

## Before the Electrical Workers Registration Board

CE No. 22766

### In the matter of:

A disciplinary hearing before the Electrical Workers Registration Board

### Between:

The Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment

### And

Matehaere Paul a registered and licensed electrical worker (E 062709, EW 146957, 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:

Wellington

Hearing Type:

In Person and by audio visual link

Hearing and Decision Date:

22 August 2024

Board Members Present:

Mr M Orange, Barrister (Presiding)  
Ms A Yan, Registered Electrical Engineer  
Ms S Cameron, Registered Electrician  
Mr J Hutton, Registered Inspector

Appearances: R Hill for the Investigator

### 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

<b>Summary of the Board’s Decision</b> .....	2
<b>Introduction</b> .....	2
<b>Function of Disciplinary Action</b> .....	3
<b>Procedure</b> .....	4
<b>Evidence</b> .....	4
<b>First Offence</b> .....	5
<b>Second Offence</b> .....	7
<b>Board’s Decision</b> .....	7
<b>Penalty, Costs and Publication</b> .....	8
Penalty.....	8
Costs.....	9
Publication.....	10
<b>Penalty, Costs and Publication Orders</b> .....	11
<b>Right of Appeal</b> .....	11

### Summary of the Board’s Decision

- [1] The Respondent carried out prescribed electrical work in a manner that was contrary to an enactment and provided a false and misleading return. He was censured and ordered to pay costs of \$250. A record of the disciplinary offending will be recorded on the public register for a period of three years.

### Introduction

- [2] 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.
- [3] 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 16 August 2023 at [OMITTED], Matehaere Paul 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) Failed to provide all required signage of PV Array system components; and/or
  - b) Failed to provide all required documentation for the PV Array system.

In breach of regulations 60 of the Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010.

Or in the Alternative

2. On or around 16 August 2023 at [OMITTED], Matehaere Paul 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) Failed to provide all required signage of PV Array system components; and/or
  - b) Failed to provide all required documentation for the PV Array system.

### **Second Alleged Disciplinary Offence**

3. On or around 16 August 2023 at [OMITTED], Mr Matehaere Paul has provided a false or misleading return being an offence under section 143(f) of the Act, IN THAT, he provided a COC/ESC which falsely certified Prescribed Electrical Work carried out by him as lawful.

[4] Prior to the hearing, Counsel for the Investigator advised the Board that the Investigator would not be pursuing the second allegation of the first alleged offence, which was that the Respondent had failed to provide all required documentation for the PV Array system. The reason was that subsequent investigations had ascertained that the documentation had been provided. On that basis, the Board only considered the first allegation in the first alleged offence.

### **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*<sup>1</sup> and in New Zealand in *Dentice v Valuers Registration Board*<sup>2</sup>.

[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*,<sup>3</sup> 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 maintained in order to protect clients, the profession and the broader community.”*

---

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

<sup>2</sup> [1992] 1 NZLR 720 at p 724

<sup>3</sup> [2016] HZHC 2276 at para 164

- [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 basis of an Agreed Statement of Facts.

### **Evidence**

- [9] The Board must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the disciplinary offences alleged have been committed<sup>4</sup>. 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.*

- [10] The Board heard from the Respondent prior to it making a decision.
- [11] The Agreed Statement of Facts set out that the Respondent had been engaged to carry out prescribed electrical work (PEW) associated with the installation of a Photovoltaic Array System (PV Array).
- [12] After completion, the Complainant, an Electrical Inspector who inspected the PV Array, filed a complaint alleging non-compliance. The Investigator instructed Mr Mark Carter, an Electrical Inspector as an expert, to review the complaint and PEW. Mr Carter’s review formed the basis of the alleged disciplinary offences. The Respondent accepted the allegations, except for the allegation relating to the provision of documentation for the PV Array. He accepted that he had been negligent.
- [13] The Board inquired of the Investigator the specifics of the allegation that the Respondent had failed to provide all required signage of PV Array system components. The Investigator directed the Board to page 8 of Mr Carter’s report, which set out:

*On review of the additional photographic evidence provided by Mr Tuckey the following deficiencies in system labelling are evident.*

- a) *Signage or information had not been provided at building main switchboard to indicate the location of the solar array, the system short circuit current, or the open circuit voltage (AS/NZS 5033:2012 clause 5.4). It is noted that this labelling was affixed to front of the installed inverter.*

---

<sup>4</sup> *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee* [2009] 1 NZLR 1

- b) *The two installed DC isolators were not provided with signage or information to denote which of the two PV arrays they controlled and were not referenced to a PV array wiring diagram (AS/NZS 5033:2012 clause 5.5).*
- c) *Signage or information had not been provided at inverter to indicate WARNING: MULTIPLE DC ISOLATORS, TURN OFF ALL DC ISOLATORS TO ISOLATE EQUIPMENT (AS/NZS 5033:2012 clause 5.5.2). It is noted that this labelling was affixed to a small sub board installed directly beneath the MEN switchboard in alignment with the mandatory requirements of AS 4777.1:2005 clause 5.5.2.*
- d) *No signage or information was provided to denote "GRID SUPPLY" had been fitted adjacent to the main isolator for the inverter energy system. The main isolator in this instance was left with no label to clearly indicate its purpose AS 4777.1:2005 clause 5.5.2.*

*Summary & TA Opinion:*

*Whilst it is evident that the installed system had been labelled to a degree, some deficiencies are evident in the labelling provided relating to both the content provided and the location of respective labels.*

*Whilst the number of omissions were few, these must be regarded as critical to ensure the safe use of the system and to provide guidance to users should emergency isolation of the system be required.*

*Ultimately, labelling had not been provided in alignment with the requirements AS/NZS 5033:2012, AS 4777.1:2005 and as such it is the TA opinion that Mr Paul had breached mandatory installation requirements of AS/NZS 5033:2012, AS 4777.1:2005 and the Electricity (Safety) Regulations.*

*Breach:*

*Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010 60  
AS/NZS 5033:2012 5.4, 5.5  
AS 4777.1:2005 5.5.2*

- [14] The Respondent accepted the above.
- [15] 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 Statement.

**First Offence**

- [16] The Board's finding was that the PEW had been carried out in a manner that was contrary to an enactment. Contrary to an enactment is a form of strict liability offence. All that has to be proven is that a relevant enactment has been breached, in

the instance, the Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010. The Board does not need to find that there was intention, fault or negligence<sup>5</sup>.

[17] The PEW was carried out on a low-voltage installation. Under regulation 59 of the Safety Regulations, the work had to be carried out in accordance with AS/NZS 3000.

[18] Regulation 60 also applied. It states:

- 60 Certain installations must comply with Part 2 of AS/NZS 3000
- (2) If any of the following are installed so as to comply with Part 2 of AS/NZS 3000, they must also comply with the standards indicated:
- (d) a photovoltaic array: AS/NZS 5033:
- (f) a low voltage mains parallel generation system that is connected to the national grid: AS/NZS 3010 and AS 4777.1.

[19] As noted in Mr Carter's findings outlined in paragraph [13] above, aspects of the PEW did not comply with provisions of AS/NZS 5033 or AS4777.1, specifically, AS/NZS 5033:2012 clauses 5.4, 5.5 and AS 4777.1:2005 clause 5.5.2. The Respondent accepted those findings and agreed that the work was not in accordance with those standards. As such, the prescribed electrical work set out in the First Offence was carried out in a manner that was contrary to an enactment.

[20] The charge was laid in the alternative of negligence or incompetence. Negligence is the departure by an electrical worker 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*<sup>6</sup> test of negligence which has been adopted by the New Zealand Courts<sup>7</sup>. Incompetence is a lack of ability, skill or knowledge to carry out or supervise prescribed electrical work to an acceptable standard. *Beattie* put it as "*a demonstrated lack of the reasonably expected ability or skill level*". In *Ali v Kumar and Others*,<sup>8</sup> it was stated as "*an inability to do the job*".

[21] The assessment of negligence and/or incompetence in a disciplinary context is a two-stage test.<sup>9</sup> 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 serious enough to warrant a disciplinary sanction. With respect to the second stage, in *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand*,<sup>10</sup> the High Court stated:

*[21] Negligence or malpractice may or may not be sufficient to constitute professional misconduct and the guide must be standards applicable by*

---

<sup>5</sup> *Blewman v Wilkinson* [1979] 2 NZLR 208

<sup>6</sup> *Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee* [1957] 1 WLR 582

<sup>7</sup> *Martin v Director of Proceedings* [2010] NZAR 333 (HC), *F v Medical Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal* [2005] 3 NZLR 774 (CA)

<sup>8</sup> *Ali v Kumar and Others* [2017] NZDC 23582 at [30]

<sup>9</sup> *Martin v Director of Proceedings* [2010] NZAR 333 (HC), *F v Medical Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal* [2005] 3 NZLR 774 (CA)

<sup>10</sup> [2001] NZAR 74

*competent, ethical and responsible practitioners and there must be behaviour which falls seriously short of that which is to be considered acceptable and not mere inadvertent error, oversight or for that matter carelessness.*

[22] In *Pillai v Messiter (No 2)*,<sup>11</sup> an Australian Court of Appeal decision that has been adopted by the Superior Courts of New Zealand, stated:

*... the statutory test is not met by mere professional incompetence or by deficiencies in the practice of the profession. Something more is required. It includes a deliberate departure from accepted standards or such serious negligence as, although not deliberate, to portray indifference and an abuse.*

[23] It was with respect to the second stage that the Board decided that the conduct did not reach the threshold for a finding of negligence or incompetence. The Board decided that the departures were minor in nature and that the conduct was not serious enough to make a finding under section 143(a)(i) of the Act.

### **Second Offence**

[24] The charge under section 143(f) of the Act related to the provision of a false or misleading return. In determining whether a return is false or misleading is a question of fact to be decided objectively and the intention of the issuer is irrelevant.<sup>12</sup>

[25] The returns referred to are issued under the Regulations. There is a requirement that an Electrical Safety Certificate be issued for all prescribed electrical work. It must contain a statement to the effect that the installation or part installation is connected to a power supply and is safe to use. There is also a requirement that a Certificate of Compliance is issued for high and general risk prescribed electrical work. 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.

[26] The specific allegations were that the Respondent falsely declared that the PEW was lawful. As there had been departures from AS/NZS 3000, it was not. The Respondent accepted the allegation, and the offence has been committed.

### **Board's Decision**

[27] The Board has decided that the Respondent **has**:

- (a) 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; and
- (b) provided a false or misleading return being an offence under section 143(f) of the Act.

---

<sup>11</sup> (1989) 16 NSWLR 197 (CA) at 200

<sup>12</sup> *Taylor Bros Ltd v Taylor Group Ltd* [1988] 2 NZLR 1

## 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<sup>i</sup>, consider the appropriate disciplinary penalty, whether the Respondent should be ordered to pay any costs and whether the decision should be published.
- [29] The Respondent made submissions at the hearing as regards 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.<sup>13</sup> It is not a formulaic exercise, but there are established underlying principles that the Board should take into consideration. They include:<sup>14</sup>
- (a) protection of the public and consideration of the purposes of the Act;<sup>15</sup>
  - (b) deterring other Electrical Workers from similar offending;<sup>16</sup>
  - (c) setting and enforcing a high standard of conduct for the industry;<sup>17</sup>
  - (d) penalising wrongdoing;<sup>18</sup> and
  - (e) rehabilitation (where appropriate).<sup>19</sup>
- [31] Overall, the Board should assess the conduct against the range of penalty options available in section 318 of the Act, reserving the maximum penalty for the worst cases<sup>20</sup> and applying the least restrictive penalty available for the particular offending.<sup>21</sup> In all, the Board should be looking to impose a fair, reasonable, and proportionate penalty<sup>22</sup> that is consistent with other penalties imposed by the Board for comparable offending.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> *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]

<sup>14</sup> Cited with approval in *Robinson v Complaints Assessment Committee of Teaching Council of Aotearoa New Zealand* [2022] NZCA 350 at [28] and [29]

<sup>15</sup> Section 3 Building Act

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

<sup>17</sup> *Dentice v Valuers Registration Board* [1992] 1 NZLR 720 (HC) at 724

<sup>18</sup> *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee* HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818, 13 August 2007 at p 27

<sup>19</sup> *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

<sup>20</sup> *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

<sup>21</sup> *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee* HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818

<sup>22</sup> *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

<sup>23</sup> *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354



- [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.<sup>24</sup>
- [33] The Board noted that the installation of the conductors and fittings associated with the PV Array was high quality. It also noted that while the non-compliant signage was important, there was some compliant signage. As such, the overall seriousness of the offending was at the lower end of the scale. On that basis, the Board decided that a censure would suffice as a disciplinary penalty. A censure is a public expression of disapproval of conduct.

### Costs

- [34] 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.
- [35] 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.<sup>25</sup>
- [36] In *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand*,<sup>26</sup> 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.*

- [37] In *Kenneth Michael Daniels v Complaints Committee 2 of the Wellington District Law Society*,<sup>27</sup> 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.*

---

<sup>24</sup> 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.

<sup>25</sup> *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.

<sup>26</sup> [2001] NZAR 74

<sup>27</sup> CIV-2011-485-000227 8 August 2011

[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.*

- [38] 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.
- [39] Based on the above, the Board's costs order is that the Respondent is to pay the sum of \$250 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.

#### Publication

- [40] 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<sup>28</sup>. 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.
- [41] 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.
- [42] Within New Zealand, there is a principle of open justice and open reporting which is enshrined in the Bill of Rights Act 1990<sup>29</sup>. The Criminal Procedure Act 2011 sets out grounds for suppression within the criminal jurisdiction<sup>30</sup>. Within the disciplinary hearing jurisdiction, the courts have stated that the provisions in the Criminal Procedure Act do not apply but can be instructive<sup>31</sup>. 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*<sup>32</sup>.
- [43] 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<sup>33</sup>. 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.

---

<sup>28</sup> Refer sections 128 of the Act

<sup>29</sup> Section 14 of the Act

<sup>30</sup> Refer sections 200 and 202 of the Criminal Procedure Act

<sup>31</sup> *N v Professional Conduct Committee of Medical Council* [2014] NZAR 350

<sup>32</sup> *ibid*

<sup>33</sup> *Kewene v Professional Conduct Committee of the Dental Council* [2013] NZAR 1055

- [44] 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.
- [45] 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.

### **Penalty, Costs and Publication Orders**

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

**Penalty:** Pursuant to section 147M(1)(g) of the Electricity Act 1992, the Respondent is censured.

**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 not be named in the publication.

- [47] 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**

- [48] The right to appeal Board decisions is provided for in sections 147ZA and 147ZB of the Act<sup>ii</sup>.

Signed and dated this 17<sup>th</sup> day of September 2024



M Orange  
Presiding

---

<sup>i</sup> **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.]

**<sup>ii</sup> 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.*