



# Employment Court of New Zealand

You are here: [NZLII](#) >> [Databases](#) >> [Employment Court of New Zealand](#) >> [2022](#) >> [2022] NZEmpC 155

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

---

## Pilgrim v Attorney-General [2022] NZEmpC 155 (26 August 2022)

Last Updated: 26 August 2022

IN THE EMPLOYMENT COURT OF NEW ZEALAND CHRISTCHURCH

I TE KŌTI TAKE MAHI O AOTEAROA  
ŌTAUTAHI

[\[2022\] NZEmpC 155](#)  
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  
EMPLOYEMNT, LABOUR  
INSPECTORATE  
First Defendant  
AND HOWARD TEMPLE, SAMUEL VALOR,  
FAITHFUL PILGRIM, NOAH HOPEFUL  
AND STEPHEN STANDFAST  
Second Defendants

Hearing: On the papers  
Judgment: 26 August 2022

### INTERLOCUTORY JUDGMENT (NO 13) OF CHIEF JUDGE CHRISTINA INGLIS

(Application for in-Court media coverage)

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 EMPLOYEMNT, LABOUR INSPECTORATE  
[\[2022\] NZEmpC 155](#) [26

August 2022]

[1] An application has been made by Stuff Limited to film, video and take still photographs during the hearing of these proceedings. The application was drawn to the attention of the parties. The plaintiffs abide the decision of the Court; the first defendant does not take a position and the second defendants have not provided a response. I infer that they are content to abide the decision of the Court.

[2] The approach to applications such as this is well established. Court proceedings are generally open to the public and the media. There are, however, restrictions on filming and recording in Court.<sup>1</sup> 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.<sup>2</sup> 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, 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.<sup>3</sup> No doubt this is an issue which can be dealt with by the applicant and others on an agreed basis.

[5] For completeness, the applicant has also sought to view the hearing via VMR (Virtual Meeting Room). VMR is not an available option for these proceedings and this aspect of the application can accordingly be put to one side.

1 Note taking is allowed on pen and paper. See Courts of New Zealand “Note taking in court”

<courtsfnz.govt.nz>.

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

3 At sch 1(1).

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

Christina Inglis Chief Judge

Judgment signed at 12.15 pm on 26 August 2022

---

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

URL: <http://www.nzlii.org/nz/cases/NZEmpC/2022/155.html>