

1 AUGUST 2016

EMPLOYMENT ALERT

Our programme on Conducting a Disciplinary Enquiry has been accredited by the Services SETA.

IN THIS ISSUE

CONSTITUTIONAL COURT CLARIFIES EMPLOYMENT EQUITY MEASURES

On 15 July 2016, the Constitutional Court in *Solidarity and Others v Department of Correctional Services and Others* (CCT 78/15) [2016] ZACC 18 handed down its judgment on disputes surrounding the Department of Correctional Services' (Department) refusal to promote or employ individuals based on the demographic targets set out in the Department's Employment Equity Plan (EEP).



[CLICK HERE](#) to view our NEW Employment Strike Guideline

CONSTITUTIONAL COURT CLARIFIES EMPLOYMENT EQUITY MEASURES

The Department's EEP for the period 2010 – 2014 contained numerical targets to be achieved by the Department within a five year period based on national demographics.

The Labour Court ruled in favour of Solidarity, the trade union representing the applicants, stating that the EEP was non-compliant with s42 of the EEA in that it failed to take into account both regional and national demographics.



On 15 July 2016, the Constitutional Court in *Solidarity and Others v Department of Correctional Services and Others* (CCT 78/15) [2016] ZACC 18 handed down its judgment on disputes surrounding the Department of Correctional Services' (Department) refusal to promote or employ individuals based on the demographic targets set out in the Department's Employment Equity Plan (EEP).

In terms of s21(1) of the Employment Equity Act, No 55 of 1998 (EEA), certain employers are required to, among other things, "prepare and implement an employment equity plan which will achieve reasonable progress towards employment equity in that employer's workforce". The Department's EEP for the period 2010 – 2014 contained numerical targets to be achieved by the Department within a five year period based on national demographics. The Department assessed its level of racial and gender group representation exclusively on national demographics.

In 2011, the Department advertised vacant posts in the Western Cape. The 10 individual applicants in this case (five coloured women, four coloured men and one white male) applied for these posts. Nine out of the 10 applicants were recommended for appointment. However, eight of the applicants were denied appointment to the respective positions due to race and gender considerations which were "over represented", according to the Department.

The Labour Court ruled in favour of Solidarity, the trade union representing the applicants, stating that the EEP was non-compliant with s42 of the EEA in that it failed to take into account both regional and national demographics. However, the Labour Court desisted from granting any relief to the applicants or declaring

the EEP invalid. Instead, the Labour Court deemed it most appropriate to order that the Department take immediate steps to ensure that in the future both national and regional demographics are taken into account when the setting equity targets for its workforce.

The applicants appealed to the Labour Appeal Court (LAC) against the Labour Court's decision not to grant the individual applicants any relief and/or declare the EEP invalid due to its non-compliance with s42. The LAC dismissed the applicants' appeal, ruling that the EEP passed the test required in terms of the EEA, read together with the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996.

In the Constitutional Court, the court addressed the Barnard principle set out in *South African Police Service v Solidarity obo Barnard* [2014] ZACC 23 which states that an employer may refuse to appoint a candidate who falls within a category of persons that is already adequately represented at a certain occupational level. In this case, the court was required to consider whether the Barnard principle's application is limited to white people only and whether this principle may also be applied in respect of gender. The court ruled that the Barnard principle is not only limited to white people but rather to candidates from all racial groups as well as both men and women.

CONSTITUTIONAL COURT CLARIFIES EMPLOYMENT EQUITY MEASURES

CONTINUED

The court held that the Department acted unlawfully and in breach of its obligations under s42 of the EEA in failing to consider regional demographics in assessing the levels of representation and subsequently setting targets for its EEP.



The applicants' submission that the Department's EEP be declared null and void due to its non-compliance with s42(a) was dismissed by the court, ruling that that the EEP had already run its course and there was no need for an order declaring its invalidity.

The court also rejected Solidarity's contention that the numerical targets constituted 'quotas', which are outlawed under the EEA. One of the distinctions, as set out in Barnard, is that a quota is 'rigid' as opposed to numerical targets, which are flexible. The court ruled that because the EEP made provision for deviations from the set targets, the targets could not be said to be rigid and did not constitute quotas.

Most importantly, the court held that the Department acted unlawfully and in breach of its obligations under s42 of the EEA in failing to consider regional demographics in assessing the levels of representation and subsequently setting targets for its EEP. The Department thus made use of a benchmark which was not authorised under the EEA and as such had no justification for using race and gender as a means to refuse the appointment/promotion of the individual applicants. Therefore, the decision not to

appoint most of the individual applicants constituted unfair discrimination.

The Department also argued that because it is a national department, it is excluded from the requirement to consider both national and regional demographics. The court similarly rejected this argument on the basis that s42(a) does not exclude national departments from its application.

Finally, the court ordered the coloured applicants, who were recommended for appointment, be appointed to the relevant posts, to the extent that those posts were vacant and be paid the remuneration attached to those posts with retrospective effect. Regarding the applicants whose posts were currently occupied, the court ordered that the Department pay the applicants the remuneration attached to those posts with retrospective effect.

The court's ruling serves as a reminder of the delicate position of employers who fall within the requirements of s42(a) of the EEA and goes a long way to clarify what is required, procedurally, to achieve a 'transformed' workplace which is compliant with the EEA.

Hugo Pienaar, Sean Jamieson and Jeffrey Long

TOP RANKED
GLOBAL CHAMBERS AND PARTNERS
2016

Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr

BAND 2
Employment

The LEGAL 500

2009-2016

Ranked Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr

TIER 2
FOR LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT

2015 RANKED #1 BY DEALMAKERS FOR M&A DEAL FLOW 7 YEARS IN A ROW
1st by General Corporate Finance Deal Flow

2014 1st by M&A Deal Flow
1st by M&A Deal Value
1st by General Corporate Finance Deal Flow

2013 1st by M&A Deal Flow
1st by M&A Deal Value
1st by Unlisted Deals - Deal Flow

2012 1st by M&A Deal Flow
1st by General Corporate Finance Deal Flow
1st by General Corporate Finance Deal Value
1st by Unlisted Deals - Deal Flow

DealMakers

2015 1ST
South African law firm and 2nd internationally for Africa & Middle East by deal value

2ND
South African law firm and 2nd internationally for Africa & Middle East by deal count

1ST
South African law firm and 15th internationally for Europe buyouts by deal value

MERGERMARKET

NO.1

6

YEARS IN A ROW
for client service excellence

#6YearsInARow

pmf
CERTIFIED

Employment STRIKE GUIDELINE

Our Employment practice's new
EMPLOYMENT STRIKE GUIDELINE
answers our clients' FAQs.

Topics discussed include strikes, lock-outs and picketing.

 [CLICK HERE TO FIND OUT MORE](#)

CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2014 - 2016 ranks our Employment practice in Band 2: Employment.

Aadil Patel ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2015 - 2016 in Band 2: Employment.

Hugo Pienaar ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2014 - 2016 in Band 2: Employment.

Fiona Leppan ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2016 in Band 3: Employment.



Michael Yeates named winner in the **2015 and 2016 ILO Client Choice International Awards** in the category 'Employment and Benefits, South Africa'.



OUR TEAM

For more information about our Employment practice and services, please contact:



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



Gillian Lumb
Regional Practice Head
Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6315
E gillian.lumb@cdhlegal.com



Fiona Leppan
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1152
E fiona.leppan@cdhlegal.com



Hugo Pienaar
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1350
E hugo.pienaar@cdhlegal.com



Nicholas Preston
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1788
E nicholas.preston@cdhlegal.com



Samiksha Singh
Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6314
E samiksha.singh@cdhlegal.com



Gavin Stansfield
Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6313
E gavin.stansfield@cdhlegal.com



Michael Yeates
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1184
E michael.yeates@cdhlegal.com



Anli Bezuidenhout
Senior Associate
T +27 (0)21 481 6351
E anli.bezuidenhout@cdhlegal.com



Kirsten Caddy
Senior Associate
T +27 (0)11 562 1412
E kirsten.caddy@cdhlegal.com



Ndumiso Zwane
Senior Associate
T +27 (0)11 562 1231
E ndumiso.zwane@cdhlegal.com



Katlego Letlonkane
Associate
T +27 (0)21 481 6319
E katlego.letlonkane@cdhlegal.com



Sipelelo Lityi
Associate
T +27 (0)11 562 1581
E sipelelo.lityi@cdhlegal.com



Anelisa Mkeme
Associate
T +27 (0)11 562 1039
E anelisa.mkeme@cdhlegal.com

BBBEE STATUS: LEVEL THREE CONTRIBUTOR

Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr is very pleased to have achieved a Level 3 BBBEE verification under the new BBBEE Codes of Good Practice. Our BBBEE verification is one of several components of our transformation strategy and we continue to seek ways of improving it in a meaningful manner.

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.

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@cdhlegal.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@cdhlegal.com

©2016 1211/AUG



LinkedIn