

## Before the Building Practitioners Board

	BPB Complaint No. CB25597
Licensed Building Practitioner:	Rajesh Kant (the Respondent)
Licence Number:	BP 132244
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:	In Person
Hearing Date:	5 May 2021
Decision Date:	17 June 2021

#### Board Members Present:

Mr. C Preston, Chair (Presiding)  
Mr. D Fabish, LBP, Carpentry and Site AOP 2  
Mr. B Monteith, LBP, Carpentry and Site AOP 2  
Mrs. F Pearson-Green, LBP, Design AOP 2

#### Appearances:

Rajendra Chaudhry, Chaudhry Legal for the Respondent  
[Omitted], Interpreter

#### 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.

**Contents**

**Summary of the Board’s Decision**..... 2

**The Hearing**..... 2

**The Charges** ..... 2

**Function of Disciplinary Action** ..... 3

**Inquiry Process** ..... 3

**Evidence**..... 4

**Board’s Conclusion and Reasoning**..... 5

**Penalty, Costs and Publication**..... 6

    Penalty ..... 7

    Costs..... 7

    Publication ..... 8

**Section 318 Order**..... 9

**Submissions on Penalty, Costs and Publication** ..... 9

**Right of Appeal**..... 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 \$2,000.

**The Hearing**

- [2] The Board, on receiving a Registrar’s Report in respect of the matter, reviewed the file and decided to deal with it by way of a Draft Decision.
- [3] The Respondent disputed the findings in the Draft Decision and sought a hearing. The Draft Decision was set aside, and a hearing was scheduled.

**The Charges**

[4] The hearing resulted from a complaint about the conduct of the Respondent and a Board resolution under regulation 10 of the Complaints Regulations<sup>1</sup> to hold a hearing in relation to building work at [Omitted]. The alleged disciplinary offences the Board resolved to investigate were 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).

---

<sup>1</sup> The resolution was made following the Board’s consideration of a report prepared by the Registrar in accordance with the Complaints Regulations.

### Function of Disciplinary Action

[5] 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>2</sup> and in New Zealand in *Dentice v Valuers Registration Board*<sup>3</sup>.

[6] 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*,<sup>4</sup> 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.”*

[7] 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 persons<sup>5</sup>:

*... 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.*

### Inquiry Process

[8] The investigation and hearing procedure under the Act and Complaints Regulations is inquisitorial, not adversarial. There is no requirement for a complainant to prove the allegations. Rather the Board sets the charges, and it decides what evidence is required at a hearing to assist it in its investigations. In this respect, the Board reviews the available evidence when considering the Registrar’s Report and determines the witnesses that it believes will assist at a hearing. The hearing itself is not a review of all of the available evidence. Rather it is an opportunity for the Board to seek clarification and explore certain aspects of the charges in greater depth.

[9] Whilst a complainant may not be required to give evidence at a hearing, they are welcome to attend and, if a complainant does attend, the Board provides them with an opportunity to participate in the proceedings.

---

<sup>2</sup> *R v Institute of Chartered Accountants in England and Wales* [2011] UKSC 1, 19 January 2011.

<sup>3</sup> [1992] 1 NZLR 720 at p 724

<sup>4</sup> [2016] HZHC 2276 at para 164

<sup>5</sup> *Pillai v Messiter (No 2)* (1989) 16 NSWLR 197 (A) at 200

## Evidence

- [10] The Board must be satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the disciplinary offences alleged have been committed<sup>6</sup>. Under section 322 of the Act, the Board has relaxed rules of evidence that allow it to receive evidence that may not be admissible in a court of law.
- [11] The procedure the Board uses is inquisitorial, not adversarial. The Board examines the documentary evidence available to it prior to the hearing. The hearing is an opportunity for the Board, as the inquirer and decision-maker, to call and question witnesses to further investigate aspects of the evidence and to take further evidence from key witnesses. The hearing is not a review of all of the available evidence.
- [12] The Respondent was engaged to carry out building work on a new residential build at [Omitted], under a building consent. The building work included restricted building work for which a record of work must be provided on completion. The Respondent's building work started on or about 1 September 2017 and came to an end on or about 23 March 2019. A record of work was not provided following completion. The Board was provided with a record of work dated 24 February 2020 as part of its investigation process.
- [13] In response to the Board Inquiry, the Respondent made a submission. He accepted that he had not provided the owner or the Territorial Authority with a copy of the record of work on the completion of the restricted building work. He said that Keyline, the main contractor, was doing all the paperwork.
- [14] At the hearing, the Respondent provided the following further evidence and submissions.
- [15] Counsel for the Respondent gave an opening submission that was based on his earlier submission to the Board dated 9 January 2021 .
- [16] Counsel, on behalf of the Respondent, explained that the Respondent now understood that he had not fulfilled his obligations to provide a record of work as required under the Act, but that at the time he was not fully aware of that obligation and was told by the head contractor that all paperwork, including the record of work, was to be provided by the head contractor who was a licenced building practitioner.
- [17] The Respondent noted that, as a visa holder, he was required to carry out any lawful instruction of his employer or risk having his visa cancelled. Mr Chaudry accepted that this did not mean the Respondent should not discharge his obligations under the Building Act to provide a record of work but submitted that the fear of having his visa cancelled prevented the Respondent from questioning his employer.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Z v Dental Complaints Assessment Committee* [2009] 1 NZLR 1

- [18] The Board asked the Respondent directly what his obligation to provide a record of work was. His answer showed he was still unsure and still thought that he was to provide it to the main contractor or to the person who asked for it.
- [19] The Board asked what publications the Respondent read and organisations he belonged to so as to keep himself updated on the industry in general and as a Licensed Building Practitioner specifically. He said he did not belong to any organisation and could not point to such publications as BRANZ Build magazine or Code Words.

### **Board's Conclusion and Reasoning**

- [20] 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.
- [21] 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>7</sup>.
- [22] 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.
- [23] The Board discussed issues with regard to records of work in its decision C2-01170<sup>8</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.
- [24] 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.
- [25] 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*<sup>9</sup> "... the only relevant

---

<sup>7</sup> Restricted Building Work is defined by the Building (Definition of Restricted Building Work) Order 2011

<sup>8</sup> *Licensed Building Practitioners Board Case Decision C2-01170* 15 December 2015

<sup>9</sup> [2018] NZHC 1662 at para 50

precondition to the obligations of a licenced building practitioner under s 88 is that he/she has completed their work”.

- [26] As to when completion will have occurred is a question of fact in each case.
- [27] 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. Completion occurred in March 2019. A record of work was not provided until February 2020, but only after the Board had commenced its investigations. 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.
- [28] 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.
- [29] In this instance, the Respondent was of the understanding the head contractor was doing all the “paperwork”. Licensed Building Practitioners should by now be aware of their obligations to provide them, and their provision should be a matter of routine.
- [30] It was also clear to the Board that from the inception of the complaint and even having been given legal advice, the Respondent was still not clear as regards what his obligations were in respect to the provision of a record of work.
- [31] It was also clear he made no effort to keep himself updated around industry changes and general information, where numerous articles and advice has been given to practitioners as to their obligations to provide a record of work. It seemed to the Board that he was happy to just go along with what he was told by the person employing him rather than understanding what his Licensed Building Practitioner obligations were.
- [32] The Respondent should also note that the requirement is on the Licensed Building Practitioner to provide a record of work, not on the owner, Head contractor 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.

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

- [33] 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.
- [34] The Board heard evidence during the hearing relevant to penalty, costs and publication and has decided to make indicative orders and give the Respondent an

opportunity to provide further evidence or submissions relevant to the indicative orders.

### Penalty

- [35] 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>10</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.*

- [36] The Board also notes that in *Lochhead v Ministry of Business Innovation and Employment*,<sup>11</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 do have the advantage of simplicity and transparency. The Court recommended adopting a starting point for a penalty based on the seriousness of the disciplinary offending prior to considering any aggravating and/or mitigating factors.
- [37] 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. There are both mitigating and aggravating factors. The mitigating factors relating to the Respondent’s employment situation. The aggravating factors include the Respondent’s continued lack of knowledge and understanding of his obligations. On balance, the Board has decided that there are no reasons to depart from a fine of \$1,500.

### Costs

- [38] 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.”
- [39] 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>12</sup>.

---

<sup>10</sup> HC Auckland CIV-2007-404-1818, 13 August 2007 at p 27

<sup>11</sup> 3 November 2016, CIV-2016-070-000492, [2016] NZDC 21288

<sup>12</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.

[40] In *Collie v Nursing Council of New Zealand*,<sup>13</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.*

[41] In this case, the Board had issued a draft decision on the papers and had indicated costs of \$500. The Respondent responded to that draft decision by asking for a hearing to be held. The draft decision, including the indicative penalty and costs was set aside.

[42] Based on the above, the Board's costs order is that the Respondent is to pay the sum of \$2,000 toward the costs of and incidental to the Board's inquiry and the holding of an in-person hearing.

#### Publication

[43] 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>14</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.*

[44] 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.

[45] Within New Zealand, there is a principle of open justice and open reporting, which is enshrined in the Bill of Rights Act 1990<sup>15</sup>. The Criminal Procedure Act 2011 sets out grounds for suppression within the criminal jurisdiction<sup>16</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>17</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>18</sup>.

[46] 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>19</sup>. It is,

---

<sup>13</sup> [2001] NZAR 74

<sup>14</sup> Refer sections 298, 299 and 301 of the Act

<sup>15</sup> Section 14 of the Act

<sup>16</sup> Refer sections 200 and 202 of the Criminal Procedure Act

<sup>17</sup> *N v Professional Conduct Committee of Medical Council* [2014] NZAR 350

<sup>18</sup> *ibid*

<sup>19</sup> *Kewene v Professional Conduct Committee of the Dental Council* [2013] NZAR 1055



however, common practice in disciplinary proceedings to protect the names of other persons involved as naming them does not assist the public interest.

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

### **Section 318 Order**

[48] 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 a fine of \$1,500.

**Costs:** Pursuant to section 318(4) of the Act, the Respondent is ordered to pay costs of \$2,000 (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(I)(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.**

[49] 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 Penalty, Costs and Publication**

[50] The Board invites the Respondent to make written submissions on the matters of disciplinary penalty, costs and publication up until close of business on 8 July 2021. The submissions should focus on mitigating matters as they relate to the penalty, costs and publication orders. If no submissions are received, then this decision will become final. If submissions are received, then the Board will meet and consider those submissions prior to coming to a final decision on penalty, costs and publication.

[51] In calling for submissions on penalty, costs and mitigation, the Board is not inviting the Respondent to offer new evidence or to express an opinion on the findings set out in this decision. If the Respondent disagrees with the Board's findings of fact and/or its decision that the Respondent has committed a disciplinary offence, the Respondent can appeal the Board's decision.

### **Right of Appeal**

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

Signed and dated this 17<sup>th</sup> day of June 2021



**Mr C 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."*

**<sup>ii</sup> 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.*