

**IN THE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AUTHORITY  
CHRISTCHURCH**

[2011] NZERA Christchurch 135  
5150309

BETWEEN                    CONAL ROYCE WATTAM  
   Applicant  
  
A N D                        VINE-TECH CONTRACTING  
   LIMITED  
   Respondent

Member of Authority:     M B Loftus  
  
Representatives:         Mary Flannery, Counsel for the Applicant  
   Diana Hudson, Counsel for the Respondent  
  
Submissions received:    19 August 2011 from the Applicant  
   31 August 2011 from the Respondent  
  
Determination:            14 September 2011

---

**COSTS DETERMINATION OF THE AUTHORITY**

---

[1]     In a determination dated 21 July 2011 I upheld Mr Wattam's claim that he had been unjustifiably dismissed by Vine-Tech Contracting Limited.

[2]     The issue of costs was reserved with Mr Wattam, as the successful party, being advised that if he wished to seek a contribution toward his costs, he should do so via a written application. He does.

[3]     Mr Wattam seeks the sum of \$4,777.75, along with a further \$359.89 as recompense of disbursements.

[4]     This is the total sum incurred after deducting the amount spent on counsel's attendance at mediation which he accepts is not claimable (refer *Trotter v Telecom Corp of NZ Ltd* [1993] 2 ERNZ 935, 937). It does, however, include counsel's attendance at the meeting at which Mr Wattam was dismissed, along with disbursements incurred prior to filing in the Authority. Neither of these may be recompensible given the principles enunciated in *Trotter v Telecom*. The costs incurred since filing amount to \$3,100 plus GST and disbursements of \$285.13.

[5] In support of the application it is noted that Counsel spent some 17 hours on the matter and submitted that that was realistic and reasonable in the circumstances.

[6] Vine-Tech acknowledges some liability given Mr Wattam's success but contends that its contribution should be small. In support of that view it is submitted that the amount sought is excessive given what was approximately a half day hearing with only one witness. It is further submitted that the claim lacks specificity and that a lot of the preparation would have been necessary for the mediation and is not, therefore, claimable.

[7] Normally the Authority will assess costs on a daily tariff basis: refer *PBO Ltd (formerly Rush Security Ltd) v Da Cruz* [2005] ERNZ 808. In assessing that tariff a common starting point is \$3,000 per day: refer *Chief Executive of the Department of Corrections v Tawhiwhirangi (No 2)* [2008] ERNZ 73. From that point adjustment may be made depending on the circumstances.

[8] As was indicated above, the hearing took approximately half a day. Applying *Da Cruz* and *Tawhiwhirangi (No 2)* the award would be \$1,500.

[9] While Mr Wattam states that he relies on the principles referred to in *PBO v Da Cruz* there is no argument as to why I should deviate from the normal daily tariff other than the assertion that the costs incurred were reasonable. That is not, in my view, an argument that sways me toward accepting what is, given the concession that costs attributable to mediation are irrecoverable, a claim for full solicitor / client costs.

[10] Conversely there is little argued in support of a reduced tariff other than the lack of specificity. Applying the accepted principles and rates nullifies that argument.

[11] Given the above, I consider it appropriate to order Vine-Tech to pay Mr Wattam the sum of \$1,500 (fifteen hundred dollars) as a contribution toward his costs.

Mike Loftus  
Member of the Employment Relations Authority