

23 FEBRUARY 2017

DISPUTE RESOLUTION ALERT

IN THIS
ISSUE

SPECIAL NEWS ALERT

PUBLIC LAW: SOUTH AFRICA'S ICC WITHDRAWAL NOTICE DECLARED INVALID

On Wednesday, 22 February 2017, the High Court in Pretoria handed down its judgment in the litigation challenging the procedural aspects of South Africa's decision to withdraw from the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Rome Statute).

PUBLIC LAW: SOUTH AFRICA'S ICC WITHDRAWAL NOTICE DECLARED INVALID

The decision to deliver the notice of withdrawal prior to obtaining parliamentary approval consequently violated s231(2) of the Constitution and breached the doctrine of separation of powers.

The High Court found that there is no question that the power to conduct international relations and conclude treaties is in the hands of the national executive in terms of s231 of the Constitution.



On Wednesday, 22 February 2017, the High Court in Pretoria handed down its [judgment](#) in the litigation challenging the procedural aspects of South Africa's decision to withdraw from the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Rome Statute).

The application was brought in November last year after South Africa delivered its notice of withdrawal to the United Nations (UN). The application before the High Court concerned four main issues:

- Was parliamentary approval required before the notice of withdrawal could be delivered to the UN?
- Was prior repeal of the Implementation of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court Act, No 27 of 2002 (Implementation Act) required before delivery of the notice to the UN?
- Was the delivery of the notice to the UN without prior consultation with parliament irrational?
- Does the withdrawal from the Rome Statute breach the state's obligations under s7(2) of the Constitution to respect, protect, promote and fulfil the rights in the Bill of Rights?

In respect of the first question, the High Court held that the national executive requires prior parliamentary approval to withdraw from an international agreement. The national executive thus did not have the power to deliver a notice of withdrawal to the UN without such approval. The decision to deliver the notice of withdrawal prior to obtaining parliamentary approval consequently violated s231(2) of the Constitution and breached the doctrine of separation of powers.

In reaching this conclusion, the High Court found that there is no question that the power to conduct international relations and conclude treaties is in the hands of the national executive in terms of s231 of the Constitution. However, in exercising this power, the national executive must engage Parliament. While the signature and delivery of the notice of withdrawal were acts in the realm of international relations, they remained an exercise of public power, which is subject to constitutional control.

Tim Fletcher was named the exclusive South African winner of the **ILO Client Choice Awards 2017** in the litigation category.



CLICK HERE to find out more about our Dispute Resolution practice.

PUBLIC LAW: SOUTH AFRICA'S ICC WITHDRAWAL NOTICE DECLARED INVALID

CONTINUED

The power to determine whether to remain bound to a treaty remains vested in Parliament.



Therefore, although the formulation of policy to withdraw from the Rome Statute falls within the purview of the Cabinet, the execution of that policy through signing and delivering the notice of withdrawal has "concrete legal effects" in international law as it is a binding, unconditional and final decision to terminate South Africa's treaty obligations under the Rome Statute. The power to determine whether to remain bound to a treaty remains vested in Parliament.

Although the state respondents argued that the Cabinet's decision could be ratified by Parliament (as it has now asked Parliament to do), the High Court rejected that argument. It held that because the national executive had purported to exercise a power it does not have under the Constitution, that conduct has no effect in law.

Importantly, the High Court was at pains to emphasise that its decision on this issue in no way affects the validity of the Minister of Justice and Correctional Services' tabling of the Implementation of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court Act Repeal Bill and Related International Instruments Bill [B23-2016] (Repeal Bill). That process is legitimately and properly before Parliament.

With regards to the second question, the High Court found that it is necessary to repeal the Implementation Act prior to delivering a notice of withdrawal, as the national executive is effectively ordering the legislature to finalise its repeal process before the effective date of the notice of withdrawal (ie 18 October 2017) and in favour of the executive, which is impermissible. As pointed out, Parliament may – after its due processes – decide against the withdrawal and the Repeal Bill.

In relation to the third question concerning procedural irrationality, the High Court noted that government action must be connected to a legitimate government purpose in order to be considered rational. The reason advanced for withdrawal from the Rome Statute was that this would enable government to pursue its peacemaker role on the African continent without the obligation to arrest indicted heads of state.

The High Court concluded that South Africa's international law obligations, including the obligation to arrest indicted persons in South African territory, are incorporated in the Implementation Act and are thus not dependent on the Rome Statute. Those obligations are not displaced unless the Implementation Act

DEALMAKER

FROM POWERFUL PARTNERSHIPS COME POWERFUL RESULTS

DealMakers®

2016 1st by M&A Deal Flow for the 8th year in a row.

2016 1st by General Corporate Finance Deal Flow.

2016 2nd by M&A Deal Value.

2016 3rd by General Corporate Finance Deal Value.

PUBLIC LAW: SOUTH AFRICA'S ICC WITHDRAWAL NOTICE DECLARED INVALID

CONTINUED

Overall, the High Court declared the notice of withdrawal from the Rome Statute as well as the national executive's decision to deliver that notice without prior parliamentary approval unconstitutional and invalid.



is repealed. The state respondents also provided no reason for the seemingly urgent need to withdraw from the Rome Statute. The High Court considered this unexplained haste on its own to constitute procedural irrationality.

Given the findings in relation to the issues above, the High Court did not delve into the fourth, substantive question of whether South Africa's withdrawal from the Rome Statute breaches s7(2) of the Constitution. This question was left open to be decided by another High Court at a later stage if necessary.

Overall, the High Court declared the notice of withdrawal from the Rome Statute as well as the national executive's decision to deliver that notice without prior parliamentary approval unconstitutional and invalid. It ordered the state respondents to revoke the notice immediately.

When considering this judgment, it is interesting to note its striking parallels with the recent United Kingdom Supreme Court's [judgment](#) in relation to triggering article 50 of the Treaty of the European Union (through delivery of a withdrawal notice) which would begin the "Brexit" process. The key question in that case was whether an article-50 notice could be delivered by government ministers without an Act of Parliament. The majority judgment in that case ruled along similar lines to the South African High Court and found that an Act of Parliament is required before any notice can be delivered triggering Britain's withdrawal from the European Union.

*Sarah McGibbon,
overseen by Lionel Egypt*

INVITATION TO COMMENT

The Portfolio Committee on Justice and Correctional

Services is currently inviting public comments on The Implementation of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court Act Repeal Bill and Related International Instruments Bill [\[B23-2016\]](#). The Bill aims to repeal the Implementation of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court Act, No 27 of 2002, by which South Africa bound itself to the obligations under the Rome Statute. Members of the public are also invited to comment on the declaration of the decision to withdraw from the ICC and the explanatory memorandum to that withdrawal. The deadline for comments is 8 March 2017. They can be emailed to vramaano@parliament.gov.za.

CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2011–2016 ranked us in Band 2 for dispute resolution.

Tim Fletcher ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2015–2016 in Band 4 for dispute resolution.

Pieter Conradie ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2012–2016 in Band 1 for dispute resolution.

Jonathan Witts-Hewinson ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2014–2016 in Band 3 for dispute resolution.

Joe Whittle ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2016 in Band 4 for construction.



OUR TEAM

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



Tim Fletcher
National Practice Head
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1061
E tim.fletcher@cdhlegal.com



Grant Ford
Regional Practice Head
Director
T +27 (0)21 405 6111
E grant.ford@cdhlegal.com

Timothy Baker
Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6308
E timothy.baker@cdhlegal.com

Roy Barendse
Director
T +27 (0)21 405 6177
E roy.barendse@cdhlegal.com

Eugene Bester
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1173
E eugene.bester@cdhlegal.com

Tracy Cohen
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1617
E tracy.cohen@cdhlegal.com

Lionel Egypt
Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6400
E lionel.egypt@cdhlegal.com

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

Thabile Fuhrmann
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1331
E thabile.fuhrmann@cdhlegal.com

Anja Hofmeyr
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1129
E anja.hofmeyr@cdhlegal.com

Willem Janse van Rensburg
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1110
E willem.jansevanrensburg@cdhlegal.com

Julian Jones
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1189
E julian.jones@cdhlegal.com

Tobie Jordaan
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1356
E tobie.jordaan@cdhlegal.com

Corné Lewis
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1042
E corne.lewis@cdhlegal.com

Janet Mackenzie
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1614
E janet.mackenzie@cdhlegal.com

Richard Marcus
Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6396
E richard.marcus@cdhlegal.com

Burton Meyer
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1056
E burton.meyer@cdhlegal.com

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

Byron O'Connor
Director
T +27 (0)21 562 1140
E byron.oconnor@cdhlegal.com

Lucinde Rhoodie
Director
T +27 (0)21 405 6080
E lucinde.rhodie@cdhlegal.com

Jonathan Ripley-Evans
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1051
E jonathan.ripleyevans@cdhlegal.com

Willie van Wyk
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1057
E willie.vanwyk@cdhlegal.com

Joe Whittle
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1138
E joe.whittle@cdhlegal.com

Jonathan Witts-Hewinson
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1146
E witts@cdhlegal.com

Pieter Conradie
Executive Consultant
T +27 (0)11 562 1071
E pieter.conradie@cdhlegal.com

Nick Muller
Executive Consultant
T +27 (0)21 481 6385
E nick.muller@cdhlegal.com

Marius Potgieter
Executive Consultant
T +27 (0)11 562 1142
E marius.potgieter@cdhlegal.com

Nicole Amoretti
Professional Support Lawyer
T +27 (0)11 562 1420
E nicole.amoretti@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

©2017 1517/FEB

