

Before the Building Practitioners Board

	BPB Complaint No. 26634
Licensed Building Practitioner:	Gary Alan Joyce (the Respondent)
Licence Number:	BP 121260
Licence(s) Held:	Carpentry

Draft 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 proceedings as a Board Inquiry
Hearing Type:	On the Papers
Hearing and Draft Decision Date:	11 September 2025
Finalised Draft Decision Date:	7 November 2025

Board Members Present:

Mr M Orange, Chair, Barrister (Presiding)
Mrs F Pearson-Green, Deputy Chair, LBP, Design AoP 2
Ms S Chetwin CNZM, Barrister and Solicitor, Professional Director
Mr G Pearson, Barrister and Solicitor – Legal Member

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 a disciplinary offence under section 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act.

The Respondent is fined \$1,500 and ordered to pay costs of \$700. A record of the disciplinary offending will be recorded on the Public Register for three years.

Contents

Summary of the Board's Decision	2
The Charges.....	2
Draft Decision Process.....	3
Evidence	3
Failure to Provide a Record of Work	3
Did the Respondent carry out or supervise Restricted Building Work	4
Was the Restricted Building work complete	4
Has the Respondent provided a record of work	4
Board's Decision	5
Penalty, Costs and Publication	5
Penalty	5
Costs	6
Publication.....	7
Section 318 Order	7
Submissions on Draft Decision	8
Request for In-Person Hearing	8
Right of Appeal.....	8
This decision and the order herein were made final on [DATE] on the basis that no further submissions were received	9

Summary of the Board's Decision

- [1] The Respondent failed to provide a record of work on completion of restricted building work. He is fined \$1,500 and ordered to pay costs of \$700.
- [2] The Respondent provided a record of work to the Owner on 18 January 2025, dated 12 November 2024, and to the Territorial Authority. As completion occurred in 2018, the provision did not meet the requirements of section 88(1) of the Act, which provides that a record of work must be provided on the completion of Restricted Building Work.

The Charges

- [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.
- [4] In this matter, the disciplinary charges the Board resolved to further investigate were that the Respondent may, in relation to building work at [OMITTED], have

failed, without good reason, in respect of a building consent that relates to restricted building work that he or she is to carry out or supervise, or has carried out 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) of the Act contrary to section 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act.

Draft Decision Process

- [5] The Board's jurisdiction is that of an inquiry. The matter arose out of a complaint that was withdrawn. The Board decided it would continue with the matter as a Board Inquiry.
- [6] Ordinarily, the Board makes a decision after holding a hearing.¹ 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.²
- [7] In this instance, the Board has decided a formal hearing is not necessary. The Board considers there is sufficient evidence before it to allow it to make a decision on the papers. There may, however, be further evidence in relation to the matter the Board was not aware of. To that end, this decision is a draft Board decision. The Respondent will be provided with an opportunity to comment on the draft findings and to present further evidence prior to the Board making a final decision. If the Respondent requests an in-person hearing, or the Board directs that one is required, this decision will be set aside, and a hearing will be scheduled.

Evidence

- [8] The Board must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the disciplinary offences alleged have been committed.³ 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.

Failure to Provide a Record of Work

- [9] A Licensed Building Practitioner must provide a record of work for any Restricted Building Work they have carried out or supervised to the Owner and the Territorial Authority on completion of their Restricted Building Work.⁴
- [10] 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

¹ Regulation 10 of the Complaints Regulations.

² 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*

³ *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee [2009] 1 NZLR 1*

⁴ Section 88(1) of the Act.

Territorial Authority on completion of Restricted Building Work⁵ unless there is a good reason for it not to be provided.⁶

Did the Respondent carry out or supervise Restricted Building Work

- [11] The Respondent was engaged to carry out and/or supervise building work on a new residential dwelling under a building consent. He was the Licensed Building Practitioner on the site and the main contractor. Construction of a new build at the property was Restricted Building Work because elements of the building work formed part of the primary structure and/or external moisture management system of a residential dwelling.⁷

Was the Restricted Building work complete

- [12] Evidence from the Owner shows the Restricted Building Work started on 12 May 2017. The Respondent's involvement came to an end when the contract was terminated on 23 April 2018. This was when a record of work should have been provided to the Territorial Authority and the Owner because, from that date, the Respondent would not be able to carry out any further Restricted Building Work, meaning his work was complete.
- [13] Council inspection records show the Respondent was present on 13 March 2018 for a final inspection. This also indicates that his restricted building work on the property was completed, and it is when he should have provided a record of work.

Has the Respondent provided a record of work

- [14] As noted, the Respondent did finally provide a record of work, but not in a timely manner, and not in accordance with the requirements of section 88(1) of the Act.

Was there a good reason

- [15] The Respondent has not been able to be contacted despite multiple attempts through emails and calls from the Case Investigator.
- [16] The Board believes there is no good reason for this prolonged failure to provide a record of work to either the Territorial Authority or to the Owner in a timely manner.

Did the Respondent fail to provide a record of work

- [17] The Respondent did fail to provide a record of work to either the Territorial Authority or the Owner once his Restricted Building Work ended in contravention of section 88(1) of the Act.

⁵ Restricted Building Work is defined by the Building (Definition of Restricted Building Work) Order 2011

⁶ Section 317(1)(da)(ii) of the Act

⁷ Clause 5 of the Building (Definition of Restricted Building Work) Order 2011

Board's Decision

- [18] The Respondent **has** failed to provide a record of work on completion of Restricted Building Work.

Penalty, Costs and Publication

- [19] Having found that one or more of the grounds in section 317 applies, the Board must, under section 318 of the Act,ⁱ consider the appropriate disciplinary penalty, whether the Respondent should be ordered to pay any costs and whether the decision should be published.
- [20] The matter was dealt with on the papers. Included was information relevant to penalty, costs, and publication. 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

- [21] The Board has the discretion to impose a range of penalties.ⁱⁱ 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.⁸ It is not a formulaic exercise, but there are established underlying principles that the Board should take into consideration. They include:⁹
- (a) protection of the public and consideration of the purposes of the Act;¹⁰
 - (b) deterring the Respondent and other Licensed Building Practitioners from similar offending;¹¹
 - (c) setting and enforcing a high standard of conduct for the industry;¹²
 - (d) penalising wrongdoing;¹³ and
 - (e) rehabilitation (where appropriate).¹⁴
- [22] 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 cases¹⁵ and applying the least restrictive penalty available for the particular offending.¹⁶ In all, the Board should be looking to impose a fair, reasonable, and

⁸ *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]

⁹ Cited with approval in *Robinson v Complaints Assessment Committee of Teaching Council of Aotearoa New Zealand* [2022] NZCA 350 at [28] and [29]

¹⁰ Section 3 Building Act

¹¹ *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

¹² *Dentice v Valuers Registration Board* [1992] 1 NZLR 720 (HC) at 724

¹³ *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee* HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818, 13 August 2007 at p 27

¹⁴ *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

¹⁵ *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

¹⁶ *Patel v Complaints Assessment Committee* HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818

proportionate penalty¹⁷ that is consistent with other penalties imposed by the Board for comparable offending.¹⁸

- [23] In general, when determining the appropriate penalty, the Board adopts a starting point based on the principles outlined above prior to it considering any aggravating and/or mitigating factors present.¹⁹
- [24] 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, an amount which it considers will deter others from such behaviour.
- [25] However, this is the third time the Board has disciplined the Respondent for failing to provide a record of work. He was disciplined by the Board on 13 March 2019 for a failure to provide a record of work²⁰ and again on 7 May 2019 for a failure to provide a record of work.²¹ It would appear the Respondent has not learnt from previous disciplinary findings. He should now know better.
- [26] Taking the above factors into consideration, the Board has adopted a starting point of a fine of \$2,000. The late provision of a record of work will be taken as a mitigating factor. A reduction in the fine of \$500 will be applied. The fine is, therefore, set at \$1,500.

Costs

- [27] 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.²²
- [28] The courts have indicated that 50% of the total reasonable costs should be taken as a starting point in disciplinary proceedings.²³ The starting point can then be adjusted up or down, depending on the particular circumstances of each case.²⁴
- [29] 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 simple. Adjustments are then made.
- [30] 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

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

¹⁸ *Roberts v A Professional Conduct Committee of the Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2012] NZHC 3354

¹⁹ 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.

²⁰ *Gary Joyce* [2019] BPB 24810

²¹ *Gary Joyce* [2019] BPB24811

²² *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand* [2001] NZAR 74

²³ *Kenneth Michael Daniels v Complaints Committee 2 of the Wellington District Law Society* CIV-2011-485-000227 8 August 2011

²⁴ *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.

scale amount for a simple matter that has been dealt with by way of a Draft Decision. It is significantly less than 50% of actual costs.

Publication

- [31] 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,²⁵ 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.
- [32] Within New Zealand, there is a principle of open justice and open reporting, which is enshrined in the Bill of Rights Act 1990.²⁶ 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.²⁷
- [33] 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.

Section 318 Order

- [34] 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 Penalty of \$1,500. |
| 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.**
- [35] The Respondent should note 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.

²⁵ Refer sections 298, 299 and 301 of the Act

²⁶ Section 14 of the Act

²⁷ Kewene v Professional Conduct Committee of the Dental Council [2013] NZAR 1055

Submissions on Draft Decision

- [36] 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.
- [37] Submissions and/or further evidence must be filed with the Board by no later than the close of business on **Thursday, 6 November 2025**.
- [38] If submissions are received, then the Board will meet and consider those submissions.
- [39] 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.
- [40] If no submissions or further evidence is received within the time frame specified, then this decision will become final.

Request for In-Person Hearing

- [41] 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.
- [42] A request for an in-person hearing must be made in writing to the Board Officer no later than the close of business on **Thursday, 6 November 2025**.
- [43] If a hearing is requested, this Draft Decision, including the Board's indicative position on penalty, costs and publication, will be set aside.

Right of Appeal

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

Signed and dated this 14th day of October 2025



Mr M Orange
Presiding Member

This decision and the order herein were made final on 7 November 2025 on the basis that no further submissions were received.

Signed and dated this 13th day of November 2025



Mr M 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 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.*