

**IN THE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AUTHORITY
CHRISTCHURCH**

**I TE RATONGA AHUMANA TAIMAHI
ŌTAUTAHI ROHE**

[2024] NZERA 552
3309540

BETWEEN XINYI CHENG
Applicant

AND THE VICE CHANCELLOR OF
LINCOLN UNIVERSITY
Respondent

Member of Authority: Peter van Keulen

Representatives: Ella Collis, counsel for the applicant
Sarah Townsend, counsel for the Respondent

Investigation Meeting: 23 August 2024 via AVL

Submissions Received: 20, 23, and 30 August 2024 and 5 September 2024 from the
Applicant
20 and 23 August 2024 and 2 September 2024 from the
Respondent

Date of Determination: 12 September 2024

DETERMINATION OF THE AUTHORITY

Employment relationship problem

[1] Xinyi Cheng was employed by the Vice Chancellor of Lincoln University as a Research Field Technician, from 1 February 2022. Ms Cheng's employment came to an end on 1 May 2024 when Lincoln University terminated her employment by reason of redundancy.

[2] As a result of events that occurred during her employment and because of the termination of her employment Ms Cheng claims she was unjustifiably disadvantaged in her employment and unjustifiably dismissed by Lincoln University. Ms Cheng seeks compensation, an award for lost remuneration and reinstatement.

[3] Ms Cheng also seeks interim reinstatement pending the investigation and determination of her substantive claims.

[4] Lincoln University opposes Ms Cheng's claims, including her application for interim reinstatement.

[5] It is Ms Cheng's application for interim reinstatement that I have investigated and this determination resolves.

The Authority's investigation

[6] Ms Cheng and Dr Steven James Gibbs, Senior Lecturer Department of Agricultural Sciences at Lincoln University, lodged affidavits in support of Ms Cheng's application for interim reinstatement; this included affidavits in reply to the affidavits lodged by Lincoln University.

[7] Julie Williamson, a Human Resources Business Partner at Lincoln University, Professor James Morton, the Professor of Protein Biochemistry at Lincoln University, and Professor Bruce McKenzie, the Interim Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture and Life Sciences at Lincoln University, lodged affidavits in support of Lincoln University's opposition to the application for interim reinstatement.

[8] Counsel for both parties lodged written submissions on 20 August 2024 and made oral submissions at the Investigation Meeting on 23 August 2024.

[9] As permitted by s 174E of the Employment Relations Act 2000 (the Act), my determination has not recorded all of the evidence and submissions received. I have stated relevant findings of fact, insofar as I have been able to establish them based on the untested affidavit evidence. I have also stated the relevant principles of law. Based on this I have reached a conclusion on whether the interim order sought should be granted or declined.

The law relating to interim injunction applications

[10] The issues to be determined at this interim stage are: ¹

- (a) Is there a serious question to be tried in respect of Ms Cheng's claim and the relief sought by her?
- (b) Where does the balance of convenience lie pending a substantive investigation and a final determination of Ms Cheng's claim?
- (c) Where does the overall justice of this case lie from now until the completion of the substantive investigation and issuing of a final determination?

A serious question to be tried

[11] The threshold for a serious question is that the claim is not frivolous or vexatious. In deciding if Ms Cheng's claim is not frivolous or vexatious I must make a judicial assessment of the evidence and the submissions advanced. ²

[12] This assessment must be applied to both Ms Cheng's claim and the relief sought; I must assess whether there is a serious question to be tried that:

- (a) Ms Cheng was unjustifiably dismissed.
- (b) Ms Cheng should be permanently reinstated.

Issues for unjustifiable dismissal

[13] Ms Cheng has been dismissed so for the unjustified dismissal claim the onus shifts to Lincoln University to establish that Ms Cheng's dismissal was justified.

[14] Justification in a redundancy situation was considered by the Court of Appeal in *Grace Team Accounting v Brake*.³ The Court said at [85]:

¹ *Humphrey v Canterbury District Health Board* [2021] NZEmpC 59; and *Western Bay of Plenty District Council v Jarron McInnes* [2016] NZEmpC 36.

² *NZ Tax Refunds v Brooks Homes Limited* [2013] NZCA 90.

³ *Grace Team Accounting Ltd v. Brake* [2014] NZCA 541.

If an employer can show the redundancy is genuine and that the notice and consultation requirements of s.4 of the Act have been duly complied with, that could be expected to go a long way towards satisfying the s.103A test.

[15] Based on s 103A of the Act for Ms Cheng's dismissal to be justified Lincoln University must show its decision to dismiss Ms Cheng and how it went about coming to that decision, comprised actions and acts that a fair and reasonable employer could have done in all of the circumstances.

[16] Putting *Grace Team Accounting* and s 103A of the Act together, if Lincoln University can show that:

- (a) Both the disestablishment of Ms Cheng's role and her redundancy were genuine, then the decision to dismiss her was a decision a fair and reasonable employer could come to.
- (b) It provided Ms Cheng with the relevant information relating to the potential disestablishment of her role and possible redundancy and it afforded her an opportunity to comment on the information, which it then considered before it made its decision on dismissal, then it acted as a fair and reasonable employer could in coming to the conclusion to dismiss Ms Cheng.

[17] At this interim stage however, Lincoln University does not need to establish this, rather I need to be satisfied that Ms Cheng has claims relating to failings on any of these aspects by Lincoln University, which based on the affidavit evidence are claims that are more than just frivolous or vexatious.

Issues for reinstatement

[18] Ms Cheng seeks reinstatement. Pursuant to s 125 of the Act, if I determine that Ms Cheng has a personal grievance then I must order reinstatement if it is practicable and reasonable to do so.

[19] In order to establish that there is a serious question to be tried in respect of the claim for reinstatement, I need to be satisfied that there is an argument, one that is not frivolous or vexatious, that permanent reinstatement of Ms Cheng is practicable and reasonable.

[20] The test for practicable and reasonable has been discussed and analysed by the Court of Appeal.⁴ Practicable means assessing whether reinstatement can be achieved successfully, noting that this it is not as simple as assessing if it can happen. Reasonable is an assessment of what is fair and right in terms of the parties' cases and an assessment of the effects of an order on the parties and others, i.e., whether it should be ordered.

What happened?

[21] Ms Cheng first attended Lincoln University as a student. In 2021 she graduated from Lincoln University with a First-Class Honours degree in Agricultural Science.

[22] Also in 2021, Dr Jim Moir, a professor in the Department of Soil and Physical Science discussed with Ms Cheng the possibility of her applying for funding for a full-time position at Lincoln University as a Research Field Technician (RFT).

[23] The application for funding was approved and in November 2021 Ms Cheng was offered employment with Lincoln University as an RFT stationed at Mount Grand Station (MGS), a high-country station located in Central Otago.

[24] MGS is one of seven farms in Lincoln University's portfolio of farms; these farms allow Lincoln University students and staff to undertake research and gain practical experience in their specialist field. MGS is the only farm in the portfolio that is outside of the Lincoln area.

[25] Ms Cheng's RFT role included that she would conduct day-to-day operational research at MGS, provide technical and field support to Lincoln University staff and post graduate students at MGS (the technical support work), and provide practical farming support

⁴ *New Zealand Educational Institute v Board of Trustees of Auckland Normal Intermediate School (NZEI)* [1994] 2 ERNZ 414 (CA); and *Lewis v Howick College Board of Trustees* [2010] NZCA 320.

(the farm support work). Ms Cheng's line manager was the MGS farm manager but she was also to take direction from Senior Research Academics.

[26] Ms Cheng's RFT role at MGS commenced on 1 February 2022. In the beginning Ms Cheng's primary focus was on benchmarking activities and producing a benchmarking report.

[27] Ms Cheng's ongoing work was divided between the technical support work, such as crop sampling, which was directed by Dr Moir and included requests from Dr Derrick Moot, and the farm support work at the request of the farm manager.

[28] Ms Cheng says her work on MGS was disrupted by two significant events. First, the farm manager took offense at her continued requests for MGS records and her subsequently advising Lincoln University that he had not been forthcoming in providing the reports; Ms Cheng says from this point the farm manager harassed and bullied her, including instructing her to undertake menial and unnecessary farm tasks. Second, Professor Morton, the Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture and Life Sciences at Lincoln University at the time, questioned Dr Moir and Dr Moot's academic supervision of Ms Cheng's role causing them to withdraw their instruction and in essence much of the ongoing technical support work Ms Cheng was doing; this occurred in August 2023.

[29] Professor McKenzie was appointed as the Interim Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture and Life Sciences on 1 January 2024. When Professor McKenzie took up this post he undertook a review of the resourcing for the Faculty, including for the portfolio of farms.

[30] Professor McKenzie says he became aware of student utilisation issues at MGS, in that the number of students utilising MGS had not increased nor had the overall research projects undertaken at MGS; both aspects had been projected to grow.

[31] Professor McKenzie looked into this and discussed it with key stakeholders. He concluded that the demand for support at MGS from Lincoln University's post graduate students and staff was limited and he was concerned that there might not be enough technical support work for Ms Cheng's RFT role.

[32] In contrast Professor McKenzie says he was aware, at that time, that there was an increasing demand from students and staff for compliance monitoring, research analysis, and technical support across all farms in the Lincoln University portfolio.

[33] As a result of these two factors Professor McKenzie formed a preliminary view that the Faculty's needs might be best served by establishing a new Field Technician position based predominantly at Lincoln University, providing technical support across all of the farms in the Lincoln University portfolio.

[34] After discussing this with Lincoln University HR, Professor McKenzie decided to commence consultation over a change proposal; his proposal was set out in writing in a "Consultation Document".

[35] The Consultation Document was four pages and included an introduction setting out relevant background regarding Lincoln University and the portfolio of farms. In regard to Ms Cheng's RFT role, the Consultation Document recorded:

Current Situation

...

The Research Field Technician position was originally established to contribute to day-to-day operational research, field and technician support to staff and students on Mt Grand Station. While this role has been a support for students and staff, the demand for technical support for students has been irregular and there is an opportunity to provide a broader range of services and support to students and staff, as well as continuing to carry out the data compilation for Mt Grand, with the role transferring to the Lincoln campus.

This document outlines a proposal to transfer the role of Research Field Technician from Mount Grand Farm to Lincoln University campus in order to best place it to deliver on current and future needs.

Reasons for change

The proposed changes are driven by the following factors:

- The regular and limited demand for technical support and assistance to staff and students from/at Mt Grand.
- The increasing requirement for compliance monitoring, research analysis and technical support across all of the universities farms.

- A growing need for technical support for academic activity (teaching and research) across the whole of the Farm's portfolio, including Mt Grand.

Proposed Changes

It is therefore proposed that the following changes are made:

The Research Field Technician (x 1 FTE) position is revised to a new position of Field Technician based predominantly on the Lincoln University Campus.

[36] On 6 March Professor McKenzie sent an email to Ms Cheng notifying her of the change proposal and inviting her to a meeting via Teams to discuss.

[37] Ms Cheng responded to the email from Professor McKenzie by requesting more time to prepare for the meeting and asking for any written material relating to the proposal.

[38] Professor McKenzie and Ms Cheng agreed to meet on 11 March 2024 and in advance of the meeting Ms Williamson provided a copy of the Consultation Document and a position description for the proposed new role of Field Technician.

[39] On 11 March 2024, Ms Cheng attended the consultation meeting together with her support person, Dr Gibbs.

[40] In this consultation meeting Professor McKenzie spoke to the proposed restructure in the following terms:

Firstly, we are talking about revising the research field technician position to a new position of field technician. That will be based predominantly on the Lincoln University campus, but not solely on the Lincoln University campus. There will still be some time spent at Mount Grand. There is no question at all about that. And there may be some time spent at some of our other farms as well. But it would be predominantly based there.

The other thing we want to do is... talk about ... why are we interested in making this change? We've had a look see at the situation on both the farms here at Lincoln and down at Mount Grand, and one of the things that it became very clear to us was there is an irregular and a limited demand for technical support and assistance to staff and students at Mount Grand and conversely on our campus, there is an increasing requirement for number one compliance monitoring, research analysis and technical support across all of the University's farms and that is just set to grow hugely.

...

So there's a really significant increase in technical support requirement on our campus. And I don't just mean the funds that everyone is aware of right now, okay, that new solar farm is going to take a lot of effort from the faculty.

[41] Further, in answer to a question from Ms Cheng, Professor McKenzie stated:

Really, I think that really what I'm saying [Ms Cheng] as we have more work on campus than we have in Mount Grand. There is no question about that. The work on campus is expanding very quickly and ... to a very significant magnitude. We very much more need your skills on our campus than we do down at Mount Grand. And that is my opinion. There is no question about that at all. That's the reason for this proposal.

[42] In this meeting, Ms Cheng and Dr Gibbs raised three key points:

- (a) Allegations of bullying and harassment of her by the two other staff at MGS; she believed the farm manager did not want her working at MGS and had asked for her to be removed.
- (b) That decisions made by Lincoln University had caused some of her technical support work to come to a premature end; that is, work that had been provided to her by Dr Muir and Dr Moot as part of the academic supervision of her role. And this work was still available as Lincoln academic staff, particularly Dr Moir and Dr Moot, would re-engage with MGS – evidenced in part by a proposal for a program of research work on MGS.
- (c) That technical support work that had been done and would need to be done in the future could only occur with a staff member on site at MGS; the funding provided for the RFT role was premised on this.

[43] On this last point, in the meeting Dr Gibbs stated:

... So, I don't understand either how a technician could be moved away. I don't understand that. I mean, I look forward to seeing the data on it.

[44] Professor McKenzie says he then consulted on the proposal with staff within the Lincoln Farms portfolio and across the Faculty. Professor McKenzie received nine submissions on the proposal.

[45] Professor McKenzie considered all of the feedback and decided to proceed with the proposal.

[46] In order to advise Ms Cheng of the outcome Professor McKenzie created an Outcomes Document, which he emailed to Ms Cheng on 28 March 2024. That document recorded the outcome as a decision to revise the RFT position to a new position of Field Technician based on the Lincoln University campus.

[47] On 3 April 2024 Lincoln University offered Ms Cheng the newly created position of Field Technician, supplying her with the confirmed position description at that time.

[48] In response to this Ms Cheng raised concerns about the restructure through her union representative. A further meeting was held 18 April 2024 where Ms Cheng repeated her concerns about the way she had been treated by the farm manger, the apparent blocking of work at MGS by Lincoln University and the scope for technician work to continue.

[49] Nothing further came from this meeting and on 29 April 2024 Lincoln University gave Ms Cheng notice of termination by reason of redundancy.

Analysis for unjustifiable dismissal

[50] Having reviewed the affidavit evidence, including the documents referenced in those affidavits and counsels' submissions I conclude there is a serious question to be tried in respect of unjustifiable dismissal. There are various aspects of the process and the substantive decision that inform my view.

[51] The overall proposal seems to be informed by Lincoln University's view that it needed to use Ms Cheng as a resource for technician work on all of the farms in the Lincoln portfolio. The best evidence of this is that the Consultation Document refers to the proposal as one to transfer the RFT role from MGS to Lincoln University. I am concerned that this has tainted the whole of the approach by Lincoln University.

[52] Ms Cheng's RFT role specifically had funding from the Struthers Family Trust and there is no evidence to show that in the process of disestablishing the funded RFT role at

MGS and creating a new Field Technician role at Lincoln University that Lincoln University was able to change the use of the approved funding to accomplish this change.

[53] In consultation there was no specific information provided to support the position that there was a downturn in both technical support work and farm support work at MGS, in fact the evidence of Professor McKenzie is that he had never met the farm manager at MGS let alone discussed the farm's operational needs with him. The information provided in connection with the downturn in technical support work comprises one paragraph in the Proposal Document (at paragraph [35] above). Then in consultation little is added to this, as seen in the quote at paragraph [40] above.

[54] Similarly, there was no specific information provided to support the view that there was increased demand for technical support work across all of the farms in the Lincoln University portfolio. This is also evident from the quotes at paragraphs [35] and [40] above.

[55] There was no information provided about on how the technical support work that remained at MGS could be done by a Field Technician based at Lincoln University; Dr Gibbs had specifically requested this information.

[56] The feedback that Professor McKenzie received on the Consultation Document was not provided to Ms Cheng or discussed with her for her to comment on. The treatment of that feedback on the Outcomes Document was not particularly helpful in terms of establishing how Lincoln University had come to the conclusion to proceed.

[57] Statements made by Professor McKenzie in consultation suggested the outcome of the proposal had been predetermined. In particular Professor McKenzie said to Ms Cheng in the 11 March 2024 consultation meeting "we very much more need your skills on our campus than we do at Mount Grand. And that is my opinion. There is no question about that at all."

[58] When Ms Cheng turned down the offer of the Field Technician role at Lincoln University there was no further discussions with her about other employment opportunities. This was despite the fact that the Outcomes Document specifically stated that if Ms Cheng turned down the Field Technician role "a process will commence to explore all available

options with affected staff e.g., redeployment, retraining, voluntary redundancy, retirement – before any compulsory redundancy is confirmed.”

[59] These are all aspects of Ms Cheng’s unjustified dismissal claim that are neither frivolous nor vexatious. In fact, the number and nature of these concerns are significant and I not only conclude that there is a serious question to be tried, I find it to be a very strong case both in terms of process and the substantive basis for the decision.

Analysis for reinstatement

[60] Ms Cheng wants to be reinstated to her role at MGS; she turned down the offer of work as a Field Technician based at Lincoln and only wants to work as an RFT at MGS.

[61] The questions of whether reinstatement is practicable, i.e., can be achieved successfully, and whether reinstatement is reasonable, i.e., whether I should order it, are informed by the same factors:

- (a) Lincoln University says Ms Cheng’s RFT role at MGS has been disestablished and there is limited work for her to undertake. In essence there is no role to reinstate her too, particularly where she has turned down the offer of the Field Technician role.
- (b) Lincoln University says the alleged relationship difficulties between Ms Cheng and the farm manager at MGS makes reinstatement problematic; at its simplest the argument is, if the allegations are true then the environment is not safe and if the allegations are not true then there may be trust issues with Ms Cheng.

[62] Based on the affidavit evidence and counsel’s submissions I am not convinced that Ms Cheng’s RFT role at MGS was properly disestablished and it follows that I am not persuaded by the argument that reinstatement is not practical or reasonable because there is no longer an RFT role at MGS. This follows the reasoning set out in *Genesys Telecommunications Laboratories Limited v Scott*.⁵

⁵ *Genesys Telecommunications Laboratories Limited v Scott* [2019] NZEmpC 113 at [119].

[63] It is my view that the relationship difficulties between Ms Cheng and the farm manager at MGS are not persuasive on the issue of reinstatement.

[64] Presently there is no resolution of the issues raised by Ms Cheng and Lincoln University is to undertake an investigation and based on that take appropriate steps. So currently there is no basis to suggest Ms Cheng should not be reinstated – to do so would be do disadvantage her for making a complaint or pre-empt the outcome by deciding there is no basis for her complaints.

[65] It follows that reinstatement pending the outcome of the investigation places the parties in the position they would have been in but for the dismissal – balancing the competing tensions of complaints and an investigation in an ongoing work environment.

[66] Overall Ms Cheng's evidence and submissions are that there is ongoing technical support work and farm support work at MGS which she can and should do in her RFT role and that despite the complaints she has made about the farm manager at MGS she is confident there with suitable precautionary measures in place, perhaps with intervention by Lincoln University, it is possible for her to work safely at MGS.

[67] I accept this and conclude that there is a serious question to be tried in respect of reinstatement of Ms Cheng to her role of RFT at MGS.

Conclusion on the question of serious question to be tried

[68] Overall, I conclude there are serious questions to be tried in respect of Ms Cheng's unjustifiable dismissal claim and for reinstatement; at this interim stage I find these to be very strong cases.

The balance of convenience

[69] The balance of convenience is about weighing relevant competing factors, as they apply in this employment relationship problem, to ascertain if they weigh in favour of

exercising my discretion to grant interim reinstatement or not.⁶

[70] In this case my assessment of the balance of convenience turns on three aspects:

- (a) The strengths of each party's case.
- (b) The impact on each party of making the interim order or not i.e., assessing the merits of preserving the status quo against ordering interim reinstatement.
- (c) The adequacy of damages if the interim position is reversed in any subsequent determination on the substantive claims.

Strength of the claims

[71] Ms Cheng has strong claims on both unjustifiable dismissal and reinstatement; this favours granting interim reinstatement.

Preserving the status quo weighed against making the interim order

[72] Preserving the status quo (not granting interim reinstatement):

- (a) Avoids any difficulties that arise in what work there is to be done by Ms Cheng and what happens between her and the farm manager at MGS given the unresolved issues that have been raised.
- (b) Means Lincoln University can use the cost of Ms Cheng's RFT role to fund the new Field Technician role at Lincoln University – as it intended with its proposal.
- (c) Means Ms Cheng will be without work in a technician role and will need to find alternative employment to further her career and to earn money.

[73] Granting interim reinstatement means:

⁶ *Team Group Realty Limited Trading as Harcourts Paremata v Martin Cardno & Ors* [2024] NZHC 553 at [66].

- (a) Lincoln University will have to find work for Ms Cheng at MGS. I am not satisfied that there is insufficient work for Ms Cheng at MGS in either the technical support work or the farm support work, but even if there is I do not envisage any difficulties or hardship on Lincoln University in finding additional work for Ms Cheng to do at MGS.
- (b) Lincoln University will have to deal with the issues between her and the farm manager at MGS. This may prove difficult but I am not persuaded that it cannot be done. There is no evidence to show that a resolution cannot be found that keeps Ms Cheng away from the farm manager as her line manager and the person who supervises her daily farm work if she was to return to work at MGS, at least until the issues raised have been resolved.
- (c) Lincoln University will have to either leave the additional field technician work across the portfolio of farms unfulfilled or find additional funding to fill the proposed Field Technician role. Either way there is some hardship for Lincoln University.
- (d) Gives Ms Cheng the opportunity to further her career, which would otherwise be difficult for her – her evidence being there are few, if any, opportunities for her to undertake technical support work in a high-country farm setting. And it provides her with income to address her ongoing costs, including the costs of perusing her claims.

[74] Overall, this analysis supports granting interim reinstatement.

Adequacy of damages

[75] If I do not grant interim reinstatement for Ms Cheng but subsequently order reinstatement on her substantive claim then the remedies I can order will cover any lost remuneration. However, there are no remedies that I can order that will replace any lost experience and the loss of the chance for Ms Cheng to reestablish herself in the RFT role at MGS sooner rather than later, but, in the context of permanent reinstatement this short period of lost experience is not material.

[76] In contrast, if I do grant interim reinstatement and then subsequently decide in the substantive claim that permanent reinstatement is not appropriate, then damages can adequately resolve Lincoln University's position i.e. Ms Cheng can be ordered to pay back any salary she is paid in the interim period. In this regard I note Ms Cheng has given an undertaking as to damages to cover this scenario.

[77] Overall, this analysis is not persuasive either way and is neutral in terms of informing the balance of convenience.

Conclusion

[78] Ms Cheng's strong claim for unjustified dismissal and permanent reinstatement as well as the benefit to her of granting interim reinstatement (as opposed to the hardship to Lincoln University) means the balance of convenience favours granting interim reinstatement.

The overall justice

[79] The overall justice assessment is essentially a check on the position that has been reached after my analysis of the serious question to be tried and the balance of convenience.⁷

[80] There are serious questions to be tried in respect of Ms Cheng's claims for unjustifiable dismissal and permanent reinstatement and the balance of convenience favours granting her interim relief.

[81] Standing back from this assessment I am not persuaded that the overall justice means I should change this, in fact the overall justice supports granting interim reinstatement.

Conclusion

[82] Ms Cheng has established that she should be reinstated to her role as an RFT at MGS on an interim basis.

⁷ *NZ Tax Refunds v Brooks Homes Limited* [2013] NZCA 90.

[83] In reliance on the undertaking as to damages provided by Ms Cheng, Lincoln University must reinstate Ms Cheng to her role of RFT at MGS pending the investigation and determination of her personal grievances. This order is subject to the following conditions:⁸

- (a) Lincoln University is to progress its investigation into the issues between Ms Cheng and the farm manager at MGS as quickly as possible and take the appropriate steps based on the outcome of its investigation.
- (b) Lincoln University and Ms Cheng are directed to attend urgent mediation in order to discuss and reach agreement on how Ms Cheng will operate in her role, particularly how dealings between her and the farm manager at MGS (if any are required) can be accommodated in a safe way.

Costs

[84] Costs in relation to this application are reserved. If the parties cannot agree costs then they will be assessed following investigation and determination of the substantive application.

Next steps

[85] A case management conference will be convened to discuss arrangements for, and establish necessary directions, for an Investigation Meeting to deal with Ms Cheng's substantive claims.

Peter van Keulen
Member of the Employment Relations Authority

⁸ Employment Relations Act 2000, s 127.