



# Employment Court of New Zealand

You are here: [NZLII](#) >> [Databases](#) >> [Employment Court of New Zealand](#) >> [2017](#) >> [\[2017\] NZEmpC 59](#)

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

---

## Y Limited v X [2017] NZEmpC 59 (18 May 2017)

Last Updated: 22 May 2017

### IN THE EMPLOYMENT COURT CHRISTCHURCH

#### [\[2017\] NZEmpC 59](#)

EMPC 181/2016

IN THE MATTER OF      a challenge to a determination of the  
Employment Relations Authority

AND IN THE MATTER    of an application by the defendant to  
vary non-publication orders

BETWEEN                Y LIMITED Plaintiff

AND                        MS X Defendant

Hearing:                On the papers filed on 19 and 24 April, and 9 May  
2017

Appearances:        No appearance for plaintiff  
P Tucker, counsel for defendant

Judgment:            18 May 2017

### JUDGMENT (NO 2) OF JUDGE K G SMITH

#### Introduction

[1] Ms X has applied to vary a non-publication order made as part of a consent judgment granted by me on 8 November 2016.<sup>1</sup>

[2] In that judgment I ordered as follows:

a) Pursuant to [s 183\(2\)](#) of the [Employment Relations Act 2000](#) (the Act), and by consent, the determination of the Employment Relations Authority is set aside.

b) It is acknowledged that each party acted in good faith at all times.

<sup>1</sup> *Y Ltd v Ms X* [\[2016\] NZEmpC 146](#).

Y LIMITED v MS X NZEmpC CHRISTCHURCH [\[2017\] NZEmpC 59](#) [18 May 2017]

c) The remaining terms of settlement between the parties are recorded in a confidential settlement agreement, which I direct is now the subject of an order for non-publication pursuant to cl 12(2) of Sch 3 of the Act.

d) There will be an order prohibiting from publication the names of the parties and any information that may lead to the identification of them.

[3] What has necessitated this application is that Ms X has issued proceedings in the High Court seeking to liquidate Y Ltd following a failure by that company to pay her as required by the agreement reached at the settlement conference as referred to in the judgment.<sup>2</sup>

#### Discussion

[4] This application has been served on the company. On 28 April 2017 I issued a Minute to the parties, in which Y Ltd was required to

take steps, no later than 4

May 2017, if it intended to oppose the application. No steps have been taken by the company.

[5] An absolute requirement of liquidation proceedings in the High Court is that public notice has to be given of the application.<sup>3</sup> Ms X is concerned that publicly notifying those proceedings is prevented because of the order for non-publication.

[6] Ms Tucker, counsel for Ms X, has filed submissions in support of this application. She submitted that the parties cannot have intended the non-publication order to be a barrier to prevent recovery of the amount agreed in settlement. While the parties requested judgment by consent to facilitate their settlement, including non-publication of their names and the terms of settlement, by oversight they did not turn their attention to potential complications if enforcement or recovery action was required.

[7] Ms Tucker's next submission was that the Court retains its ability to vary the non-publication order by exercising the equity and good conscience jurisdiction in s

189(1) of the [Employment Relations Act 2000](#) (the Act). She also submitted that, if

<sup>2</sup> At [3].

<sup>3</sup> High Court Rules, r 31.9.

necessary, that jurisdiction extended so far as to reinstating or recalling the proceeding so that this application could be considered.<sup>4</sup>

[8] I agree that the interests of justice would not be served if the non-publication order could have an unintended consequence of preventing recovery action to obtain the agreed settlement; at least one aspect of that order only came about because of the settlement now being enforced. I accept Ms Tucker's proposition that there ought to be no technical barrier to initiating recovery proceedings caused by the non- publication order in those circumstances.

[9] I am satisfied that s 189 of the Act is sufficiently broadly drafted that it enables me to grant this application to facilitate recovery proceedings. Had it been necessary I would have granted this application relying on the slip rule in r 11.10 of the High Court Rules.<sup>5</sup> While I have decided to grant the application, this judgment remains anonymised to allow for the possibility that payment may be made before public notice of the liquidation proceeding is given.

[10] I consider the best course of action, to enable Ms X to take whatever steps she considers appropriate, is to amend the orders contained in [3](c) and (d) of the judgment so that those orders do not apply to public notification of liquidation proceedings, or to any other recovery proceedings that Ms X may take. Leave is reserved to apply to seek further or other orders if required.

[11] Orders are made accordingly. [12] Costs are reserved.

KG Smith

Judge

Judgment signed at 2.30 pm on 18 May 2017

<sup>4</sup> Relying on such cases as *Wellington and Taranaki Caretakers, Cleaners, Lift Attendants and Watchmen's IUOW v St Mark's School* [1983] ACJ 825 (AC).

<sup>5</sup> Relying on [Employment Court Regulations 2000](#), reg 6.

---

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

URL: <http://www.nzlii.org/nz/cases/NZEmpC/2017/59.html>