

**IN THE EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS AUTHORITY  
AUCKLAND**

**I TE RATONGA AHUMANA TAIMAHI  
TĀMAKI MAKĀURAU ROHE**

[2026] NZERA 328  
3431805

BETWEEN	JASPREET SINGH Applicant
AND	SHARAN SOLUTIONS LIMITED First Respondent
AND	MANSHARAN SINGH SOHI Second Respondent

Member of Authority:	Helen van Druten
Representatives:	Susanne Lass, advocate for the Applicant No appearance for the Respondents
Investigation Meeting:	On the papers
Submissions received:	21 April 2026 from the Applicant No submission from the Respondents
Determination:	29 May 2026

---

**DETERMINATION OF THE AUTHORITY**

---

**Employment Relationship Problem**

[1] In a determination issued on 11 November 2025, Sharan Solutions Limited (SSL) was ordered to pay Jaspreet Singh arrears of wages and holiday pay totalling \$10,837.80, interest on that amount until it is paid, personal grievance remedies of \$15,552 for lost wages and \$15,000 as distress compensation.<sup>1</sup> SSL was also ordered to pay penalties of \$5,000 for breaches of employment standards.

[2] The determination also provided leave under s 142W of the Employment Relations Act 2000 (the Act) for Mr Singh to recover from Mansharan Singh Sohi

---

<sup>1</sup> *Jaspreet Singh v Sharan Solutions Limited & Anor* [2025] NZERA 724 at [118] to [123].

personally, as Second Respondent, the arrears of wages and other money due to him, to the extent SSL is unable to pay those arrears. Mr Sohi is director of SSL.

[3] A subsequent costs determination on 11 December 2025 ordered SSL and Mr Sohi, on a joint and several basis, to pay \$9,000 to Mr Singh as a contribution to his costs of representation and \$71.55 paid as a fee to lodge his application in the Authority.<sup>2</sup>

[4] In Mr Singh's witness statement, he confirmed that neither SSL nor Mr Sohi has paid any portion of the amounts ordered to be paid to Mr Singh.

[5] The most recent application to the Authority by Mr Singh therefore seeks a compliance order under s 137 of the Act against the respondents to enforce the existing orders made in those determinations, together with interest and costs.

### **The Authority's investigation**

[6] By Authority minute of 13 April 2026, the parties were asked to provide relevant submissions on the issues for determination. Ms Lass, as representative for Mr Singh, requested that the matter be determined on the papers and confirmed the issues for determination. She provided submissions for Mr Singh on 21 April 2026. The respondents did not engage with the Authority. I am satisfied that all relevant documents were served on both SSL and Mr Sohi.

[7] The respondents were given a further opportunity to lodge any affidavits, information and submissions by 21 May 2026 with the Authority directions couriered and a further reminder by email on 15 May 2026. I am satisfied that both respondents were served appropriate documentation.

[8] As permitted by s 174E of the Act, this determination has stated findings of fact and law, expressed conclusions on issues necessary to dispose of the matter and specified orders made. It has not recorded all evidence and submissions received.

### **The issues**

[9] The issues requiring investigation and determination were:

---

<sup>2</sup> *Jaspreet Singh v Sharan Solutions Limited & Anor* [2025] NZERA 815 at [12] and [13].

- a. Whether Sharan Solutions Ltd or Mr Sohi have complied with the determinations of the Authority of 11 November and 11 December 2025.<sup>3</sup> If not, whether:
  - i. a compliance order should be issued under s 137 of the Act
  - ii. Mr Sohi should be ordered to pay the wage arrears and interest incurred personally (as provided in the determination and as sought by Mr Singh).
  - iii. Whether interest should be awarded on the unpaid amounts.
- b. Whether one party should contribute to the costs of the other party in this matter.

### **SSL's position**

[10] Neither SSL nor Mr Sohi engaged with the Authority on this compliance application.

### **Mr Singh's submissions**

- [11] Mr Singh provided a number of reasons in support of his application:
- a. It is now almost six months since those determinations were issued. Mr Sohi has not made any attempt to engage with Mr Singh, his representative or the Authority to comply with these orders. By email on 10 December 2025 and again in the minute of 13 April 2026, Mr Singh's representative indicated that Mr Singh may consider a reasonable proposed payment plan. Mr Sohi did not respond to that proposal.
  - b. The payment deadlines were by valid and binding order of the Authority.
  - c. The sums in the awards include minimum wage entitlements.
  - d. SSL's filing of an annual return on 5 April 2026 demonstrates that SSL remains active and has taken no steps to prioritise compliance with the Authority's determinations.

---

<sup>3</sup> Above n. 1 and n. 2.

### **Compliance order to be issued**

[12] It is appropriate to issue a compliance order under s 137(1)(b) of the Act to prevent any further non-compliance. This order also requires Mr Sohi to personally comply with the orders of the Authority in those determinations as required by s 142Y of the Act.<sup>4</sup>

### **Interest**

[13] It is appropriate to order interest to be paid, as Mr Singh has been deprived of the use of the money he is entitled to. As the determinations were issued one month apart, I will follow the approach recently taken by the Authority<sup>5</sup> and take the due date of amounts owed in the first determination as the commencement date for interest accrual on wage arrears.

[14] Within 28 days of this determination, SSL must pay Mr Singh interest on \$10,837.80 wage arrears calculated in accordance with Schedule 2 of the Interest on Money Claims Act 2016 until the amount is paid in full.

### **Orders**

[15] Within 28 days of the date of this determination SSL must comply with the Authority's earlier orders by paying the amounts detailed in those determinations as follows:

- a. \$10,035 wage arrears;
- b. \$802.80 holiday pay;
- c. \$15,552 reimbursement of wages lost;
- d. \$15,000 compensation;
- e. \$9,000 costs; and
- f. \$71.55 filing fee.

[16] In accordance with [14] above, SSL is also ordered to pay interest on wage arrears.

[17] Within 28 days of the date of this determination, Mr Sohi must take all reasonable steps to ensure that SSL makes the payments to Mr Singh.

---

<sup>4</sup> Above n. 1 and n. 2.

<sup>5</sup> *Lescure v Hoki Dental Ltd & Anor* [2026] NZERA 291 at [25].

## **Liability as Second Respondent**

[18] If wage arrears (and interest), holiday pay, costs and the filing fees are not paid by SSL as required in this determination, Mr Sohi is personally liable for payment of those amounts.

[19] The orders set out above are made pursuant to the Authority's power under s137 of the Act.

## **Costs**

[20] Mr Singh is also entitled to costs on this application and seeks costs of half the Authority's notional daily tariff. Ms Lass provided information on the time incurred. In the absence of any submission from the respondents to suggest otherwise, the amount is appropriate.

[21] Costs may be ordered against parties, so both respondents are potentially liable. There is no reasonable basis on which to distinguish their liability, so they are jointly and severally liable for costs on this application.

[22] Within 28 days of this determination, SSL and Mr Sohi must pay further costs totalling \$2,250 and a further Authority filing fee of \$71.55 to Mr Singh.

[23] I draw to the respondents attention the power of the Employment Court under s 140 of the Act, should they not comply with the orders made.

Helen van Druten  
Member of the Employment Relations Authority