

**IN THE EMPLOYMENT COURT OF NEW ZEALAND  
CHRISTCHURCH**

**I TE KŌTI TAKE MAHI O AOTEAROA  
ŌTAUTAHI**

**[2026] NZEmpC 24  
EMPC 363/2021**

IN THE MATTER OF	a declaration under s 6(5) of the Employment Relations Act 2000
AND IN THE MATTER OF	an application to access Court documents
BETWEEN	HOSEA COURAGE, DANIEL PILGRIM AND LEVI COURAGE Plaintiffs
AND	THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL SUED ON BEHALF OF THE MINISTRY OF BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND EMPLOYMENT, LABOUR INSPECTORATE First Defendant
AND	HOWARD TEMPLE, FERVENT STEDFAST, ENOCH UPRIGHT, SAMUEL VALOR, FAITHFUL PILGRIM, NOAH HOPEFUL AND STEPHEN STANDFAST Second Defendants
AND	FOREST GOLD HONEY LIMITED AND HARVEST HONEY LIMITED Third Defendants
AND	APETIZA LIMITED Fourth Defendant

**EMPC 85/2022**

IN THE MATTER OF	a declaration under s 6(5) of the Employment Relations Act 2000
AND IN THE MATTER OF	an application to access Court documents

BETWEEN

SERENITY PILGRIM, ANNA  
COURAGE, ROSE STANDTRUE,  
CRYSTAL LOYAL, PEARL VALOR  
AND VIRGINIA COURAGE  
Plaintiffs

AND

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL SUED  
ON BEHALF OF THE MINISTRY  
OF BUSINESS, INNOVATION  
AND EMPLOYMENT, LABOUR  
INSPECTORATE  
First Defendant

AND

HOWARD TEMPLE, SAMUEL  
VALOR, FAITHFUL PILGRIM,  
NOAH HOPEFUL AND STEPHEN  
STANDBAST  
Second Defendants

Hearing: On the papers

Appearances: K Elcoat, counsel for plaintiffs  
A Wicks, counsel for first defendant  
C Pearce, counsel for second defendants  
R Kirkness, counsel to assist the Court  
K McCallum on behalf of the applicant NHNZ Worldwide

Judgment: 12 February 2026

---

**INTERLOCUTORY JUDGMENT (NO 18) FOR EMPC 363/2021 AND  
(NO 39) FOR EMPC 85/2022 OF CHIEF JUDGE CHRISTINA INGLIS  
(Application to access Court documents)**

---

## **Introduction**

[1] An application to access Court documents has been made by Ms McCallum, Associate Producer of the Natural History Unit of Television New Zealand.

[2] The application is for copies of all suppression orders and judgments made in both the *Courage* and the *Pilgrim* proceedings (referred to as the “boys” and the “girls” cases).

## **Approach**

[3] The Employment Relations Act 2000 does not deal with access to documents held on the Court file, nor do the Employment Court Regulations 2000. It is, however, well accepted that the Court may grant access to documents held on the Court file, and has an inherent power to control the use of information disclosed in proceedings, where such control is necessary for the due administration of justice.

[4] A balancing exercise is required, including having regard to each party's interests. In undertaking the analysis, the Court has previously found it helpful to have regard to the approach set out in the Senior Courts (Access to Court Documents) Rules 2017 (the Rules).<sup>1</sup>

[5] The Rules are made under the Senior Courts Act 2016. Section 173 of that Act provides that “[a]ny person may have access to court information of a senior court to the extent provided by, and in accordance with, rules of court.” Schedule 2 provides that “court information” includes the formal court record, the court file, information relating to particular cases and electronic records of hearings. A person may ask to access any document under r 11 of the Rules.

[6] Rule 12 specifies a range of matters that must be considered when determining an application for access. These include the orderly and fair administration of justice and the protection of privacy interests. Rule 13 deals with the approach to balancing the matters to be considered under r 12.

## **Analysis and result**

[7] None of the parties oppose the application; they are each content to abide the decision of the Court.

[8] Access is sought to ensure compliance with orders of this Court and standards of the Broadcasting Standards Authority in the development of a documentary series

---

<sup>1</sup> Applied via reg 6 of the Employment Court Regulations 2000 and/or by way of helpful analogy.

on Gloriavale. I accept that providing access to the material sought is appropriate, having regard to the reasons underlying the request, and aligns with the interests of justice.

[9] There is accordingly an order permitting Ms McCallum, Associate Producer, access to copies of all suppression orders and judgments made in both the *Courage* and the *Pilgrim* proceedings.

[10] Finally, it should be noted, as counsel for the first defendant points out, that suppression orders have been made in criminal proceedings relating to Gloriavale; it will accordingly be necessary to ensure that any such orders are also complied with when considering publication of any reference to or allegation of criminal offending.

[11] No issue of costs arises.

Christina Inglis  
Chief Judge

Judgment signed at 9.45 am on 12 February 2026