



Employment Court of New Zealand

You are here: [NZLII](#) >> [Databases](#) >> [Employment Court of New Zealand](#) >> [2017](#) >> [2017] NZEmpC 16

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

Thomson v Arrow Linemarking Limited [2017] NZEmpC 16 (23 February 2017)

Last Updated: 27 February 2017

IN THE EMPLOYMENT COURT AUCKLAND

[\[2017\] NZEmpC 16](#)

EMPC 250/2016

IN THE MATTER OF a challenge to a determination of
 the
 Employment Relations Authority

BETWEEN ROSS THOMSON Plaintiff

AND ARROW LINEMARKING LIMITED
 Defendant

Appearances: E Burke, counsel for plaintiff
 S Scott, counsel for
 defendant

Judgment: 23 February 2017

CONSENT JUDGMENT OF JUDGE M E PERKINS

[1] These proceedings involved a non-de novo challenge to an oral determination of the Employment Relations Authority dated 1 July 2016,¹ and a further written determination of the Authority dated 31 August 2016.²

[2] The parties have now resolved all issues between them arising from those determinations. The terms and conditions of the settlement are in full and final settlement of the non-de novo challenge and are to remain confidential to the parties.

[3] Pursuant to [s 183\(2\)](#) of the [Employment Relations Act 2000](#) (the Act), and by consent, those parts of the determinations which were subject to the non-de novo

challenge are set aside.

1. *Thomson v Arrow Line Marking Ltd* [2016] NZERA Auckland 218 (the July 2016 determination).
2. *Thomson v Arrow Line Marking Ltd* [2016] NZERA Auckland 218 (the August 2016 determination).

ROSS THOMSON v ARROW LINEMARKING LIMITED NZEmpC AUCKLAND [\[2017\] NZEmpC 16](#) [23

February 2017]

[4] The terms of settlement, being confidential to the parties, are subject to an order prohibiting publication pursuant to cl 12(2) of sch 3 to the Act.

[5] There are no issues as to costs.

ME Perkins

Judge

Judgment signed at 9.15 am on 23 February 2017
