

**IN THE EMPLOYMENT COURT OF NEW ZEALAND
AUCKLAND**

**I TE KŌTI TAKE MAHI O AOTEAROA
TĀMAKI MAKĀURAU**

**[2023] NZEmpC 171
EMPC 275/2023**

IN THE MATTER OF	a challenge to a determination of the Employment Relations Authority
BETWEEN	E TŪ INCORPORATED Plaintiff
AND	SHER SINGH Defendant

Hearing: On the papers

Appearances: S Mitchell KC, counsel for plaintiff
D Fleming, counsel for defendant

Judgment: 4 October 2023

**JUDGMENT OF CHIEF JUDGE CHRISTINA INGLIS
(Recall)**

[1] It has been drawn to the attention of the Court that inadvertent errors are contained in the Court's interlocutory judgment (made by consent) granting a stay of execution.¹ Minor alterations should be made to the sums referred to at [1]² and [3](a),³ and deleting reference to the orders made by the Employment Relations Authority at [2].

[2] It is well established that the Court has power to deal with obvious errors of this kind. It does so by applying the slip rule described in r 11.10 of the High Court

¹ *E Tū Inc v Singh* [2023] NZEmpC 155.

² The correct sum is \$32,270.56 not \$20,000 lost wages and \$5,000 not \$3,000 costs.

³ The correct sum is \$44,827.54, per counsels' consent memorandum filed on 29 September 2023, at [5].

Rules 2016, via reg 6 of the Employment Court Regulations.⁴ The nature of the slips in this case and the reasons underlying them, are set out in a joint memorandum of counsel and supporting affidavit.

[3] I am satisfied that it is appropriate to correct the judgment as sought by counsel, and I have today reissued the corrected judgment to reflect the Court's intentions.

Christina Inglis
Chief Judge

Judgment signed at 1.15 pm on 4 October 2023

⁴ *Snowden v Radio New Zealand Ltd* [2013] NZEmpC 91 at [7]-[8] and *Muldoon v Nelson Marlborough District Health Board* [2011] NZEmpC 115 at [12].