

Before the Electrical Workers Registration Board

CE No. 22925

In the matter of: A disciplinary hearing before the Electrical Workers Registration Board

Between: The Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment

And

Norman Short a registered and licensed electrical inspector (EW023988, I 914, Electrical Inspector) (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: By Audio Visual Link
Hearing Date: 17 October 2025
Decision Date: 17 October 2025

Board Members Present:

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

Appearances: M Brown, counsel for the Investigator and M Johnson, Investigator
P Harman, counsel for the Respondent

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)(i) and 143(f) of the Act.

Contents

Summary of the Board’s Decision	2
Introduction	2
Function of Disciplinary Action	3
Evidence	4
Procedure	4
Board’s Decision	5
Negligence.....	5
Penalty, Costs and Publication	7
Penalty.....	7
Costs.....	9
Publication.....	10
Penalty, Costs and Publication Orders	11
Right of Appeal	12

Summary of the Board’s Decision

- [1] The Board determined the Respondent committed a disciplinary offence under sections 143(a)(i) and 143(f) of the Act.
- [2] The Board ordered:
- a. A fine of \$1,000 (reduced from \$2,000 starting point due to cooperation and guilty plea);
 - b. Costs of \$500 (taking into account two Agreed Statement of Facts hearings were required);
 - c. The name of the Respondent to be published in the Electron newsletter, the Board’s decision that will be available on its website, and on the public register for three years.

Introduction

- [3] 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.
- [4] The Respondent was engaged to carry out an inspection of a caravan for the purpose of issuing a Warrant of Electrical Fitness (WoEF) at [OMITTED], on 3 August 2020.
- [5] The Respondent was served with a Notice of Proceeding dated 13 March 2025 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:

First Alleged Disciplinary Offence:

On or around 3 August 2020 at [OMITTED], Mr Norman Short has carried out or caused to be carried out prescribed electrical work in a manner contrary to any enactment being an offence under section 143(a)(ii) of the Act, IN THAT, he failed to carry out adequate safety verification and testing prior to the issue of the Warrant of Electrical Fitness (WoEF), on a Caravan registration number [OMITTED] with the following non-compliant issue:

a. No overload switch fitted to protect appliances and fittings within caravan

In breach of regulation 78 of Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010 which required the WoEF to be issued in accordance with AS/NZS 3001:2008.

Or in the Alternative

On or around 3 August 2020 at [OMITTED], Mr Norman Short 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 failed to carry out adequate safety verification and testing prior to the issue of the Warrant of Electrical Fitness (WoEF), on a Caravan registration number [OMITTED] with the following non-compliant issue:

b. No overload switch fitted to protect appliances and fittings within caravan

Second Alleged Disciplinary Offence:

On or around 3 August 2020 at [OMITTED], Mr Norman Short has provided a false or misleading return being an offence under Section 143(f) of the Act, IN THAT, he issued a Warrant of Electrical Fitness on a Caravan, registration number [OMITTED] that did not meet all the lawful requirements as set out in regulation 78 of Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010.

[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 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.

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.

- [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 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 (ASOF), with the Respondent accepting responsibility for the disciplinary offences.
- [12] The Board notes that the matter had previously been scheduled for an ASOF hearing on 16 July 2025. During the course of that hearing, the Respondent disputed aspects of the ASOF. The Board adjourned the hearing to allow the Respondent opportunity to prepare a defence if he wished to proceed on that basis. The Respondent subsequently engaged legal counsel, Mr Paul Harman. The Respondent provided additional responses disputing findings in Mr McDonald’s initial technical report. An updated technical report was commissioned by the Investigator and provided to all parties. After reviewing the updated technical report, the Respondent decided to proceed by way of ASOF rather than defending the charges.
- [13] In summary, the ASOF established that:
- a. The Respondent is a licensed Electrical Inspector (EW023988 / I 914) and at all relevant times was the holder of a current practising licence;
 - b. The Respondent was engaged to carry out an inspection of a caravan (registration number [OMITTED]) for the purpose of issuing a Warrant of Electrical Fitness on 3 August 2020;
 - c. By carrying out the inspection, the Respondent was carrying out prescribed electrical work on the caravan;
 - d. The Respondent failed to carry out the required checks during the WoEF inspection because he failed to carry out adequate safety verification and testing prior to issuing the WoEF. Specifically, the caravan was not fitted with an overload switch to protect appliances and fittings;
 - e. A complaint was lodged by Mr [OMITTED] on 19 August 2024 alleging that the Respondent carried out non-compliant PEW on the caravan;

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

- f. Mr Glen McDonald (I 265954) was engaged by the Investigator to provide a technical review of the complaint and PEW undertaken;
- g. Mr McDonald identified that:
 - i. The Respondent did not complete the electrical inspection of the mobile installation correctly. The WoEF was issued, and the caravan owner was assured the system was safe;
 - ii. The electrical system was in fact, without a mandatory overload switch, which meant that the caravan could have high energy appliances plugged into the power outlets, culminating in an overload leading to damage to property;
 - iii. Issuing the WoEF was in breach of Electricity (Safety) Regulations 78, 7 and AS/NZS 3001:2008, Section C 6.4, 3.3.1.1, AS/NZS 3000:2007 A1+A2 Section 8.2.2 (c) (ii), (f) (vii).
- h. The Respondent confirmed that he read Mr McDonald's report;
- i. The Respondent accepted he has committed the disciplinary offences;
- j. The Respondent has cooperated with the Investigator throughout the investigation and proceedings;
- k. The Respondent has previously appeared before the Board in 2013, where he was found guilty of disciplinary offences under Sections 143(b)(ii) and 143(f) of the Electricity Act 1992.

Board's Decision

- [14] Based on the ASOF and having considered all relevant factors, the Board finds that the Respondent has committed disciplinary offences under sections 143(a)(i) and 143(f) of the Act.
- [15] While the first charge included two alternatives under sections 143(a)(ii) and 143(a)(i), the Board finds that the conduct is most appropriately dealt with under section 143(a)(i).
- [16] In order to make a finding under section 143(a)(i), the Board has to be satisfied that the Respondent had conducted himself in a negligent manner.

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

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)

- [18] The New Zealand Courts have stated that an assessment of negligence in a disciplinary context is a two-stage test⁶. 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
- [20] In this case, the Respondent's failures as accepted in the ASOF constituted a significant departure from the standard expected of a licensed electrical inspector.
- [21] The applicable standard was AS/NZS 3001:2008 - Electrical Installations for Transportable Structures and Vehicles. Section 3.3.1.1 of that standard requires that each supply be protected by a separate overcurrent circuit breaker located within the transportable structure, with the maximum rating of the circuit breaker not to exceed the maximum current of the supply lead fittings.
- [22] The caravan was fitted with a 40 amp circuit breaker (an RCCB/RCD). However, this did not meet the requirements of the standard for a connectable installation supplied by a 16 amp caravan inlet, which requires a device fitted to limit the current flow to a maximum of 16 amps.
- [23] At the hearing, counsel for the Respondent raised the issue of whether the 40 amp circuit breaker present in the caravan minimised the risk. The Board explained that while a 40 amp device provides some protection, it does not provide adequate protection for a caravan. The connection devices (plugs, sockets and cables) used to connect caravans to a power supply are rated for only 16 amps. With a 40 amp circuit breaker, the caravan could draw up to 40 amps of current before the breaker operates. This creates a serious risk of the 16 amp rated connection devices overheating, melting or catching fire before the 40 amp breaker activates, posing risks of fire and electric shock.
- [24] The Respondent, as an Electrical Inspector, failed to:
- a. Identify that the caravan lacked the mandatory overload protection required by AS/NZS 3001:2008;

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

- b. Carry out adequate safety verification and testing before issuing the WoEF;
- c. Remove the switchboard cover to conduct a proper visual inspection, which would have revealed the non-compliant 40 amp RCD.

[25] At the hearing, the Respondent acknowledged his error and explained that he had implemented improved procedures since this incident, including:

- a. Using a form to record all tests;
- b. Taking photos of all circuit breakers;
- c. Carrying a torch and magnifying glass to assist with reading small text on equipment.

[26] Similarly, by issuing a Warrant of Electrical Fitness stating the installation was compliant when it did not meet the mandatory requirements of AS/NZS 3001:2008, the Respondent provided a false or misleading return under section 143(f).

[27] Based on the above, the Board finds the charges under sections 143(a)(i) and 143(f) have been proven.

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 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.

[29] The Board received submissions from the parties at the hearing regarding penalty, costs, and publication.

Penalty

[30] 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;
- (b) deterring Respondent and other Electrical Workers from similar offending;¹¹
- (c) setting and enforcing a high standard of conduct for the industry;¹²
- (d) penalising wrongdoing;¹³ 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 *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

¹² *Dentice v Valuers Registration Board* [1992] 1 NZLR 720 (HC) at 724

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

(e) rehabilitation (where appropriate).¹⁴

- [31] 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 cases¹⁵ and applying the least restrictive penalty available for the particular offending.¹⁶ In all, the Board should be looking to impose a fair, reasonable, and proportionate penalty¹⁷ that is consistent with other penalties imposed by the Board for comparable offending.¹⁸
- [32] 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.¹⁹
- [33] Counsel for the Investigator submitted that a fine should be imposed. Counsel acknowledged mitigating factors including the Respondent's cooperation with the investigation and that an ASOF was ultimately reached.
- [34] Counsel for the Investigator noted that the Respondent was previously found guilty of disciplinary offences in 2013 for failing to adequately inspect and test electrical work performed by another practitioner. The Respondent was found guilty of disciplinary offences under Sections 143(b)(ii) and 143(f) of the Act, resulting in a fine of \$4,250 and costs of \$1,500. The 2013 case involved more serious offending under section 143(b)(ii) which relates to risk of serious harm.
- [35] Counsel for the Respondent submitted that, in accordance with District Court practice, offences over 10 years old should not be factored into sentencing, and that the Respondent should be treated as having no relevant prior disciplinary history. Counsel submitted that the Respondent was genuinely not up to date with the 2008 standards, and once this was clarified, he readily admitted the offending in the ASOF. Counsel submitted that a fine of \$1,000 would be appropriate and in line with previous penalties for similar offending.
- [36] The Board noted the previous offending in 2013, which involved similar disciplinary charges under section 143(f) (false or misleading return). However, the Board accepted that given the significant period of time that has elapsed (over 10 years), and that the 2013 matter involved more serious offending under section 143(b)(ii), the previous offence should not be taken into account when determining the appropriate penalty in this case.
- [37] In terms of penalty, the Board considered a fine is warranted in the circumstances.
- [38] The Board adopted a starting point of \$2,000 for a fine. This is reduced by 50% to \$1,000 taking into account:

¹⁴ *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

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

¹⁶ *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee* HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818

¹⁷ *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

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

¹⁹ 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.

- a. The Respondent's cooperation with the investigation and proceeding by way of an ASOF; and
- b. The Respondent's guilty plea and acceptance of responsibility.

[39] Accordingly, a fine of \$1,000 is imposed.

Costs

[40] 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.

[41] 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.²⁰

[42] In *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand*,²¹ 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.

[43] In *Kenneth Michael Daniels v Complaints Committee 2 of the Wellington District Law Society*,²² 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.

[44] 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.

²⁰ *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.

²¹ [2001] NZAR 74

²² CIV-2011-485-000227 8 August 2011

- [45] Counsel for the Investigator noted that this matter was previously scheduled for an ASOF hearing on 16 July 2025, but during the course of that hearing the Respondent disputed aspects of the ASOF. The hearing was adjourned and further preparation was required, including the commissioning of an updated Technical Assessor Report from Mr McDonald, resulting in additional time and cost being incurred. Counsel submitted that increased costs beyond those normally sought for an ASOF hearing may be appropriate.
- [46] Based on the above, the Respondent is to pay costs of \$500, taking into account that two ASOF hearings were required due to the adjournment of the first hearing when the Respondent disputed aspects of the ASOF.

Publication

- [47] 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.²³ 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.
- [48] 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.
- [49] Within New Zealand, there is a principle of open justice and open reporting, which is enshrined in the Bill of Rights Act 1990²⁴. The Criminal Procedure Act 2011 sets out grounds for suppression within the criminal jurisdiction.²⁵ Within the disciplinary hearing jurisdiction, the courts have stated that the provisions in the Criminal Procedure Act do not apply but can be instructive.²⁶ 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*²⁷.
- [50] 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.²⁸ 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.
- [51] Counsel for the Respondent submitted that the Respondent encouraged publication, including naming him in the publication, as it would serve an educative purpose for

²³ Refer sections 128 of the Act

²⁴ Section 14 of the Act

²⁵ Refer sections 200 and 202 of the Criminal Procedure Act

²⁶ *N v Professional Conduct Committee of Medical Council* [2014] NZAR 350

²⁷ *ibid*

²⁸ *Kewene v Professional Conduct Committee of the Dental Council* [2013] NZAR 1055

the industry. Counsel noted that the Respondent had seen “quite a few, like hundreds of caravans like this” and that three prior WoEFs had been issued for this same caravan by other inspectors. It was submitted that the Respondent was of sufficient character and integrity that he could bear his name being published for the educative benefit of the profession.

- [52] In this case, the Board has decided that it will publish a general article in the Electron summarising the matter where the Respondent will be identified. The Board considers this matter raises important issues regarding inspection standards for connectable installations and the application of AS/NZS 3001:2008, which would benefit the profession. Further, a copy of the decision will be available on the EWRB website and the Respondent will be named. The Respondent’s name will also be recorded on the public register for a period of three years.
- [53] The Board also reminded the Respondent that electrical inspectors are held in higher regard in the industry and the Board has high expectations of electrical inspectors to be leaders, to lead by example, and to know current cited standards and where to find them. Electrical inspectors should be able to provide good, clear leadership to other electrical workers if they seek their guidance.

Penalty, Costs and Publication Orders

- [54] 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 \$1,000.

Costs: Pursuant to section 147N of the Act, the Respondent is ordered to pay costs of \$500 (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

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

Signed and dated this 25th day of November 2025



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.*