



# Employment Court of New Zealand

You are here: [NZLII](#) >> [Databases](#) >> [Employment Court of New Zealand](#) >> [2022](#) >> [2022] NZEmpC 156

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

---

## Pilgrim v Attorney-General [2022] NZEmpC 156 (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 156](#)  
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, 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: 26 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 156](#) [26

August 2022]

INTERLOCUTORY JUDGMENT (NO 14) OF CHIEF JUDGE CHRISTINA INGLIS

(Application for in-Court media coverage)

[1] An application has been made by RNZ to film and take photographs during the hearing of these proceedings. The application has not been advanced within the usual timeframes, for reasons which are explained in the application form (essentially RNZ has only recently become aware that visual pool arrangements have been put in place involving other media organisations). The application is essentially one to extend an earlier approval made by the Court allowing for sound recording.<sup>1</sup>

[2] The application was drawn to the attention of the parties, with a conflated timeframe for response having regard to the impending hearing. The plaintiffs and second defendants abide the decision of the Court. The first defendant has not advised a position on the application (and I infer is not opposed to it).

[3] I am satisfied that it is appropriate to grant the application having regard to the principles set out in the In-Court Media Guidelines 2016 (Media Guidelines),<sup>2</sup> and it is an approach that is consistent with that adopted in respect of other similar applications in these proceedings. It should be noted that the Guidelines anticipate one camera only in Court.<sup>3</sup> This is an issue which can be dealt with by the applicant and others on an agreed basis.

[4] The application is accordingly granted subject to the standard conditions (which the applicant has agreed to comply with), and any further order of the Court.

Christina Inglis Chief Judge

Judgment signed at 3.10 pm on 26 August 2022

1 *Pilgrim v Attorney-General (No 8)* [2022] NZEmpC 147.

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

3 At sch 1(1).

---

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

URL: <http://www.nzlii.org/nz/cases/NZEmpC/2022/156.html>