

Serisha Hariram

Senior Associate



Serisha Hariram is a Senior Associate in our Dispute Resolution practice. Serisha specialises in class action and high court litigation having successfully resolved disputes involving personal injury, personal liability, product liability as well as general commercial and contractual issues. Serisha also has experience in the registration and administration of trusts.

About Serisha

Serisha was admitted as an attorney in September 2019, as a notary in August 2021 and joined CDH as a Senior Associate in September 2023.

Credentials

Education

- LL.B (University of the Free State) – 2016
- Practical Legal Training (L.E.A.D) - 2017
- Admission as an Attorney (Gauteng Division, Pretoria) - 2019
- Admission as a Notary (Gauteng Division, Pretoria) – 2021

Experience

- Serisha gained experience in class action and high court litigation having worked on four prominent class action lawsuits launched in South Africa including the class action lawsuit launched against Tiger Brands following the listeria outbreak in 2017, the class action lawsuit against the Steinhoff Group following one of the biggest corporate fraud scandals in South Africa, the class action lawsuit against Volkswagen following the company's global emissions scandal of 2014 as well as the recent class action lawsuit instituted against Johnson & Johnson and Coloplast over alleged defective pelvic mesh devices.

News

[Considering applications for special leave to appeal](#)

Section 17(3) of the Superior Courts Act 10 of 2013, read with section 16(1)(b), allows for persons dissatisfied with a decision of a full bench, to appeal the decision to the Supreme Court of Appeal (SCA).

Contact Serisha

+27 (0)11 562 1649

serisha.hariram@cdhlegal.com

[Serisha on LinkedIn](#)

Expertise

[Dispute Resolution](#)

Location

Johannesburg

Language

English

When does the proverbial clock begin to tick under section 7(1) of PAJA?

A ruling was made by the Constitutional Court at the end of last year in Sasol Chevron Holdings Limited v Commissioner for the South African Revenue Services ZACC30, confirming that the 180-day period afforded by section 7(1) of the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act 3 of 2000 (PAJA) starts running from the date that reasons for the decision are provided with sufficient detail to allow the offended party to file an objection against the decision. A party's request for more detailed reasons does not afford that party room to argue that the 180-day period only starts running once those more detailed reasons are provided.

Transacting at arm's length

The Supreme Court of Appeal (SCA), in the recent case of Allied Steelrode (Pty) Ltd v Dreyer and Another ZASCA 181, set aside an order of the Gauteng Division of the High Court, Johannesburg, after it had concluded that a loan agreement entered into between parties who shared a close bond and where no interest was levied against the borrower, was subject to the National Credit Act 34 of 2005 (NCA) and that a subsequent acknowledgement of debt (AOD) constituted a credit agreement under the NCA.

The answer lies in the rules of interpretation

In the recent case of Zoviflo (Pty) Ltd v Prokas and Others (010253/2023) ZAGPJHC 918 (15 August 2023), the essential issue for determination by the Gauteng Division of the High Court, Johannesburg, was whether the existence of a nominee agreement was impacted by the failure to successfully conclude and implement a joint venture agreement. Are the agreements interlinked or can they be viewed as independent, standalone contracts between the parties?

[All news by Serisha Hariram →](#)