

Human Rights Reports of New Zealand

12 HRNZ 152 to 313

Please circulate to:

<input type="checkbox"/>	File behind the Bulletin thumbtab at the
<input type="checkbox"/>	front of the volume.
<input type="checkbox"/>	CAN WE HELP? For all enquiries, please call
.....	our Customer Care Team on 0800 10 60 60
Return to:	or email Care.ANZ@thomsonreuters.com .

CASES REPORTED IN THIS UPDATE:

- Fitzgerald v R* (2020) 12 HRNZ 234 (CA)
- Green v Eastern Institute of Technology* (2020) 12 HRNZ 192 (HRRT)
- Kerr v New Zealand Police* (2020) 12 HRNZ 174 (CA)
- Make It 16 Inc v Attorney-General* (2020) 12 HRNZ 265 (HC)
- McKeogh v Attorney-General* (2020) 12 HRNZ 289 (HRRT)
- Vivash v Accident Compensation Corp* (2020) 12 HRNZ 152 (HRRT)



INDEX OF CASES REPORTED:

BILL OF RIGHTS

Democratic and civil rights – Electoral rights – Section 12 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 affirmed the right to vote from the age of 18 however s 19 of the Act prohibited discrimination on the basis of age from the age of 16 – Whether the voting age provisions are inconsistent with s 19 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 – Whether that inconsistency was a justified limit – Electoral Act 1993; International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Art 25; Local Electoral Act 2001; New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, ss 4, 5, 6, 12, 19.

Make It 16 Inc v Attorney-General (2020) 12 HRNZ 265 (HC)

Freedom from discrimination – Discrimination on the basis of age – Section 12 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 affirmed the right to vote from the age of 18 however s 19 of the Act prohibited discrimination on the basis of age from the age of 16 – Whether the voting age provisions are inconsistent with s 19 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 – Whether that inconsistency was a justified limit – Electoral Act 1993; International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Art 25; Local Electoral Act 2001; New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, ss 4, 5, 6, 12, 19.

Make It 16 Inc v Attorney-General (2020) 12 HRNZ 265 (HC)

Right not to be subjected to disproportionately severe punishment – Three strikes law – Sentencing court imposed the maximum sentence of seven years for a third strike offence of indecent assault in circumstances where the indecent assault would not have normally resulted in a sentence of imprisonment – Whether s 86D(2) of the Sentencing Act 2002 could be interpreted in a way consistent with the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 – New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, ss 4, 6, 9; Sentencing Act 2002, ss 86D(2), 106, 107.

Fitzgerald v R (2020) 12 HRNZ 234 (CA)

Rights of persons arrested or detained – Drink driving – Refusal to provide blood specimen – Appellant’s lawyer could not be contacted so constable attempted to contact 12 other lawyers – Whether obligation on executive to ensure legal advice available under drink driving scheme – Whether appellant’s right to consult and instruct a lawyer had been sufficiently facilitated – Whether evidence admissible – New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, s 23(1)(b).

Kerr v New Zealand Police (2020) 12 HRNZ 174 (CA)

CRIMINAL JUSTICE

Sentencing – Three strikes law – Indecent assault – Sentencing court imposed the maximum sentence of seven years for a third strike offence of indecent assault in circumstances where the indecent assault would not have normally resulted in a sentence of imprisonment – Whether the sentencing Judge correctly interpreted the interface between s 86D(2) and ss 106 and 107 of the Sentencing Act 2002 – Whether s 86D(2) of the Sentencing Act 2002 excluded the application of the convict and discharge powers under s 106 of the Sentencing Act 2002 – New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, ss 4, 6, 9; Sentencing Act 2002, ss 86D(2), 106, 107.

Fitzgerald v R (2020) 12 HRNZ 234 (CA)

ELECTORAL LAW

Age of voting — New Zealand electoral law enables people to vote from the age of 18 — Right to vote from age of 18 affirmed by s 12 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 however s 19 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 prohibited discrimination on the basis of age from the age of 16 — Whether the voting age provisions are inconsistent with s 19 of the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990 — Whether that inconsistency was a justified limit — Electoral Act 1993; International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Art 25; Local Electoral Act 2001; New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, ss 4, 5, 6, 12, 19.

Make It 16 Inc v Attorney-General (2020) 12 HRNZ 265 (HC)

HUMAN RIGHTS

Discrimination on basis of marital status — Discrimination on basis of family status — Reduction in New Zealand Superannuation payments where spouse received an overseas pension higher than the New Zealand Superannuation — Whether s 70 of the Social Security Act 1964, discriminated against the spouse of a person who received an overseas pension — Whether difference in treatment on the basis of family status — Whether difference in treatment on the basis of marital status — Human Rights Act 1993; New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, s 19; Social Security Act 1964, ss 70, 70(1).

McKeogh v Attorney-General (2020) 12 HRNZ 289 (HRRT)

PRIVACY

Access to personal information — Accident Compensation Corp destroyed file on injury 10 years after date of last action as per destruction policy, although medical evidence indicated injury would cause ongoing problems — Whether “loss” under Information Privacy Principle 5 restricted to accidental, unintended or fortuitous loss as opposed to intentional destruction — Whether destruction of physical file interfered with the plaintiff’s right to personal information — Whether purpose for which that information gathered had been “spent” — Privacy Act 1993, IPPs 1, 5, 5(a)(i), 6, 9.

Vivash v Accident Compensation Corp (2020) 12 HRNZ 152 (HRRT)

Disclosure of personal information — Employee referred to personal information of third party obtained during employment when making application for a restraining order against that third party — Whether application made in work or personal capacity — Whether employer can rely on employee’s belief on reasonable grounds that disclosure was necessary — Whether employer took reasonable steps to protect personal information of third party — Harassment Act 1997; Privacy Act 1993, s 66(1)(b)(iii), IPPs 5, 11, 11(e)(iv).

Green v Eastern Institute of Technology (2020) 12 HRNZ 192 (HRRT)

SOCIAL SECURITY

New Zealand Superannuation — Spousal deduction — Reduction in New Zealand Superannuation payments where spouse received an overseas pension higher than the New Zealand Superannuation — Whether s 70 of the Social Security Act 1964, discriminated against the spouse of a person who received an overseas pension — Whether difference in treatment on the basis of family status — Whether difference in treatment on the basis of marital status — Human Rights Act 1993; New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, s 19; Social Security Act 1964, ss 70, 70(1).

McKeogh v Attorney-General (2020) 12 HRNZ 289 (HRRT)

TRANSPORT

Drink-driving — Refusal to provide blood specimen — Appellant's lawyer could not be contacted so constable attempted to contact 12 other lawyers — Whether obligation on executive to ensure legal advice available under drink driving scheme — Whether appellant's right to consult and instruct a lawyer had been sufficiently facilitated — Whether evidence admissible — New Zealand Bill of Rights Act 1990, s 23(1)(b).

Kerr v New Zealand Police (2020) 12 HRNZ 174 (CA)