



Employment Court of New Zealand

You are here: [NZLII](#) >> [Databases](#) >> [Employment Court of New Zealand](#) >> [2023](#) >> [\[2023\] NZEmpC 21](#)

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

Pilgrim v Attorney-General [2023] NZEmpC 21 (21 February 2023)

Last Updated: 27 February 2023

IN THE EMPLOYMENT COURT OF NEW ZEALAND CHRISTCHURCH

I TE KŌTI TAKE MAHI O AOTEAROA
ŌTAUTAHI

[\[2023\] NZEmpC 21](#)
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 recall of judgment

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
STANDBAST
Second Defendants

Hearing: On the papers

Appearances: BP Henry, D Gates and S Patterson, counsel for plaintiffs
J Catran, K Sagaga and A Piaggi, counsel for first
defendant
S Valor and P Righteous, representatives for second
defendants R Kirkness, counsel to assist the Court
RK Stewart, counsel for RNZ

Judgment: 21 February 2023

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 [\[2023\] NZEmpC 21](#) [21

February 2023]

INTERLOCUTORY JUDGMENT (NO 26) OF CHIEF JUDGE CHRISTINA INGLIS

(Application for recall of judgment)

[1] This judgment resolves the second defendants' application for a recall of the Court's judgment dated 16 February 2023.¹ In that judgment, I partly allowed an application made by RNZ to attend a site visit to the Gloriavale premises, make limited sound recordings and take still photographs.

[2] The second defendants submit that the Court proceeded on an erroneous assumption, namely that it did not understand any party to dispute the existence of a power to make the orders sought and accepted that the Court had a discretion to allow media to attend the site visit. The second defendants say that this was mistaken, and that they did raise the question of a lack of power and the Court failed to address that issue. It is submitted that, because it would be contrary to the interests of justice and the rule of law to allow ultra vires orders to stand, justice requires the judgment to be recalled.

[3] Rule 11.9 of the [High Court Rules 2016](#) allows for High Court judgments to be recalled at any time before they are sealed. The Employment Court too can recall its judgments.²

[4] Generally speaking, and subject to rights of appeal, a judgment once delivered must stand for better or worse. A decision to recall will only be made in exceptional circumstances.³ This reflects the importance of finality in litigation to the administration of justice.⁴ There are three established categories of cases in which a judgment may be recalled:⁵

1 *Pilgrim v Attorney-General (No 24)* [\[2023\] NZEmpC 15](#).

2. See for example *Waikato District Health Board v New Zealand Nurses Organisation* [\[2017\] NZCA 247](#); *Gilbert v Attorney-General* [\[2006\] NZEmpC 13](#); [\[2006\] ERNZ 1](#).

3 *S (SC 39/2017) v R* [\[2022\] NZSC 7](#) at [\[3\]](#).

4 *Alkazaz v Enterprise IT Ltd (No 11)* [\[2022\] NZEmpC 15](#) at [\[2\]](#).

5 *Horowhenua County v Nash (No 2)* [\[1968\] NZLR 632 \(SC\)](#).

(a) where, since the hearing, there has been an amendment to a relevant statute or regulation or a new judicial decision of relevance and high authority;

(b) where counsel have failed to direct the Court's attention to a legislative provision or authoritative decision of plain relevance; and

(c) where for some other very special reason of justice requires that the judgment be recalled.

[5] The second defendants submit that the circumstances of this case bring it within the third category. As the authorities make clear, the third category is narrow,⁶ and cases appropriate for recall on this basis are rare. Beyond that, the Court's decision is discretionary. That discretion is exercised on a case-by-case basis, ultimately depending on the interests of justice.

[6] It has been recognised that failure to consider an issue may constitute a very special reason requiring a recall.⁷ However, there is no basis for recall in cases where the Court has considered an issue but has decided either not to deal with it, or to deal with it on a narrower basis than argued. Further, the Court is not obliged in its reasons for judgment to discuss every aspect of argument.⁸ And where a party considers that the Court has got the law wrong, for example by exercising a power that it does not possess, it may seek to challenge that decision via the appeal pathway.⁹

[7] I do not consider the judgment reflects a failure to consider an issue. Reference was made to the Court's powers under [s 82](#) of the [Evidence Act 2006](#) and the In-Court Media Guidelines.¹⁰ It was determined that the Court had jurisdiction to allow the media to attend and that it was appropriate, in the circumstances, to do so subject to a number of conditions. The judgment referred to an understanding that no party was

6 *Zhang v Yu* [\[2020\] NZCA 592](#) at [\[9\]](#).

7. *Brake v Boote* [\[1991\] NZHC 1484](#); [\(1991\) 4 PRNZ 86 \(HC\)](#); *Waikato District Health Board v New Zealand Nurses Organisation* [\[2017\] NZCA 247](#), [\[2017\] ERNZ 378](#) at [\[55\]](#).

8. *Lusty v Thorburn* [\[2021\] NZHC 2045](#) at [\[6\]](#); citing *R v Nakhla (No 2)* [\[1974\] 1 NZLR 453 \(CA\)](#) at 456

9 [Employment Relations Act 2000](#), s 214.

10 *Pilgrim*, above n 1, at [\[4\]](#)-[\[5\]](#).

contending the Court did not have the power to allow media to attend the site visit.¹¹ To the extent that this was a misunderstanding of the second defendants' position, I do not consider that it amounts to the sort of special circumstance that would justify recall of the judgment.

[8] The application for recall is accordingly declined.

[9] Costs are reserved.

Christina Inglis Chief Judge

Judgment signed at 1.40 pm on 21 February 2023

11 At [4].

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

URL: <http://www.nzlii.org/nz/cases/NZEmpC/2023/21.html>