



Employment Court of New Zealand

You are here: [NZLII](#) >> [Databases](#) >> [Employment Court of New Zealand](#) >> [2026](#) >> [2026] NZEmpC 24

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

Courage v Attorney-General [2026] NZEmpC 24 (12 February 2026)

Last Updated: 15 February 2026

IN THE EMPLOYMENT COURT OF NEW ZEALAND CHRISTCHURCH

I TE KŌTI TAKE MAHI O AOTEAROA
ŌTAUTAHI

[\[2026\] NZEmpC 24](#)
EMPC 363/2021

IN THE MATTER OF a declaration under [s 6\(5\)](#) of the
[Employment Relations Act 2000](#)

AND IN THE MATTER OF an application to access Court
documents

BETWEEN HOSEA COURAGE, DANIEL
PILGRIM AND LEVI COURAGE
Plaintiffs

AND THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL SUED
ON BEHALF OF THE MINISTRY OF
BUSINESS, INNOVATION AND
EMPLOYMENT, LABOUR
INSPECTORATE
First Defendant

AND HOWARD TEMPLE, FERVENT
STEDFAST, ENOCH UPRIGHT,
SAMUEL VALOR, FAITHFUL
PILGRIM, NOAH HOPEFUL AND
STEPHEN STANDFAST
Second Defendants

AND FOREST GOLD HONEY LIMITED
AND HARVEST HONEY LIMITED
Third Defendants

AND APETIZA LIMITED
Fourth Defendant

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 to access Court
documents

COURAGE, PILGRIM AND COURAGE v THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL SUED ON BEHALF OF THE MINISTRY OF BUSINESS, INNOVATION
AND EMPLOYMENT, LABOUR INSPECTORATE [2026]

NZEmpC 24 [12 February 2026]

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: K Elcoat, counsel for plaintiffs
A Wicks, counsel for first defendant
C Pearce, counsel for second defendants R Kirkness,
counsel to assist the Court
K McCallum on behalf of the applicant NHNZ
Worldwide
Judgment: 12 February 2026

INTERLOCUTORY JUDGMENT (NO 18) FOR EMPC 363/2021 AND (NO 39) FOR EMPC 85/2022 OF CHIEF JUDGE CHRISTINA INGLIS

(Application to access Court documents)

Introduction

[1] An application to access Court documents has been made by Ms McCallum, Associate Producer of the Natural History Unit of Television New Zealand.

[2] The application is for copies of all suppression orders and judgments made in both the *Courage* and the *Pilgrim* proceedings (referred to as the “boys” and the “girls” cases).

Approach

[3] The [Employment Relations Act 2000](#) does not deal with access to documents held on the Court file, nor do the [Employment Court Regulations 2000](#). It is, however, well accepted that the Court may grant access to documents held on the Court file, and has an inherent power to control the use of information disclosed in proceedings, where such control is necessary for the due administration of justice.

[4] A balancing exercise is required, including having regard to each party’s interests. In undertaking the analysis, the Court has previously found it helpful to have regard to the approach set out in the [Senior Courts \(Access to Court Documents\) Rules 2017](#) (the Rules).¹

[5] The Rules are made under the [Senior Courts Act 2016](#). [Section 173](#) of that Act provides that “[a]ny person may have access to court information of a senior court to the extent provided by, and in accordance with, rules of court.” Schedule 2 provides that “court information” includes the formal court record, the court file, information relating to particular cases and electronic records of hearings. A person may ask to access any document under r 11 of the Rules.

[6] Rule 12 specifies a range of matters that must be considered when determining an application for access. These include the orderly and fair administration of justice and the protection of privacy interests. Rule 13 deals with the approach to balancing the matters to be considered under r 12.

Analysis and result

[7] None of the parties oppose the application; they are each content to abide the decision of the Court.

[8] Access is sought to ensure compliance with orders of this Court and standards of the Broadcasting Standards Authority in the development of a documentary series

¹ Applied via reg 6 of the [Employment Court Regulations 2000](#) and/or by way of helpful analogy.

on Gloriavale. I accept that providing access to the material sought is appropriate, having regard to the reasons underlying the request, and aligns with the interests of justice.

[9] There is accordingly an order permitting Ms McCallum, Associate Producer, access to copies of all suppression orders and judgments made in both the *Courage* and the *Pilgrim* proceedings.

[10] Finally, it should be noted, as counsel for the first defendant points out, that suppression orders have been made in criminal proceedings relating to Gloriavale; it will accordingly be necessary to ensure that any such orders are also complied with when considering publication of any reference to or allegation of criminal offending.

[11] No issue of costs arises.

Christina Inglis Chief Judge

Judgment signed at 9.45 am on 12 February 2026

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

URL: <http://www.nzlii.org/nz/cases/NZEmpC/2026/24.html>