

**IN THE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AUTHORITY
CHRISTCHURCH**

**I TE RATONGA AHUMANA TAIMAHI
ŌTAUTAHI ROHE**

[2025] NZERA 420
3294299

BETWEEN	DHARAMJEET SINGH Applicant
AND	MAJESTYWOODS LIMITED First Respondent
AND	MAJESTY CARE NZ LIMITED Second Respondent
AND	NAVNEET DHIMAN Third Respondent
AND	RAMANPREET SINGH Fourth Respondent

Member of Authority:	Peter van Keulen
Representatives:	Maryline Suchley, advocate for the Applicant Ashleigh Fechny, advocate for the Respondent
Investigation Meeting:	On the papers
Submissions Received:	15 July 2025 from the Applicant No submissions from the Respondent
Date of Determination:	15 July 2025

COSTS DETERMINATION OF THE AUTHORITY

The substantive determination

[1] In a determination dated 4 July 2025, I found that Majestywoods Limited and Majesty Care NZ Limited acted unjustifiable in issuing Dharamjeet Singh with a written warning, and this caused a disadvantage to Mr Singh's employment, and they had unjustifiably dismissed

Mr Singh. I also found that Majestywoods and Majesty Care failed to pay Mr Singh the correct wage amount for all the hours that worked. I awarded Mr Singh various remedies.¹

[2] In my determination I reserved costs so that the parties could try to agree costs. The parties have been unable to agree and now Mr Singh has applied for costs.

Application for costs

[3] Mr Singh seeks an award of \$4,500 for costs based on a one-day investigation meeting.²

[4] Majestywoods and Majesty Care have not provided any submissions on costs; their advocate advised they would not be lodging any submissions as both companies were being liquidated.

Analysis

Costs in the Authority

[5] The power of the Authority to award costs is set out at clause 15 of Schedule 2 of the Employment Relations Act 2000 (the Act). The principles and approach adopted by the Authority in respect of this power are outlined in the Authority's practice note on costs.³

Costs for Mr Singh

[6] The starting point is that costs should follow the event. As the employment relationship problem was resolved in favour of Mr Singh he is entitled to an award of costs.

Applying the daily tariff

[7] There is no reason to depart from the normal practice of awarding costs based on the daily tariff.

¹ *Dharammeet Singh v Majestywoods limited & ors*[2025] NZERA 396.

² The normal practice of the Authority when setting costs is to apply a set amount for each day of the investigation meeting calculating quantum based on the time spent in the investigation meeting; this is applying the daily tariff.

³ For further information about the factors considered in assessing costs, see:

www.era.govt.nz/determinations/awarding-costs-remedies/#awarding-and-paying-costs-1.

[8] The investigation meeting took about an hour more than a half day investigation meeting. In the circumstances I consider that an award of two thirds of one day of the daily tariff is appropriate.

[9] The current rate for the daily tariff is \$4,500 for the first day of the Investigation Meeting so Mr Singh is entitled to an award of \$3,000.

Adjusting the daily tariff

[10] Mr Singh has not sought an adjustment to the daily tariff and there is no basis for an adjustment in any event.

Order

[11] Majestywoods and Majesty Care are to pay Mr Singh \$3,000 as a contribution to his costs in this matter.

Peter van Keulen
Member of the Employment Relations Authority