

MINING & MINERALS

MINISTER OF MINERAL RESOURCES NOT EMPOWERED TO WAIVE THE LEGAL REQUIREMENT TO EXHAUST INTERNAL APPEAL FOR ANY ADVERSE ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION(S) – THE MINERAL AND PETROLEUM RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

MINISTER OF MINERAL RESOURCES NOT EMPOWERED TO WAIVE THE LEGAL REQUIREMENT TO EXHAUST INTERNAL APPEAL FOR ANY ADVERSE ADMINISTRATIVE DECISION(S) – THE MINERAL AND PETROLEUM RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT ACT

The Minister of Mineral Resources or his delegated officials are not empowered to waive the legal requirement to exhaust internal appeal for any adverse administrative decision(s) – the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act, No 28 of 2002 (as amended).

The Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Act, No 28 of 2002 (MPRDA) as amended by the Mineral and Petroleum Resources Development Amendment Act, No 49 of 2008 (Amendment Act) is the principal legislation in South Africa which, *inter alia*, regulates the granting or refusal of prospecting rights, mining rights, exploration rights and production rights to applicants by the state as the custodian of all mineral and petroleum resources of South Africa through the Minister of Mineral Resources (Minister).

The legislature in terms of s96 of the MPRDA introduced a compulsory internal appeal process which an aggrieved party must follow. The internal appeal process must first be complied with before approaching a court for relief as s96(3) of the MPRDA makes it clear that no person is entitled to apply to a court for the review of an administrative decision taken in terms of the MPRDA until that person has exhausted their internal remedies. However in exceptional circumstances if a court deems it in the interest of justice an aggrieved persons would be entitled in terms of s7(2)(c) of Promotion of Administrative Justice Act, No 3 of 2000 to directly approach a court for relief without exhausting the internal remedies.

The Constitutional Court in the case of *Dengetenge Holdings (Proprietary) Limited v Southern Sphere Mining & Development Co Limited and Others* 2014 (5) SA 138 (CC) recently confirmed "The promulgation of PAJA made it compulsory for aggrieved parties to exhaust internal remedies before approaching a court for review unless they were exempted from this duty by a competent court. The corollary was that the (peremptory) remedy-exhaustion requirement in s96 of the MPRDA could not be waived by administrative functionaries. They were bound to consider the aggrieved party's internal appeals."

Any party who approached a court for the judicial review of a decision by the Minister without first exhausting the internal remedies does so at their own peril. The biggest concern most aggrieved parties have with internal appeals to an administrator is that the internal appeal does not automatically suspend the administrative decision of the Minister or their delegated official. However, the new s96(2)(b) of the Amendment Act, which came into effect on 7 June 2013, also introduced additional protection to aggrieved persons by suspending any competing applications in terms of the MPRDA in respect of the same/ similar rights pending the finalisation of an internal appeal.

Further in respect of internal appeals (including judicial review) there are time-periods within which such process must be initiated. The failure to initiate the process within the prescribed time-periods could result in a court refusing to review and set aside the adverse decision even though such decision was irregular. It is important to obtain legal advice on whether a proper case could be pleaded to demonstrate to a court or an appeal forum that a right or legitimate expectation was materially and adversely affected by the decision of the Minister or her delegated official, which decision must be reviewed, set aside and substituted with the correct decision.

Should you require further information relating to the aforesaid, please contact Jackwell Feris on (T) 011 562 1825 or jackwell.feris@dlacdh.com.

CONTACT US

For more information about our Mining and Minerals services, please contact:



Allan Reid
Director
Corporate and Commercial
T +27 (0)11 562 1222
E allan.reid@dcladh.com



Jackwell Feris
Director
Dispute Resolution
T +27 (0)11 562 1825
E jackwell.feris@dcladh.com



Rishaban Moodley
Director
Dispute Resolution
T +27 (0)11 562 1666
E rishaban.moodley@dcladh.com



Sandra Gore
Director
Environmental
T +27 (0)11 562 1433
E sandra.gore@dcladh.com



Aadil Patel
National Practice Head
Director
Employment
T +27 (0)11 562 1107
E aadil.patel@dcladh.com



Willem Jacobs
National Practice Head
Director
Corporate and Commercial
T +27 (0)11 562 1555
E willem.jacobs@dcladh.com



Verushca Pillay
Director
Corporate and Commercial
T +27 (0)11 562 1800
E verushca.pillay@dcladh.com



Fiona Leppan
Director
Employment
T +27 (0)11 562 1153
E fiona.leppan@dcladh.com



Terry Winstanley
National Practice Head
Director
Environmental
T +27 (0)21 562 6332
E terry.winstanley@dcladh.com



Banzi Malinga
Director
Corporate and Commercial
T +27 (0)11 562 1100
E banzi.malinga@dcladh.com



Giada Masina
Director
Corporate and Commercial
T +27 (0)11 562 1221
E giada.masina@dcladh.com

This information is published for general information purposes and is not intended to constitute legal advice. Specialist legal advice should always be sought in relation to any particular situation. Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr will accept no responsibility for any actions taken or not taken on the basis of this publication.

BBBEE STATUS: LEVEL THREE CONTRIBUTOR

JOHANNESBURG

1 Protea Place Sandton Johannesburg 2196, Private Bag X40 Benmore 2010 South Africa
Dx 154 Randburg and Dx 42 Johannesburg
T +27 (0)11 562 1000 F +27 (0)11 562 1111 E jhb@dcladh.com

CAPE TOWN

11 Buitengracht Street Cape Town 8001, PO Box 695 Cape Town 8000 South Africa
Dx 5 Cape Town
T +27 (0)21 481 6300 F +27 (0)21 481 6388 E ctn@dcladh.com

cliffedekkerhofmeyr.com

Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr is a member of DLA Piper Group, an alliance of legal practices.

©2014 0168/OCT14