

**IN THE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AUTHORITY
CHRISTCHURCH**

**I TE RATONGA AHUMANA TAIMAHI
ŌTAUTAHI ROHE**

[2025] NZERA 598
3312580

BETWEEN ALBERT VAN BERKEL AND
 OTHERS
 Applicants

AND SEALORD GROUP LIMITED
 Respondent

Member of Authority: Peter van Keulen

Representatives: Peter Cranney and Emily Griffin, counsel for the Applicants
 David France, counsel for the Respondent

Investigation Meeting: 27 May 2025 in Nelson and 24 June 2025 by AVL

Submissions Received: Up until 24 June 2025 from the Applicant
 Up until 24 June 2025 from the Respondent

Date of Determination: 25 September 2025

DETERMINATION OF THE AUTHORITY

Employment relationship problem

[1] Sealord Group Limited operates a wetfish factory in Nelson in which fresh fish is processed (the wetfish factory).

[2] The applicants, listed in Schedule One to this determination, are all members of E tū Union.

[3] The applicants have all been employed by Sealord to work in the wetfish factory. Each applicant's employment has been covered by one or more fixed term employment agreements that incorporate terms of the applicable collective agreement between Sealord and E tū.

[4] The applicants' fixed term employment agreements have varied over time but the relevant provisions relating to the fixed term nature of the employment relationships have remained similar. An example of the relevant wording in the applicants' fixed term employment agreements is:

We are pleased to confirm the terms of our offer of fixed term employment with Sealord Group Limited (Sealord).

...

2. Employment Status and Terms

Your employment is effective from 8 January 2024.

This agreement is for the purpose of performing duties for the Sanford Orange Roughy Contract which is for a limited term. Your employment is therefore for a fixed term only.

The reason for it being fixed term contract is due to additional processing requirements as a result of the Sanford Orange Roughy Contract. The processing work is due to be completed approximately 17 May 2024. Your employment will end following the end of the Sanford Orange Roughy Contract which will be on or around 17 May 2024, because the duties you are employed to perform under this fixed term employment agreement will cease.

...

Due to the variability of fishing and/or the project processing ahead of or behind schedule, this contract may be extended or shortened by providing you with one week's notice, depending on the Company's needs.

[5] Clause 14(d)(i) of the applicable collective agreement between Sealord and E tū provides:

Temporary

Temporary workers may be employed in any job covered by this agreement for specific reasons to cover limited terms needed for additional labour including seasonal or market fluctuations or to cover extended absences. Employment and termination of Temporary workers will be in accordance with s 66 of the Employment Relations Act 2000. Where the period of employment extends beyond twelve (12) months that person shall be deemed permanent and continuous time served shall count towards service related benefits.

[6] The applicants say that their employment with Sealord has been continuous because:

- (a) They have been employed on consecutive fixed term employment agreements resulting in each employee's period of employment exceeding 12 months and

therefore, pursuant to cl 14(d)(i) of the applicable collective agreement their employment is permanent.

(b) The fixed term employment agreements do not comply with s 66 of the Employment Relations Act 2000 (the Act).

My investigation

[7] The applicants lodged a statement of problem in the Authority seeking a determination that each applicant's employment is continuous by operation of the applicable collective agreement and/or non-compliance with s 66 of the Act.

[8] Sealord denies that each applicant's employment is continuous stating that each applicant's employment has not exceeded 12 months and the fixed term agreements comply with s 66 of the Act.

[9] The question of whether each applicant's employment with Sealord is continuous forms the employment relationship problem that I have investigated and this determination resolves.

[10] I investigated this employment relationship problem by receiving written evidence and documents and holding an investigation meeting on 27 May 2025 in Nelson and 24 June 2025 by AVL.

[11] There are 56 applicants in this employment relationship problem. Rather than considering evidence on every applicant's employment circumstances I agreed with counsel that I would investigate evidence relating to six employees selected by E tū that are said to be indicative of the employment circumstances of all applicants.

[12] In my investigation meeting, under oath or affirmation, these six witnesses as well as two witnesses from Sealord, confirmed their written evidence and gave oral evidence in answer to questions from myself and the parties' representatives. The representatives subsequently provided written and oral submissions.

[13] As permitted by s 174E of the Act I have not recorded all the evidence and submissions that I received, in this determination. I have set out my findings of fact and law, then based on this I have expressed conclusions on issues as necessary to dispose of this employment relationship problem, and then I have specified the orders made as a result.

What events give rise to this employment relationship problem?

[14] Sealord's business operations comprise deepwater fishing, seafood processing and aquaculture.

[15] Sealord's seafood processing operations include three land-based factories in Nelson; one factory where crumbed and battered fish is processed, the wetfish factory that processes fresh fish, and one factory that processes fish meal out of by-products from the wetfish factory.

[16] Sealord's deepwater fishing is primarily carried out with vessels that have capacity to process fish on board vessels. Sealord has one non-factory trawler and the fish caught by this trawler is delivered to the wetfish factory.

[17] Sealord employs a base of permanent employees to process fish at the wetfish factory – 46 at the time of my investigation. Sealord also employs additional employees in the wetfish factory depending on the amount of fresh fish to be processed.

[18] Hoki is the largest volume fishing species processed by Sealord. The wetfish factory predominantly processes hoki during May to September each year, this being during the hoki season which lasts 16 – 18 weeks. During this processing Sealord operates all lines in the wetfish factory and runs a three-shift operation. Sealord can employ up to 400 people during the hoki season to run the land-based processing.

[19] Outside the hoki season Sealord processes other fish caught such as jack mackerel, dory, ling, and orange roughy. The amount of catch processed in the wetfish factory varies but is significantly less than the amount of hoki processed – Sealord operates a one-shift operation in the wetfish factory outside of the hoki season.

[20] The amount of fresh fish to be processed in the wetfish factory varies throughout the year. The volume of fish to be processed at any given time in a year is dependent on variables:

(a) Fishing seasons, particularly the hoki fishing season.

(b) What other catch is to be processed. This is impacted by two main factors: what sales contracts Sealord has for processed fish and contract manufacturing agreements where Sealord processes fish caught by other companies.

[21] The volume of fresh fish to be processed year on year can also vary depending on:

- (a) How catch is allocated to Sealord's vessels.
- (b) Quotas and catch limits, which can be altered annually.
- (c) Volume of fish caught in a season – volume can be lower than anticipated if the weather is bad or fishing is poor.
- (d) Customer circumstances changing such that sales contracts and processing agreements are entered into, renewed, modified or cancelled.

[22] The number of employees that Sealord needs to work in the wetfish factory varies throughout the year and can vary between years depending on the amount of fish to be processed. To accommodate this fluctuation in employee numbers Sealord employs all additional employees in the wetfish factory on fixed term employment agreements for a particular fishing season or catch amount. So, by way of example employees have been employed on a fixed term employment agreement for the hoki season and employed on a fixed term agreement for the processing of an amount of jack mackerel for Pelco NZ Limited.

[23] In simple terms Sealord manages the number of employees required for the wetfish factory by estimating the predicted volume of processing for each season or contract (sometimes referred to as projects – so for example the contract to process jack mackerel for Pelco was labelled the Pelco Processing Project) and calculating the number of employees required for that predicted processing. Sealord then offers fixed term employment to the number of employees above its permanent employee headcount.

[24] Sealord has offered consecutive fixed term employment agreements to many employees over the years. This is because the volume of fish to be processed has been at a level that more employees have been required in the wetfish factory than the permanent employees. And because Sealord's processing requirements based on fishing seasons and/or project requirements have been able to be run consecutively with little or no break between processing production. A review of the evidence shows there has been on occasion breaks of a few days between fixed term agreements (and presumably processing) and for a few weeks for Christmas shutdown although that had not been the case every year.

What are the issues that I must address?

[25] The issues I must answer to resolve this employment relationship problem are:

- (a) Is the employment of the applicants continuous pursuant to clause 14(d)(i) of the applicable collective agreement?
- (b) Do the applicants' fixed term employment agreements comply with s 66 of the Act?

Is the employment of the applicants continuous pursuant to clause 14(d)(i) of the applicable collective agreement?

[26] The question of whether the employment of the applicants is continuous pursuant to clause 14(d)(i) of the applicable collective agreement requires me to interpret clause 14(d)(i) and then apply that to the facts arising here.

[27] In *E Tu Inc v New Zealand Steel Ltd* the Employment Court summarised the principles of interpretation applying to collective agreements:¹

[16] The proper approach is an objective one, the aim being to ascertain the meaning the written agreement would convey to a reasonable person having all the background knowledge that would reasonably have been available to the parties at the time of the agreement. This objective meaning is taken to be that which the parties intended. The context provided by the agreement as a whole and any relevant background informs meaning. Nevertheless, while context is a necessary element of the interpretive process, and the focus is on interpreting the document as a whole, rather than particular words, the text remains centrally important. If the language at issue, construed in the context of the whole agreement, has an ordinary and natural meaning, that will be a powerful, albeit not conclusive, indicator of what the parties meant. But the wider context may point to some interpretation other than the most obvious one and may also assist in determining the meaning intended in cases of ambiguity or uncertainty.

[28] So, to interpret clause 14(d)(i) I must consider if the language construed in the context of the whole agreement has an ordinary and natural meaning. If it does, then that

¹ *E Tu Inc v New Zealand Steel Ltd* [2024] NZEmpC 29 citing *Firm PI 1 Ltd v Zurich Australian Insurance Ltd* [2014] NZSC 147; *New Zealand Air Line Pilots' Assoc Inc v Air New Zealand Ltd* [2017] NZSC 111; *Bathurst Resources Ltd v L&M Coal Holdings Ltd* [2021] NZSC 85; and *Vulcan Steel Ltd v Manufacturing & Construction Workers Union* [2022] NZEmpC 78 (footnotes omitted).

interpretation will be the basis of what the parties meant – in these circumstances wider context (background knowledge available to the parties) has limited utility in interpretation. If the language construed in the context of the whole agreement does not have an ordinary and natural meaning, then wider context can be used to ascertain what the parties intended the clause to mean.

[29] Logically this means my interpretation of clause 14(d)(i) will involve a consideration of:

- (a) The ordinary and natural meaning of the text.
- (b) The context of the entirety of the relevant collective agreement.
- (c) Any relevant background information as appropriate.

[30] The natural and ordinary meaning of clause 14(d)(i) viewed in the context of the whole collective agreement is that Temporary employees are a category of employee – the other categories include, Full-time, Part-time and Casual, as listed in clauses 14(a) – 14(c) of the relevant collective agreement. Temporary employees are those on fixed term agreements, pursuant to s 66 of the Act, employed to undertake work for a specific reason to provide additional labour due to seasonal or market variations to processing. Temporary employees whose employment extends beyond 12 months will be deemed permanent employees. In the context of the collective agreement, permanent means continuing employment either as a Full-time or Part-time employee depending on the number of hours worked.

[31] For the question posed, the relevant part of my interpretation of clause 14(d)(i) is the phrase “employment extends beyond 12 months”. Employment must mean the period the Temporary employee is engaged to work by Sealord. This is easy to calculate if the Temporary employee has only one fixed term agreement – it is simply the length of the fixed term, including any extension if that occurs. But the calculation becomes problematic where a Temporary employee has consecutive fixed term agreements so that cumulatively they have worked for Sealord for a consecutive period exceeding 12 months – which is what has occurred for the applicants and is the basis on which they say clause 14(d)(i) applies so that they are continuing employees. Sealord says the period of employment can only be the period of each fixed term agreement and is not calculated cumulatively, in short to do so would undermine the point of using fixed term arrangements.

[32] My observation is that the ordinary meaning of clause 14(d)(i) supports the view that reference to employment extending must be to the period of any fixed term agreement that is renewed so that it is for a period longer than 12 months. Nothing in the clause contemplates or indicates that Temporary workers would have consecutive or even multiple fixed term agreements. The clause contemplates that Temporary workers will be engaged for a set period for a specific purpose and that the start and finish of a period of employment will be governed by s 66 of the Act, so a singular fixed term for a particular period, event, or project.

[33] Further to my analysis, the background information is relevant. In this regard Colin Paulin, Sealord CEO, gave evidence of both the circumstances that give rise to Sealord using fixed term employees – see facts in paragraphs [14] – [23] – and the bargaining over the use of fixed term employees with E Tu.

[34] In terms of the latter Mr Paulin's evidence included:

- (a) The Temporary employee category has been a long-standing category of employee in the collective agreements and the use predated his involvement in either any collective bargaining or management of fixed term employees. The use of Temporary employees in the wetfish factory prior to the 2013/2014 financial year was minimal and not done consecutively – he estimated only one or two Temporary employees on occasion.
- (b) There was an increase in the use of Temporary employees after a restructuring of the wetfish factory in the 2013/2014 financial year. As a result of the restructuring Sealord found it did not have enough employees in the wetfish factory to undertake the processing required as processing volumes changed throughout the year – for the reasons outlined previously.
- (c) Mr Paulin negotiated and agreed with E Tū that Sealord would use Temporary employees to cover any additional labour required in the wetfish factory rather than Casual employees.
- (d) Mr Paulin also agreed that, to the extent it was able to, Sealord would structure its processing at the wetfish factory so that some Temporary employees (depending on need) could be offered consecutive fixed term appointments so that they would not be without work for any significant period between one fixed term appointment ending and another commencing.

[35] For interpretation purposes I draw on three key pieces of context:

- (a) The use of Temporary employees is to ensure Sealord has sufficient employees at any time in a year to deal with the wetfish factory processing requirements. Temporary employees are used because the number of employees required in the wetfish factory fluctuates depending on fishing seasons and customer requirements. Using Full-time or Part-time employees creates issues with excess employees at times and potential redundancy situations or having to run the wetfish factory at a loss.
- (b) The use of consecutive fixed term appointments for some Temporary workers was to provide employees with more employment spaced throughout the year and it was not about accumulating service for entitlements (either employment standards or under the collective agreement) and this was done at E Tū's request.
- (c) Clause 14(d)(i) was likely bargained when the use of Temporary workers was minimal and not done consecutively – the evidence being that the use of consecutive fixed term agreements was in response to the position of Sealord needing additional employees in varying amounts after the 2013/2014 restructuring.

[36] This supports an interpretation that employment extending is calculated by reference to a single fixed term agreement length.

[37] My finding is that the relevant part of clause 14(d)(i) – “Where the period of employment extends beyond twelve (12) months that person shall be deemed permanent” – means that where the period of employment under a single fixed term agreement exceeds 12 months that Temporary worker will become a permanent employee, either a Full-time employee or a Part-time employee; consecutive fixed term agreements are not used to calculate if a period of employment for a Temporary worker exceeds 12 months.

[38] Based on the evidence in my investigation none of the fixed term agreements exceeded 12 months in duration.

[39] I conclude therefore that none of the applicants are permanent employees pursuant to clause 14(d)(i) of the relevant collective agreement.

Do the applicants' fixed term employment agreements comply with s 66 of the Act?

[40] Section 66 of the Act sets out provisions relating to the use of fixed term employment:

66 Fixed term employment

- (1) An employee and an employer may agree that the employment of the employee will end—
 - (a) at the close of a specified date or period; or
 - (b) on the occurrence of a specified event; or
 - (c) at the conclusion of a specified project.
- (2) Before an employee and employer agree that the employment of the employee will end in a way specified in subsection (1), the employer must—
 - (a) have genuine reasons based on reasonable grounds for specifying that the employment of the employee is to end in that way; and
 - (b) advise the employee of when or how his or her employment will end and the reasons for his or her employment ending in that way.
- (3) The following reasons are not genuine reasons for the purposes of subsection (2)(a):
 - (a) to exclude or limit the rights of the employee under this Act;
 - (b) to establish the suitability of the employee for permanent employment;
 - (c) to exclude or limit the rights of an employee under the Holidays Act 2003.
- (4) If an employee and an employer agree that the employment of the employee will end in a way specified in subsection (1), the employee's employment agreement must state in writing—
 - (a) the way in which the employment will end; and
 - (b) the reasons for ending the employment in that way.
- (5) Failure to comply with subsection (4), including failure to comply because the reasons for ending the employment are not genuine reasons based on reasonable grounds, does not affect the validity of the employment agreement between the employee and the employer.
- (6) However, if the employer does not comply with subsection (4), the employer may not rely on any term agreed under subsection (1)—
 - (a) to end the employee's employment if the employee elects, at any time, to treat that term as ineffective; or
 - (b) as having been effective to end the employee's employment, if the former employee elects to treat that term as ineffective.

[41] The applicants say the fixed term employment arrangements utilised by Sealord do not comply with the requirements in s 66 of the Act. The applicants' arguments in this respect cover three points (alternatively):

- (a) Each applicant's employment under the fixed term employment agreements does not end. The applicants continue to work they simply change tasks – processing one type of fish for a period and then changing to another; this change often happening overnight based on a supposed termination. The real nature of the applicants' employment is understood by considering how the collective agreement and the fixed term employment agreements operate in practice – continuously.
- (b) If each applicant's employment does come to an end this is not because of any specified period, event or project identified in the fixed term employment agreements. If the applicants' employment come to an end, then that is by one week's notice given in line with the agreements.
- (c) If each applicant's employment does come to an end because of the ending of a specified period, event or project then the reason for the specified period, event or project is not a genuine reason based on reasonable grounds. Rather Sealord's reasons are to defeat employee entitlements particularly leave and redundancy entitlements.

[42] Sealord says its fixed term employment agreements comply with s 66 of the Act. There is, in each fixed term employment agreement, an agreement that the employment will end at the occurrence of a specified event or the conclusion of a project – so for example, the end of the hoki season in 2024 or the completion of the Pelco Processing Project. And it says it has genuine reasons based on reasonable grounds for specifying the way each fixed term employment period will end – based on the varying processing requirements throughout the year and year on year which impacts the number of employees required at any given time.

[43] Whilst there is some attraction to the submission that I should consider the real nature of the applicants' employment by looking at how their employment operate in practice; however, this approach has not been endorsed by the Employment Court. In *Morgan v*

Tranzit Coachlines Wairarapa Ltd, the Court stated:²

[26] The position as to the multiplicity of fixed term agreements can be summarised as follows. The fact that a fixed term agreement has been rolled over, even several times, does not automatically mean the arrangement falls foul of s 66(2)(a). There is no magic number or bright-line test that applies. In other words, while rollover is likely to represent a flag that attracts the Court's attention and scrutiny, the mere existence of agreement multiplicity does not of itself give rise to ineffectiveness. Ineffectiveness, if it is to be invoked by an employee, must be based on the *reasons* for the fixed term agreement.

[44] Or as the Court also put it – “The point is, however, there may be circumstances in which a fixed term agreement is entered into on a number of occasions for genuine reasons based on reasonable grounds. In such circumstances the tail (agreement multiplicity) does not wag the dog (effectiveness).”³

[45] So, it is not how the consecutive fixed term agreements operate in practice that is the issue to focus on but rather whether each fixed term agreement is for a genuine reason based on reasonable grounds.

[46] Before I consider the question of genuine reasons for each fixed term agreement, I will look at the issue of how each fixed term agreement has come to an end.

[47] Section 66(1) of the Act provides for the specified ways in which employment may come to an end for that employment period to be a valid fixed term agreement. These are the close of a specified date, the occurrence of a specified event, or the conclusion of a specified project.

[48] The specified way in which the applicants' fixed term employment agreements are to end are said to be either the occurrence of a specified event – such as the end of the hoki season – or the conclusion of a specified project – such as the end of the Pelco Processing Project.

[49] The problem that arises is that at the outset of the fixed term employment agreements Sealord cannot identify a date by which specified events end or specified projects are completed. This is simply because of the variability in fishing; there is no basis on which Sealord can, at the start of the fixed term, specifically identify when the hoki season will finish or when the Pelco Processing Project will be completed – these occurrences are dictated

² *Morgan v Tranzit Coachlines Wairarapa Ltd* [2019] NZEmpC 66.

³ At [24].

by the underlying fishing operations and the volume of catch, which in turn are variable depending on factors outside of Sealord's control, such as weather. The best that Sealord can do is give an estimated time frame or date and then give notice of the end of the event or conclusion of the project once that has been established. This is why Sealord uses one week's notice. The notice provision in the fixed term employment agreements is tied to Sealord's needs (i.e. processing needs) arising from the variability of fishing (so, the hoki season extending or being shorter than anticipated) or the project running ahead or behind schedule.

[50] In these circumstances I do not read the applicants' fixed term employment agreements as being terminable on notice, rather they express that the applicants will receive notice of the occurrence of a specified event (such as the end of the hoki season) or the conclusion of a specified project (such as completion of the Pelco Processing project).

[51] Therefore, I determine that the applicants' fixed term agreements comply with s 66(1) of the Act.

[52] Turning to the question of Sealord having genuine reasons based on reasonable grounds for the applicants' employment ending in a specified way, i.e., compliance with s 66(2) of the Act, there are two aspects to consider. First, does Sealord have genuine reasons and second, are the reasons to exclude or limit rights of employees under the Act or the Holidays Act 2003 or to establish suitability for employment.⁴

[53] I have considered Sealord's evidence on its reasons for using fixed term employment agreements and the facts established. I am satisfied that Sealord has genuine reasons for using the occurrence of a specified event (such as the Hoki season) or the conclusion of a specified project (such as completion of the Pelco Processing Project) to bring the applicants' employment to an end. The key aspect in Sealord's position is the variability of its processing requirements from the extremes of the hoki season to much lower volumes for particular supply or processing agreements. It makes commercial sense to be able to adjust the employment need in response to the varying processing requirements, otherwise the processing undertaken at the wetfish factory would be uneconomic. Mr Paulin's evidence, whilst dramatic was apposite – if Sealord can not control its employment costs to the processing demand, then he would have to close the factory.

[54] The other aspect of my assessment however is to consider if the use of fixed term

⁴ Employment Relations Act 2000, s 66(3).

agreements is for the purpose of defeating employee rights or to establish suitability for employment. In this regard:

- (a) I am not persuaded that Sealord is using fixed term employment to defeat the applicants' rights under the Act or the Holidays Act. Again, Mr Paulin's evidence on this point was clear. And, interestingly Sealord has, in the past, given employees additional rights such as the accrual of leave when Covid 19 impacted operations or employees ability to work. I accept that employees on fixed term agreements with a duration of less than six months do not get sick leave entitlements, but this is a consequence of the fixed term arrangements not a reason for them.
- (b) Sealord does use fixed term agreements so that it does not incur redundancy costs. This was very clear from the evidence. However, this is not a prohibited reason under s 66(3) of the Act and is exactly the economic consequences that feeds the genuineness of Sealord's reasons. Sealord is seeking to limit its employment cost when there is insufficient work for all of the employees, that cost sounding as payment for no work or redundancy payments. This is the economic rationale underpinning the need to have and use fixed term employment and cannot invalidate the fixed term employment agreements.
- (c) Sealord does not use the fixed term employment agreements to assess suitability for employment. Sealord readily accepts that when it is offering new fixed term employment to employees whose existing fixed term employment is coming to an end it uses a selection criterion if the number of new agreements is less than the number of employees seeking employment. But this is not about suitability for a role rather it is a way of selecting employees. Sealord was very clear that this is not a suitability assessment tool – if an employee is not suitable for employment, then that is addressed through competency or disciplinary processes during employment.

[55] I am satisfied that Sealord has genuine reasons based on reasonable grounds for the applicants' employment ending in a specified way, i.e., Sealord's fixed term employment agreements comply with s 66(2) of the Act

[56] Overall, I find that the fixed term employment agreements that Sealord has with the

applicants comply with s 66 of the Act. As a result, the applicants are not permanent employees.

What is the outcome?

[57] This employment relationship problem is resolved in favour of Sealord. Each applicants' employment with Sealord is not permanent.

Costs

[58] Costs are reserved. The parties are encouraged to resolve any issue of costs between themselves.

[59] If the parties are unable to resolve costs, and an Authority determination on costs is needed, Sealord may lodge, and then should serve, a memorandum on costs within 28 days of the date of this determination. From the date of service of that memorandum the applicants will then have 14 days to lodge any reply memorandum. On request by either party, an extension of time for the parties to continue to negotiate costs between themselves may be granted.

[60] The parties can anticipate the Authority will determine costs, if asked to do so, on its usual "daily tariff" basis unless circumstances or factors, require an adjustment upwards or downwards.⁵

Peter van Keulen
Member of the Employment Relations Authority

⁵ For further information about the factors considered in assessing costs see:
www.era.govt.nz/determinations/awarding-costs-remedies/#awarding-and-paying-costs-1

Schedule 1 – List of Applicants

1	Albert Van Berkel	35	Nguan Zi Thuang
2	Simon Capenerhurst	36	Joshua McGee
3	James Stanley Byrom	37	Jim Byrom
4	Bradley Blomfield	38	Duha Kim
5	Steve Thomas	39	Tan Dang
6	Ollie Gardener	40	Huu Vantang
7	Terrence Peter Walters	41	Cassandra Clarke
8	Maria Cory	42	John Michael Raal
9	Pen Zang	43	Khuppi Khawl
10	Dar Rig	44	Tin Thai
11	Rosita M.C Barnes	45	Tial Tlu Mag
12	David Iang Lian Ching	46	Ni Tha Len
13	Ceu Bik	47	Me Meh
14	Hshaw Reh	48	Cunglian Thawng
15	Ni lang Hlawn Ceu	49	Tana Htoo
16	Thang Boih Cinzah	50	Su Meh
17	Siang Awi	51	Biak Tlei
18	Robin Ching	52	Ngun Sui
19	Ngun Dong Chin	53	Tial Hla Lua
20	Ricky Smith	54	Ko Reh
21	Maria Lorma Igaran	55	La Reh
22	Zion Haira	56	Naw Ellis
23	Deg Reh		
24	Raami Manaja		
25	Katrina Johnson		
26	Zakir Hussain Jafari		
27	Carmen O'Leisa Castrillo		
28	Ci Thang Saya		
29	Mon Magar		
30	Lila Puwarmargar		
31	Ami Magar		
32	Iokopo Saman		
33	Fuaillelagi		
34	Chung hum puii		