**IMMIGRATION ADVISERS COMPLAINTS AND DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL**

Decision No: [2021] NZIACDT 05

Reference No: IACDT 06/20

| | |
|---|---|
| **IN THE MATTER** | of an appeal against a decision of the Registrar under s 54 of the Immigration Advisers Licensing Act 2007 |
| **BY** | **KG**<br>Appellant |
| **AND** | **THE REGISTRAR OF IMMIGRATION ADVISERS**<br>Registrar |

**SUBJECT TO SUPPRESSION ORDER**

---

**DECISION**
**Dated 22 March 2021**

---

**REPRESENTATION:**

Appellant: Self-represented
Registrar: M Denyer, counsel

## INTRODUCTION

[1] This is an appeal against the decision of the Registrar of Immigration Advisers (the Registrar) of 20 October 2020, declining to pursue a complaint made by KG (the appellant) against UU, a licensed immigration adviser (the adviser).

[2] The appellant is aggrieved about various mistakes by the adviser, despite a successful outcome to the immigration application. When the complaint was made, the adviser acknowledged his mistakes, apologised and offered a partial refund. The Registrar accordingly decided the complaint disclosed only a trivial or inconsequential matter.

[3] The essential issue to consider is whether the adviser's conduct justifies a formal disciplinary process in the Tribunal.

## BACKGROUND

[4] The adviser is a director of [company] of [city]. At the relevant time, he was employed by [company 2] (the immigration consultancy).

[5] The appellant is a national of Sweden. He is an electrician.

[6] In July 2017, while still in Sweden, the appellant filled out an online assessment form for the immigration consultancy. Another adviser from the consultancy sent him an initial assessment on 5 July showing he was entitled to 185 points and was eligible to migrate, subject to certain requirements, including a qualification recognised by the New Zealand Qualifications Authority (NZQA) and an offer of skilled employment. He was told he was required to contact the Electrical Workers Registration Board (EWRB) to gain registration to work in New Zealand.

[7] On 6 July 2017, the appellant signed a client service agreement with the adviser and/or the immigration consultancy (agreement unseen by the Tribunal). The agreed fee was $4,753.00, which was paid in two tranches by the appellant.

[8] The EWRB advised the appellant on 3 January 2018 that he was entitled to apply for an electrician's limited certificate. He had been assessed as having 7,000 hours towards the full 8,000 hours required for registration as an electrician. He could apply for a limited certificate for 18 months to complete the outstanding work experience requirement, along with examinations and practical assessments.

[9] The appellant accepted fulltime employment with an employer on about 19 April 2018.

[10] The appellant was granted a limited certificate by the EWRB on 8 May 2018, allowing him to work in this country for 18 months.

[11] On 14 May 2018, the adviser lodged with Immigration New Zealand a work-to-residence visa application for the appellant which was approved on 16 May. He lodged temporary visa applications for the appellant's wife and two children on 29 May.

[12] The appellant arrived in New Zealand in June 2018.

[13] On about 21 June 2018, the adviser sent at least one email to the appellant informing him that he had breached the service agreement by acting for himself and contacting Immigration New Zealand. He had already been warned of this. Furthermore, if he terminated the contract, there would be no refund.

[14] The family's visas were granted on about 20 July 2018. They joined him in New Zealand in August 2018.

[15] At about this point, the appellant started acting for himself, though sought advice from the adviser from time to time.

[16] On 20 November 2018, the EWRB informed the appellant that his qualifications had been accepted. He was exempt from certain coursework, an examination and some practical assessments. He now had 7,500 hours recognised. He had to complete 500 hours, as well as "the courses, examinations and practical assessments".

[17] NZQA informed the appellant on 20 November 2018 that his qualifications had been accepted, exempting him from certain examination and work experience criteria needed for full registration as an electrician. Then on 4 January 2019, NZQA issued a statement recognising the appellant's Swedish electrical qualification as equivalent to a New Zealand level 4 certificate.

[18] The appellant informed the adviser on about 7 February 2019 that he had full New Zealand electrical registration, having passed the "Registration, Practical assessment and Safety Training".

[19] On an unknown date, the appellant completed and filed his residence application on his own without assistance from the adviser. The application presumably included his family. This was granted on 4 July 2019.

[20] The adviser left the immigration consultancy in February 2020. At an unknown time, he joined his present company.

*Complaint to Authority*

[21] On 17 April 2020, the Immigration Advisers Authority (the Authority) received the appellant's complaint against the adviser. He alleged incompetence and dishonest or misleading behaviour.

[22] The appellant said that he had been advised by the immigration consultancy that it was possible to obtain residence based on his qualification (which was of short duration). He would never have signed up and paid the hefty fee otherwise. He would have terminated the agreement after realising the error with their assessment and their recommendation to wait for two years before applying for residence under the work-to-residence category. However, the adviser had told him no refund would be given if he terminated the agreement.

[23] According to the appellant, the immigration consultancy did not do much apart from forwarding to him details from Immigration New Zealand. Their services were not worth anything. He expected the fee of $4,753 to include:

1. Helping with employment;

2. Obtaining a work visa; and

3. Obtaining residence.

[24] But the immigration consultancy actually only accomplished:

1. Obtaining free details from Immigration New Zealand, compiling a less professional CV and sending details to one employer who did not reply;

2. Making errors in completing visa applications (passport numbers, birth dates and more) which he had to check and rewrite. Their excuse was that he had rushed them, but this had been done because of an earlier mistake by them; and

3. Advising him he could not apply for residence until he had worked for two years in New Zealand under the "work for residence" category. But he had signed up with the immigration consultancy in order to seek residence immediately after arriving.

[25] The appellant set out other complaints:

1. He was advised to apply for an assessment from NZQA and pay a fee, even though he had already asked NZQA questions and did not think he would be accepted. The adviser also later told him to apply for an assessment for which he received a refund, but he had spent a great deal of time on it and paid for translations;

2. The adviser told his future employer, without his consent, that he had obtained a visa (leading to him cancelling a trip with his family, to come to New Zealand to work);

3. The adviser was unable to give him proper answers to questions and would not contact the visa officer, leading to him calling Immigration New Zealand three times. The visa officer did not completely agree with the adviser. It would have been easier to do it himself; and

4. The adviser gave him false hope he could seek residence immediately after arriving, later telling him he would have to wait for two years. But he was able to obtain residence in July 2019 on his own behalf as he was awarded full electrical registration in New Zealand. He was therefore charged $4,753 to make applications which were more difficult and expensive and delayed residence for 1.5 to 2 years. For this reason, he would not accept a partial refund. Nor would he accept a full refund.

[26] The adviser became aware of the complaint. In an email to Immigration New Zealand on 4 May 2020, he requested information as to how the appellant could meet the occupational requirements for residence with a limited licence. He said the information would be used to illustrate to the Authority that his advice to the appellant was accurate. A visa officer replied on 4 and 5 May 2020.

*Registrar's initial response to complaint*

[27] On 21 August 2020, the Registrar wrote to the appellant advising that it had been determined that the complaint could best be settled using the adviser's own complaints procedure. The Registrar set out in some detail the complaint. He then listed what he found the documents to have established. In particular, it was found that the adviser had undertaken a reasonable amount of work, the details of which were set out. It was noted that there was no evidence that the appellant had told the adviser he was not satisfied

with the service. Nor was there any evidence that he had terminated the adviser's service and asked for a refund.

[28] According to the Registrar, a refund would best be negotiated between the appellant and the adviser. If the issue could not be resolved, the complaint would be reassessed.

*Adviser apologises and offers refund*

[29] On the same day, the adviser wrote to the appellant. The letter was almost identical to the one he sent one week later on 28 August (see below).[1]

[30] The adviser wrote to the appellant on 28 August 2020, explaining at length what had happened. He expressed regret that the appellant was not satisfied with the service. He recognised that it was imperfect. However, the appellant had not informed them that he had revisited the NZQA assessment and pushed NZQA to recognise his qualification. That was a key change enabling him to obtain residence earlier. The appellant did not inform the adviser of that until 24 August 2020. Once his eligibility changed, he chose to act for himself without notifying them. He contacted them in February 2019, but he said nothing of the change in his circumstances or his decision to act for himself.

[31] According to the adviser, the appellant's decision to act for himself was in breach of the service agreement. He had prevented them from completing the contracted service.

[32] In answer to the contention that the appellant had received no benefit from the adviser's work, the adviser set out in detail what they had done.

[33] It was accepted by the adviser in his letter of 28 August that small errors had been made. They took that seriously and apologised.

[34] The adviser further accepted that it was incorrect to tell the appellant that there would be no refund if the agreement was terminated. The immigration consultancy's agreement had now been revised. The appellant should have been informed that a partial refund was possible. On reviewing the file, the adviser could see that the appellant's payment of 50 per cent of the "residual fee" was in excess of the service provided at that time.

[1] It is not apparent why there were two such letters.

[35] The appellant was therefore entitled to a fair and reasonable refund, since the residence service was not completed. The calculation of the refund was set out. He had paid $4,753. From this would be deducted $4,262 being the fair value of the service provided. Hence, the refund should be $471 ($541.65 including GST). However, the adviser and his former employer would offer 20 per cent of $4,733, being $946.60, split between the adviser and the adviser's company. The offer would be open until 1 September 2020.

[36] In the letter of 28 August, the adviser further stated that the appellant had told them he was upset that his employer was informed by them of his visa grant, without his consent. They had apologised to him at the time. It was acknowledged this did not meet their obligation of confidentiality. The mistake was regretted, and they had learned from it.

[37] The adviser wrote again to the appellant on 31 August 2020, in response to an email from the appellant with additional documents (email unseen by the Tribunal). He answered various specific points made by the appellant. It was stated, in relation to the typos and mistakes made by them, that there was duress from the appellant who had sought an urgent filing. The adviser knew that the appellant would check the documents, and he did in fact do so, correcting birth dates and passport details. They were relatively minor. These factors did not excuse the mistakes, but they did mitigate any refund owed. There was no loss as a result of the mistakes. The visas had been granted. The adviser did apologise for them though.

[38] In his letter of 31 August to the appellant, the adviser stated that he wished to resolve the matter, offering to meet him in person or by *Zoom*. The adviser repeated that the appellant did not inform him of significant changes in his circumstances and breached the service agreement. Indeed, he intentionally misled the adviser. Furthermore, he availed himself of specialist immigration advice (from the adviser) when he needed it.

[39] The assertion that the appellant had to act for himself as the advice he was given was inaccurate, was not supported by the factual record. It was much more likely that he decided to act for himself, yet he continued to retain the safety net of a licensed adviser to draw on for advice when needed. Once the residence application was safely granted, he then made a complaint.

[40] According to the adviser, a fair and reasonable refund had been offered in the previous letter.

[41] The appellant's response to the letter of 31 August 2020 has not been sent to the Tribunal.

[42] On 1 September 2020, the adviser wrote to the appellant recording that the offer of a part refund had been refused. No counter-offer or claim had been made. The offer to meet or speak with him had been refused. On carefully reviewing his complaint, it was found that the immigration advice given had been accurate. It could have been better provided and they had learned from this mistake. The adviser repeated much of what was said in his earlier letters, including his various apologies.

*Registrar's decision on complaint*

[43] On 20 October 2020, the Registrar advised the appellant that it had been determined that the complaint disclosed only a trivial or inconsequential matter and it would not be pursued.

[44] In his letter, the Registrar noted:

1. There were potentially breaches of cls 1, 4 and 24(a) of the Licensed Immigration Advisers Code of Conduct 2014 (the Code).

2. While the client agreement provided for residence in the skilled migrant category, the temporary visa application signed by the appellant and approved by Immigration New Zealand was a work-to-residence visa. This showed that the appellant had accepted that the skilled migrant pathway was not viable.

3. The appellant chose not to disclose to the adviser that he had continued to work without the adviser's assistance on his residence application, which was granted in July 2019.

4. The adviser assisted him and his family to obtain temporary visas to enter New Zealand. There was no significant delay or issue with the documents submitted.

5. The adviser had an obligation of confidentiality and should not have informed the appellant's employer when the visa was granted. However, this was not a serious breach as the appellant had made a commitment to begin work with the employer as soon as the visa was granted. The adviser had apologised for this failing and put measures in place to ensure it did not happen again.

6. The adviser had an obligation to ensure the agreement allowed for refunds, but this was not a serious breach as the appellant did not seek a refund or use the complaint process of the immigration consultancy. The adviser had admitted a refund should have been offered and the standard agreement had been changed to reflect this.

7. There were some inaccuracies in the adviser's services resulting in a failure to be diligent and to conduct himself with due care, but he had admitted his service was not perfect and apologised. This included mistakes in filling out the temporary visa applications for the family. These were minor and it was unlikely they would have resulted in a negative result from Immigration New Zealand.

8. There was no significant adverse impact on the appellant or his family from the services provided by the adviser.

9. While the adviser did not submit the residence application, he did undertake a significant amount of work. Furthermore, he offered a refund of approximately 20 per cent ($946.60) which the appellant declined.

**JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURE**

[45] The grounds for a complaint against a licensed adviser are listed in s 44(2) of the Immigration Advisers Licensing Act 2007 (the Act):

(a) negligence;

(b) incompetence;

(c) incapacity;

(d) dishonest or misleading behaviour; and

(e) a breach of the Code.

[46] Section 45(1) provides that on receipt of a complaint, the Registrar may:

(a) determine that the complaint does not meet the criteria set out in section 44(3), and reject it accordingly;

(b) determine that the complaint does not disclose any of the grounds of complaint listed in section 44(2), and reject it accordingly;

(c) determine that the complaint discloses only a trivial or inconsequential matter, and for this reason need not be pursued; or

(d) request the complainant to consider whether or not the matter could be best settled by the complainant using the immigration adviser's own complaints procedure.

[47] In accordance with s 54 of the Act, a complainant may appeal to the Tribunal against a determination of the Registrar to reject or not pursue a complaint under s 45(1)(b) or (c).

[48] After considering the appeal, the Tribunal may:[2]

(a) reject the appeal; or

(b) determine that the decision of the Registrar was incorrect, but nevertheless reject the complaint upon another ground; or

(c) determine that it should hear the complaint, and direct the Registrar to prepare the complaint for filing with the Tribunal; or

(d) determine that the Registrar should make a request under section 45(1)(d).

[49] The adviser against whom the complaint is made is not a party to the appeal and has not been served. The appeal itself cannot result in the Tribunal upholding the complaint against the adviser.

[50] The Tribunal issued directions on 3 December 2020 setting a timeframe for further evidence and submissions.

*Submissions of the appellant*

[51] On the appeal form, the appellant states that the adviser made several significant errors that would have had a huge impact on the immigration process if the appellant himself had not recognised and dealt with them. The adviser had also presented a great deal of lies to the Authority.

[52] The appellant provided submissions with the appeal on 28 October 2020. He is very disappointed that the Registrar accepted the adviser's response without verifying the statements made. This was due to too much information to process. The appellant

[2] Immigration Advisers Licensing Act, s 54(3).

says he has compiled two documents listing many of the significant errors and lies by the adviser. They show the gravity of his performance.

[53] The appellant posed three questions in a communication from him to the Registrar on 20 October 2020 (communication not sent to the Tribunal):

1. Is it acceptable for an adviser to make serious errors that would have gravely affected the outcome, so long as the client recognises them and deals with everything?

2. Is it acceptable for an adviser to fabricate a response to the Authority consisting of several pure lies and loose allegations?

3. Is it acceptable for an adviser to notify a client that no refund will be given regardless, after an internal complaint has been made by the client?

[54] The appellant is certain the immigration outcome would have been very different had he followed his adviser's instructions.

[55] According to the appellant, the Registrar decided that the complaint could be settled by the adviser's own procedure, but no satisfactory agreement was reached. Even a full refund would not have been sufficient, given the adviser made the application more time-consuming and expensive. Proper penalties for the adviser are the appellant's highest priority. The apology is not sufficient, given all the adviser's lies and loose allegations.

[56] It is accepted by the appellant that he did not terminate the service agreement, nor ask for a refund. There was no point after the adviser told him there would be no refund.

[57] In his email of 28 October 2020 to the Tribunal, the appellant lists the points he would like reviewed (his section 3) and the other key incidents to be reviewed (section 4). Other documents sent by the appellant also list the adviser's alleged "significant errors" (see, for example, [1.11.13] of an attachment to the email of 28 October).

[58] In support of the appeal, documentary evidence was provided.

[59] Further comprehensive submissions were sent to the Tribunal by the appellant on 23 December 2020, with numerous support documents. He repeats the submissions and allegations already made to the Tribunal.

[60] In particular, the appellant lists his complaints against the adviser (section 3 – summary of adviser's performance; section 4 – points to be reviewed; section 5 – key incidents; section 6 – examples of the adviser's lies and allegations of less significance). The appellant states that a solution satisfactory to him would involve a considerable fine against the adviser, the revocation of his licence for a minimum of six months, as well as the refund offered, though the adviser does not deserve any payment at all.

[61] In the voluminous supporting documents, the Tribunal notes that attachment 4 is a summary of errors by the adviser.

[62] Additional submissions were sent to the Tribunal by the appellant on 8 February 2021, in answer to those of the Registrar of 29 January 2021. The appellant repeats that alarm bells should have been set off by the adviser's push for him to file an expression of interest (EOI) in April/May 2018 and apply for residence, even if his actual points were only 120. He wants his complaint to be properly investigated. The Registrar had not answered any details apart from the initial complaint. Extensive materials, largely already sent to the Tribunal, were attached. This included a point-by-point response to the Registrar's submission.

*Submissions of the Registrar*

[63] Mr Denyer, counsel for the Registrar, produced submissions on 29 January 2021.

[64] It is noted by counsel that the allegedly incorrect initial assessment as to the appellant's eligibility was given by another adviser. Furthermore, the appellant was informed at the start that he would need to engage with both the NZQA and EWRB to meet qualification and registration requirements. He was able to obtain a limited certificate in April/May 2018 and employment. The whole family was able to promptly obtain temporary visas with the adviser's assistance.

[65] The adviser had acknowledged some incorrect biographical details, which were checked by the appellant, before filing. These were not sufficiently serious to warrant referral to the Tribunal. Nor was the adviser's failure to obtain consent to tell the employer about the visa, for which the adviser had apologised.

[66] According to counsel, there was limited engagement between the adviser and the appellant once the family had the temporary visas. The appellant had become dissatisfied with the perceived inaccurate advice, including advice that he would have to wait longer for residence having failed to have his qualification recognised. He was,

however, able to have his qualification recognised and obtain residence more quickly, by working on the application himself (and without telling the adviser).

[67] The main thrust of the complaint is that the adviser provided incorrect information about the requirements for recognising the appellant's qualification. The Registrar acknowledged that the advice did not give the appellant the fastest path to recognition of his qualification. The appellant himself was able to achieve that favourable outcome by seeking re-assessment of his qualification, without telling the adviser.

[68] Counsel contends that such matters require knowledge of both the immigration instructions and the standards set by industry bodies, together with overseas qualifications. The adviser had made it clear to the appellant that he needed to engage with the NZQA and EWRB and gave him some guidance. The adviser's knowledge may not have been up to date. However, the Registrar did not believe that this amounted to incompetence or any other breach of the Code.

[69] It is therefore submitted by Mr Denyer that the complaint has been properly considered by a specialist decision-maker who came to a conclusion based on a full assessment of the relevant information. It took into account that the appellant's applications were successful in all respects and that the adviser was not given the opportunity to complete the residence applications. The adviser demonstrated an appropriate level of knowledge of the immigration instructions, albeit with shortcomings in respect of external processes. The complaint was properly found to disclose only trivial or inconsequential matters.

**ASSESSMENT**

[70] The appellant has a very long list of criticisms of the adviser, backed by comprehensive documentation. Despite his protestations otherwise, he has set out his complaint clearly and with a high standard of English.

[71] Based on the materials produced, I agree with Mr Denyer as to the thrust of the complaint. The appellant appears to have been advised he was eligible for residence, based on recognition of his industry qualification and experience from Sweden. That advice may have been optimistic as the initial recognition he obtained from the EWRB in January 2018 was limited. On his own initiative, in November 2018 he managed to obtain additional recognition of his work experience and qualifications. However, it was still only a limited certificate and the requirement to work and to complete examinations and practical assessments remained.

[72] While the initial advice as to eligibility came from another licensed adviser, the adviser against whom the complaint is made, effectively adopted it by continuing to act for the appellant without correcting any error in that initial assessment.

[73] According to the appellant, once he obtained the limited certificate from the EWRB, the adviser told him that he would have to wait longer for residence than should have been needed. That may be so, but as noted above, the appellant corrected this himself by seeking a reassessment, which appears to have resulted in another 500 hours of work experience being approved, as well as further exemptions from the examination and practical assessment requirements. It did not though, lead to full recognition.

[74] I also agree with Mr Denyer that there is little or no evidence of wrong advice as to immigration criteria or processes. After all, the appellant, his wife and children all obtained temporary visas without delay. That included work visas for both the appellant and his wife. The adviser correctly set him on the path to vocational recognition and may have even been responsible for the January 2018 recognition from the EWRB (I do not have the adviser's entire immigration file and do not know who originally applied to the EWRB and/or the NZQA).

[75] I have not seen evidence as to the immigration advice given by the adviser once the limited certificate was obtained, but the appellant says he would have had to wait longer for residence if he had followed it. Mr Denyer notes the Registrar's acknowledgement that the advice did not give the appellant the fastest path to recognition of his qualification and therefore residence. It would appear therefore that the adviser was wrong about how long residence would take following the January 2018 certificate, but that seems to have been a misunderstanding about the requirements for full vocational registration (rather than misunderstanding the immigration instructions).

[76] I leave open for another complaint whether advice about vocational registration is "immigration advice", as defined in the Act, and therefore whether the professional obligations apply.[3] At the very least I see a shared responsibility. A client with a professional or trade qualification wishing to migrate to New Zealand, particularly one competent in written English, bears some responsibility for investigating the registration requirements here, if not the primary responsibility. I do not see anything unusual or worthy of criticism of an adviser because a client (already in New Zealand) decided to take charge of vocational registration and achieved a better outcome than the adviser.

[3] Immigration Advisers Licensing Act 2007, s 7.

[77] By this stage, the appellant had taken the residence process out of the adviser's hands and sought it himself, and it is to his credit that he did so successfully. It is not clear that the appellant's dissatisfaction with the adviser which led him to do this justifies a professional misconduct complaint.

[78] I accept that there were a host of mistakes of a biographical or typographical nature with certain immigration forms for the family which the adviser was responsible for. These were all identified and corrected by the appellant, again to his credit. The adviser says he was pressured by the appellant into rushed applications and furthermore, he was aware his client would check them. I do not accept that either factor excuses shoddy accuracy, but there is no evidence the errors were widespread and, fortuitously perhaps, no harm was done. I note also the adviser's acknowledgment and apology for the errors. In the circumstances, they do not justify a complaint before the Tribunal.

[79] There was also the breach of confidentiality in advising the employer as to the grant of the visa. There was no real harm to the appellant. Again, the adviser has acknowledged the wrongdoing and apologised.

[80] As the Registrar found, there was a professional breach by the adviser in his warning or threat to the appellant to refuse any refund of fees paid in advance, in the event that his services were to be terminated. I assume the adviser had been paid the full fee, including for residence, but he did not actually prepare or file the family's residence application. In refusing a refund, the adviser was apparently relying on the client agreement (not seen by the Tribunal).

[81] This conduct was a breach of the obligation to have a refund policy allowing for fair and reasonable refunds.[4] To some extent, this was mitigated by the appellant's failure to terminate the agreement. He continued to obtain advice from the adviser, even after he started acting for himself. At no time did he actually notify termination or request a refund. That would have tested whether the adviser would have followed through on the threat not to refund, which would have crystallised a more serious breach.

[82] Be that as it may, the adviser eventually did the right thing when faced with the complaint. A refund was offered and an apology for the breach made. It has not been shown that the refund offered was not fair and reasonable. The appellant seeks a full refund, but that would not be appropriate given the work done by the adviser.

---

[4] Licensed Immigration Advisers Code of Conduct 2014, cls 19(k), 24(a).

[83] Finally, I record that there is no evidence that the adviser has lied to the Authority or the appellant, as alleged.

*Conclusion*

[84] The investigation of the appellant's complaint was appropriate and I agree with the outcome. The Registrar correctly referred it to the adviser's complaint procedure. It was treated seriously by the adviser and a substantial refund offered, coupled with acknowledgments of mistakes and apologies. There is no evidence that the level of refund does not fairly represent the unearned portion of the full fee as a result of not having to file the residence application. The adviser's errors do not justify reference of the complaint to the Tribunal.

**OUTCOME**

[85] The appeal is rejected.

**ORDER FOR SUPPRESSION**

[86] The Tribunal has the power to order that any part of the evidence or the name of any witness not be published.[5]

[87] There is no public interest in knowing the name of the appellant, or of the adviser against whom the complaint is made.

[88] The Tribunal orders that no information identifying the appellant, the adviser (or the adviser's employers) is to be published other than to Immigration New Zealand.

D J Plunkett
Chair

[5] Immigration Advisers Licensing Act 2007, s 50A.