

Māori Law Review

A MONTHLY REVIEW OF LAW AFFECTING MĀORI

Te Kōti Matua – High Court

Injunction – Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tāmaki nui-ā-Rua deed of settlement

Griggs and Chamberlain on behalf of Ngāi Tūmapūhia-ā-Rangi Hapū v Attorney-General

[2021] NZHC 2913
29 October 2021

Report by Craig Linkhorn

Whakataunga – Overview and result

The Court refused to grant an interim injunction to prevent the Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tāmaki nui-ā-Rua Settlement Trust from signing a deed of settlement of historical claims with the Crown.

(Continued at p 3)

Editors

Carwyn Jones
Craig Linkhorn

Publisher

Māori Law Review Ltd
PO Box 25433
Wellington 6146
New Zealand

T +64 4 472 2667

W maorilawreview.co.nz

Associate Editor

Toni Love

Student Editor

Hinemoana Markham-Nicklin

Consultant Editors

Tom Bennion
John Borrows
Judge Craig Coxhead
Jacinta Ruru
Māmari Stephens

© Copyright Māori Law Review Ltd 2021. No part may be reproduced by any process without prior written permission.

This issue may be cited as:
(2021) November Māori LR

ISSN 1172-8434



Use this QR code to visit
our website

Contents

(2021) Whiringa-ā-rangi Māori LR

Te Kōti Mātua – High Court

- Injunction – Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tāmaki nui-ā-Rua deed of settlement – *Griggs and Chamberlain on behalf of Ngāti Tūmapūhia-ā-Rangi Hapū v The Attorney-General* [2021] NZHC 2913 – Craig Linkhorn 1

Te Kōti Whenua Māori – Māori Land Court

- Trusts – trustee misconduct – remedies – *Taueki v Sword – Horowhenua 11 (Lake) Block* (2021) 437 Aotea MB 86 (437 AOT 86) – Elizabeth Derby 5
- Alienation – confirmation – declined – inadequate consideration – *Waaka v Goldsmith – Paengaroa North A1 Section 2* (2021) 262 Waiariki MB 37 (262 WAR 37) – Elizabeth Derby 10
- Trusts – continuing to act as trustee after resignation – *Witana v Cutforth – Kohewhata 27C2A* (2021) 238 Taitokerau MB 150 (238 TTK 150) – Elizabeth Derby 11
- Trusts – breach of trust – liability to repay funds – removal of trustee – *Sherard v Devereux – Otakanini Church Site* (2021) 238 Taitokerau MB 185 (238 TTK 185) – Elizabeth Derby 13
- Trusts – review of trust – trust varied – *Bamber – Tuhorakuri A* (2021) 259 Waiariki MB 274 (259 WAR 274) – Hinemoana Markham-Nicklin 14

The Māori Law Review is proud to have an association with the Faculty of Law at Victoria University of Wellington and Buddle Findlay New Zealand lawyers.



VICTORIA UNIVERSITY OF
WELLINGTON
TE HERENGA WAKA

BUDDLE FINDLAY

This print edition of the Māori Law Review is published 11 times each year starting with the February issue. <http://maorilawreview.co.nz> has author profiles, free resources, regular updates, decisions for download and more information about the Māori Law Review.

Disclaimer

Any views expressed in the *Māori Law Review* are those of the author of each article and not necessarily those of the editors or publisher. The information contained in this publication is a summary only. You should seek professional advice before taking any action in relation to matters dealt with in this publication. The parties involved in this publication exclude any liability for any damage, loss or liability from use of or reliance on this publication.

Contents (continued) (2021) Whiringa-ā-Rangi Māori LR

Te Rōpū Whakamana i Te Tiriti o Waitangi – Waitangi Tribunal

Te Mana Whatu Ahuru: Take a Takiwā – report on Te
Rohe Pōtae Claims Part VI – Zoe Rose-Curnow 16

(Continued from p 1)

Injunction – interim injunction – Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tāmaki nui-ā-Rua deed of settlement – dismissed	
Date	29 October 2021
Case	Griggs and Chamberlain on behalf of Ngāti Tūmapūhia-ā-Rangi Hapū v Attorney-General (372 KB PDF)
Citation	[2021] NZHC 2913
Court	Te Kōti Matua – High Court
Judge(s)	Cooke J
Earlier/later decisions	
Legislation cited	Treaty of Waitangi Act 2021, ss 8A and 8HB; High Court Rules 2016, r 7.53; Trusts Act 2019, ss 126 and 127.
Cases cited	Mercury NZ Ltd and Ors v The Waitangi Tribunal and Ors [2021] NZHC 654; Wairarapa Moana Ki Pouakani Inc v Mercury NZ Ltd [2021] NZSC 134; Wairarapa ki Tararua Report (Wai 863, 2010); Determinations of the Tribunal Preliminary to Interim Recommendations under Sections 8A and 8HC of the Treaty of Waitangi Act 1975 (Wai 863, 2020); NZ Tax Refunds Ltd v Brooks Honey Ltd [2013] NZCA 90, (2013) 13 TCLR 531; Te Runanga o Wharekauri Rekohu Inc v Attorney-General [1993] 2 NZLR 301 (CA); Milroy v Attorney-General [2005] NZAR 562 (CA); New Zealand Maori Council v Attorney-General [2007] NZCA 269, [2008] 1 NZLR 318; Port Nicholson Block Settlement Trust v Attorney-General [2012] NZHC 3181; Ngāti Whātua Ōrākei Trust v Attorney-General [2018] NZSC 84, [2019] 1 NZLR 116; Te Runanga o Wharekauri Rekohu Inc v Attorney-General [1993] 2 NZLR 301 (CA); Ririnui v Landcorp Farming Ltd [2016] NZSC 62, [2016] 1 NZLR 1056; Wilson v White [2005] 1 NZLR 189 (CA); Petrocorp Exploration Ltd v Minister of Energy [1991] 1 NZLR 641 (PC); Curtis v Minister of Defence [2002] 2 NZLR 744 (CA); CREEDNZ Inc v Governor-General [1981] 1 NZLR 172 (CA); Petrocorp Exploration Ltd v Minister of Energy [1991] 1 NZLR 1 (CA); Ngāti Mutunga o Wharekauri Iwi Trust v the Minister for Treaty of Waitangi Negotiations [2019] NZHC 1942; Mandic v The Cornwell Park Trust Board (Inc) [2011] NZSC 135, [2012] 2 NZLR 194;

	<i>Haronga v Waitangi Tribunal</i> [2011] NZSC 53, [2012] 2 NZLR 53.
Overview and result	Application for an interim injunction so that the Ngāti Kahungunu ki Wairarapa Tāmaki nui-ā-Rua Settlement Trust, the third defendant in these proceedings, would be prevented from signing a deed of settlement with the Crown. The applicants also sought a declaration from the Court that, were the Crown to sign a deed of settlement which purported to include Wai 429 without waiting for a final determination by the Waitangi Tribunal of the Wai 429 application for remedies recommendations (involving the Tribunal in an adjudicative function over possible resumption of assets), it would breach the Crown's commitments under Te Tiriti o Waitangi and the Crown Forest Agreement. The plaintiffs' first cause of action was a direct cause of action against the Crown. It alleged that the Crown's actions in entering the deed of settlement would be a breach of the Treaty of Waitangi. Held, the Court dismissed the application for an interim injunction. (The applicants applied for leave to appeal this decision, which the Court granted and this judgment also contains the reasons for that decision.) The Court identified comity issues arising. Namely, that "because a deed of settlement is normally the precursor to anticipated Parliamentary enactment there is a danger that the Court is being invited to consider the merits of matters that are for Parliament, and not the Courts, to address." However, the Court also maintained that it would be "constitutionally inappropriate for the Court not to adjudicate on a matter that is properly within its jurisdiction to determine, even if that includes a question associated with the entry of a Deed of Settlement." (See [14]-[20].) The Court worked through facts associated with whether the trustees of the settlement trust had met obligations in order to enter into a deed of settlement. While the plaintiffs' had an arguable case that formal requirements were not met, the Court accepted submissions that relevant obligations were met in a substantive sense and concluded that it would be very difficult to contend that the decision to enter a deed of settlement was not one that was reasonably open to the trustees. (See [21]-[36].) The Court did not accept that the plaintiffs had a serious question to be tried on the first cause of action – a direct cause of action against the Crown about the proposed entry into the deed of settlement. The Court said it could not identify a cause of action, remarking: "The Crown commits no identified legal wrong by entering the Deed." (See [40].) The Court also queried whether there is jurisdiction to grant an

	interim injunction in a proceeding seeking purely declaratory relief but did not decide this beyond noting (at [42]): "The jurisdiction to grant declarations is limited to declaring what a legal position is." The Court then found that both the balance of convenience and the overall interests of justice were not in favour of granting the injunction. The injunction sought was declined. The Court's reasons for judgment notes the connection between this litigation, about entry into a deed of settlement of claims, and judicial review of a preliminary determination by the Waitangi Tribunal, issued in the course of adjudicating on remedies recommendations. See Mercury NZ Ltd and Ors v The Waitangi Tribunal and Ors [2021] NZHC 654.
--	--

Te Kōti Whenua Māori – Māori Land Court

Trusts – trustee misconduct – remedies

Taueki v Sword – Horowhenua 11 (Lake) Block

(2021) 437 Aotea MB 86 (437 AOT 86)
10 September 2021

Report by Elizabeth Derby

Whakataunga – Overview and result

Decision following an earlier decision to enforce trust obligations. Following receipt of further submissions and evidence, the Court determined issues of trustee liability and ineligibility for reappointment.

Trusts – trustee misconduct – remedies – trustee accountability – liability – ineligibility for reappointment	
Date	10 September 2021
Case	Taueki v Sword – Horowhenua 11 (Lake) Block (389 KB PDF)
Citation	(2021) 437 Aotea MB 86 (437 AOT 86)
Court	Te Kōti Whenua Māori – Māori Land Court
Judge(s)	Judge L R Harvey
Earlier/later decisions	Taueki v Procter – Horowhenua 11 Lake Block (2020) 415 Aotea MB 1 (415 AOT 1); <i>Taueki – Horowhenua 11 (Lake) Māori Reservation</i> (2005) 163 Aotea MB 99 (163 AOT 99).
Legislation cited	Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993, ss 19(1)(a), (b), (c), 43, 238, 239, and 240.
Cases cited	Pook v Matchitt – Matangareka 3B [2019] Māori Appellate Court MB 167 (2019 APPEAL 167); <i>Proprietors of Mangakino Township v Māori Land</i>

	Court CA65/99; Fenwick v Naera [2015] NZSC 68; <i>Hemi v Proprietors of Mangakino Incorporation</i> (1999) 73 Taupō MB 30 (73 TPO 30); <i>Eriwata v Trustees of Waitara SD s6 and 91 Land Trust – Waitara SD s6 and 91 Land Trust</i> (2005) 15 Aotea Appellate MB 192 (15 WGAP 192); <i>Deputy Registrar v Moeahu – Lot 1 DP 17494 Part Section 2345 New Plymouth (Old Railway Line) and Other Blocks</i> (2021) 437 Aotea MB 3 (437 AOT 3); Taueki v McMillan – Horowhenua 11 (Lake) (2014) 324 Aotea MB 144 (324 AOT 144); Savage v Adlam – Lot 39A Sec 2A Parish of Matatā (2014) 95 Waiariki MB 176 (95 WAR 176); <i>Wall v Karaitiana – Tauhara Middle 15 Trust</i> (2008) 88 Taupō MB 63 (88 TPO 63); <i>Tamihere v Taumaunu</i> HC Auckland 2005; Paki v Māori Land Court [2015] NZHC 2535; Rātima v Sullivan – Tataraakina C Trust (2017) 64 Tākitimu MB 121 (64 TKT 121); <i>Adlam v Savage</i> [2016] NZAR 1393; Rameka v Hall [2013] NZCA; <i>Clarke v Karaitiana</i> [2011] NZCA 154.
Overview and result	Decision relating to an earlier decision about enforcing trust obligations. The Court found that trustees Mr Sword and Mr Warrington would have been removed for cause if they had been validly reappointed as responsible trustees. Following receipt of further submissions and evidence, the Court sought to determine whether: relief from liability should be granted to any of the former trustees, the trustees should serve a period of ineligibility for reappointment, any of the former trustees should be reappointed following the 2019 election, and whether any further inquiry should be held into funds paid to the former trustees. Held, the former trustees were entitled to relief from liability for payments made because the funding providers were satisfied with the project outcomes and the trust did not suffer a loss. Further, the decisions to contract the former trustees and issue payments are now approved; Mr Sword and Mr Warrington would be ineligible for reappointment for two consecutive terms of office (being six years); the remainder of the former trustees would be ineligible for reappointment for three years; the question of reappointment following the 2 February 2019 election is redundant, given the determination that all former trustees must serve a period of ineligibility for reappointment; and, no further inquiry into funding is required given the views of the funding providers, pending the outcome of an audit of the trust's accounts. The Court ordered that an audit of the trust accounts should be undertaken before the next election. In terms of reappointment of trustees, the Court directed that an election should be held before the end of February 2022. The Court confirmed that,

	since the period of ineligibility for the former trustees (with the exception of Mr Sword and Mr Warrington) would have expired, they would be eligible to stand for election at that meeting.
--	--

Kōrero whānui – Background

In the earlier (2020) decision, orders were issued concerning lengthy proceedings for, among other things, the enforcement of obligations of trust. In that decision, it was found that two of the former trustees, Messrs Sword and Warrington, would have been removed for cause for breach of their duties if they had been validly reappointed responsible trustees in 2016 (which they were not). As a result of this, the Court declined to reappoint these trustees. Submissions were then invited from counsel on matters that were to be determined in this judgment, as laid out below.

The issues for determination in this judgment were: whether relief from liability should be granted to any of the former trustees; whether the trustees should serve a period of ineligibility for reappointment; whether any of the former trustees should be reappointed following the 2019 election; and whether any further inquiry should be held into funds paid to the former trustees. See the earlier (2020) decision for further background on this case.

Kōrerorero – Discussion

Relief of trustees from liability

The applicants, Mr Taueki (a trust beneficiary) and Mr Rudd (a former trustee), submitted that it is generally accepted that relief from liability is not available where the former trustees have failed to act honestly or reasonably, or where the former trustees have failed to seek directions. They submitted that the breaches of trust were continuing, persistent, significant and egregious, and arguably willful. On this basis, it was contended that relief should not be available as the former trustees had not acted reasonably.

As to the non-profit and non-conflict rules, counsel for the applicants submitted that, without appropriate approval, a trustee is required to refund the trust where payments have been received improperly. The applicants believed that this was not a case in which the former trustees could apply to the Court for relief on the basis that the trust might have been enriched by their conduct. This was because they disputed that the work undertaken by the trustees amounted to a benefit to the trust.

Counsel for the former trustees submitted that they were entitled to relief from liability because the interests of the beneficiaries of the trust and the central and local government objectives in relation to the lake were aligned and therefore the former trustees were focused on carrying out operations and initiatives that would improve the health and wellbeing of the lake. Further, the former trustees kept these activities under review with the oversight of central government and local authorities to ensure they were delivering services that would improve the health of the lake to advance

the interests of the trust's beneficial owners. The former trustees asserted that the beneficiaries were informed of the funding approved and the management of the funds through the publication of trustee minutes, annual accounts, and at annual general meetings, and as a result of these activities the trust had performed very well by generating cash reserves and building successful working relationships with central government and local and regional authorities. Ultimately, the former trustees submitted that their activities had made a significant positive impact on the trust and the lake and thus the trust was better off as a result of their services.

The Court did not consider that the amounts paid to the other former trustees (excluding Messrs Sword and Warrington) warranted any further inquiry or comment over and above the assessment made in the principal judgment. This is because the Court was satisfied that the amounts paid to them were reasonable and that they had completed the tasks required to an acceptable standard.

As for payments made to Messrs Sword and Warrington, the Court raised three points relevant to the issue of whether the former trustees should be responsible for these funds. Firstly, neither of the trustees employed or contracted themselves. Those were the decisions of the governance group, which were eventually endorsed by a majority of trustees, who agreed that Messrs Sword and Warrington were well placed to provide the services that the trust was seeking. Secondly, the approvals for payments to the two trustees were made by the governance group and, occasionally, the other trustees themselves. While the Court found that the rules of conflict management had not been consistently observed, it did not consider that this had the effect of voiding the work completed by them for the benefit of the trust. To do this would be to provide the trust with a benefit without cost. Finally, it was confirmed that the funding bodies who provided the resources for the projects were satisfied with the outcomes. Further, the trust had not suffered any loss so, while the processes were far from satisfactory, the outcomes for the trust had been positive. Thus, the Court did not consider that any of the former trustees should be required to refund the trust for these payments. It was found that the former trustees were entitled to relief from liability in the context of the payments made to Messrs Sword and Warrington.

The Court accepted that all of the former trustees (except Messrs Sword and Warrington) acted honestly and reasonably in the context of the appointment of the contractors, the payment of their fees, and in the receipt of fees by the majority of trustees.

Ineligibility for reappointment

Counsel for the applicants argued that when a trustee is removed for cause, that trustee cannot be reappointed, and this sanction has no time limit. While this does not strictly apply in this situation as Messrs Sword and Warrington were not actually removed, the applicants submitted that, as it had been found that they would have been removed had they been properly reappointed as trustees, this should serve as a starting point for the Court in that a period of ineligibility should undoubtedly be imposed on the trustees. Thus, the only thing left to decide was the length of the period. It was further submitted that a period of ineligibility would facilitate the

restoration of beneficiary trust and confidence in their representatives, as the lengthy and costly litigation that was required to hold the trustees to account has damaged relationships. The applicants argued that an ineligibility period of three three-year terms (nine years in total) would be an appropriate length of time, and that this period would be appropriate for all former trustees who had been found in breach of their fundamental trustee duties.

For Messrs Sword and Warrington, the Court concluded, having taken all the relevant factors into account, that an ineligibility period of six years (two consecutive terms of office) was appropriate. For the rest of the former trustees, the Court decided that they should serve a single term of three years of ineligibility for reappointment.

Reappointment of former trustees

Counsel for the applicants contended that none of the former trustees should be reappointed following the 2019 election because of the seriousness of their misconduct. It was argued that this deserved an appropriately serious response from the Court.

Counsel for the former trustees submitted that the former trustees' breaches of trust were largely technical in nature and that, overall, they had added value to the trust and had retained the support of the trust beneficiaries.

Counsel for both the applicants and respondents had implored the Court to defer any future election of trustees until a final decision had been issued as this would provide trust beneficiaries with a clear picture of the Court's conclusions on the matters at hand. Following the delivery of the earlier 2020 judgment, the Court saw no reason why an election should not be held to fill the remaining trustee vacancies. The Court directed the current trustees to convene an election of trustees for the vacant positions to be held on or before 28 February 2022. As the Court chose to use the date of the last election (2 February 2019) as the starting point for the former trustees' period of ineligibility for re-election, it was confirmed that any of the former trustees (except Messrs Sword and Warrington) would be eligible to stand for election at that meeting.

Further inquiry into funds paid to the former trustees

Counsel for the applicants submitted that, given that there had not been any audit or review of the actual bank account operated by the governance group, it might be appropriate for the Court to inquire further to satisfy itself that there were no further issues that would require investigation.

Counsel for the former trustees argued that no further inquiry was required as the payments made to the trustees were for services which have benefited the trust and which were satisfactorily provided. Thus, the trust would be unduly enriched if it were to receive a windfall gain by those monies being returned.

The Court did not consider any further inquiry into the trust funds paid to the former trustees to be necessary unless the results of an independent audit warranted further review. The Court was satisfied that the funding

providers were satisfied with the contract outcomes. Therefore, the payments were authorised by the Court. The Court ordered that the registrar should engage an auditor experienced in dealing with Māori land entities to undertake an audit of the trust's accounts before the next election.

Alienation – confirmation – declined – inadequate consideration

Waaka v Goldsmith – Paengaroa North A1 Section 2

(2021) 262 Waiariki MB 37 (262 WAR 37)
4 October 2021

Report by Elizabeth Derby

Whakataunga – Overview and result

Application for confirmation of a proposal to sell shares in a land block. The issue for determination was whether the purchase price was adequate. The Court found it was not adequate.

Alienation – confirmation – declined – inadequate consideration	
Date	4 October 2021
Case	Waaka v Goldsmith – Paengaroa North A1 Section 2 (235 KB PDF)
Citation	(2021) 262 Waiariki MB 37 (262 WAR 37)
Court	Te Kōti Whenua Māori – Māori Land Court
Judge(s)	Judge C T Coxhead
Earlier/later decisions	
Legislation cited	Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993, s 164.
Cases cited	
Overview and result	Mr Waaka owns interests in Paengaroa North A1 Section 2. Mr Goldsmith is a beneficiary of a trust which also owns interests in the block. Mr Goldsmith made an offer to purchase Mr Waaka's shares, valued at \$56,588.50, for a purchase price of \$10,000.00. The issue before the Court was whether the purchase price for the shares was an adequate consideration, with regard to the relationship of Mr Waaka and Mr Goldsmith and other special circumstances in this particular case. Mr Goldsmith submitted that Mr Waaka has been trying to sell his shares for over 20 years with no luck, and that the \$10,000.00 would provide a benefit to him during his lifetime, which would otherwise be unavailable. He also submitted that he sought to purchase the shares so that he can apply for an occupation order to build a home on the land.

	Because of this, he submitted that he was taking a risk in buying the shares because he has no guarantee that the trustees would consent to his application for this order. It was noted that, at the time of the hearing, Mr Waaka was not aware of the value of his shares. The Court found this to be an important consideration in terms of the circumstances of this case. Held, application dismissed. Even after taking into consideration the risk that Mr Goldsmith would be taking in buying the shares, the Court was not convinced that the purchase price was adequate consideration for shares with five times the value.
--	---

Trusts – continuing to act as trustee after resignation

Witana v Cutforth – Kohewhata 27C2A

(2021) 238 Taitokerau MB 150 (238 TTK 150)
6 October 2021

Report by Elizabeth Derby

Whakataunga – Overview and result

Decision determining whether an interim injunction should be granted to restrain trustees in relation to a development project, and whether a former trustee was entitled to participate in trustee decisions between the date of his resignation and the date of his removal. The application for an interim injunction was dismissed. The former trustee was entitled to act as a trustee during the period in question.

Trustees – trustee continuing to act as trustee after resignation – interim injunction denied	
Date	6 October 2021
Case	Witana v Cutforth – Kohewhata 27C2A (285 KB PDF)
Citation	(2021) 238 Taitokerau MB 150 (238 TTK 150)
Court	Te Kōti Whenua Māori – Māori Land Court
Judge(s)	Judge M P Armstrong
Earlier/later decisions	<i>Witana v Tau – Omapere Taraire E</i> (2019) 191 Taitokerau MB 1 (191 TTK 1).
Legislation cited	Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993, ss 19 and 231.
Cases cited	<i>Shanton Apparel Ltd v Thornton Hall Manufacturing Ltd</i> [1989] 3 NZLR 304; <i>Attorney-General v Equiticorp Industries Group Ltd</i> [1996] 1 NZLR 528; <i>GL Baker Ltd v Medway Building and Supplies Ltd</i> [1958] 1 WLR 1216; <i>Klissers Farmhouse Bakeries Limited v Harvest Bakeries Limited</i> [1985] 2 NZLR 129; <i>Bowkett v Action Finance Limited</i> [1992] 1 NZLR

	449; Lomax v Apatu – Awarua o Hinemanu Trust (2013) 22 Takitimu MB 282 (22 TKT 282); <i>Henry Roach (Petroleum) Pty Ltd v Credit House (Vic) Pty Ltd</i> [1976] VR 309; <i>Sutton v The House of Running Ltd</i> [1979] 2 NZLR 750; <i>Wellington International Airport Ltd v Air New Zealand Ltd</i> HC Wellington CIV-2007-485-1756, 2008; <i>Cayne v Global Natural Resources Plc</i> [1984] 1 All ER 225; Ngamoki-Cameron v Koopu – The Proprietors of Mangaroa and other blocks Incorporated (2014) 91 Waiariki MB 279 (91 WAR 279); Taueki v Horowhenua 11 Part Reservation Trust – Horowhenua 11 (Lake) Block (2016) 347 Aotea MB 269 (347 AOT 269).
Overview and result	A decision concerning a number of applications to determine two issues. The first, whether an interim injunction should be granted to restrain the trustees in relation to a vineyard development project. The second, to determine whether a former trustee, Dr Robust, was entitled to participate in trustee decisions between the date of his resignation and the date of his removal. The applicant submitted, as evidence of there being serious questions to be tried and, thus, a need for an interim injunction, that Dr Robust participated in the decision approving the project in breach of trust due to a conflict of interest and, as a result, the trustees were inquorate when making that decision. Held, the application seeking an urgent interim injunction was dismissed. The Court determined that there was a serious question on the issue of a conflict of interest, and that there was also a serious question as to whether the trustees were inquorate. However, the balance of convenience did not support the grant of an interim injunction. On the second issue the Court found that Dr Robust was entitled to act as a trustee following his resignation up until he was removed as a trustee by Court order. This is because a trustee still owes trustee obligations during that period and, if a trustee cannot exercise trustee powers following a valid resignation (but before removal), then he or she cannot owe trustee obligations either. Therefore, the trustee must be able to exercise trustee powers. In making this ruling the Court pointed to the different statutory context in which Māori land trusts operate from other trusts given trustees are appointed and removed by the Court.

Trusts – breach of trust – liability to repay funds – removal of trustee

Sherard v Devereux – Otakanini Church Site

(2021) 238 Taitokerau MB 185 (238 TTK 185)

8 October 2021

Report by Elizabeth Derby

Whakataunga – Overview and result

Decision to determine whether the respondents should account for funds spent in breach of trust; who, out of the trustees, should account for the funds; and whether a trustee should be removed for cause.

Trusts – repayment of funds spent in breach of trust – removal of trustee	
Date	8 October 2021
Case	Sherard v Devereux – Otakanini Church Site (275 KB PDF)
Citation	(2021) 238 Taitokerau MB 185 (238 TTK 185)
Court	Te Kōti Whenua Māori – Māori Land Court
Judge(s)	Judge M P Armstrong
Earlier/later decisions	Hill – Otakanini Māori Reservation (2015) 108 Taitokerau MB 76 (108 TTK 76); Sherard v Devereux – Otakanini Māori Reservation (Haranui Marae) (2016) 140 Taitokerau MB 60 (140 TTK 60).
Legislation cited	Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993, ss 237, 238, 239, and 338(7); Māori Reservation Regulations 1994, reg 6.
Cases cited	Rameka v Hall [2013] NZCA 203; Fenwick v Naera [2015] NZSC 68; <i>New Zealand Māori Council v Foulkes</i> [2014] NZHC 1225; Ratima v Sullivan – Tatarakina C (2017) 64 Tākitimu MB 121 (64 TKT 121); <i>Bank of New Zealand v New Zealand Guardian Trust Co Ltd</i> [1999] 1 NZLR 213; <i>Bank of New Zealand v New Zealand Guardian Trust Co Ltd</i> [1999] 1 NZLR 664; <i>Selkirk v McIntyre</i> [2013] 3 NZLR 265; Moeahu v Winitana – Waiwhetu Pā No 4 (2014) 319 Aotea MB 166 (319 AOT 166); <i>Witana v Cutforth – Kohewhata 27C2A</i> (2021) 238 Taitokerau MB 150 (238 TTK 150).
Overview and result	This decision determined whether the respondents should account for funds (amounting to over \$70,000.00) spent in breach of trust, who, out of the trustees, should account for the funds, and whether Ratu Waata should be removed as a trustee for cause. Held, the Court found that funds were spent in breach of trust. This was firstly because, out of the 11 trustees in office at that time, at least a majority had to authorise the payment of funds. The evidence showed that three trustees were effectively running the trust at that time, and those three trustees did not have sufficient authority to approve the payments.

	Secondly, the respondents also failed to properly account for those funds. There was a lack of primary records and trustee meeting minutes to prove the funds were spent for proper purposes. The Court found this to be a significant concern. The Court determined that \$67,838.86 should be repaid to the marae. The Court found that seven of the eleven trustees were jointly and severally liable to repay the money to the Otakanini Māori Reservation Trust. These seven respondents were jointly and severally liable because they were given the opportunity throughout the process to seek relief, and none did. Two of the eleven trustees were excluded from liability because they were considered to have acted honestly, having made an attempt to freeze the Trust's bank account to prevent further payments. They also supported this application. The other two were excluded because the Court considered them to have had no involvement with the trust over the relevant period, so there was no evidence to demonstrate that they would have been aware of the activity of the other trustees, or the breaches that occurred. Finally, the Court found that Mr Waata was personally liable to repay funds to the trust (along with the other respondents). This liability arose because of breaches of trust concerning the payment of trust funds. Further, because Mr Waata is now a debtor to the trust, and because of his conduct, he is no longer suitable to hold office. Thus, the Court found that he should be removed as a trustee for cause.
--	--

Review of trust – variations to trust instrument

Bamber – Tahorakuri A

(2021) 259 Waiariki MB 274 (259 WAR 274)
10 August 2021

Report by Hinemoana Markham-Nicklin

Whakataunga – Overview and result

The case concerns two applications filed in 2012 and 2017 seeking a review of trust and variations to the trust deed to allow for an owners' hui to be held annually, the payment of trustee fees per meeting and reimbursement for trustees' travel expenses. Reimbursement for trustees' travel costs had occurred prior to the variation and trustees were ordered to repay these costs prior to the variation being agreed to. Court granted the variations as sought.

Review of trust – variation to trust deed granted – repayment of unapproved trustee travel expenses

Date	10 August 2021
Case	Bamber – Tahorakuri A (300 KB PDF)
Citation	(2021) 259 Waiariki MB 274 (259 WAR 274)
Court	Te Kōti Whenua Māori – Māori Land Court
Judge(s)	Judge Coxhead
Earlier/later decisions	
Legislation cited	Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993, ss 231 and 244.
Cases cited	Wikiriwhi v Walters – Oruanui 9 Block and Part Oruanui 10 Block, Lot 1 Deposited Plan 471989 and Lot 2 Deposited Plan 471989 (2020) 232 Waiariki MB 212 (232 WAR 212); <i>Proprietors of Mangakino Township v Māori Land Court</i> CA65/99, 16 June 1999; Corrigan – Ngatihine H2B (2014) 71 Taitokerau MB 72 (71 TTK 72); Tupe Snr v Everton – Manunui No 1 4th Residue (2015) 334 Aotea MB 227 (334 AOT 227); Clarke v Karaitiana [2011] NZCA 154; Matchitt v Butler – Matangareka 3B (2018) 189 Waiariki MB 74 (189 WAR 74); <i>Ngāi Tai Ki Tāmaki Tribal Trust v Karaka</i> [2012] NZCA 268; Marks v Orbell – Rowallan Block XIII Secs 1 and 5 Trusts (2015) 28 Te Waipounamu MB 37 (28 TWP 37); Olsen v Vercoe – Matata Parish Lot 6A (2015) 116 Waiariki 63 (116 WAR 63).
Overview and result	The case concerns two applications filed in 2012 and 2017. The 2012 application was filed by Kathleen Bamber and Dick Keremete who sought a review of trust per s 231 of Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993. Ms Bamber was particularly concerned about the management of the trust and sought a termination of trust and removal of trustees. The 2017 application was filed by Perpetual Guardian on behalf of the trustees to review the trust and vary the trust deed. Held, trustees ordered to repay reimbursements of costs prior to 30 September 2017; variations to the trust deed granted. The first issue concerned whether any Court intervention was required to address the conduct of trustees in respect of the matters raised by Ms Bamber. Ms Bamber alleged that the trustees had failed to keep proper financial records and meeting minutes, failed to hold owners' meetings and give proper notice, lacked clarity regarding trust payments among other operational concerns including allegations that trustees were dishonest and acting fraudulently and failing to manage conflicts of interest. The Court found the allegations in relation to financial records and meeting minutes were unsubstantiated. In regard to auditing the trust's accounts, all owners aside from Ms Bamber voted in support of dispensing with auditing requirement due to cost and the Court confirmed that auditing is outside the trust's current financial means. The trustees had delayed holding hui for various reasons and the Court confirmed that a hui had taken place on 7 November 2020 and notice was not at issue.

	The Court decided there was not an evidential basis for many of Ms Bamber's allegations. The second issue was the status of Ms Bamber's counterclaim with the Court deciding there was no application for a counterclaim. The third issue was whether the variations to the trust instrument sought by the trustees should be granted. The trustees sought to amend the trust order to require an owners' hui to be held annually and to allow the payment of trustee fees for meetings held as well as reimbursement for trustees' travel expenses. The trustees had already been claiming and receiving reimbursement for travel expenses and the Court found this was in breach of the trust order and trustee duties. However, the Court was not persuaded that this breach justified the removal of trustees. The Court considered that in light of the circumstances and the difficulties faced by the trustees they were entitled to retain the costs they had received since 30 September 2017, where the owners had resolved to approve fees and travel costs as a variation of the trust deed. However, the trustees were ordered to repay the costs they received prior to that date. The Court considered that there was no opposition to the variations to the trust deed and the amounts sought by the trustees were reasonable. These changes to the trust instrument were granted.
--	---

Te Rōpū Whakamana i Te Tiriti o Waitangi – Waitangi Tribunal

Te Mana Whatu Ahuru: Take a Takiwā

Te Mana Whatu Ahuru: Report of Te Rohe Pōtae Claims – pre-publication version part VI

Te Rōpū Whakamana i Te Tiriti o Waitangi (Wai 898, 2020)

Report by Zoe Rose-Curnow

Whakataunga – Overview

The Waitangi Tribunal released the sixth and final part of its report on Te Rohe Pōtae Claims at the end of 2020. This report follows on from part V which was released in June 2020. Part VI focuses on the nearly 280 iwi, hapū, whānau, block-specific and district-wide claims lodged in the inquiry. The claims are grouped by takiwā (sub-region), and the Tribunal has attempted to summarise every claim, situate them within their local context, and record any claim-specific findings.

Parts I to V of the Tribunal's magisterial report on its district inquiry, comprising 24 kaupapa chapters, were released progressively in pre-publication format since September 2018. They focused on the major thematic issues agreed by parties, addressed and made findings on the impact of Crown actions, omissions, policy, and legislation on the ability of Te Rohe Pōtae Māori to exercise mana whakahaere and tino rangatiratanga, in a range of contexts and periods.

See [Te Mana Whatu Ahuru: Report on Te Rohe Pōtae Claims Part I](#) for a summary of chapters 1-6.

See [Te Mana Whatu Ahuru: Report of Te Rohe Pōtae Claims Part II](#) for a summary on chapters 7-11.

See [Te Mana Whatu Ahuru: Report of Te Rohe Pōtae Claims Part III](#) for a summary on chapters 12-17.

See [Te Mana Whatu Ahuru: Report of Te Rohe Pōtae Claims Part IV](#) for a summary on chapters 18-22.

See [Te Mana Whatu Ahuru: Report of Te Rohe Pōtae Claims Part V](#) for a summary on chapters 23-24.

For a shorter overview see [Te Rohe Pōtae district inquiry – Te Mana Whatu Ahuru: Report on Te Rohe Pōtae Claims – overview](#)

Te Mana Whatu Ahuru (Part VI)	
Date	21 December 2020
Case	Te Mana Whatu Ahuru: Report on Te Rohe Pōtae Claims Part VI (5.9 MB, PDF)
Citation	Wai 898, 2020
Court	Te Rōpū Whakamana i Te Tiriti o Waitangi
Judge(s)	Deputy Chief Judge Fox (presiding officer), Sir Hirini Mead, Professor Pou Temara, John Baird, and Dr Aroha Harris

Introduction

This report, titled 'Take a Takiwā', focuses on the nearly 280 iwi, hapū, whānau, block-specific and district-wide claims lodged in the inquiry.

The Tribunal has aimed to summarise every claim, to situate each within its local context, and to record claim-specific findings. The claims are grouped according to takiwā: the seven geographical sub-regions which comprise Te Rohe Pōtae and where claimants shared traditional evidence with the Tribunal at the very start of the inquiry process in 2010.

The inquiry district extends from Whāingaroa Harbour to northern Taranaki, and inland to the Waikato River and Taumarunui. The seven takiwā are:

1. Waipā-Pūniu
2. Taumarunui

3. Kāwhia-Aotea
4. Whāingaroa
5. Te Kūiti-Hauāuru
6. Waimiha-Ōngarue
7. Mōkau

This article follows these takiwā as they have been laid out by the Tribunal in its report. For each takiwā, the claims have been grouped into "well-founded" and "not well-founded", and where applicable, specific findings are reported.

Additionally, the Tribunal's jurisdiction to inquire into and report on certain Te Rohe Pōtae claims – especially those regarding raupatu – was constrained by Treaty settlements reached between the Crown and some iwi and hapū. The settlement legislation which affected claims in this inquiry is the Waikato Raupatu Claims Settlement Act 1995, the Ngāti Tama Claims Settlement Act 2003, the Raukawa Claims Settlement Act 2014, the Maraeroa A and B Settlement Act 2012, and the Ngāti Tamaoho Claims Settlement Act 2018.

1. Waipā-Pūniu

Ngā Iwi me ngā Hapū

Claimants in this takiwā affiliate to, or made claims on behalf of, the following groups:

- Ngāti Paretekawa
- Ngāti Unu and Ngāti Kahu
- Ngāti Ngutu
- Ngāti Wharekōkōwai
- Ngāti Ngāwaero
- Ngāti Apakura
- Ngāti Parewaeono

Claims settled by the Raukawa Claims Settlement Act 2014

During the inquiry process, the Raukawa claims were settled by the Raukawa Claims Settlement Act 2014. The Act provides that subject to the Deed of Settlement, the Raukawa historical claims are 'settled'. Therefore, the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to make any findings or recommendations in respect of Raukawa historical claims. This applies to the following claims:

- Wai 255, 389, 443, 538, 1340, 1472, 1473, 1474, 1602, 1615, 1708, 1769, 1887, 2019, 2076, 2077, 2078, 2329. All the claimants in this group represent hapū affiliated to Raukawa. The Wai 443 claim is intended to be the overarching claim for Raukawa and to represent the wider claim group

- Hinemata Hapū Claim (Wai 1944)
- Ngāti Huia Land Alienation (Wright) Claim (Wai 2267)

Maraeroa A and B blocks

To the extent that a claim concerns the Maraeroa A and B blocks, the Maraeroa A and B Settlement Act 2012 removes the Tribunal's jurisdiction to inquire into or make findings on historical claims relating to land within these two blocks. The Tribunal's findings are attributable to the following claims to the extent that it relates to lands outside Maraeroa A and B blocks:

- Tokanui Block Claim (Wai 1099)
- Te Māpara and Kahuwera Land Blocks Claim (Wai 1100)
- Ōtorohanga Land Block Claim (Wai 1132)
- Ouruwhero Land Block Claim (Wai 1133)
- Aōtea Land Blocks Claim (Wai 1137)
- Waipā River Claim (Wai 1138)
- Ketemaringi-Hurakia Forest Reserve Claim (Wai 1139)
- Descendants of Rewi Manga Maniapoto Claim (Wai 1798)

The Ngāti Tamaoho Claims Settlement Act 2018

The Ngāti Tamaoho Claims Settlement Act 2018 settled Ngāti Tamaoho's historical claims, and removes the Tribunal's jurisdiction to inquire into or make findings on Ngāti Tamaoho's claims. This applies to the following claim:

- Ngāti Mahanga, Ngāti Tamaoho, and Ngāti Apakura (Tahapeehi) Lands Claim (Wai 1992)

Well-founded claims

The majority of claims were found to be well-founded by the Tribunal. The Tribunal reached this conclusion having considered (a) the extent to which their findings on general issues affecting Te Rohe Pōtae Māori apply to this claim and (b) whether the claim raises specific local allegations or issues requiring additional Tribunal findings.

The Tribunal listed which of their findings on general issues (set out in chapters 4-24 of the report) applied to each claim. This can be found against each claim in the report.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Other claims in the same claim group
Tokanui Land claim (Wai 440)	Robert Taohua Te Huia, Robert Mihi Elliot, Harold Te Pikikotuku Maniapoto, Jocelyn Rangimamae Johnson (nee Muraahi), Walter	Ngāti Paretekawa, Ngāti Paea, Ngāti Maniapoto/Raukawa affiliation, and Tainui.	

	Wayne Winiata Taitoko, Tiriti-o- Waitangi Emery (nee Maraku) (1994), Glen Muraahi, John Farrah, and Pania Roa (2007).		
Hauturu East 3B2 and 3A blocks Claim (Wai 457)	Meihana Uenuku Tuwhata Tuhoro (1994), Caroline Turner, Marina Angina Tuhoro, Peter Tuhoro, John Tuhoro, James Tuhoro, Tommy Mike Tuhoro, Jimmy Tuhoro, Ilyace Darling Roberts (nee Tuhoro), Ann King-Webb (nee Tuhoro), Janie Te Aroha Kewpie Tuhoro, Joseph Sonny Tuhoro, and Anthony Mehana Tuhoro (2006).	Descendants of Te Meihana Tuhoro.	
Waikowhitiwhiti Block (Ōtorohanga Town Hall) Claim (Wai 472)	Miria Tauariki (1994).	The descendants of Parehuia Maratini.	472, 847, 986, 993, 1015, 1016, 1054, 1058, 1095, 1115, 1437, 1586, 1608, 1612, 1965, 2120, 2335. All claimants in the group are descendants of Maniapoto and describe themselves as 'Te Hauāuru claimants'. They represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.
Ngāti Ngāwaero Land Blocks Claim (Wai 551)	George Searancke, Piripi Te Ruruanga Kapa, Jack Te Ngaio, Rewi Santa Panapa, Pura Panapa, Reremoana Jones, Shannon Wetere, Pare Te Wiwini Hunia, Te Ngaehere Herangi, Ngaroimata Waaka, Janet Hede, and Rosie Herbert (1995).	The descendants of the hapū Ngāti Ngāwaero.	551, 948. The claimants in this group are Ngāti Ngāwaero or Ngāti Unu.
Ngāti Kauwhata Lands and Resources Claim (Wai 784)	Gloria Kereama-Baker (1999), Rodney Graham (2006), Charles Graham and Kevin Emery (2007), and Edward Penetito and Adeline Anderson (2009).	Themselves, the Kauwhata Treaty Claims Komiti, and Ngā Uri Tangata o Ngāti Kauwhata ki Te Tonga.	972, 784, 1482.

Kakepuku Mountain and Kakepuku Block Claim (Wai 846)	Lynnette Gloria Waitiahoaho Te Ruki (1999), Gary Shane Te Ruki, George Waraki Te Ruki, Gary David Brent Te Ruki, and Isobel Waitiahoaho Emery (2012).	Ngāti Kahu, Ngāti Unu, the Te Kopua Marae Committee and the Te Kopua Marae Trustees.	
Kōpua 1 Block and Other Lands Claim (Wai 847)	Beryl Roa (2000).	Hapū in the Ngāti Maniapoto rohe.	472, 847, 986, 993, 1015, 1016, 1054, 1058, 1095, 1115, 1437, 1586, 1608, 1612, 1965, 2120, 2335. All claimants in the group are descendants of Maniapoto and describe themselves as 'Te Hauāuru claimants'. They represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.
Tokanui and Ōtorohanga Land Confiscation Claim (Wai 948)	Rawiri Bidois and Piripi Kapa (2001) and Millie Maringirangi Bidois (2006).	Ngāti Unu, Ngāti Te Kanawa, and Ngāti Taumata.	551, 948. The claimants in this group are members of Ngāti Ngāwaero or Ngāti Unu.
Ngāti Kauwhata ki te Tonga Surplus Lands Claim (Wai 972)	Edward Tautahi Penetito, Shane Dean Tautahi Penetito, Adeline Francis Anderson, Penahira Simeon, William Papanui, Kewana Emery, Anaru Te One Himiona, Donald Koro Tait, and Margaret Anne Love.	Themselves, the Ngāti Kauwhata Claims Committee, Te Marae Komiti o Kauwhata Trust and Ngā Uri Tangata o Ngata Kauwhata.	784, 972, 1482.
Ōtorohanga Township and Lands Claim (Wai 986)	May Te Kanawa and others (2002).	Ngāti Urunumia, Ngāti Hinewai, Ngāti Rungaterangi, Ngāti Rora, Ngāti Taiwa, and Ngāti Parewaeono.	472, 847, 986, 993, 1015, 1016, 1054, 1058, 1095, 1115, 1437, 1586, 1608, 1612, 1965, 2120, 2335. All claimants in the group are descendants of Maniapoto and describe themselves as 'Te Hauāuru claimants'. They represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.
Neha King Country Lands	Eddie Neha and others (2001).	Himself and others for and on	As above.

Claim (Wai 993)		behalf of Ngāti Urunumia, Ngāti Rungaterangi, Ngāti Te Rahurahu, Ngāti Matakore, Ngāti Hinewai, Ngāti Parewhata, Ngāti Ngāwaero, Ngāti Paretekawa, Ngāti Taiwa, Ngāti Parewaeono, Ngāti Uekaha, and Ngāti Paretāpoto.	
Hauturu West Block Claim (Wai 1004)	Mike Taitoko, Nelson Herbert, Kape Te Kanawa, Jim Taitoko, Piko Davis, Steve Walsh, Mavis Walters, and Kathy Te Kanawa (2001).	All the descendants of 'ngā tūpuna, Ko Turongo, Ko Whatihua, Ko Matuaiwi, Ko Apakura, Ko Matamata ki te Rangi.'	
Ngāti Maniapoto Te Awaroa Block Claim (Wai 1015)	Jack Tamaki and Bob Tata (2001) and Manny Tata (2011).	Hapū in the Ngāti Maniapoto rohe.	472, 847, 986, 993, 1015, 1016, 1054, 1058, 1095, 1115, 1437, 1586, 1608, 1612, 1965, 2120, 2335. All claimants in the group are descendants of Maniapoto and describe themselves as 'Te Hauāuru claimants'. They represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.
Te Awaroa B4 Section 4B1 and Hauturu Waipuna C Blocks Claim (Wai 1016)	Loui Rangitaawa and others.	Hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.	As above.
Pirongia Allotment No 265 Claim (Wai 1054)	Walter Te Huia Tata (2002).	His family and the descendants of Reihana Wahanui Te Huatare.	As above.
Orahiri and Other Blocks Claim (Wai 1058)	Barry Benjamin Carr (2002).	Hapū in the Ngāti Maniapoto rohe.	As above.

Huiputea Block Claim (Wai 1095)	Thomas Charles Roa (2003).	His family and hapū Ngāti Hinewai, Ngāti Rungaterangi, Ngāti Matakore, Ngāti Parewaeono, Ngāti Urunumia, Ngāti Paretāpoto, Ngāti Taiwa, and other hapū of Ngāti Maniapoto.	As above.
Waikeria Regional Prison Farm Claim (Wai 1098)	John Mana Roa.	Himself and 'the collective of the Muraahi, Waho, Patea and Mokau whānau'. They belong to Ngāti Te Rahurahu, Ngāti Ngutu, Ngāti Manga and Ngāti Paretekawa.	
Tokanui Block Claim (Wai 1099)	Raymond Francis Mokau (2003).	Ngā tūpuna Mokau Hapimana and Te Whakataute Te Huia of Ngāti Maniapoto and their descendants.	1099, 1100, 1132, 1133, 1136, 1137, 1138, 1139, 1798. The claimants in this group are members of Ngāti Paretekawa and Ngāti Parewaeono.
Te Māpara and Kahuwera Land Blocks Claim (Wai 1100)	Harriet Rose Chase (2003).	The extended whānau of Napinapi Marae and local hapū.	As above.
Kaipihia Block Alienation Claim (Wai 1115)	Harry Turner (2002).	His family and hapū Ngāti Taramatau, Ngāti Hikairo, Ngāti Apakura, and other hapū of Ngāti Maniapoto.	472, 847, 986, 993, 1015, 1016, 1054, 1058, 1095, 1115, 1437, 1586, 1608, 1612, 1965, 2120, 2335. All claimants in the group are descendants of Maniapoto and describe themselves as 'Te Hauāuru claimants'. They represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.
Ōtorohanga Land Block Claim (Wai 1132)	Wiremu Clarke and Winifred Rika (2003) and Raymond Monk (2009).	Themselves and the descendants of Ngāti Parewaeono.	1099, 1100, 1132, 1133, 1137, 1138, 1139, 1798. The claimants in this group are members of

			Ngāti Paretekawa and Ngāti Parewaeono.
Ouruwhero Land Block Claim (Wai 1133)	As above.	As above.	As above.
Tokanui and Pokuru Land Blocks Claim (Wai 1136)	Kaawhia Muraahi and Maehe Joseph Muraahi (2003).	The extended whānau of Te Muraahi Niketi, Taurangamowa o Te Kohika, Pareumuroa Te Kohika and Patea Taanirau of Ngaati Te Rahurahu and Ngaati Paretekaawa.	As above.
Aōtea Land Blocks Claim (Wai 1137)	Kaawhia Muraahi and Maehe Joseph Muraahi (2003).	The tūpuna of Rewi Manga Maniapoto and other rangatira within Maniapoto and Te Rohe Pōtae.	As above.
Waipā River Claim (Wai 1138)	Winifred Rika and Kaawhia Muraahi (2003) and Raymond Monk (2009).	Themselves, their tūpuna, the Te Keeti Marae, and the hapū of Ngāti Parewaeono.	As above.
Ketemaringi-Hurakia Forest Reserve Claim (Wai 1139)	Winifred Clarke Rika and Kaawhia Muraahi (2003) and Raymond Monk (2009).	Their ancestors in common and the hapū of Ngāti Parewaeono.	1099, 1100, 1132, 1133, 1137, 1138, 1139, 1798. The claimants in this group are members of Ngāti Paretekawa and Ngāti Parewaeono.
Te Uri o Te Hira Kīngi Claim (Wai 1360)	Lee Ann Head (2006.)	Te Uri o Te Hira Kīngi. The claim is whānau-based. The whānau belong to Ngāti Kaputuhi, Ngāti Pourāhui, Ngāti Parewaeono, Ngāti Paretekawa-Ngāti Manga, and Ngāti Te Rahurahu, all hapū of Ngāti Maniapoto.	
Te Akaiimapuhia Māori Land	Mike Taitoko.	Te Akaiimapuhia Maori Incorporation.	

Incorporation Claim (Wai 1389)			
Parish of Pirongia Lot 359 Claim (Wai 1437)	Te Aroha Norman Apirana (2007).	The descendants of Mihi Piro.	472, 847, 986, 993, 1015, 1016, 1054, 1058, 1095, 1115, 1437, 1586, 1608, 1612, 1965, 2120, 2335. All claimants in the group are descendants of Maniapoto and describe themselves as 'Te Hauāuru claimants'. They represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.
Ngāti Apakura ki Kahotea Lands Claim (Wai 1469)	Jenny Charman, Jack Cunningham, Rangitiepā Huriwaka, and Te Ra Wright (2007).	Ngāti Apakura. The claimants are 'members of the iwi of Ngāti Apakura, who formerly lived at Rangiaohia, and whose kāinga is now at Kahotea, north of Ōtorohanga'.	1469, 2291. These claims 'represent the comprehensive Ngāti Apakura te iwi claims before this Inquiry District'.
Te Kopua Marae, Ngāti Ngā Waero, and Ngāti Unu Hapū Claim (Wai 1481)	Jack Te Ngaio Tamaki, Bishop Brian Tamaki, Patricia Anne Cowley, and Douglas Allen Tamaki.	Ngāti Ngawaero and Ngāti Unu.	
Te Kotahitanga o te Iwi o Ngāti Wehi Wehi Claim (Wai 1482)	Richard Edward Orzecki, Ropata William Miratana, and Patricia Ngatakutai Jacobs.	Themselves and Te Kotahitanga o Te Iwi o Ngāti Wehi Wehi.	784, 972, 1482.
Effects of Crown Government (Searancke and Others) Claim (Wai 1504)	Mihirawhiti Searancke, Renee Hinerangi Searancke, Doreen Hinemania Richards, and others (2008).	Herself, her mother Renee Hinerangi Searancke, and their whānau.	
Ngāti Ingoa (McDonald) Claim (Wai 1523)	Morehu McDonald.	The Rawiri and Rapata whānau.	
Descendants of Te Maawe Uri o Newha and Nathaniel Barrett Claim (Wai 1586)	Dawn Magner (2008).	Herself and the descendants of Te Maawe Uri o Newha and Nathaniel Barrett.	.472, 847, 986, 993, 1015, 1016, 1054, 1058, 1095, 1115, 1437, 1586, 1608, 1612, 1965, 2120, 2335. All claimants in

			the group are descendants of Maniapoto and describe themselves as 'Te Hauāuru claimants'. They represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.
Te Whakataute Interests Claim (Wai 1593)	Wairehua R Te Huia, Te Pikikōtuku Harold Maniapoto, Matarangimahue Valerie Ingley, Tamatea D Te Huia, Te Kawenata R Anderson, and Paranapa R Otimi (2008).	Nga Uri o Te Whakataute.	
Ngāti Te Kanawa and Ngāti Te Peehi (Green) Claim (Wai 1595)	Elvie Green (2008).	Ngāti Te Kanawa and Ngāti Te Peehi.	
Taumatatotara Blocks Claim (Wai 1608)	Weno Iti (2008).	Ngāti Maniapoto.	472, 847, 986, 993, 1015, 1016, 1054, 1058, 1095, 1115, 1437, 1586, 1608, 1612, 1965, 2120, 2335. All claimants in the group are descendants of Maniapoto and describe themselves as 'Te Hauāuru claimants'. They represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.
Ngāti Kaputahi Claim (Wai 1759)	Rore Stafford and Paul Meredith (2008).	All members of Ngāti Kaputahi.	The same claimants also lodged the Wai 1760 claim.
Oneroa Whānau Claim (Wai 1760)	Rore Stafford and Paul Meredith (2009).	All members of the Oneroa Whānau.	The same claimants also lodged the Wai 1759 claim.
Solomon Opataia Tane Whānau and Ngāti Uekaha Claim (Wai 1761)	Roa Edmund Tane (2008).	Solomon Opataia Tane Whānau and Ngāti Uekaha.	
Te Haate Whānau Claim (Wai 1765)	Gordon Thomson (2008).	Ruby Davis, Margaret Graham, Heperea Peno Te Haate and families, and	

		those members of the extended Te Haate Whānau who are not represented in past, current or future claims of interest affecting all descendants of Wipaia Manu Te Haate.	
Ngāti Te Rahurahu and Ngāti Paretekawa (Patea) Claim (Wai 1771)	David Patea (2008).	Descendants of original owners of Kahuwera, Parish of Tamahere, Tokanui, Waipapa, and Hauhungaroa land blocks.	
Descendants of Rewi Manga Maniapoto Claim (Wai 1798)	Aperhama Nuitone, Pania Roa, Jocelyn Johnson, and Te Mauri Mei Maguire (2008).	Ngāti Paretekawa.	Other claims in the same claim group 1099, 1100, 1132, 1133, 1136, 1137, 1138, 1139, 1798. The claimants in this group are members of Ngāti Paretekawa and Ngāti Parewaeono.
Ngāti Paretekawa Health Issues Claim (Wai 1818)	Thomas Te Winitana Maniapoto, Winston Te Winitana Maniapoto, and Georgina Marata Haereroa (2008).	Themselves and Te Pae Tapu o Paretekawa for Ngāti Paretekawa.	
Ngā Tupuna Awa (Maniapoto) Claim (Wai 1926)	Harold Te Pikikotuku Maniapoto and Dana Erina Moala-Maniapoto (2008).	The members of the Mangatoatoa, Parawera, Owairaka, Aotearoa, and Te Kopua Marae, and the members of the Ngāti Maniapoto, Ngāti Raukawa, Ngāti Hikairo, Ngāti Apakura, Tuwharetoa, and Waikato-Tainui tribes 'having customary interests in the Tupuna Awa'.	
Waitomo Lands (Tauariki)	Miria Tauariki (2008).	Ngāti Uekaha.	472, 847, 986, 993, 1015, 1016, 1054, 1058, 1095, 1115,

Claim (Wai 1965)			1437, 1586, 1608, 1612, 1965, 2120, 2335. All claimants in the group are descendants of Maniapoto and describe themselves as 'Te Hauāuru claimants'. They represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.
Ngāti Mahanga, Ngāti Tamaoho, and Ngāti Apakura (Tahapeehi) Lands Claim (Wai 1992)	Piriwhariki Tahapeehi (2008).	Ngāti Mahanga, Ngāti Tamaoho, and Ngāti Apakura hapū.	
Ngāti Paretekawa non-Raupatu Claim (Wai 2014)	Harold Te Pikikotuku Maniapoto, Thomas Te Whiwhi Maniapoto, Dana Erina Maniapoto, Maria Pare Raukawa Maniapoto, and Joana Johnston (2008).	Themselves and Te Pae Tapu o Paretekawa for Ngāti Paretekawa.	2014, 2068.
Ngāti Paretekawa Lands (Parangi) Claim (Wai 2015)	Sonya Kararaina Parangi, Dana Erina Maniapoto and Walter Wayne Winiata Taitoko (2008).	Themselves and Te Pae Tapu O Ngaati Paretekawa for Ngaati Paretekawa.	
Wipaea Manu Trust/Ngāti Paia Lands (Farrar) Claim (Wai 2018)	John Farrar, Wayne Fitzell, Jacqueline Newton, Joanne Thomson, Gordon Thomson, Pepi Farrar, and Raphael Rolleston (2008).	Wipaea Manu Trust and themselves and the beneficiaries and hapū of Ngāti Paia.	
Ngāti Paretekawa (Maniapoto and Others) Raupatu Claim (Wai 2068)	Harold Te Pikikotuku Maniapoto, Winston Te Winitana Maniapoto, Sonya Kararaina Parangi, Jack Tahana, and Rovina Te Kawenata Maniapoto-Anderson (2008).	Themselves and Te Pae Tapu o Paretekawa and for the benefit of the members of Ngāti Paretekawa.	2014, 2068.
Descendants of Uekaha Lands (Aranui) Claim (Wai 2120)	Hinekahukura (Tuti) Aranui (2008).	The descendants of Ngāti Uekaha.	472, 847, 986, 993, 1015, 1016, 1054, 1058, 1095, 1115, 1437, 1586, 1608, 1612, 1965, 2120, 2335. All claimants in the group are descendants of Maniapoto and

			describe themselves as 'Te Hauāuru claimants'. They represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.
Descendants of Mere Penetita Claim (Wai 2274)	Perry Taituha (2008).	The descendants of Mere Penetita.	
Mangaroa 2 Lands Alienation (Fenton) Claim (Wai 2291)	Raymond Anton Fenton and Gordon Lennox.	Themselves and Ngāti Apakura.	1469, 2291.
Ngā Uri o Ropata (Maniapoto) Claim (Wai 2312), Ropata Interests Claim	Thomas Te Whiwhi Maniapoto, Harold Te Pikikōtuku Maniapoto, and Dana Erina Maniapoto.	Themselves and Ngā Uri o Ropata.	
Te Pae Tapu o Paretekawa and Ngā Uri o Te Whiwhi Mokau (Maniapoto) Claim (Wai 2313)	Thomas Te Whiwhi Maniapoto, Harold Te Pikikōtuku Maniapoto, and Jacqueline Wiripine Smith (2008).	Themselves and Te Pae Tapu o Paretekawa for Ngā Uri o Te Whiwhi Mokau.	
Te Pae Tapu o Paretekawa and Ngā Whakatupu o Peehi Tukorehu (Maniapoto) Claim (Wai 2314)	Thomas Te Whiwhi Maniapoto, Harold Te Pikikōtuku Maniapoto, and Dana Erina Maniapoto (2008).	Themselves and Te Pae Tapu o Paretekawa for ngā whakatupu o Peehi Tukōrehu, and more specifically for the Ngāti Paretekawa sections of Ngāti Maniapoto.	
Ngāti Uekaha Taonga and Land (Weno Iti) Claim (Wai 2335)	Weno Iti (2008).	Himself and the descendants of Ngāti Uekaha.	472, 847, 986, 993, 1015, 1016, 1054, 1058, 1095, 1115, 1437, 1586, 1608, 1612, 1965, 2120, 2335. All claimants in the group are descendants of Maniapoto and describe themselves as 'Te Hauāuru claimants'. They represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.

Not well-founded

The Tribunal found that the following claims are not well-founded because:

- the allegations of Crown actions and/or omissions and prejudice contained in the claim are incomplete and/or unspecific; and/or
- they make allegations of specific local Treaty breaches and prejudice that are not encompassed by the findings listed in parts I-V of this report; and/or
- the Tribunal did not receive sufficient evidence to allow it to make any additional findings on the specific local allegations raised in the claim.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Additional comments
Te Akaiimapuhia Māori Land Incorporation Claim (Wai 1389)	Mike Taitoko.	Te Akaiimapuhia Maori Incorporation.	
Ngāti Te Kanawa and Ngāti Te Peehi (Green) Claim (Wai 1595)	Elvie Green (2008).	Ngāti Te Kanawa and Ngāti Te Peehi.	The claim makes the additional allegation that Forest Rangers destroyed a 'refugee centre' at Te Mahoe, causing Ngāti Te Kanawa and Ngāti Te Peehi to flee to the Te Rohe Pōtae region. Having considered all the evidence presented to it, the Tribunal found this aspect of the claim is not well-founded because the Tribunal did not receive sufficient evidence to allow it to make any additional findings on the specific local allegations or issues raised in the claim.

Specific local allegations requiring additional Tribunal findings

In addition to the conclusions listed above, the Tribunal made additional specific findings on the following claims:

Ngāti Apakura ki Kahotea Lands Claim (Wai 1469)

In relation to the issue of climate change, the Tribunal noted the decision of the Presiding Officer, dated 6 September 2012, that 'the issues of climate change/global warming and the Emissions Trading Scheme will not be inquired into as part of this inquiry'. It was the conclusion of the Presiding Officer that 'climate change/global warming and the Emissions Trading Scheme are kaupapa issues that are more suited to be heard as part of a separate kaupapa inquiry than this district inquiry'.

Effects of Crown Government (Searancke and Others) Claim (Wai 1504) & Descendants of Uekaha Lands (Aranui) Claim (Wai 2120)

These claims raise issues related to the Crown's alleged failure to protect the mana whenua rights of wāhine within Te Rohe Pōtae. Claims specific to the status and recognition of mana wāhine are not encompassed by the general findings presented in chapters 4-24 of the report. The issues they raise are to be addressed in the Waitangi Tribunal's ongoing mana wāhine kaupapa inquiry. However, the special contribution of mana wāhine to the inquiry district is discussed at section 18.5.4 and throughout parts I-IV of the report.

Ngāti Paretekawa Health Issues Claim (Wai 1818)

The Tribunal did not receive sufficient evidence to allow it to make any definite additional findings on the allegation that the Crown has burdened Ngāti Paretekawa with the care of the Tokanui Mental Hospital cemetery. However, it noted that it seems likely the overlay of an institutional cemetery on a known urupā and the Crown's subsequent withdrawal of maintenance doubly prejudiced uri of kōiwi buried there, including Ngāti Paretekawa.

2. Taumarunui

Ngā Iwi me ngā Hapū

Claimants in this takiwā affiliate to, or made claims on behalf of, the following groups:

Ngāti Hāua, Ngāti Hekeāwai, and Tamahaki (Whanganui), and Ngāti Hinemihi. Other significant groups are Ngāti Hikairo, Ngāti Hinewai, Ngāti Hotu, Ngāti Rangatahi, Ngāti Urunumia, Ngāti Pahere, Ngāti Hari, and Ngāti Huru (Maniapoto).

Maraeroa A and B blocks

To the extent that a claim concerns the Maraeroa A and B blocks, the Maraeroa A and B Settlement Act 2012 removes the Tribunal's jurisdiction to inquire into or make findings on historical claims relating to land within these two blocks. The Tribunal's findings are attributable to the following claims to the extent that it relates to lands outside Maraeroa A and B blocks:

- Te Reu Reu Land Claim (Wai 651)
- Ngāti Huru Claim (Wai 1230)
- Mahuta Hapū Lands and Resources Claim (Wai 1435)

Well-founded claims

The Tribunal determined the majority of claims were well-founded. The Tribunal reached this conclusion having considered (a) the extent to which their findings on general issues affecting Te Rohe Pōtae Māori apply to this claim and (b) whether the claim raises specific local allegations or issues requiring additional Tribunal findings.

The Tribunal listed which of their findings on general issues (set out in chapters 4-24 of the report) applied to each claim. This can be found against each claim in the report.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Other claims in the same claim group
Ōkahukura Block Claim (Wai 37)	Terrill Temanua Campbell (2006).	Themselves and Ngāti Hikairo.	37, 933, 1196. All three claims were lodged by Ngāti Hikairo claimants.
Whanganui ki Maniapoto Claim (Wai 48)	Kevin Amohia (2008).	Ngāti Hāua.	48, 81, 146.
Rangitoto – Tuhua 55A Block Claim (Wai 50)	Paora Ropata (1988).	Himself, and all members of the Te Kotahitanga Incorporated Society and ngā hapū katoa o Te Rohe Pōtae.	50, 1059.
Waihaha and Other Lands Claim (Wai 81)	Kevin Amohia (2008).	Ngāti Hāua.	48, 81, 146.
King Country Lands Claim (Wai 146)	Kevin Amohia (2001).	Ngāti Hāua.	48, 81, 146.
Hutt Valley Lands Claim (Wai 366)	Roger Puhia Herbert (1993) 138 and Wayne Herbert (1999).	Ngāti Rangatahi.	366, 1064.
Taumatamahoe Block Claim (Wai 555)	Robert Wayne Cribb and Rangi Joseph Bristol.	Themselves and the Tamahaki Council of Hapū and Tamahaki Incorporated Society.	Wai 555 (Tamahaki) and Wai 1224 (Uenuku Tūwharetoa).
Ngāti Tūwharetoa Comprehensive Claim (Wai 575)	Te Ariki Tā Tumu te Heuheu.	Himself and the hapū of Ngāti Tūwharetoa.	
Te Reu Reu Land Claim (Wai 651)	Turoa Andrew Karatea (1996) and Anthony Nopera Karatea (2012).	All descendants of Ngāti Matakore and Ngāti Rangatahi (of Ngāti Maniapoto), Ngāti Waewae (of Ngāti Tūwharetoa), and Ngāti Pīkahu (of Ngāti Raukawa).	
Te Moana Rotoaira and Other Resources Claim (Wai 833)	Waiparaki Allen Pakau (1999), Carmen Kura Kapea-Sutcliffe, James Raumanuka Pakau, Whetumarama Pakau, Lyndon Karl Pakau	Themselves, Ngāti Pourotu, and Ngāti Te Ika of Ngāti Hikairo Iwi.	965, 1044, 1605. The claimants are Ngāti Hikairo.

	Bowring, and Daryn Roy Pakau (2008), Ema Te Toroa Tangiariki Pohatu (2011), and Rere Pakau (2013).		
Ōhura, Niho Niho, Tuhua and Ōtangiwhai Claim (Wai 845)	Amy Coburn-Levae and Hinemoa Kahu Piari Coburn.	The Tohengarua whānau and the Ngāti Waiora hapū of Ngāti Maniapoto.	
Lake Rotoaira and Wairehu Stream Claim (Wai 933)	Alec Philips.	Himself and Ngāti Hikairo.	37, 933, 1196. Consolidated under Wai 37.
Ngāti Pouroto Taurewa No 1 Block Claim (Wai 965)	Leonard Hiraka Erickson, Carmen Kura Kapea-Sutcliffe, and Ema Te Toroa Tangiariki Pohatu.	Themselves, Ngāti Pouroto, and Ngāti Te Ika of the Ngāti Hikairo Iwi.	965, 1044, 1605.
Rangitoto – Tuhua Land Block Claim (Wai 987)	Thomas Leslie Te Nuinga Tuwhangai and Wayne Anthony Houppapa.	Themselves and the hapū of Ngāti Hari/Ngāti Urunumia. They are descendants of Hari 'who was in turn of Ngāti Urunumia and Ngāti Maniapoto descent'. Ngāti Hari/Ngāti Urunumia are 'a hapū of the Ngāti Maniapoto confederation of hapū.	
Ngāti Te Ika Taupō Claim (Wai 1044)	Rawinia Konui-Paul, Te Maioro Konui, and Heta Konui (2004).	Themselves, Ngāti Pouroto, Ngāti Te Ika of Ngāti Hikairo.	965, 1044, 1605.
Toi Tu Ki Te Rangi Incorporated Society Te Rohe Pōtae Claim (Wai 1059)	Greg Keenan, Marie Stewart, and Leslie Howe (2010).	Themselves and all members of the Te Kotahitanga Incorporated Society and ngā hapū katoa o Te Rohe Pōtae.	50, 1059.
Ngāti Rangatahi Public Works Claim (Wai 1064)	Robert Waretini Tukureho Herbert (deceased) (2003) 255 and Robert Jonathan (2012).	Ngāti Rangatahi.	366, 1064.
Ngāti Kowhaikura Waimarino and Ruapehu Blocks Alienation Claim (Wai 1073)	Chris Ngataierua (2003) and Petuere Kiwara (2009).	The descendants of Te Kere Ngataierua.	1073, 1197, 1388, 1738.
Te Uri Ōhura South Claim (Wai 1147)	Michael John Le Gros (2004), Grace	Themselves, the descendants of Kopere Tanoa 1st,	1147, 1203.

	Ngaroimata Le Gros and Cedric Powhiriwhiri Tanoa (2008), and Tahuri Te Ruruku (2008).	and the descendants of Te Whiutahi who wish to be included.	
Tongariro Power Development Scheme Lands Claim (Wai 1196)	Merle Maata Ormsby, Tiaho Pillot, Daniel Ormsby, and Manu Patena.	Themselves and Ngāti Hikairo.	37, 933, 1196.
Ngāti Tumanuka Waimarino Lands Claim (Wai 1197)	Matiu Haitana (2004), Henry Haitana (2006), and Adam Haitana (2008).	The descendants of Tumanuka and their hapū Ngāti Tumanuka.	1073, 1197, 1388, 1738.
Ōhura South B and Associated Land Blocks Claim (Wai 1203)	Lois Jean Tutemahurangi, Ihaia Te Akau, and Piripi Tutemahurangi (2004).	Themselves, the descendants of Tutemahurangi and Waikura, and the descendants of Te Tarapounamu.	1147, 1203.
Uenuku Tūwharetoa Lands and Minerals Claim (Wai 1224)	Robert Wayne Cribb and Roberta Rose Williams.	All descendants of Uenuku Tūwharetoa.	555 (Tamahaki), and 1224 (Uenuku Tūwharetoa).
Ngāti Huru Claim (Wai 1230)	Tame Te Nuinga Tuwhangai, Wayne Anthony Houppapa, Abra Matena, Terry Turu, and Rangi Tahuri Te Ruruku.	Themselves and the hapū of Ngāti Huru.	
Ngāti Hekeawai Land Block Claim (Wai 1299)	Te Poumua Francis Rupe and Para Bell (2007).	Ngāti Hekeāwai. 366 A hapū of Maniapoto, they are also known as Ngāti Heke, Ngāti Wiwi, and Ngāti Kurawhatia.	
Tamakana, Ruakopiri, and Maringi Mana Whenua Claim (Wai 1388)	Matiu Haitana, Rangi Bristol, Raymond Rapana, Garth Hiroti, Aiden Gilbert, and Patrick Te Oro (2007).	Ngāti Tamakana, Ngāti Ruakopiri, and Ngāti Maringi.	1073, 1197, 1388, 1738.
Te Whare Ponga Taumatamāhoe Incorporated Society and Te Whare Ponga Whānau Trust Claim (Wai 1393)	Rosita Dixon, Phillip Ponga, Sharlane Winiata, and Geraldine Taurerewa.	Tamahaki, Uenuku, Ngāti Hinekura, Ngāti Rangitautahi, Tamakana, Ngāti Ruru, Ngāti Pare, and Ngāti Tumanuka.	
The Ngāti Hotu Rohe Claim (Wai 1408)	Monica Matamua.	Ngāti Hotu and Ngāti Hinewai.	

Mahuta Hapū Lands and Resources Claim (Wai 1435)	Anne Kimiora Craig, Ann-Marie Taitoko, and James Craig (2007).	Themselves and Ngāti Hikairo and Mahuta.	
Ngāti Hinemihi Lands and Resources Claim (Wai 1447)	Ihaia Corbet Te Akau, Dominic Otimi, and Edwin Ashford (2007).	Themselves and Ngāti Hinemihi.	
Descendants of Te Hore Te Waa Nukuraerae Claim (Wai 1594)	Geraldine Taurerewa (2008).	Her whānau and the descendants of Te Hore Nukuraerae.	
Albert and Sophia Ketu Whanau Claim (Wai 1605)	Maxine Ketu.	Herself, Ngāti Pourou, Ngāti Te Ika of Ngāti Hikairo Iwi.	965, 1044, 1605.
Waimarino Block (Bristol) Claim (Wai 1738)	Rufus Bristol (2008).	Himself and other descendants of the non-sellers in the Waimarino block.	1073, 1197, 1388, 1738.
Descendants of Ngāti Rora and Ngāti Hia (Ormsby and Hetet) Claim (Wai 1768)	Edwin Daniel Valkai Ormsby and George Ngatai Hetet (2008).	Themselves and descendants of Ngāti Rora and Ngāti Hia of Ngāti Maniapoto Iwi Tainui.	
Ngāti Hari (Turu and Canterbury) Claim (Wai 1803)	Veronica Canterbury and Terry Turu (2011).	Themselves and Ngāti Hari hapū.	
Te Uranga B2 Incorporation Claim (Wai 1994)	Alan Kerei Cockle, Andrew Matene Martin, Derek Kotuku Totorewa Wooster, Traci Houppapa, and Vonda Houppapa (2008).	The registered owners of Te Uranga B2 Incorporation of Ngāti Maniapoto descent.	

Not well-founded

The Tribunal found that the following claims are not well-founded because:

- the allegations of Crown actions and/or omissions and prejudice contained in the claim are incomplete and/or unspecific; and/or
- they makes allegations of specific local Treaty breaches and prejudice that are not encompassed by the findings listed in parts I-V of this report; and/or
- the Tribunal did not receive sufficient evidence to allow it to make any additional findings on the specific local allegations raised in the claim.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Additional comments
-------------	----------------	---------------------	---------------------

Tongariro Power Development Scheme Lands Claim (Wai 1196)	Merle Maata Ormsby, Tiaho Pillot, Daniel Ormsby, and Manu Patena.	Themselves and Ngāti Hikairo.	In their claimant-specific closing submissions (2014), the Wai 1196 claimants repeated allegations about the adverse social impacts of the Native Lands Act 1909 and the Adoption Act 1909 that appear in the cluster's consolidated claim (May 2008). The Tribunal considered this specific allegation was not well-founded.
Ngāti Hinemihi Lands and Resources Claim (Wai 1447)	Ihaia Corbet Te Akau, Dominic Otimi, and Edwin Ashford (2007).	Themselves and Ngāti Hinemihi.	The claimants raised a specific allegation concerning the circumstances of the landlocking of Petania Marae and urupā. This claim is part of the Te Rohe Pōtae district inquiry. The Tribunal considered this specific allegation was not well-founded.
Hurakia A1 Owners Claim (Wai 1597)	Phillip Crown (2008).	The Hurakia A1 owners and associated whānau.	

Withdrawn

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Other claims in the same claim group
Descendants of Rex Te Rangi ita Petera Taumata (Dunn) Lands Claim (Wai 2069)	Sharon Dunn.	Her children and mokopuna.	

3. Kāwhia-Aotea

Ngā Iwi me ngā Hapū

Claimants in this takiwā affiliate to, or made claims on behalf of, the following groups:

Ngāti Hikairo, Ngāti Whakamarurangi, Ngāti Apakura, Ngāti Te Wehi, Ngāti Whawhākia, Ngāti Mahuta, Ngāti Patupō, Hapū of Ngāti Maniapoto, Ngāti Toa Tupāhau, Ngāti Koata.

Well-founded claims

The Tribunal determined the majority of claims were well-founded. The Tribunal reached this conclusion having considered (a) the extent to which their findings on general issues affecting Te Rohe Pōtae Māori apply to this claim and (b) whether the claim raises specific local allegations or issues requiring additional Tribunal findings.

The Tribunal listed which of their findings on general issues (set out in chapters 4-24 of the report) applied to each claim. This can be found against each claim in the report.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Other claims in the same claim group
Kāwhia Fisheries Claim (Wai 74)	John Puke.	Ngāti Kiriwai, Ngāti Hounuku, Ngāti Korokino, and Ngāti Te Kanawa Te Maunu.	74, 1450, 1498, 1975, 1976, 1978, 1996, 2070. All claimants represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.
Te Uku Landing Reserve Claim (Wai 426)	Rangiwahia Kathleen Huirama Osborne.	Herself and the three hapū of Waingaro – Ngāti Tehuaki, Ngāti Tamainupō, and Ngāti Kotara.	
Te Maika Land Claim (Wai 614)	Isaac Kuila, Edith Uru Dockery, and Allan Rubay.	Themselves and the beneficiaries of the Te Maika Trust.	
Section 137 of the Māori Affairs Act 1953 Claim (Wai 656)	Linda Cudby (nee Lihou).	The descendants of Parekāhuki Parete (also known as Pare Barrett).	
Oioroa Block, Aōtea Head (King Country) Claim (Wai 827)	Huihana Rewa, Diane Bradshaw, Miki Apiti, and Thomas Moke.	Ngāti Te Weehi.	
Marokopa Reserves Claim (Wai 870)	Kahuwaiaora Hohaia (2000).	Herself and Ngāti Toa Tupāhau.	
Kāwhia Harbour, Rivers, and Lakes Claim (Wai 1112)	Manihera Watson Forbes (2002), Marlene Pikia Edwards, and Tiriata Thorne (2014).	Themselves and Te Rūnanganui o Ngāti Hikairo Incorporated.	1112, 1113, 1439, 2351, 2352, 2353. The claimants in this grouping are all members of Ngāti Hikairo.
Te Rohe Pōtae Land Alienation Claim (Wai 1113)	Manihera Watson (2002), Marlene Pikia Edwards, and Tiriata Thorne (2014).	As above.	1112, 1113, 1439, 2351, 2352, 2353.
Lands and Resources of Ngāti Ngutu/Ngāti Hua Claim (Wai 1409)	Marge Pongo Rameka (2007).	Herself, her whānau, and the hapū of Ngāti Ngutu and Ngāti Hua.	
Aōtea Harbour and Waahi Tapu Claim (Wai 1410)	Davis Apiti (2007).	Ngāti Te Wehi.	
Ngāti Te Patupō Kāwhia and Aōtea Harbours Claim (Wai 1438)	Allan Rubay (2007).	Himself and all descendants of Ngāti Patupō.	
Oparau Station Trust Claim (Wai 1439)	John Pouwhare (2007).	Himself and all the trustees and beneficial owners of the Oparau No 1 block.	1112, 1113, 1439, 2351, 2352, 2353.

Ngāti Te Wehi Kāwhia Harbour and Resources Claim (Wai 1448)	Nancy Āwhitu (2007) and Rose Pairama (2011).	The tangata whenua of Aotea Harbour, namely Ngāti Te Wehi.	1448, 1495, 1501, 1502, 1592, 1804, 1899, 1900, 2125, 2126, 2135, 2137, 2183, 2208. The claimants in this group are members of the Ngāti Te Wehi Cluster.
Hauturu West and Other Land Blocks Claim (Wai 1450)	John Kaati, Shane Edwards, and Nick Tuwhangai.	Themselves and the hapū of Ngāti Ngutu, Ngāti Kinohaku, Ngāti Te Kanawa, Ngāti Hikairo, Ngāti Tamainu, and other resident hapū of the Kāwhia Harbour.	74, 1450, 1498, 1975, 1976, 1978, 1996, 2070. All claimants represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.
Pearl Comerford Hapū of Te Rohe Pōtae Claim (Wai 1495)	Pearl Comerford (2008).	The hapū of Te Rohe Pōtae.	1448, 1495, 1501, 1502, 1592, 1804, 1899, 1900, 2125, 2126, 2135, 2137, 2183, 2208.
Ngāti Ngutu Hapū Claim (Wai 1497)	Richard Albert Williams (2008).	Ngāti Ngutu.	
Floyd Kerapa and Ngāti Ngutu Hapū Claim (Wai 1498)	Floyd Kerapa (2008).	Himself and the Ngāti Ngutu hapū.	74, 1450, 1498, 1975, 1976, 1978, 1996, 2070. All claimants represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.
Vernon Houpapa and Ngāti Ngutu Hapū Claim (Wai 1499)	Vernon Houpapa (2008).	Ngāti Ngutu and Ngāti Mahuta.	
Petunia Taylor Te Rohe Pōtae Claim (Wai 1501)	Petunia Taylor Mahara (2008), Miki Apiti, Ron Boss Mahara, and Phillip Mahara (2012).	'Those Maori of the Rohe Potae'.	1448, 1495, 1501, 1502, 1592, 1804, 1899, 1900, 2125, 2126, 2135, 2137, 2183, 2208. Members of the Ngāti Te Wehi Cluster.
Okapu F2 Land Block (Mahara) Claim (Wai 1502)	Steve Mahara (2008) and Raymond Mahara (2012).	The claimants and their whānau.	As above.

Okapu C Block (King) Claim (Wai 1534)	Janet King (2008).	Herself and the descendants of Ngāti Whawhakia.	
Ngāti Mahuta (McQueen) Claim (Wai 1587)	Te Amohia McQueen (2008).	Herself, Ngāti Mahuta, and the descendants of Te Wherowhero.	
Descendants of Turongo (New Zealand Constitution Act 1852) Claim (Wai 1588)	Phillip Tauri King (2008).	Ngāti Mahuta.	1588, 1589, 1590, 1591. The claimants are members of the 'hapuu of Ngaati Mahuta'.
Descendants of Turongo (Native Land Acts) Claim (Wai 1589)	Phillip Tauri King and Verna Tuteao.	Ngāti Mahuta.	As above.
Descendants of Turongo (Māori Reserved Land) Claim (Wai 1590)	Phillip Tauri King (2008).	Ngāti Mahuta.	As above.
Descendants of Turongo (Native Land Court) Claim (Wai 1591)	Phillip Tauri King (2008).	Ngāti Mahuta.	As above.
Moerangi (Descendants of Te Apiti) Claim (Wai 1592)	Marge Blackie (2006).	Herself and the descendants of Te Apiti.	1448, 1495, 1501, 1502, 1592, 1804, 1899, 1900, 2125, 2126, 2135, 2137, 2183, 2208. Ngāti Te Wehi Cluster.
Forbes Whānau Claim (Wai 1596)	Allan Shane Forbes (2008).	The Forbes whānau, who are descendants of Mahuta.	
Ngāti Urunumia ki Hauauru Claim (Wai 1598)	Moepatu Borell (2008).	Herself and Ngāti Urunumia ki Hauauru.	
Moke Whānau Claim (Wai 1611)	James Allen Marcum (2008).	Himself and the Moke Whānau. The claimant affiliates to Ngāti Te Wehi of Aotea/Kāwhia.	
Te Hiwi Whānau Claim (Wai 1764)	John Winara Natana Te Hiwi Junior and Te Hiwi Whānau (2008).	The Te Hiwi whānau; 'Ngāti Kapu, Te Mate Awa, Ngāti Tukorehe'.	
Descendants of Tokotahi Moke Claim (Wai 1804)	Ian Shadrock (2008).	His grandfather, Tokotahi Moke, and Tokotahi's descendants.	1448, 1495, 1501, 1502, 1592, 1804, 1899, 1900, 2125, 2126, 2135, 2137, 2183, 2208.

			Ngāti Te Wehi Cluster.
Tekikiri Meroiti Haungurunguru Toangina Toto Whānau Trust Claim (Wai 1826)	Daniel Toto (2008).	Himself, his whānau, and the descendants of his tupuna.	
Ngāti Mahanga Hourua, Ngāti Wairere, Ngāti Tai, Ngāti Paoa, Ngāti Patupō (Dixon) Claim (Wai 1897)	Boyd Turongo Dixon (2008).	Ngāti Mahanga Hourua, Ngāti Wairere, Ngāti Tai, Ngāti Paoa, Ngāti Patupō.	
Ngāti Ngutu Hapū (Helen Green) Claim (Wai 1898)	Helen Tawhairoa Green (2008).	Herself, her whānau, and the hapū of Ngāti Ngutu.	
Ngāti Te Wehi (Elizabeth Mahara) Claim (Wai 1899)	Elizabeth Mahara (2006).	Herself and Ngāti Te Wehi.	1448, 1495, 1501, 1502, 1592, 1804, 1899, 1900, 2125, 2126, 2135, 2137, 2183, 2208. Ngāti Te Wehi Cluster.
Okapu F2 Land Block (Kerapa) Claim (Wai 1900)	Isabel Kerapa (2006).	Herself and all those affected by laws concerning amalgamation, partition, and consolidation within the Rohe Pōtae Inquiry.	As above.
Wallis Whānau Claim (Wai 1908)	Christine Wallis (2009).	Herself and her descendants.	
Mokoroa, Waipuna, and Awaroa Blocks (Hepi) Claim (Wai 1974)	Koha Margaret Hepi (2008).	Ngāti Mahuta, Ngāti Ngutu, and Ngāti Kiriwai hapū.	
Awaroa and Mokoroa Blocks (Clark) Claim (Wai 1975)	Susan Rangiaroha Clark (2008).	Herself, and 'the grandchildren and further descendants of her father who have been dispossessed of their ancestral connections to their Ngātihaupoto 107 land block and other land blocks, by the operation of New Zealand succession law'.	74, 1450, 1498, 1975, 1976, 1978, 1996, 2070. All claimants represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.
Marokopa, Mangamahoe, and Hauturu West Blocks (King) Claim (Wai 1976)	Avalon King.	Ngāti Te Kanawa and Ngāti Urunumia.	As above.

Hauturu Waipuna C Block (Herbert) Claim (Wai 1978)	Fred Herbert (2008).	Himself and Ngāti Paretekawa, Ngāti Ngutu, Ngāti Te Mawe, and Ngāti Ruanui hapū.	As above.
Ngāti Ngutu, Ngāti Te Kanawa and Ngāti Urunumia (Hepi) Lands Claim (Wai 1993)	Sonny Hepi (2008).	Himself, his whānau, Ngāti Ngutu, Ngāti Te Kanawa and Ngāti Urunumia.	
Ngāti Hikairo, Ngāti Tamainu, Ngāti Taiharuru, and Ngāti Kiriwai (Jerry) Lands Claim (Wai 1995)	Howard Jerry (2008).	Himself, his whānau, and Ngāti Hikairo, Ngāti Tamainu, Ngāti Taiharuru, and Ngāti Kiriwai.	
Ngāti Ngutu and Ngāti Hua (Toia) Lands Claim (Wai 1996)	Raewyn Maria Toia (2008).	Herself and the Ngāti Ngutu and Ngāti Hua hapū.	74, 1450, 1498, 1975, 1976, 1978, 1996, 2070. All claimants represent hapū affiliated to Ngāti Maniapoto.
Te Kanawa, Ngāti Kinohaku, and Ngāti Raukawa (Reihana-Hikuroa) Lands Claim (Wai 2070)	Reg Te Ratu Reihana-Hikuroa (2008).	Himself and the Te Kanawa, Ngāti Kinohaku, and Ngāti Raukawa hapū.	As above.
Railway Lines and Assets (Whanga) Claim (Wai 2075)	Robin Tukaha Whanga (2003).	Himself and the descendants of Te Wherowhero of Waikato Maniapoto.	
Ngāti Tamainu and Ngāti Kiriwai (Pu) Claim (Wai 2084)	Shirley Pu (2008).	Herself and Ngāti Tamainu and Ngāti Kiriwai hapū.	
Ngāti Hua and Ngāti Mahuta Lands (Houpapa) Claim (Wai 2086)	Shirley Houpapa (2008).	Herself, her whānau, Ngāti Hua, and Ngāti Mahuta.	
Ngāti Kiriwai and Ngāti Mahuta (Uerata) Claim (Wai 2087)	Homai (Hopu David) Uerata (2008).	Ngāti Kiriwai and Ngāti Mahuta ki Mokoroa. These hapū affiliate to Ngāti Maniapoto.	
Mana Wāhine (Nelson) Claim (Wai 2125)	Peggy Nelson (2008).	Herself, her kuia Karena Pitman and the mana wāhine o Te Rohe Pōtae.	1448, 1495, 1501, 1502, 1592, 1804, 1899, 1900, 2125, 2126, 2135, 2137, 2183, 2208. The Ngāti Te Wehi Cluster.
Puketarata Block and Other Lands	John Mahara (2008).		As above.

(Mahara) Claim (Wai 2126)			
Ngāti Patupō Lands and Resources (Paul) Claim (Wai 2134)	Marie Paul.	Herself and Ngāti Patupō – Aotea.	
Ngāti Maniapoto and Ngāti Te Wehi Lands (Moke) Claim (Wai 2135)	Karohe Moke (2008) and Tom Herbert (2011).		1448, 1495, 1501, 1502, 1592, 1804, 1899, 1900, 2125, 2126, 2135, 2137, 2183, 2208. The Ngāti Te Wehi Cluster
Ngāti Ngutu and Ngāti Kiriwai Lands (Jenkins) Claim (Wai 2136)	Maureen Jenkins (2008).	Herself and Ngāti Ngutu and Ngāti Kiriwai hapū.	
Hapū Rangātiratanga (Brennan) Claim (Wai 2137)	Lorna Brennan (2008) and Bob Pairama (2011).	The hapū of Te Rohe Pōtae.	1448, 1495, 1501, 1502, 1592, 1804, 1899, 1900, 2125, 2126, 2135, 2137, 2183, 2208. the Ngāti Te Wehi Cluster.
Ngāti Hikairo, Ngāti Patupō, and Ngāti Te Wehi Lands (Mahara) Claim (Wai 2183)	Jack Mahara (2008).	Ngāti Hikairo, Ngāti Patupō, and Ngāti Te Wehi.	As above.
Ngāti Hikairo Lands (Reti) Claim (Wai 2208)	Diane Rewa Bradshaw (2008) and Bob Reti (2009).	Ngāti Hikairo and others.	As above.
Ngāti Whakamarurangi and Ngāti Tūirangi Lands and Waterways (Thompson) Claim (Wai 2273)	Heather Thomson (2008).	Ngāti Whakamarurangi and Ngāti Tūirangi.	
Ngāti Hikairo and Kāwhia Blocks (Barton) Claim (Wai 2352)	Phillipa Barton (2008).	Herself and her whānau, who are all of Ngāti Hikairo.	1112, 1113, 1439, 2351, 2352, 2353. The claimants in this grouping are all members of Ngāti Hikairo.
Honerau Tai Hauaru Whānau Trust and Opu land (Whiu) Claim (Wai 2353)	Hinga Whiu.	Herself and the Honerau Tai Hauaru Whānau Trust.	As above.

Not well-founded

The Tribunal found that the following claims are not well-founded because:

- the allegations of Crown actions and/or omissions and prejudice contained in the claim are incomplete and/or unspecific; and/or
- they make allegations of specific local Treaty breaches and prejudice that are not encompassed by the findings listed in parts I-V of this report; and/or
- the Tribunal did not receive sufficient evidence to allow it to make any additional findings on the specific local allegations raised in the claim.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Other claims in the same claim group
Manuaitu Blocks (Waikato) Claim (Wai 908)	Ben Ranga.	Tainui and Ngāti Ruanui (Tainui) and Ngāti Ruanui (Aotea).	Section 445 of the Maori Affairs Act 1953 gave the Māori Land Court the jurisdiction to make recommendations to the Māori Trustee to acquire 'uneconomic' interests in Māori land upon the making of consolidation orders. If the Māori Trustee consented to buy the interests, and there were no objections, the court vested the interests in the Māori Trustee thereby facilitating the alienation of those interests. However, the Tribunal received no evidence on the impact of this provision.
Ngāti Mahuta (McQueen) Claim (Wai 1587)	Te Amohia McQueen (2008).	Herself, Ngāti Mahuta, and the descendants of Te Wherowhero.	The claim raised two issues which required further consideration. The first is the claim to have been prejudiced by 'the constitutional illegitimacy' of successive New Zealand Governments. The claim also raises allegations concerning the Waikato War and the raupatu. The claim also raises allegations on whangai. The first two issues are jurisdictionally barred, and the last issue is not well-founded.
Forbes Whānau Claim (Wai 1596)	Allan Shane Forbes (2008).	The Forbes whānau, who are descendants of Mahuta.	
Iwitahi Hapū Native Council Claim (Wai 1603)	Ratahi Marshall, Lai Toy, Te Wairangi Tangataiti, Albert McQueen, and Te Amohia McQueen (2008).	'Our whanau, who are all descendants from the Whaingaroa, Aotea, Kawhia areas'.	

Ngāti Ngutu Hapū (Helen Green) Claim (Wai 1898)	Helen Tawhairoa Green (2008).	Herself, her whānau, and the hapū of Ngāti Ngutu.	The claimants raised a specific allegation concerning the Crown's acquisition of land in the Te Awaroa block in order to settle returned soldiers after the First World War. However, no evidence was brought in the inquiry about which lands were allegedly acquired for this purpose, or what their ultimate fate was. Further, the Tribunal noted the analysis of the Crown's efforts to rehabilitate and support returned soldiers in chapter 17, and the consequences for Te Rohe Pōtae Māori, is confined to the post-Second World War period.
Descendants of Io Matua Kore (McQueen) Claim (Wai 2118)	Albert McQueen and Te Amohia McQueen.	On behalf of themselves and 'the descendants of Te Wherowhero of Waikato Maniapoto'.	The claimants raised allegations concerning the Crown's failure to sufficiently recognise He Whakaputanga (the 1835 Declaration of Independence of the United Tribes of New Zealand) as the foundational constitutional document. This allegedly prejudiced Waikato the Treaty of Waitangi. However, this claim sits outside of the Tribunal's jurisdiction to inquire into claims of Crown breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi. As a consequence, the Tribunal was unable to comment on the substance of the claim. The claimants also raise allegations concerning the Waikato War and the raupatu. Ngāti Mahuta's raupatu claims were settled in 1995 by the Waikato Raupatu Claims Settlement Act 1995, and the Tribunal has no jurisdiction to inquire into Waikato raupatu claims. The claimants did not address this jurisdictional issue in evidence or submissions. The Tribunal did not consider that this claim meets the jurisdictional test set out in section 1.4.2.2.
Ngāti Hikairo Lands and War (Thorne) Claim (Wai 2351)	Frank Thorne (2008).	Himself and Ngāti Hikairo.	This claim is part of the Te Rohe Pōtae district inquiry. The claimant does not seek a finding from the Tribunal on any of the Crown acts or omissions identified in this claim. Accordingly, no further Tribunal comment is required.

Specific local allegations requiring additional Tribunal findings

In addition to their conclusions listed above, the Tribunal made additional specific findings on the following claims:

Te Rohe Pōtae Land Alienation Claim (Wai 1113)

The Wai 1113 claimants raised the matter of the removal of a taonga known as Taumata Atua from Tiritirimatangi. According to their evidence, this taonga – placed on the island by the claimants' tūpuna to protect the descendants of Rakataura and Hoturoa – was uncovered and removed in 1980 when the Ōpārau land development scheme was in operation. It subsequently ended up in a museum (Waikato Museum of Art and History).

While this grievance is undoubtedly of considerable importance to the claimants, the Tribunal was constrained in its ability to address it. As Crown counsel explained: 'the Tribunal's jurisdiction relates to prejudice to Māori caused by the Crown's acts or omissions'.

In the case of Taumata Atua's removal from Tiritirimatangi, there is no evidence of Crown involvement.

Accordingly, while the Tribunal acknowledged the importance of this taonga to the claimants, no evidence was placed before it indicating Crown involvement in the matter and, in turn, no Treaty breach is demonstrated.

In section 21.8, the Tribunal commented on the Crown's long-standing failure to adequately protect wāhi tapu, important sites, and material taonga.

Railway Lines and Assets (Whanga) Claim (Wai 2075)

The claim raised issues which related to He Whakaputanga (the 1835 Declaration of Independence of the United Tribes of New Zealand), which the claimant said is the 'constitutional foundation document of this country'. However, this aspect of the claim sits outside of the Tribunal's jurisdiction to inquire into claims of Crown breaches of the Treaty of Waitangi.

Ngāti Kiriwai and Ngāti Mahuta (Uerata) Claim (Wai 2087)

This claim raised several issues about succession, covering the period from the establishment of the Native Land Court in the district through to the introduction of the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993. In section 16.3 (part III) of the report, the Tribunal found that the 'fragmentation of titles and fractionation of interests due to excessive partitioning and the court's succession rules posed serious challenges for Māori who wished to utilise their land'. It also found that, in the early twentieth century, a large number of succession cases before the Native Land Court were resolved several years, or even decades, after the death of the owner. The Tribunal noted that the Crown attempted to solve the problem of multiply owned land by focusing on succession; for example, by applying conversion provisions at the point of successions in the Maori Affairs Act 1953 (see section 16.5.1).

In closing submissions, claimant counsel raised the issue of previous succession laws allowing Māori land to pass to non-hapū members. The Tribunal noted this contention is consistent with the findings of the Hauraki Report. There, the Tribunal found the changes to the law of succession under the Maori Affairs Amendment Act 1967 – which provided for Māori wills to come under the same law as European wills, and intestate succession to be determined as if the deceased were a European – prejudicially affected Māori. On the implications of the Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 for succession and the operation of trust models of collective land management, the Tribunal make the following finding in section 16.6.4:

- While incorporations and trusts have had some successes in addressing the individualisation or overcrowding of titles, these successes have been limited. That is because lands vested in incorporations and ahu whenua trusts are still subject to successions, leading to further fractionation of ownership interests. Maintaining contact with these owners can be a difficult – if not impossible – task for committees of management and trustees.
- On balance, and even though there remain issues to be addressed through legislative review of the relevant succession provisions, the Tribunal did not find that the Crown has acted in a manner inconsistent with the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi with respect to governance of Māori land by incorporations or trusts.

Mana Wāhine (Nelson) Claim (Wai 2125)

This claim raised issues related to the Crown's alleged failure to protect the mana whenua rights of wāhine within Te Rohe Pōtae. Claims specific to the status and recognition of mana wāhine are not encompassed by the general findings presented in chapters 4-24 of the report. The issues they embody are to be addressed in the Waitangi Tribunal's ongoing mana wāhine kaupapa inquiry. However, the special contribution of mana wāhine to the inquiry district is discussed at section 18.5.4 and throughout parts I-IV of the report.

Māui's Dolphin Claim (Wai 2331) & Maui Dolphin Claim (Wai 2481)

These claims are part of the Te Rohe Pōtae district inquiry and were addressed in the Tribunal's Priority Report Concerning Māui's Dolphin (2016). While the Tribunal acknowledged concerns about the adequacy of the Crown's management plan in preventing Māui's dolphin extinction, it did not believe the Crown could be said to have failed to actively protect the claimants' interests in the taonga, or to have acted unreasonably or without good faith.

The Tribunal also said that it reserved the right to comment in the main report on the wider historical events and environmental regimes that have led to the present circumstances, including what the claimants told the Tribunal about the usurpation of their rangatiratanga as kaitiaki.

As such, the Tribunal's findings on the statutory and administrative regime the Crown established to manage the environment, natural resources, and heritage and customary resource sites in Te Rohe Pōtae, are relevant to

this claim. These findings are set out in chapter 21 and summarised in section 21.8 (part IV).

4. Whāingaroa

Ngā Iwi me ngā Hapū

Claimants in this takiwā affiliate to, or made claims on behalf of, the following groups:

Ngāti Māhanga, Tainui Awhiro / Tainui o Tainui, Ngāti Tahinga, Ngāti Whakamarurangi and Ngāti Tūirangi, Ngāti Tamainupō.

Well-founded claims

The Tribunal determined the majority of claims were well-founded. The Tribunal reached this conclusion having considered (a) the extent to which their findings on general issues affecting Te Rohe Pōtae Māori apply to this claim and (b) whether the claim raises specific local allegations or issues requiring additional Tribunal findings.

The Tribunal listed which of their findings on general issues (set out in chapters 4-24 of the report) applied to each claim. This can be found against each claim in the report.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Other claims in the same claim group
Raglan Harbour Claim (Wai 125)	Vivian Te Uranga Morell Kawharu.	Ngāti Koata (ki Whāingaroa), Ngāti Kahu, Ngāti Tahau, Ngāti Te Kore, Ngāti Pukoro, Ngāti Te Ikaunahi, Ngāti Tira, Ngāti Heke, Ngāti Rua Aruhe, Ngāti Hounuku, Paetoka, and Ngāti Te Karu. Collectively known as Tainui Awhiro or Tainui, (confederation of 12 hapū).	
Ngāti Tahinga Iwi Claim (Wai 537)	Richard Tiki o Te Rangi Thompson.	Tahinga hapū.	
Whāingaroa Harbour and Other Waikato Waters Claim (Wai 775)	Edward Parahi Wilson (1998).	Ngāti Tamainupō.	
Ngāti Māhanga Claim (Wai 1327)	Maude Shaw, Tuahu Watene, Ken Te Houpihake Rautangata, Sunnah Thompson, and Henare Gray.	Ngāti Mahanga me nga uri o Te Awaitaia.	

Descendants of Patara Te Tuhi Claim (Wai 1772)	Wiremu Puke (2008).	The descendants of Patara Te Tuhi of Ngāti Mahuta.	
Ngāti Pane and Ngāti Mahanga Claim (Wai 1967)	Te Whau Barbara Te Hui Hui Pumipi (2008).	The Patutahi, Rawiri, Te Anau, Thompson, and Pumipi whānau, and Ngāti Pane and Ngāti Mahanga hapū.	
Tamatea Tuatahi Karaka Peraka Haru Whānau Trust Claim (Wai 2270)	Lamour Clark (2006).	Tamatea Tuatahi Pera Karaka Haru Whānau.	
Descendants of Wetini Mahikai and Hera Parekawa (Tuteao) Claim (Wai 2345)	Verna Tuteao.	Descendants of Wetini Mahikai.	

Not well-founded claims

The Tribunal found that the following claim is not well-founded because:

- the allegations of Crown actions and/or omissions and prejudice contained in the claim are incomplete and/or unspecific; and/or
- it makes allegations of specific local Treaty breaches and prejudice that are not encompassed by the findings listed in parts I-V of this report; and/or
- the Tribunal did not receive sufficient evidence to allow it to make any additional findings on the specific local allegations raised in the claim.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Other claims in the same claim group
Descendants of Te Wiwini aa Rongo, Te Weera, and Edna Coffey Claim (Wai 1766)	Lai Toy.	Lai Toy and 'my whanau, and descendants of Te Wiwini aa Rongo, from Whaingaroa, and TeWera from Waitara, and Edna Coffey our Taranaki Tupuna'.	

Specific local allegations requiring additional Tribunal findings

In addition to their conclusions listed above, the Tribunal made additional specific findings on the following claims:

Ngāti Tahinga Iwi Claim (Wai 537)

In respect of the claimant's allegations about the effects of the Crown's Emissions Trading Scheme, the Tribunal noted the decision of the presiding officer, dated 6 September 2012, that this issue would not be inquired into as part of this inquiry. It was his conclusion that 'climate change / global warming and the Emissions Trading Scheme are kaupapa

issues that are more suited to be heard as part of a separate kaupapa inquiry than this district inquiry’.

This claim also raised issues related to the Crown’s alleged failure to protect the mana whenua rights of wāhine within Te Rohe Pōtae. Claims specific to the status and recognition of mana wāhine are not encompassed by the general findings presented in chapters 4-24 of the report. The issues they raise are to be addressed in the Waitangi Tribunal’s ongoing mana wāhine kaupapa inquiry. However, the special contribution of mana wāhine to the inquiry district is discussed at section 18.5.4 and throughout parts I-IV of the report.

Descendants of Patara Te Tuhi Claim (Wai 1772)

The claim alleged that the claimant and other descendants of Patara Te Tuhi have been prejudicially affected by the omissions of the Crown in the Karioi 1D1D3B2 block. The block is also known as Te Tuahupapa Reserve. The claimant alleged that Crown agencies and the Historic Places Trust failed to declare the block a historic reserve, and this lack of action resulted in a further loss of association with the birthplace of two ancestors of Tainui.

Based on an assessment of the available evidence, the Tribunal found that the location of the tūāhupapa should have been declared a historic reserve. However, the Tribunal also noted that the exact location of this tūāhupapa – and to whom it is significant – is disputed. Nonetheless, the Tribunal considered that the Crown missed an opportunity to comply with its Treaty obligations to protect Māori land and taonga. The Tribunal suggested that the Historic Places Trust, with tangata whenua, inquire into the issue of a reserve being established. However, the Tribunal noted that neither the Tribunal as a judicial body nor the Treaty settlement process has the ability to compel the return of privately held land.

5. Te Kūiti-Hauāuru

Ngā Iwi me ngā Hapū

Claimants in this takiwā affiliate to, or made claims on behalf of, the following groups:

Ngāti Rōrā, Ngāti Kinohaku, Ngāti Tarahua, Ngāti Putakitemuri, Ngāti Tauhunu, Ngāti Huiao, Ngāti Te Kanawa, Ngāti Peehi, Ngāti Uekaha, Ngāti Ruapuha, Ngāti Ngutu, Ngāti Urunumia, Ngāti Rereahu, and Ngāti Rarua.

Maraeroa A and B Settlement Act 2012

To the extent that a claim concerns the Maraeroa A and B blocks, the Maraeroa A and B Settlement Act 2012 removes the Tribunal’s jurisdiction to inquire into or make findings on historical claims relating to land within these two blocks. The Tribunal’s findings are attributable to the following claims to the extent that it relates to lands outside Maraeroa A and B blocks:

- Ngāti Rereahu (Chamberlin) Claim (Wai 1599)

- Ngāti Rereahu (Dyall) Claim (Wai 1894)

Well-founded claims

The Tribunal determined the majority of claims were well-founded. The Tribunal reached this conclusion having considered (a) the extent to which their findings on general issues affecting Te Rohe Pōtae Māori apply to this claim, and (b) whether the claim raises specific local allegations or issues requiring additional Tribunal findings.

The Tribunal listed which of their findings on general issues (set out in chapters 4-24 of the report) applied to each claim. This can be found against each claim in the report.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Other claims in the same claim group
Rohe Pōtae Lands Claim (Wai 329)	Reverend Robert Percival Emery (deceased), Haami Te Puni Haami Bell, Thomas John Moke, and Daniel Takutaimoana Te Kanawa (1992).	The iwi of the Maniapoto region.	329, 1584.
Umukaimata Block Claim (Wai 556)	Edwin Daniel Vaikai Ormsby.	Himself and the Ngāti Rōrā hapū of Ngāti Maniapoto Iwi (Ngāti Rōrā).	556, 616, 1377, 1820.
Ngāti Te Puta Hapū Claim (Wai 586)	Richard Nga Hua Ote Tau Ngatai, Wayne Douglas Jensen, and Moepatu Borell (2007).	Mōtītī Marae, Ngāti te Putaitemuri, Ngāti Tauhunu, Ngāti Turiu me Ngāti Kinohaku.	586, 753, 1585, 2020, 2090, 1396.
Ngāti Te Kanawa and Ngāti Te Peehi Claim (Wai 587)	Pita Pou Haereti, Haamiora Moerua (1996), and Ratapu Kaa (2007).	Themselves and the Ngāti Te Kanawa and Ngāti Te Pēhi hapū of Ngāti Maniapoto iwi.	
Ngāti Rōrā Claim (Wai 616)	Rewi Nankivell and Mack Waretini.	Ngāti Rōrā.	556, 616, 1377, 1820.
Ngāti Kinohaku Lands, Forests, and Fisheries Claim (Wai 753)	Puhi Paparaahi, Stephen Rewi Walsh, Rangi Joseph, Glen Katu, Leslie Stewart, and Henry Baker.	Ngāti Kinohaku.	586, 753, 1396, 1585, 2020, 2090.
Kinohaku West No 11 Block Claim (Wai 991)	Meri Walters (2001).	Herself, her whānau, the Te Korakora Incorporation, other descendants of the coastal hapū of Ngāti Urunumia, and the	

		descendants of original owners in Kinohaku West No 11.	
Te Kūiti Aerodrome and Associated Lands Claim (Wai 1190)	Rama Martin, Joanne Matana, Karyn Skudder, Elaine Wi, Tiriti o Waitangi Tahiti, Christopher Hamahona Atutahi, and Hinuoriwa Olive Atutahi.	Themselves and the descendants of Kiore Pakore, also known as Kiore Tuariri Hohepa.	
The Ngāti Paemate and Maniapoto Tainui Claim (Wai 1352)	Te Tahana Tangihaere.	Ngāti Paemate hapū and Maniapoto Tainui iwi.	
Whānau and Descendants of Whitiui Joseph of Ngāti Kinohaku Claim (Wai 1361)	Te Pare Kauī Joseph and Rangī Joseph.	The whānau of Whitiui Joseph of Ngāti Kinohaku.	
Uekaha A11 and Part A10 Land Blocks Claim (Wai 1376)	Thomas Heta Holden and Norman Tane.	Themselves and all beneficial owners of land known as Uekaha A11 and Part A10 blocks.	
The Hori Tana (George Turner) Claim (Wai 1377)	Ngaraima (Georgina) Turner-Nankivell (2007).	Ngāti Rōrā.	556, 616, 1377, 1820.
Ngāti Huiao and Kinohaku East Claim (Wai 1386)	Robert Koroheke, Rudolph Hotu, and Patsy Roach.	Themselves and Ngāti Huiao and Ngāti Kinohaku of Te Kauae Marae, Hangatiki.	1386, 1762. The claimants all affiliate to Ngāti Huiao.
Owners of Taumatotara A5 Block Claim (Wai 1396)	Rora Evans, Te Pare Kauī Joseph, Kevin Tregoweth, Garry Mahuri Paki-Titi, Weo Maag, Pita Hotu, and Raewyn Renata.	The Trustees and beneficial owners of Taumatotara A5 block.	586, 753, 1396, 1585, 2020, 2090.
Matiu Payne and Descendants of Te Herepounamu alias Koteriki Claim (Wai 1496)	Matiu Payne (2008).	Himself and the descendants of Te Herepounamu/ Koteriki.	
Taharoa C Inc Land Block Claim (Wai 1500)	John Hone Arama Tata Henry and Duane Tamauenuku Tata Henry.	Themselves and the Tuarau Te Tata Henry Whānau.	
Ngāti Maniapoto (Bell) Claim (Wai 1584)	Roderick Tiwha Bell (2008).	The marae, iwi, and hapū of Maniapoto.	329, 1584.

Ngāti Tarahuia and Associated Oparure Whānau Claim (Wai 1585)	Glen Katu and Wayne Jensen.	Themselves and Ngāti Tarahuia me Ngāti Kinohaku.	586, 753, 1396, 1585, 2020, 2090.
Ngāti Rereahu (Chamberlin) Claim (Wai 1599)	Pani Paora-Chamberlin (2008).	Ngāti Wharekōkōwai, a hapū of Rereahu.	
Te Korapatū Marae Claim (Wai 1606)	Liane Ramari Green.	Herself and on behalf of Ngāti Peehi and Ngāti Te Kanawa, and the trustees of the Te Korapatū Marae.	
Ngāti Huiao (Tapara) Claim (Wai 1762)	Waehapera Tapara (2008).	Puke Tapara and the hapū Ngāti Huiao.	1386, 1762. The claimants affiliate to Ngāti Huiao.
Ruapuha Uekaha Hapū Trust Claim (Wai 1805)	Josephine Huti Anderson (2008).	The Ruapuha Uekaha Hapū Trust and the hapū of Ruapuha and Uekaha in respect of Hauturu East 8.	
Ngāti Maniapoto (Ingle) Claim (Wai 1806)	Albert Ingle (2008).	Himself and descendants of original owners in the Pukenui, Te Kūiti Township, Rangitoto, and Rangitoto – Tuhua blocks.	
Descendants of Wharona Paterangi and Rama Rihi Claim (Wai 1820)	George Ngatai (2008).	Himself and the descendants of Wharona Paterangi and Rama Rihi.	556, 616, 1377, 1820.
Ngāti Urunumia and Ngāti Ngutu (Rangitaawa-Schofield) Claim (Wai 1823)	Michaela Rangitaawa-Schofield (2008).	Ngāti Urunumia and Ngāti Ngutu, hapū of Ngāti Maniapoto.	
Rawiri Whānau Claim (Wai 1824)	Glennis Ngawai Rawiri (2008).	Herself and her whānau. Their iwi affiliations include Ngāti Tamainupō, Ngāti Wairere, and Ngāti Maniapoto.	2102. The claimants in this group share interests in Rangitoto A60B.
Ngāti Rereahu (Dyall) Claim (Wai 1894)	Gary Dyall (2008).	Himself and all descendants of Ngāti Rereahu.	
Ngāti Maniapoto Natural Resources (Davis) Claim (Wai 1977)	Piko Davis (2008).	The tangata whenua of Ngāti Maniapoto and the 23 marae of Ngāti Maniapoto.	
Raukura Whānau Trust Lands Claim (Wai 2016)	Evelyn Rayner.	The Raukura Whānau Trust, Waitomo Caves.	
Aranui Cave (Thompson) Claim (Wai 2017)	Tess Thompson, Lisa Docherty, Gina Kaio, Alexia	Themselves and the descendants of Te Ruruku Aranui.	

	Alderson, and Tiahuia Danielle Sukroo.		
Descendants of Parehuiroro Hohepa Land Claim (Wai 2020)	Hinekopa Te Kanawa-Barrett and Maxine Ketu.	Themselves and ngā uri o Huihana Parehuiroro, me ngā hapū o Ngāti Kinohaku me Ngāti Maniapoto.	586, 753, 1396, 1585, 2020, 2090.
Ngāti Maniapoto Lands (Green) Claim (Wai 2085)	Tawhai Kohotu Green (2008).	Herself, her whānau, and Ngāti Maniapoto.	
Kinohaku East 4B1 Block (Wana) Claim (Wai 2088)	William Gene Wana.	Himself and all beneficial owners of the Piopio A1B block.	
Haputanga and Ngā Tatai Tuhononga i a ia Lands (Jensen) Claim (Wai 2090)	Wayne Douglas Jensen.	Himself and Ngā uri o Iriaka Puhia me Rerehau Haupokia, Ngāti Urunomia, Ngāti Rangatahi, Ngāti Hari, Ngāti Waiora me ngā hapū katoa o Ngāti Kinohaku.	586, 753, 1396, 1585, 2020, 2090.
Descendants of Manganui Ngaamo Lands Claim (Wai 2102)	Bessie May Thocolich (2008).	Herself and the descendants of Manganui Ngaamo and Ngāti Wairere and Te Ihingarāngi.	1824. The claimants in this group share interests in Rangitoto A60B.
Ngāti Tahinga, Ngāti Tanetinorau, Ngāti Te Whatu and Others Lands and Resources (Walsh) Claim (Wai 2117)	Stephen Rewi Walsh (2008).	Ngāti Tahinga, Ngāti Tanetinorau, Ngāti Te Whatu, Ngāti Tuarumia, Ngāti Huhu, Ngāti Tuwaikoia, Ngāti Te Arawaere, Ngāti Pukauae, Ngāti Paretona, Ngāti Tionga, Ngāti Waipua, Ngāti Kahumoana, Ngāti Kairarunga, Ngāti Pareteata, Ngāti Turangapeke, Ngāti Tinirau, Ngāti Maui, Ngāti Korokino, Ngāti Uenuku, Ngāti Maru, Ngāti Mahuri, Ngāti Kahinga, Ngāti Toa Rangatira, Ngāti Orereko, Ngāti Kahutiari, Ngāti Te Maunu, Ngāti Takamaiterangi, Ngāti Tumania, Ngāti Pakau, Ngāti Werawera, Ngāti	

		Hore, and Ngāti Hinewai.	
Ngāti Maniapoto and Ngāti Uekaha Lands and Other Issues (Tane) Claim (Wai 2128)	Ben Tinorau Tane (2008).	Ngāti Maniapoto and Ngāti Uekaha and descendants in the Hauturu West, Hauturu East, and Waitomo blocks.	
Waitomo and Other Lands (Tapara) Claim (Wai 2129)	Doug Tapara (2008).	Himself and descendants of original owners of the Pukeroa-Hangatiki, Waitomo, Orahiri, Tahaia, Hauturu East, Pehitawa, and Marokopa blocks.	
Ngāti Maniapoto Land and Other Issues (Reid) Claim (Wai 2130)	Dolly Rangi Reid (2008).	Herself and Ngāti Waiora descendants of the original owners of the Arapae, Kawhia, Marokopa, and Te Hape blocks.	
Ngāti Kinohaku and Others Lands (Nerai-Tuaupiki) Claim (Wai 2131)	Taane Steven Nerai-Tuaupiki (2008).	Himself and descendants of original owners in the Ototoika, Kinohaku West, Taharoa, and Kawhia blocks.	
Ngāti Maniapoto and Others Lands (Tohengaroa) Claim (Wai 2132)	Wally Hauauru Tohengaroa (2008).	Himself and descendants of original owners of the Karu o te Whenua, Mahoenui, Mangaawakino, Ongarue Township, Orahiri, Otiao, Puketarata, Puketiti, Pukeuha, Pura Pura, Rangitoto – Tuhua, Reu Reu, Onutai, and Waipuna blocks.	
Descendants of Charles Hone Takerei Campbell Lands (Campbell) Claim (Wai 2168)	Benjamin Koneke Charles Campbell (2008).	Himself and the descendants of Charles Hone Takerei Campbell.	
Ngāti Urunumia and Ngāti Hari (Herbert) Claim (Wai 2271)	Casey Taupiri Herbert (2008).	Herself, her whānau, Ngāti Urunumia, and Ngāti Hari hapū.	
Ngāti Rarua Marokopa Waikawau Region Claim (Wai 2304)	Lee Russell Luke, Amorua Luke, John Te Rangi o Kiwa Morgan, Barry Mathew Mason, Joseph Henry Stafford, Tracey Marie	Ngāti Rarua Iwi Trust.	

	Stewart, Desmond Willison, and Andrew Paora Wilkie (2008).		
--	--	--	--

Not well-founded

The Tribunal found that the following claims are not well-founded because:

- the allegations of Crown actions and/or omissions and prejudice contained in the claim are incomplete and/or unspecific; and/or
- they make allegations of specific local Treaty breaches and prejudice that are not encompassed by the findings listed in parts I-V of this report; and/or
- the Tribunal did not receive sufficient evidence to allow it to make any additional findings on the specific local allegations raised in the claim.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Additional comments
Nikora Whānau Te Kūiti Township Claim (Wai 1031)	Pumi Hone Nikora.	The direct descendants of the claimant's great-grandfather, Te Hauparoa, and grandfather, Te Amohanga.	
Matu Payne and Descendants of Te Herepounamu alias Koteriki Claim (Wai 1496)	Matu Payne (2008).	Himself and the descendants of Te Herepounamu/ Koteriki.	
Descendants of Pohe Paki Titi (Paki) Lands Claim (Wai 2133)	Arlene Teresa Paki, Mere Isobel Hapimarika, Rina Adelaide Paki and Tiemi Matu Bose Ahu (2008).	Descendants of Pohe Paki Titi.	
Ngāti Rarua Marokopa Waikawau Region Claim (Wai 2304)	Lee Russell Luke, Amorua Luke, John Te Rangi o Kiwa Morgan, Barry Mathew Mason, Joseph Henry Stafford, Tracey Marie Stewart, Desmond Willison, and Andrew Paora Wilkie (2008).	Ngāti Rarua Iwi Trust.	A specific claim in respect of the claimants' specific allegation about the circumstances preventing their return in the 1860s to the Te Rohe Pōtae lands they had previously occupied.

Specific local allegations requiring additional Tribunal findings

In addition to their conclusions listed above, the Tribunal made additional specific findings on the following claims:

Wai 586, 753, 1396, 1585, 2020, 2090

The group's amended statement of claim states that the construction of the Kapuni and Maui natural gas pipelines in the late 1960s affected many Ngāti Kinohaku blocks and sites of significance, including an urupā located on part of the Tapuiwahine block in which they have interests.

The Tribunal found that the Māori landowners of the Tapuiwahine blocks were denied appropriate compensation for the installation of the pipeline. The Tribunal found that the Crown breached the Treaty principles of partnership, protection of tino rangatiratanga and active protection by:

- failing to properly engage in full and genuine consultation with Māori over the appropriation of Māori land for the purposes of laying the Kapuni and Maui gas pipelines across the Tapuiwahine block;
- failing to ensure Māori landowners were fairly compensated for the easements;
- siting the pipelines insensitively; failing to protect a site of importance to Māori; and failing to engage in appropriate consultation over the routes.

Finally, the Tribunal had insufficient evidence to determine the nature or extent of any historic or ongoing costs arising from the presence of the pipeline on Ngāti Kinohaku land. Thus, it made no findings on that particular aspect of the claim. However, it suggested that the Crown engage with the claimants to determine the extent of any incidental costs incurred, now or in the past, as a result of the pipeline's presence and also to consider appropriate forms of redress through consultation.

Ngāti Huiao and Kinohaku East Claim (Wai 1386) & Ngāti Huiao (Tapara) Claim (Wai 1762)

These claims raised issues about the Crown's alleged failure to protect Māori veterans of foreign wars during and following military service. Claim allegations specific to the health, status, and recognition of late twentieth century military veterans are not encompassed by the general findings presented in chapters 4-24 of the report, as the issues they raise are being addressed in the Waitangi Tribunal's ongoing kaupapa inquiry into Māori military veterans.

Ngāti Urunumia and Ngāti Ngutu (Rangitaawa-Schofield) Claim (Wai 1823)

The Tribunal noted the decision of the presiding officer, dated 6 September 2012, that 'the issues of climate change/global warming and the Emissions Trading Scheme will not be inquired into as part of this inquiry'. It was the conclusion of the presiding officer that 'climate change/global warming and the Emissions Trading Scheme are kaupapa issues that are more suited to be heard as part of a separate kaupapa inquiry than this district inquiry'.

Ngāti Maniapoto Natural Resources (Davis) Claim (Wai 1977)

Regarding the allegation that railway surveyors caused a smallpox outbreak, the Tribunal did not receive sufficient evidence to allow it to make any additional findings on this matter.

Waitomo and Other Lands (Tapara) Claim (Wai 2129)

Regarding the claimant's allegation about the re-designation of Crown lands as Department of Conservation lands, the Tribunal did not receive sufficient evidence to allow it to make any additional finding on this matter.

6: Waimiha-Ōngarue*Ngā Iwi me ngā Hapū*

Claimants in this takiwā affiliate to, or made claims on behalf of, the following groups:

Ngāti Urunumia, Ngāti Pahere, Ngāti Raerae, Ngāti Tūtakamoana and Ngāti Hopu, Ngāti Te Ihingārangi, Ngāti Rereahu, Ngāti Whakatere ki te Tonga, Ngāti Rōrā, and Ngāti Ngutu.

Maraeroa A and B Settlement Act 2012

To the extent that a claim concerns the Maraeroa A and B blocks, the Maraeroa A and B Settlement Act 2012 removes the Tribunal's jurisdiction to inquire into or make findings on historical claims relating to land within these two blocks. The Tribunal's findings are attributable to the following claims to the extent that it relates to lands outside Maraeroa A and B blocks:

- Rangitoto – Tuhua Rohe Claim (Wai 729)
- Whānganui River Crown Negotiations Claim (Wai 998)
- Te Anapungapunga Lands Claim (Wai 1255)
- Ngāti Te Ihingarangi Claim (Wai 1309)
- Ngāti Whakatere ki te Tonga Claim (Wai 1640)
- Ngāti Rereahu (Emery) Claim (Wai 1704)

Well-founded claims

The Tribunal determined the majority of claims were well-founded. The Tribunal reached this conclusion having considered (a) the extent to which their findings on general issues affecting Te Rohe Pōtae Māori apply to this claim, and (b) whether the claim raises specific local allegations or issues requiring additional Tribunal findings.

The Tribunal listed which of their findings on general issues (set out in chapters 4-24 of the report) applied to each claim. This can be found against each claim in the report.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Other claims in the same claim group

Te Rongoroa Forest Farm Trust Claim (Wai 399)	Jennifer Roslynd Rata, Jennifer Rata, Daniel Haki Rata, Louise Rae Rata, and Te Hika Daniel Te Rata.	Te Hika Daniel Te Rata.	
Koromiko and Tarata Claim (Wai 424)	Titoko Hohepa and Dean Houppapa (1994).	Tarata Trust, Ngāti Te Ihingarangi, Ngāti Rereahu.	
Pukepoto Farm Trust Claim (Wai 478)	Roy Matengaro Haar (1994), Jade Cherie Moir Haar, Marise Lousie Haar-Winthrop, Gail Bell, and Lia Haar (2010).	Himself and the owners/shareholders of Pukepoto Farm Trust.	
Rangitoto – Tuhua Rohe Claim (Wai 729)	Hardie Peni.	Himself and on behalf of Rangitoto Tuhua Inc, Ngāti Rereahu – Maniapoto iwi.	
Waimiha River Eel Fisheries (King Country) Claim (Wai 762)	Rangi Harry Kereopa (1998) and Te Urunga Evelyn Kereopa (2010).	Te Ihingārangi.	
Makotuku Block IV Claim (Wai 836)	Patricia Matthews and Vivienne Matthews (1999).	Themselves and Te Puawaitanga Mokopuna Trust, Ellen Anaru Whanau Trust, and the descendants of Te Tira Taurerewa.	
Ngāti Pahere and Ngāti Rae Rae (Taumarunui) Claim (Wai 928)	Michael Tangahoe Burgess and Jane Crown.	Themselves and the hapū of Ngāti Raerae.	
Te Anapungapunga Lands Claim (Wai 1255)	John Wi and Pauline Kay Stafford.	Themselves and the hapū of Ngāti Urunumia.	
Ngāti Te Ihingarangi Claim (Wai 1309)	Takinga Wharekoka (deceased) and Jack Te Reti.	Themselves and the whānau and hapū of Te Ihingārangi.	
Ngāti Tutakamoana Lands and Resources Claim (Wai 1455)	Hoane Titare John Wi, Lamia Mere Rata, Antonio Tipene, Erina Rata, Te Aroha Hemana, and Raewyn Wi.	Ngāti Tūtakamoana and Ngāti Hopu.	
Ngāti Pahere Claim (Wai 1480)	Noeline Henare.	Ngāti Pahere, hapū of Ngāti Maniapoto.	
Ngāti Whakaterere ki te Tonga Claim (Wai 1640)	Te Meera Hyde, Te Huihuinga Tamara Sprott, Ngaroi Gilman, Peta Ann Kohika, Moana Mannsell,	Ngāti Whakaterere ki te Tonga.	

	Robyn Kararaina Kohika, Huhana Susan Anderson, Ani Rauhihi, Tracey Robinson, Heemi Te Peeti, Rhea Hyde, and Amira Lena Tita Wikohika.		
Ngāti Rereahu (Emery) Claim (Wai 1704)	Edward Piriwiritua Emery (2008).	The hapū of Ngāti Rereahu.	
Ongarue, Ōhura, and Otunui River Areas Claim (Wai 1812)	Hoane Titari John Wi, Tame Te Nuinga Tuwhangai, Raymond Tawhaki Wi, Donna Tuwhangai, Mere McGee, Evelyn Kereopa, Greg Keenan, and Les Howe.	The whānau and marae within the Ōngarue, Ōhura, and Otunui River area.	

Withdrawn

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Other claims in the same claim group
Whānganui River Crown Negotiations Claim (Wai 998)	John Manunui.	Ngāti Manunui of Ngāti Tūwharetoa.	

Not well-founded

The Tribunal found that the following claim is not well-founded because:

- the allegations of Crown actions and/or omissions and prejudice contained in the claim are incomplete and/or unspecific; and/or
- it makes allegations of specific local Treaty breaches and prejudice that are not encompassed by the findings listed in parts I-V of this report; and/or
- the Tribunal did not receive sufficient evidence to allow it to make any additional findings on the specific local allegations raised in the claim.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Additional comments
Ngāti Rereahu (Emery) Claim (Wai 1704)	Edward Piriwiritua Emery (2008).	The hapū of Ngāti Rereahu.	Having considered all the evidence presented to us, we determine that the allegations about road construction desecrating a Ngāti Rereahu battleground and the purposes

			behind the introduction of telephone lines and rental charges are not well-founded.
--	--	--	---

7. Mōkau

Ngā Iwi me ngā Hapū

Claimants in this takiwā affiliate to, or made claims on behalf of, the following groups:

Ngāti Te Paemate, Ngāti Rungaterangi, Ngāti Waiora, Ngāti Tukawakawa, Ngāti Waikorara, Ngāti Tu (Tumae/Tumai), Ngāti Hineuru, Ngāti Rākei, Ngāti Wai, Ngāti Parekarau, Ngāti Waimauku, and Ngāti Hinerua.

Well-founded claims

The Tribunal determined the majority of claims were well-founded. The Tribunal reached this conclusion having considered (a) the extent to which their findings on general issues affecting Te Rohe Pōtae Māori apply to this claim, and (b) whether the claim raises specific local allegations or issues requiring additional Tribunal findings.

The Tribunal listed which of their findings on general issues (set out in chapters 4-24 of the report) applied to each claim. This can be found against each claim in the report.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Other claims in the same claim group
Umukaimata and Waiaraia Blocks Claim (Wai 483)	Thomas Noel Bidois.	The descendants of Te Rewatu Hiriako and Ngāti Te Paemate.	
Mōkau Mohakatino Block Claim (Wai 529)	Paraone Lake and Haumoana White (1995).	Te Iwi o Mōkau.	
Ngāti Maniapoto Lands and Resources Claim (Wai 535)	Rongo Herehere Wetere and William Wetere.	Themselves and Ngāti Maniapoto.	
Poutama Land Blocks Claim (Wai 577)	Poutama Lewis Te Rata and Hika Daniel Te Rata (1996).	Themselves and their descendants.	
Pio Pio Stores Site Claim (Wai 691)	Tohe Rauputu and Muiora Barry (1997), Oriwia Woolf (2008), Katherine Anne Barry (2010), and Lenny Turner (2012).	All the descendants of the original owners of Part Kaingapipi 9, Karu te Whenua, and Kinohaku East 4B1 blocks.	691, 788, 2349.
Mōkau Mōhakatino and Other Blocks	Atiria Rora Ormsby Takiari,	The hapū of Mōkau ki Runga.	691, 788, 2349.

(Maniapoto) Claim (Wai 788)	Jacob Wikiperi Hiriaki, Barbara Ngawai Taite Marsh, Wareriana Ngauru, Muira Barry, and Patrick Louis Taylor (1999); Margaret Miriama Drummond (2008), and Lenny Turner (2012).		
Ngāti Maniapoto/Ngāti Tama (Mōkau) Claim (Wai 800)	Harold Te Pikikotuku Maniapoto, Roy Matengaro Haar, Tame Tuwhangai, Tiaki Ormsby-VanSelm, and Valerie Matarangimahue Ingley.	Themselves and for the benefit of their respective hapū and the Ngāti Maniapoto iwi.	
King Country Land Banking Claim (Wai 849)	James Taitoko.	Ngāti Rungaterangi, Ngāti Te Paemate, and Ngāti Waiora.	
Awakino and Other Lands Claim (Wai 868)	Jim Taitoko (2000).	Himself, his grandchildren, and other descendants in the Maniapoto rohe.	
Kahuwera Mountain Claim (Wai 1094)	Ron Te Uaki Waho and Jean Apaapa.	Themselves, their tūpuna, Ngāti Hia, Ngāti Waiora, Ngāti Manga – Ngāti Paretekaawa ki Napi Napi.	
Arapae No 1 Block A4A Kinohaku East Claim (Wai 1387)	Makareta Wirepa-Davis (2006).	The Trustees and Owners of Arapae No 1 Block.	
Ngā Hapū o Poutama (White and Gibbs) Claim (Wai 1747)	Haumoana White and Parani Gibbs (2008).	Ngā Hapū o Poutama.	
Te Kaha Hapu (Thompson and Wi Repa) Claim (Wai 1962)	Mona Thompson and Ronald Wi Repa.	Themselves and Ngāti Waiora, Nga Uri o Pehira Keepa, and Nga Uri o Wi Repa.	
Māori Affairs Amendment Act 1967 (Eketone) Claim (Wai 2101)	Anaru Eketone (2008).	Albert Eketone.	
Ngāti Maniapoto (Stockman) Claim (Wai 2349)	Peter Raymond George Stockman.	Himself and the grandchildren and further descendants of his father.	691, 788, 2349.

Not well-founded

The Tribunal found that the following claims are not well-founded because:

- the allegations of Crown actions and/or omissions and prejudice contained in the claim are incomplete and/or unspecific; and/or
- it makes allegations of specific local Treaty breaches and prejudice that are not encompassed by the findings listed in parts I-V of this report; and/or
- the Tribunal did not receive sufficient evidence to allow it to make any additional findings on the specific local allegations raised in the claim.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Other claims in the same claim group
Pungaereere No 1 Block Claim (Wai 1796)	Nicole Reeves (2008).	Her mother and her whānau.	
Descendants of Riria Te Wehenga Claim (Wai 1966)	Andrew Waiora Marshall and Emily Amokura Wehi (2008).	Themselves and the descendants and family of Riria Te Wehenga.	

Specific local allegations requiring additional Tribunal findings

In addition to their conclusions listed above, the Tribunal made additional specific findings on the following claim:

Te Kaha Hapu (Thompson and Wi Repa) Claim (Wai 1962)

The Tribunal did not receive sufficient evidence to allow it to make any additional finding on the alleged forging of signatures on Crown purchase deeds.

8. Cross-Regional Claims

The Tribunal has designated these claims ‘cross-regional’ because they either straddle takiwā, or primarily pursue issues of significance to the inquiry district as a whole, rather than having a clear regional basis.

Well-founded

The Tribunal determined the majority of claims were well-founded. The Tribunal reached this conclusion having considered (a) the extent to which their findings on general issues affecting Te Rohe Pōtae Māori apply to this claim, and (b) whether the claim raises specific local allegations or issues requiring additional Tribunal findings.

The Tribunal listed which of their findings on general issues (set out in chapters 4-24 of the report) applied to each claim. This can be found against each claim in the report.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Other claims in the same claim group
Kete and Others Land Claim (Wai 2074)	Epiha Alex Kete (2008).	Himself, Puhiwahine Tanatiira, Ihaia Tangihira, Katipo Keteteiwikawhena whānau, Metapere Kawhe, and John O'Brian.	
Ngāti Tahinga, Ngāti Maniapoto, and Other Health Issues (McKinnon) Claim (Wai 2121)	Inuwai McKinnon (2008).	Ngāti Tahinga and Ngāti Maniapoto (amongst others), including his whānau and hapū.	
Land Alienation (McKay) Claim (Wai 2319)	Richard McKay (2008).	The McKay, MacKay, and Joyce whānau. The claimants are of Ngāti Mahuta hapū.	

Not well-founded

The Tribunal found that the following claims are not well-founded because:

- the allegations of Crown actions and/or omissions and prejudice contained in the claim are incomplete and/or unspecific; and/or
- they make allegations of specific local Treaty breaches and prejudice that are not encompassed by the findings listed in parts I-V of this report; and/or
- the Tribunal did not receive sufficient evidence to allow it to make any additional findings on the specific local allegations raised in the claim.

Claim title	Named claimant	Lodged on behalf of	Other claims in the same claim group
Te Aka-i-Mapuhia Māori Incorporation Claim (Wai 1834)	Mikaere Taitoko (2008).	Ngā Hapū and Whānau o Ngāti Maniapoto, and all Tangata whenua.	
Ngāti Rauhoto (Taylor) Claim (Wai 1836)	Robert Taylor (2008).	Ngāti Rauhoto. Ngāti Rauhoto is a hapū of Ngāti Tūwharetoa, based at Nukuhau, Taupō.	
Alienation and Confiscation (Campbell) Claim (Wai 2238)	Hori Campbell (Takerei) (2008).	Himself and descendants of original owners of land in blocks including Arapae, Kinohaku East and West, Otamakahu, Rangitoto – Tuhua, Piopio, and Maraetāua.	

Specific local allegations requiring additional Tribunal findings

In addition to their conclusions listed above, the Tribunal made additional specific findings on the following claim:

Land Alienation (McKay) Claim (Wai 2319)

The Tribunal noted that section 9(2) of the Waikato Raupatu Claims Settlement Act 1995 precludes the Tribunal from inquiring into most Waikato raupatu claims, including ‘all claims arising from the loss of land and of interests in land in the Waikato claim area by confiscation’ (see section 8(b)). However, as it stated in section 1.4.2 of our report, the Tribunal nonetheless inquired into such claims where the claimants can establish that they are making it ‘on the basis of some other non-Waikato affiliation’.

In this case, the Tribunal could not inquire into or make findings on the claimant’s specific raupatu-related allegations about land at Rangiriri, as it was not clear to it from the evidence whether the claim is being brought on the basis of non-Waikato affiliations. The Tribunal limited its findings to those general findings set out in chapter 6 that apply to Ngāti Mahuta within Te Rohe Pōtae, such as the ongoing portrayal of them as ‘rebels’ (see section 6.9.8.2).

Whiringa-ā-rangi 2021 – additional content online

Te Kōti Whenua Māori – Māori Land Court

[Trusts](#) – trustee removal and replacement – trust varied – *Bloor v Karaitiana – Runanga 2E* (2021) 259 Waiariki MB 286 (259 WAR 286) – Hinemoana Markham-Nicklin

[Trusts](#) – review of trust – enforcement of trust – removal of trustees – *Puha v Crawford – Mokoia 19A* (2021) 439 Aotea MB 68 (439 AOT 68) – Elizabeth Derby

[Trusts](#) – interim trustees – obtaining directions – *Goldsmith – Matata Parish 63Z Block* (2021) 263 Waiariki MB 214 (263 WAR 214) – Elizabeth Derby

[Trusts](#) – application for direction – transfer of funds – *Wharekura v Skerrett-White – Kawerau A8D* (2021) 263 Waiariki MB 71 (263 WAR 71) – Elizabeth Derby