HIGH COURT OF AUSTRALIA

GLEESON J

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION BY DJURAN BUNJILEENEE FOR LEAVE TO ISSUE OR FILE

[2026] HCASJ 38
Date of Judgment: 2 November 2026
M99 of 2026

ORDER

1. The application filed 28 September 2026 for leave to issue or file the application dated 4 September 2026 is refused.

Representation

The applicant is unrepresented

GLEESON J.

Background to application

1 Pursuant to r 6.07.3 of the *High Court Rules 2004* (Cth) ("the Rules") and by application filed on and dated 28 September 2026 ("the leave application"), the applicant on behalf of Camp Sovereignty seeks leave to have issued or filed an application in proceedings M50 of 2026 (*White Australia Party Inc v Commonwealth of Australia*) ("the White Australia Party proceedings") dated 4 September 2026 ("the proposed application"), seeking orders principally concerning the applicant's participation in the final hearing in the White Australia Party proceedings on 8 and 9 September 2026. The leave application is supported by an affidavit made by the applicant on 28 September 2026.

2 At the commencement of the final hearing on 8 September 2026, Gageler CJ recorded that, pursuant to leave previously granted, the Court received written submissions on behalf of Camp Sovereignty as intervener. On 9 September 2026, the Court reserved its decision in the White Australia Party proceedings.

3 On 10 September 2026, Beech-Jones J made a r 6.07.2 direction to the Registrar to refuse to issue or file the proposed application without first having and obtaining the leave of a Justice of this Court.

Consideration and disposition

4 Implicit in the requirement that a document the subject of an application under r 6.07.3 be considered "on its face" is that such an application falls to be determined on the papers, that is, without an oral hearing.[1]

5 The discretion to refuse the leave sought by the applicant is to be exercised by reference to the criteria set out in r 6.07.1, which include whether an application "appears ... on its face ... to be frivolous",[2] in the sense that it has no arguable basis in fact or law.[3]

6 In this case, the leave application must be refused without listing it for hearing, in accordance with r 13.03.1 of the Rules, because Camp Sovereignty was permitted to intervene in the White Australia Party proceedings and the Court received written submissions on its behalf. The applicant has not identified any arguable basis on which to assert that Camp Sovereignty was not afforded a sufficient opportunity to intervene. Accordingly, the proposed application is

---

1 *Re Young* (2020) 94 ALJR 448 at 451 [12]; 376 ALR 567 at 570.

2 *Re Young* (2020) 94 ALJR 448 at 451 [11]; 376 ALR 567 at 570.

3 *Re Martin's Application* (2001) 180 ALR 453 at 457 [19].

frivolous in the relevant sense. Leave to file the proposed application must therefore be refused. These orders will be made and these reasons will be published in chambers, consistently with r 13.04 of the Rules.