

## Before the Building Practitioners Board

	BPB Complaint No. CB25100
Licensed Building Practitioner:	Joel Johnson (the Respondent)
Licence Number:	BP 129376
Licence(s) Held:	Roofing – AOP Metal Tile Roof

---

### 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	Board Inquiry
Hearing Location	Wellington
Hearing Type:	On the Papers
Draft Decision Date:	14 January 2020
Final Decision Date:	31 March 2020

#### Board Members Present:

Chris Preston (Presiding)  
Richard Merrifield, LBP, Carpentry and Site AOP 2  
Mel Orange, Legal Member  
Faye Pearson-Green, LBP Design AOP 2

#### 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

<b>Introduction</b> .....	2
<b>Disciplinary Offences Under Consideration</b> .....	3
<b>Function of Disciplinary Action</b> .....	3
<b>Evidence</b> .....	3
<b>Draft Conclusion and Reasoning</b> .....	4
<b>Draft Decision on Penalty, Costs and Publication</b> .....	6
Penalty .....	6
Costs.....	7
Publication .....	8
<b>Draft Section 318 Order</b> .....	8
<b>Submissions on Draft Decision</b> .....	9
<b>Request for In-Person Hearing</b> .....	9
<b>Submissions Made</b> .....	9
<b>Final Decision</b> .....	9
<b>Final Section 318 Order</b> .....	10
<b>Right of Appeal</b> .....	10

## Introduction

- [1] On 14 January 2020 the Board received a Registrar’s Report in respect of a Board Inquiry into the conduct of the Respondent. The matter had originally come to the Board as a complaint but, following a withdrawal of the complaint by the Complainant, the Board resolved to continue with the matter as a Board Inquiry.
- [2] Under regulation 22 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 21 of the Complaints Regulations applies. Having received the report the Board decided that regulation 21 did not apply. Under regulation 22 the Board is required to hold a hearing.
- [3] The Board’s jurisdiction is that of an inquiry. Board Inquiries 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 procedures<sup>1</sup>. 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Clause 27 of Schedule 3

legislation<sup>2</sup>. 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.

- [4] 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.
- [5] The Board does, however, note that there may be further evidence in the possession of the Respondent 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**

- [6] 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 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**

- [7] 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*<sup>3</sup> and in New Zealand in *Dentice v Valuers Registration Board*<sup>4</sup>.

### **Evidence**

- [8] 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.

---

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

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

<sup>4</sup> [1992] 1 NZLR 720 at p 724

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

- [9] Johnson Brothers Roofing Limited was engaged to carry out building work on a new residential build under a building consent. The Respondent, together with [Omitted] the respondent in a related Board Inquiry (CB25099), carried out and/or supervised the work which included restricted building work.
- [10] The Respondent's work commenced in May 2017. In or about July 2017, prior to the full scope of work being finished, Johnson Roofing withdrew from the build. The full scope of the building work to be undertaken by Johnson Roofing (roofing and wall cladding) was completed by other contractors. Following the disengagement, the Complainant alleged a record of work was sought but one was not provided.
- [11] The Respondent provided a response to the complaint. It was a joint from the Respondent and [Omitted]. It noted the circumstances under which the job came to an end. It stated that the job was invoiced in March 2018 but that payment had not been made till November 2018. In December 2018, just before Christmas when both he and [Omitted] were on holiday, there was a request from the main contractor for a record of work to be provided. There were no previous requests for a record of work.
- [12] The response further set out that it was not until the complaint was received on 21 January 2019 that it became apparent that a record of work had not been issued. A record of work dated 20 March 2018 was then issued under the name of [Omitted]. The record of work noted that the "roof" (other than purlins) had been supervised by [Omitted] and that the "roof cladding or roof cladding system" had been carried out by [Omitted].

### **Draft Conclusion and Reasoning**

- [13] 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.
- [14] 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 work<sup>6</sup>.
- [15] 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.

---

<sup>6</sup> Restricted Building Work is defined by the Building (Definition of Restricted Building Work) Order 2011

- [16] The Board discussed issues with regard to records of work in its decision C2-01170<sup>7</sup> 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.
- [17] 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.
- [18] 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 ...”.
- [19] 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. Contractual or intervening events can, however, lead to situations where the licensed building practitioner’s record of work must be provided even though the full scope of restricted building work has not been completed.
- [20] One such situation is where it is clear the licensed building practitioner will not be returning to carry out any further restricted building work as has occurred in the present case. Johnson Roofing elected not to finish the job. When that decision was made and communicated completion, in terms of section 88 of the Act, occurred and a record of work was due.
- [21] In this respect it is to be noted that Johnson Roofing invoiced for the work in March 2018 and that a record of work was filled out on 20 March 2018. The completion of the record of work in March 2018 indicates that was an appreciation that the restricted building work was complete. Notwithstanding a record of work was not provided until after a complaint had been made in January 2019. That record of work was provided by [Omitted] a person who, on the documentation that was before the Board, did not appear to have any connection with the restricted building work that was completed.
- [22] As noted above each and every licensed building practitioner who carries out or supervises restricted building work is required to do a record of work for their restricted building work. In this instance the evidence was that two licensed building practitioners were on site and involved in the restricted building work being the Respondent and {Omitted}. Both the Respondent and [Omitted] were, therefore, required to complete and provide record of work for their respective restricted building work. As neither as provided a record of work the simple fact is that a record of work has not, as per the requirements of the Act, been provided. On this

---

<sup>7</sup> *Licensed Building Practitioners Board Case Decision C2-01170* 15 December 2015

basis the Board finds that a record of work was not provided on completion as required and that the disciplinary offence has been committed.

- [23] 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 case will be decided by the Board on its own merits but the threshold for a good reason is high.
- [24] In this instance there was a delayed payment. 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.
- [25] The response to the complaint also noted that there had not, prior to December 2018, been a request for a record of work. In this respect the Respondent should 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. He is required to act of his own accord and not wait for others to remind him of his obligations.

#### **Draft Decision on 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. 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**

- [28] 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*<sup>8</sup> 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.*

---

<sup>8</sup> HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818, 13 August 2007 at p 27

- [29] The Board also notes that in *Lochhead v Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment*<sup>9</sup> 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.
- [30] 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 some mitigating factors present. The Board also notes that two persons have been disciplined in relation to a single matter. It has taken this into consideration.
- [31] Based on the above the Board's penalty decision is that the Respondent pay a fine of \$500.

### Costs

- [32] 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."
- [33] 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 case<sup>10</sup>.
- [34] In *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand*<sup>11</sup> 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.*
- [35] 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. Normally, in such circumstances the Board's costs order would be a sum of \$500. Again, it is noted that there were two complaints about the same matter and as such the Board has decided that the amount of costs will be apportioned between the two Respondents. The amount ordered is \$250 being a sum the Board considers is reasonable for the Respondent to pay toward the costs and expenses of, and incidental to, the inquiry by the Board.

---

<sup>9</sup> 3 November 2016, CIV-2016-070-000492, [2016] NZDC 21288

<sup>10</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>11</sup> [2001] NZAR 74

## Publication

[36] 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>12</sup>. The Board is also able, under section 318(5) of the Act, to order publication over and above the public register:

*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.*

[37] 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.

[38] Within New Zealand there is a principle of open justice and open reporting which is enshrined in the Bill of Rights Act 1990<sup>13</sup>. The Criminal Procedure Act 2011 sets out grounds for suppression within the criminal jurisdiction<sup>14</sup>. Within the disciplinary hearing jurisdiction, the courts have stated that the provisions in the Criminal Procedure Act do not apply but can be instructive<sup>15</sup>. 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*<sup>16</sup>.

[39] 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 interest<sup>17</sup>. 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.

[40] Based on the above the Board will not order further publication.

## **Draft 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 ordered to pay a fine of \$500.

**Costs:** Pursuant to section 318(4) of the Act, the Respondent is ordered to pay costs of \$250 (GST included) towards the costs of, and incidental to, the inquiry of the Board.

<sup>12</sup> Refer sections 298, 299 and 301 of the Act

<sup>13</sup> Section 14 of the Act

<sup>14</sup> Refer sections 200 and 202 of the Criminal Procedure Act

<sup>15</sup> *N v Professional Conduct Committee of Medical Council* [2014] NZAR 350

<sup>16</sup> *ibid*

<sup>17</sup> *Kewene v Professional Conduct Committee of the Dental Council* [2013] NZAR 1055

**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.**

[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.

#### **Submissions on Draft Decision**

[43] 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.

[44] Submissions and/or further evidence must be filed with the Board by no later than the close of business on 24 March 2020.

[45] If submissions are received, then the Board will meet and consider those submissions.

[46] 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.

[47] If no submissions or further evidence is received within the time frame specified, then this decision will become final.

#### **Request for In-Person Hearing**

[48] 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.

[49] A request for an in-person hearing must be made in writing to the Board Officer no later than the close of business on 24 March 2020

#### **Submissions Made**

[50] The Board received a submission from the Respondent on 23 March 2020.

[51] The Respondent stated that whilst he did not agree with the decision, he would abide by it.

#### **Final Decision**

[52] Given the above the Board affirms its draft decision and penalty.

### Final Section 318 Order

[53] 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 \$500.

**Costs:** Pursuant to section 318(4) of the Act, the Respondent is ordered to pay costs of \$250 (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

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

Signed and dated this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of April 2020



**Chris Preston**  
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 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.*