

[1] Mr Orlov seeks an order dispensing with the standard requirement that he pay security for costs in this appeal. The background to the application is set out in my minute dated 12 March 2013. There, I recorded that the parties were agreed that I should deal with the application on the papers.

[2] The only ground advanced by Mr Orlov in support of a waiver of security is that the appeal raises matters of public importance or constitutional significance. That is (he says) because the appeal raises the issue of whether the Lawyers and Conveyancers Tribunal has the power summarily to dismiss a charge which is vexatious or obviously groundless. In the memorandum filed by Mr Orlov there is no reference to his inability to pay the standard security.

[3] Mr Pyke referred me to the decisions of Asher J in *Bright v Auckland City Council* HC Auckland CIV-2008-404-8468, 20 February 2009 and Laurenson J in *Bernard v Space 2000 Ltd* (2001) 15 PRNZ 138. Applying the approach adopted in those cases persuades me that no waiver should be granted. While accepting that the issues are of some moment to Mr Orlov personally, it is relevant that the appeal does not relate to any final determination of his rights or liabilities; it is an appeal against interlocutory orders only. And while there may be a jurisdictional point at issue it does not appear to me to be one that is of great legal significance or of general importance or interest. And lastly, there was, as I have said, no reliance placed by Mr Orlov in his memorandum on any particular financial difficulties and nor is there any evidence of the same.

[4] Mr Orlov's application to dispense with security is dismissed accordingly. He is to pay \$1990 to the Registrar within 10 working days of the date of this decision.

Rebecca Ellis J