



Parole hearing  
under section 21(1) of the Parole Act 2002

**PAUL RUSSELL WILSON**

**Hearing:** 29 June 2007  
at Christchurch Prison

**Members of the Board:** Judge D J Carruthers - Panel Convenor  
Judge J L Rota  
Judge B Lovegrove  
A/Prof. P Brinded  
Ms J Jackson  
Ms F Grenfell  
Mr R Wilson

---

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

---

Mr Paul Russell Wilson, aged now 43, appears for the first time to be considered for parole. He was convicted of a murder in 1994. It was a particularly nasty murder. The Sentencing Judge in sentencing him had this to say about it "the features of your offence which in my view do make it exceptional, are the degree of planning, the immobilising of the victim's flatmate, the cruel treatment, and the nature of torture, of the victim by refusing her medical treatment for wounds to her hands, and by callously cutting off her jeans and pants when she complained of cold; and the act of having sexual intercourse with her while she was in that condition and obviously fearing for her life. The method of killing her was forceful and deliberately designed to end her life. It was not an ill directed stabbing which appears to have cut her right open but rather, an intentional cutting of her throat. The events which you yourself recounted to the court in Greymouth were chilling".

Mr Wilson is now described by the latest psychological assessment as being at low risk of reoffending. He has a glowing report from the prison. He has received 275 individual sessions with four different psychologists. He has had nearly 300 escorted outings. He presents himself as being on the path to release and he seeks now a recommendation from this Board that he be allowed Releases to Work outside the prison.

We have had the benefit of meeting with victims of his offending. A summary of what they have said to us has been given to Mr Wilson at the beginning of this hearing with him. Their summary is a brief one. They are opposed to his release. They are fearful of him. They say he has shown no remorse for the life he took and they have spoken about the consequences to them which continue, and will continue for the rest of their lives.

We have spoken with Mr Wilson about these matters today. We are concerned at what seems to have been numerous interventions in his case without focusing on the aspects of the offence he committed. For us, the beginning of any journey to release is an honest recollection by him of what he did and some insight into why he did it at the time.

It seems to us that he is still denying and minimising large parts of that. His insistence that sexual intercourse with his victim was consensual is part of that. In the circumstances of him taking a knife into the flat, binding the flatmate, grabbing the knife and cutting her hands, to then talk about consensual sexual intercourse, is clearly in the circumstances arrant nonsense of a worrying kind.

We are not particularly helped by the psychological assessment we have at the present time, which we think has not concentrated sufficiently on his actions. There is a sexual aspect to them which seems to have been ignored by everyone. The Judge's comments at sentencing and on appeal, are particularly relevant in this area.

We are not prepared to advance Mr Wilson's progress towards reintegration at the present time. We are going to ask for a fresh psychological assessment which will focus on his offending, on what exactly happened on that occasion; why it happened, and what he has

done about that subsequently so that we can get a better view of his risk at the present time.

We have had glowing reports of his ability as a worker. Very fine people have testified to that. He is otherwise very well behaved in prison. All of that is commendable but it is expected by us, although commendable, none of it washes in the sense that it does not relate to what he did on this appalling occasion and we lack that focus. This makes us feel uncomfortable and uncertain about his future.

We are declining to parole him at the present time. We will see him again in accordance with the statutory cycle and we seek a further report which will focus on the matters which we have mentioned above.

For now, parole declined.

Judge D J Carruthers  
Panel Convenor

#### Review

- You may apply for a review of the Board's decision under section 67(1). The only grounds under which you may make an application for review are that the Board, in making its decision:
  - a) Failed to comply with procedures in the Parole Act 2002; or
  - b) Made an error of law; or
  - c) Failed to comply with Board policy resulting in unfairness to the offender; or
  - d) Based its decision on erroneous or irrelevant information that was material to the decision reached; or
  - e) Acted without jurisdiction.
- To apply for a review you must write to the Board within 28 days of its decision stating which of the above ground(s) you consider to be relevant in your case and giving reasons why you believe that ground(s) applies.
- Reviews are considered on the papers only. There is no hearing in respect of your Review Application.



NEW ZEALAND  
**PAROLE BOARD**

Parole hearing

Under Section 21(1) of the Parole Act 2002

**PAUL RUSSELL WILSON**

**Hearing:** 17 June 2008  
At Christchurch Prison

**Members of the Board:** Judge D J Carruthers  
The Hon. M Frater  
Judge D J L Saunders  
A/Prof. P Brinded  
Ms F Grenfell  
Ms J Jackson  
Ms S Baragwanath  
Mr R Lewis

**Counsel:**

---

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

---

Paul Russell Wilson is a life-sentenced prisoner following convictions for murder in 1994.

He has been in many ways an excellent prisoner and previously thought he was on a very serious path to release. All that changed with the decision of the Board last time. In that decision, the Board drew attention to the fact that although there had been numerous interventions in his case there had been no real focus on the more serious aspects of the appalling offence he had committed.

We were concerned that there had been large numbers of psychological interventions with him, and that there had been very good reports about his work, but nothing had concentrated on the central aspects of his offending and the appalling consequences to his victim.

Today we have told him again that we have recently met with members of his victims' family. In brief, they have been devastated by his offending. They expressed to us, as has been now expressed to him through their statements, their dismay that there could be any thought of him being released, particularly to the West Coast where they still live. They told us in very graphic terms of the way in which his offending had been so destructive to members of the family.

Those terrible wounds continue for them daily.

Today Mr Wilson has talked to us about his situation. He has received a more recent psychological assessment which has explored the issues identified by the Board last time. He seems to us to have adopted the language of the occasion very well, but we are not convinced he has any depth to his understanding of the points we have made nor of the effects of his offending on others.

There are five recommendations made by the psychologist in the new report. We support them all.

The central recommendation is that he continues to engage with individual treatment identifying and exploring the new aspects which were referred to in our last decision. He is doing that. That should continue.

There is a recommendation that he completes a comprehensive release prevention plan and that the matters set out by the Board are covered in it. None of that as yet has been done.

What we have experienced today is Mr Wilson's ability with language. He now confirms, instead of talking about "making love" to his victim, he says "I forced her" and he uses the word "rape".

It seems to us at the present time that he has this new language but he does not convey to us any real depth of feeling nor any real impression that he has made some changes to the way in which he has thought about this matter or to his behaviour in the future which would give us confidence that the community would be safe if he were to be released.

We support recommendations of the psychological report. They must continue.

Parole will be declined today. He has work to get on with. He understands that. He is well supported by the family members. We will see him when we meet again whether we have the impression from him that he has digested, in a thorough way, the matters of which have been discussed to day and in the report.

We raise also with him the question of a postponement order. We are acutely conscious of the distress to the family members that these annual events occasion to them. We will think about that next time. We mention it only in the context of today, and our concern he gets on with the work that awaits him.

Finally, we do not recommend any outings to the West Coast for him. Queries were made by family members about that. It is utterly insensitive to the victims' needs to even consider such a thing. In our view, such occasions cannot be contemplated now or in the future. When and if he is ever released it will not be to the West Coast area and he understands that.

When next we see him we expect a further psychological report about the work that has been done. We know that he is pre-approved for release to work. Those matters can take their course.

---

Judge D J Carruthers  
Panel Convenor

Review

- You may apply for a review of the Board's decision under section 67(1). The only grounds under which you may make an application for review are that the Board, in making its decision:
  - a) Failed to comply with procedures in the Parole Act 2002; or
  - b) Made an error of law; or
  - c) Failed to comply with Board policy resulting in unfairness to the offender; or
  - d) Based its decision on erroneous or irrelevant information that was material to the decision reached; or
  - e) Acted without jurisdiction.

To apply for a review you must write to the Board within 28 days of its decision giving reasons why you believe one or more of the above grounds apply in your case.

- Reviews are considered on the papers only; there is no hearing in respect of your Review Application.



NEW ZEALAND  
**PAROLE BOARD**

Parole Hearing

Under section 21(1) of the Parole Act 2002

**PAUL RUSSELL WILSON**

**Hearing:** 30 June 2009  
at Christchurch Prison

**Members of the Board:** The Hon. M A Frater – Panel Convenor  
Judge R M Kean  
A/Prof. P Brinded  
Ms J Donaldson  
Mrs J Jackson  
Mr J Thomson

**In Attendance:** [withheld]  
[withheld]

**Support:** [withheld]

---

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

---

Paul Russell Wilson, who is 45 years of age, is serving a life sentence for the sinister and brutal murder of his former partner, 21 year old Kim Schroder, at Hokitika in 1994.

He became eligible for parole in 2007. This is his third appearance before the Board.

Prior to each hearing, the Board has met with victims of Mr Wilson's crime. We have heard of the devastating impact that Ms Schroder's death, and particularly the awful circumstances of it, have had not only on her family, but also on her friends and others in the close knit community in which she lived. While wishing that Mr Wilson could remain incarcerated for the rest of his natural life, they recognise that he will probably

be released at some stage. Their primary concern is that in that event he not be allowed to return to the West Coast under any circumstances – whether to live or simply to visit.

The Board which saw Mr Wilson in 2007 was concerned that although during his time in prison he had had numerous individual psychological counselling sessions, they had not addressed essential aspects of his offending, especially the sexual aspects.

A year later the Board was not convinced that Mr Wilson really understood their concerns or the effect of his offending on others. They therefore recommended that he continue to work on this with a psychologist and complete a comprehensive relapse prevention plan.

Mr Wilson is described as a model prisoner. He is said to have made excellent progress in his therapy sessions over the past year. These focussed on his offence and his behaviour at the time. He is said to have been open and apparently contrite when discussing his behaviour in these sessions and to have accepted full responsibility for his offending.

The psychologist who prepared the latest psychological assessment report for the Board endorsed the opinion of the two previous report writers that Mr Wilson poses a low risk of further violent or general re-offending. In his view any further offending, if it were to occur, would most likely be in the context of relationship difficulties leading to an escalation in his attempts to influence or control his partner.

In his view, Mr Wilson has gone as far as he should in individual therapy; anymore would be counter productive. The next step for Mr Wilson would be to participate in group treatment which would provide opportunities to challenge himself and develop new skills.

Mr Wilson seeks to do this via the [withheld] – initially by way of temporary releases, followed by release to their residential or self care accommodation.

If, however, the Board did not consider Mr Wilson suitable for release, the psychologist recommended that the Board support him in engaging in release to work so that he could progress his electrical studies.

The Board may only release an offender on parole if it is satisfied on reasonable grounds that he will not pose an undue risk to the safety of the community having regard to the support and supervision available to him and the public interest in his reintegration into society as a law abiding citizen. In deciding whether Mr Wilson does pose an undue risk the Board is bound by Section 7(3) of the Parole Act 2002 to consider both the likelihood of further offending by him and the nature and seriousness of that offending.

While acknowledging that Mr Wilson continues to be assessed as posing a low risk of re-offending on the basis of both static and dynamic risk factors the Board has reservations about supporting his release into the community in the near future. We are not satisfied that it is safe to do so. This has to do with many factors including the appalling nature of his offending, the impact of it on his victims, and whether he has learnt the lessons and made the changes asked of him.

We agree that when he is paroled, release via the [withheld] would be a sensible and safe option.

However, before indicating our support for even temporary releases there we would like further psychological assessment report on his risk of re-offending to be prepared. This should include an assessment of his risk using the PCL:R (psychopathy checklist). There is no record of such an assessment being undertaken before. We would ask that if at all possible, this be undertaken by [withheld] who is a recognised leader in this field. We accept that we are effectively asking for a second opinion in respect of the previous assessments which were undertaken by senior and respected psychologists, but make no apology for that. In our view the risk of making an error is too great.

For now, parole is declined. As we told Mr Wilson, we think he needs to consolidate and apply the skills that he has learnt in therapy over the years. From the Board's

perspective it is time to reflect and double check before embarking on the next stage for Mr Wilson.

---

The Hon. M A Frater  
Panel Convenor

Review

- You may apply for a review of the Board's decision under section 67(1). The only grounds under which you may make an application for review are that the Board, in making its decision:
  - a) Failed to comply with procedures in the Parole Act 2002; or
  - b) Made an error of law; or
  - c) Failed to comply with Board policy resulting in unfairness to the offender; or
  - d) Based its decision on erroneous or irrelevant information that was material to the decision reached; or
  - e) Acted without jurisdiction.
- To apply for a review you must write to the Board within 28 days of its decision stating which of the above ground(s) you consider to be relevant in your case and giving reasons why you believe that ground(s) applies.
- Reviews are considered on the papers only. There is no hearing in respect of your Review Application.



NEW ZEALAND  
**PAROLE BOARD**

Parole hearing  
Under section 21(1) of the Parole Act 2002

**Paul Russell WILSON**

**Hearing:** 2 June 2010  
at Christchurch Prison

**Members of the Board:** Hon. M A Frater  
Judge D Saunders  
Dr J Skipworth  
MrJ Thomson  
Ms F Grenfell

**Observers:** [withheld]  
[withheld]

**Counsel:** Mr P Allan

---

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

---

1. Paul Russell Wilson, who is 46 years of age, is serving a life sentence of imprisonment for the terrible murder of Kim Schroder in 1994.
2. This is his 16th year in custody and his fourth appearance before the Board.
3. Prior to this hearing we also met with members of Ms Schroder's family and their supporters, as we have done prior to each of the other Board hearings. They remain adamantly opposed to his release but ask that if that were to happen, he not be allowed to enter the West Coast. We have conveyed those views to Mr Wilson. We also discussed with him his recent experience participating in the Sycamore Tree Programme and the effect that that has had on his understanding of the victim's position.
4. In anticipation of this hearing Mr Wilson was reassessed by a Departmental psychologist. This has happened prior to each of the other hearings and in each case a different but very experienced psychologist has undertaken the assessment. These assessments have

addressed issues such as the background to the offending, the treatment undertaken and to be undertaken and, significantly for our purposes, Mr Wilson's risk of reoffending and an assessment of his release plan.

5. Each of the first three report writers assessed Mr Wilson's risk of reoffending in a manner similar to his index offending, or at all, as low, with high risk situations identified as being close or intimate relationships.
6. Following strong submissions from family and supporters of the victim, and because of our own concerns, we asked that he be reassessed using an assessment tool known as the PCL-R (psychopathy checklist). The conclusion reached mirrored that of all the previous assessments. It also discounted the suggestion that he displays psychopathic personality traits.
7. The report says:

*"In summary, a review of the dynamic factors associated with recidivism suggests that Mr Wilson will be able to effectively manage his assessed low actuarial risk of reoffending at the present time."*

8. The issue for the Board then is where to from here.
9. Over the years Mr Wilson has had the benefit of extensive individual counselling to address all aspects of his functioning and offending. In the course of this work he has developed an offence chain to analyse why he committed the murder, and a safety plan to help avoid a similar tragedy occurring again. The reports say that he has made considerable gains in treatment and is committed to a positive approach to rehabilitation and genuinely contrite for his offending.
10. We must say that we did not observe that improvement in our interview with him. He said that he turns to jelly prior to the Board hearings. Whatever the reason, he was unable to answer even relatively simple questions and gave extremely limited and inadequate responses.
11. Notwithstanding Mr Wilson's presentation to the Board, on the basis of the consistent professional assessment of him as posing a low risk of further offending and the extensive work he is said to have undertaken in addressing the causes of his offending, we are satisfied that it is now appropriate for him to take the next step towards reintegration. He

has, of course, over the five years that he has been living in [withheld] undertaken many escorted forays into the community. We are told that he has had 171 outings. Accordingly, mixing in the community *per se* should not be a problem for him. The problem will be in establishing relationships and confronting his offending. He will be assisted to do that in group work at [withheld].

12. Parole is declined today. Mr Wilson should be scheduled to be seen again at the late November sitting of the Extended Board in Christchurch. We support him undertaking temporary day releases to [withheld] in the intervening period but want to see him again before he begins any overnight or extended temporary releases.

13. For now, parole is declined.

14. We make no promises as to the outcome of the next hearing. An updated psychological report is not required at that stage.

Hon. MA Frater  
Panel Convenor

Review

- You may apply for a review of the Board's decision under section 67(1). The only grounds under which you may make an application for review are that the Board, in making its decision:
  - a) Failed to comply with procedures in the Parole Act 2002; or
  - b) Made an error of law; or
  - c) Failed to comply with Board policy resulting in unfairness to the offender; or
  - d) Based its decision on erroneous or irrelevant information that was material to the decision reached; or
  - e) Acted without jurisdiction.
- To apply for a review you must write to the Board within 28 days of its decision stating which of the above ground(s) you consider to be relevant in your case and giving reasons why you believe that ground(s) applies.
- Reviews are considered on the papers only. There is no hearing in respect of your Review Application.



NEW ZEALAND  
**PAROLE BOARD**

Parole hearing

Under section 21(1) of the Parole Act 2002

**Paul Russell WILSON**

**Hearing:** 02 December 2010  
at Christchurch Men's Prison

**Members of the Board:** Hon. MA Frater  
Judge J Macdonald  
Dr J Skipworth  
Mr J Thomson  
Mr R Wilson

**Observer:** Mr S Berry - Department of Corrections

**Counsel:** Mr P Allan

**Support Person:** [withheld]

---

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

---

1. Paul Russell Wilson is serving a life sentence for the murder of Kim Schroder in 1994. He accepts that he also raped her although he was not charged with that offence.
2. We have talked to Mr Wilson about the victims' position - how they continue to grieve for the tragic loss of their much loved family member and friend, and the horrendous circumstances of her death. They believe that a sentence of life imprisonment should mean just that, and oppose his release. They say that he showed no remorse at the time of his trial or when he first became eligible for parole, and doubt that he is remorseful now. We had a much more constructive dialogue with Mr Wilson this time than we had at the last hearing. He assured us that he is deeply sorry for what he did and the pain that he caused and that he understands and accepts the victims' stance.
3. The question of restorative justice was raised at the victim meeting and Mr Wilson's parole hearing in May. At that time one of the victims expressed a willingness to meet with Mr Wilson in a professionally facilitated restorative justice conference. Mr Wilson

expressed a willingness to be involved in that process then and he still is. Regrettably it seems that the appropriate referrals were not made in May. We have asked that they are now.

4. Since the last hearing Mr Wilson has continued to live in [withheld] at Christchurch Men's Prison. He has been there for five years. He has also continued to participate in escorted shopping outings and the community work gang. As is to be expected, his behaviour on these outings is described as "exemplary" and "faultless". He is also reported to have a good rapport with staff and offenders, and to communicate easily with them. He maintains a minimum security classification and an IDU-free status and has not been involved in any incident reports or incurred any misconducts. He has not undertaken any further counselling as that was thought to be counterproductive.
5. The recent change for Mr Wilson is that he has had the opportunity of attending and participating in the [withheld] on day paroles. There was concern about how he would manage in a group setting given that all the therapy he has undertaken in prison has been on a one to one basis. [withheld], who is the programme director, told us that, after some initial hesitation, he has done very well. Accordingly, he has been offered a bed on the programme from 17 January 2011.
6. The [withheld] programme is intensive. The rules are detailed and strictly adhered to. The participants live in and participate in daily therapeutic sessions. They also engage in individual sessions, tailored to their needs. Their progress is monitored carefully. Initially they are unable to leave the premises. Privileges such as meeting with family members or leaving the premises on unescorted outings are earned over a lengthy period. Participants can remain on the programme for up to two years. We anticipate that Mr Wilson will be there for at least a year. He will find it very challenging.
7. As discussed in the Board's previous decision, Mr Wilson has consistently been assessed as posing a low risk of reoffending. We see no reason for that assessment to change.
8. We are satisfied that Mr Wilson is aware of his high risk situations and has appropriate strategies to address them.
9. On that basis, and having regard to the extensive support and oversight which will be provided by the staff at [withheld], coupled with the support from his probation officer, family members and friends, and his strong release plan, we are satisfied that Mr Wilson

will not pose an undue risk to the safety of the community, or any members of it if released at this stage of his sentence.

10. Accordingly, he will be released on parole on 17 January 2011.
11. He will, of course, be subject to the standard release conditions for life. He will also be subject to the following special conditions for five years from the date of release:
  - (1) To attend for a psychological assessment if directed. To attend and complete any treatment/counselling as recommended by the psychological assessment to the satisfaction of your Probation Officer and treatment provider.
  - (2) To notify your Probation Officer prior to starting, terminating or changing your position or place of employment.
  - (3) To reside at [withheld] and participate in the [withheld] to the satisfaction of the programme director and your Probation Officer.
  - (4) After completion of the [withheld] to reside at an address approved by a Probation Officer and not to move from that address without the prior written approval of a Probation Officer.
  - (5) To attend for a progress hearing before the Extended Board in August 2011 on a date and at a place to be advised by the New Zealand Parole Board.
12. The following two special conditions will continue for life:
  - (6) Not to visit the West Coast of the South Island for any reason.
  - (7) Not to have contact or otherwise associate with the victim(s) of your offending, or witnesses from your trial, directly or indirectly, unless you have the written consent of your Probation Officer.

Hon. MA Frater  
Panel Convenor

Review

- You may apply for a review of the Board's decision under section 67(1). The only grounds under which you may make an application for review are that the Board, in making its decision:
  - a) Failed to comply with procedures in the Parole Act 2002; or
  - b) Made an error of law; or
  - c) Failed to comply with Board policy resulting in unfairness to the offender; or
  - d) Based its decision on erroneous or irrelevant information that was material to the decision reached; or
  - e) Acted without jurisdiction.
- To apply for a review you must write to the Board within 28 days of its decision stating which of the above ground(s) you consider to be relevant in your case and giving reasons why you believe that ground(s) applies.
- Reviews are considered on the papers only. There is no hearing in respect of your Review Application.



NEW ZEALAND  
**PAROLE BOARD**

Progress hearing

Under section 29B(2)(b) of the Parole Act 2002

**Paul Russell WILSON**

**Hearing:** 30 August 2011  
at [withheld]

**Members of the Board:** Judge DJ Carruthers  
Judge R Callander  
Dr J Skipworth  
Mr J Thomson

**Observer:** [withheld]

**In Attendance:** [withheld]

---

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

---

1. Paul Russell Wilson appears for a progress and monitoring hearing.
2. He has an excellent report. He is presently at the [withheld] where he is doing very well.
3. He speaks about the therapeutic atmosphere there in glowing terms.
4. [withheld] is present. She says he has done extremely well there. There was discussion about his anxiety problems. In addition, he has had some medical difficulties recently in the form of [withheld]. They are being investigated and he is presently on medication. He seemed well today but clearly some other matters are being investigated for him.
5. He will remain at [withheld]. He hopes to transfer to the flats and will continue there for some time. All that is ahead of him.
6. A very good thing to report is that he began work on Monday. He has a job with [withheld]. He secured that himself. That is very much to his credit.

7. We do not need to see him again. We think he has had a very good start and has done very well indeed. He has good support and is showing that he can control his anxiety levels and get on with the tasks ahead of him in a very positive way. He is obviously a valuable member of the community at [withheld].
8. The good report is noted. No changes are made.

Judge DJ Carruthers  
Panel Convenor

Review

- You may apply for a review of the Board's decision under section 67(1). The only grounds under which you may make an application for review are that the Board, in making its decision:
  - a) Failed to comply with procedures in the Parole Act 2002; or
  - b) Made an error of law; or
  - c) Failed to comply with Board policy resulting in unfairness to the offender; or
  - d) Based its decision on erroneous or irrelevant information that was material to the decision reached; or
  - e) Acted without jurisdiction.
- To apply for a review you must write to the Board within 28 days of its decision stating which of the above ground(s) you consider to be relevant in your case and giving reasons why you believe that ground(s) applies.
- Reviews are considered on the papers only. There is no hearing in respect of your Review Application.



Application for recall

Under section 60(1) of the Parole Act 2002

between

**[withheld]**

**Delegate for The Chief Executive of the Department of Corrections**

Applicant

and

**Paul Pounamu TAINUI**

Respondent

**Hearing:** 26 April 2018  
at Christchurch Men's Prison  
by AVL from New Zealand Parole Board, Wellington

**Reserved Decision Issued:** 30 April 2018

**Members of the Board:** Alan Ritchie (Panel Convenor)  
Mr P Elenio  
Mr M Quigg

**Counsel:** Ms R Buddicom for Respondent  
Mrs P Currie for Applicant

**In Attendance:** [withheld]

---

### DECISION OF THE BOARD

---

1. The Board has considered an application for Paul Tainui to be recalled from parole to prison to continue serving his life sentence for murder committed in 1994.
2. He was released on 17 January 2011 with standard conditions for life and special conditions for five years from the date of release.

3. The application has been made by Operations Director [withheld] on behalf of the Chief Executive. It has been supported by an affidavit by Probation Officer [withheld], who has attended for the Department, along with Mrs Currie prosecuting.
4. In her affidavit in support [withheld] has deposed to Mr Tainui having been charged with serious offending.
5. Mr Tainui was represented by counsel, Ms Buddicom, who advised that the application was not opposed nor was the making of a final recall order.
6. The Board has discussed with counsel the question of confidentiality or suppression of information. Mrs Currie and Ms Buddicom appeared to be at one on the issue. They have advised us of relevant applications in the High Court. We understand it is possible that suppression orders could extend to this decision of the Board.
7. On the basis of the information provided to us, including the advice from Ms Buddicom, we find grounds to be made out and, in the exercise of our discretion, we find risk undue and a final recall order is made.
8. We will schedule Mr Tainui to be seen for the further consideration of parole in December 2018. He needs to have the active charges resolved. If that occurs in his favour he has an entitlement to apply for an earlier hearing under section 26 of the Parole Act.

Alan Ritchie  
Panel Convenor



Parole Hearing  
Under section 21(1) of the Parole Act 2002

**Paul Pounamu TAINUI**

**Hearing:** 3 December 2018  
at Christchurch Men's Prison

**Members of the Board:** Sir Ron Young – Chairperson  
Assoc Prof. P Brinded  
Ms P Rose

---

**DECISION OF THE BOARD**

---

1. Paul Pounamu Tainui was imprisoned for murder in 1994. He was sentenced to life imprisonment. He was subsequently released on parole and in April 2018 recalled on the basis that he was charged with another very serious crime. He has pleaded guilty to that crime but not guilty to other charges arising from the same set of facts. He is yet to be tried on those.
2. He has waived his right of appearance today before the Board. The current intention is that he will be sentenced on the charge he has pleaded guilty to later in December 2018. In those circumstances, he remains very high risk. We will see him again in just under two years in November 2020.

Sir Ron Young  
Chairperson