

# Unjustified entry and use of force during search in Whangārei

## Summary of the Incident

1. On 15 December 2018, Police were notified that a stolen cell phone, taken in an earlier burglary along with other items, had been electronically traced to Ms Z's address. Police believed this gave them authority to enter the address to search for the phone and other stolen property. When Police arrived, the door was open, so they went inside to begin the search.
2. Ms Z told Police to leave. Police warned Ms Z she was obstructing them and could be arrested. She pushed an officer, who tried to restrain her, but she began kicking and spitting at officers.
3. During the arrest, Officer A sprayed pepper spray into the palm of her own hand and wiped it across Ms Z's eyes. This allowed officers to handcuff Ms Z and complete the arrest.
4. Police took Ms Z outside and put her into the back seat of a Police car. Ms Z said one of the officers punched her while she was sitting in the back seat. Ms Z was released without being charged. She provided photographs taken three days later, showing her with two black eyes, grazing, and a cut to her face.
5. Ms Y was at the address and was filming the arrest on Ms Z's cell phone. She said Police took this phone as well as the stolen phone.
6. On 16 December 2018, Ms Z went to the Whangārei Police Station to make a complaint about the uses of force against her and collect her phone (which was taken from Ms Y). She said Officer G denied Police had the phone and told her not to make a complaint. Officer G then emailed other officers saying he'd convinced Ms Z not to make a complaint. His email also referred to the seized phone.
7. Ms Y said the phone was dropped back at her address two days after Ms Z's arrest, and that Police had deleted the video she had taken.
8. On 20 December 2018 the Authority received a complaint from Ms Z, alleging Police had used excessive force against her during a search of her home.

## Issues examined by the Authority

- Issue 1:** Did Police have lawful authority to search Ms Z's address?
- Issue 2:** Was the force used to arrest Ms Z justified?
- Issue 3:** Did Police use force against Ms Z when she was in the Police car?
- Issue 4:** Did Police have lawful authority to take Ms Y's cell phone, and was it managed in accordance with policy?
- Issue 5:** Did Police refuse to take a complaint from Ms Z after the incident?

## The Authority's Findings

9. The Authority found Police had no lawful authority to enter the address and search for the cell phone without a warrant to do so. Initial uses of force against Ms Z would have been justified if the arrest had been lawful. However, because Police should not have been searching the address, Ms Z was justified in resisting them. This also means Ms Z should not have been arrested for obstruction and all uses of force on her constituted an assault.
10. The Authority considers it is unlikely Ms Z was punched in the back of the Police car.
11. We also concluded that:
- 1) It was unlawful for Police to seize the second cell phone from Ms Y, and an unidentified officer deliberately lied to the Authority to conceal his or her wrongdoing; and
  - 2) Police did not manage their custody of the second cell phone in accordance with their property policy; and
  - 3) Ms Z did try to make a complaint with Police directly, and Police should have taken this complaint.

## Analysis of the Issues

### ISSUE 1: DID POLICE HAVE LAWFUL AUTHORITY TO SEARCH MS Z'S ADDRESS?

---

12. Ms Z told the Authority she was at home on Saturday, 15 December 2018, having been drinking at a friend's house. She had drunk about 10 cans of pre-mixed bourbon and was very intoxicated. Ms Y who was 16 years old at the time, was one of several adolescents or children present. She had also consumed alcohol. An acquaintance came to visit at about 10pm and asked if she could charge her cell phone. Others in the house suspected the cell phone might have been stolen, so asked her to charge it in the garage, separate from the house. The acquaintance then left.

13. Prior to this, Police had received a complaint about a stolen cell phone and some other property. They were contacted by the owner, who had located the phone at Ms Z's address using an online tracking programme. At about 11pm, Police arrived at Ms Z's address to recover the phone and search for the other stolen property. The search was carried out without a search warrant.
14. Any person, including a Police officer, has an implied licence to enter a property with the agreement of the occupants, and can stay until the occupant asks them to leave. However, Police must make the reason for the entry clear, and tell the occupant they have the right to consent or refuse to consent.
15. Officer C said the front door was open. Ms Z said about 10 officers just "*came barging in*" to the house. Ms Y said: "*They opened the door and walked in*", saying, "*there's a stolen phone on this property and we need to find it.*" Mr X (Ms Z's ex-partner) said "*... the cops entered the room with me and my kids, five cops... They barged straight into the room....*".
16. The Authority is satisfied the officers did not tell Ms Z she had the right to refuse Police entry, and that she did not do so.
17. Officer B recorded in his notebook that this was a search for stolen goods under section 8 of the Search and Surveillance Act 2012 (the Act).<sup>1</sup> In his interview, he said he was "*going to do a door knock for a phone that had been stolen*" with Officer C. When they knocked on the door and went in, Officer B's role was to get everyone into the lounge and get them seated. He explained they were there under the Act, advised the occupants of their rights under the New Zealand Bill of Rights Act, and confirmed they understood. Ms Z did not recall Police referring to the Search and Surveillance Act.
18. Other officers also noted they were relying on the Search and Surveillance Act to enter and search the property but did not specify the power they were relying on. Officer A recorded in her use of force report that she was helping to execute a search warrant (even though no warrant existed).
19. The only power in the Search and Surveillance Act which could conceivably apply to this situation is section 8. That section gives Police the power to enter a place without a warrant to search for and arrest an offender who they reasonably suspect has committed an imprisonable offence, if:
  - they have reasonable grounds to believe the person is there; and
  - they have reasonable grounds to believe that the person will either flee or destroy, damage or conceal evidence before they have an opportunity to obtain a warrant.
20. The requirements of that section were clearly not met in this situation. Section 8 allows entry for the purposes of an arrest. By their own admission, the officers entered for the purpose of searching for the cell phone. They had no power to do that before effecting an arrest in any event. Police entry into the house was therefore manifestly unlawful.

---

<sup>1</sup> See paragraph 72

## FINDING ON ISSUE 1

Police did not have lawful authority to enter the address and search for the cell phone without a warrant.

## ISSUE 2: WAS THE FORCE USED TO ARREST MS Z JUSTIFIED?

### *Ms Z's version of events*

21. Ms Z said Police had *"come roaring in, like a murder had come upon the scene."* She said she asked Police why they were there, and because she was drunk, she was aggressive. Police asked her to calm down and sit down, and she told them: *"... you can't tell me to sit in my own house"*.
22. Ms Y had earlier retrieved the phone from a shed on the property. When Police inquired about the phone, she gave it to her brother who was also Ms Z's partner (Mr X), who in turn gave it to Police. Ms Z told the Police *"Fuck, you've got the phone, fuck off."* She said she pushed a female officer, as she was *"claustrophobic"* and felt she was being *"overpowered"*, she wanted them to move, and it was not intentional. Mr X described this as a *"shrug off"*. In response, Police told her she was obstructing them and tried to restrain her. She said they handcuffed her, and after she was handcuffed, she was pepper sprayed. Ms Z acknowledged she was forcefully resisting Police. In her complaint she acknowledged she was *"very intoxicated"* and *"very energetic"*. Ms Z said four officers held her down and tried to restrain her, and that she only weighs 65kgs.
23. She told the Authority an officer closed the door on her family to prevent them from seeing what was happening. She said she was struggling and finding it difficult to breath.
24. Ms Y said:

*"Four, five cops, four men cops and the lady cop, they came, they all started beating her up in the hallway, like cramming their knees into her neck and to her back, pushing her head into the ground, picking her head up and like slamming it into the ground, from her hair..."*
25. Ms Y also told us there were about 10 or 15 officers present, and those who were not *"getting"* Ms Z, closed the hallway door and pushed them back to try to isolate them from Ms Z.
26. Mr X said Police were handcuffing Ms Z and were *"all on her attacking her like, grabbing her and slammed her whole head into the wooden [floor]"*. He tried to help, but an officer came and *"stood over"* him and his son.

### *Officers' versions of events*

27. When Police arrived at Ms Z's address, they tried to gather everyone present in the living room. Officers B and C supervised. They were concerned someone might try to hide or destroy the property they were looking for. Officer B said Ms Z's partner told Ms Z to get the phone and give it to Police.

28. Officer A was in the hallway. She said Ms Z stood up and tried to walk out of the lounge, past Officer A into the hallway. Officer A said: *"...she looked very intoxicated to me, she stumbled... her eyes were quite glazed over."* She told Ms Z to sit down in the lounge, but Ms Z told her *"to get fucked and that she would do what she wants."* Ms Z pushed Officer A, who held her back by putting her arm on Ms Z's shoulder. Officer A warned Ms Z she would be arrested for obstructing Police. Ms Z began throwing punches towards Officer A. Officer A grabbed Ms Z's arms and pushed her onto the ground.
29. Officer C came out of the lounge and, with Officer D, tried to restrain Ms Z so Officer A could handcuff her. Ms Z was struggling violently, kicking, pushing and trying to punch the officers. They were in the hallway, which was narrow and made it difficult to control Ms Z.
30. Officer A sprayed pepper spray directly into the palm of her hand, then wiped it across Ms Z's eyes. The effect of the pepper spray was not immediate, but eventually subdued Ms Z enough to allow Officer A to handcuff her.

### Use of pepper spray

31. In her report on her use of force, Officer A stated she:

*"... sprayed OC spray into the palm of my hand near [Ms Z's] head and wiped it across her eyes in an attempt to stop her from assaulting us. I did this to avoid other staff being affected in the crossfire of the OC spray due to such a confined area we were in."*

32. Ms Z described being *"sprayed in the eyes"*. Ms Y described pepper being *"sprayed into [Ms Z's] face"* by a female officer. Given the dynamics of the situation and the influence of alcohol on Ms Z and Ms Y, we prefer Officer A's account.
33. Officer A's supervisor and the incident reviewer both reviewed Officer A's report and confirmed their support of her actions. The incident reviewer stated: *"...although unconventional the [method] is very practical and restricts contamination in an otherwise risky environment for the use of such a tactical option."*
34. Officers are not trained to use pepper spray in the way Officer A did. Police policy and training materials do not address the use of pepper spray by spraying it into the hand and wiping it on a person's face.
35. Officer A stated once Ms Z was sprayed, they were able to handcuff her. There were four officers present at the time. As a less risky alternative to spraying Ms Z in the way Officer A did, the officers who were not already restraining her could have assisted in applying handcuffs.
36. Ms Z accepted she was fighting and wriggling in order to make it harder for Police. She told us she was sprayed after she was handcuffed, which is inconsistent with Officer A's version of events. If this was the case, the use of spray would have been unnecessary as Police would already have had control of her. Mr X said Ms Z was handcuffed inside the house, and pepper sprayed after she was taken outside.

37. Ms Z told us she was not offered any water to clean the spray from her face.
38. Ms Y stated: "... they pepper-sprayed her in the hallway and when she was taken outside my brother seen her pepper-sprayed again...." She did not specify whether Ms Z was handcuffed when she was sprayed in the hallway.

#### Other uses of force inside the house

39. Because the entry to the house was unlawful, the arrest for obstruction was also unlawful. Therefore, any uses of force during the arrest were also unlawful.
40. However, if the arrest had been lawful, the force used (including the unorthodox use of the pepper spray) was proportionate to the resistance Ms Z was putting up and would therefore have been justified. The Authority accepts the Police accounts as being sufficiently consistent with Ms Z's account, taking into account her imperfect recall due to intoxication.

#### FINDING ON ISSUE 2

Police had no lawful authority to be inside Ms Z's house, and she was justified in resisting them. Her arrest was therefore unlawful, and all uses of force on her constituted an assault.

#### ISSUE 3: DID POLICE USE FORCE AGAINST MS Z IN THE POLICE CAR?

41. Ms Z said a "ginger haired" officer punched her in the face after she was put in the back of the Police car. She had black eyes after the incident, and cuts and grazes which could have been inflicted by hitting or punching.
42. Officers D and A acknowledged using an arm bar to walk Ms Z to the Police car. Officer D put her into the back seat and Officer E put a seat belt on her. Officer E watched her while Officer D went to check that he could return to the station.
43. Officer D sat in the back seat as Officer E drove them back to the station. Ms Z said she was still fighting and spat in his mouth. Officer D did not say Ms Z was fighting, but said:  
  
*"She was highly intoxicated and rambling about many things. At times she would have clarity and ask why she was arrested, and I responded every time that she was arrested for 'obstruction'."*
44. Officer D told us he did not see her spit at any time. He denied punching Ms Z, and stated he did not see anyone else do so.
45. Officer E told us he saw Ms Z spitting on the window of the car, but it did not land on him. He stated:

*"I will emphatically tell you that at no point in the back of my car at any time was she punched or abused or hit or stuck or anything like that. When she got out of the seat she lost her balance when her hand was on the centre console, she fell back into the seat and the seat belt was put back on her and I put my foot on the [seatbelt] receiver...."*

46. He accepted that it may have appeared like he struck her when he took the seatbelt receiver and put it in, but he did not do so.
47. Mr W, who was visiting an address across the road, walked over when he heard a commotion at Ms Z's house. He said he saw Police take Ms Z to the Police car and put her in the back seat, like she was a "ragdoll". He said Ms Z looked "beaten up" but did not think Police were responsible. He told us he had seen Ms Z outside with Ms Y about 15 or 20 minutes before Police arrived. Ms Y had tripped Ms Z up, and Ms Z had landed heavily, with her face hitting the bumper of a parked car. Mr W told us he would have intervened if he had seen Police harm Ms Z. Officer D recalled seeing Mr W outside when he took Ms Z to the car, and said Mr W was telling other people on the street to "let the Police do their job".
48. Ms Z was very intoxicated and did not remember if she had fallen and hit her head. This could explain the bruising and grazes on her face.
49. Another witness, Mr V, was at an address across the road. He told us the officer who put Ms Z in the car "grabbed her by her hair and slammed her in the car". Ms Z and the officer were swearing and abusing each other. At the time the officer was standing outside the car door. Mr V could see the officer was getting frustrated. The officer opened the car door, struggled with Ms Z and hit at her with his right hand, although Mr V was unsure whether this connected. Mr V told the officer to stop, but he punched Ms Z in the face with his left hand and she started screaming.
50. Mr V did not think Ms Z was injured when she walked out of the house, but when the officer moved away, her eye was swollen. Mr V described the officer as the driver of the car. He told other officers present that Ms Z had been assaulted however, they denied it and refused to give him the officer's badge number.
51. There are conflicting statements as to what happened when Ms Z was in the back of the Police car. Two independent witnesses saw what happened but have different recollections as to whether Ms Z was punched. Ms Z's intoxication means her evidence is unreliable and the officers deny striking her. Officer E accepts his actions in reaching in and securing Ms Z's seatbelt may have led bystanders to believe he was exerting illegitimate force, but he was not.
52. There is a conflict as to the condition of Ms Z's face before and after she got into the car, as such this is of little help in determining whether her facial injuries were a result of a punch. Mr W says they occurred when she fell earlier, and Mr V thought they were a result of the punch.
53. The Authority is unable to come to a definitive conclusion as to whether or not Ms Z was punched, however, on the balance of probability we believe it was unlikely.

### FINDING ON ISSUE 3

The Authority considers it is unlikely Ms Z was punched in the back of the Police car.

### ISSUE 4: DID POLICE HAVE LAWFUL AUTHORITY TO TAKE MS Z'S CELL PHONE, AND WAS IT MANAGED IN ACCORDANCE WITH POLICY?

54. When Police arrived, Ms Y had Ms Z's phone. She said she used it to record the search, then Ms Z's arrest. Both Ms Z and Mr X had told her to do so. She said three officers forcefully pulled the phone out of her hand, even though she was holding a one-year old child (Ms Z's son) at the time. At one point an officer grabbed the child's leg, thinking it was Ms Y's arm. She did not specify which officers took the phone from her, although she said there were two or three of them, one was tall, white, with ginger hair, a ginger beard and "coloured eyes" and one was white. Mr X also said he witnessed this.
55. Officer F, who processed Ms Z into custody, said she did not have a cell phone on her/with her property when she was received at the Police station.
56. On 16 December 2018, Ms Z went to the counter of the Whangārei Police station and asked for the phone back. Officer G, who was looking after the front counter that day, told us he did not have access to seized property because it was a Sunday, so he emailed Officers C and D. After discussing Ms Z's complaint, the email said:
- "... she does however want her phone (not the originally stolen one) that was seized returned. [Officer C] I'll leave that up to you, but she indicated she would come in on Monday to uplift it."*
57. Officer C replied to the email at 4.57pm, asking Officers D and E to "please return phone tonight. Think I saw it in the watch house night on a shelf." Officer D recalled getting this email but did not return the phone himself. Ms Y told us Ms Z's phone was returned to her (as opposed to Ms Z directly) two days after the search by an officer she recognised from the night. She said three of the officers who had attended the incident came to the address and she identified one of them as the officer who had taken the phone from her, a short Māori guy, a "short ginger fulla", and a tall male.
58. She said they did not give any explanation: "They just handed the phone over and said 'Sorry' and they left." Ms Z said she did not get the phone back until two weeks afterwards. The Authority saw notebook entries made by all officers who might have returned the phone, and none had recorded doing so.
59. The above emails, combined with the accounts of Mr X, Ms Y and Ms Z, clearly demonstrate to the Authority that the phone was seized. This seizure was unlawful; Police had already found the cell phone they were searching for, and had no lawful reason to take Ms Z's phone from Ms Y.
60. All officers denied taking Ms Z's phone. Officer C acknowledged telling Officer B to take it, but says he then told him not to worry about it. Curiously, Officer B could not recall seeing anyone else with a cell phone and was not aware of Ms Y filming anything. Since the cell phone was seized, it follows that one of the officers either forgot they seized it or deliberately misled the Authority in order to conceal their unlawful behaviour. We consider the latter to be more likely.
61. Ms Y told us the video she had recorded on the night was deleted. Ms Z said she checked the 'recently deleted' folder, but the video was gone from there as well. Her phone required a passcode, and she was unsure how Police "tapped into it".



62. There were photos taken before Police arrived, and a screenshot captured shortly after midnight. Ms Y thought the screenshot was taken inadvertently while Police were struggling to take the phone from her hand.
63. With Ms Z's permission, we had an expert examine the phone. They found no traces of deleted content on the phone, so it was impossible to confirm whether Police had deleted a video. Equally they could not confirm there was ever a video on the phone. There was no time during the incident for the video to have been reviewed by Ms Y and she did not claim she did. Other than Ms Y saying she operated the phone, there is no evidence the video existed and there is a possibility of operator error or phone malfunction. Police also did not have Ms Z's passcode. We are unable to make a definitive finding on this point.
64. On the basis of Mr X, Ms Y and Ms Z's evidence that the phone was taken, that Officer C saw a phone on the shelf at the Police station, and that the phone was returned, it is evident someone from Police clearly took it from Ms Y. However, we are unable to identify which officer did so.

#### FINDING ON ISSUE 4

Ms Z's cell phone was unlawfully seized. However, we are unable to identify which officer seized it.

An unidentified officer deliberately lied to the Authority to conceal his or her wrongdoing.

Police did not manage their custody of Ms Z's cell phone in accordance with policy.

#### ISSUE 5: DID POLICE REFUSE TO TAKE A COMPLAINT FROM MS Z AFTER THE INCIDENT?

65. On 16 December 2018, Ms Z went to the counter to complain about her arrest and injuries, and to ask for the return of her cell phone. She said the officer she spoke to (who was Officer G) initially said there was no record of her being in custody.
66. Officer G sent an email to Officers C and D, dated 16 December 2018 at 10.30am. The email read:

*"I had [Ms Z] come into the Whangarei Station wanting to make a complaint about excessive force during her arrest. Long story short, I have convinced her that her behaviour was probably the overriding factor and she no longer wishes to pursue the complaint."*

67. When asked, Officer G said the main issue Ms Z had when she came into the station was the return of her phone. We questioned Officer G at length about his discussion with Ms Z, leading to the email he sent. He was adamant that the only complaint she had initially was that she had been thrown onto the ground. He could not recall Ms Z talking about having been punched by Police or knocked out. After he discussed the arrest with her, he said she did not pursue the matter of making a complaint:

*"If she'd made a complaint, I would've taken the complaint. She left without making a complaint. I didn't talk her out of making a complaint. I discussed with her, her charges. She disclosed you know around intoxication and her behaviour, she left without making a complaint."*

68. Officer G told us he had never been to Ms Z's address and had no interactions with her other than this one discussion. The only reason he might have had to discourage Ms Z from laying a complaint would have been to protect officers involved in the arrest.
69. Based on Ms Z's account, and the wording of Officer G's email at the time, the Authority considers it is likely that Ms Z did try to lay a complaint but at the least was pressured by Officer G not to do so.
70. It is also entirely probable that Officer G began by saying that there was no record of Ms Z's time in custody, since there is no reason for Ms Z to have made this up.
71. Officer G's actions on this respect were inappropriate and a neglect of his duty. It is incumbent on officers to take complaints and to ensure that these are notified to the Authority.

#### FINDING ON ISSUE 5

Ms Z tried to lay a complaint and Officer G should have taken it at the counter.



**Judge Colin Doherty**

Chair  
Independent Police Conduct Authority

10 December 2020

**IPCA: 18-1302**

## Appendix – Laws and Policies

### WARRANTLESS POWERS TO SEARCH A PROPERTY

---

72. Police policy on warrantless searches is derived from the law, in particular, the Search and Surveillance Act 2012.
73. Section 8 of the Search and Surveillance Act allows Police to enter a place or vehicle without a warrant, and search for and arrest a person that they suspect has committed an offence punishable by imprisonment. Police must believe that the person was there, and that if they don't enter the place or vehicle immediately, the person will leave to avoid arrest or evidential material relating to the offence will be destroyed, hidden, altered or damaged. Police can only search for property under section 8 if they arrest the alleged offender.
74. Section 15 of the Search and Surveillance Act allows Police to enter a place without a warrant and search for evidence, whether or not the offender is there. To rely on this, Police must suspect an offence has been committed which is punishable by imprisonment for 14 years or more, and believe that the evidence is at the place and will be destroyed, concealed, altered or damaged if entry is delayed to obtain a search warrant.

### USE OF FORCE

---

#### The Crimes Act 1961

75. Section 39 of the Crimes Act 1961 provides for officers to use reasonable force in the execution of their duties such as arrest and enforcement of warrants. Specifically, it provides that officers may use *“such force as may be necessary”* to overcome any force used in resisting the law enforcement process.
76. Section 40(1) provides for Police officers to use reasonable force to *“prevent the escape of that other person if he takes flight in order to avoid arrest”*, unless the escape can be prevented *“by reasonable means in a less violent manner”*.

#### Policy use of force policy

77. Under the Police 'Use of Force' policy Police officers are taught a range of ways to safely use force without a weapon, known as 'empty hand techniques'. Officers can use empty hand techniques to:
- distract a subject,
  - physically control a subject, and/or
  - defend themselves or another.

78. Use of empty hand techniques must be fully reported in a tactical options report, except for touching, guiding, escorting, lifting, and pushing where a person does not fall to the ground. An officer must submit the TOR to their supervisor before the end of the shift in which they used force, or with their supervisor's approval, within 3 days of the end of shift and prior to any rostered days off or leave during this period.

#### Use of Pepper spray

79. The 'Oleoresin Capsicum (OC) Spray' policy states that pepper spray may only be used on someone who is actively resisting and then only when the situation cannot be resolved by less forceful means. Active resistance includes physical actions such as pulling, pushing or running away – that is, *“more than verbal defiance”*.

# About the Authority

## WHO IS THE INDEPENDENT POLICE CONDUCT AUTHORITY?

---

The Independent Police Conduct Authority is an independent body set up by Parliament to provide civilian oversight of Police conduct.

We are not part of the Police – the law requires us to be fully independent. The Authority is overseen by a Board, which is chaired by Judge Colin Doherty.

Being independent means that the Authority makes its own findings based on the facts and the law. We do not answer to the Police, the Government or anyone else over those findings. In this way, our independence is similar to that of a Court.

The Authority employs highly experienced staff who have worked in a range of law enforcement and related roles in New Zealand and overseas.

## WHAT ARE THE AUTHORITY'S FUNCTIONS?

---

Under the Independent Police Conduct Authority Act 1988, the Authority receives and may choose to investigate:

- complaints alleging misconduct or neglect of duty by Police;
- complaints about Police practices, policies and procedures affecting the complainant in a personal capacity;
- notifications of incidents in which Police actions have caused or appear to have caused death or serious bodily harm; and
- referrals by Police under a Memorandum of Understanding between the Authority and Police, which covers instances of potential reputational risk to Police (including serious offending by a Police officer or Police actions that may have an element of corruption).

The Authority's investigation may include visiting the scene of the incident, interviewing the officers involved and any witnesses, and reviewing evidence from the Police's investigation.

On completion of an investigation, the Authority must form an opinion about the Police conduct, policy, practice or procedure which was the subject of the complaint. The Authority may make recommendations to the Commissioner.

## THIS REPORT

---

This report is the result of the work of a multi-disciplinary team of investigators, report writers and managers. At significant points in the investigation itself and in the preparation of the report, the Authority conducted audits of both process and content.

---



Mana Whanonga Pirihimana Motuhake

PO Box 25221, Wellington 6140  
Freephone 0800 503 728  
[www.ipca.govt.nz](http://www.ipca.govt.nz)

---