



New Zealand Employment Relations Authority Decisions

You are here: [NZLII](#) >> [Databases](#) >> [New Zealand Employment Relations Authority Decisions](#) >> [2017](#) >> [2017] NZERA 2048

[Database Search](#) | [Name Search](#) | [Recent Decisions](#) | [Noteup](#) | [LawCite](#) | [Download](#) | [Help](#)

**Jury v Efficient Lighting Technology Limited (Wellington) [2017] NZERA 2048;
[2017] NZERA Wellington 48 (12 June 2017)**

New Zealand Employment Relations Authority

[\[Index\]](#) [\[Search\]](#) [\[Download\]](#) [\[Help\]](#)

**Jury v Efficient Lighting Technology Limited (Wellington) [2017] NZERA 2048
(12 June 2017); [2017] NZERA Wellington 48**

Last Updated: 24 June 2017

IN THE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AUTHORITY WELLINGTON

[2017] NZERA Wellington 48
3000203

BETWEEN MORRIS JURY BRENDAN LAUGHTON MELISSA DEN HOLLANDER and EMMET MCATEER Applicants

A N D EFFICIENT LIGHTING TECHNOLOGY LIMITED First Respondent

HAROLD LEAUPEPE Second Respondent

Member of Authority: T G Tetitaha

Representatives: B Larcy, Counsel for Applicants

G Denholm, Counsel for Respondents

Investigation Meeting: On the papers

Submissions: 12 April and 3 May 2017 from Applicant

20 April from Second R3espondent

Date of Determination: 12 June 2017

COSTS DETERMINATION OF THE AUTHORITY

A. Given his conduct, I decline to grant costs to Mr Leaupepe.

B. Efficient Lighting Technology Limited is ordered to pay to the applicants \$4,500 towards their legal costs.

Employment relationship problem

[1] The Authority in its substantive determination dated 6 April 2017¹ dismissed the application against the Second Respondent, Harold Leaupepe and made orders for

payment of wage arrears and penalties against the First Respondent.

¹ *Morris Jury & Ors v Efficient Lighting Technology Ltd & Anor* [2017] NZERA Wellington

[2] The applicants seek costs at the Authority's daily costs tariff of \$4,500. The second respondent also seeks costs of \$6,850.00. Neither party has provided evidence about their actual costs.

What is the starting point for assessing costs?

[3] In the Authority there is a daily tariff based approach to costs.² The current notional daily tariff is \$4,500 per hearing day. This matter involved a one day investigation meeting. The starting point for assessing costs is therefore \$4,500.

Are there any factors that warrant adjusting the notional daily tariff?

[4] There was conduct by Mr Leaupepe that unnecessarily increased costs. This included:

a) Failure to attend 1 February 2017 telephone conference;

b) Failure to file evidence as directed;

c) Late filing of evidence on the eve of the hearing;

d) Unnecessarily disputing holiday pay owed to Mr McAteer;

e) Non-attendance in person at hearing;

f) Late notice of his non-attendance in person at hearing resulting in an unnecessary telephone conference and time wasted in travelling to video conferencing facilities; and

g) A late application for Mr Leaupepe to give oral evidence in lieu of any written evidence.

[5] Given his conduct, I decline to grant costs to Mr Leaupepe.

[6] There is no basis to make any adjustment to the costs sought by the applicants against the First Respondent.

24.

2 *Mattingly v Strata Title Managment Ltd* [2014] NZEMPC 15 at [16]

[7] Efficient Lighting Technology Limited is ordered to pay to the applicants

\$4,500 towards their legal costs.

TG Tetitaha

Member of the Employment Relations Authority

NZLII: [Copyright Policy](#) | [Disclaimers](#) | [Privacy Policy](#) | [Feedback](#)

URL: <http://www.nzlii.org/nz/cases/NZERA/2017/2048.html>