

**BETWEEN**            **CENTRAL RUGBY LEAGUE CLUB (INCORPORATED)**  
**Appellant**

**AND**                 **BAY OF PLENTY DISTRICT RUGBY LEAGUE**  
**(INCORPORATED)**  
**Respondent**

---

**DECISION OF SPORTS TRIBUNAL  
DATED 25 October 2019**

---

**Hearing**            16 October 2019

**Tribunal**            Dr James Farmer QC (Chair)  
Hon Nicholas Davidson QC  
Pippa Hayward

**Participants**        B Sandford for the Appellant (Committee members elected then  
suspended)  
D Clemens for E Walker (the “new” committee)

**Registrar**           Mike Selwyn

## Introduction and Facts

1. This Decision relates to an appeal brought in the name of Central Rugby League Club (Incorporated) [CRLC] against a decision made by Bay of Plenty District Rugby League (Incorporated) [BOPDRL] on 4 December 2018 suspending the members of the Committee of CRLC and against the further decision of the Appeals Committee of New Zealand Rugby League (Incorporated) [NZRL] upholding that decision.
2. CRLC is a sports club with a long and proud history going back 70 years. It has had teams competing at all levels (junior through to senior grade) in rugby league games conducted by BOPDRL.<sup>1</sup> The objects of BOPDRL, as set out in its Constitution, include fostering and controlling rugby league within the Bay of Plenty District. Rugby league is controlled nationally by the New Zealand Rugby League Incorporated [NZRL]. District Leagues come under the jurisdiction of NZRL whose objectives include the promotion, fostering and development of rugby league throughout New Zealand, the maintenance of standards of behaviour and values “that all players and administrators can embrace” and otherwise promoting the interests of rugby league. Pursuant to those objectives, the constitutional powers of NZRL include that of deciding any disputes or hearing any appeals on matters relating to rugby league.
3. CRLC went through a difficult period, financially and otherwise, a decade or so ago but in December 2017, at its Annual General Meeting, a new committee was elected pursuant to its Rules as filed with the Registrar of Incorporated Societies. The committee comprised a President, Secretary, Honorary Treasurer and 6 executive members. From this time, CRLC also began fielding netball teams.
4. In December of that year, a former member, Mr Ernie Walker, approached the President of the Club, Mr Kerry Mason, and discussed the question of a senior team being entered in the competition, that team to be coached by Mr Walker. The discussion did not go well and since then there have in effect been two “camps”, the first consisting of the committee at that time, represented as the appellant in the hearing before this Tribunal by Mr Ben Sandford, and the second what became the committee of the Club as a result of an AGM held on 15 June 2019, represented at the hearing by Mr Doug Clemens. During 2018, relations between CRLC and BOPDRL also soured. Further, a dispute arose between Mr Walker and his colleagues and the committee of CRLC as to whether they were being denied membership, the latter claiming that no membership applications were actually made.
5. On 9 November 2018, BOPDRL wrote to Mr Mason and to the Secretary of CRLC a letter which read in full:

---

<sup>1</sup> Both CRLC and BOPDRL are incorporated under the Incorporated Societies Act.

“It has come to our attention there are serious concerns over the management of the Central Rugby League Club. It is the objective of the Board to provide guidance and leadership to all clubs within the District. We therefore respectfully ask that you attend a meeting to be held on Monday November 12<sup>th</sup> 4 pm at BOPDRL HQ Puketawhero Park.

The purpose of the meeting is for you to have the opportunity to explain the current situation of the club.”

6. It is to be noted at this point that there was no articulation of what the “serious concerns” were or who had been expressing those concerns. However, while changing the date of the meeting to 19 November 2018, BOPDRL advised Mr Mason that the concerns were:

“1-Changes to the Central Rugby League Constitution, as an affiliate to [BOPDRL] any club wishing to amend its constitution must notify the board for approval of such proposed changes. (Refer to -Rules Governing Clubs – 22 in BOPDRL Constitution)  
2-Declining opportunities to add a team to the club without due consultation.  
3-Declining members without reason.  
4-Declining payment for public supporters with interest in the club to become financial.”

7. It would seem that items 2, 3 and 4 related to the matters referred to in paragraph 4 above, namely the membership issue and the question of whether a senior team coached by Mr Walker could be entered in competition in the Club’s name. Item 1 referred to changes to the Club’s Constitution that had been undertaken by CRLC at an SGM on 4 February 2018 and which had subsequently been lodged with the Registrar of Incorporated Societies and registered as alterations to the Club’s Rules. The changes included an alteration of the objects of the Club to include netball, along with rugby league and all amateur sports “which increase the health, participation and education of the community”. However, relevant to this case, the principal change was one which it was said, by the NZRL Appeal Committee, empowered the Club Committee to “effectively give the existing executive the power to block nominations for their positions”.
8. Irrespective of the merits or otherwise of this last claim, it was also said by BOPDRL (and agreed to by the NZRL Appeal Committee) that the failure of the Club’s Committee to obtain the approval of BOPDRL to the Club’s Constitutional changes amounted to a breach of rule 22 of the BOPDRL’s Constitution. Rule 22 is at the heart of this matter before the Tribunal and we set it out in full, as follows:

“22. RULES GOVERNING CLUBS

The Constitution, By Laws, Rules, Uniforms and any Sponsorship Agreement of each Club and every alteration and amendment thereof shall be submitted to the Board of Directors [of BOPDRL] and until approved of in writing shall have no binding effect. In the event of any Club failing to comply with this Clause the Board of Directors shall have the power to suspend or relegate *the club* or *take such other action to ensure compliance with the provisions of this Clause.*"<sup>2</sup>

9. CRLC had not obtained the approval in writing of BOPDRL and this ultimately led to the suspension of the President and other members of the committee of the club. As noted, the President and Secretary of the Club had been summoned to a meeting on 19 November 2019 to discuss this "concern" and other issues. The meeting was attended by Mr Mason and 2 committee members along with their counsel, Mr Sandford. They were somewhat surprised to find that Mr Walker, who did not hold office in BOPDRL, was also in attendance. At the meeting, BOPDRL raised the fact of the failure of the CRLC committee to obtain prior or any approval of BOPDRL to the changes to the CRLC Constitution, as required by rule 22. The CRLC representatives acknowledged that they had not been aware of the rule and then agreed that they would take steps to call an SGM to rescind the changes to the Constitution. They took steps immediately to do this.
10. On 21 November, 2 days after the meeting, Mr Mason wrote to the Secretary of BOPDRL asking for its written consent to change the Constitution back (that is, consent in terms of rule 22) and advised that the Committee would then send out a 14 days notice of the proposed SGM for the purpose of changing the Constitution "with all the correct information, reason, time, date and venue". There were further exchanges between Mr Mason and BOPDRL's Secretary on 23 and 24 November as to the documents that were needed for progressing to the SGM. However, a little over a week later and before notice of the SGM had been sent out, without any prior notice to CRLC or any person on its committee, BOPDRL held a meeting and late in the evening of 4 December 2018 emailed a letter to Mr Mason. That letter read:

"Regarding the current situation of the Central Rugby League Club  
– Effective Immediately.

You are advised the following members Kerry Mason, Annette Nahu, Jenna Rowe and including current committee have acted in breach of the Bay of Plenty District Rugby League Constitution Clause 22.

[Clause 22 was then set out in full]

All the above named and current committee are suspended effective immediately, you are required to hand over all club

---

<sup>2</sup> Emphasis added.

property, including club room keys, all of which will remain the property of the Central Rugby League Club.

The BOPDRL will appoint an administrator of interim committee to manage the club while a full investigation will take place of the club's activities whilst under your control.

Following this investigation, the BOPDRL will decide what further action to take.

Please contact Graeme Hill [BOPDRL Chairman, telephone number provided], or Jenny Nahu [BOPDRL secretary, telephone number provided] to arrange the hand over within the next 24 hours from receipt of this letter."

11. Prior to that letter being emailed to Mr Mason on the evening of 4 December 2018, BOPDRL had during the afternoon already sent an email to locksmiths which read: "Ernie Walker is representing [CRLC] and Bay of Plenty Rugby League to have locks changed at the Central Rugby League club rooms Linton Park Edmond Road Rotorua." On the following day, Mr Walker went to the locksmiths and the padlocks to the club rooms were rekeyed. The situation then deteriorated with further changes to the locks and a trespass notice being issued by the committee against Mr Walker and allegations of interference with that notice and false claims of the appointment of a temporary Administrator of the Club which we do not think we need to consider further in order to determine this appeal.
12. An appeal against the suspension was filed promptly by CRLC with the Appeal Committee established by NZRL. That appeal was heard on 15 February 2019 and by Decision dated 28 February 2019 dismissed. (We consider the reasoning of that Decision later in this Decision.) That then led to the filing on 1 March 2019 of a further appeal by CRLC to this Tribunal. Subsequently, by agreement between the parties Mr Greg Steele on 4 April 2019 was appointed as Administrator of the Club and it was agreed that these Tribunal proceedings should be held in abeyance in the meantime. Mr Steele successfully organized and held an SGM on 19 May 2019 and the contested rule changes were rescinded and notification given to the Registrar of Incorporated Societies. Mr Steele then gave notice for an AGM to be held on 4 June 2019.
13. However, the overall situation deteriorated again with disputes as to membership and alleged threats and on-line bullying and intimidation. This culminated in Mr Mason resigning as President of CRLC on 25 May 2019 and, as tensions continued to rise, Mr Steele cancelled the AGM and resigned as Independent Administrator. However, BOPDRL itself then gave notice (but only on its Facebook Page) of an AGM for CRLC to be held on 15 June 2019. Having learned of that fact, the original committee (still under suspension despite the rescinding of the earlier Constitutional changes) protested the validity of the proposed AGM. The meeting went ahead and a new committee, of which Mr Walker is Deputy Chairman, was elected. The validity of that AGM

and election is challenged by the original committee on the grounds that the new committee members are not members of the Club and that in any event their suspension on 4 December 2018 was unlawful and they remain the lawful committee of CRLC.

14. An unsuccessful attempt was made by this Tribunal to set up a mediation and, following a series of Tribunal Minutes and procedural Directions, an amended appeal was filed, a defence and cross appeal also filed by BOPDRL, and statements of evidence from the Appellant (sworn or affirmed at the hearing) and an affidavit from Mr Walker. Mr Clemens, who represents the members of the “new” committee provided a number of signed informal statements from various people, none of whom attended the hearing despite a Minute from the Tribunal (dated 22 August 2019) advising that none of those statements would be received into evidence unless presented in proper form and sworn or affirmed at the hearing. In any event, none of that material bears directly on the legal issues that the Tribunal has to decide or on the facts that are relevant to the suspension issue in particular.
15. The hearing was held at Rotorua on 16 October 2019. We had previously received written submissions from all parties and received oral submissions of Mr Sandford (for the original committee), Mr Clemens (for the new committee) and from Mr Hill, representing BOPDRL with Jenny Nahu, secretary BOPDRL. Although NZRL had been named as an Interested Party and, through its solicitors, had been kept informed throughout the Tribunal process, it did not attend, by counsel or otherwise, the hearing. We think this unfortunate given its objectives referred to in paragraph 2 above and would have expected that it take an active role in facilitating a resolution of this whole matter, and it considers that it has an important role in implementation of this decision.

### **Issues and Remedies Sought**

16. From the beginning, at the heart of the CRLC appeal has been the legal validity of the notice of suspension of 4 December 2018. The amended Notice of Appeal incorporates CRLC’s written submissions which seek a number of declarations from the Tribunal, the first of which is that the “decisions to suspend the Central Committee members are invalid and set them aside”. We take the reference to “decisions” as being first the suspension decision made by BOPDRL and secondly the decision of the Appeals Committee upholding that decision. A number of consequential declarations are then sought, in essence permitting the original committee members to resume their positions, to set up an AGM and confirming their authority to determine membership applications. A declaration is also sought to the effect that the June 2019 AGM was “null and void”, which we think would follow if the first declaration that the suspension of the original committee members was invalid is made.

17. In its counterclaim, BOPDRL seeks what is in effect the reverse of the CRLC remedies, in particular declarations that the suspended Committee is “no longer in place,” that the AGM held on 15 June 2019 was valid and that the “new” committee was properly elected on that day. In his submissions, Mr Clemens for the new committee asked the Tribunal “to enforce the decision that has been made with the new committee, particularly the return of the CRLC’s premises, keys to the premises, return of all plant and equipment that was present previously in the premises, return of all uniforms, access to bank account and all general documentation and correspondence received by the CRLC...”
18. Other orders were also sought by CLRC and BOPDRL against each other and named individuals which we think are either outside our powers or which we do not think are appropriate in any event. This was advised to the parties at the hearing and we say no more about them.

### **Our Decision**

19. The principal arguments made by Mr Sandford for the original committee members were that:
  - (1) The suspension decision of 4 December 2018 was made in breach of natural justice.
  - (2) BOPDRL acted outside its powers (*ultra vires*) in suspending the individual committee members, as did the Appeals Committee in upholding that suspension.
20. We agree with both submissions.
21. As to natural justice, Mr Sandford in his written submissions referred to a number of legal authorities, including Decisions of this Tribunal, and then submitted:

“The decision of BOPDRL is clearly in a breach of natural justice. Not one single person was given prior notice of the charge, advised of the charges against them, given fair opportunity to answer the charges, notified of possible sanctions or given the opportunity to present their case. The decision of 4<sup>th</sup> December 2018 was made without hearing from any of the members of Central’s Committee or advising them that they were even being considered for sanction.”
22. Mr Sandford also made the point that the ground relied on for suspension, namely the breach of clause 22 had been previously resolved at the meeting of 19 November 2018 by the agreed plan to hold an SGM to rescind the changes made to the Constitution. Immediate action had been taken by CRLC to

implement that plan but, without notice, BOPDRL had acted to suspend the Committee members before the plan could be carried out. We agree and have no difficulty in arriving at the decision that there has been an egregious breach of natural justice in the manner in which the suspension decision was made. We note in passing that there is no reference in the Appeal Committee's Decision to natural justice but, whether that was argued or not, it has been forcibly argued before us and we think properly so. No point was taken by any other party that it was not open to the suspended committee members to argue the issue in this Tribunal. In the original Notice of Appeal, CRLC invoked as a ground of appeal rule 42(a) of the Tribunal's Rules which states "natural justice was denied". We make a declaration that the decision by BOPDRL to suspend the members of the CRLC committee was in breach of natural justice and invalid.

23. Mr Sandford's next argument (Tribunal Rules 42(b)) was that BOPDRL acted outside its powers (i.e. acted ultra vires). This requires a consideration of the wording and scope of clause 22. It will be recalled that where a breach of the requirement to obtain the approval of BOPDRL to a rule change has been established, the Board of BOPDRL "shall have the power to suspend or relegate the club or take such other action to ensure compliance with the provisions of this Clause".
24. Two questions arise from this power:
  - (1) Does the power to suspend "the club" extend to suspending individual members of the club and/or the committee of the club?
  - (2) Is BOPDRL entitled to maintain the suspensions, which were made on the ground that no approval had been obtained to the rule change, now that that has been rectified (by the SGM organized by the then Administrator)?
25. As to the first, the Appeals Committee thought that the words in clause 22 "take such other action to ensure compliance with the provisions of Clause 22" entitled BOPDRL to suspend individuals if they "genuinely" considered "that was a way in which compliance with Clause 22 moving forward could be complied with". That, in our view, requires an expanded reading of the power to suspend a club to a power to suspend a club or individual members of a club. Mr Sandford referred to a recent Judgment of the High Court – *Middeldorp v. Avondale Jockey Club Inc* [2019] NZHC 901, a judgment of Gordon J<sup>3</sup> – which ruled that express power to suspend an elected committee member from his or her office is required. We agree that that represents the law and are not prepared to give the broader interpretation to the words in clause 22 referred to that were adopted by the Appeal Committee. We accept the submission therefore that BOPDRL acted beyond its powers in exercising its power to

---

<sup>3</sup> Relief was refused in that case on discretionary grounds.

suspend a club to suspend the individual members of the CRLC who constituted its committee. We make a declaration accordingly.

26. The Appeal Committee recorded that in the hearing held by it evidence was given by BOPDRL that “part of the reason [it] decided to suspend the Central Executive following the breach was because they perceived the attitude of the Central executives to be aggressive and uncooperative, and that they had concerns regarding allegations that had been made about how the Central executive were dealing with members or potential members.” The Appeals Committee rejected a submission that this fell outside clause 22. We observe first of all that the terms of the Decision of 4 December 2018 make no reference to these matters and we for ourselves give them no weight and, if necessary, would rule that in exercising its powers under clause 22 in respect of the failure to obtain approval to the rule change BOPDRL would be taking into account irrelevant considerations if it were to exercise its power of suspension (even if otherwise valid) on this grounds, in whole or in part.
27. In relation to the second question above, during the hearing it was put to Mr Hill, representing BOPDRL, that now that the clause 22 breach had been rectified, the suspension ought to be lifted. This followed a submission by Mr Sandford that highlighted the fact that the suspensions in terms purported to be permanent. Mr Hill took the position that the suspensions should remain in place because there may be other matters to address which are relevant to the functions of the Committee. The Tribunal does not accept that position and is of the view and, if necessary, would have directed that the suspensions be lifted. However, given that our Decision is that the suspensions were invalid both on the grounds of natural justice and ultra vires it is not necessary for us to make such a direction.
28. It follows that, in our view, there was no power in BOPDRL to hold the AGM on 15 June 2019 and that the election of the committee on that date had no lawful effect. We make a declaration accordingly.

### **Next steps**

29. The Tribunal explored with the parties their co-operation in the holding of an AGM (which is now well overdue), including the resolution of any membership processes and other issues. A tentative consensus did seem to emerge that it would be desirable, in both the short and long term interests of the Club, for that process and all issues including membership arising from it to be managed and supervised by an independent person, notwithstanding that the result of this Decision will be to reinstate the original committee and, for the time being, to put them in a governing position but subject to all their fiduciary and other legal obligations that that encompasses.

30. Before addressing the way in which the decision of the Tribunal is to be implemented, we refer to some more of the history, including the proud record of the Central Rugby League Club which reaches back to 1949, and the very clear intent on both sides of the argument that the Club should be restored to its former mana, for the sake of all of those who have contributed to its status and importance over the years, and for the sake of those of all ages who benefit from a club with such strong historical roots, now in rugby league and netball. These clubs are the lifeblood of communities throughout New Zealand. It was quite clear to the Tribunal that the differences between people who share these very values have threatened the very existence of the Club. So too has the pain of the loss of the clubrooms some years back as a result of finance stresses. This should not be laid at the door of any of the parties to this appeal.
31. However, for this Club to be restored to its vibrant and important place in the community, the Tribunal does not consider it can simply leave the parties with the legal decision described above, whereby those suspended are restored to their position, and the future of the Club be threatened by historic tensions.
32. The Constitution is old, and does not reflect a “modern” Constitution which by its nature should evolve from time to time. This is where NZRL comes in, as like most governing bodies it will have, or should have, a perspective of a good working Constitution. The Tribunal does not go further than stress the importance of such.
33. The two issues which most concern the Tribunal are membership and the relationships between the parties and the two camps which are reflected in the evidence on this appeal. The membership provisions of the Constitution (clause 5) provide for election of members on the nomination of an existing member in writing, on application forms approved by the Club, to be dealt with at the next committee meeting. A majority vote of the members present will result in election and membership.
34. It is quite clear that the second issue of concern to the Tribunal, namely personal relationships, may affect and be perpetuated in the membership process. There are members, and there are others who want to be members, some of whom will not have surfaced in the written material put before the Tribunal. The relationship between members and would be members, and others, must be addressed. Mr Sandford and the members restored to the committee by this decision gave an assurance of “good faith” in dealing with applications for membership. The intensity of some of the media messaging and other behaviour described to the Tribunal will make it hard for the restored committee members and their supporters, and those who opposed them, to come together in the spirit of kotahitanga. Yet they must, and it will take a big hearted and forgiving attitude on both sides to mend the fractured personal relationships, of which the Tribunal has become well aware. For the sake, in particular of young people whose lives week by week depend on this club, all

parties must put the past behind them and work to the common good. The Tribunal was moved by the description of the way the Club continues to function with its voluntary contributions and the dedication of members and their supporters.

35. For that reason the Tribunal is of the view that consequent upon this decision the restored committee (which does not include Mr Mason who has resigned) should give notice that all those who wish to become members should make application on a form which should be readily available in hard copy and also on a website or other electronic platform. It should give a reasonable period, say one month, for such applications to be received and then dealt with by the restored committee. As with any committee addressing membership, there may be reasons which preclude a majority vote in support of membership. That may be more difficult here where the restored committee has been subject, directly or indirectly, to some hostility, which they may or may not have reciprocated. For that reason, the process of receipt and processing membership applications should be overseen by (we suggest) a legally qualified person, a solicitor with experience with constitutions of such clubs, or equivalent experience, who will guide the restored committee through the process of calling for and addressing membership applications.
36. With that process and the membership settled, at least for the time being, there should be an Annual General Meeting called at which the ordinary business of the Club will be conducted including the election of an incoming committee, and we suggest consideration of a new Constitution.
37. We think the steady hand of someone removed from the recent fray is needed to guide the restored committee or else we can see the prospect of more difficulties rather than the reconciliation which is needed. The Tribunal therefore reserves a right to supervise the implementation of the Decision it has made both as to the call for new membership applications and the formalities attending that, the way in which they are addressed, and the notification of an AGM with a clear agenda. If there are difficulties in this regard, then the Tribunal under its reserved power will address those but we hope that will not be necessary.
38. We expect the Bay of Plenty District Rugby League and NZRL to support Central in the steps which must now be taken.
39. Costs are reserved.



For the Tribunal: Dr James  
Farmer QC. The Hon. Nicholas  
Davidson QC. Pippa Hayward

<b>Chronology of events relating to Central Rugby League Club (CRLC)</b>	
<b>Date</b>	<b>What happened</b>
Approx.70 years ago	CRLC was formed.
26 September 1964	CRLC became an Incorporated Society.
2000's	CRLC went through a period of financial difficulty (CRLC sold its clubrooms in 2006 as a result.)
December 2017	CRLC held an Annual General Meeting (AGM) and a new Committee was elected. The Committee elected was the same Committee that was later suspended on 4 December 2018.
4 February 2018	A Special General Meeting (SGM) was held by CRLC. The Committee voted in favour of making a number of changes to the Constitution.
8 February 2018	Companies Office received the "Alteration to the Rules document", filed by CRLC.
9 November 2018	BOPDRL wrote to Mr Mason (President) and Ms Nahu (Secretary) of CRLC, stating that they had concerns about the management of CRLC. BOPDRL invited Mr Mason and Ms Nahu to attend a meeting on 12 November 2019.
12 November 2018	Meeting postponed until 19 November 2018.
19 November 2018	Meeting between Mr Mason and Mr Nahu, one other committee member and Mr Sandford with BOPDRL. Mr Walker also present.
21 November 2018	Mr Mason wrote to the Secretary of BOPDRL asking for written consent from BOPDRL to change the Constitution back.
23/24 November 2018	Emails exchanged between Mr Mason and BOPDRL's as to what was needed to change the Constitution.
4 December 2018	BOPDRL suspended members of the Committee of CRLC. BOPDRL advised locksmith, prior to sending notice of suspension to Committee members, that Mr Walker was authorised to have the locks to CRLC's clubrooms changed.
5 December 2018	Mr Walker changed the locks to CRLC's clubrooms.
12 January 2019	A notice was published in the Rotorua Daily Post that an AGM would be held on 19 January 2019.
18 January 2019	A trespass notice was served on Mr Walker.
19 January 2019	Mr Walker held an AGM at the clubrooms.
15 February 2019	NZLR Appeals Committee conducted a hearing in which CRLC appealed the decision of BOPDRL to suspend the board.

28 February 2019	NZLR Appeals Committee issued its decision to dismiss the appeal from CRLC.
28 February 2019	Email sent from Mr Hill (on behalf of BOPDRL) to Mr Mason and Mr Sandford requesting the keys of CRLC clubrooms to be sent to BOPDRL.
1 March 2019	A Notice of Appeal was filed on behalf of CRLC with the Sports Tribunal.
4 April 2019	Mr Greg Steele was appointed by BOPDRL with the agreement of the suspended committee members as Administrator of the Club.
19 May 2019	Mr Steele successfully organised and held an SGM at which the contested rule changes were rescinded. Notification was given to the Registrar of Incorporated Societies. Mr Steele then gave notice that an AGM was to be held on 4 June 2019.
25 May 2019	Mr Mason resigned as President of CRLC.
3 June 2019	Mr Steele cancelled the SGM and resigned as Administrator.
7 June 2019	AGM for CRLC was advertised on BOPDRL's Facebook page for 16 October 2019.
15 June 2019	AGM was held at BOPDRL headquarters and the "second camp" committee, including Mr Walker, was elected.
17 June 2019	Letter received by Sandford and Partners (Mr Sandford) on CRLC letterhead informing them that a new Committee had been elected and CRLC no longer wished to employ Sandford and Partners.
2 July 2019	An amended Notice of Appeal was filed on behalf of CRLC with the Sports Tribunal.
9 July 2019 (received by the Sports Tribunal)	BOPDRL Defence and Counterclaim filed with the Sports Tribunal.
16 October 2019	Sports Tribunal hearing in Rotorua.