

Before the Building Practitioners Board

	BPB Complaint No. CB25294
Licensed Building Practitioner:	Christopher Barnett (the Respondent)
Licence Number:	BP 117536
Licence(s) Held:	Carpentry

Decision of the Board in Respect of the Conduct of a Licensed Building Practitioner Under section 315 of the Building Act 2004

Complaint or Board Inquiry	Complaint
Hearing Location	Auckland
Hearing Type:	On the Papers
Draft Decision Date:	5 March 2020
Final Decision Date:	11 May 2020

Board Members Present:

Mel Orange, Deputy Chair, Legal Member
Richard Merrifield, LBP, Carpentry and Site AOP 2 (Presiding)
David Fabish, LBP, Carpentry and Site AOP 2
Faye Pearson-Green, LBP Design AOP 2
Robin Dunlop, Retired Professional Engineer

Procedure:

The matter was considered by the Building Practitioners Board (the Board) under the provisions of Part 4 of the Building Act 2004 (the Act), the Building Practitioners (Complaints and Disciplinary Procedures) Regulations 2008 (the Complaints Regulations) and the Board's Complaints and Inquiry Procedures.

Board Decision:

The Respondent **has** committed a disciplinary offence under section 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act.

Contents

Introduction	2
Regulation 9 Decisions	2
Draft Decision Process	3
Disciplinary Offences Under Consideration	3
Function of Disciplinary Action	4
Evidence	5
Draft Conclusion and Reasoning	5
Draft Decision on Penalty, Costs and Publication	7
Penalty	7
Costs.....	8
Publication	8
Draft Section 318 Order	9
Submissions on Draft Decision	10
Request for In-Person Hearing	10
Submissions Made	10
Final Decision and Section 318 Order	11
Right of Appeal	12

Introduction

- [1] On 29 January 2020 the Board received a Registrar’s Report in respect of a complaint into the conduct of the Respondent.
- [2] Under regulation 10 of the Complaints Regulations the Board must, on receipt of the Registrar’s Report, decide whether to proceed no further with the complaint because regulation 9 of the Complaints Regulations applies.
- [3] Having received the report the Board decided that regulation 9 applied to aspects of the complaint but not to the allegation that the Respondent had failed to provide a record of work on completion of restricted building work under section 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act. Under regulation 10 the Board is required to hold a hearing in respect of that matter.

Regulation 9 Decisions

- [4] The complaint to the Board also contained allegations that the Respondent had carried out building work in a negligent or incompetent manner contrary to section 317(1)(b) of the Act.
- [5] With regard to those two allegations the Board decided that regulation 9(e) applied. It provides:

Complaint not warranting further investigation

A complaint does not warrant further investigation if—

(e) *there is insufficient evidence to warrant the investigation of the complaint;*

- [6] Regulation (9)(e) relates to the sufficiency of the evidence provided as part of the complaint. To test sufficiency the Board needs to inquire whether there is evidence which, if un-contradicted, would, on the balance of probabilities, justify consideration of the complaint. In this instance the Board noted that the allegations made in the complaint as regards negligence or incompetence were not supported by any corroborating evidence.

Draft Decision Process

- [7] The Board's jurisdiction is that of an inquiry. Complaints are not prosecuted before the Board. Rather, it is for the Board to carry out any further investigation that it considers is necessary prior to it making a decision. In this respect the Act provides that the Board may regulate its own procedures¹. It has what is described as a summary jurisdiction in that the Board has a degree of flexibility in how it deals with matters; it retains an inherent jurisdiction beyond that set out in the enabling legislation². As such it may depart from its normal procedures if it considers doing so would achieve the purposes of the Act and it is not contrary to the interests of natural justice to do so.
- [8] In this instance the Board has decided that a formal hearing is not necessary. The Board considers that there is sufficient evidence before it to allow it to make a decision on the papers.
- [9] The Board does, however, note that there may be further evidence in the possession of persons involved in the matter or that the Board may not have interpreted the evidence correctly. To that end this decision is a draft Board decision. The Respondent will be provided with an opportunity to make comment on the Board's draft findings and to present further evidence prior to the Board making a final decision. If the Board directs or the Respondent requests an in-person hearing, then one will be scheduled.

Disciplinary Offences Under Consideration

- [10] On the basis of the Registrar's Report the Respondent's conduct that the Board resolved to investigate was that the Respondent had failed, without good reason, in respect of a building consent that relates to restricted building work that he or she is to carry out (other than as an owner-builder) or supervise, or has carried out (other than as an owner-builder) or supervised, (as the case may be), to provide the

¹ Clause 27 of Schedule 3

² *Castles v Standards Committee No.* [2013] NZHC 2289, *Orlov v National Standards Committee 1* [2013] NZHC 1955

persons specified in section 88(2) with a record of work, on completion of the restricted building work, in accordance with section 88(1) (s 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act.

Function of Disciplinary Action

[11] The common understanding of the purpose of professional discipline is to uphold the integrity of the profession. The focus is not punishment, but the protection of the public, the maintenance of public confidence and the enforcement of high standards of propriety and professional conduct. Those purposes were recently reiterated by the Supreme Court of the United Kingdom in *R v Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales*³ and in New Zealand in *Dentice v Valuers Registration Board*⁴.

[12] Disciplinary action under the Act is not designed to redress issues or disputes between a complainant and a respondent. In *McLanahan and Tan v The New Zealand Registered Architects Board*⁵ Collins J. noted that:

“... the disciplinary process does not exist to appease those who are dissatisfied The disciplinary process ... exists to ensure professional standards are maintained in order to protect clients, the profession and the broader community.”

[13] In a similar vein the Board’s investigation and hearing process is not designed to address every issue that is raised in a complaint or by a complainant. The disciplinary scheme under the Act and Complaint’s Regulations focuses on serious conduct that warrants investigation and, if upheld, disciplinary action. Focusing on serious conduct is consistent with decisions made in the New Zealand courts in relation to the conduct of licensed persons⁶:

... the statutory test is not met by mere professional incompetence or by deficiencies in the practice of the profession. Something more is required. It includes a deliberate departure from accepted standards or such serious negligence as, although not deliberate, to portray indifference and an abuse.

[14] Finally, the Board can only inquire into “the conduct of a licensed building practitioner” with respect to the grounds for discipline set out in section 317 of the Act. Those grounds do not include contractual breaches other than when the conduct reaches the high threshold for consideration under section 317(1)(i) of the Act which deals with disrepute.

[15] The above commentary on the limitations of the disciplinary process are important to note as, on the basis of it, the Board Board’s inquiries, and this decision, focus on and deal with the serious conduct complained about.

³ *R v Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales* [2011] UKSC 1, 19 January 2011.

⁴ [1992] 1 NZLR 720 at p 724

⁵ [2016] HZHC 2276 at para 164

⁶ *Pillai v Messiter (No 2)* (1989) 16 NSWLR 197 (A) at 200

Evidence

- [16] The Board must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the disciplinary offences alleged have been committed⁷. Under section 322 of the Act the Board has relaxed rules of evidence which allow it to receive evidence that may not be admissible in a court of law.
- [17] The Respondent was engaged to undertake building work on a new residential dwelling under a building consent. The Respondent's building work, which include restricted building work, started on 16 April 2018 and came to an end on or about 20 December 2018.
- [18] The Complainant alleged that the Respondent failed to provide a record of work on completion of the restricted building work. She noted, in the complaint, that she had requested a record of work on 17 July 2019 and again on 25 July 2019 but that she had received no response. She made a complaint to the Board on 1 August 2019.
- [19] The Respondent provided a written response to the complaint. He acknowledged the requirement to provide a record of work but stated that, in his opinion, the work was not complete. There was an ongoing dispute and he was waiting for resolution of that dispute. His understanding that his record of work was not due till the final code compliance inspection occurred. He was waiting for that to occur prior to providing documentation. He had advised the Complainant to apply for a code compliance certificate in December 2018.
- [20] The Respondent noted that he has, since receiving the complaint, taken advice and has become aware that his understanding of his obligations was incorrect. He stated he provided a record of work within 48 hours of receiving the advice.
- [21] A record of work dated 13 August 2019 was provided by the Respondent to the owner (the Complainant) on 14 August 2019. It was also provided by the Respondent to the territorial authority on 16 October 2019 after the Respondent made enquiries and ascertained that the owner had not provided it to the territorial authority.
- [22] The Respondent submitted that the complaint was invalid as the owner was seeking a record of work so that a code compliance certificate could be obtained and that notwithstanding the provision the owner had not made the application.

Draft Conclusion and Reasoning

- [23] The Board has decided that the Respondent **has** failed, without good reason, in respect of a building consent that relates to restricted building work that he or she is to carry out (other than as an owner-builder) or supervise, or has carried out (other than as an owner-builder) or supervised, (as the case may be), to provide the persons specified in section 88(2) with a record of work, on completion of the restricted building work, in accordance with section 88(1) (s 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act) and **should** be disciplined.

⁷ *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee* [2009] 1 NZLR 1

- [24] There is a statutory requirement under section 88(1) of the Building Act 2004 for a licensed building practitioner to provide a record of work to the owner and the territorial authority on completion of restricted building work⁸.
- [25] Failing to provide a record of work is a ground for discipline under section 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act. In order to find that ground for discipline proven, the Board need only consider whether the Respondent had “good reason” for not providing a record of work on “completion” of the restricted building work.
- [26] The Board discussed issues with regard to records of work in its decision C2-01170⁹ and gave guidelines to the profession as to who must provide a record of work, what a record of work is for, when it is to be provided, the level of detail that must be provided, who a record of work must be provided to and what might constitute a good reason for not providing a record of work.
- [27] The starting point with a record of work is that it is a mandatory statutory requirement whenever restricted building work under a building consent is carried out or supervised by a licensed building practitioner (other than as an owner-builder). Each and every licensed building practitioner who carries out restricted building work must provide a record of work.
- [28] The statutory provisions do not stipulate a timeframe for the licenced person to provide a record of work. The provisions in section 88(1) simply states “on completion of the restricted building work ...”. As was noted by Justice Muir in *Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment v Bell*¹⁰ “... the only relevant precondition to the obligations of a licenced building practitioner under s 88 is that he/she has completed their work”.
- [29] As to when completion will have occurred is a question of fact in each case. In most situations’ issues with the provision of a record of work do not arise. The work progresses and records of work are provided in a timely fashion.
- [30] In the present case completion occurred in December 2018. The Respondent’s own evidence that he advised the owner to seek a code compliance certificate in December 2018 is testament to this.
- [31] A record of work was not provided until August 2019 and only after a complaint had been made. On this basis the Board finds that the record of work was not provided on completion as required and the disciplinary offence has been committed.
- [32] Section 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act provides for a defence of the licenced building practitioner having a “good reason” for failing to provide a record of work. If they can, on the balance of probabilities, prove to the Board that one exists then it is open to the Board to find that a disciplinary offence has not been committed. Each

⁸ Restricted Building Work is defined by the Building (Definition of Restricted Building Work) Order 2011

⁹ *Licensed Building Practitioners Board Case Decision C2-01170* 15 December 2015

¹⁰ [2018] NZHC 1662 at para 50

case will be decided by the Board on its own merits but the threshold for a good reason is high.

- [33] In this instance there was an ongoing dispute. The Board has repeatedly stated that a Record of Work is a statutory requirement, not a negotiable term of a contract. The requirement for it is not affected by the terms of a contract, nor by contractual disputes. Licensed building practitioners should now be aware of their obligations to provide them and their provision should be a matter of routine.
- [34] The Respondent has stated that he misunderstood his obligations. Ignorance of the law is not a good reason.
- [35] The Board does not accept the Respondent's submission that the complaint was not valid, one because the Complainant has not used the record of work since making the complaint. What the owner does with a record of work following receipt of it is irrelevant. It has no bearing on the obligation to provide one. The Respondent should also note that the requirement is on the licensed building practitioner to provide a record of work, not on the owner or territorial authority to demand one. the Respondent is required to act on his own accord and not wait for others to remind him of his obligations.

Draft Decision on Penalty, Costs and Publication

- [36] Having found that one or more of the grounds in section 317 applies the Board must, under section 318 of the Actⁱ, consider the appropriate disciplinary penalty, whether the Respondent should be ordered to pay any costs and whether the decision should be published.
- [37] The matter was dealt with on the papers. Included was information relevant to penalty, costs and publication and the Board has decided to make indicative orders and give the Respondent an opportunity to provide further evidence or submissions relevant to the indicative orders.

Penalty

- [38] The purpose of professional discipline is to uphold the integrity of the profession; the focus is not punishment, but the enforcement of a high standard of propriety and professional conduct. The Board does note, however, that the High Court in *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee*¹¹ commented on the role of "punishment" in giving penalty orders stating that punitive orders are, at times, necessary to provide a deterrent and to uphold professional standards. The Court noted:

[28] I therefore propose to proceed on the basis that, although the protection of the public is a very important consideration, nevertheless the issues of punishment and deterrence must also be taken into account in selecting the appropriate penalty to be imposed.

¹¹ HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818, 13 August 2007 at p 27

- [39] The Board also notes that in *Lochhead v Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment*¹² the court noted that whilst the statutory principles of sentencing set out in the Sentencing Act 2002 do not apply to the Building Act they have the advantage of simplicity and transparency. The court recommended adopting a starting point for penalty based on the seriousness of the disciplinary offending prior to considering any aggravating and/or mitigating factors.
- [40] Record of work matters are at the lower end of the disciplinary scale. The Board's normal starting point for a failure to provide a record of work is a fine of \$1,500. There are no aggravating nor mitigating factors present. As such the Board sees no reason to depart from the starting point. The fine is set at \$1,500.

Costs

- [41] Under section 318(4) the Board may require the Respondent "to pay the costs and expenses of, and incidental to, the inquiry by the Board."
- [42] The Respondent should note that the High Court has held that 50% of total reasonable costs should be taken as a starting point in disciplinary proceedings and that the percentage can then be adjusted up or down having regard to the particular circumstances of each case¹³.
- [43] In *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand*¹⁴ where the order for costs in the tribunal was 50% of actual costs and expenses the High Court noted that:
- But for an order for costs made against a practitioner, the profession is left to carry the financial burden of the disciplinary proceedings, and as a matter of policy that is not appropriate.*
- [44] The Board notes the matter was dealt with on the papers. There has, however, been costs incurred investigating the matter, producing the Registrar's Report and in the Board making its decision. The costs have been less than those that would have been incurred had a full hearing been held. As such the Board will order that costs of \$500 be paid by the Respondent. The Board considers that this is a reasonable sum for the Respondent to pay toward the costs and expenses of, and incidental to, the inquiry by the Board.

Publication

- [45] As a consequence of its decision the Respondent's name and the disciplinary outcomes will be recorded in the public register maintained as part of the Licensed Building Practitioners' scheme as is required by the Act¹⁵. The Board is also able, under section 318(5) of the Act, to order publication over and above the public register:

¹² 3 November 2016, CIV-2016-070-000492, [2016] NZDC 21288

¹³ *Cooray v The Preliminary Proceedings Committee* HC, Wellington, AP23/94, 14 September 1995, *Macdonald v Professional Conduct Committee*, HC, Auckland, CIV 2009-404-1516, 10 July 2009, *Owen v Wynyard* HC, Auckland, CIV-2009-404-005245, 25 February 2010.

¹⁴ [2001] NZAR 74

¹⁵ Refer sections 298, 299 and 301 of the Act

In addition to requiring the Registrar to notify in the register an action taken by the Board under this section, the Board may publicly notify the action in any other way it thinks fit.

- [46] As a general principle such further public notification may be required where the Board perceives a need for the public and/or the profession to know of the findings of a disciplinary hearing. This is in addition to the Respondent being named in this decision.
- [47] Within New Zealand there is a principle of open justice and open reporting which is enshrined in the Bill of Rights Act 1990¹⁶. The Criminal Procedure Act 2011 sets out grounds for suppression within the criminal jurisdiction¹⁷. Within the disciplinary hearing jurisdiction, the courts have stated that the provisions in the Criminal Procedure Act do not apply but can be instructive¹⁸. The High Court provided guidance as to the types of factors to be taken into consideration in *N v Professional Conduct Committee of Medical Council*¹⁹.
- [48] The courts have also stated that an adverse finding in a disciplinary case usually requires that the name of the practitioner be published in the public interest²⁰. It is, however, common practice in disciplinary proceedings to protect the names of other persons involved as naming them does not assist the public interest.
- [49] Based on the above the Board will not order further publication.

Draft Section 318 Order

- [50] For the reasons set out above, the Board directs that:

Penalty: Pursuant to section 318(1)(f) of the Building Act 2004, the Respondent is ordered to pay a fine of \$1,500.

Costs: Pursuant to section 318(4) of the Act, the Respondent is ordered to pay costs of \$500 (GST included) towards the costs of, and incidental to, the inquiry of the Board.

Publication: The Registrar shall record the Board's action in the Register of Licensed Building Practitioners in accordance with section 301(1)(iii) of the Act.

In terms of section 318(5) of the Act, there will not be action taken to publicly notify the Board's action, except for the note in the Register and the Respondent being named in this decision.

- [51] The Respondent should note that the Board may, under section 319 of the Act, suspend or cancel a licensed building practitioner's licence if fines or costs imposed as a result of disciplinary action are not paid.

¹⁶ Section 14 of the Act

¹⁷ Refer sections 200 and 202 of the Criminal Procedure Act

¹⁸ *N v Professional Conduct Committee of Medical Council* [2014] NZAR 350

¹⁹ *ibid*

²⁰ *Kewene v Professional Conduct Committee of the Dental Council* [2013] NZAR 1055

Submissions on Draft Decision

- [52] The Board invites the Respondent to:
- (a) provide further evidence for the Board to consider; and/or
 - (b) make written submissions on the Board's findings. Submissions may be on the substantive findings and/or on the findings on penalty, costs and publication.
- [53] Submissions and/or further evidence must be filed with the Board by no later than the close of business on **26 March 2020**.
- [54] If submissions are received, then the Board will meet and consider those submissions.
- [55] The Board may, on receipt of any of the material received, give notice that an in-person hearing is required prior to it making a final decision. Alternatively, the Board may proceed to make a final decision which will be issued in writing.
- [56] If no submissions or further evidence is received within the time frame specified, then this decision will become final.

Request for In-Person Hearing

- [57] If the Respondent, having received and considered the Board's Draft Decision, considers that an in-person hearing is required then one will be scheduled, and a notice of hearing will be issued.
- [58] A request for an in-person hearing must be made in writing to the Board Officer no later than the close of business on **26 March 2020**.

Submissions Made

- [59] The Board received a submission from the Respondent on 9 March 2020. The Respondent asked that the Board reconsider publication.
- [60] With regard to the disciplinary offending being recorded in the Register the Board does not have a discretion. The Register is established by section 298 of the Act and section 299 sets out its purposes which are:

The purpose of the register is—

- (a) *to enable members of the public to—*
 - (i) *determine whether a person is a licensed building practitioner and, if so, the status and relevant history of the person's [licensing]; and*
 - (ii) *choose a suitable building practitioner from a list of licensed building practitioners; and*
 - (iii) *know how to contact the building practitioner; and*
 - (iv) *know which licensed building practitioners have been disciplined within the last 3 years; and*
- (b) *to facilitate the administrative, disciplinary, and other functions of the Board and the Registrar under this Act.*

- [61] Section 301 sets out the matters to be contained in the Register. The section uses the phrasing “must” which makes the provisions mandatory, not discretionary:
- (1) *The register must contain all of the following information, to the extent that the information is relevant, for each licensed building practitioner whose name is entered in the register:*
- (l) *information about the status and history of the person's [licensing], particularly—*
- (i) *the class [in which the person is licensed]; and*
- (ii) *the date on which the person's name was entered in the register; and*
- (iii) *any action taken under section 318 on a disciplinary matter in respect of the person in the last 3 years:*
- [62] The final provision, action taken under section 318, is the reason why detail on the disciplinary offence must be contained in the Register.
- [63] Taking the above provisions into consideration it is clear that one of the purposes of the Register is to allow informed consumer and providing information as regards disciplinary action helps to facilitate this. It is also clear that the Board has no discretion as regards information on disciplinary action being retained on the Register.
- [64] The Complainant also made a submission. The submission related to the timing of the record of work and raising issues of integrity. The complainant has been upheld and a finding has been made that the record of work was not provided as per the requirements of the Act. Issues of integrity do not come within the ambit of section 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act. They may come within the disrepute provisions of section 317(1)(i). The Respondent was not, however, given notice of such an allegation and to consider it now would be contrary to the principles of natural justice.

Final Decision and Section 318 Order

- [65] Given the above the Board affirms its draft decision and penalty and directs that:
- Penalty:** Pursuant to section 318(1)(f) of the Building Act 2004, the Respondent is ordered to pay a fine of \$1,500.
- Costs:** Pursuant to section 318(4) of the Act, the Respondent is ordered to pay costs of \$500 (GST included) towards the costs of, and incidental to, the inquiry of the Board.
- Publication:** The Registrar shall record the Board’s action in the Register of Licensed Building Practitioners in accordance with section 301(1)(iii) of the Act.
- In terms of section 318(5) of the Act, there will not be action taken to publicly notify the Board’s action, except for the note in the Register and the Respondent being named in this decision.

Right of Appeal

[66] The right to appeal Board decisions is provided for in section 330(2) of the Actⁱⁱ.

Signed and dated this 25th day of May 2020



Mel Orange
Presiding Member

ⁱ **Section 318 of the Act**

- (1) *In any case to which section 317 applies, the Board may*
 - (a) *do both of the following things:*
 - (i) *cancel the person's licensing, and direct the Registrar to remove the person's name from the register; and*
 - (ii) *order that the person may not apply to be relicensed before the expiry of a specified period:*
 - (b) *suspend the person's licensing for a period of no more than 12 months or until the person meets specified conditions relating to the licensing (but, in any case, not for a period of more than 12 months) and direct the Registrar to record the suspension in the register:*
 - (c) *restrict the type of building work or building inspection work that the person may carry out or supervise under the person's licensing class or classes and direct the Registrar to record the restriction in the register:*
 - (d) *order that the person be censured:*
 - (e) *order that the person undertake training specified in the order:*
 - (f) *order that the person pay a fine not exceeding \$10,000.*
- (2) *The Board may take only one type of action in subsection 1(a) to (d) in relation to a case, except that it may impose a fine under subsection (1)(f) in addition to taking the action under subsection (1)(b) or (d).*
- (3) *No fine may be imposed under subsection (1)(f) in relation to an act or omission that constitutes an offence for which the person has been convicted by a court.*
- (4) *In any case to which section 317 applies, the Board may order that the person must pay the costs and expenses of, and incidental to, the inquiry by the Board.*
- (5) *In addition to requiring the Registrar to notify in the register an action taken by the Board under this section, the Board may publicly notify the action in any other way it thinks fit."*

ⁱⁱ **Section 330 Right of appeal**

- (2) *A person may appeal to a District Court against any decision of the Board—*
 - (b) *to take any action referred to in section 318.*

Section 331 Time in which appeal must be brought

An appeal must be lodged—

- (a) within 20 working days after notice of the decision or action is communicated to the appellant; or*
- (b) within any further time that the appeal authority allows on application made before or after the period expires.*