



[6] There are, however, three factors which would warrant an increase in the tariff. They are:

- a. The investigation meeting should have taken longer and had to be prepared for accordingly. Its truncation was attributable to Mr Bennetts failure to participate meaningfully;
- b. Mr Bennetts' conduct prior to the investigation saw A's advocate required to devote time that would not normally be expected. This, in turn, added to A's costs and should be recognised; and
- c. Mr Bennetts refused to address A's claims in good faith during the investigation meeting and it is inevitable his conduct would see the tariff increased.

[7] Having balanced the competing factors, and in the absence of a contrary argument, I conclude the amount sought is reasonable.

[8] For the above reasons I order Mr Aaron Bennetts pay the applicant, A, \$3,500 (three thousand, five hundred dollars) as a contribution toward costs. This is in addition to the amounts already awarded in the substantive determination.

M B Loftus  
Member of the Employment Relations Authority