



Employment Court of New Zealand

You are here: [NZLII](#) >> [Databases](#) >> [Employment Court of New Zealand](#) >> [2022](#) >> [2022] NZEmpC 148

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

Pilgrim v Attorney-General [2022] NZEmpC 148 (19 August 2022)

Last Updated: 24 August 2022

IN THE EMPLOYMENT COURT OF NEW ZEALAND CHRISTCHURCH

I TE KŌTI TAKE MAHI O AOTEAROA
ŌTAUTAHI

[\[2022\] NZEmpC 148](#)
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 for in-Court media
coverage

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, FERVENT
STEDFAST, ENOCH UPRIGHT,
SAMUEL VALOR, FAITHFUL
PILGRIM, NOAH HOPEFUL AND
STEPHEN STANDFAST
Second Defendants

Hearing: On the papers

Appearances: B P Henry, D Gates and S Patterson, counsel for plaintiffs
J Catran and A Piaggi, counsel for first defendant
P Skelton QC, S G Wilson, J Hurren and H Rossie, counsel
for second defendants
R Kirkness, counsel to assist the Court

Judgment: 19 August 2022

SERENITY PILGRIM, ANNA COURAGE, ROSE STANDTRUE, CRYSTAL LOYAL, PEARL VALOR AND VIRGINIA COURAGE v THE
ATTORNEY-GENERAL SUED ON BEHALF OF THE MINISTRY OF BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND EMPLOYMENT, LABOUR INSPECTORATE
[\[2022\] NZEmpC 148](#) [19

August 2022]

INTERLOCUTORY JUDGMENT (NO 9) OF CHIEF JUDGE CHRISTINA INGLIS

(Application for in-Court media coverage)

[1] An application has been made by NZME to film, record sound and take photographs during the hearing of these proceedings. The application was drawn to the attention of the parties. The plaintiffs have no objection to the application; the second defendants advise that they abide the decision of the Court. The first defendant has not advised a position on the application and I infer is content to abide the decision of the Court.

[2] Court proceedings are generally open to the public and the media. There are, however, restrictions on taking notes, filming and recording in Court. Anyone wishing to do so must obtain prior judicial permission. That permission involves the exercise of a broad discretion.

[3] The In-Court Media Guidelines 2016 (Media Guidelines) have been developed to assist.¹ Those guidelines set out a number of principles which are relevant. The key underlying principle is the promotion of open justice. Other principles must also be weighed in the mix, including the need for a fair trial; the principle that the media has an important role in the reporting of trials as the “eyes and ears of the public”; and the interests, reasonable concerns and perceptions of the parties and witnesses.

[4] These proceedings plainly involve matters of significant public interest. Having regard to the matters set out in the Guidelines, and the position adopted by the parties, I am satisfied that it is appropriate to grant the application subject to the standard conditions (which the applicant has agreed to comply with). It should be noted that the Guidelines anticipate one camera only in Court.² No doubt this is an issue which can be dealt with by the applicant and others on an agreed basis.

1 Ministry of Justice “10.8 In Court Media Guidelines 2016” <justice.govt.nz>.

2 At sch 1(1).

[5] The application is granted subject to the standard conditions and any further order of the Court.

Christina Inglis Chief Judge

Judgment signed at 4.05 pm on 19 August 2022

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

URL: <http://www.nzlii.org/nz/cases/NZEmpC/2022/148.html>