

difficulties since it appears to raise many other issues 'possibly' related to the earlier High Court actions. The petition however must challenge the decision of the single judge and this it does not do.

[3] If the Petitioner were to succeed with the petition in this court, and he be granted an enlargement of time, he might then raise the other issues in the petition before the Full Court. If not, the voluminous "other" issues will not be relevant to the enlargement application.

[4] A Summons was filed by the Petitioner returnable on 25th January 2018. In that Summons the unrepresented Petitioner sought several reliefs which were initially rejected in a letter sent by the Registrar to the Petitioner. The main body of that letter read:

"Reference is made to the above matter and to your two applications received in September and October 2017.

Your application for Legal Aid assistance to be rendered to you has been sighted by the Hon. President of the Supreme Court. His Lordship has directed that you as the Petitioner must apply to the Legal Aid Commission to seek their assistance as to costs.

As to your other application for a pre-trial conference between the parties, His Lordship has noted this application cannot be entertained by the Court as it is misconceived. His Lordship would like to suggest to you to instruct counsel who could examine this case to see if it can be argued properly.

His Lordship would also like to stress the importance in complying with the orders already relayed to you, for eg: security for costs, otherwise the appeal cannot proceed."

[5] The Petitioner had been ordered by the Registrar to pay security for costs of \$6,000. Subsequently he approached the Legal Aid Commission for the Commission to pay that security for him which was denied.

[6] He tried to have issued a further summons this one seeking "for a pre-trial conference at the Pearl Hotel", and for the Respondents to pay the security for costs.

- [7] The gentle advice to the Petitioner had been that it “would be wise to instruct counsel who could examine the case to see if it could be argued properly or at all.” Unfortunately that advice has not been taken up, and the petition may be struck out for non-compliance with the Rules.
- [8] The request for interlocutory orders for the Respondents to pay security for costs or to conduct a pre-trial conference must be denied.
- [9] As for the main appeal against the single judge’s order refusing enlargement of time, that may be listed at the next call over for a hearing date for the petition in the next sittings in August 2019, only if there is compliance with the Rules.



A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be "ANT", written over a dotted line.

.....
The Hon. Mr. Justice Anthony Gates
Judge of the Supreme Court

Solicitors:

Petitioner in Person

Attorney-General’s Chambers for 1st Respondent

iTaukei Land Trust Board Legal Service for 2nd and 4th Respondent

uln