Employer Bulletin

Our Weekly News Digest for Employers

Friday, 29 May 2020

In this Issue

Contact Us

NZ 0800 300 362
AU 1800 300 362
E advice@ema.co.nz
ema.co.nz

Cases

Employment Court: One Case

Proceeding was not removed to the Employment Court

Mr Delvo resigned from his position with Rauland NZ Ltd (Rauland) in September 2018. He then commenced employment with Rauland's main competitor, Hills Health Solutions, a trading branch of Hills Ltd. The proceedings filed with the Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) alleged breaches of Mr Delvo's employment agreement.

These proceedings were removed to the Employment Court (the Court) pursuant to section 178 of the Employment Relations Act 2000 (the Act). In this determination, the Court looked at whether the matter was properly removed. The determination revolved around two issues. Rauland had submitted that there was an important question of law in relation to its claim for an account of profits. The important question was described as being related to causation. Mr Delvo did not accept that an important question of law had been identified. Rauland had also relied upon section 178(2)(c) of the Act. It argued that the search order proceeding meant that the Court already had proceedings before it, which involved the same parties and the same or similar or related issues.

The Court saw the Authority's decision to rely upon these issues as erroneous, having regard to the particular circumstances existing in this case. Firstly, while the issue of causation may in some cases be complicated, it is primarily resolved upon a factual basis. Secondly, a finding by the Authority that the Court already had proceedings before it relating to the same parties and involving the same or similar or related issues, was a misunderstanding of the nature of the search order jurisdiction in the Court.

As indicated earlier, the application for a search order must be founded upon substantive proceedings. In this case, the proceedings with the Authority were not filed until after the search order had been executed. There were not two sets of proceedings in this matter, only one. Because of the jurisdictional limits, it was the Court that had to consider the application for a search order and use it to uncover and protect evidence. However, that was for the purposes of the proceedings which are with the Authority.

The purpose of the Authority considering removal when the Court already has proceedings before it was to ensure that there was not a duplication of evidence and expenditure of unnecessary costs in having proceedings conducted in both the Court and the Authority at the same time.

This was apparent in this case. It was the Court who had to decide its involvement in issues relating to the search order, and it would then be for the Authority to use its investigative powers to deal with relevant documents.

Both parties were given an opportunity by the Court to make submissions on the removal. Ms Mansell, counsel for Rauland, made the submission that, even if the Authority did not properly remove the proceedings to the Court, the delays made it just in the circumstances for the proceedings to remain with the Court. The Court held the submission was not properly based. This was because the possibility of an appeal was purely speculative. The Court held that while the Authority does not follow formal procedures in dealing with documentary evidence as the Court does, it nevertheless has wide powers to call for and consider such evidence as part of its investigative process.

When an application for removal is being considered by the Court, a party must be given the right to an investigation. In this case, Mr Delvo had been unjustifiably deprived of that entitlement against his wishes. The determination stated that the matter was finely balanced and that it would be more cost effective and efficient for one body to consider the issues rather than a moving of matters back and forth between the Authority and the Court. The Court said that this was a misunderstanding of the nature of the application to the Court for search orders, which would not continue beyond any further technical issues relating to forensic analysis. It is the Authority and not the Court that would be dealing with the substantive issues in what is one set of proceedings. If the Authority was correct on this point, it would mean that every case where a search order was applied for, the substantive proceedings, which are required to be filed in the Authority, would be removed.

It was for those reasons that the Court decided that in the circumstances, the matter was not properly removed and that the Authority could continue with its investigation.

Rauland NZ Limited v Delvo [[2019] NZEmpC 169; 21/11/2019; Judge Perkins]

Employment Relations Authority: Three Cases

Employment protected under Parental Leave and Employment Protection Act 1987

Ms Zhang claimed that there were important questions of law arising from her employment relationship problems with the Waitemata District Health Board (WDHB) and therefore warranted removal to the Employment Court. Her employment relationship problems consisted of a parental leave complaint as well as a claim that she was unjustifiably dismissed by the WDHB. The WDHB opposed removal to the Employment Court. It said that the questions raised by Ms Zhang were largely factual, not legal and were matters that could be dealt with by the Employment Relations Authority (the Authority). Ms Zhang asked for her application in the Authority to be removed to the Employment Court to hear and determine.

Ms Zhang was employed by WDHB as a management accountant in October 2016. Ms Zhang commenced parental leave on 7 March 2018. On 25 July 2018 Ms Zhang received an email from WDHB advising of a proposed restructure of the finance team, including the proposed disestablishment of Ms Zhang's position as well as other management accountant positions. Confirmation of the disestablishment of Ms Zhang's position was made on 23 August 2018 and Ms Zhang was informed of new positions within WDHB that she could apply for. No suitable redeployment options were available. On 11 March 2019, Ms Zhang's position was terminated on the grounds of redundancy.

Ms Zhang claimed that her dismissal amounted to a parental leave complaint under section 56 of the Parental Leave and Employment Protection Act 1987 (PLEPA) on the basis that she was made redundant by WDHB because she was pregnant. Ms Zhang argued that this action breached section 49(1) of the PLEPA because the dismissal occurred during her absence on parental leave, or during the 26 week period after her parental leave ended.

In support of the application to remove her claims to the Employment Court, Ms Zhang claimed that four questions of law were important to be considered. Firstly, whether the termination of the Ms Zhang's employment took place either during her absence on parental leave or, alternatively, during the subsequent twenty-six week period? Secondly, whether there was a prospect of the WDHB being able to appoint Ms Zhang to a position that was vacant and substantially similar to Ms Zhang's previous position? Thirdly, did the WDHB

prejudicially affect Ms Zhang's seniority? Lastly, was the WDHB prepared to accord to Ms Zhang preference over other applicants?

The WDHB treated Ms Zhang's period of parental leave as ending on 11 March 2019 which was also the date of the termination of her employment. In a letter to Ms Zhang on 5 March 2018, WDHB informed Ms Zhang that her parental leave was not to exceed fifty-two weeks. Ms Zhang says her parental leave commenced on the day that her primary carer leave started which was 7 March 2018. Therefore, Ms Zhang's period of fifty-two weeks of combined primary carer leave and extended leave appeared to have started on 7 March 2018 and ended on 6 March 2019, not 11 March 2019. Accordingly, a question of law arose as to the date on which Ms Zhang's period of parental leave ended. The date on which it is proved that Ms Zhang's parental leave ended determined whether a special defence under the PLEPA applied. The Authority accepted the end of the Ms Zhang's parental leave was an important question of law and held it would determine the special defences available under the PLEPA.

In regards to establishing whether there was a role substantially similar and vacant to Ms Zhang's position, the Authority relied upon *Lewis v Greene.* However the case was sixteen years old and its facts its facts differed from those in Ms Zhang's case, which involved a restructure and the creation of new positions. The terms, prejudicially affected and the employee's seniority in the context of section 51(c) did not appear to have been subject to judicial interpretation. The Authority member agreed that in the context of the application of the test in section 51(c) that it was an important question of law and the answer to it would have a broad effects on employers and employees in workplace restructuring.

The Authority agreed that there needed to be an assessment of whether other positions were substantially similar or not. This required an interpretation of the meaning of a vacant and substantially similar role. It also required the WDHD to establish why they were unable to appoint someone to such a role or such a role did not exist and whether they were prepared to give the employee preference over applicants.

As a result, the application for removal to the Employment Court to hear and determine was granted.

Zhang v Waitemata District Health Board [[2020] NZERA 139; 2/04/2020; A Fitzgibbon]

Preliminary decision to dismiss employee suffering from psychological effects from workplace assault

Ms Cuttriss claimed that she was unjustifiably disadvantaged by her employer's investigation and preliminary decision in relation to issues relating to her employment. Ms Cuttriss claimed compensation for the hurt and humiliation she suffered. Pact Group (Pact) denied unjustifiably disadvantaging Ms Cuttriss and said that she resigned during the investigation which it was entitled to carry out.

Ms Cuttriss worked for Pact as a mental health support worker from 13 November 2016. In December 2016 Ms Cuttriss was assaulted by a client. Ms Cuttriss took time off from work afterwards to recover, received the employee assistance programme (EAP) and had lodged a claim with ACC. Ms Cuttriss said the incident had long-lasting psychological effects on her and this manifested itself at times during her employment when triggered by certain events.

In January 2017 Ms Cuttriss was the subject of an investigation regarding her conduct arising from an incident with another client. No formal disciplinary outcome resulted but Ms Cuttriss was provided with further training and was required to attend weekly supervision with a manager for three months.

Ms Cuttriss was off work on sick leave, special paid leave, and ACC for several weeks from February 2017 in relation to the incident in December 2016. She returned to work to a different workplace and only returned to her usual place of work on 1 July 2017.

Ms Cuttriss received a letter on 16 October 2017 outlining an incident of assault on 3 October 2017 between two other colleagues. The letter alleged Ms Cuttriss had breached her employment agreement obligations by failing to follow Pact's policy and procedures in supporting clients. The letter also alleged she had not displayed the conduct expected from a support worker in discussing personal issues in front of clients and other employees.

Pact invited Ms Cuttriss to a meeting eleven days later, informed her of her right to representation at the meeting and noted that the meeting was flexible within reason to suit the availability of a representative. She was advised

that this could result in a disciplinary process and may have wished to take independent advice before meeting with her employer or providing any response. Ms Cuttriss was offered EAP and was asked to maintain confidentiality in respect to the matters. Ms Cuttriss went on sick leave after receiving the letter.

The meeting took place 7 November 2017. Pact sent a further letter to Ms Cuttriss on 20 November 2017 referring to the allegations made against Ms Cuttriss and her responses to them. Noted was Ms Cuttriss' support person's suggestion that the incident involving the two colleagues had triggered the stress of her assault in December 2017. A response to Ms Cuttriss's allegations gave reasons that as a preliminary view, Pact could not have trust and confidence in Ms Cuttriss within their employment relationship. A preliminary view was given that Ms Cuttriss should be dismissed. Pact gave Ms Cuttriss an opportunity to "*point to any flaws in our reasoning or other matters, which would support an argument that you should not be dismissed*."

Ms Cuttriss raised a personal grievance in a letter on 28 November 2017. It was noted in the letter that though the incident in January 2017 did not result in disciplinary action, the incident remained "*a black mark*" on Ms Cuttriss' employment file and played a part in the outcome of the incident on 3 October 2017. Ms Cuttriss' representative stated that the letter given on 16 October 2017 did not make Ms Cuttriss aware of the possible implications of the disciplinary meeting. The letter referred to Pact having to decide *"whether or not there has been misconduct."* The only part of the letter that referred to serious misconduct was in relation to the confidentiality requirement. It was claimed that the failure to alert Ms Cuttriss to the possibility of making a serious misconduct finding misled Ms Cuttriss so that she could not properly consider how she could respond. It was argued that Ms Cuttriss would have responded in writing had she believed her employment was in jeopardy as opposed to the verbal response she gave in the meeting.

The Employment Relations Authority (the Authority) found merit that Pact did not refer to serious misconduct in relation to the incident. The number of issues raised and the cumulative weight of those issues and allegations should have alerted Ms Cuttriss to the need for careful and considered response in writing. However, that did not relieve Pact of its obligation to put Ms Cuttriss fairly on notice and that if the allegations were substantiated and serious enough that her employment could be terminated. The Authority was not persuaded that Pact considered the effect of her assault in December 2016. Pact was aware that Ms Cuttriss had been significantly affected by it as they received her ACC medical certificates containing her diagnosis and had met with her ACC case manager to discuss a return to work plan to her normal workplace.

The Authority found it reasonable for Pact to raise its concerns with Ms Cuttriss in relation to the protection and safety of its clients. Pact however, chose to do so in a heavy-handed manner rather than assess her reactions in the context of her own relatively recent assault. The Authority noted that Pact had raised the possibility that Ms Cuttriss suffered from post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), but dismissed this. The Authority found that it was not the action of a fair and reasonable employer to dismiss the possibility of PTSD so readily and without further investigation. The Authority also found that Pact did not consider Ms Cuttriss' explanations properly before reaching its preliminary decision.

The Authority stated that Pact could have managed the situation with an enquiry as to why Ms Cuttriss responded to the incident the way she had. In that respect, the Authority found the investigation to be unfair to Ms Cuttriss, as well as the preliminary decision to dismiss.

Pact was ordered to pay the sum of $3,000 for humiliation, loss of dignity and injury to feelings. Costs were reserved.

Cuttriss v Pact Group [[2019] NZERA 600; 21/10/2019; T MacKinnon]

Disciplinary process deemed to be procedurally unfair

MUF was employed by Suncrest Orchard Limited (SOL) in 2010 until 7 November 2017 as Liaison Manager. MUF was dismissed from employment after allegations of assault on another employee. As part of the proceedings in the Employment Relations Authority (the Authority), MUF applied for their name to not be published on the basis that publication would have significant and lasting adverse consequence. There is a principle of open justice and the standard to justify a departure from this fundamental principle is a high threshold. The Authority declined the application, but an interim order prohibiting publication of the applicant's name was given for 28 days from the date of this determination. The Authority referred to the applicant as MUF

which were three letters randomly selected. MUF claimed that his dismissal was unjustified, substantively and procedurally and he sought reimbursement, lost wages and compensation.

On 25 October 2017 a staff member made a report to the Office Manager, Ms Roughan, of MUF touching employee A. Employee A brushed MUF's hand away. The staff member said that when talking to employee A at a later point, employee A had stated MUF kept doing it and that she had asked him to stop and that she would message him again. Mr Roughan took a note, which she later had typed up about what was said to her by the staff member.

Ms Roughan spoke to the director Ms Jones about the incident and they decided to review CCTV footage of the shop floor to see if the alleged incident had been captured on camera. Ms Roughan carried out some preliminary investigations between 25 and 31 October 2017. Employee A had sent a text message to Ms Roughan about MUF which stated *"I know he's only joking. We are alright. So I don't want to get him in trouble and I don't want this to go any further."*

On 1 November 2017 Ms Roughan sent a letter to MUF inviting him to attend a disciplinary meeting for serious misconduct. Potential actions up to dismissal were set out as they appeared in the employment agreement. MUF accepted and asked if employee A could come as a support person as she had offered. MUF was sent a secondary letter on 2 November 2017 confirming employee A as his support person with all evidence, including the ability for MUF to view the CCTV footage prior to the meeting. There was also reference to a previous incident of a similar nature involving MUF in 2015. The allegation was also changed from inappropriate touching to sexual harassment in the subsequent letter.

MUF explained at the disciplinary meeting on 6 November 2017 that he was *"just joking"* and that he did not think he did anything wrong. Employee A agreed to the claim and that he had apologised to her and it was alright. On 7 November 2017 Mr Jones emailed MUF of a preliminary decision that the allegation of serious misconduct was upheld and that there was a proposal to terminate MUF's employment. An opportunity for feedback was given. MUF provided a response that day which Mr Jones did not consider was sufficient to change the preliminary decision. MUF was sent a letter of termination that same day.

SOL had at the end of its sexual harassment policy in bold *"Remember always the final decision rests with the Staff member concerned."* Sexual harassment was not defined in MUF's employment agreement or the sexual harassment policy. The employment agreement stated that sexual harassment was considered serious misconduct. A fair and reasonable employer could have been expected to investigate staff member one's concerns. SOL could have been expected in the circumstances to have taken a fuller preliminary investigation prior to finding serious misconduct constituting a disciplinary process.

The preliminary investigation was important as it determined whether the matter went any further. What was said by MUF as an explanation was important. MUF was not told about the CCTV footage or encouraged to view it to respond. The failure to disclose the complaint by staff member one, the statement by other staff including employee A and the failure to disclose the footage was unfair and not in accordance with good faith obligations. This was not a minor procedural matter. The preliminary investigation was not one that a fair and reasonable employer could have been expected to have carried out in all the circumstances before moving to the next stage.

The Authority noted that SOL did not follow its own policy to leave the final decision for the staff member. A fair and reasonable employer could be expected to follow their own policies just as employees are expected to adhere to them. A fair and reasonable employer could have declined the request to have employee A as a support person as it may have been inappropriate as she was the alleged victim.

Mr Jones reached views regarding the footage without input from employee A or MUF. A fair and reasonable employer could have been expected to investigate whether employee A was being pressured to support MUF's response. Further investigation could have been expected in relation to whether employee A had asked MUF to stop the touching on more than one occasion and if so when.

The process was found to not be carried out in a fair and reasonable manner. The procedural unfairness was not of a minor nature. The Authority did not find that given the extent of the procedural unfairness that there was a substantive justification for the dismissal.

MUF was unjustifiably dismissed from employment. SOL was ordered to pay MUF $2,635 for lost wages and $12,750 in compensation.

MUF v Suncrest Orchard Limited [[2019] NZERA 713; 16/12/2019; H Doyle]

For further information about the issues raised in this week's cases, please refer to the following resources:

Discipline

Restructuring and Redundancy

Parental Leave

Stress and Fatigue

Surveillance

Employer News

Milestone cash flow support to SME's

The EMA says the Government's budget amidst COVID-19 was always going to have to strike the right balance between spending and debt levels to regenerate the economy for the benefit of all.

- Almost $1 billion in interest-free loans for small businesses
- More than 55,000 businesses have applied; 95% approved
- Average loan approx. $17,300
- 90% of applications from firms with ten or fewer staff
- A wide cross-section of businesses have applied, the most common are the construction industry, accommodation providers, professional firms, and retail
- 88% of those seeking loans also got support from the Wage Subsidy

A billion dollar milestone is about to be passed as government cash flow support rolls out to small businesses through interest-free loans. Revenue and Small Business Minister Stuart Nash says small and medium enterprises (SMEs) have reacted enthusiastically to the Small Business Cash flow Loan Scheme in its first fortnight of operation.

"Cash flow is crucial to kick-starting the economic recovery for our small businesses," Mr Nash said.

"More than 55,000 businesses have applied for around $960 million in interest-free loans. We expect to pass the billion-dollar mark within the next day or so. Around 95% have already been approved and cash usually arrives in bank accounts within five days.

"The interest-free loans have come at just the right time. This is much-needed working capital for small businesses who for a variety of reasons have not been able to approach banks or investors for support. I have received positive feedback about how easy it is to apply online and how fast the loan has arrived.

"Around 45% of applications are from firms with just one employee; 33% have 2-5 staff; 12% have 6-10 staff; and 7% have 11 to 20 staff. Around half of those taking out loans are mature or long-standing firms that have been trading for more than five years.

"Provincial businesses are making good use of the government lending. Tauranga businesses account for 2,528 applications; there are 1,575 from Palmerston North; 1,482 from Whangarei; 1,240 from Nelson, and 1,181 applications from Napier businesses.

"Loans are interest free if repaid within a year. After that the interest rate is 3% for a maximum term of five years. Repayments are not required for the first two years. SMEs employing 50 or fewer staff are eligible to apply.

"I urge business owners to talk to their bookkeeper, tax agent or accountant, or log onto the MyIR portal, to ensure they take advantage of government support as quickly as possible. Applications are due by 12 June but I am seeking advice on extending the deadline given the substantial demand for the loans.

"We're also boosting cash flow in other ways to help with fixed costs for SMEs. This includes tax refunds, the wage subsidy, commercial property reform and consultancy support. We now have a substantive package to help these firms and sole traders get through this phase and into recovery," Mr Nash said.

The global COVID-19 pandemic and economic crisis is hitting every nation hard. Outside the $4 billion business support package in Budget20, previously announced support for small businesses includes:

- Wage subsidies for more than 390,000 businesses to pay 1.6 million staff. More than 210,000 businesses who received direct support were the self-employed, and a further 170,000 businesses employ up to 19 staff;
- Income relief payments for those who have lost their business or job, up to $490 per week for 12 weeks, tax-free;
- Tax refunds of up to $3.1 billion through the loss carry-back scheme
- Tax breaks worth $2 billion for commercial landlords through changes to depreciation arrangements;
- $25 million for professional consultancy services through Regional Business Partners;
- Government departments are taking the lead on prompt payments to SMEs, with a target of 95% of invoices paid in 10 working days. Ministers have now asked top-50 listed companies on the NZX to consider doing the same;
- Other tax measures allow businesses to get tax write-offs for low-value assets like laptops and phones; remove 95,000 taxpayers from the provisional tax regime; and allow interest to be waived on late payments

More information is available here: www.ird.govt.nz/covid-19/business-and-organisations/small-business-cash-flow-loan

New Zealand Government [27 May 2020]

New payment support Kiwi's through COVID

- Further support for New Zealanders affected by 1-in-100 year global economic shock
- 12-week payment will support people searching for new work or retraining
- Work programme on employment insurance to support workers and businesses

The Government today announced a new temporary payment to support New Zealanders who lose their jobs due to the global COVID-19 pandemic to adjust and find new employment or retrain. A new COVID Income Relief Payment is being introduced, alongside a wider work programme on possible future employment insurance as we rebuild our economy in a way that supports workers and businesses together.

The payment will be available for 12 weeks from 8 June for anyone who has lost their job due to the impact of COVID-19 since March 1. It will pay $490 a week to those who lost full-time work and $250 for part-time. The payment will not be taxed. Finance Minister Grant Robertson said the payment acknowledges that the global economy is facing a 1-in-100 year recession, which is impacting on New Zealand, and supports the Governments priority of protecting jobs where possible and supporting workers back into jobs where necessary.

“The Government’s priority is making sure people are in work and able to find new work if their job has been impacted by COVID. That’s why we made a $1.6 billion investment in the Budget to help people retrain. The Budget also invested to create practical jobs for New Zealanders through environmental work, construction and infrastructure. This payment will help Kiwis as they make these transitions.

“We’ve always acknowledged that we won’t be able to save every job or every business and we have not hidden the fact that this is a global economic crisis and things are likely to get worse. But the Government is investing to cushion the blow on households and businesses to make sure we’re in the best position to respond, recover and rebuild,” Grant Robertson said.

The scheme announced today is very similar to the Job Loss Cover payment introduced by the previous Government during the Canterbury earthquakes, and has a number of similarities to the ReStart package for workers who lost their jobs in the Global Financial Crisis.

“We know these schemes reduced the impact on people who lost their jobs due to those shocks. They show how important it is for people to have a safety net to support themselves and their families as they look for new work or retrain,” Grant Robertson said.

Grant Robertson confirmed that work is underway on the possibility of a more permanent unemployment insurance scheme in New Zealand. The Future of Work Ministers group has commissioned the work following a request from Business New Zealand and the Council of Trade Unions.

“As we move from the respond and recover phases of our COVID response, and towards rebuilding the economy, we have an opportunity to reset some of the foundations of the safety net for working New Zealanders.

“Around the world there are many examples of countries that created strong systems to cushion the blow of job loss through both income protection and retraining. These schemes ensure workers don’t suffer large income drops if they’re made redundant through no fault of their own, and save on redundancy costs for businesses going through restructuring.”

Social Development Minister Carmel Sepuloni said today’s announcement of extra support for those hit hard by redundancy will help cushion the blow for people who are looking for work, or taking the time to retrain.

“New Zealand is in a better position than many because we went hard and early to put support in place through the wage subsidy. Internationally countries are facing increased unemployment due to COVID-19 and New Zealand is not immune. As a response to this MSD will not only be delivering the COVID-19 income relief payment but have significantly bolstered employment support."

People with partners who are still working may be eligible for this payment, as long as their partner is earning under $2000 per week. Receipt of the payment comes with expectations from the Government, and responsibilities. People who receive the COVID payment will be required to:

- Be available for, and actively seeking, suitable work opportunities while they receive the payment
- Take appropriate steps towards gaining new employment; and
- Identify and take opportunities for employment, re-deployment and training.

Students who have lost part-time work as a result of COVID-19 may also be eligible for the part-time rate.

The 12-week scheme is forecast to cost about $570 million. This incorporates $1.2 billion of payments offset by $635 million of saved benefit payments, with small administrative costs. This fits with the Government’s intention for COVID response spending to be targeted, temporary and timely. It will be funded from the COVID Response and Recovery Fund.

"New Zealand is in a good position to use the Government's strong balance sheet to invest to create jobs and support the private sector as we cushion the blow of COVID-19 on households and businesses," Grant Robertson said.

"Last week, international credit ratings agency Moody's reaffirmed our world-leading Aaa rating. Moody's said the investments made in the Budget were affordable, and that New Zealand would continue to have some of the lowest debt and interest costs in the developed world due to our careful management of the Government books.

"We went hard and early with support to cushion the blow of COVID-19 on workers and the economy, through the wage subsidy, business tax refunds and interest-free loans for small businesses. Now we're taking the next step in our plan to respond, recover and rebuild the economy," Grant Robertson said.

New Zealand Government [25 May 2020]

Legislation

Note: Bills go through several stages before becoming an Act of Parliament: Introduction; First reading; Referral to select committee; Select committee report, Consideration of report; Committee stage; Second reading; Third reading; and Royal assent.

Bills open for submissions: Four Bills

Six Bills are currently open for public submissions to select committees.

Regulatory Systems (Transport) Amendment Bill (01 June 2020)

Child Support Amendment Bill (24 June 2020)

Inquiry into the operation of the COVID-19 Public Health Response Act 2020 (28 June 2020)

Overseas Investment Amendment Bill (No 3) (31 August 2020)

Overviews of bills - and advice on how to make a select committee submission - available at: https://www.parliament.nz/en/pb/sc/make-a-submission/

Full text of bills available at: http://www.parliament.nz/en-nz/pb/legislation/bills

The Employer Bulletin is a weekly update on employment relations news and recently published legal decisions. It is EMA's policy to summarise cases that contain legal issues relevant to employers. The purpose of the Employer Bulletin is to provide and to promote best practice in employment relations. If you would like to provide feedback about the Employer Bulletin, contact advice@ema.co.nz