

Under the Employment Relations Act 2000

**BEFORE THE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AUTHORITY
AUCKLAND OFFICE**

BETWEEN Nadine Sprung (Applicant)
AND Khan Marjan Limited (Respondent)
REPRESENTATIVES Greg Peploe, Advocate for Applicant
Sardar Taher, Advocate for Respondent
MEMBER OF AUTHORITY R A Monaghan
MEMORANDUM RECEIVED 28 November 2001
DATE OF DETERMINATION 19 December 2001

DETERMINATION OF THE AUTHORITY

In a determination dated 14 November 2001 I concluded that Ms Sprung had a personal grievance on the ground that she had been dismissed without the notice to which she was entitled. I awarded the sum of \$500 in respect of the notice not given, and a further \$500 as compensation under s 123(c)(i) of the Employment Relations Act. In the determination I allowed the employer an opportunity to respond to the advocate for the applicant's submissions on costs which were presented at the investigation meeting.

Mr Taher, for the respondent, has submitted that an appropriate award should not exceed \$500. He pointed to the fact that the investigation meeting lasted only half a day, and that the respondent's arguments had prevailed with the exception of the narrow ground on which the determination was made.

These submissions have merit, and I order that the respondent contribute to the applicant's costs in the sum of \$500.

R A Monaghan
Member, Employment Relations Authority