

EDITORIAL NOTE: CHANGES MADE TO THIS JUDGMENT APPEAR IN  
[SQUARE BRACKETS]

**ORDER PROHIBITING PUBLICATION OF NAME(S), ADDRESS(ES),  
OCCUPATION(S) OR IDENTIFYING PARTICULARS OF DEFENDANT  
PURSUANT TO S 200 CRIMINAL PROCEDURE ACT 2011.**

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT  
AT MASTERTON**

**CRI-2017-035-001273  
[2018] NZDC 4648**

**NEW ZEALAND POLICE**  
Prosecutor

v

**[RYDER LAMBERT]**  
Defendant

Date of Ruling: 12 March 2018  
Appearances: Sergeant J May for the Prosecutor  
Defendant appears in Person  
Judgment: 12 March 2018

---

**RULING OF JUDGE B A MORRIS**  
**[Name Suppression]**

---

[1] Mr [Lambert] is here in respect of posting a digital communication that caused emotional stress. It is a serious charge.

[2] Mr [Lambert] appeared for himself. From discussions with him and looking at the material on the file, Mr [Lambert] suffers from Asperger's syndrome and also suffers from significant anxiety.

[3] The issue arose toward the end of the hearing as to the likely impact of his name being published. Mr [Lambert] indicated that at the time that this all occurred, there was significant stress in his life. Things have improved since then and he has managed to secure employment in [location deleted]. But certainly, the underlying medical conditions continue, and they were manifestly obvious in Court today.

[4] Mr [Lambert]'s name, of course, would normally be published and must be published unless under the Criminal Procedure Act 2011 there is demonstrated to be extreme hardship to him. "Hardship" is not enough; "undue" hardship is not enough. It must be *extreme* hardship.

[5] I asked that our very experienced forensic nurse see Mr [Lambert], as he did not want to have this issue dealt with and to remain in Court because it was causing him such distress. It was quite clear during the course of the discussions, Mr [Lambert] raised the issue of suicide as an outcome for him.

[6] I am grateful for the media in this area, their customary compassionate, reasonable and professional approach. They, of course, are of the view that if there is no suppression order, then the name will be published, and that is perfectly reasonable.

[7] I am also grateful to the experienced sergeant, who has made this application for name suppression having heard and seen what we all did today.

[8] I can make this order from my motion, but certainly I am satisfied of the test that publication of Mr [Lambert]'s name would cause him extreme hardship. Accordingly, his name is suppressed.

[9] I gave some indication earlier to the press that there might be some need for suppression of surrounding sensitive medical issues. However, I think with the name being suppressed, then other information can go into the public arena, it not being able to be identified as Mr [Lambert]. But of course, as always, no details can be published that are likely to lead to his identity being known.

B A Morris  
District Court Judge