

**I TE KOOTI WHENUA MĀORI O AOTEAROA
I TE ROHE O AOTEA**

*In the Māori Land Court of New Zealand
Aotea District*

AP-20230000033279

WĀHANGA
Under

Sections 239, Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993

MŌ TE TAKE
In the matter of

Rangitikei Manawatu Part B4 being Lot 1 DP 4102
(Old Post Office) and Others

I WAENGA I A
Between

NICOLA KING ON BEHALF OF THE
TRUSTEES OF TE RANGIMARIE MĀORI
RESERVATION TRUSTS
Ngā kaitono
Applicants

ME
And

ANNE KEENE, REBECCA HUNT, KAPIKI TE
AWE AWE, CHRISTINE KING AND JOHN
LARKINS
Ngā kaiwhakahē
Objectors

Nohoanga:
Hearing

480 Aotea MB 78 – 98, dated 25 January 2024
Second hearing, dated 7 March 2024
(Heard at Palmerston North)

Whakataunga:
Judgment date

13 March 2024

TE WHAKATAUNGA A KAIWHAKAWĀ M J DOOGAN
Judgment of Judge M J Doogan

Hei timatanga kōrero*Introduction*

[1] This is an application to appoint trustees to three trusts, “Te Rangimarie Trusts”. Each trust has the same trustees and beneficiaries. The application is opposed, not on the basis that any of the proposed trustees are unsuitable, but because of a concern that an important requirement of Te Rangimarie Marae Trust Charter (“the Charter”) was not complied with.

[2] The matter first came before me on 25 January 2024. That hearing was by Zoom, a large number of trustees and beneficiaries were in attendance and wished to be heard. I indicated to parties that whilst I would hear from those who wished to speak, it was my preference that a contested matter like this be dealt with in-person and I proposed to set the matter down for hearing at the next sitting of the Māori Land Court. Most of those in attendance on the 25 January 2024 agreed, although a number urged me to determine the matter on that day.

[3] After hearing from those who wished to be heard on the 25 January 2024, I adjourned the matter to an in-person hearing at the conclusion of the court list set down for Palmerston North on the 7 March 2024. I gave the parties a preliminary indication that I was minded to make the appointments of replacement trustees but would not make a final determination until hearing further from the parties on the 7 March 2024. I also provided an opportunity for those who wished to make further submissions to do so in writing prior to the hearing. Further submissions were received. I will turn to these shortly when I summarise the position of the parties both for and against the proposed trustee appointments.

[4] After hearing from the parties on 7 March 2024, I issued a brief oral decision confirming that I would make the appointment of the replacement trustees with reasons to follow. I now set out the relevant background, summarise the arguments of the parties and then set out my reasons for making the appointments in light of the statutory requirements and relevant legal principles.

[5] I turn first to the factual background.

Ngā Tarati*The Trusts*

[6] The three Te Rangimarie Trusts are:

[6.1] Rangitikei Manawatu Pt B4 Lot 1 DP 4102 (Old Post Office) Trust, an ahu whenua trust, was established over the 0.1012 ha block and vested in five trustees pursuant to ss 438(1) and (2) of the Māori Affairs Act 1953.¹

[6.2] Rangitikei-Manawatu B4 Part (Rangiotu School) Māori Reservation is a 2.2197 ha block set aside “as a place of learning for the descendants of Wiremu Te Awe Awe and Manawaroa Te Awe Awe and their descendants”.²

[6.3] Te Rangimarie Marae/Urupa/Church/Recreation Māori Reservation was set up in 1979 for “the benefit of the descendants of Wiremu Te Awe Awe and Manawaroa Te Awe Awe”.³ The purpose and land comprised in the reservation was varied in 2017 to include a “burial ground, recreation ground, church site, meeting house site and marae”.⁴ The Reservation is over an area of 4.2051 ha (3.8582 ha and 1.3779 ha blocks).

Te Horopaki*Background*

[7] This application arises from the Annual General Meeting (“AGM”) held for all three trusts on 26 March 2023. The minutes record that nominations for up to seven trustees were sought and that George Larkins resigned as a trustee and both David Matenga and Mary Jane Scott retired as trustees. While there are no letters of resignation or retirement on file, all three outgoing trustees were in attendance at the AGM and no objections to their replacement was recorded in the minutes.

[8] Four existing trustees were re-elected. They are Nuwyne Kiri Te Awe Awe Mohi, Wiremu Kingi Te Awe Awe III, Paul David Matenga, and Charles William Matenga. The

¹ (1992) 23 Aotea MB 62-63 (23 AOT 62-63).

² (2003) 134 Aotea MB 65-66; purpose varied TN14664 (30 March 2004) and TN 14664 (29 April 2004); New Zealand Gazette No.46, page 1165 dated 29 April 2004.

³ 81 OTI 264 – NZ Gazette No.18, page 571 dated 15 March 1979.

⁴ NZ Gazette No. 25 dated 9 March 2017.

three newly elected trustees are Bryan Kingi Matenga, Hoani Meihana Matenga, and Sarah Ann Larkins.

Te Take

The Issue

[9] The objection to the appointment of the three replacement trustees is centred on the complaint that the following provision in the Charter has not been complied with:

3) TRUSTEES

The process for nominating and selecting trustees.

Trustees are to be direct descendants of Manawaroa Te Awe Awe or such other persons as may be agreed by the said descendants at a Hui properly convened to elect trustees.

[10] This provision was in issue because outgoing trustee George Larkins and his daughter Sarah are not direct descendants of Manawaroa Te Awe Awe or Wiremu Te Awe Awe.⁵

[11] George Larkins was raised by his birth mother (no whakapapa link) and by Joe Larkins, who was a direct descendent of Manawaroa Te Awe Awe and Wiremu Te Awe Awe. George Larkins considers himself a whāngai of Joe Larkins. He is supported in this view by a number of his fellow trustees and others.

[12] George Larkins had served as a trustee for approximately five years before his resignation in 2023. No issue was taken by any party with his performance as a trustee. Clause 3 of the Charter became an issue during the AGM because George Larkins nominated his daughter Sarah Larkins to be a replacement trustee. His right to do so was challenged by Anne Keene (and others) because cl. 3 of the Charter limited trusteeship to those who were direct descendants of Wiremu and Manawaroa Te Awe Awe. The minutes record that following Sarah's nomination Anne Keene spoke regarding beneficiary status regarding whāngai. The minutes go on to say that discussions were held on this matter following which the Chair, Wiremu Te Awe Awe, moved the following motion:

⁵ It is common ground that cl. 3 of the Charter should refer to Wiremu Te Awe Awe as well as Manawaroa Te Awe Awe and that this omission is a typographical error.

That all direct descendants of Manawaroa present at today's meeting agree and approve that all and any whāngai present and any direct descendants of any whāngai present be permitted to vote at this year's election.

[13] The motion was seconded by Nuwyne Te Awe Awe Mohi and was carried with 32 in favour and three against. Those opposing the trustee appointments say that this motion was not proper as it is contrary to cl. 3 of the Charter and also because there was no way to be certain that it was passed by a clear majority of direct descendants of the named tupuna.

[14] I accept the evidence of George Larkins that he and his immediate whānau in attendance (numbering five in total) did not vote on this resolution. The attendance list filed with the minutes list 47 people in attendance at the AGM. Of the 47 in attendance a total of 35 voted on the motion approving participation of whāngai and descendants of whāngai in the 2023 trustee elections. On the basis of responses to questions I raised with a number of parties at the hearing, I am satisfied that there were no significant irregularities in the voting on this motion by reason of participation by those who were not direct descendants of Wiremu and Manawaroa Te Awe Awe.

[15] There were 12 nominations for the 7 trustee positions. Those elected and the votes in support are as follows: Hoani Matenga (31); Sarah Larkins (28); Nuwyne Te Awe Awe Mohi (27); Bryan Matenga (27); Paul Matenga (26); Wiremu Kingi Te Awe Awe Snr (24), and; Charles Matenga (24). After objection was raised, George Larkins withdrew his nomination of his daughter Sarah. She was then nominated by Aareta Mohi.

[16] Renee Hunt, Michael Matenga, Murray Manawaroa, Triest Te Awe Awe and Christine King were unsuccessful candidates.

[17] After the AGM, Anne Keene, Rebecca Hunt, Kapiki Te Awe Awe, Christine King and John Larkins ("the Objectors") wrote two letters to the trustees dated 23 April 2023 and 16 July 2023 respectively, objecting to the validity of the trustee election process. The trustees replied on 13 August 2023 acknowledging the objections raised but confirming they were satisfied with the process and results of the election.

Ngā tapaetanga o ngā Kaiwhakahē

Submissions of the Objectors

[18] The Court received a letter from Anne Keene, Rebecca Hunt, Kapiki Te Awe Awe, Christine King and John Larkins on 12 January 2024 opposing the trustee election held at Te Rangimarie Marae AGM. On 22 January 2024, Mary Jane Scott advised she was also in support of the objections raised.

[19] The Objectors state that they regret not having opposed the motion during the AGM but felt “a lot was happening in a short space of time” and it was hard for them to “carefully consider all of the implications” of the motion. The Objectors do not accept that it is too late to object to the election process; if George Larkins is held not to be a “direct descendant” then they say that the process was fundamentally flawed and could not be fixed by a motion. Overall, the Objectors believe there were “serious irregularities” at the AGM which invalidate the election.

[20] The Objectors asks that the existing seven trustees continue to act as trustees for an interim period until such time a further meeting is held and new trustees elected.

[21] The Objectors believe that their concern, that George Larkins suffers from a conflict of interest, have been ignored. They say that George Larkins involvement at the AGM and in the trustees’ response to the two letters raises serious questions as to whether George Larkins should in continue in his role as trustee until the next election.

Whāngai status

[22] The Charter stipulates that only the “direct descendants of Manawaroa Te Awe Awe and Wiremu Kingi Te Awe Awe” can nominate and stand as trustees. It is the position of the Objectors that this clause should be strictly abided to; George Larkins would only be eligible to nominate and vote if he was legally adopted by Joe Larkins.

[23] Further, the five Objectors strongly doubt that George Larkins can claim the status of a whāngai. They propose a definition of whāngai that they submit aligns with the tikanga of their hapū:⁶

A whāngai child as a child born within a hapū or whānau, who is parented from birth (or almost from birth), by one or two persons, also part of the same hapū or whānau as the child, who are not the birth parents of the child.

⁶ Second Letter of the Objectors dated 16 July 2023.

[24] The Objectors have also directed the Court to the definition of ‘whāngai’ in *Pomare – Succession to Peter Here Pomare*.⁷

[...] the main principle in whāngai is kinship...there has to be a whakapapa link which is readily established... the taking the point of relationship in the whāngai situation, outside the fourth cousin status is too far removed to allow a whāngai to have rights in the use of family land. Thus a close blood relationship is a pre-requisite to the whāngai eventually assuming rights in land.

[25] They say that since George Larkins was primarily raised by his birth mother and was not born within the Te Awe Awe hapū, he does not qualify as a whāngai within this definition.

[26] Further, the Objectors believe that the same considerations that are relevant to whether whāngai can succeed to rights to land should apply to George Larkins and his whānau in this application, as they are seeking to acquire rights of descendants of Manawaroa which ultimately concern land.

[27] They also submit a comparison to the Adoption Act 1955, which did not allow an adoptive parent pass on their legal or Māori customary rights to a non-biological child other than by legally adopting them under this Act. George Larkins was not legally adopted by Joe.

[28] The Objectors say that the Chairman and trustees have also failed thus far to indicate whether they have investigated George Larkins claim to recognition as a whāngai and what the outcome of such an investigation was:

Unless George Larkins can validly claim the status of whāngai for himself and his descendants to vote as beneficiaries, the motion approved at the AGM to allow whāngai and their descendants to vote as beneficiaries, did not apply to George Larkins and his descendants and the fact that they were permitted to vote rendered voting as a whole invalid and ineffective to establish new trustees.

[29] The Objectors assert it is the duty of the trustees to investigate and explain to the beneficiaries George Larkins whāngai claim. Once the trustees have sufficiently dealt with this matter, the Objectors seek a formal explanation of any position come to.

Conflict of Interest

⁷ (2015) 103 Taitokerau MB 95 (103 TTK 95) at [60].

[30] The Objectors submit that George Larkins was an existing trustee and the whāngai issue was directly related to him, therefore he is conflicted and should have not be involved in this matter beyond explaining his view to the trustees.

[31] At the AGM, and the meeting of the trustees held on 27 July 2023 to discuss the issues regarding the trustee elections, the Objectors have raised concerns that George Larkins suffered from a conflict of interest and should not have been present.

[32] The Objectors say that the correct procedure was for George Larkins to explain how he is whāngai, answer questions of the trustees, and then withdraw from the meeting so that the trustees could discuss and vote.

Ngā tapaetanga o ngā Kaitono

Submissions of the Applicants

Trustees' Submissions

[33] Hoani Matenga replied, on behalf of Bryan Matenga, Paul Matenga and David Matenga, to the Objectors on 16 January 2024. Their position is that the voting process at the AGM was conducted in accordance with the Charter, their tikanga, and the principles which underpin trustee elections.

Whāngai status

[34] Prima facie, the trustees maintain that George Larkins has beneficiary status as a successor to Joe Larkins as whāngai. George Larkins is recognised as whāngai of the hapū by tikanga, provisions of Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993, and the AGM motion dated 26 March 2023. Further, George Larkins has served as a trustee for the last five years without any issues, demonstrating his commitment and capability in his role.

[35] However, the trustees hold that the motion passed at the AGM show support for George Larkins ability to vote in this meeting and support the validity of the election.

Conflict of interest

[36] The trustees deny that George Larkins had a conflict of interest either at the AGM or

the subsequent meeting in July 2023.

[37] They emphasise that the Objectors agreed to proceed with the vote during the AGM and participated in the trustee election process. Moreover, they say that this matter has been discussed multiple times in the bimonthly trustee meetings, and there has been consistent agreement that George Larkins and his immediate whānau have the right to vote.

[38] Sarah Larkins was also nominated for a trustee position by Aareta Mohi, who is daughter of current trustee Nuwyne Te Awe Awe Mohi, therefore the nomination did not come solely from George Larkins. The trustees assert that “this highlights the collective decision-making process and dispels any notion of undue influence or conflict of interest on the part of Mr Larkins.”

[39] The trustees ask the Court to confirm the trustees as they were elected at the AGM.

George Larkins

[40] George Larkins responded to the issues raised by letter to the Court dated 21 January 2024. He notes that no concerns have been raised about his five years as a trustee and that the current Objectors, including Rebecca Hunt and Anne Keene, were present some years ago at the AGM when he was nominated and elected as a trustee. No objection was raised at that time. He also says that when the issue was raised at the 2023 AGM he asked that the draft resolution be changed to remove his name and replace it with the word ‘whāngai.’

Whāngai status

[41] George Larkin also says that his status as a whāngai of Joe has never been challenged nor questioned:⁸

I’ve only ever known my father as Joe Larkins. My earliest memories are from Rangiotu, where I started school. He raised me, instilling ethical values and essential life skills. We supported each other through various challenges. He celebrated my successes, shared laughter, acknowledged sorrows, and is known as Grandad by my children.

He always referred to me as his son, which is also evidence in his Will. His marriage to my mother further solidified our family bonds. We attended numerous Hui at Te Rangimarie

⁸ George Larkins’ letter to the Court dated 21 January 2024.

Marae, where the whanau consistently acknowledged me as his whāngai son. Our presence at significant Hui, including the Treaty Settlement signing, marked my commitment and his guidance during the challenging years leading up to that moment.

[42] George Larkins submits that during his five years as trustee of the trusts, no notice of concern has been raised regarding him serving despite cl. 3 of the Charter and, as shown at the AGM, the Objectors represent a minority of opinion. There was also no notice of their intention to challenge the right of any whāngai to vote.

[43] Moreover, he says that the Objectors are seeking to redefine ‘whāngai’ in the Charter, without consultation with the hapū. George Larkins proposes, instead, to add it as an agenda item at the next AGM, allowing beneficiaries to decide this issue through due process and voting.

[44] In summary, George Larkins seeks that the new elected trustees be confirmed, and the voting rights of whāngai, and its definition, should be determined by the beneficiaries in the future.

Conflict of Interest

[45] George Larkins denies that his presence at the AGM when the motion was passed, and at the later meeting of the trustees, constituted a conflict of interest. George Larkins asks the Court to look at his tenure as trustee and his “voting patterns” to reject the claim as unfounded.

[46] The claim that George Larkins “took control” of the meeting denies the established protocol of meetings chaired by the Chair, and the trustees’ explanations about his understanding of whāngai were provided in his response to the Objector’s letter of 16 July 2023.

Further Submissions of the Objectors

[47] The Objectors filed further submissions on 27 February 2024. They continue to emphasise their concerns with the election process at the AGM, and concern with George Larkins claiming whāngai status when he, in their eyes, should not.

[48] The Objectors also point to the case of *Tukapua – Horowhenua 11B 36 2L 4A Block (Kawiu Marae)* in which the Court held a trustee election was invalid as the trustees had attempted to alter the election process, as set out in the charter, without following the proper process to alter the charter.⁹ I accept this case as authority for the proposition that marae trustees cannot arbitrarily depart from the provisions of the charter (if one is in place).

[49] The distinguishing feature of this case however is the fact that cl. 3 of the Charter specifically permits descendants of the named tupuna to widen the class of trustees at a hui properly convened to elect trustees.

Ngā Ture

The Law

[50] The courts power to appointment and remove trustees for these trusts is set out in Section 239 of Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 which provides:

239 Addition, reduction, and replacement of trustees

- (1) The Court may at any time, on application, in respect of any trust to which this Part applies, add to or reduce the number of trustees or replace 1 or more of the trustees.
- (2) The Court may amend the Court's records for a trust if a trustee dies and the Court receives a death certificate for the deceased trustee.
- (3) In exercising the powers in subsections (1) and (2), the Court may order the vesting of land or other assets of the trust in any person or persons (with the consent of that person or those persons) upon the terms of the trust, whether or not that person was previously a trustee."

[51] Further, s 222(2) of TTWMA provides:

222 Appointment of trustees

[...]

- (2) The Court, in deciding whether to appoint any individual or body to be a trustee of a trust constituted under this Part of this Act,—
 - (a) Shall have regard to the ability, experience, and knowledge of the individual or body; and
 - (b) Shall not appoint an individual or body unless it is satisfied that the appointment of that individual or body would be broadly acceptable to the beneficiaries."

⁹ (2013) 307 Aotea MB 117 (307 AOT 117).

[52] And s 338(7) of TTWMA provides:

338 Maori reservations for communal purposes

[...]

- (7) The Court may, by order, vest any Maori reservation in any body corporate or in any 2 or more persons in trust to hold and administer it for the benefit of the persons or class of persons for whose benefit the reservation is made, and may from time to time, as and when it thinks fit, appoint a new trustee or new trustees or additional trustees.”

[53] TTWMA grants wide discretion to trustees, and beneficiaries, when regulating the administration of their reservation. Under s 338A of TTWMA, the trustees may specify the powers and processes by which trustees act in relation to the reservation, either by charter or trust deed.

[54] The Māori Reservation Regulations 1994 (“MRR”) supplement TTWMA and provide a set of default processes for the administration and management of Māori reservations. Under reg. 7(e) of the MRR the trustees, in agreement with the beneficiaries, may create a charter to establish principles to which the trustees will have regard to in relation to the marae, including the election and powers of trustees and dispute resolution processes.

[55] It has been held by this Court that the process of trustee elections merely provides evidence to the Court of which candidates those at the meeting support for nomination.¹⁰ The Court then takes into account a broad range of factors when considering who should be appointed as trustee, including who the reservation has been set aside for, the characteristics of the proposed trustees and any other related matters.

[56] Also noteworthy is cl.7 of the Charter which provides:

7) RESOLVING CONFLICTS BETWEEN BENEFICIARIES AND TRUSTEES

A conflict may be resolved by direct discussion and agreement between the Beneficiary/ies and Trustee/s concerned.

A Resolution may be sought at an Annual General Meeting.

¹⁰ *Gibbs v Te Runanga o Ngati Tama – Part Lot 2 & Lot 1 DP 4866 (TNK 4/901) and Section 1SO 10359 CT TNK4/792* (2011) 274 Aotea MB 47 (274 AOT 47) at [57].

A conflict that remains unresolved may be tabled at a Meeting of all the Beneficiaries including Trustees, specially convened to resolve the conflict or tabled with reasonable notice at the next Annual General Meeting.

[57] I see George Larkins proposal that the current conflict over whāngai entitlement be referred to the next AGM, as consistent with this provision.

Kōrerorero

Discussion

[58] As I indicated at the hearing on 7 March 2024, I accept that the Objectors have raised an important issue with regard to compliance with cl. 3 of the Charter. I am, however, satisfied that is appropriate to make the trustee appointments for the following reasons.

[59] Clause 3 of the Charter specifically provides the descendants of Wiremu and Manawaroa Te Awe Awe with a discretion to nominate and elect trustees, who are not direct descendants, at a hui properly convened to elect trustees.

[60] I am satisfied that the AGM was a properly convened hui. I am also satisfied that the resolution passed at that AGM, approving the participation of whāngai and direct descendants of whāngai in the trustee election, was properly put and passed by a clear majority. I also accept the evidence of George Larkins at the motion approving the participation of whāngai in the voting process was changed during discussion to replace his name with the word “whāngai”. George Larkins said he had suggested this to shift the focus from his personal situation to the broader issue of whāngai voting rights. This, he said, was because the complainants insisted the matter was about the Charter and not solely about him. George Larkins says that the challenge to his status as a whāngai arose after the AGM. It was not a matter raised at the AGM itself.

[61] I am satisfied that cl. 3 provided the direct descendants of Wiremu and Manawaroa Te Awe Awe present at the AGM the discretion to approve a change to voting entitlement and that this was done in a procedurally correct and fair manner. I am also satisfied by the totality of the evidence that the motion passed at the AGM was understood by those present as permitting whāngai and descendants of whāngai to not only vote at the trustee election, but also to be nominated as a trustee, and if elected, to serve as a trustee. I see this as the

proper inference to draw from the way in which the issue arose, which was first by way of an objection to George Larkins' right to nominate his daughter as a trustee. Following discussion of this objection, not only was the amending motion put and passed, but Sarah Larkin was then nominated by a direct descendant of the named tupuna and was elected as the second-highest polling trustee.

[62] I am also satisfied from the totality of the evidence that at the time of the 2023 AGM those present and voting on the amending motion did so on the understanding that George was not a direct descendant of Manawaroa and Wiremu Te Awe Awe, but he was a whāngai of Joe Larkins who was a direct descendant. This seems clear from the uncontested evidence on how the motion was drafted, and from the fact that there was no evidence of any objection or challenge to the participation of George Larkins or Sarah Larkins from voting on the basis that George Larkins was a whāngai of Joe Larkins. I see no reason for the Court to intervene in this instance and direct a fresh election. I acknowledge that the issue of whāngai entitlement and the provisions of the charter will remain a live issue following this decision. I repeat the offer I made at the hearing to appoint an independent facilitator for the next AGM if parties consider that to be helpful. Leave is reserved to the trustees to apply for such assistance. The costs will be met from the Courts special aid fund.

[63] It is also common ground that all trustees elect (and returning trustees) are suitable for appointment. Having reviewed the evidence, the minutes, and the trustee consent forms I am also satisfied that it is right to appoint the three newly elected trustees and to reappoint the four returning trustees.

Ngā Ōta

The Orders

[64] Accordingly I confirm the following orders, which were made in open court at Palmerston North on 7 March 2024:

[65] The Court makes the following orders pursuant to Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993 as follows:

- (a) section 239 replacing David Matenga, George Patrick Larkins and Mary Jane Scott with Bryan Kingi Matenga, Hoani Meihana Matenga and Sarah Ann Larkins as

responsible trustees for the Rangitikei Manawatu Pt B4 being Lot 1 DP 4102 (Old Post Office) Ahu Whenua Trust;

- (b) sections 239 and 338(7) replacing David Matenga, George Patrick Larkins and Mary Jane Scott with Bryan Kingi Matenga, Hoani Meihana Matenga and Sarah Ann Larkins as responsible trustees for the Rangitikei Manawatu B4 Māori (Rangiotu School) Reservation; and
- (c) sections 239 and 338(7) replacing David Matenga, George Patrick Larkins and Mary Jane Scott with Bryan Kingi Matenga, Hoani Meihana Matenga and Sarah Ann Larkins as responsible trustees for the Rangitikei Manawatu B4 Māori (Te Rangimarie Marae/Urupa/Church Recreation) Reservation.

[66] For the avoidance of doubt, the trustees of each trust are Nuwyne Kiri Te Awe Awe Mohi, Wiremu Kingi Te Awe Awe III, Paul David Matenga, Charles William Matenga, Bryan Kingi Matenga, Hoani Meihana Matenga and Sarah Ann Larkins.

[67] Under Rule 7.5(2)(b) of the Māori Land Court Rules 2011, these orders are to be completed without delay.

[68] There is a direction to the trustees that an application for a review of the Rangitikei Manawatu Pt B4 being Lot 1 DP 4102 (Old Post Office) Trust be filed within six months of today's hearing.

[69] There is a recommendation that the newly appointed trustees undertake the Māori Land Court trustee training within six months of today's hearing.

I whakapuaki i te wā 3:00pm ki Te Whanganui-a-Tara, 13 o ngā rā o Poutū-te-rangi i te tau 2024.

Pronounced at Wellington this 13th day of March 2024.

M J Doogan
JUDGE