

WHEN REGULATION BECOMES BUSINESS INTERRUPTION

Paradise Haulage / related transport operations - NZTA administration, TSLs, RUC, vehicle interventions and downstream financial harm

Prepared 19 August 2026 | Version 0.01



If the power is lawful, show the power. If the record is correct, show the record. If the decision is fair, show what made it fair.

WE REVIEW THE CROWN

A public review initiative

isayso.net

Evidence status: this report separates verified documents, attributed allegations, inference and missing evidence. It does not determine fraud, bad faith, professional misconduct, criminal liability or unlawful targeting.

Tracy Lynch
On behalf of the Trustees of the Private Trust

**WE IRVIEW
THE CROWN**

A PUBLIC REVIEW INITIATIVE



TRANSPARENCY • ACCOUNTABILITY • EVIDENCE



WE ASK



WE SEEK THE TRUTH



WE HOLD
TO ACCOUNT

ISAYSO.NET

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report examines a potentially important upstream cause of the later finance and receivership crisis affecting a New Zealand trucking operation: the administration and enforcement activity of NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (NZTA) and related road-transport enforcement processes.

The core question is not whether NZTA has power to regulate commercial transport. It does. NZTA publicly describes its regulatory role as including transport service licences (TSLs), road user charges (RUC), audits, investigations, compliance interventions and suspension or revocation of transport licences. The question is whether the powers used in this matter were exercised on an accurate administrative record, under the correct statutory authority, and with proper consideration of information held by the Agency.

The affected parties report that TSL administration, RUC enforcement, vehicle removal or impoundment, and repeated regulatory interference materially disrupted trucking operations. They say that the resulting loss of operating capacity contributed to severe revenue loss, inability to service business finance, receivership, liquidation and threatened enforcement against private property. Those propositions require primary records and cannot responsibly be published as established causation until the administrative file is reconstructed.

The immediate purpose of this report is therefore twofold: first, to identify the public-interest questions; second, to set out a tightly framed administrative review and Official Information Act 1982 request designed to obtain the missing primary record.

What is established - and what is not

Category	Current position
Verified public regulatory role	NZTA regulates commercial transport, including TSLs, RUC and compliance action. It can suspend or revoke TSLs and undertake audits/investigations.
Reported case position	The affected business says NZTA records and enforcement concerning TSL/RUC status were wrong or poorly administered and trucks were taken out of operation.
Not yet established	That NZTA deliberately targeted the business; that a personal vendetta existed; that every vehicle intervention lacked lawful authority; or that NZTA alone caused the later insolvency.
Forensic task	Obtain the complete licence, RUC, enforcement, communication and audit trail and compare each decision with the information actually held at the time.

THE CAUSATION CHAIN THAT MUST BE TESTED

Administrative decision or enforcement -> truck unavailable -> revenue interruption -> finance stress/default -> receivership/liquidation -> private-property enforcement.

That sequence is currently a working hypothesis, not a completed finding. Each arrow must be supported by dated primary evidence. In particular, the audit must identify the exact vehicle affected, the legal status of the TSL and RUC position at that time, the enforcement power used, the duration of interruption, and the resulting net loss rather than gross turnover alone.

Key forensic questions

- What TSL or TSLs were recorded as valid on each material date?
- Did NZTA or another enforcement body communicate that the operator did not hold a TSL when NZTA records showed otherwise?
- Were any licence records altered, corrected, suspended, revoked or reactivated; by whom and when?
- What RUC liabilities were outstanding for each vehicle, and was any repayment or instalment arrangement in force?
- Which trucks were stopped, prohibited, immobilised or impounded, for how long, and under what statutory power?
- What information was available to the decision-maker before each intervention?
- Were contrary records or explanations considered?
- Were NZTA records or allegations communicated to Police, customers, lenders, receivers, liquidators or other third parties?
- What documented loss followed from each vehicle being unavailable?
- Did any internal NZTA review identify administrative error, data-quality problems, incorrect operator status or inconsistent treatment?

PUBLIC-INTEREST REPORT: WHEN ADMINISTRATION HITS A BUSINESS

Commercial transport regulation is necessary. Heavy vehicles operate within a dense statutory system because licensing, road-user charging and safety compliance affect other road users and public infrastructure. That does not make administrative accuracy optional. The more consequential the power, the stronger the case for a complete record showing why it was exercised.

A trucking company can lose revenue almost immediately when vehicles are taken out of service. A decision made in an office can therefore have a direct operational consequence: drivers cannot work, contractual loads are not carried, customers move elsewhere, fixed finance costs continue, and cashflow collapses. If the administrative premise for the intervention was materially wrong, the downstream consequences can be disproportionate.

The public-interest question is not: “Why was the company regulated?” It is: “Was the regulation based on the right facts, the right legal power and a complete administrative record?”

TSL administration

The affected parties say the operator was accused or treated as though it did not hold the necessary transport service authority, while their understanding is that NZTA records showed valid TSL authority. That is a high-priority factual issue. The entire licence history, database audit trail, decision notes and external communications should be produced before any public conclusion is reached.

Road User Charges and vehicle interventions

The affected parties also report that trucks were taken out of operation in connection with RUC liabilities and that an arrangement existed concerning payment. The existence, terms and performance of any arrangement must be established from primary records. For each truck the record should show the RUC position, notices, officer, legal power, date, duration and release conditions.

Personal targeting: question, not conclusion

Concerns have been raised that one person associated with the business may have been treated differently or targeted. No such motive should be stated as fact without evidence. The proper forensic question is whether the decision record shows departures from ordinary process, unusual escalation, unsupported adverse comments, inconsistent treatment, or reliance on considerations unrelated to the statutory criteria.

The downstream finance crisis

The later finance and receivership dispute should remain a separate legal stream. However, if the evidence establishes that trucks were wrongly prevented from operating, the resulting business interruption may be relevant to explaining how arrears arose and why the business lost the ability to service finance. That connection should be quantified by an accountant from contemporaneous contracts, invoices, bank records, fleet availability and actual net profit evidence.

NZTA ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW + OFFICIAL INFORMATION ACT 1982 REQUEST

To: NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi - Official Information / Regulatory Services

From: WE REVIEW THE CROWN | isayso.net

Subject: Paradise Haulage / related transport operations - TSL administration, RUC enforcement, vehicle interventions and administrative review

This request seeks the primary administrative record. It is not presently an allegation that any NZTA employee deliberately acted unlawfully. It asks NZTA to identify what happened, what information was held, what power was used, and whether the record was corrected if an error occurred.

1. TSL history and status

1. Provide the complete TSL history for each relevant operator, including applications, issues, renewals, amendments, suspensions, revocations, cancellations and reinstatements.
2. Provide database extracts or status-history records showing the TSL status at each material date.
3. Provide the audit trail for alterations to any relevant licence or operator record, including date, user and reason where recorded.
4. Provide all internal notes and communications concerning whether the operator held a valid TSL.
5. Identify every occasion on which NZTA communicated to another person or agency that the operator did not hold, had lost, or could not rely upon a TSL, and provide the communication and source record relied upon.

2. RUC records and arrangements

6. For each relevant truck, provide RUC licences purchased, amounts assessed, alleged arrears, penalties and additional charges.
7. Provide every instalment, repayment, deferment or other arrangement concerning RUC, together with the payment history and any decision that the arrangement had been breached.
8. Provide all demands, warnings, infringement material and escalation notes connected with the RUC position.
9. Provide the calculation or ledger supporting each material amount claimed.

3. Vehicle interventions

10. For each truck stopped, prohibited, immobilised, impounded or otherwise prevented from operating, provide registration, date, time, location, officer, statutory provision, factual basis, documents considered, notice given, duration and conditions for return to service.
11. Provide photographs, inspection records, roadside notes, body-worn or site video where held, and any subsequent internal review or reconsideration.

4. Communications and third-party disclosure

12. Provide communications concerning the relevant operator, principals, TSLs, RUC position or vehicles with New Zealand Police, compliance contractors, inspection providers, customers, finance companies, receivers, liquidators, banks or other external parties.
13. Where personal information must be protected, redact only what is necessary and preserve the date, sender/recipient role, purpose and substance of the communication.

5. Administrative quality and escalation

14. Provide internal file notes, case-management records, meeting notes and management escalations showing why enforcement escalated and who authorised it.
15. Provide records identifying concerns about data accuracy, licence status, operator identity, RUC status or enforcement proportionality.
16. Provide any records of corrections, apologies, withdrawals, amended decisions or instructions to update third parties.

6. Business-impact awareness

17. Provide records in which NZTA discussed or was notified that its action caused trucks to be unavailable, contracts to be lost, revenue interruption, financing difficulty, receivership, liquidation or other serious business consequences.
18. Provide any internal assessment of whether those consequences were relevant to reconsideration, discretion, review or remedial action.

7. Preservation and response format

19. Preserve all relevant emails, messages, call notes, database entries, audit logs, screenshots, enforcement images/video, licence records, RUC records and metadata.
20. Provide responsive information electronically and in searchable form where reasonably practicable.
21. For each withholding, identify the specific information and statutory ground relied upon. Where another agency holds the information, identify that agency and consider transfer under the Official Information Act.
22. If any part is considered insufficiently particular, contact the requester for clarification rather than treating the whole request as incapable of response.

EVIDENCE REGISTER - WHAT MUST BE BUILT NEXT

Issue	Primary record required	Status	Why it matters
TSL validity	Full TSL history + audit log	Missing / to verify	Tests whether enforcement premise matched NZTA records
RUC arrangement	Written arrangement + ledger + performance	Reported, not yet proved in this pack	Tests arrears/enforcement foundation
Truck intervention	Notice, officer notes, legal power, duration	Incomplete	Connects decision to operational loss
Third-party communications	Police/finance/receiver/customer communications	Incomplete	Tests dissemination and downstream effects
Administrative correction	Internal review, corrections, apologies	Unknown	Tests whether NZTA later recognised error
Business loss	Contracts, invoices, bank evidence, net-profit analysis	Requires accounting proof	Quantifies causation rather than rhetoric

FORENSIC PUBLICATION STANDARD

- Publish a fact only when supported by an identified primary record or reliable independent source.
- Label statements from affected parties as reported or alleged until independently verified.
- Do not publish “personal vendetta” as fact unless the record supports motive or improper purpose.
- Distinguish gross revenue from net loss and obtain accounting evidence before quantifying damages.

- Keep NZTA regulatory causation separate from the Revive/Blacklock Rose mortgage and receivership dispute, while preserving a dated bridge between the two where evidence supports it.
- Offer NZTA and any identified person a meaningful right of reply before final publication of adverse conclusions.

PUBLIC NOTE

This review asks a basic accountability question: when public administration has the power to stop commercial vehicles, alter licence status, escalate enforcement or communicate adverse information, what records demonstrate that the action was accurate, authorised and fairly administered?

WHERE'S OUR CUT? Not a demand for a private share of public revenue - a public-interest question about what service, accountability and transparent administration the public receives for the systems it funds.

NZTA publicly states that RUC contributes to road maintenance and safety infrastructure. This report does not claim that RUC provides “nothing back”. Any broader value-for-money review should be undertaken separately from the case-specific administrative audit and should compare RUC revenue, administration costs, network expenditure and service outcomes from official records.

SOURCE AND RECORD NOTE

Public regulatory references checked 19 August 2026: NZTA commercial transport regulatory information; NZTA TSL information; NZTA RUC resources; and NZTA Official Information Act guidance. Case-specific assertions in this report are treated as reported positions unless and until matched to the primary NZTA, Police, vehicle, accounting or correspondence record.

The separate Revive/Blacklock Rose finance and receivership materials are not re-litigated in this report. They are relevant only to the limited downstream-causation question: whether loss of trucking operations materially contributed to later financial distress.

Prepared for public-interest review by

Yours faithfully,

Tracy Lynch

Tracy Lynch

WE REVIEW THE CROWN

isayso.net

Tracy Lynch
On behalf of the Trustees of the Private Trust

**WE IRVIEW
THE CROWN**

— A PUBLIC REVIEW INITIATIVE —



TRANSPARENCY • ACCOUNTABILITY • EVIDENCE



WE ASK



WE SEEK THE TRUTH



WE HOLD
TO ACCOUNT

ISAYSO.NET