

Juror Satisfaction Survey

2019 Results

31/10/2019



MINISTRY OF
JUSTICE
Tabu o te Ture

New Zealand Government

Contents

- Results overview - infographic 1**
- Survey background 2**
- Summary 3**
 - Progress from 2018 3
 - Improvements in progress 4
- Results 5**
 - Overall satisfaction 5
 - Satisfaction with court services 5
 - Staff 5
 - Safety and security 6
 - Satisfaction with court facilities 7
 - Parking 7
 - Waiting areas and retiring rooms 7
 - Food and beverage facilities 8
 - Jurors' satisfaction with the information provided 8
 - Information prior to arriving at court 8
 - Information about whether jurors are required at court the next day 9
 - Information surrounding the process 10
 - Post-trial information 10
 - Emergency evacuation information 10
- Appendix A: Methodology, analysis and limitations 11**
- Appendix B: Comparison to previous years 16**
- Appendix C: Survey questions 18**
- Appendix D: Survey locations 19**

Juror Satisfaction Survey 2019

Results overview - infographic

↑ ↓ Increase/decrease from 2018

— No change from 2018



What our jurors said they liked the most

"Friendly, attentive and informative staff"

"The cleanliness of facilities"

"The safety and security at court"

"The food and beverages available at court"



"The opportunity to take part in the juror experience"

"The information provided about the process"

The improvements our jurors suggested



"Larger, more comfortable jury retiring rooms"

"Better parking facilities, and information about parking"

"Better technology at the court"

"A wider, healthier selection of food and beverages"

"Less time spent waiting around at court, or set better expectations of the amount of waiting time involved"



Survey background

Objectives

The Juror Satisfaction Survey (the survey) has been carried out annually in all New Zealand District Courts and High Courts since 2008. The survey is conducted to understand jurors' satisfaction with the services and facilities provided by the Ministry of Justice (the Ministry) at court.

The survey is an important part of the Ministry's operations, the findings provide valuable insights and form part of the Ministry's annual performance measures.

Methodology

Jurors have the opportunity to complete the survey after the trial they are serving on has finished. The survey is voluntary and anonymous, and court staff exercise discretion as to whether distributing the survey would be appropriate. For example, it may be inappropriate to distribute the survey due to emotional stress the trial may have placed on the jury.

This year, the survey was carried out between 13 May and 21 June. It consisted of 24 questions that asked jurors to rate their satisfaction with various aspects of their experience, and to provide comments on what they liked, and what could be improved. Please refer to *Appendix C: 2019 survey questions* for a full list of the questions included in the survey.

During the survey period, 1,152 jurors who served were invited to take part in the survey, with 1,044 (91%) completing it. This is a 17.6% increase from the 888 jurors who completed the survey in 2018, returning the number of respondents to a level more in line with previous years.

Full details of the survey's methodology, data analysis and limitations can be found in *Appendix A: Methodology, Analysis and Limitations*. A map of the courts that participated in this year's survey can be found in *Appendix D: Survey locations*.

Summary

Jurors' overall satisfaction with the services and facilities provided by the Ministry is consistently high. For 2019, it was rated at 90%. This is similar to previous years. The results suggest the Ministry continues to provide a high standard of services and facilities to jurors at court.

The results show variation in satisfaction levels with certain services and facilities, with some rated much higher than others. For example:

- Satisfaction with the way jurors were treated by staff continues to be the highest rated aspect of the experience, at 98%
- In contrast, only 44% of jurors stated that there was an up-to-date phone message informing them whether their attendance was required in court the following day.

The most commonly suggested improvements from jurors were:

- Improvements to the jury retiring room,
- Better parking facilities, and better information about parking options),
- Improvements to the technology used at court,
- A wider, better quality, and healthier selection of food and beverages.

The remainder of this report details the key national-level results. Where possible, the results have been compared to those from 2018.

Progress from 2018

From the 2018 survey results, three areas for improvement were identified:

1. communications to jurors about whether they are required in court the next day
2. increasing awareness of the court's emergency procedures
3. increasing awareness of where to find the defendant's sentence post-trial.

Table 1 below compares the 2018 and 2019 results across these areas to illustrate changes in satisfaction levels.

Table 1: Improvement area comparisons 2018–2019

Improvement area	2018	2019	Variance
Up-to-date information on the website about whether jurors were needed in court the next day	55.5%	59.1%	+ 3.6%
Up-to-date phone message available with information about whether jurors were needed in court the next day	55.1%	44.0%	- 11.1%
Jurors informed of the courts emergency procedures	72.3%	70.5%	- 1.8%
Jurors informed how to find out about the sentence the defendant will receive	59.8%	61.3%	+ 1.5%

Slight improvement has been made toward having up-to-date information for jurors on the Ministry's since 2018. The lack of progress on the other improvement areas from 2018 indicates further work is required.

Improvements in progress

Juror Service website

In June 2019, improvements were made to the Juror Service website to make information clearer and easier to find. The impact of these changes for jurors will be measured in the 2020 survey.

Parking

Changes to include more information about parking in the juror webform confirmation email are underway. The email will include several suggestions of where jurors can park when arriving at court. These changes will address the improvements recommended by jurors in the 2018 and 2019 surveys.

Results

Overall satisfaction

Jurors were asked to rate their overall satisfaction with the services and facilities provided by the Ministry at court. The result from this question is used to report against the Ministry's performance measure standard of 90%.

Overall, 90% of jurors responded that they were either "satisfied" or "very satisfied" with the services and facilities at court. The overall satisfaction rating has been broadly consistent at 90% since 2009.

This result is slightly lower than the 2018 rating of 93.2%, which was the highest level since the survey began. The result indicates a high standard of services and facilities delivered to jurors. For an overview of the results from this question in previous years, refer to Table 4, *Appendix B: Comparison to previous years*.

Average satisfaction at District Courts was 91.2%, while at High Courts it was 80.9%. The number of responses received from High Court jurors were significantly lower than those from the District Court. This has an impact on the overall score. Refer to *Appendix A: Methodology, Analysis and Limitations* for response rates.

Satisfaction with court services

Staff

Jurors' satisfaction with the way they are treated by staff continues to be the highest rated measure of the survey. This year, 97.7% were satisfied with the way they were treated by staff, consistent with the 98.0% rating received in 2018.

Questions in the survey that relate to court staff received the highest satisfaction ratings. Of those surveyed, 91.0% reported that staff gave them information when they asked for it, and 88.4% reported that staff kept them well informed about any potential delays.

Additionally, 52.7% stated that staff were what they most liked about the services and facilities at court. Staff were described as friendly, respectful, attentive and well-informed. Of the comments that mention staff, 24.0% identify a particular staff member by name.

“Very personable and informative staff (and patient!)” – Auckland HC

“The staff at the court were very professional and the staff member [name] was very helpful and professional” – Hamilton DC

“The court staff were very helpful and friendly” – Wellington DC

Safety and security

Of those surveyed, 90.3% were satisfied with the safety and security at court. This result is slightly lower than the 91.2% rating in 2018 but still shows strong performance in this area.

One area of safety and security that has scored significantly lower than in 2018 is satisfaction with the way jurors were kept separate from the public during the trial. In 2019, 83.8% were satisfied, compared with 90.8% in 2018. 7.0% of jurors suggested the security at court could be improved upon, with many of these comments referring to the way jurors are kept separate from the public.

At several courts, jurors were not satisfied with their proximity to members of the defendant’s family, or their supporters. Of those who responded to the question, 7.0% of jurors suggested the security at court could be improved upon, with many of these comments referring to the way jurors are kept separate from the public. Several jurors commented that they felt intimidated and uncomfortable sharing public spaces with supporters of the defendant.

“The court [was] very secure” – Auckland HC

“[I] felt very safe in the building” – Christchurch DC

“I found that I felt intimidated by being amongst the [defendant’s] family out front of court at the beginning and end of the day and in local cafes at lunch time” – Tauranga DC

“Court security was generally very good, however as a juror I felt a little uncomfortable walking through the public waiting room, past witnesses, etc.” – Whangarei DC

Satisfaction with court facilities

Parking

Prior to 2018, jurors were asked to rate their satisfaction with the parking facilities available at court. However, this question was amended in 2018 to reflect that the Ministry does not have control over the parking facilities themselves; instead jurors are currently asked to rate their satisfaction with the information provided about the parking facilities near the court.

Overall, 70.7% were satisfied with the information provided to them regarding parking. This is an improvement from 69.0% in 2018. However, 10.0% of jurors commented that they would have liked more information about the parking facilities available

The availability of parking facilities continues to be a frequently mentioned area for improvement. In 2019, of those who answered the question, 9.2% commented that parking facilities could be improved.

"[I would have liked] to get parking information in initial jury summons or a follow up reminder email" – Auckland DC

"Those chosen to serve on the jury could be given a card/pass ... to exempt them from parking fees" – New Plymouth DC

"[I would have liked] more detail about parking prior to coming to court" – Tauranga DC

Waiting areas and retiring rooms

Of those jurors surveyed, 80.5% were satisfied with the waiting area facilities at court. This is similar to the 81.5% rating in 2018. Additionally, 77.5% were satisfied with the jury retiring room, a decrease from 80.0% in 2018.

The jury retiring room was the most commonly mentioned area in need of improvement, with 74.1% of jurors who suggested improvements to a specific area highlighting the jury retiring room. Most of the criticisms about the waiting areas and retiring rooms related to the size, layout, lighting and temperature control of the rooms. These comments have been made across a number of years.

"Initial waiting area could be larger given the amount of people summoned" – Dunedin DC

"The jury rooms are very small and confined for 12 people" – New Plymouth DC

"Air conditioning in the juror room is not flexible. Can't change the temperature when necessary" – Whangarei HC

Food and beverage facilities

Of those who responded to the question, 20.4% of jurors commented that the food and beverages provided were one of the things they liked most about the services and facilities at court. Many of the positive comments praised the complementary hot drinks and biscuits provided.

Of those who suggested improvements, 13.8% mentioned the food and beverages. Several jurors suggested that the quality and selection of lunches and hot beverages provided could be improved. Ten jurors also commented that they would have liked the option of healthier snacks, such as fruit and herbal teas, to choose from.

A small percentage of respondents to the question (2.1%) noted that they would have liked more information provided to them about the food and beverages available to them prior to arriving on their first day.

"[I liked the] food provided and tea and coffee" – Christchurch DC

"[I liked] the supply of biscuits and lovely lunch" – Hamilton DC

*"There were lots of chocolate biscuits, something healthier would have been nice" –
Kaikohe DC*

Jurors' satisfaction with the information provided

Information prior to arriving at court

Before arrival, jurors are provided with information by post and can look at the jury service website to find information about what to expect at court.

Of those surveyed, 90.8% were satisfied with the information received in the post, down from 93.3% in 2018. Additionally, 78.4% of jurors were satisfied with the information available on the jury service website. This is a significant increase from the 71.6% satisfaction rating in 2018. As no changes had been made to the website at the time of the survey, this result is likely to be a consequence of the random sample of respondents in this year's survey.

Despite this large increase, some respondents reported they would like more information on what to expect. Jurors mentioned improvements to the information about parking, the likely time commitment involved in service, waiting times, and if, and when, food and beverages would be provided.

When asked what additional information jurors would have found useful, the majority of those who responded to this question (32.8%) stated that they were satisfied with the information they received.

“[I would have liked] pre-service information, i.e. availability of microwave, tea/coffee facilities” – Auckland DC

“[I would have liked] before arriving a list of what we can bring, drinks, lunch, books, laptops, etc.” – Auckland DC

“[More information about] the time spent serving as a member of the jury. We were told 2-3 days but 5 days later we finished” – Kaikohe DC

Information about whether jurors are required at court the next day

Jurors can find out whether they are required in court the next day via the jury service website or by calling a phone number for a pre-recorded message. These services have previously been identified for improvement as jurors have consistently rated them lower than other services.

Of those who visited it, 59.1% of jurors reported that they found up-to-date information on the jury service website about whether they were needed in court the next day. This is an increase from 55.5% in 2018. In contrast, 8.5% of jurors responded that they did not find up-to-date information, which is a decrease from 11.5% in 2018. This question had one of the highest “doesn’t apply to me” response rates (19.2%) and “don’t know” response rates (18.0%), indicating that many jurors may not have used the website for this purpose, or were not aware that this service was available.

Of those who called, only 44.0% of respondents reported that there was an up-to-date recorded phone message available with information about whether jurors were required in court the next day. This result is significantly lower than the 55.1% rating in 2018. Additionally, 7.8% did not find up-to-date information, 21.4% responded “doesn’t apply to me” and 30.1% responded “don’t know”.

“The phone number [to ring the] night before coming ... was out of date” – Auckland DC

“The information as to if I was still needed the night before wasn’t there” – Auckland HC

“[I would have liked] to find out prior to leaving home if it was known that court was not going to be in session that day” – Rotorua HC

Information surrounding the process

Jurors were unsure at times of the processes and rules they were required to follow. Comments highlighted that some jurors were not fully aware of the selection process, with 10.4% of those who would have liked more information specifically mentioning the selection process.

Additionally, 19.4% of those who would have liked more information on the process commented that they were unsure of some of the rules they were required to follow throughout service. For example, jurors would have liked more information on how to carry out deliberations and what was expected of them in this process, as well as more information on what jurors are able or not able to do during the service.

Some jurors were unsure of information regarding the law and legal aspects of a trial. Of those jurors who would have liked more information on the trial, 31.0% commented they would have liked definitions of certain legal terms used in the trial and further information and clarification about the charges and possible sentences the defendants may face.

“[I would have liked information on] the sentence ranges for the charges” – Auckland DC

“[I would have liked] knowing more about the ballot process and jury selection before being called in” – Gisborne DC

“Perhaps more suggestions/guidance on how or when to discuss evidence” – Wellington DC

Post-trial information

Jurors are asked, if the defendant in the trial they served on was found guilty, whether they were told how to find out information on the sentence the defendant will receive. Of the respondents this question applied to, 61.3% reported that they were told this information. This is a slight increase from 59.8% in 2018, following it being identified as an area for improvement in the 2018 survey.

Emergency evacuation information

Providing jurors with information on the court’s emergency evacuation procedure was an area identified for improvement following the 2018 survey. In 2018, 72.3% of jurors were informed of the emergency evacuation procedures at court. This has decreased slightly in 2019, with only 70.5% of jurors informed of emergency evacuation procedures.

Appendix A: Methodology, analysis and limitations

Survey methodology

The Juror Satisfaction Survey has been carried out annually in District Courts and High Courts since 2008. The survey allows the Ministry to gain valuable insights on juror experiences at court by measuring their experience and satisfaction in relation to key criteria set out in the *National Standards of Court Services for Jurors* (An overview of what people can expect from the court during jury service).

The survey is divided into three main sections:

- General satisfaction with court facilities and communication material
- Adherence to the National Standard of Court Services for Jurors
- Questions seeking qualitative feedback regarding the services and facilities at court, including what jurors liked most and what could be improved.

The 2019 survey was carried out between 13 May and 21 June 2019 and consisted of 24 questions.

Surveys are distributed in paper format to jurors by court staff upon completion of the trial. Court staff exercise discretion as to whether distributing the survey would be appropriate. For example, it may be inappropriate to distribute the survey due to emotional stress the trial may have placed on the jury.

Jurors are asked to complete the survey only once, even if they served on multiple juries. The survey is voluntary and anonymous, with no personal information collected from jurors. The only identifying information is the court stamp at the bottom of the questionnaire.

During the survey period, 1,152 jurors who served at New Zealand's District and High Courts were given the opportunity to take part in the survey, with 1,044 (91%) completing it. This is a significant increase from the 888 jurors who completed the survey in 2018.

Of these responses, 908 were received from District Court jury trials and 136 were received from High Court jury trials.

The following District and High Courts were included in this year's survey:

District Courts

Auckland, Christchurch, Dunedin, Gisborne, Hamilton, Invercargill, Kaikohe, Manukau, Napier, Nelson, New Plymouth, Rotorua, Tauranga, Timaru, Wanganui, Wellington, and Whangarei.

High Courts

Auckland, Blenheim, Rotorua, Wellington, and Whangarei.

Please note, only District and High Courts with a jury trial scheduled between 13 May and 21 June 2019 were eligible to take part in the survey.

Table 2 displays the sample size and response rate for each survey since 2008.

Table 2: Survey response rates 2008–2019

Year ¹	Number of jurors who were given the survey	Number of responses	Response Rate
2008	1,269	1,053	82.98%
2009	1,520	1,170	76.97%
2010	1,461	1,122	76.80%
2011	1,380	1,156	83.77%
2012	1,171	1,087	92.82%
2014	1,209	1,044	86.35%
2015	1,248	1,028	82.37%
2016	1,104	957	86.68%
2017	1,164	1,115	95.79%
2018	1,140	888	77.89%
2019	1,152	1,044	90.63%

Results analysis and adjustments

For each question, jurors were given the opportunity to answer saying that the question 'does not apply'. For some questions the 'does not apply' response rate was as high as 26%,

¹ No survey was completed in 2013.

although for several questions this option was not selected by any respondents. These responses affect the overall satisfaction rate because the calculation includes all survey participants, rather than excluding 'does not apply' responses.

To mitigate this effect, the ratings used in the final report are the percentage of those who the question applied to. An example of how the adjusted values are calculated can be found below. Table 3 shows the difference between the unadjusted satisfaction rates and the adjusted satisfaction rates in 2019.

Satisfaction Q1

$$= \frac{\text{number of jurors satisfied Q1} + \text{number of jurors very satisfied Q1}}{\text{total surveys received} - \text{number of doesn't apply responses Q1}}$$

This calculation only excludes responses where the participants specifically stated that the question did not apply to them.

It should be noted, for questions on the topic of whether jurors were required at court the next day, responders may have used “does not apply to me” and “don’t know” interchangeably. This has affected the adjustment process because it cannot be reasonably inferred from the responses whether the respondent did not know about the information because they did not need the resource, or whether they did not know due to technical difficulties or other circumstances.

Table 3: Comparison between 2019 unadjusted and adjusted satisfaction rates

Question	Unadjusted	Adjusted
1	90.3%	90.8%
2	79.2%	81.9%
3	72.0%	79.7%
4	97.7%	97.7%
5	80.5%	80.5%
6	75.8%	77.5%
7	64.7%	70.7%
8	90.3%	90.3%
9	65.6%	78.4%
10	89.8%	89.9%
14	47.8%	59.1%

Question	Unadjusted	Adjusted
15	34.6%	44.0%
16	85.1%	85.6%
17	82.3%	82.7%
18	87.9%	88.8%
19	89.6%	91.0%
20	70.2%	70.5%
21	87.0%	88.4%
22	79.9%	83.8%
23	85.8%	88.6%
24	45.9%	61.3%

Limitations of the survey

While the results give a general understanding of the national satisfaction of jurors, there are limitations to the survey that may influence the results and mean the results are not truly representative of all jurors.

Survey methodology

Only courts that have jury trials during the survey period are included in the survey sample. This may bias the results toward the larger, more metropolitan courts, which are more likely to hold a jury trial during any given period. If a court has a large number of trials during the timeframe, that court will have a much greater influence over the final results, which might not reflect its typical level of representation over a full year. This may be problematic as some courts have consistently higher satisfaction rates than others and, if these courts have a different number of trials during the sample period compared to other years, the overall satisfaction rate could be different despite no actual change to the services and facilities.

Only five of the 18 High Courts were represented in the 2019 survey. This is likely caused by the High Courts generally holding fewer trials. The lower number of High Court trials may result in their under-representation in the national satisfaction rate.

Sample and timing

The survey is also limited by its sample and singular timeframe. The survey provides a satisfaction rate across a single six-week period. Extenuating circumstances throughout the

survey period may severely influence the results of the survey, however, measuring satisfaction across a longer or more diverse survey period may yield a more accurate and valid representation of satisfaction.

Questions

The survey questions also result in several limitations to the survey, and the conclusions that can be drawn from the results. The majority of the questions in the survey are Likert-scale questions which although provide useful insights, limit the conclusions that can be drawn due to the closed and limited nature of the responses. These questions are useful for providing insights into jurors' satisfaction levels, but cannot necessarily provide insights into why jurors may feel this way.

To counter this issue, the survey does include three qualitative questions where jurors are able to provide more detailed and open answers. While these questions provide more valuable insights, the response levels for such questions are significantly lower. Questions 11 and 12 were answered only by 56% of respondents, while Question 13 was answered only by 23%, whereas all remaining questions were answered by between 87% and 99% of respondents. Such response rates for Questions 11 to 13 limit the value and generalisability of the findings.

A final limitation of the questions in the survey stems from the possible responses to the Likert questions. Jurors have the opportunity to respond with "Don't know" or "Does not apply to me". These responses allow the Ministry to understand satisfaction rates for only those to whom the questions applied, however they do create some issues. For certain questions, such as Questions 14 and 15, it is not possible to conclude from the responses whether jurors used "Don't know", "Doesn't apply to me" or "No" interchangeably. If a juror did not check the website to find out whether they were required in court the next day, the expected response would be "Does not apply to me", however the responses "No" and "Don't know" may also resonate with jurors to convey the same answer. This may cause some inaccuracies when analysing the results.

Appendix B: Comparison to previous years

Overall satisfaction rates 2008-2019

Table 4 below shows jurors' overall satisfaction with the services and facilities provided by the Ministry at court (question 10) since 2008.

Table 4: Jurors' overall satisfaction rate 2008–2019

Year ²	Statement of intent performance measure	Number of responses	Satisfaction with the services and facilities provided
2008	70%	1,053	86%
2009	85%	1,170	90%
2010	85%	1,122	90%
2011	90%	1,156	90%
2012	90%	1,087	92%
2014	90%	1,044	89%
2015	90%	1,028	90%
2016	90%	957	90%
2017	90%	1,115	91%
2018	90%	888	93%
2019	90%	1,044	90%

As the above table shows, while the number of respondents to the survey does vary each year, overall ratings of satisfaction have remained largely consistent since 2009. It can therefore be concluded that the Ministry consistently performs highly with regard to the services and facilities provided to jurors at court.

² No survey was conducted in 2013

Comparison to 2018 results

The 2019 survey included all questions from the 2018 survey, allowing for a direct year-on-year comparison of the results. This has not always been possible in previous years due to regular amendments to the questionnaire. Table 5 below displays the adjusted satisfaction rates (as detailed in *Appendix A: Survey methodology and further information*) for each question in 2018 and 2019, excluding questions 11–13.

Table 5: 2018–2019 satisfaction rate year-on-year comparison

Question	2018	2019	Variance
1	93.3%	90.8%	-2.5%
2	85.4%	81.9%	-3.6%
3	79.4%	79.7%	0.3%
4	98.0%	97.7%	-0.3%
5	81.5%	80.5%	-0.9%
6	80.0%	77.5%	-2.5%
7	69.0%	70.7%	1.7%
8	91.2%	90.3%	-0.9%
9	71.6%	78.4%	6.8%
10	93.2%	89.9%	-3.3%
14	55.5%	59.1%	3.6%
15	55.1%	44.0%	-11.1%
16	89.3%	85.6%	-3.6%
17	87.7%	82.7%	-5.0%
18	93.7%	88.8%	-4.9%
19	95.5%	91.0%	-4.6%
20	72.3%	70.5%	-1.9%
21	93.1%	88.4%	-4.7%
22	90.8%	83.8%	-7.0%
23	93.6%	88.6%	-4.9%
24	59.8%	61.3%	1.4%

Appendix C: Survey questions

Table 6: 2019 survey questions

Question	
1	How satisfied were you with the quality of information you received in the mail?
2	How satisfied were you with the DVD you saw in court?
3	How satisfied were you with the leaflets you were given at the court?
4	How satisfied were you with the way you were treated by staff?
5	How satisfied were you with the waiting area facilities?
6	How satisfied were you with the jury retiring room?
7	How satisfied were you with the information we provided you with about parking facilities?
8	How satisfied were you with the safety and security at the court?
9	How satisfied were you with the information available on the jury service website?
10	Overall, how satisfied were you with the services and facilities provided?
11	What did you most like about the services and facilities at court?
12	What services and facilities could be improved?
13	What other information would you have found useful as a juror?
14	Did you find up-to-date information on the juror website about whether you needed to go to court the next day?
15	Was there a recorded phone message available with up-to-date information about whether you needed to go to court the next day?
16	Were you given information about the fees you will be paid and expenses you can claim?
17	Was the reception or information point at court clearly marked?
18	Were you directed or taken to the appropriate waiting area?
19	Did you feel that court staff gave you information when you asked for it?
20	Were you told about the court's emergency evacuation procedure?
21	Did court staff keep you well informed about any potential delays?
22	During the trial, were you happy with the way you were kept separate from the public?
23	Were you provided with the things you needed in the jury retiring room?
24	If the person in your trial was found guilty, were you told how to find out about the sentence they will receive?

Appendix D: Survey locations

KEY

-  District Court
-  High Court



Ministry of Justice
Tāhū o te Ture

justice.govt.nz

info@justice.govt.nz

0800 COURTS
0800 268 787

National Office
Justice Centre | 19 Aitken St
DX SX10088 | Wellington | New Zealand

