

Before the Electrical Workers Registration Board

	CE No. 22157
Electrical Worker:	Michael Franklin (the Respondent)
Registration Number:	E 245751
Electrical Worker Number:	EW 106132
Registration Class:	Electrician

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

Hearing Type:	On the Papers
Hearing Date:	23 April 2020
Decision Date:	23 April 2020

Board Members Present:

Mel Orange (Presiding)
Michael Macklin, Registered Inspector
Monica Kershaw, Registered Electrician
Mac McIntyre, Registered Electrician
Jane Davel, Lay Member
Russell Keys, Registered Inspector
Ashley Yan, Registered Electrical Engineer

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 disciplinary offences under sections 143(a)(ii) and 143(f) of the Act.

Contents

Introduction	2
Function of Disciplinary Action	3
Procedure	4
Evidence	4
Board’s Conclusion and Reasoning	5
Penalty, Costs and Publication	6
Penalty	6
Costs.....	7
Publication	8
Penalty, Costs and Publication Orders	9
Right of Appeal	9

Introduction

- [1] 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.
- [2] The Respondent was served with a notice setting out the alleged disciplinary offences the Investigator reported should be considered by the Board. They were:

First Alleged Disciplinary Offence

1. On or around 26 August 2014 and 9 April 2015 at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Mr Michael Franklin 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:
 - a) installed a loose connection from the main switch to the sub board circuit breaker; and/or
 - b) overloaded a residual current device (RCD) on the switchboard; and/or
 - c) failed to adequately label a distribution board.

Or in the Alternative

2. On or around 26 August 2014 and 9 April 2015 at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] Mr Michael Franklin 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:

- a) installed a loose connection from the main switch to the sub board circuit breaker; and/or
- b) overloaded an RCD on the switchboard; and/or
- c) failed to adequately label a distribution board

In breach of regulations 59 of the Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010.

Second Alleged Disciplinary Offence

3. On or around 26 August 2014 at [REDACTED] Mr Michael Franklin has provided a false return being an offence under section 143(f) of the Act, IN THAT, he certified work on a Certificate of Compliance as being safe to connect and tested in accordance with the Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010.

Third Alleged Disciplinary Offence

4. On or around 9 April 2015 at [REDACTED] Mr Michael Franklin has failed to provide a return being an offence under section 143(f) of the Act, IN THAT, he certified work on a Certificate of Compliance as being safe to connect and tested in accordance with the Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010.

[3] Prior to the hearing the Respondent and the Board were provided with all of the documents the Investigator had in his/her power or possession.

[4] No Board Members declared any conflicts of interest in relation to the matters under consideration.

Function of Disciplinary Action

[5] 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 recently 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.

[6] Disciplinary action under the Act is not designed to redress issues or disputes between a complainant and a respondent. In *McLanahan and Tan v The New Zealand Registered Architects Board*³ Collins J. noted that:

“... the disciplinary process does not exist to appease those who are dissatisfied The disciplinary process ... exists to ensure professional standards are

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 [2016] HZHC 2276 at para 164

maintained in order to protect clients, the profession and the broader community.”

- [7] 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. It does not have any jurisdiction over contractual matters.

Procedure

- [8] The matter proceeded on the papers and on the basis of an Agreed Statement of Facts.
- [9] The Investigator did not pursue the Second Alleged Disciplinary Offence.
- [10] The appearance of the Investigator and Counsel for the investigator was excused.

Evidence

- [11] The Board must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the disciplinary offences alleged have been committed⁴. The Board notes that 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.

- [12] The matter proceeded on the basis of an Agreed Statement of Facts as an onto the papers hearing. The Statement set out that the Respondent was engaged to install a new combined main switch and meter board to the exterior of the house. The Respondent also installed an external socket outlet adjacent to the meter box along with carrying out a variety of prescribed electrical work at the property over an eight-month period.
- [13] Following completion of the prescribed electrical work the owner experienced nuisance tripping. Another electrical worker was engaged to determine the cause. He identified a loose mains terminal with evidence of heating, noncompliance relating to switchboard labelling and one residual current device(RCD) circuit with four sub-circuits when the maximum allowance is three.
- [14] The Investigator sought an expert opinion from Mr Peter MacMillan an Electrical Inspector. He identified that the Respondent had connected four final sub circuits to an RCD when a maximum of three are permitted under AS/NZS3000: 2007 2.6.2.4 (b) (i) and that the Respondent had not adequately labelled the switchboard for all the circuits at the property.
- [15] The Agreed Statement of Facts noted that the Respondent accepted that he had carried out prescribed electrical work in a manner that was contrary to an

⁴ *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee* [2009] 1 NZLR 1

enactment. It also noted that the Respondent accepted that he had, on 9 April 2015, issued a false and misleading return in that he issued a Certificate of Compliance for the noncompliant prescribed electrical work.

- [16] The Respondent noted that the work related to earthquake repairs including the disconnection and removal of any TRS (Tough Rubber Sheathed) and VIR (Vulcanised Indian Rubber) cabling and the relocation of the main switchboard into the existing meter box. A new distribution board was installed in the hallway and RCD/MCB protection was installed. He also provided an external socket for the builders to use. He stated he carried out the required testing prior to completion.
- [17] During completion of the project it was identified one circuit breaker was tripping when multiple kitchen appliances were working. These circuits were existing and had been installed pre earthquake by others. It is one of those circuits that was the fourth circuit connected to an RCD. The Respondent assumed the circuits were installed as a fourth circuit as a temporary solution at the time to stop nuisance tripping of a 10 amp circuit breaker. The circuit arrangement concerned was a 63 amp rated RCD with a series of circuit breakers totalling 42 amps. The Respondent submitted there was no possibility of overloading the RCD. He carried out remedial work including installing an additional RCD and compensated the owner. There have not been any reports of nuisance tripping since the circuits were split up.
- [18] The Agreed Statement of Facts noted that the two issues raised are compliance issues that did not relate to the overall safety of the installation.
- [19] The Respondent noted that a contractor being engaged to install an alarm system on the last day of the contract and that this interfered with the flow of the work. He submitted that the additional RCD and labelling would most likely have been completed on the final day if the contractor had not been carrying out work at that time. He nevertheless accepted responsibility.
- [20] The general rule is that all facts in issue or relevant to the issue in a case must be proved by evidence. As the Investigator and Respondent agreed to the facts as outlined above it was not necessary to call any further evidence or to test the evidence as outlined in the summary.

Board's Conclusion and Reasoning

- [21] The Board has decided that the Respondent **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:
- (a) installed a loose connection from the main switch to the sub board circuit breaker; and
 - (b) overloaded a residual current device (RCD) on the switchboard; and
 - (c) failed to adequately label a distribution board.

- [22] Contrary to an enactment is a form of strict liability offence in that all that need be proven is that the relevant enactment has been breached – in the instance a cited standard in the Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010, AS/NZS 3000:2007. The Board does not need to find that there was intention, fault or negligence⁵.
- [23] In this instance there was an Agreed Statement of Facts which accepted that the allegations and clear evidence of regulatory contraventions.
- [24] Whilst the Respondent submitted there were not safety concerns the Board did note that the loose terminal with signs of overheating did raise safety concerns. It also noted that RCDs are safety devices. There are also safety reasons for the restrictions on the number of circuits that can be fed from an RCD. The raises these matters as it considers the contraventions should not be trivialised.
- [25] The Board has decided that the Respondent **has** provided a false return being an offence under section 143(f) of the Act, in that, on or around 9 April 2015 at [REDACTED] [REDACTED] he falsely certified work on a Certificate of Compliance as being safe to connect and tested in accordance with the Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010.
- [26] Certification offences are also a form of strict liability. Determining whether a return is false or misleading is a question of fact to be decided objectively and the intention of the issuer is irrelevant⁶.
- [27] A Certificate of Compliance must state that the prescribed electrical work has been done lawfully and safely and that the information in the certificate is correct. In this instance, due to the contraventions of a cited standard noted, the work had not been done lawfully.

Penalty, Costs and Publication

- [28] Having found that one or more of the grounds in section 143 applies the Board must, under section 147M of the Actⁱ, consider the appropriate disciplinary penalty, whether the Respondent should be ordered to pay any costs and whether the decision should be published.
- [29] The matter was dealt with on the papers. Included was information relevant to penalty, costs and publication. The Board has made a decision based on it.

Penalty

- [30] The purpose of professional discipline is to uphold the integrity of the profession; the focus is not punishment, but the enforcement of a high standard of propriety and professional conduct. The Board does note, however, that the High Court in *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee*⁷ commented on the role of "punishment"

⁵ *Blewman v Wilkinson* [1979] 2 NZLR 208

⁶ *Taylor Bros Ltd v Taylor Group Ltd* [1988] 2 NZLR 1

⁷ HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818, 13 August 2007 at p 27

in giving penalty orders stating that punitive orders are, at times, necessary to provide a deterrent and to uphold professional standards. The Court noted:

[28] I therefore propose to proceed on the basis that, although the protection of the public is a very important consideration, nevertheless the issues of punishment and deterrence must also be taken into account in selecting the appropriate penalty to be imposed.

- [31] The Board also notes that in *Lochhead v Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment*⁸ the court noted that whilst the statutory principles of sentencing set out in the Sentencing Act 2002 do not apply to the Electricity Act they have the advantage of simplicity and transparency. The court recommended adopting a starting point for penalty based on the seriousness of the disciplinary offending prior to considering any aggravating and/or mitigating factors. The same applies to disciplinary proceedings under the Electricity Act.
- [32] The disciplinary offences committed are at the lower end of the disciplinary scale. The Board considered that a fine was the appropriate form of penalty. It adopted a starting point of \$1,500. The Respondent has accepted responsibility at an early stage. A 25% reduction in the penalty is therefore warranted. There are mitigating factors including that the Respondent remediated the work and compensated the owner. A further 25% reduction will be applied. The final penalty is set at \$750.

Costs

- [33] 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, prosecution and the hearing.
- [34] 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 case⁹.
- [35] In *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand*¹⁰ where the order for costs in the tribunal was 50% of actual costs and expenses the High Court noted that:
- 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.*
- [36] Based on the above the Board's costs order is that the Respondent is pay the sum of \$450 toward the costs of and incidental to the matter. In setting the amount of costs the Board took into account that the Respondent had agreed to the matter proceeding by way of an Agreed Statement of Facts.

⁸ 3 November 2016, CIV-2016-070-000492, [2016] NZDC 21288

⁹ *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.

¹⁰ [2001] NZAR 74

Publication

- [37] 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 Act¹¹. 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.
- [38] 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.
- [39] Within New Zealand there is a principle of open justice and open reporting which is enshrined in the Bill of Rights Act 1990¹². The Criminal Procedure Act 2011 sets out grounds for suppression within the criminal jurisdiction¹³. Within the disciplinary hearing jurisdiction the courts have stated that the provisions in the Criminal Procedure Act do not apply but can be instructive¹⁴. 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*¹⁵.
- [40] 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 interest¹⁶. 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.
- [41] Based on the above the Board will publish a general article in the Electron summarising the matter but will not order further publication. The Respondent will not be identified in the Electron.
- [42] The Respondent should also note that the Board has not made any form of order under section 153(3) of the Act which allows for prohibition of publication.

¹¹ Refer sections 128 of the Act

¹² Section 14 of the Act

¹³ Refer sections 200 and 202 of the Criminal Procedure Act

¹⁴ *N v Professional Conduct Committee of Medical Council* [2014] NZAR 350

¹⁵ *ibid*

¹⁶ *Kewene v Professional Conduct Committee of the Dental Council* [2013] NZAR 1055

Penalty, Costs and Publication Orders

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

Penalty: Pursuant to section 147M(1)(f) of the Electricity Act 1992, the Respondent is ordered to pay a fine of \$750.

Costs: Pursuant to section 147N of the Act, the Respondent is ordered to pay costs of \$450 (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.

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 not be named in the publication.

In terms of section 147Z of the Act, there will not be action taken to publicly notify the Board's action.

[44] The Respondent should note that the Board may refuse to relicense an electrical worker who has not paid any fine or costs imposed on them.

Right of Appeal

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

Signed and dated this 29th day of April 2020



Mel Orange
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.*