

Before the Electrical Workers Registration Board

CE No. 22629

In the matter of:

A disciplinary hearing before the Electrical Workers Registration Board

Between:

The Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment

And

Christopher Scheib a registered and licensed electrical worker (E 283422, EW 139658, 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:

In Person

Hearing and Decision Date:

20 July 2023

Board Members Present:

Mr R Keys, Registered Inspector (Presiding)

Ms J Davel, Lay Member

Ms M Kershaw, Registered Electrician

Mr M Macklin, Registered Inspector

Ms A Yan, Registered Electrical Engineer

Mr M Perry, Registered Electrician

Appearances: Rhys Boyd 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(b)(ii), 143(a)(i) and 143(f) of the Act.

Contents

Summary of the Board’s Decision	2
Introduction	2
Function of Disciplinary Action	6
Procedure	6
Interim Suspension	6
Evidence	7
Board’s Conclusion and Reasoning	9
Penalty, Costs and Publication	11
Penalty	11
Costs.....	13
Publication	14
Penalty, Costs and Publication Orders	15
Right of Appeal	15

Summary of the Board’s Decision

- [1] The Respondent committed multiple disciplinary offences, including negligently creating a risk of serious harm. The prescribed electrical work involved the installation of sockets for connectable installations. The Respondent installed inlets as opposed to outlets. A person received an electric shock as a result of the Respondent’s negligence.
- [2] The Board suspended the Respondent’s licence and ordered that he undertake specified training. The suspension was on the basis that it would be lifted once the training had been successfully completed. Costs of \$250 were ordered. The offending will be recorded on the Register for a period of 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 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. Between 1 April 2022 and 15 July 2022 at [OMITTED], in a shed on the property identified as “main shed” Mr Christopher Scheib 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 socket inlet fitting creating an electrically unsafe installation with access to live parts; and/or
- B. Failed to carry out adequate visual inspection and testing of electrical fittings.

In breach of regulations 13(1)(a), 20(a), 59 (2), 63(a)(b), and 73A(a)(b) of the Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010.

Or in the Alternative

- 2. Between 1 April 2022 and 15 July 2022 at [OMITTED], in a shed on the property identified as “main shed” Mr Christopher Scheib 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 socket inlet fitting creating an electrically unsafe installation with access to live parts; and/or
- B. Failed to carry out adequate visual inspection and testing of electrical fittings.

Or in the Alternative

- 3. Between 1 April 2022 and 15 July 2022 at [OMITTED], in a shed on the property identified as “main shed” Mr Christopher Scheib 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 installed socket inlet fittings creating an electrically unsafe installation with access to live parts.

Second Alleged Disciplinary Offence

- 4. On or around 15 July 2022 at [OMITTED], Mr Christopher Scheib has provided a false or misleading return being an offence under section 143(f) of the Act, IN THAT, he provided a Certificate of Compliance for Prescribed Electrical Work which was carried out unlawfully and unsafely (COC one – Main Shed).

Third Alleged Disciplinary Offence

- 5. On 15 July 2022 at [OMITTED], Mr Christopher Scheib has failed to provide a return being an offence under section 143(f) of the Act, IN THAT, failed to provide a Electrical Safety Certificate for Prescribed Electrical Work within 20 days of the connection to the supply for the main shed at the property (COC one – Main Shed).

Fourth Alleged Disciplinary Offence

6. Between 1 July 2022 and 25 July 2022 at [OMITTED], in a small shed on the property identified as “small shed” Mr Christopher Scheib 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 socket inlet fitting creating an electrically unsafe installation with access to live parts; and/or
 - B. Failed to install RCD protection for a new socket outlet; and/or
 - C. Failed to carry out adequate visual inspection and testing of electrical fittings.

In breach of regulations 13(1)(a), 20(a), 59(2), 63(a)(b), and 73A(a)(b) of the Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010.

Or in the Alternative

7. Between 1 July 2022 and 25 July 2022 at [OMITTED], in a small shed on the property identified as “small shed” Mr Christopher Scheib 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 socket inlet fitting creating an electrically unsafe installation with access to live parts; and/or
 - B. Failed to install RCD protection for a new socket outlet; and/or
 - C. Failed to carry out adequate visual inspection and testing of electrical fittings.

Or in the Alternative

8. Between 1 July 2022 and 25 July 2022 at [OMITTED], in a small shed on the property identified as “small shed” Mr Christopher Scheib 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 installed socket inlet fittings creating an electrically unsafe installation with access to live parts.

Fifth Alleged Disciplinary Offence

9. On or around 16 August 2022 at [OMITTED], Mr Christopher Scheib has provided a false or misleading return being an offence under section 143(f) of the Act, IN THAT, he provided a Certificate of Compliance for Prescribed Electrical Work which was carried out unlawfully and unsafely (COC two – Small Shed).

Sixth Alleged Disciplinary Offence

10. On or around 2 September 2022 at [OMITTED], in the main shed AND the small shed of the property Mr Christopher Scheib 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 failed to install switches adjacent to socket outlets in breach of regulations 59 (2) of the Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010.

Or in the Alternative

11. On or around 2 September 2022 at [OMITTED], in the main shed AND the small shed of the property Mr Christopher Scheib 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 install switches adjacent to socket outlets.

Seventh Alleged Disciplinary Offence

12. On or around 2 September 2022 at [OMITTED], in a small shed on the property identified as “small shed” Mr Christopher Scheib 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 failed to adequately label the switchboard after installing an RCD device in breach of regulations 59 (2) of the Electricity (Safety) Regulations 2010.

Or in the Alternative

13. On or around 2 September 2022 at [OMITTED], in a small shed on the property identified as “small shed” Mr Christopher Scheib 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 adequately label the switchboard after installing an RCD device.

Eighth Alleged Disciplinary Offence

14. On or around 6 September 2022 at [OMITTED], Mr Christopher Scheib has provided a false or misleading return being an offence under section 143(f) of the Act, IN THAT, he provided a Certificate of Compliance for Prescribed Electrical Work which contained errors and did not detail the installation of the RCD to the switchboard in the Small Shed (COC three – Remedial Work).

[5] 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.

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

Function of Disciplinary Action

- [7] 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.

- [8] 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 maintained in order to protect clients, the profession and the broader community.”

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

Procedure

- [10] The matter proceeded on the basis of an Agreed Statement of Facts.

Interim Suspension

- [11] On 7 October 2022, the Board decided that it would impose an interim suspension of the Respondent’s licence. The order was made on the basis that a suspension was necessary to protect the safety of the public. The Respondent sought a revocation of the suspension, and on 28 October 2022, the Board decided it would modify its interim suspension order by imposing restrictions.

- [12] Under section 147I(3) of the Act, a suspension remains in place until such time as it is revoked by the Board, the Investigator determines that the complaint should not be considered by the Board, or the matter is dealt with in accordance with section 147M of the Act. As this matter has been heard, the interim suspension order is revoked.

- [13] The Respondent should note, however, that as part of the Board’s disciplinary findings, a suspension under section n147M of the Act has been imposed. As such, the Respondent’s licence continues to be suspended.

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

Evidence

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

- [15] The Board heard from the Respondent prior to it making a decision.
- [16] As noted, the matter proceeded on the basis of an Agreed Statement of Facts. The Statement stated that the Respondent had been engaged to install three caravan power sockets, two in a Main Shed and one in a Small Shed. The Respondent said that he obtained electrical supplies in a rush and did not fully inspect the materials he received. When carrying out the prescribed electrical work (PEW), the Respondent incorrectly installed three socket inlets as opposed to outlets for both the Main Shed and the Small Shed and failed to notice that he had installed the incorrect fittings. As a result, the sockets had exposed live pins, which created an unsafe risk to persons who could have touched the pins or to persons who may attempt to connect a supply lead for a connectable installation (caravan or similar) to the fittings.
- [17] After installing the sockets, the Respondent did not verify, identify or recognise the live pins of the socket inlets were exposed and the subsequent risk of electrical shock created once they were connected to power. The Respondent also failed to identify that the switchboard the Small Shed socket was connected to had not been protected by a Residual Current Device (RCD). The Respondent also failed to install switches adjacent to the sockets as required.
- [18] The Respondent issued a Combined Certificate of Compliance (CoC) and Electrical Safety Certificate (ESC) dated 15 July 2022 in relation to work carried out on the Main Shed but did not complete the ESC portion of the form. On 16 August 2022, a combined CoC/ESC was issued for the PEW on the Small Shed.
- [19] After the Respondent had connected the PEW, a person received an electric shock. The Respondent was informed, and he replaced the inlets with outlets and installed an RCD for the Small Shed outlet but failed to label the switchboard. A further combined CoC/ESC was issued after that work had been completed. The certification did not include the installation of the RCD.

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

- [20] The Investigator obtained a technical review and opinion of the PEW from an Electrical Inspector. His report noted the Respondent:
- (a) installed three appliance inlets connected to power, which had fittings accessible to live parts, which resulted in an unsafe electrical installation and an electrical shock;
 - (b) following the PEW, failed to conduct verification and testing to verify the correct electrical fittings were fit for purpose, and his PEW was correct and electrically safe per the Electrical Safety Regulations;
 - (c) did not install switches with or adjacent to the socket outlets as required;
 - (d) did not verify or test correctly when he installed an external 16-amp socket outlet to the Small Shed, which was not connected to an RCD device;
 - (e) issued three CoC's which were absent of information, did not describe all PEW work performed, and were false and misleading; and
 - (f) did not label the electrical fittings contained in the distribution switchboard in the small shed after installing an RCD device on his return visit to the property for remedial work.
- [21] The report resulted in the charges as set out in the Notice of Proceeding.
- [22] The Respondent replied to the investigation by saying he fell behind in his work due to having COVID-19 twice and because of government isolation restrictions and guidelines. He was stressed, and he did not want to lose out on jobs. He tried to complete his jobs and take on more work so that he had money to pay bills. He had been working too much, and he had been pushing himself to try and keep up with the demand and expectations of the market as there was a shortage of tradespeople in the Far North.
- [23] Mr Scheib further stated he went to a different electrical wholesaler, and there was a miscommunication about the materials he sought. He did not inspect the materials he received, and when he ultimately tested the sockets, he did not recognise that what he had installed were incorrect fittings. Had he identified this, he would have taken the materials back to the electrical wholesaler to swap them for the correct materials. With respect to the failure to install an RCD, the Respondent stated he had put himself on time constraints and overlooked the small switchboard that had been installed prior to his arrival and that had he noticed it, he would have installed an RCD to ensure everything was protected the way it was meant to be.
- [24] The Respondent expressed remorse and was distressed that the Complainant had received an electrical shock. He accepted that he was responsible for the PEW he completed and the subsequent certifications he made and that he had committed the disciplinary offences as set out in the Notice of Proceeding. He also expressed a

willingness to engage in relevant training to improve his knowledge and help increase his abilities in the electrical field.

- [25] 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 for any further evidence or to test the evidence as outlined in the Statement.

Board's Conclusion and Reasoning

- [26] The Board has decided that the Respondent **has**:

First Alleged Disciplinary Offence:

- (a) 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 installed socket inlet fittings creating an electrically unsafe installation with access to live parts; and
- (b) carried out or caused to be carried out prescribed electrical work in a negligent manner, being an offence under section 143(a)(i) of the Act, in that he failed to carry out adequate visual inspection and testing of electrical fittings.

Second, Third, Fifth and Eighth Alleged Disciplinary Offences provided false or misleading returns being an offence under section 143(f) of the Act.

Fourth Alleged Disciplinary Offence:

- (a) 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 installed a socket inlet fitting creating an electrically unsafe installation with access to live parts; and
- (b) carried out or caused to be carried out prescribed electrical work in a negligent manner, being an offence under section 143(a)(i) of the Act, in that failed to install RCD protection for a new socket outlet and to carry out adequate visual inspection and testing of electrical fittings.

Sixth Alleged Disciplinary Offence 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 install switches adjacent to socket outlets.

Seventh Alleged Disciplinary Offence 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 adequately label the switchboard after installing an RCD device.

- [27] The findings are made on the basis that the Respondent accepted that he had committed the disciplinary offences and for the reasons that follow.

- [28] The First and Fourth charges were laid in the alternatives of negligently creating a risk of serious harm to any person, or a risk of significant property damage under section 143(b)(ii) and, as alternatives, negligence or incompetence under section 143(a)(i) and contrary to an enactment under section 143(a)(ii).
- [29] The Board decided that installing socket inlets in the manner that they were installed negligently created a risk of serious harm. Serious harm 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.*
- [30] Actual serious harm or significant property damage need not occur. There need only be a risk that either might occur. The risk must be real in that there needs to be a material or substantial possibility, chance or likelihood that serious harm or significant property damage will occur. A real risk has also been described as one that a reasonable person would not brush aside as being far-fetched or fanciful⁵.
- [31] In this instance, a person received an electric shock. As such, there was no question as to whether there was a risk of serious harm. The installation of an inlet as opposed to an outlet created a significant safety hazard. It occurred because of the Respondent's inadvertence and failure to check and verify his PEW. In that respect, the Respondent had conducted himself in a negligent manner. Negligence is considered to be 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*⁶ test of negligence which has been adopted by the New Zealand Courts⁷.
- [32] The New Zealand Courts have stated that an assessment of negligence in a disciplinary context is a two-stage test⁸. The first is for the Board to consider whether the practitioner has departed from the acceptable standard of conduct of a professional. The second is to consider whether the departure is significant enough to warrant a disciplinary sanction. In this instance, the departure was serious, and it is appropriate that the Respondent be disciplined.

⁵ Overseas Tankship (UK) Ltd v Miller Steamship Co Pty Ltd (The Wagon Mound No 2) [1967] 1 AC 617

⁶ *Bolam v Friern Hospital Management Committee* [1957] 1 WLR 582

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

⁸ *Martin v Director of Proceedings* [2010] NZAR 333 (HC), *F v Medical Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal* [2005] 3 NZLR 774 (CA)

- [33] The same tests as regards negligence apply to the findings that the Respondent carried out or supervised PEW in a negligent manner. The Respondent's PEW fell below the standard to be expected of an electrical worker.
- [34] The findings under section 143(f) of the Act related to the provision of false or misleading returns. 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 irrelevant⁹.
- [35] 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. In each instance, the certification was, as set out in the Notice of Proceeding, either false or misleading, and it certified work as being lawfully completed and safe to connect when it was not.

Penalty, Costs and Publication

- [36] 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.
- [37] The Respondent made submissions at the hearing as regards penalty, costs and publication.

Penalty

- [38] 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.¹⁰ It is not a formulaic exercise, but there are established underlying principles that the Board should take into consideration. They include:¹¹

- (a) protection of the public and consideration of the purposes of the Act;¹²
- (b) deterring other Licensed Building Practitioners from similar offending;¹³

⁹ *Taylor Bros Ltd v Taylor Group Ltd* [1988] 2 NZLR 1

¹⁰ *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]

¹¹ Cited with approval in *Robinson v Complaints Assessment Committee of Teaching Council of Aotearoa New Zealand* [2022] NZCA 350 at [28] and [29]

¹² Section 3 Building Act

¹³ *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

- (c) setting and enforcing a high standard of conduct for the industry;¹⁴
 - (d) penalising wrongdoing;¹⁵ and
 - (e) rehabilitation (where appropriate).¹⁶
- [39] 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 cases¹⁷ and applying the least restrictive penalty available for the particular offending.¹⁸ In all, the Board should be looking to impose a fair, reasonable, and proportionate penalty¹⁹ that is consistent with other penalties imposed by the Board for comparable offending.²⁰
- [40] 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.²¹
- [41] The disciplinary offending was serious. A commensurate penalty is required. The Board's starting point is that the Respondent's licence be suspended under section 147M(1)(b) of the Act.
- [42] The Board notes that the Respondent has been subject to a prolonged period of suspension, and, whilst the suspension was modified so that the Respondent could continue to carry out PEW with restrictions in place, it has had an impact on him. The Board has also taken into account the manner in which this matter has been dealt with and the Respondent's expression of remorse. The Board has also noted the Respondent's desire to undertake training and development.
- [43] Given those factors, the Board decided that the suspension would be lifted once the Respondent has attended and successfully completed a specified course of training (section 147M(1)(b)(ii) of the Act).
- [44] The training is ordered under section 147M(2) of the Act. The specific training is that the Respondent is to attend and pass, to the satisfaction of the tutor, a practical course of instruction on verification by inspecting and testing with an emphasis on AS/NZS3000 Section 8 and AS/NZS3017. Once the course has been successfully completed, written confirmation from the tutor specifically stating that the Respondent is competent is to be sent to the Board. Once received, the Board will lift the interim suspension.

¹⁴ *Dentice v Valuers Registration Board* [1992] 1 NZLR 720 (HC) at 724

¹⁵ *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee* HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818, 13 August 2007 at p 27

¹⁶ *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

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

¹⁸ *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee* HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818

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

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

²¹ 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.

Costs

[45] 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.

[46] 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 case²².

[47] In *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand*,²³ 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.

[48] In *Kenneth Michael Daniels v Complaints Committee 2 of the Wellington District Law Society*,²⁴ 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.

[49] 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 moderate. Adjustments based on the High Court decisions above are then made.

[50] 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, the Board took into account that the Respondent had agreed to the matter proceeding by way of an Agreed Statement of Facts.

²² *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.

²³ [2001] NZAR 74

²⁴ CIV-2011-485-000227 8 August 2011

Publication

- [51] 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 Act²⁵. 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.
- [52] 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.
- [53] Within New Zealand, there is a principle of open justice and open reporting which is enshrined in the Bill of Rights Act 1990²⁶. The Criminal Procedure Act 2011 sets out grounds for suppression within the criminal jurisdiction²⁷. Within the disciplinary hearing jurisdiction, the courts have stated that the provisions in the Criminal Procedure Act do not apply but can be instructive²⁸. 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*²⁹.
- [54] 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 interest³⁰. 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.
- [55] 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.
- [56] 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.

²⁵ Refer sections 128 of the Act

²⁶ Section 14 of the Act

²⁷ Refer sections 200 and 202 of the Criminal Procedure Act

²⁸ *N v Professional Conduct Committee of Medical Council* [2014] NZAR 350

²⁹ *ibid*

³⁰ *Kewene v Professional Conduct Committee of the Dental Council* [2013] NZAR 1055

Penalty, Costs and Publication Orders

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

Penalty: Pursuant to section 147M(1)(b)(ii) of the Electricity Act 1992, the Respondent's licence is suspended until he completes Board ordered training ordered under section 147M(2) of the Act as set out in this decision.

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.


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.

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

Right of Appeal

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

Signed and dated this 28th day of August 2023



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.

