

**IN THE SUPREME COURT OF NEW ZEALAND
I TE KŌTI MANA NUI**

SC 105/2024

BETWEEN

RASIER OPERATIONS BV
First Appellant

UBER PORTIER BV
Second Appellant

UBER BV
Third Appellant

PORTIER NEW ZEALAND LIMITED
Fourth Appellant

RASIER NEW ZEALAND LIMITED
Fifth Appellant

AND

E TŪ INCORPORATED
First Respondent

FIRST UNION INCORPORATED
Second Respondent

RESPONDENTS' CHRONOLOGY
16 April 2025

PRESENTED FOR FILING BY:

OAKLEY MORAN
Solicitors
P.O. Box 241 Wellington
Phone: (04) 472.3055

Person Acting: Peter Cranney

1. Mr Ang registered with Uber on 23 July 2016 and commenced work on 25 August 2016. He completed 6,250 trips and ceased Uber work on 17 November 2018.
2. Mr Keil registered with Uber on 12 February 2017 and commenced work on 27 February 2017. He completed 19,991 trips and ceased Uber work on 27 January 2022.
3. Mr Rama registered with Uber on 22 December 2018 and commenced work on 18 July 2019. He completed before 20 May 2022 3,226 trips. He also completed 35 Uber Eats deliveries during the Covid shutdown. He is still an Uber driver.
4. Mr Abdurahman registered with Uber on 14 June 2020 and commenced work on 8 October 2020. He completed 1,885 trips and ceased Uber work on 17 February 2022.
5. All clicked or electronically signed the various documents which Uber required over the period of their Uber work.
6. All are part of a proceeding seeking minimum entitlements current underway in the Employment Relations Authority (involving more than 1,000 Uber drivers who are members of the second respondent). The second respondent has also initiated collective bargaining with Uber but that has not progressed pending this proceeding being resolved.
7. The Employment Court issued its judgment on 25 October 2022 concluding that Uber was the employer and the drivers were Uber employees.
8. The Court of Appeal dismissed an appeal against the judgment on 26 August 2024.
9. Uber appealed to this Court on 6 July 2023.

Peter Cranney/Grace Liu/Emily Griffin
Counsel for respondents
16 April 2025

Pursuant to the requirements under the Supreme Court Submissions Practice Note and having made appropriate inquiries, counsel hereby certify that, to the best of their

knowledge, this chronology for the respondents does not contain any suppressed information and is therefore suitable for publication.