

**IN THE MATTER OF**

A complaint made under s 73 of the Private Security Personnel and Private Investigators Act 2010

**AGAINST**

**PRINCIPLE PROTECTION SERVICES LIMITED**

**Heard** virtually on 15 February 2023

**APPEARANCES**

Ashneel Kumar for CIPU

Jon Field & Duncan Fong for Principle Protection Services Limited

**DECISION**

[1] In March 2022 I referred a complaint relating to actions of security workers at the Craic Irish Bar in Christchurch to the Complaints Investigation and Prosecution Unit (CIPU) for investigation and report. CIPU's investigation established that one of those security workers was Philip Akurangi. At the time he was engaged by Principle Protection Services Limited but he did not have a current certificate of approval and was not wearing his certificate of approval (COA).

[2] Principle Protection accept they breached s45(1) of the Act by engaging Mr Akurangi to work in security although he did not have a current COA. They advise it was oversight as they were short staffed, and this was the first time Mr Akurangi worked for them since his COA expired. Principle Protection advise they have changed their record keeping and processes to ensure this type of breach does not happen again.

[3] Principle Protection have further contravened the Act by continuing to work in security without a current licence. Principle Protection's security licence expired on 2 October 2022 and they did not apply for a new licence until 29 November 2022 when they received the CIPU report and hearing directions. The application however was incomplete, and the missing documents were not filed until 26 January 2023.

[4] Conduct by a licence holder that contravenes the Act fits within the definition of misconduct as set out in s 4 of the Act. Principle Protection is therefore guilty of misconduct by engaging someone to work as a crowd controller without a certificate and by continuing to operate a security business without a current licence.

[5] Misconduct is a discretionary ground for cancelling a licence. However, I accept that the misconduct was a result of poor record keeping rather than intentional. Principle Protection have taken steps to ensure such breaches do not happen again, so as far as it is possible, they have remedied the breaches. I therefore conclude that the appropriate outcome is a reprimand and warning.

**Summary & Conclusion**

[6] Principle Protection Services Limited have contravened the Act and are therefore guilty of misconduct by engaging someone to work as a crowd controller who did not have a

certificate of approval and by continuing to operate a security business without a current licence. I therefore make the following order

- a) Principle Protection Services Limited is formally reprimanded under s 78(1)(vii) of the Act.
- b) Principle Protection is given a formal warning that any further breaches of the Act could result in prosecution and suspension of its licence.

**DATED** at Wellington this 21<sup>st</sup> day February 2023



P A McConnell  
**Private Security Personnel Licensing Authority**