

Before the Electrical Workers Registration Board

CE No. 22781

In the matter of:

A disciplinary hearing before the Electrical Workers Registration Board

Between:

The Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment

And

Francis Cortez a registered and licensed electrical worker (LMTM 272506/LMD 272505 EW 132018, Electrician) (the Respondent)

Decision of the Board in Respect of the Conduct of an Electrical Worker Under section 147G and 147M of the Electricity Act 1992

Hearing Location:

Auckland

Hearing Type:

Audio Visual Link

Hearing Date:

22 November 2024

Decision Date:

22 November 2024

Board Members Present:

Mr R Keys, Registered Inspector (Presiding)
Ms L Wright, Barrister
Mr T Wiseman, Registered Inspector
Mr J Hutton, Registered Inspector
Mr T Tran, Barrister

Appearances: R Boyd for the Investigator

Francis Cortez, self-represented

Procedure:

The matter was considered by the Electrical Workers Registration Board (the Board) under the provisions of Part 11 of the Electricity Act 1992 (the Act), the Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010 (the Regulations) and the Board's Disciplinary Hearing Rules.

Board Decision:

The Respondent has committed a disciplinary offence under section 143(b)(ii) of the Act.

Contents

Summary of the Board's Decision	2
Introduction	3
Function of Disciplinary Action	4
Evidence	4
Procedure	4
Board's Decision	5
Negligence.....	6
Risk of Serious Harm or Significant Property Damage	6
Penalty, Costs and Publication	8
Penalty	8
Costs.....	9
Publication	10
Penalty, Costs and Publication Orders	11
Right of Appeal	11

Summary of the Board's Decision

- [1] The Board determined the Respondent committed a disciplinary offence under section 143(b)(ii) of the Act, specifically that he negligently created a risk of serious harm to any person, or a risk of significant property damage.
- [2] Key points that led to this finding:
- a. While wearing an asbestos suit, the Respondent delegated testing to another worker instead of removing the suit to conduct proper testing himself;
 - b. The disconnected neutral conductor created significant safety risks including potential fatal electric shock;
 - c. The issue remained undetected from October 2022 until August 2023;
 - d. The Respondent accepted responsibility as the person in charge of the work.
- [3] The Board ordered:
- a. A fine of \$3,000 (reduced from \$6,000 starting point due to cooperation, early guilty plea, remorse and first offence);
 - b. Costs of \$250;
 - c. There will be publication in the Electron newsletter, a record of the disciplinary finding on the Public Register for 3 years and the decision to be published on the Board website.

Introduction

- [4] The hearing resulted from a complaint about the conduct of the Respondent and a report under section 147G(1) of the Act from the Investigator that the complaint should be considered by the Board.
- [5] The Respondent was served with a Notice of Proceeding dated 6 May 2024 setting out the alleged disciplinary offences the Investigator reported should be considered by the Board.
- [6] The following disciplinary charges were alleged in the Notice of Proceeding:
- a. On or around 11 October 2022 at **[Omitted]**, the Respondent has carried out or caused to be carried out prescribed electrical work in a manner contrary to any enactment relating to prescribed electrical work that was in force at the time the work was done being an offence under section 143(a)(ii) of the Act, IN THAT, he:
 - i. Failed to connect the neutral conductor to the supply pillar; and/or
 - ii. Failed to undertake adequate electrical testing and visual inspection to verify the integrity of all electrical connections prior to the reconnection of the supply to the Property.
- In breach of regulations 13 and 38 of the Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010.

Or in the alternative

- b. On or around 11 October 2022 at **[Omitted]**, Mr Francis Cortez has carried out or caused to be carried out prescribed electrical work in a negligent or incompetent manner being an offence under section 143(a)(i) of the Act, IN THAT, he:
 - i. Failed to connect the neutral conductor to the supply pillar; and/or
 - ii. Failed to undertake adequate electrical testing and visual inspection to verify the integrity of all electrical connections prior to the reconnection of the supply to the Property.

Or in the alternative

- c. On or around 11 October 2022 at **[Omitted]**, Mr Francis Cortez has negligently created a risk of serious harm to any person, or a risk of significant property damage, through having carried out or caused to be carried out prescribed electrical work being an offence under section 143(b)(ii) of the Act, IN THAT, he:
 - i. Failed to connect the neutral conductor to the supply pillar; and/or
 - ii. Failed to undertake adequate electrical testing and visual inspection to verify the integrity of all electrical connections prior to the reconnection of the supply to the Property.

- [7] Prior to the hearing, the Respondent and the Board were provided with all of the documents the Investigator had in his power or possession.

Function of Disciplinary Action

- [8] The common understanding of the purpose of professional discipline is to uphold the integrity of the profession. The focus is not punishment but the protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence and the enforcement of high standards of propriety and professional conduct. Those purposes were reiterated by the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom in *R v Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales*¹ and in New Zealand in *Dentice v Valuers Registration Board*.²
- [9] The Board can only inquire into “the conduct of an electrical worker” with respect to the grounds for discipline set out in section 143 of the Act. Those grounds relate to carrying out or supervising prescribed electrical work (PEW).

Evidence

- [10] The Board must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the disciplinary offences alleged have been committed.³ The Board notes, as regards evidence in proceedings before it, that the provisions of section 147W of the Act apply. This section states:

In all proceedings under this Part, the Board may, subject to section 156, receive as evidence any statement, document, information, or matter that may in its opinion assist it to deal effectively with the matter before it, whether or not it would be admissible as evidence in a court of law.

Procedure

- [11] The matter proceeded on the basis of an Agreed Statement of Facts dated 2 October 2024 (ASOF).
- [12] The ASOF provided the background to the complaint. In summary:
- a. The Respondent was registered at all material times and therefore is subject to the disciplinary provisions under the Act.
 - b. The Respondent was engaged to carry out prescribed electrical work associated with the completion of a pillar replacement at **[Omitted]**. The work was carried out alongside another worker who is also employed by Counties Energy.
 - c. The work was completed around 11 October 2022.
 - d. On 11 August 2023, Counties Energy received a voltage complaint stemming from the Property. A fault person was dispatched and found a disconnected neutral conductor at the pillar.

¹ *R v Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales* [2011] UKSC 1, 19 January 2011.

² [1992] 1 NZLR 720 at p 724.

³ *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee* [2009] 1 NZLR 1.

- e. Enquiries established that the Respondent and another worker had carried out the replacement work. It was then indicated via smart meter data that the low voltage had started in October 2022 when the pillar was replaced.
- f. On the day the worker was the one to test the work, however, the Respondent was in charge of the work and responsible for ensuring that it had been properly done and tested.
- g. The Respondent explained that at the time the work was finished, he was supposed to carry out the testing, however, he had the asbestos suit still on so the other worker carried out the testing instead.
- h. The Respondent accepted that he was ultimately responsible for the failure to adequately test the Pillar which led to the neutral conductor being left disconnected.
- i. The Respondent acknowledged his failure stating "I pride myself on being a well-trained and professional electrical worker. Because of the complexities of the work involving the pillar at [Omitted], the asbestos works in particular, in this instance, I have been distracted from some of my core responsibilities, as an electrical worker, to adequately ensure the safety of others."
- j. The Respondent has cooperated with the investigation, expressed remorse, and demonstrated a commitment to learning from this incident. The Respondent has not previously appeared before the Board.

[13] Following the incident, Counties Energy carried out an investigation and identified that correct recording of testing via an ESC was not carried out during this project. The investigation found that employees did not have a clear understanding that when a pillar was replaced, an ESC should be completed. Counties Energy subsequently carried out training to make it clear to employees what testing and paperwork is required when work has been completed on a customer's installation point.

Board's Decision

- [14] Based on the ASOF and having considered all the evidence, particularly the Technical Advisor's comprehensive analysis, the Board finds that the Respondent negligently created a risk of serious harm to any person, or a risk of significant property damage through having carried out or caused to be carried out prescribed electrical work being an offence under section 143(b)(ii) of the Act.
- [15] While the charges were laid in the alternative, with section 143(a)(ii) being the primary charge and section 143(a)(i) being another alternative charge, the Board finds that the conduct is most appropriately dealt with under section 143(b)(ii). This is because the evidence establishes not only that the Respondent's conduct was negligent, but that this negligence created a serious risk of harm, making section 143(b)(ii) the most appropriate charge to reflect both the conduct and its potential consequences.
- [16] In order to make a finding under section 143(b)(ii), the Board must firstly establish that the Respondent had conducted himself in a negligent manner and secondly that

he created a risk of serious harm. The Board will address each of these elements in turn.

Negligence

- [17] Negligence, in a disciplinary context, is the departure by an electrical worker whilst carrying out or supervising prescribed electrical work from an accepted standard of conduct. It is judged against those of the same class of licence as the person whose conduct is being inquired into. This is described as the *Bolam*⁴ test of negligence which has been adopted by the New Zealand Courts.⁵
- [18] The New Zealand Courts have stated that an assessment of negligence in a disciplinary context is a two-stage test.⁶ The first is for the Board to consider whether the practitioner has departed from the acceptable standard of conduct. The second is to consider whether the departure is significant enough to warrant a disciplinary sanction.
- [19] When considering what an acceptable standard is, the Board must have reference to the conduct of other competent and responsible practitioners and the Board's own assessment of what is appropriate conduct, bearing in mind the purpose of the Act,⁷ which includes protecting the health and safety of members of the public in connection with the supply and use of electricity, and promoting the prevention of damage to property in connection with the supply and use of electricity. The test is an objective one and, in this respect, it has been noted that the purpose of discipline is the protection of the public by the maintenance of professional standards and that this could not be met if, in every case, the Board was required to take into account subjective considerations relating to the practitioner.⁸

Risk of Serious Harm or Significant Property Damage

- [20] Turning to risk of serious harm, the term is defined in section 2 of the Act. It means:
- death; or*
- injury that consists of or includes loss of consciousness; or*
- a notifiable injury or illness as defined in section 23 of the Health and Safety at Work Act 2015.*
- [21] It is noted that actual serious harm need not occur for the Board to make a finding. It is the *risk* of serious harm.
- [22] In this case, the evidence clearly establishes that the Respondent was responsible for the prescribed electrical work at **[Omitted]**. While he had a worker carry out the testing

⁴ *Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee* [1957] 1 WLR 582

⁵ *Martin v Director of Proceedings* [2010] NZAR 333 (HC), *F v Medical Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal* [2005] 3 NZLR 774 (CA)

⁶ *Martin v Director of Proceedings* [2010] NZAR 333 (HC), *F v Medical Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal* [2005] 3 NZLR 774 (CA)

⁷ *Martin v Director of Proceedings* [2010] NZAR 333 at p.33

⁸ *McKenzie v Medical Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal* [2004] NZAR 47 at p.71

due to wearing an asbestos suit, the Respondent has accepted that he was in charge of the work and was the one responsible for ensuring proper testing was completed.

[23] The Technical Advisor, Mr Mark Carter, provided evidence in his report dated 28 February 2024 that clearly identified the serious risks created by the failure to identify the disconnected neutral conductor:

- a. Forming a fundamental component of the MEN electrical supply system, the failure to connect the neutral conductor for [Omitted] will have impacted on the electrical safety of the electricity supply in that the protective earthing system will have been solely dependent on the main protective earth conductor and its connection to the earth electrode.
- b. In his supplementary statement dated 8 November 2024, the Technical Advisor explained that the disconnection of the mains neutral conductor will obstruct the flow of return current and in this scenario, current will seek to return via paths of lesser impedance (resistance) to the mass of earth.
- c. This created a significant safety hazard as current would flow within protective earthing conductors, energising earthed conductive surfaces throughout the installation including:
 - i. Copper water and gas pipes;
 - ii. Metal tap fixtures;
 - iii. Metal bathtubs;
 - iv. Benchtaps;
 - v. Earthed metallic appliances and luminaires.
- d. The Technical Advisor confirmed that in situations where persons are not sufficiently insulated from the mass of earth e.g., are in direct contact with the ground or are barefoot, in a worst-case scenario fatal electric shock may occur.
- e. Additionally, a further risk exists to property in that a normally stable mains voltage becomes instable and is prone to fluctuate, in turn risking damage to electrical equipment.

[24] The seriousness of the risk is evidenced by the fact that the neutral conductor remained disconnected from October 2022 until August 2023, creating an ongoing risk during this period. Smart meter data indicated that the low voltage had started in October 2022 when the pillar was replaced.

[25] In his response dated 6 March 2024 to the Technical Advisor's report, the Respondent acknowledged his failure and acknowledged that in this instance, he had been distracted from some of his core responsibilities, as an electrical worker, to adequately ensure the safety of others.

[26] The Board considers that while the Respondent was dealing with asbestos removal requirements, this does not excuse the failure to ensure proper testing was completed. Electrical safety testing is a fundamental requirement that cannot be

compromised due to other work considerations. The Respondent has accepted that he should have removed his asbestos suit to conduct the testing himself rather than delegating this critical safety check.

- [27] The Board notes that this was not a minor oversight but rather a fundamental failure to verify the integrity of electrical connections that are crucial to the safety of the electrical supply. The disconnection of a neutral conductor creates one of the most serious risks an electrical worker can introduce into an electrical installation, as evidenced by the Technical Advisor's detailed explanation of the potential consequences.
- [28] The Board therefore finds that through his failure to ensure proper testing was completed, the Respondent negligently created a risk of serious harm to any person, or a risk of significant property damage through having carried out or caused to be carried out prescribed electrical work being an offence under section 143(b)(ii) of the Act.

Penalty, Costs and Publication

- [29] Having found that one or more of the grounds in section 143 applies, the Board must, under section 147M of the Act,ⁱ consider the appropriate disciplinary penalty, whether the Respondent should be ordered to pay a fine, any costs and whether the decision should be published.
- [30] The Board received submissions at the hearing regarding penalty, costs, and publication.

Penalty

- [31] The Board has the discretion to impose a range of penalties, which are set out in section 147M of the Act. Exercising that discretion and determining the appropriate penalty requires that the Board balance various factors, including the seriousness of the conduct and any mitigating or aggravating factors present.⁹ It is not a formulaic exercise, but there are established underlying principles that the Board should take into consideration. They include:¹⁰
- (a) protection of the public and consideration of the purposes of the Act;¹¹
 - (b) deterring Respondent and other Electrical Workers from similar offending;¹²
 - (c) setting and enforcing a high standard of conduct for the industry;¹³
 - (d) penalising wrongdoing;¹⁴ and

⁹ *Ellis v Auckland Standards Committee 5* [2019] NZHC 1384 at [21]; cited with approval in *National Standards Committee (No1) of the New Zealand Law Society v Gardiner-Hopkins* [2022] NZHC 1709 at [48]

¹⁰ Cited with approval in *Robinson v Complaints Assessment Committee of Teaching Council of Aotearoa New Zealand* [2022] NZCA 350 at [28] and [29]

¹¹ Section 3 Building Act

¹² *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

¹³ *Dentice v Valuers Registration Board* [1992] 1 NZLR 720 (HC) at 724

¹⁴ *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee* HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818, 13 August 2007 at p 27

(e) rehabilitation (where appropriate).¹⁵

- [32] Overall, the Board should assess the conduct against the range of penalty options available in section 147M of the Act, reserving the maximum penalty for the worst cases¹⁶ and applying the least restrictive penalty available for the particular offending.¹⁷ In all, the Board should be looking to impose a fair, reasonable, and proportionate penalty¹⁸ that is consistent with other penalties imposed by the Board for comparable offending.¹⁹
- [33] In general, when determining the appropriate penalty, the Board adopts a starting point based on the principles outlined above prior to it considering any aggravating and/or mitigating factors present.²⁰
- [34] In terms of penalty, the Board considered a fine is warranted in the circumstances.
- [35] The Board adopted a starting point of \$6,000 for a fine. This is reduced by 50% to \$3,000 taking into account:
- a. The Respondent's early guilty plea;
 - b. His co-operation with the investigation;
 - c. He had expressed remorse and commitment to learning from this incident;
 - d. The training undertaken;
 - e. This was his first appearance before the board.

[36] Accordingly, a fine of \$3,000 is imposed.

Costs

- [37] Under section 147N of the Act, the Board may require the Respondent to pay the Board any sum that it considers just and reasonable towards the costs and expenses of and incidental to the investigation, the prosecution and the hearing.
- [38] The Respondent should note that the High Court has held that 50% of total reasonable costs should be taken as a starting point in disciplinary proceedings and that the percentage can then be adjusted up or down having regard to the particular circumstances of each case.²¹
- [39] In *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand*,²² where the order for costs in the tribunal was 50% of actual costs and expenses, the High Court noted that:

¹⁵ *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354; *Shousha v A Professional Conduct Committee* [2022] NZHC 1457

¹⁶ *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

¹⁷ *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee* HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818

¹⁸ *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

¹⁹ *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

²⁰ In *Lochhead v Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment* 3 November [2016] NZDC 21288 the District Court recommended that the Board adopt the approach set out in the Sentencing Act 2002.

²¹ *Cooray v The Preliminary Proceedings Committee* HC, Wellington, AP23/94, 14 September 1995, *Macdonald v Professional Conduct Committee*, HC, Auckland, CIV 2009-404-1516, 10 July 2009, *Owen v Wynyard* HC, Auckland, CIV-2009-404-005245, 25 February 2010.

²² [2001] NZAR 74

But for an order for costs made against a practitioner, the profession is left to carry the financial burden of the disciplinary proceedings, and as a matter of policy that is not appropriate.

- [40] In *Kenneth Michael Daniels v Complaints Committee 2 of the Wellington District Law Society*,²³ the High Court noted:

[46] All cases referred to in Cooray were medical cases and the Judge was careful to note that the 50 per cent was the general approach that the Medical Council took. We do not accept that if there was any such approach, it is necessarily to be taken in proceedings involving other disciplinary bodies. Much will depend upon the time involved, actual expenses incurred, attitude of the practitioner bearing in mind that whilst the cost of a disciplinary action by a professional body must be something of a burden imposed upon its members, those members should not be expected to bear too large a measure where a practitioner is shown to be guilty of serious misconduct.

[47] Costs orders made in proceedings involving law practitioners are not to be determined by any mathematical approach. In some cases 50 per cent will be too high, in others insufficient.

- [41] The Board has adopted an approach to costs that uses a scale based on 50% of the average costs of different categories of hearings: simple, moderate and complex. The current matter was simple. Adjustments based on the High Court decisions above are then made.
- [42] Based on the above, the Respondent is to pay costs of \$250, which is significantly less than actual costs in recognition of his co-operation through the ASOF process.

Publication

- [43] As a consequence of its decision, the Respondent's name and the disciplinary outcomes will be recorded in the Public Register as required by the Act.²⁴ The Board can, pursuant to section 147Z of the Act, also order publication over and above the public register notation. Under section 147Z the Board may, if no appeal is brought within 20 working days of its decision, direct the Registrar to cause a notice stating the effect of the decision or order, the reasons for the decision or order, and (unless the Board directs otherwise) the name of the person in respect of whom the decision or order was made, to be published in the Gazette and any other publications as may be directed by the Board.
- [44] As a general principle, such further public notification may be required where the Board perceives a need for the public and/or the profession to know of the findings of a disciplinary hearing. This is in addition to the Respondent being named in this decision.
- [45] Within New Zealand, there is a principle of open justice and open reporting, which is enshrined in the Bill of Rights Act 1990²⁵. The Criminal Procedure Act 2011 sets out

²³ CIV-2011-485-000227 8 August 2011

²⁴ Refer sections 128 of the Act

²⁵ Section 14 of the Act

grounds for suppression within the criminal jurisdiction.²⁶ Within the disciplinary hearing jurisdiction, the courts have stated that the provisions in the Criminal Procedure Act do not apply but can be instructive.²⁷ The High Court provided guidance as to the types of factors to be taken into consideration in *N v Professional Conduct Committee of Medical Council*²⁸.

- [46] The courts have also stated that an adverse finding in a disciplinary case usually requires that the name of the practitioner be published in the public interest.²⁹ It is, however, common practice in disciplinary proceedings to protect the names of other persons involved as naming them does not assist the public interest.
- [47] Based on the above, the Board will publish a general article in the Electron summarising the matter where the Respondent will be identified in the Electron. Further, a copy of the decision will be available on the EWRB website and the Respondent will be named.
- [48] Finally, at the hearing, the Respondent enquired whether the disciplinary finding would affect his licence. The Board advised him to check with the licensing team regarding any potential impacts and payment arrangements for the fine.

Penalty, Costs and Publication Orders

- [49] For the reasons set out above, the Board directs that:

- Penalty:** Pursuant to section 147M(1)(f) of the Act, the Respondent is ordered to pay a fine of \$3,000.
- Costs:** Pursuant to section 147N of the Act, the Respondent is ordered to pay costs of \$250 (GST included) towards the costs of, and incidental to, the inquiry of the Board.
- Publication:** The Registrar shall record the Board's action in the Register of Electrical Workers in accordance with section 128(1)(c)(viii) of the Act.
- The Respondent will be named in this decision, which will be publicly available on the Board's website.
- A summary of the matter will be published by way of an article in the Electron which will focus on the lessons to be learnt from the case. The Respondent will be named in the publication.

Right of Appeal

- [50] The right to appeal Board decisions is provided for in sections 147ZA and 147ZB of the Actⁱⁱ.

²⁶ Refer sections 200 and 202 of the Criminal Procedure Act

²⁷ *N v Professional Conduct Committee of Medical Council* [2014] NZAR 350

²⁸ *ibid*

²⁹ *Kewene v Professional Conduct Committee of the Dental Council* [2013] NZAR 1055

Signed and dated this 17th day of December 2024



R Keys
Presiding Member

ⁱ Section 147M of the Act

- (1) *If the Board, after conducting a hearing, is satisfied that a person to whom this Part applies is guilty of a disciplinary offence, the Board may—*
 - (a) *do 1 or more of the following things:*
 - (i) *order that the person's registration or practising licence (or both) be cancelled:*
 - (ii) *order that the person's provisional licence be cancelled:*
 - (iii) *order that the person may not apply to be reregistered or re-licensed before the expiry of a specified period:*
 - (b) *order that the person's registration or practising licence (or both), or the person's provisional licence, be suspended—*
 - (i) *for any period that the Board thinks fit; or*
 - (ii) *until that person does 1 or more of the things specified in subsection (2):*
 - (c) *order that the person's registration or practising licence (or both), or the person's provisional licence, be restricted for any period that the Board thinks fit, in either or both of the following ways:*
 - (i) *by limiting the person to the work that the Board may specify:*
 - (ii) *by limiting the person to doing, or assisting in doing, work in certain circumstances (for example, by limiting the person to work only on approved premises or only in the employ of an approved employer):*
 - (d) *order that the person be disqualified from doing or assisting in doing prescribed electrical work that the person would otherwise be authorised to do in that person's capacity as a person to whom this Part applies—*
 - (i) *permanently, or for any period that the Board thinks fit; or*
 - (ii) *until that person does 1 or more of the things specified in subsection (2):*
 - (e) *order the person to do 1 or more of the things specified in subsection (2) within the period specified in the order:*
 - (f) *order the person to pay a fine not exceeding \$10,000:*
 - (g) *order that the person be censured:*
 - (h) *make no order under this subsection.*
- (2) *The things that the person can be required to do for the purposes of subsection (1)(b), (d), and (e) are to—*
 - (a) *pass any specified examination:*
 - (b) *complete any competence programme or specified period of training:*
 - (c) *attend any specified course of instruction.*
- (3) *The Board may take only 1 type of action in subsection (1) in relation to a case, except that it may impose a fine under subsection (1)(f) in addition to taking the action under subsection (1)(b), (c), (e) or (g).*
- (4) *No fine may be imposed under subsection (1)(f) in relation to an act or omission that constitutes an—*

-
- (a) offence for which the person has been convicted by a court; or
 - (b) infringement offence for which the person has been issued with an infringement notice and has paid an infringement fee.
 - (5) The Board must not exercise any authority conferred by this section in respect of any offence committed by any person before the date of that person's registration or, as the case may be, the date on which that person's provisional licence was issued if at that date the Board was aware of that person's conviction for that offence.
 - (6) If a person is registered under Part 10 in respect of more than 1 class of registration, the Board may exercise its powers under subsection (1)(a) to (e) in respect of each of those classes or 1 or more of those classes as the Board thinks fit.]

ii Section 147ZA Appeals

- (1) A person who is dissatisfied with the whole or any part of any of the following decisions, directions, or orders may appeal to the District Court against the decision, direction, or order:
 - (e) any decision, direction, or order under any of sections 108, 109, 120, 133, 137, and 153 or Part 11 (except section 147C).

Section 147ZB Time for lodging appeal

An appeal under section 147ZA must be brought within—

- (a) 20 working days after notice of the decision, direction, or order was given to, or served on, the appellant; or
- (b) any further time that the District Court may allow on application made before or after the expiration of that period.