



AGENDA

Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting Monday, 23 March 2026

I hereby give notice that a Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting will be held on:

Date: Monday, 23 March 2026

Time: 9:00 am

**Location: Tauranga City Council Chambers
L1, 90 Devonport Road
Tauranga**

Please note that this meeting will be livestreamed and the recording will be publicly available on Tauranga City Council's website: www.tauranga.govt.nz.

**Marty Grenfell
Chief Executive**

Terms of reference – Regulatory Hearings Panel

Membership

Chair	Mary Dillon
Members	Puhirake Ihaka Terry Molloy Alan Tate
Quorum	At least two members
Meeting frequency	As required

Role

- To conduct hearings and make decisions of a quasi-judicial nature on regulatory matters through specific hearings and decision-making.

Scope

Regulatory matters

- To conduct hearings and make decisions of a quasi-judicial nature on behalf of the Council on any regulatory matter that the Council is legally:
 - empowered or obligated to hear and determine;
 - permitted to delegate to a subordinate decision-making body of Council under the Local Government Act 2002, or any other Act.
- To exercise this function in accordance with:
 - the applicable legislation;
 - the Council's corporate strategies, policies, plans and bylaws; and
 - the principles of administrative law and natural justice.
- Regulatory matters include (but are not limited to):
 - dog control matters;
 - matters arising from the exercise of Council's enforcement functions; and
 - regulatory matters that require a hearing under Council's policies (including, without limitation, Council's Gambling Venues Policy) and bylaws.

Matters excluded from scope

- The following are excluded from the scope of the Regulatory Hearings Panel:
 - matters relating to the sale and supply of alcohol;
 - matters under the Resource Management Act 1991; and
 - matters the Council is precluded from delegating to a subordinate decision-making body by the Local Government Act 2002, or any other Act.

Power to act

Regulatory matters

- All powers, duties and discretions necessary to conduct hearings and make decisions of a quasi-judicial nature on behalf of the Council on any regulatory matter that the Council is legally empowered or obligated to hear and determine, including (but not limited to):
 - All powers, duties and discretions necessary to hear and make decisions on behalf of the Council in respect of any matter that the Council is empowered or obligated to hear and determine under the Dog Control Act 1996, the Local Government Act 2002, the Local Government Act 1974 and any regulatory matters that require a hearing under Council's policies and bylaws.
- For the avoidance of doubt, the above delegation includes authority to hear and make decisions on appeals under Council's Gambling Venues Policy, including to decline an application to appeal.
- The power to establish and amend hearings protocols relating to the general conduct of hearings and hearings related matters in accordance with the applicable legislation and the principles of administrative law and natural justice.
- The power to co-opt expert advice on an as required basis.

Matters excluded from power to act

- For the avoidance of doubt, the Regulatory Hearings Panel does not have the power to hear:
 - matters relating to the sale and supply of alcohol;
 - matters under the Resource Management Act 1991; or
 - matters that the Council is precluded from delegating to a subordinate decision-making body by the Local Government Act 2002, or any other Act.

Power to recommend

- The Regulatory Hearings Panel is unlikely to need to make recommendations to the Council as it has the power to conduct hearings and make decisions of a quasi-judicial nature on behalf of Council as per its powers to act. However, the Panel may make recommendations to the Council if, in the circumstances of a matter, it considers it appropriate to do so.

Note:

The Regulatory Hearings Panel is established as a subordinate decision-making body of Council and delegated the powers specified in its Terms of Reference under clauses 30 and 32 of Schedule 7 Local Government Act 2002 respectively. It is not a committee or subcommittee of Council.

Regulatory Hearings Panel

Summary of hearings procedure



Who is involved in a hearing?

- Regulatory Hearings Panel – these are independent persons who make the decision
- Tauranga City Council staff – staff who write the report and attend the hearing
- Applicant/objector or their representative – those who will present their evidence
- Witnesses/experts – called by staff or applicant/objector



What happens before the hearing?

- The applicant/objector will be given at least seven days' notice of the date, time and place of the hearing.
- An agenda with the staff report and any documents will be sent to the panel members and the applicant/objector before the hearing.
- The applicant/objector can organise evidence and call witnesses in support of their application/objection.
- If the applicant/objector can't be present at the hearing they can organise a representative to attend on their behalf.

What happens at the hearing?

- The hearings will be conducted without a lot of formality and will make sure that all parties and witnesses receive a fair hearing.
- Staff will present Council's case (including evidence and any witnesses) in support of its decision that is the subject of the application/objection.
- The applicant/objector presents their case (including any evidence and any witnesses).
- Council staff have a right of reply but can't submit any new evidence or call any further witnesses.
- The chairperson and panel members may ask questions from any party or witness.
- Other persons may ask the chairperson to put a question to any party or witness on their behalf but that is at the discretion of the chairperson as to whether the question is put.

- No cross examination is permitted.
- The chairperson's rulings on any matter is final.
- The hearing is generally open to the public unless there is good reason to have the hearing with the public excluded.

What happens after the hearing?

- The panel will usually deliberate in private immediately after the hearing and make their decision.
- The panel may, but is not required to, deliver its decision in the open section of a meeting. A notice of decision will be given (or sent) in writing to the applicant/objector as soon as practicable after the panel has made its decision.
- The chairperson will then close the hearing.
- If the chairperson has allowed further information to be provided before the hearing is closed, then the hearing will be adjourned, and the panel will reserve its decision until it has considered the further information.
- Where the applicant/objector has a right to appeal the panel's decision, that will be advised in writing.
- No discussions or communication of any kind will happen outside of the hearing between the panel, the parties or witnesses until a decision is issued, including during any site visits, adjournment or break.
- Minutes of the meeting will be kept as evidence of the hearing.

Order of Business

1	Opening karakia	7
2	Apologies	7
3	Declaration of conflicts of interest	7
4	Confirmation of minutes	8
4.1	Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 18 August 2025.....	8
4.2	Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 2 December 2025	16
5	Business	23
5.1	Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Applicant Mandeep Kaur	23
5.2	Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objector Jesse HARTLEY	35
6	Public excluded session	43
6.1	Public Excluded Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 18 August 2025.....	43
6.2	Public Excluded Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 2 December 2025.....	43
7	Closing karakia	44

- 1 OPENING KARAKIA**
- 2 APOLOGIES**
- 3 DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST**

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 18 August 2025

File Number: A19910914

Author: Anahera Dinsdale, Governance Advisor

Authoriser: Sarah Holmes, Team Leader: Governance & CCO Support Services

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 18 August 2025 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 18 August 2025



MINUTES

**Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting
Monday, 18 August 2025**

Order of Business

1	Opening Karakia	3
2	Apologies	3
3	Confirmation of minutes	3
4.1	Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 1 May 2025.....	3
4	Declaration of conflicts of interest	3
5	Business	3
5.1	Objection to Menacing Classification - Kim Crosby	3
PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION		4
BUSINESS CONTINUED		5
5.1	Objection to Menacing Classification - Kim Crosby	5
PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION		6
Business continued -.....		7
5.1	Objection to Menacing Classification - Kim Crosby	7
7	Closing Karakia	7

**MINUTES OF TAURANGA CITY COUNCIL
REGULATORY HEARINGS PANEL MEETING
HELD AT THE TAURANGA CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, L1, 90 DEVONPORT ROAD,
TAURANGA
ON MONDAY, 18 AUGUST 2025 AT 9:30AM**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mrs Mary Dillon (Chair), Mr Puhirake Ihaka, Mr Terry Molloy, Mr Alan Tate.

IN ATTENDANCE: Brent Lincoln (Team Leader: Animal Services), Anahera Dinsdale (Governance Advisor), Caroline Irvin (Governance Advisor)

EXTERNAL: Ms Kim Crosby (Objector)

1 OPENING KARAKIA

Mr Puhirake Ihaka opened the meeting with a karakia.

2 APOLOGIES

Nil

3 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 1 May 2025

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/25/0/1

Moved: Mr Alan Tate
Seconded: Mr Terry Molloy

That the Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 1 May 2025 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

CARRIED

4 DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil

5 BUSINESS

5.1 Objection to Menacing Classification - Kim Crosby

Staff Brent Lincoln, Team Leader: Animal Services

External Ms Kim Crosby, Objector

Staff Key Points

- Staff explained that Animal Services evaluated dog attack incidents to determine the most appropriate outcome for public protection, referencing the Dog Control Act, specifically section 62, which mandates that a dog known to have attacked a person must be muzzled and under lead control in public. He clarified that the menacing classification formalises these requirements and was intended to minimise future risk.
- Staff described the incident as occurring on the owner's property, with the delivery person lawfully present. He emphasized that, under the law, liability for a dog attack rested entirely with the dog owner, regardless of warning signs or prior arrangements, and that the owner must take all precautions to prevent such incidents.
- Staff detailed the assessment process, noting that the dog was classified as menacing due to the nature of the incident, the lack of restraint, and the potential for future attacks. He explained that, while the physical injuries were minor, the psychological impact on victims was often significant, and the classification served as a clear warning to the owner.
- Staff clarified the differences between section 62 and the menacing classification, stating that section 62 applied automatically with no right of appeal, while the menacing classification could be appealed and was easier to enforce in the event of a repeat incident. He also explained the practical implications for the owner, including requirements for muzzling and lead control in public.

Objector Key Points – Ms Kim Crosby

- Ms Crosby recounted that her dog, Bandit, was approximately eleven months old at the time, had been neutered, and had never previously bitten anyone. She described the incident as a result of a procedural error—opening the gate prematurely and not receiving the expected text message from the delivery service—leading to Bandit encountering the delivery person unexpectedly.
- Ms Crosby stated that the delivery person had a longstanding arrangement to have Bandit secured during deliveries. On the day of the incident, she did not witness the bite but was told by the delivery person that Bandit 'got his hand,' with no visible injury or significant distress reported at the time. Ms Crosby apologized and assisted with the delivery.
- Ms Crosby questioned the use of the term 'attack' in the Council's report, the accuracy of the assessment, and the objectivity of the officer's observations, noting that the officer never met Bandit. She argued that the incident was more consistent with 'mouthing' than a true bite and that the classification was disproportionate given the circumstances.
- Ms Crosby outlined steps taken to prevent recurrence, including plans to build additional fencing to separate the front and back of the property, ensuring all visitors were instructed to call before entering, and ongoing training for Bandit. She emphasized their commitment to public safety and responsible dog ownership.
- Ms Crosby expressed concern about the requirement for Bandit to be muzzled in public, noting the negative impact on Bandit's quality of life and the family's ability to enjoy activities such as dog parks. She requested reconsideration of the classification, citing the isolated nature of the incident and the steps taken to mitigate future risk.

PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION**Resolution to exclude the public****COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/25/0/2**

Moved: Mr Alan Tate

Seconded: Mr Terry Molloy

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject matter of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48 for the passing of this resolution
6.1 – Dog Hearings - Objection to Classification – Menacing – Kim Crosby	To enable the Panel to deliberate in private on the objections heard.	s48(1)(d) That the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the Council to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in any proceedings before a Council where the Council is required, by any enactment, to make a recommendation in respect of the matter that is the subject of those proceedings.

CARRIED

OPEN BUSINESS CONTINUED**5.1 Objection to Menacing Classification - Kim Crosby**

Staff Brent Lincoln, Team Leader: Animal Services

Key Points

- The committee acknowledged the steps Ms Crosby had taken to prevent future incidents, including fencing improvements and adherence to muzzling requirements in public. They discussed the practical implications of the classification and the owner's cooperation.
- The committee clarified that the menacing classification could be reviewed and potentially

overturned after a period of time if no further incidents occurred, upon written application by the owner. They explained that section 62 requirements would still apply in the background even if the classification was lifted.

In response to questions

- In response to a question, staff noted that the Section 62 applied.

PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION

Resolution to exclude the public

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/25/0/3

Moved: Mr Puhirake Ihaka

Seconded: Mr Terry Molloy

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject matter of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48 for the passing of this resolution
6.1 – Dog Hearings - Objection to Classification – Menacing – Kim Crosby	To enable the Panel to deliberate in private on the objections heard.	s48(1)(d) That the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the Council to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in any proceedings before a Council where the Council is required, by any enactment, to make a recommendation in respect of the matter that is the subject of those proceedings.

CARRIED

OPEN BUSINESS CONTINUED - DECISION

5.1 Objection to Menacing Classification - Kim Crosby

COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

Moved: Mr Alan Tate

Seconded: Mr Terry Molloy

That the Regulatory Hearings Panel

- (a) Receives the report "Objection to Menacing Classification - Kim Crosby".
- (b) Upholds the classification of menacing.

In Favour: Crs Mary Dillon, Terry Molloy and Alan Tate

Against: Cr Puhirake Ihaka

CARRIED 3/1

7 CLOSING KARAKIA

Mr Puhirake Ihaka closed the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting closed at 11:52am.

The minutes of this meeting were confirmed as a true and correct record at the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on _____.

.....
Mary Dillon
CHAIR

4.2 Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 2 December 2025

File Number: A19910904

Author: Anahera Dinsdale, Governance Advisor

Authoriser: Sarah Holmes, Team Leader: Governance & CCO Support Services

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 2 December 2025 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 2 December 2025**



DRAFT MINUTES

**Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting
Tuesday, 2 December 2025**

Order of Business

1 Opening Karakia 3

2 Apologies 3

3 Confirmation of minutes..... 5

4 Declaration of conflicts of interest 3

5 Business..... 3

 3.1 Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 1 May 2025..... 5

 5.1 Objection to Disqualification as Dog Owner – Ms Natalie Kennedy 3

6 Public excluded session 5

 Confidential Attachment 3 5.1 - Objection to Disqualification as Dog Owner - Natalie
 Kennedy 6

5 Business continued..... 7

 5.1 Objection to Disqualification as Dog Owner – Ms Natalie Kennedy 7

7 Closing Karakia..... 7

**MINUTES OF TAURANGA CITY COUNCIL
REGULATORY HEARINGS PANEL MEETING
HELD AT THE TAURANGA CITY COUNCIL CHAMBERS, L1, 90 DEVONPORT ROAD,
TAURANGA
ON TUESDAY, 2 DECEMBER 2025 AT 9:00 AM**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Mrs Mary Dillon, Mr Puhirake Ihaka, Mr Terry Molloy, Mr Alan Tate

IN ATTENDANCE: Oscar Glossop (Team Leader: Animal Services), Sarah Holmes (Team Leader: Governance & CCO Support Services), Anahera Dinsdale (Governance Advisor), Caroline Irvin (Governance Advisor)

EXTERNAL: Natalie Kennedy, Murray Munro, Sara Elliot-Warren, Sandra Conchie (Bay of Plenty Times)

1 OPENING KARAKIA

Mr Puhirake Ihaka opened the meeting with a karakia.

2 APOLOGIES

Nil

At 9.18am the meeting adjourned.

At 9.24am the meeting resumed in open.

3 DECLARATION OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

Nil

5 BUSINESS

5.1 Objection to Disqualification as Dog Owner – Ms Natalie Kennedy

Staff Oscar Glossop, Team Leader: Animal Services

External Ms Natalie Kennedy, Ms Sara Elliot-Warren, Mr Murray Munro

Key Points

- Staff reviewed the events of November 13, 2024, when Ms Kennedy was walking three dogs in a public reserve. One of her dogs, Judah, bit a 79-year-old man, resulting in hospitalisation

and lasting physical and psychological effects for the victim. The incident was described in detail, including conflicting accounts from Ms Kennedy and the victim, and the victim's son corroborated the distress via a phone call during the attack.

- Following the incident, legal proceedings resulted in Judah being euthanised and Ms Kennedy being disqualified from dog ownership. The court imposed a \$1,000 reparation order and classified another dog, Taika, as menacing, requiring it to be muzzled in public. The panel discussed the legislative framework, the grounds for disqualification, and the owner's right to appeal after 12 months or escalate to the District Court.

In response to questions

- Team Leader: Animal Services noted that the team have not been actively monitoring whether Taika was muzzled.

Ms Sara Elliot-Warren speaking on behalf of Ms Natalie Kennedy

Key Points

- Ms Kennedy felt she was portrayed as a bad person when she believed she was not a bad person and emphasised she never victim blamed.
- Ms Kennedy, Ms Elliot-Warren and Mr Munro provided detailed statements disputing claims that she blamed the victim, emphasising her immediate actions to assist the victim, her history of responsible dog ownership, and the emotional and practical impact of the disqualification. They highlighted that charges against Taika were dropped, and that Ms Kennedy had consistently complied with animal control requirements since the incident.
- Ms Kennedy and Ms Elliot-Warren explained the significant stress and potential reputational harm that publication of her name would cause, including concerns about employment and community standing.
- Natalie requested timely notification of the panel's decision to avoid prolonged uncertainty, referencing previous delays in communication.

In response to questions

- Ms Kennedy explained her long history of responsible dog ownership, including keeping dogs on lead, using muzzles as required, and providing secure fencing. She explained her approach to walking multiple dogs, her use of two-metre leads, and her efforts to socialise and train her dogs.
- Panel members raised concerns about the challenges of managing more than one dog, especially in public spaces, and questioned whether Ms Kennedy could safely control multiple animals. They discussed the specific circumstances of the incident and the potential risks of similar events recurring.

Discussion Points Raised

- The panel decided to issue an interim order prohibiting publication of Ms Kennedy's name and indicated they would discuss with TCC Legal Team whether there are grounds for the Panel to issue permanent order for name suppression.
- The panel discussed the process for communicating the decision to Ms Kennedy to avoid unnecessary distress or delays.

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/25/3/1

Moved: Mr Alan Tate
Seconded: Mr Terry Molloy

That the Regulatory Hearings Panel:

- a) Considerate order that the name be suppressed in public, due to privacy reasons.

CARRIED

4 CONFIRMATION OF MINUTES

4.1 Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 1 May 2025

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/25/3/2

Moved: Mrs Mary Dillon
Seconded: Mr Terry Molloy

That the Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 1 May 2025 be confirmed as a true and correct record.

CARRIED

At 10.43am the meeting adjourned.

At 10.48am the meeting resumed in open.

6 PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION

Resolution to exclude the public

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/25/3/3

Moved: Mr Puhirake Ihaka
Seconded: Mr Terry Molloy

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject matter of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48 for the passing of this resolution
Confidential Attachment 3 - 5.1 - Objection to Disqualification as Dog Owner - Natalie Kennedy	s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	s48(1)(a) the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7

CARRIED

The meeting continued in open at 11am.

5 BUSINESS CONTINUED

5.1 Objection to Disqualification as Dog Owner – Ms Natalie Kennedy

COMMITTEE RESOLUTION RHP/25/3/4

Moved: Mr Puhirake Ihaka

Seconded: Mr Alan Tate

That the Regulatory Hearings Panel:

- (a) Receives the report "Objection to Disqualification as Dog Owner - Ms Natalie Kennedy".
- (b) Terminate the disqualification.
- (c) **Attachment 3** is to remain in confidential permanently.

CARRIED

7 CLOSING KARAKIA

Mr Puhirake Ihaka closed the meeting with a karakia.

The meeting closed at 11:10am.

The minutes of this meeting were confirmed as a true and correct record at the Regulatory Hearings Panel at the meeting held 23 March 2026.

5 BUSINESS

5.1 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Applicant Mandeep Kaur

File Number: A19597271

Author: Oscar Glossop, Team Leader: Animal Services

Authoriser: Sarah Omundsen, General Manager: Regulatory and Community Services

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. To consider an application under section 71(4) of the Dog Control Act 1996 (**the Act**) from Mandeep Kaur, for the release of her dog Diesel which is currently retained by Tauranga City Council pending prosecution.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Regulatory Hearings Panel:

- (a) Receives the report "Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Applicant Mandeep Kaur" under s 71(4), Mandeep Kaur; and.
- (b) After considering whether it is satisfied that the release of the dog would not threaten public safety under section 71(5) of the Dog Control Act 1996, resolves to either:
 - (i) Uphold the retention of the dog pending prosecution; or
 - (ii) Grant the grant the release of the dog pending prosecution, subject to any lawful conditions.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Mandeep Kaur is the registered owner of the dog named Diesel, a large 2.5 year old German Shepherd.
3. On 15 November 2025 Diesel was involved in an attack on a person for which Tauranga City Council Animal Services intends to prosecute the owner under Section 57 of the Act.
4. Diesel was seized and impounded.
5. Mandeep Kaur was served with a notice per Section 71(3) of the Act, explaining Council's intention to retain the dog Diesel pending prosecution due to public safety concerns.
6. On 24 November 2025 Mandeep Kaur applied for the release of the dog Diesel under Section 71(4).
7. In determining this application, must assess whether it is satisfied that the release of the dog Diesel would not threaten the safety of any person, stock, poultry, domestic pet, or protected wildlife, in accordance with section 71(5).
8. If the applicant is not satisfied with the panel's decision, they may appeal that decision to the District Court under section 71(6).

BACKGROUND

9. Previous attack: On 9 March 2024 Diesel was not under control or contained within the owner's property. The Victim was walking to his car from a neighbouring property, with his young son, when Diesel ran at them aggressively. The Victim lifted his son out of the way before Diesel lunged and bit the Victim on the forearm. The Victim got Diesel to the ground as Diesel attempted to bite him for a second time. The outcome for this attack was a warning. The outcome was mitigated by the owner Mandeep Kaur undertaking to carry out fencing work on the property. Furthermore, the owner was advised of her obligations under Section 62 of the Dog Control Act 1996 that Diesel must now be confined or muzzled and on a lead in a public place. (Attachment 1)
10. On 15 November 2025 Diesel was not under control, not contained within the owner's property, nor wearing a lead or a muzzle. The second Victim, was walking from her parked car outside a neighbouring property when Diesel ran at her and bit her on the upper left hamstring. This resulted in a series of teeth shaped wounds and required medical treatment. (Attachments 4 & 5)
11. On the same day, Diesel was seized and impounded by Tauranga City Council Animal Services.
12. Tauranga City Council Animal Services intends to prosecute Mandeep Kaur for this incident under Section 57 of the Act. This is a strict liability offence. Animal Services must prove the elements that Mandeep Kaur is the owner of the dog and that the dog did attack a person. Caselaw defines an attack as making contact, even with clothing. Animal Services considers there is strong evidence and a reasonable prospect of conviction. If convicted the court is required to make an order for the destruction of the dog unless it is satisfied that the circumstances of the offence were exceptional and do not warrant destruction of the dog.
13. On 21 November 2025 Mandeep Kaur paid the balance of seizure and associated pound fees due and was served with a notice under Section 71(3) of the Act, advising of Council's intention to retain the dog Diesel pending prosecution due to public safety concerns.
14. Animal Services officers and Pound Staff report that Diesel has displayed an extremely high level of aggression toward people and other dogs while in custody. Animal Services staff may attend the hearing to provide evidence in relation to Diesel's behaviour while impounded.
15. On 24 November 2025 Mandeep Kaur submitted an application for the release of the dog Diesel under Sec. 71(4). (Attachment 2)
16. Mandeep Kaur provided a video of Diesel playing in an orchard environment to support the nature of the dog (Attachment 3). The video depicts Diesel engaging in playful behaviour in a controlled and familiar setting.
17. Mandeep Kaur also provided written letters of support from neighbouring residents, which are attached to this report and form part of the material before the Panel (Attachments 4 and 5). The neighbours describe Diesel as generally calm and non-aggressive in their interactions with him and express support for Diesel being returned to her.

Assessment under section 71(5) – Public Safety

18. Under section 71(5) of the Act, the Panel must be satisfied that the release of Diesel at this time would **not threaten the safety** of any person, stock, poultry, domestic pet, or protected wildlife. In assessing this, the Panel may have regard to:
 - (a) Diesel's involvement in two separate attacks resulting in bites to victims;
 - (b) The spontaneous and unprovoked nature of those attacks;
 - (c) The owner's repeated failure to contain or control Diesel;
 - (d) Non-compliance with section 62 requirements following the earlier incident;
 - (e) Reported aggressive behaviour while Diesel has been in Council Pound custody; and

- (f) Any evidence provided in support of the application, including the video footage and any neighbour support.
19. The application requires a forward-looking assessment of risk, regardless of the eventual outcome of the prosecution.
 20. The Panel may consider the neighbour letters as character evidence relevant to Diesel's behaviour in certain circumstances. However, the neighbours were not present at the time of either attack and the letters do not address the circumstances in which Diesel escaped containment and attacked members of the public or non-compliance of statutory control requirements following the first incident.
 21. The Panel may also take the video footage into account as evidence of Diesel's behaviour in that specific context. However, the video does not address Diesel's behaviour when escaping containment or encountering members of the public in uncontrolled environments, which are the circumstances relevant to the incidents giving rise to this application.
 22. In Summary, the dog Diesel has been involved in two reported attacks where he has bitten people, while Diesel was not contained or controlled. Mandeep Kaur has failed in her obligations to contain and control her dog. Her previous commitment to improve fencing has not prevented further incidents and she has not abided by the requirements of Section 62 of the Dog Control Act. These matters are relevant to the Panel's assessment of future public safety risk.
 23. If the panel were to grant the release of the dog pending prosecution, the panel must be satisfied that the dog will not pose a threat to the safety of any person, stock, poultry, domestic pet, or protected wildlife under section 71(5).

STATUTORY CONTEXT

24. The Dog Control Act 1996 stipulates functions, duties and powers conferred on Territorial Authorities, such as Tauranga City Council, to facilitate the objects of the Act.
25. This report references several sections of the Dog Control Act 1996 which prescribe obligations and provisions:
 - (a) Section 71, Retention of a dog threatening public safety.
 - (b) Section 62, Allowing dogs known to be dangerous to be at large unmuzzled.
 - (c) Section 57, Dogs attacking persons or animals.
26. The Tauranga City Council Regulatory Hearings Panel has authority to make decisions by way of delegation as per the Local Government Act 2002.

SIGNIFICANCE

27. The Local Government Act 2002 requires an assessment of the significance of matters, issues, proposals and decisions in this report against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. Council acknowledges that in some instances a matter, issue, proposal or decision may have a high degree of importance to individuals, groups, or agencies affected by the report.
28. In making this assessment, consideration has been given to the likely impact, and likely consequences for:
 - (a) the current and future social, economic, environmental, or cultural well-being of the district or region
 - (b) any persons who are likely to be particularly affected by, or interested in, the decision.
 - (c) the capacity of the local authority to perform its role, and the financial and other costs of doing so.
29. In accordance with the considerations above, criteria and thresholds in the policy, it is considered that the decision is of low significance.

ENGAGEMENT

30. Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of low significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

ATTACHMENTS

1. **Section 62 Letter Mandeep KAUR - A19597286**  
2. **Sec 71 objection email - Mandeep KAUR - A19597287**  
3. **Supporting letter neighbour 1 - A19596933**  
4. **Supporting letter neighbour 2 - A19596927**  
5. **Victim Injury Photo - A19598355**  
6. **Victim Medical Certificate - A19598354**  

22 March 2024

MANDEEP KAUR



Dear Mandeep

Investigation of complaint number [REDACTED] - attack on a person.

We have completed an investigation into the incident in which the complainant alleged that at [REDACTED] a German Shepherd dog bite the complainant on the forearm.

Based on the information obtained, Council is satisfied that your German Shepherd named Diesel was the dog in question.

Section 62 of the Dog Control Act 1996 provides that the owner or person in charge of a dog that has attacked or endangered any person; or any stock; or poultry; or domestic animal; or property; must not allow that dog to be at large or in a public place or private way without being muzzled and controlled on a leash.

This is an automatic consequence of this incident. It is not a restriction imposed by Council and is not subject to an objection reviewable by Council. It would be considered an aggravating factor if your dog was to attack again, or endanger a person or animal, and was not controlled by a lead and muzzled at the time.

In addition to the above, on this occasion Council has considered that

Although this type of offence is considered to be serious, it was agreed that this particular case did not warrant prosecution.

Whilst we believe that prosecution isn't warranted, in this case we do need to advise you that any further justified complaint of this nature may lead to a recommendation for a prosecution or may lead to a fine not exceeding \$3000 or other consequences.

The following are important provisions from the Dog Control Act information that you should also be aware of as a dog owner:

Section 5: Obligations of dog owners

- 1) The obligations imposed on dog owners by the Dog Control Act require every owner:
 - to ensure that the dog is kept under control at all time
 - to take all reasonable steps to ensure that the dog does not injure, endanger, intimidate, or otherwise cause distress to any person
 - to take all reasonable steps to ensure that the dog does not injure, endanger, or cause distress to any stock, poultry, domestic animal, or protected wildlife
 - to take all reasonable steps to ensure that the dog does not damage or endanger any property belonging to any other person.

Section 52A: Control of dog on owner's property

The owner of a dog must, at all times, ensure that either:

- a) the dog is under the direct control of a person; or
- b) the dog is confined within the land or premises in such a manner that it cannot freely leave the land or premises.

You can be fined up to \$3000 and an Animal Services officer may seize and impound the dog.

Section 57 & 58: Dogs attacking persons or animals / Dogs causing serious injury

The owner or any person in charge of a dog, which attacks, can be fined up to \$20,000 and imprisoned for three years. The court is likely to make an order for the dog's destruction unless the circumstances of the attack are exceptional.

Section 57A: Dogs rushing at persons, animals or vehicles

The owner or any person in charge of a dog which rushes at a person, animal or vehicle in a public place can be fined up to \$3000. The court may make an order for the dog's destruction.

Section 60: Seizure or destruction of dog running at large among stock or poultry

The owner of any stock or poultry may forthwith either seize or destroy any dog running at large among that stock or poultry.

Section 61: Orders relating to dog seen worrying stock

Where a complaint is made to a District Court by the owner of any stock or poultry that any dog has been seen at large among that stock, or poultry, the court, if it is satisfied as to the grounds of the complaint, may order the owner to keep the dog under proper restraint or make an order for the destruction of the dog.

Section 63: Owner liable for damage done by dog


The owner of a dog is liable for any damage done by their dog.

As you can see, the penalties that may be imposed under the Act are severe. Therefore, it is important that you understand the need to keep Diesel under proper control at all times.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance with this investigation.

If you would like to discuss the matter further, please contact us on 07 577 7000.

Yours sincerely,



Animal Services team
Tauranga City Council

07 577 7000

info@tauranga.govt.nz



From: [REDACTED]
Sent: [REDACTED]
To: info@tauranga.govt.nz
Subject: Team Leader of Animal Services- Application for Release of Dog "Diesel" Under Section 71
Dear Team Leader of Animal Services,
I am writing to formally apply for the release of my dog Diesel currently impounded under Section 71 of the Dog Control Act.

Dog Details-

Name: Diesel

Breed: German Shepherd

Microchip number- [REDACTED]

Date Impounded: 15/11/2025

I understand that Diesel was seized after an incident in which he exited the property due to a visitor accidentally leaving the gate open, and caused bruising to a person. I acknowledge that this incident occurred and that any injury to a member of the public is taken seriously. I have cooperated fully with Animal Services and accept responsibility for ensuring that such an event cannot happen again. I understand that the person involved was medically checked and found to have some bruising as I have spoken with the victim on the day and also after the day of the incident, and I am thankful that no serious harm occurred. To ensure absolute safety and prevent any future incidents, we are making significant improvements to our property by adding a new 1.8m solid wall boundary fence and fully locked gate at the front. This is a major upgrade from the previous partial backyard fencing. I have attached the invoice that we have paid to the fencing company to complete the job. Until the council is satisfied that all risks are mitigated, I commit to keeping Diesel on lead whenever he is outside the secured area and supervising him at all times and using a muzzle in public if required. Diesel is a socialised and friendly dog who normally exercises daily in the orchard and is not aggressive by nature. I have attached a short video clip of Diesel at the orchard (private property) playing with workers and also have attached the neighbours' statement that Diesel is not aggressive by nature and not a threat to the public safety in their viewpoint. I respectfully submit that with the new containment system, strict control plan, and commitment to responsible ownership, Diesel does not represent any risk to public safety. Given the substantial improvements we're making to the property, particularly the 1.8m solid fence and locked gate at the front, the original cause of the escape will be fully addressed. I have paid the requested impound fees and prepared to pay any sustenance fees required. I kindly request that The Tauranga City Council review this application and approve Diesel's release. I am prepared to take any conditions implemented by the council for the release of my dog Diesel. Thank you for considering my application.
Yours sincerely,
Mandeep Kaur

Tauranga City Council Dog Control Office

Regarding the compliant against Deisel the dog and his owners Mandeep and [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Compliant pertaining to the frightening of a neighbour parking her vehicle on the property's verge.

The back part of section where Deisel is housed, is well fenced, he can not and has not jumped the fence. In the two years in which we have lived next door to him, he has not been any trouble. The only time I have seen him in the front part of the section is when he is being loaded in a vehicle for transportation.

All dogs are guardians of their property. Deisel barks when you walk by the section, he is a large dog so the size of him may intimidate some people. but if you talk to him quietly, he soon stops. Since, Deisel does not know the boundary of the front part of his section, he would only be warning people to stay away.

[REDACTED]



To whom it may concern

My husband [redacted] and I live at the above address which is directly opposite to the Singh residence. We have lived here for the last four and a half years & have got to know the Singhs & their family well. We have a great neighbourly relationship.

For the past few years the Singhs have owned a German Shepherd dog named Diesel. He is housed in the backyard where he is safe and secure. He has never wandered around the neighbourhood and apart from the odd bout of barking, it is difficult to know there is a dog in residence. There are several dogs domiciled around both our properties who are barking frequently both day and night.

The Singhs have the side gate to their backyard boarded up and are surrounded by secure boundary fences and iron gates to the side of their garage. Diesel has never escaped. He spends most days of the week at the Singh's orchards and is transferred to the car from the backyard under Mr Singh's guidance. I frequently have "dog discussions" with Diesel when enroute to my car that is parked on the beam outside our property. The few times I have encountered Diesel, accompanied by Mr Singh, he has bounded up to me in a friendly manner. I consider the dog to be harmless and note that he is a much loved pet, well kept, safely housed & well fed. He is not a threat to the general public.

I have owned several dogs, a Border Collie & a Labrador/Pointer cross. Both boisterous but both loved family pets.

In my opinion Diesel is a well kept family pet and certainly no threat to the general public.

Yours faithfully,







MEDICAL CERTIFICATE


Patient Name:
Address:



To whom it may concern:

This is to certify that Brooke [redacted] was examined by me on 15 Nov 2025, and in my opinion has an injury of the thigh that is consistent with, and classic for, a single bite from a large dog.

Sincerely



5.2 Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objector Jesse HARTLEY

File Number: A19864018

Author: Oscar Glossop, Team Leader: Animal Services

Authoriser: Sarah Omundsen, General Manager: Regulatory and Community Services

PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

1. To hear an objection from Jesse Hartley, opposing his disqualification as a dog owner under Section 25(1)(a) of the *Dog Control Act 1996*.

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the Regulatory Hearings Panel:

- (a) Receives the report "Regulatory Hearings Panel Report - Objector Jesse HARTLEY".
- (b) It is recommended that the panel uphold the disqualification of Jesse Hartley as a dog owner for 5 years. However, the panel has three options:
 - (i) Uphold the disqualification; or
 - (ii) Bring forward the date of termination; or
 - (iii) Terminate immediately the disqualification

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2. Mr Jesse Hartley was disqualified from dog ownership under Section 25(1)(a) of the *Dog Control Act 1996* after meeting the statutory threshold of three or more infringement offences within 24 months.
3. Mr Hartley's compliance history is extensive and indicates persistent non-compliance:
 - (a) 13 infringements since 2021,
 - (b) All of which have been filed with the Court, and
 - (c) A new infringement was issued even after meeting the disqualification threshold, demonstrating ongoing failure to meet legal obligations.
4. The infringements involve repeated failure to keep a dog under control, multiple instances of failure to comply with a menacing dog classification, and a pattern of failure to register a dog.
5. Given the seriousness, frequency, and continued nature of these offences, officers consider there is insufficient evidence of improved behaviour or responsible dog ownership. It is therefore recommended that the Panel uphold the disqualification.

BACKGROUND

6. Mr Hartley is the owner of one menacing dog within the Tauranga City Council jurisdiction.
7. Since 2021, he has received 13 infringements, including repeated notices relating to dog control, prohibited-area breaches, registration failures, and non-compliance with a menacing dog classification.
8. The relevant infringements that triggered the current disqualification, along with earlier infringements demonstrating an ongoing pattern of behaviour, are:

9. Recent Infringements (within the 24-month statutory period)
- 22/02/2026** - INF 29099 – Section 20: Failure to keep dog under control (Clause 6.3)
Tuff Cooky found roaming, picked up at 6 Penrhyn Place by First Security.
Complainant stated that they thought Tuff Cooky was drugged, beaten, and left to roam.
- 17/10/2025** – INF 28919 - Failure to comply with classification of dog as menacing
Tuff Cooky was unmuzzled in public on Penrhyn Place
- 17/10/2025** – INF 28918 - Section 20: Failure to keep dog under control (Clause 6.3)
Tuff Cooky was roaming on Penrhyn Place
- 07/10/2025** – INF 28917 - Failure to register dog
Tuff Cooky was unregistered
- 03/11/2024** – INF 28329 - Section 20: Failure to keep dog under control (Clause 6.3)
Video footage was received showing Tuff Cooky running down Penrhyn Place roaming.
- 03/11/2024** – INF 28330 - Failure to comply with classification of dog as menacing
Video footage was received showing Tuff Cooky running down Penrhyn Place unmuzzled in a public place.
- 14/08/2024** – INF 27822 - Section 20(7): Dog in prohibited area (Clause 7.1)
CCTV footage captured Jesse HARTLEY and Tuff Cooky on coming from Mauao and into the Pilot Bay trailer parking area. This is a dog prohibited area.
- 14/08/2024** – INF 27821 - Failure to comply with classification of dog as menacing
CCTV footage captured Tuff Cooky at the Pilot Bay Trailer park unmuzzled and not desexed at the time.
- 14/08/2024** – INF 27822 - Failure to register dog
CCTV footage captured Tuff Cooky in the Pilot Bay trailer parking area unregistered at the time.
10. In total, 13 infringements have been issued to Mr Hartley since 2021, all of which have been filed with the Court.
11. On 1st May 2025 this panel heard a previous objection from Mr Hartley to his disqualification as a dog owner and as a result rescinded the disqualification.
12. Since this panel rescinded Mr Hartley's disqualification as a dog owner he has received a further four infringements.
13. On 23rd February 2026, Mr Hartley was served a notice disqualifying him from dog ownership for 5 years under Section 25(1)(a), Dog Control Act 1996.
14. On 28th February 2026, Mr Hartley lodged an objection to his disqualification under Section 26 of the Act.

STATUTORY CONTEXT

15. Under the *Dog Control Act 1996*:
- (a) Section 25(1)(a) requires Territorial Authorities to disqualify an owner who commits three or more infringement offences within 24 months.
- (b) Section 26(3) requires the Panel to consider:
- (i) The circumstances and nature of the offences
- (ii) The competency of the owner

- (iii) Steps taken to prevent further offences
- (iv) The matters advanced in support of the objection
- (v) Any other relevant matters

16. The Panel may:

- (i) Uphold the disqualification; or
- (ii) Bring forward the date of termination; or
- (iii) Terminate immediately the disqualification

STRATEGIC ALIGNMENT

17. This contributes to the promotion or achievement of the following strategic community outcome(s):

	Contributes
We are an inclusive city	<input type="checkbox"/>
We value, protect and enhance the environment	<input type="checkbox"/>
We are a well-planned city that is easy to move around	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
We are a city that supports business and education	<input type="checkbox"/>
We are a vibrant city that embraces events	<input type="checkbox"/>

18. Effective enforcement of the Dog Control Act supports safer public spaces, responsible dog ownership, and reduced animal-related incidents, contributing to a safer and more liveable city.

OPTIONS ANALYSIS

19. Option 1: Uphold the Disqualification (Recommended)

- Statutory requirements met.
- Significant and repeated non-compliance across many years.
- Repeated breaches of menacing-dog conditions increase risk.
- New infringement issued *after* disqualification threshold reached.
- No evidence of improved dog management or mitigation steps.

20. Option 2: Bring Forward the Date of Termination

- Requires demonstrated improvement or proactive behavioural change.
- No such evidence has been presented.

21. Option 3: Immediately Terminate the Disqualification

Inappropriate given the:

- Volume of offending (13 infringements).
- Seriousness and repeat nature of the offences.
- Continued offending even after reaching disqualification threshold.

FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

22. No additional financial implications beyond normal enforcement operations.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS / RISKS

23. The Panel must ensure compliance with Section 25 and Section 26 requirements. A failure to properly consider statutory criteria may result in appeal under **Section 27**.

TE AO MĀORI APPROACH

24. This matter is a regulatory enforcement process and does not directly impact Council's Te Ao Māori principles. Effects relate to general community wellbeing and safety.

CONSULTATION / ENGAGEMENT

25. This matter concerns individual compliance and does not require wider consultation.

SIGNIFICANCE

26. The Local Government Act 2002 requires an assessment of the significance of matters, issues, proposals and decisions in this report against Council's Significance and Engagement Policy. Council acknowledges that in some instances a matter, issue, proposal or decision may have a high degree of importance to individuals, groups, or agencies affected by the report.
27. In making this assessment, consideration has been given to the likely impact, and likely consequences for:
- the current and future social, economic, environmental, or cultural well-being of the district or region
 - any persons who are likely to be particularly affected by, or interested in, the .
 - the capacity of the local authority to perform its role, and the financial and other costs of doing so.
28. In accordance with the considerations above, criteria and thresholds in the policy, it is considered that the decision is of low significance.

ENGAGEMENT

29. Taking into consideration the above assessment, that the decision is of low significance, officers are of the opinion that no further engagement is required prior to Council making a decision.

Click here to view the [TCC Significance and Engagement Policy](#)

NEXT STEPS

30. Council will provide Mr Hartley with a written decision, including reasons for the determination.

ATTACHMENTS


1. **Disqualification Notice - A19886139** [↓](#) 
2. **Objection - A19886131** [↓](#) 

DISQUALIFICATION FROM DOG OWNERSHIP



23 February 2026

JESSE HARTLEY



Delivery Confirmation:

Recipient name:

Signature:

Date:

Time:

Served by:

Signature:

Notice of disqualification from dog ownership (Section 25, Dog Control Act 1996)

This is to inform you that you have been disqualified under section 25 (1) (a) of the Dog Control Act 1996 from owning any dog.

This follows three or more infringement offences (not relating to a single incident or occasion) having been committed by you, within a continuous period of 24 months.

This disqualification will apply from 17 October 2025 and will expire on 16 October 2028.

A summary of the effect of the disqualification and your right to object is provided below.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Oscar Glossop".

Oscar Glossop
Animal Services: Team Leader
07 577 7000
info@tauranga.govt.nz

EFFECT OF DISQUALIFICATION***Section 28, Dog Control Act 1996***

You are required to dispose of every dog owned by you within 14 days of the date of this notice. However, you may not dispose of a dog:

- to a person who resides at the same address as you.
- in a way that constitutes of an offence against the Dog Control Act 1996 or any other Act.

You must not become the owner, even on a temporary basis, of any dog while you are disqualified. You may have possession of a dog only for the purpose of:

- preventing it from causing injury, damage, or distress.
- returning, within 72 hours, a lost dog to a territorial authority for the purpose of restoring the dog to its owner.

You will commit an offence and be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding \$3000 if you:

- fail to dispose of every dog owned by you within 14 days of this notice.
- at any time while disqualification, become the owner of any dog.
- dispose of a dog owned by you:
 - to a person who resides at the same address as you.
 - in a manner that constitutes an offence against the Dog Control Act 1996 or any other Act.

If you are convicted of the first or second of these offenses, your period of disqualification may be further extended. You will also commit an offence and be liable on conviction to a fine not exceeding \$3000 if you dispose or give custody or possession of a dog to a person knowing that person to be disqualified from ownership under section 25 of the Dog Control Act 1996.

Full details of the effect of disqualification are provided in the Dog Control Act 1996.

RIGHT OF OBJECTION TO DISQUALIFICATION***Section 26, Dog Control Act 1996***

You may object to the disqualification by lodging a written objection with Tauranga City Council setting out the grounds on which you object. You are entitled to be heard in support of your objection and will be notified of the time and place when your objection will be heard.

No objection can be lodged within 12 months of the hearing of any previous objection to the disqualification. If an objection is lodged within 14 days after the date of this notice, the requirement to dispose of every dog owned by you will be suspended until Tauranga City Council has determined the objection.

There is a further right of appeal to a District Court if you are dissatisfied with the decision of Tauranga City Council on your objection.

Note: In the event of a Council hearing, the council report and minutes of the hearing will be posted on the Council's website. Any objection heard by the Regulatory Hearings Panel is a publicly notified meeting, and members of the public, including the media, may attend. While your name and your dog's name may be published, your contact details will not be reported.

From: Jesse Hartley [REDACTED]
Sent: 28 February 2026 12:14
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@tauranga.govt.nz](mailto:[REDACTED]@tauranga.govt.nz)>
Subject: Appeal of disqualification

CAUTION: External Email.

To: Operations Manager – Dog Control

I write regarding the current disqualification status of my dog and his recent impoundment.

All impound and associated fees have been paid in full. I am formally disputing the continued disqualification and the circumstances that have led to repeated complaints and enforcement action.

There are serious concerns regarding external interference contributing to the alleged roaming. My property is double-gated. I am actively investigating how my shed door and gate were opened, enabling my dog to leave the section. I have reason to believe third-party involvement may be a contributing factor.

I have personally observed a neighbouring resident throwing food scraps outside, despite being aware my dog is on a controlled diet. I have also observed behaviour from another complainant that appears inconsistent, including holding my dog on a lead until animal control officers arrived at an early hour.

There are additional concerns involving the neighbouring dog (“Teddy,” a black poodle), jointly associated with two complainants. That dog has been left to bark continuously during the owner’s absence and has reportedly developed kennel cough. I also confirm there was an incident where that dog bit me, which was not addressed by its owners. I have not pursued this matter to date, but it remains relevant to the broader pattern of conduct.

For clarity, my dog is not aggressive. His temperament is consistently friendly and social. Any allegations implying otherwise are strongly disputed.

Accordingly, I formally request:

1. A complete copy of all file notes, complaint records, officer observations, internal communications, and any supporting evidence relating to my dog.
2. Confirmation of the legal basis relied upon for the current disqualification decision.
3. Disclosure of any statements made by third parties that contributed to enforcement action.
4. Confirmation of the process available to formally appeal or review the disqualification.

Please provide the full file record to me in writing. I also request that a duplicate copy be forwarded to:



This letter serves as formal notice that I intend to pursue all available legal remedies should procedural fairness or evidentiary standards not be met.

I expect acknowledgment of this correspondence and a timeline for disclosure within statutory requirements.

Yours faithfully,

Jesse Hartley

6 PUBLIC EXCLUDED SESSION

Resolution to exclude the public

RECOMMENDATIONS

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject matter of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48 for the passing of this resolution
6.1 - Public Excluded Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 18 August 2025	s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	s48(1)(a) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7
6.2 - Public Excluded Minutes of the Regulatory Hearings Panel meeting held on 2 December 2025	s7(2)(a) - The withholding of the information is necessary to protect the privacy of natural persons, including that of deceased natural persons	s48(1)(a) - the public conduct of the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting would be likely to result in the disclosure of information for which good reason for withholding would exist under section 6 or section 7

Resolution to exclude the public**RECOMMENDATIONS**

That the public be excluded from the following parts of the proceedings of this meeting.

The general subject matter of each matter to be considered while the public is excluded, the reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter, and the specific grounds under section 48 of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 for the passing of this resolution are as follows:

General subject of each matter to be considered	Reason for passing this resolution in relation to each matter	Ground(s) under section 48 for the passing of this resolution
5.1 – Deliberations – Applicant Mandeep KAUR	To enable the Panel to deliberate in private on the objections heard.	s48(1)(d) That the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the Council to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in any proceedings before a Council where the Council is required, by any enactment, to make a recommendation in respect of the matter that is the subject of those proceedings.
5.2 – Deliberations – Objection to disqualification as a dog owner Jesse HARTLEY	To enable the Panel to deliberate in private on the objections heard.	s48(1)(d) That the exclusion of the public from the whole or the relevant part of the proceedings of the meeting is necessary to enable the Council to deliberate in private on its decision or recommendation in any proceedings before a Council where the Council is required, by any enactment, to make a recommendation in respect of the matter that is the subject of those proceedings.

7 CLOSING KARAKIA