

IN THE MATTER OF

A complaint laid by the Police under s 74 of the Private Security Personnel and Private Investigators Act against **CELESTE SHAW**

DECISION

[1] In July 2022 I referred a complaint against Celeste Shaw to the Complaints Investigation and Prosecution Unit (CIPU) for investigation and report. The complaint related to Ms Shaw's conduct while she was working as a security guard at a bar in Mount Maunganui on the 15th and 16th of July 2022.

[2] CIPU say that Ms Shaw's conduct on the evening in question was unprofessional and that some patrons found her offensive. CIPU concluded there is insufficient evidence to support a finding of misconduct, but Ms Shaw's behaviour may have met the threshold for unsatisfactory conduct.

[3] Unsatisfactory conduct is defined in s 4 of the Act as:

- (a) conduct that falls short of the standard that a reasonable member of the public is entitled to expect from a reasonably competent ...certificate holder; or
- (b) conduct that is incompetent or negligent; or
- (c) conduct that would reasonably be regarded by private security personnel or private investigators of good standing as being unacceptable.

[4] I accept that Ms Shaw's conduct on the night of 16 July did not amount to misconduct but was unsatisfactory. However, there were extenuating circumstances that contributed to her behaviour. The night had been hectic with a couple of fights having broken out. Security was short staffed and did not have adequate support. In the process of trying to defuse a fight Ms Shaw ended up getting blood on her from a patron's bleeding nose which had not been cleaned up at the time of her initial interaction with the complainant.

[5] Ms Shaw's subsequent behaviour was however more likely to escalate the situation rather than defuse it. She swore at patrons and some patrons considered her conduct to be offensive. Ms Shaw's conduct therefore fell short of the standards that a member of the public is entitled to expect from a reasonably competent crowd controller.

[6] Since the night in question Ms Shaw was removed from working at the venue and she is no longer working in security. I accordingly conclude that the appropriate outcome of the complaint is an official reprimand and a warning. I also recommend that if Ms Shaw returns to work in the security industry she should first undertake some refresher training including advanced de-escalation training.

Conclusion & Orders

[7] Ms Shaw's behaviour on the evening of 15 July 2023 amounts to unsatisfactory conduct: Ms Shaw is therefore:

- Formally reprimanded

- Warned that such behaviour is not acceptable and if it is repeated further disciplinary action is likely to be taken against her.

DATED at Wellington this 5th day of May 2023

The image shows a handwritten signature in black ink that reads "P A McConnell". To the right of the signature is a circular blue ink stamp. The stamp features a central coat of arms with a crown on top, surrounded by the text "THE PRIVATE SECURITY PERSONNEL LICENSING AUTHORITY".

P A McConnell
Private Security Personnel Licensing Authority