he filed written submissions essentially challenging the legitimacy of the current legal order and therefore his incarceration; and suggesting he is not the person in whose name he is incarcerated.

[5] I am satisfied that this application for a writ of habeas corpus must be dismissed. The warrant pursuant to which Mr Warren is detained is valid. He is serving a sentence of preventive detention, a sentence handed down by Brewer J on 11 August 2017.

[6] Crown counsel refers to authorities both with respect to Mr Warren's claimed dual personality, and with respect to the challenge to jurisdiction. Without needing to refer to any of them, I find that neither argument has any prospect of success.

[7] The application is dismissed accordingly.

Williams J

Solicitors:
Crown Law, Wellington for Respondent

Cc Mr R Warren, Rimutaka Prison