

# HJORT

**TO** Girteka Group  
**FROM** Jørn A Uggerud and Ole Iversen Kalvø  
**DATE** 2. August 2018

---

## Review of registered inspections by the Norwegian Labour Inspection Authority

### 1 Introduction and summary of findings

Advokatfirmaet Hjort DA have been approached by the Girteka Group to review the Norwegian Labour Inspection Authority's inspection of the Girteka Group companies. Our research and review has been directed towards the following companies of the Girteka Group:

- UAB Trasis
- UAB Termolita
- UAB Girmeta
- UAB Girteka logistics
- UAB KLP transport
- UAB ME transportas

In summary, our research revealed a number of registered inspections. In all cases the relevant Girteka Group Company has provided the Labour Inspection Authority with requested documentation. As a result of their findings following this communication, all cases were closed with no violations from the Girteka Group companies.

In the following we will give a summary of each inspection of the different companies.

### 2 UAB Trasis

Our research revealed no registered inspection of UAB Trasis. Consequently, the company has no registered violations.

### 3 UAB Termolita

Our research revealed no registered inspection of UAB Termolita. Consequently, the company has no registered violations.

## 4 UAB Girmeta

### 4.1 Inspection reference: 2015/53454

The purpose of the inspection was to audit whether the driver's hourly wages and working conditions were in compliance with Norwegian labour law. The driver was conducting a Cabotage transport within Norway. For the hours of work within Norway the company was therefore obliged to comply with the Norwegian regulations regarding minimum hourly wage and daily subsistence allowance.

The Labour Inspection Authority requested UAB Girmeta to provide documentation of compliance in the above mentioned topics. Based on the information provided by UAB Girmeta, the Labour Inspection Authority regarded the company to be in compliance with the Norwegian regulations regarding minimum hourly wages and daily subsistence allowances. Following this, the inspection was closed with no violations.

### 4.2 Inspection reference: 2015/54140

The inspection concerned the same matters as *Inspection 2015/53454* and as described under this review's subparagraph 4.1. Based on the documentation provided by UAB Girmeta, the Labour Inspection Authority concluded that the company was in compliance with the Norwegian regulations regarding minimum hourly wage and daily subsistence allowance. The inspection was therefore closed with no violations.

### 4.3 Inspection reference: 2016/18011

The inspection concerned the same matters as *Inspection 2015/53454* and as described under this review's subparagraph 4.1. Based on the documentation provided by UAB Girmeta, the Labour Inspection Authority concluded that the company was in compliance with the Norwegian regulations regarding minimum hourly wage and daily subsistence allowance. The inspection was therefore closed with no violations.

### 4.4 Inspection reference: 2016/27335

The inspection concerned the same matters as *Inspection 2015/53454* and as described under this review's subparagraph 4.1. Based on the information provided by the driver, the Labour Inspection Authority did not regard the operation as Cabotage. The inspection was therefore closed with no violations.

### 4.5 Inspection reference: 2016/41767

The inspection concerned the same matters as *Inspection 2015/53454* and as described under this review's subparagraph 4.1. Based on the documentation provided by UAB Girmeta, the Labour

Inspection Authority concluded that the company was in compliance with the Norwegian regulations regarding minimum hourly wages and daily subsistence allowances. The inspection was therefore closed with no violations.

#### **4.6 Inspection reference: 2016/42711**

The inspection concerned the same matters as *Inspection 2015/53454* and as described under this review's subparagraph 4.1. Based on the documentation provided by UAB Girmeta, The Labour Inspection Authority concluded that the company was in compliance with the Norwegian regulations regarding minimum hourly wages and daily subsistence allowances. The inspection was therefore closed with no violations.

#### **4.7 Inspection reference: 2016/44438**

Our research revealed one inspection conducted solely by the Norwegian Road Authority. This was a general inspection regarding the state of the vehicle. The inspection revealed no violations in relation to the vehicle itself. However, a fine was issued on the basis of a compulsory toll tag not being visibly installed in the front window.

Evident by the documentation provided by UAB Girmeta to the Road Authorities, the vehicle had a valid contract in relation the required toll tag. Following a complaint by UAB Girmeta, the fine was later waived on the basis of it only being issued on the grounds of the tag not being visible in the front window.

#### **4.8 Inspection reference: 2017/17378**

The inspection concerned the same matters as *Inspection 2015/53454* and as described under this review's subparagraph 4.1. Based on the documentation provided by UAB Girmeta, The Labour Inspection Authority concluded that the company was in compliance with the Norwegian regulations regarding minimum hourly wages and daily subsistence allowances. The inspection was therefore closed with no violations.

#### **4.9 Inspection reference: 2017/30317**

The inspection concerned the same matters as *Inspection 2015/53454* and as described under this review's subparagraph 4.1. Based on the information provided by the drivers, the Labour Inspection Authority didn't see a reason to request additional documentation from UAB Girmeta. The inspection was therefore closed with no violations.

**4.10 Inspection reference: 2017/33684**

The inspection concerned the same matters as *Inspection 2015/53454* and as described under this review's subparagraph 4.1. Based on the documentation provided by UAB Girmeta, the Labour Inspection Authority concluded that the company was in compliance with the Norwegian regulations regarding minimum hourly wage and daily subsistence allowance. The inspection was therefore closed with no violations.

**4.11 Inspection reference: 2018/9692**

The inspection concerned the same matters as *Inspection 2015/53454* and as described under this review's subparagraph 4.1. Based on the documentation provided by UAB Girmeta, the Labour Inspection Authority concluded that the company was in compliance with the Norwegian regulations regarding minimum hourly wage and daily subsistence allowance. The inspection was therefore closed with no violations.

**5 UAB Girteka logistics****5.1 Inspection reference: 2016/8833**

The inspection concerned the same matters as *Inspection 2015/53454* and as described under this review's subparagraph 4.1. Based on the documentation provided by UAB ME Transportas, The Labour Inspection Authority concluded that the company was in compliance with the Norwegian regulations regarding minimum hourly wages and daily subsistence allowances. The inspection was therefore closed with no violations.

**5.2 Case reference: 2018/16095**

The case registered on UAB Girteka logistics with reference ID 2018/16095 concerns an inquiry made by UAB Girteka logistics to the Labour Inspection Authority and accompanying correspondence. Seeing as this is not related to an inspection of possible violations it is not relevant to our review.

**6 UAB KLP transport****6.1 Inspection reference: 2017/17335**

The inspection concerned the same matters as *Inspection 2015/53454* and as described under this review's subparagraph 4.1. Based on the documentation provided by UAB KLP transport, The Labour Inspection Authority concluded that the company was in compliance with the Norwegian regulations regarding minimum hourly wage and daily subsistence allowance. The inspection was therefore closed with no violations.

## 7 UAB ME transportas

### 7.1 Inspection reference: 2016/36618

The inspection concerned the same matters as *Inspection 2015/53454* and as described under this review's subparagraph 4.1. Based on the documentation provided by UAB ME transportas, the Labour Inspection Authority concluded that the company was in compliance with the Norwegian regulations regarding minimum hourly wage and daily subsistence allowance. The inspection was therefore closed with no violations.

### 7.2 Inspection reference: 2016/43591

The inspection concerned the same matters as *Inspection 2015/53454* and as described under this review's subparagraph 4.1. Based on the information provided by the driver, the Labour Inspection Authority did not regard the operation as Cabotage. The inspection was therefore closed with no violations.

### 7.3 Inspection reference: 2017/25953


The inspection concerned the same matters as *Inspection 2015/53454* and as described under this review's subparagraph 4.1. Based on the documentation provided by UAB ME transportas, the Labour Inspection Authority concluded that the company was in compliance with the Norwegian regulations regarding minimum hourly wages and daily subsistence allowances. The inspection was therefore closed with no violations.

### 7.4 Inspection reference: 2017/30323

The inspection concerned the same matters as *Inspection 2015/53454* and as described under this review's subparagraph 4.1. Based on the documentation provided by UAB ME transportas, the Labour Inspection Authority concluded that the company was in compliance with the Norwegian regulations regarding minimum hourly wages and daily subsistence allowances. The inspection was therefore closed with no violations.

**On behalf of Advokatfirmaet Hjort DA**

**Oslo, 2. August 2018**



---

Jørn A. Uggerud  
Lawyer / Partner