

## Before the Building Practitioners Board

	BPB Complaint No. 26791
Licensed Building Practitioner:	Baylee Goddard (the Respondent)
Licence Number:	BP 141542
Licence(s) Held:	Roofing – Profiled Metal Roof and/or Wall Cladding

---

### 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 Type:	On the Papers
Draft Decision Date:	8 September 2025
Final Decision Date:	14 January 2026
Board Members Present:	
	Mr M Orange, Chair, Barrister (Presiding)
	Mr G Anderson, LBP, Carpentry and Site AoP 2
	Ms E Harvey McDouall, Registered Architect

#### 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.

#### Disciplinary Finding:

The Respondent **has** committed disciplinary offences under section 317(1)(i) of the Act.

The Respondent is fined \$1,000 and ordered to pay costs of \$700. A record of the disciplinary offending will be recorded on the Public Register for a period of three years.

## Contents

<b>Summary of the Board's Decision</b> .....	2
<b>The Charges</b> .....	2
Regulation 10 Decision .....	3
Regulation 9 Decisions.....	3
<b>Draft Decision Process</b> .....	3
<b>Evidence</b> .....	4
<b>Background</b> .....	4
<b>Further Evidence and Submissions Received</b> .....	5
<b>Disrepute</b> .....	5
The conduct complained about .....	6
Was the conduct serious enough .....	6
<b>Board's Decision</b> .....	6
<b>Penalty, Costs and Publication</b> .....	6
Penalty .....	6
Costs.....	7
Publication .....	8
<b>Section 318 Order</b> .....	9
<b>Right of Appeal</b> .....	9

## Summary of the Board's Decision

- [1] The Respondent quoted for building work and took funds from the Complainant for that work, but did not carry it out or repay the funds. The Board found that the Respondent had conducted himself in a disreputable manner contrary to section 317(1)(i) of the Act. In its Draft Decision, the Board indicated it would fine the Respondent \$1,500. The Respondent accepted the Board's findings but made mitigation submissions. The Board decided, on the basis of them, to reduce the fine \$1,000. The Respondent is also ordered to pay costs of \$700. A record of the disciplinary offending will be recorded on the Public Register for a period of three years.

## The Charges

- [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. Having received the report, the Board decided that regulation 9 applied to some but not to all of the allegations.

### Regulation 10 Decision

- [3] The prescribed investigation and hearing procedure is inquisitorial, not adversarial. There is no requirement for a complainant to prove the allegations. The Board sets the charges and decides what evidence is required.<sup>1</sup>
- [4] In this matter, the disciplinary charge the Board resolved to further investigate<sup>2</sup> was whether the Respondent may have conducted himself or herself in a manner that brings, or is likely to bring, the regime under this Act for licensed building practitioners into disrepute contrary to section 317(1)(i) of the Act.

### Regulation 9 Decisions

- [5] The complaint to the Board also contained allegations that the Respondent had breached the Code of Ethics prescribed under section 314A of the Act (s 317(1)(g) of the Act).
- [6] With regard to the allegation, the Board decided that regulation 9(a) of the Complaints Regulations applied. It provides:

***Complaint not warranting further investigation***

*A complaint does not warrant further investigation if—*

*(a) it does not come within the grounds for discipline;*

- [7] The reason is that the matters complained about do not come within the Code because the allegations relate to payments, and the Code refers to breaches whilst carrying out or supervising building work. The same limitation does not apply to the investigation of the Respondent's conduct under section 317 (1)(i) of the Act (the disrepute provision), which the Board is investigating.

### **Draft Decision Process**

- [8] 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 necessary prior to it making a decision.
- [9] Ordinarily, the Board makes a decision after holding a hearing.<sup>3</sup> The Board may, however, 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.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> 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. The evidentiary standard is the balance of probabilities, *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee* [2009] 1 NZLR 1.

<sup>2</sup> The resolution was made following the Board's consideration of a report prepared by the Registrar in accordance with regulation 10 of the Complaints Regulations.

<sup>3</sup> Regulation 10 of the Complaints Regulations.

<sup>4</sup> Under Clause 27 of Schedule 3 the Board may regulate its own procedure and it has summary jurisdiction, which allows for a degree of flexibility in how it deals with matters: *Castles v Standards Committee No.* [2013] NZHC 2289, *Orlov v National Standards Committee 1* [2013] NZHC 1955

- [10] In this instance, the Board decided that a formal hearing was not necessary. The Board considered that there was sufficient evidence before it to allow it to make a decision on the papers. It noted, however, that there may have been further evidence in relation to the matter that the Board was not aware of. To that end, it issued a Draft Decision. The Respondent was provided with an opportunity to comment on the draft findings and to present further evidence prior to the Board making a final decision. The Board further noted that if the Respondent requested an in-person hearing, then the Draft Decision would be set aside, and a hearing would be scheduled. The Respondent did not request a hearing.

### **Evidence**

- [11] The Board must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the disciplinary offences alleged have been committed<sup>5</sup>. 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.

### **Background**

- [12] The Complainant entered into an agreement with the Respondent for the Respondent to carry out roofing work on a residential dwelling. The Complainant paid a deposit of \$8,216.58 for the work on 19 August 2024. The deposit was half of the agreed full amount for the roofing work to be completed. The Respondent did not start the work, and he stopped engaging with the Complainant. Requests for a refund went unanswered.
- [13] On 1 April 2025, the Respondent made an arrangement with the Complainant whereby he would provide a cut list from which the Complainant could procure the required materials rather than the Respondent supplying them. Again, after the arrangement had been made, the Complainant stated that the Respondent stopped communicating. None of the agreed-upon roofing work covered by the deposit has been carried out.
- [14] The Respondent did not formally reply to the complaint when it was sent to him. An investigator rang him on 26 June 2025 and gave him an extension to respond. Notwithstanding, a response was not received. The Respondent stated in the telephone conversation, of which the investigator took a case note, that his company had been liquidated due to substantial amounts of money owed. He outlined that he had offered a deal to the Complainant, who could use the remaining 50% of the payment to buy materials, and the Respondent would do the work for free. He stated the Complainant accepted the offer, but then the Respondent could not get hold of him.
- [15] Companies Officer records show that the Respondent's company, Capital Roofing and Cladding Limited, was placed into liquidation on 16 June 2025, which was almost a year after the Respondent agreed to do the work.

---

<sup>5</sup> *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee* [2009] 1 NZLR 1

- [16] Companies Office records also show that the Respondent is a shareholder and director of Capital Trailers Limited, Capital Roofing Services Limited, and Signature Roofing Wellington Limited, all of which continue to trade.
- [17] The Board noticed the difference in evidence between that of the Complainant and the Respondent regarding the 1 April 2025 offer and, in particular, with the Respondent engaged thereafter. The Board accepts the evidence of the Complainant, which is more consistent with the events that transpired since the Respondent was first contracted.

### **Further Evidence and Submissions Received**

- [18] Following the Board issuing its Draft Decision, it received a submission from the Respondent. In it, he accepted the Board's findings and apologised for his conduct. He outlined various mitigating factors that he requested the Board consider. The Board has considered the submissions with regard to the penalty imposed.

### **Disrepute**

- [19] Conduct which brings or is likely to bring the regime into disrepute is that which may result in the regime being held in low esteem by the public. Examples include:
- criminal convictions<sup>6</sup>;
  - honest mistakes without deliberate wrongdoing<sup>7</sup>;
  - provision of false undertakings<sup>8</sup>; and
  - conduct resulting in an unethical financial gain<sup>9</sup>.
- [20] The Courts have consistently applied an objective test when considering such conduct.<sup>10</sup> The subjective views of the practitioner, or other parties involved, are irrelevant. The conduct need not have taken place in the course of carrying out or supervising building work.<sup>11</sup>
- [21] To make a finding of disreputable conduct, the Board needs to determine, on the balance of probabilities,<sup>12</sup> that the Respondent has brought the regime into disrepute and that the conduct was sufficiently serious enough for the Board to make a disciplinary finding.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> *Davidson v Auckland Standards Committee No 3* [2013] NZAR 1519

<sup>7</sup> *W v Auckland Standards Committee 3 of the New Zealand Law Society* [2012] NZCA 401

<sup>8</sup> *Slack, Re* [2012] NZLCDT 40

<sup>9</sup> *Colliev Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2000] NZAR 7

<sup>10</sup> *W v Auckland Standards Committee 3 of the New Zealand Law Society* [2012] NZCA 401

<sup>11</sup> *Davidson v Auckland Standards Committee No 3* [2013] NZAR 1519

<sup>12</sup> *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee* [2009] 1 NZLR 1. 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.

<sup>13</sup> *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2001] NZAR 74

### The conduct complained about

- [22] The conduct in this matter is that of obtaining an unethical financial gain. The Respondent has taken the Complainant's money but has not carried out the promised work or returned the funds. He has stopped communicating.
- [23] On the basis of the evidence before the Board, it finds that the Respondent has conducted himself in a disreputable manner in that he obtained an unethical financial gain.

### Was the conduct serious enough

- [24] Taking money and retaining it without providing the agreed-upon services is serious. It undermines public faith in the licensing regime, and it should result in a disciplinary outcome.

### **Board's Decision**

- [25] The Respondent **has** brought the licensing regime into disrepute.

### **Penalty, Costs and Publication**

- [26] Having found that one or more of the grounds in section 317 applies, the Board must, under section 318 of the Act<sup>i</sup>, consider the appropriate disciplinary penalty, whether the Respondent should be ordered to pay any costs and whether the decision should be published.
- [27] The matter was dealt with on the papers. The Board made an indicative order in its Draft Decision. It has since received submissions and has made a final decision regarding penalty, costs, and publication.

### Penalty

- [28] The Board has the discretion to impose a range of penalties.<sup>ii</sup> Exercising that discretion and determining the appropriate penalty requires that the Board balance various factors, including the seriousness of the conduct and any mitigating or aggravating factors present.<sup>14</sup> It is not a formulaic exercise, but there are established underlying principles that the Board should take into consideration. They include:<sup>15</sup>
- (a) protection of the public and consideration of the purposes of the Act;<sup>16</sup>
  - (b) deterring the Respondent and other Licensed Building Practitioners from similar offending;<sup>17</sup>
  - (c) setting and enforcing a high standard of conduct for the industry;<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> *Ellis v Auckland Standards Committee* 5 [2019] NZHC 1384 at [21]; cited with approval in *National Standards Committee (No1) of the New Zealand Law Society v Gardiner-Hopkins* [2022] NZHC 1709 at [48]

<sup>15</sup> Cited with approval in *Robinson v Complaints Assessment Committee of Teaching Council of Aotearoa New Zealand* [2022] NZCA 350 at [28] and [29]

<sup>16</sup> Section 3 Building Act

<sup>17</sup> *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

<sup>18</sup> *Dentice v Valuers Registration Board* [1992] 1 NZLR 720 (HC) at 724

- (d) penalising wrongdoing;<sup>19</sup> and
- (e) rehabilitation (where appropriate).<sup>20</sup>

- [29] Overall, the Board should assess the conduct against the range of penalty options available in section 318 of the Act, reserving the maximum penalty for the worst cases<sup>21</sup> and applying the least restrictive penalty available for the particular offending.<sup>22</sup> In all, the Board should be looking to impose a fair, reasonable, and proportionate penalty<sup>23</sup> that is consistent with other penalties imposed by the Board for comparable offending.<sup>24</sup>
- [30] In general, when determining the appropriate penalty, the Board adopts a starting point based on the principles outlined above prior to considering any aggravating and/or mitigating factors present.<sup>25</sup>
- [31] In this matter, the Board adopted a starting point of a fine of \$1,500, which is at the lower end of the disciplinary scale and is consistent with other fines imposed by the Board for similar conduct. In its Draft Decision, the Board set out that it considered that any funds the Respondent has available would be better directed to the Complainant. The Board noted that if the Respondent repaid the Complainant, the Board would reduce the penalty to one of censure. A censure is a public expression of disapproval of conduct.
- [32] The Respondent provided mitigation submissions. He noted the liquidation of his business and stated he was not able to keep in contact with the Complainant. The Respondent set out that he has been working on repaying debts, and whilst he provided details of another debt that he was repaying, he did not provide any evidence that he is repaying the Complainant in this matter.
- [33] The Board does, however, accept that there were additional mitigating factors it was not aware of and, on that basis, it has decided that it will reduce the fine to \$1,000.

### Costs

- [34] Under section 318(4) of the Act, the Board may require the Respondent to pay the costs and expenses of, and incidental to, the inquiry by the Board. The rationale is that other Licensed Building Practitioners should not be left to carry the financial burden of an investigation and hearing.<sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee* HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818, 13 August 2007 at p 27

<sup>20</sup> *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354; *Shousha v A Professional Conduct Committee* [2022] NZHC 1457

<sup>21</sup> *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

<sup>22</sup> *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee* HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818

<sup>23</sup> *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

<sup>24</sup> *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

<sup>25</sup> In *Lochhead v Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment* 3 November [2016] NZDC 21288 the District Court recommended that the Board adopt the approach set out in the Sentencing Act 2002.

<sup>26</sup> *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2001] NZAR 74

- [35] The courts have indicated that 50% of the total reasonable costs should be taken as a starting point in disciplinary proceedings<sup>27</sup>. The starting point can then be adjusted up or down, depending on the particular circumstances of each case<sup>28</sup>.
- [36] The Board has adopted an approach to costs that uses a scale based on 50% of the average costs of different categories of hearings: simple, moderate and complex. The current matter was moderately complex. Adjustments are then made.
- [37] Based on the above, the Board's costs order is that the Respondent is to pay the sum of \$700 toward the costs of and incidental to the Board's inquiry. This is the Board's scale amount for a moderately complex matter that has been dealt with by way of a Draft Decision. It is significantly less than 50% of actual costs.

#### Publication

- [38] 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 Act,<sup>29</sup> and he will be named in this decision, which will be available on the Board's website. The Board is also able, under section 318(5) of the Act, to order further publication.
- [39] Within New Zealand, there is a principle of open justice and open reporting, which is enshrined in the Bill of Rights Act 1990.<sup>30</sup> Further, as a general principle, publication 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, and the courts have stated that an adverse finding in a disciplinary case usually requires that the name of the practitioner be published.<sup>31</sup>
- [40] Based on the above, the Board will not order any publication over and above the record on the Register, the Respondent being named in this decision, and the publication of the decision on the Board's website. The Respondent should note, however, that as the Board has not made any form of suppression order, other entities, such as the media or the Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment, may publish under the principles of open justice reporting.

---

<sup>27</sup> *Kenneth Michael Daniels v Complaints Committee 2 of the Wellington District Law Society* CIV-2011-485-000227 8 August 2011

<sup>28</sup> *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.

<sup>29</sup> Refer sections 298, 299 and 301 of the Act

<sup>30</sup> Section 14 of the Act

<sup>31</sup> *Kewene v Professional Conduct Committee of the Dental Council* [2013] NZAR 1055



## Section 318 Order

[41] 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 fined \$1,000.

**Costs:** Pursuant to section 318(4) of the Act, the Respondent is ordered to pay costs of \$700 (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(l)(iii) of the Act.

**In terms of section 318(5) of the Act, the Respondent will be named in this decision, which will be published on the Board's website.**

[42] 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.

## Right of Appeal

[43] The right to appeal Board decisions is provided for in section 330(2) of the Act<sup>iii</sup>.

Signed and dated this 28<sup>th</sup> day of January 2026



**Mr M Orange**  
Presiding Member

---

### <sup>i</sup> 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 318 Disciplinary Penalties**

- (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 1 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.

**iii 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.*