

**I TE KOOTI WHENUA MĀORI O AOTEAROA
I TE ROHE O TE TAITOKERAU**

*In the Māori Land Court of New Zealand
Taitokerau District*

AP-20260000010960

WEHENGĀ
Under

Section 19, Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993

MŌ TE TAKE
In the matter of

Te Wairahi A1D2B Part

I WAENGĀ I A
Between

HOHI SOPHIE RIINI (nee WAATA)
Te kaitono
Applicant

ME
And

RAVEN SENIOR WALTERS
Te kaiurupare
Respondent

Kōtitanga: On the papers
Hearing

Whakataunga: 23 September 2026
Judgment date

TE WHAKATAUNGA A KAIWHAKAWĀ T K T A R WILLIAMS
Judgment of Judge T K T A R Williams

Hei tīmatanga kōrero*Introduction*

[1] Hohi Sophie Riini has filed an application seeking an urgent injunction relating to the Te Wairahi A1D2B block against Raven Snr Walters. In this decision I determine whether an interim injunction should be granted.

What has occurred?

[2] The applicant, Hohi is one of thirty two landowners on the block. The respondent, Raven Snr Walters is not a landowner in the block. The block borders the Te Wairahi A1C2B land block which is owned by Steven Walters (deceased) a brother of the respondent.

[3] The applicant pleads that the respondent has installed a septic tank and performed earth works (“the works”) on the land block that are unauthorised. On 12 August 2026 the applicant filed an application seeking an urgent injunction in order to stop the respondent from performing the works on the Te Wairahi A1D2B block (“the block”).

[4] The applicant says that the respondent does not have a licence to occupy or occupation order in respect of the land block nor has the respondent sought the consent of the other owners in the block to the works performed.

[5] It is also asserted that the respondent is illegally occupying a portion of the land block. Further, that despite being asked to cease works on the block, that request has been ignored.

[6] It is suggested that the respondent is a beneficiary of a whānau trust that holds shares in the land. However, the name of trust is not known nor has the respondent provided any evidence that he is a beneficiary of a shareholding trust or that he has the consent of the trust to perform the works on the land.

[7] The respondent has also performed works on an adjacent block, Te Wairahi A1C2B which is recorded as being owned by Stephen Walters who is deceased.

[8] The wife of Stephen Walters is the administrator of the estate. The administrator has advised the Court that she does not consent to the works being performed by the respondent

on that block either. However, this application focuses on the Te Wairahi A1D2B block and this information is simply provided by way of context.

[9] On the 28th of August, the Court provided the respondent with the opportunity to file and serve a response to the application within 14 days. To date no response has been received and therefore the applicant seeks to proceed with the urgent injunction application.

Why am I determining this application without a hearing?

[10] Per Regulation 9.6(3) of the Māori Land Court Rules 2011, I can determine an urgent application seeking an interim injunction without notice in the panui, without notice to any party, and without any appearance by the applicant. I am doing that here as:

- (a) This application is urgent. According to the applicant the respondent has trespassed and performed unauthorised works on the block in respect of which the respondent is not an owner.
- (b) The issue is important to preserve the land and taonga of the owners in the block and there is sufficient information before me to determine this interim urgent application.

What legal principles apply?

[11] An interim injunction is a form of interlocutory relief that is granted to protect the parties position pending the determination of an outstanding substantive application. In order to obtain an interim injunction, the applicant must demonstrate:

- (a) There is a serious question to be tried in the substantive application;
- (b) The balance of convenience supports an injunction; and
- (c) It is in the interests of justice to grant an injunction.

Can I grant the injunction application?

[12] As the respondent is not a landowner in the block, nor sought the consent of the other landowners to the works, the respondent has trespassed upon the land and performed works on the land which are injurious. The evidence is that a large septic tank has been installed by the respondent and that may have a prejudicial impact on the natural puna resource which is a taonga on the land.

[13] The respondent has been given the opportunity to respond to the application by the court and has failed and/or refused to do so.

[14] The situation is distressing for the applicant who on behalf of all the owners, has sought to engage with the respondent in an effort to require the works to cease. That has been unsuccessful.

[15] Given the above it appears clear that in terms of s 19(1(a) there has been an actual trespass to the block. Further that the trespass is causing injury to the land.

[16] Therefore, there is a serious question to be tried.

[17] Given the lack of response from the respondent, I also consider that the balance of convenience supports an injunction, and it is in the interests of justice to do so. As such I propose to grant the interim injunction application.

Kupu whakatau*Decision*

[18] I grant the urgent interim injunction application prohibiting Raven Senior Walters from performing any work on the Te Wairahi A1D2B block and/or residing on the land.

[19] A hearing should be scheduled to consider what is required of the respondent to remedy the trespass and injury to the land.

I whakapuakina i te 12:30pm i Whangarei, i te rua tekau ma toru o ngā rā o Hepetema i te tau 2026.

Pronounced at 12:30pm in Whangarei, this 23rd day of September 2026.

T K T A R Williams
JUDGE