



Employment Court of New Zealand

You are here: [NZLII](#) >> [Databases](#) >> [Employment Court of New Zealand](#) >> [2025](#) >> [\[2025\] NZEmpC 33](#)

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

Vegepod NZ Limited v Lowe [2025] NZEmpC 33 (4 March 2025)

Last Updated: 11 March 2025

IN THE EMPLOYMENT COURT OF NEW ZEALAND AUCKLAND

I TE KŌTI TAKE MAHI O AOTEAROA
TĀMAKI MAKĀURAU

[\[2025\] NZEmpC 33](#)
EMPC 90/2025

IN THE MATTER OF	a challenge to a determination of the Employment Relations Authority
AND IN THE MATTER OF	an application for a stay of execution
BETWEEN	VEGEPOD NZ LIMITED Plaintiff
AND	ANDREW LOWE First Defendant
AND	LISA LOWE Second Defendant

Hearing: On the papers
Appearances: M O'Brien, counsel for plaintiff
S Mitchell KC, counsel for defendants
Judgment: 4 March 2025

INTERLOCUTORY JUDGMENT OF CHIEF JUDGE CHRISTINA INGLIS

(Application for a stay of execution)

[1] The plaintiff has filed a challenge to a determination of the Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) ordering the defendants be reinstated on an interim basis pending the outcome of their personal grievance claims for unjustified dismissal.¹ The Authority ordered that reinstatement was to be initially to the payroll

¹ *Lowe v Vegepod NZ Ltd* [\[2025\] NZERA 109](#) (Member Kennedy-Martin).

VEGEPOD NZ LIMITED v ANDREW LOWE [\[2025\] NZEmpC 33](#) [4 March 2025]

for a period of two weeks to enable the parties to make arrangements for a return to the workplace until further order of the Authority or the Court.²

[2] The plaintiff applied to the Court for urgency in respect of their challenge and filed a parallel application for a partial stay of the Authority's orders pending the outcome of the challenge.

[3] In light of the circumstances, including the timeframe within which the Authority's orders were to take effect and the fact that reinstatement was at issue, I ordered the challenge be accorded urgency.³

[4] The parties have since filed a joint memorandum seeking orders, by consent. I am satisfied that it is appropriate to make

the orders sought. I accordingly make an order staying execution of that part of the Authority's determination directing that the defendants be returned to the plaintiff's workplace as of 6 March 2025. For the avoidance of doubt, that part of the Authority's order requiring that the defendants be reinstated to the payroll is not subject to the stay order.

[5] The defendants should advise the Court promptly as to whether they are agreeable to the timetabling directions sought by the plaintiff in the memorandum of counsel dated 3 March 2025. Otherwise, a telephone conference should be scheduled at the first available time to progress the challenge on an urgent basis.

[6] Costs are reserved.

Christina Inglis Chief Judge

Judgment signed at 11.45 am on 4 March 2025

2 At [108].

3 *Vegepod NZ Ltd v Lowe* EMPC 90/2025, 3 March 2025.

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

URL: <http://www.nzlii.org/nz/cases/NZEmpC/2025/33.html>