

9 OCTOBER 2019

DISPUTE RESOLUTION ALERT

IN THIS ISSUE >

Let's kill all the lawyers

If the title of this article appealed to you, perhaps you've recently had to pay an attorney's invoice. Or you had to pay someone else's attorney's invoice? You might be thinking that Dick the Butcher, in Shakespeare's *Henry VI*, had a point: "Let's kill all the lawyers!" Fortunately for us attorneys – and as an aside – it has been reported that this line is often misinterpreted. Dick the Butcher was a follower of the rebel Jack Cade (who led a popular revolt in 1450 against the English government), and thought that if he disturbed law and order, he could become king. Shakespeare was suggesting that attorneys and judges help to maintain law and order! Phew!

Careful how you cancel – a strict approach to following cancellation clauses in construction contracts

The temptation to terminate a construction contract out of pure frustration can be difficult to resist. It all starts with the project falling behind schedule, an aggrieved party granting an extension to complete the works, only for the extension to be insufficient for the contractor to meet the new deadlines and the project costs increasing day by day. The case of *Hodgkinson v K2011104122 (Pty) Ltd and another* [2019] 2 All SA 754 (WCC) (*Hodgkinson*) is a caution to parties employing contractors to pause and carefully consider the cancellation clause contained in the construction contract before acting on the impulse to cancel.

FOR MORE INSIGHT INTO OUR
EXPERTISE AND SERVICES

CLICK HERE 



CLIFFE DEKKER HOFMEYR

Let's kill all the lawyers

In the current climate, everyone is looking for ways to cut costs and maximise efficiency and there are in fact several ways that you can cut your legal costs – all entirely within your control.

If the title of this article appealed to you, perhaps you've recently had to pay an attorney's invoice. Or you had to pay someone else's attorney's invoice? You might be thinking that Dick the Butcher, in Shakespeare's Henry VI, had a point: "Let's kill all the lawyers!" Fortunately for us attorneys – and as an aside – it has been reported that this line is often misinterpreted. Dick the Butcher was a follower of the rebel Jack Cade (who led a popular revolt in 1450 against the English government), and thought that if he disturbed law and order, he could become king. Shakespeare was suggesting that attorneys and judges help to maintain law and order! Phew!

But let's be honest [insert lawyer joke here], attorneys (and litigators specifically) are often a grudge purchase. If you have to see a lawyer, it probably means that something has gone wrong and now you have to spend money to resolve it. In the current climate, everyone is looking for ways to cut costs and maximise efficiency and there are in fact several ways that you can cut your legal costs – all entirely within your control.

A risk averse "friend" in the legal business

Having a close relationship with your attorney has several benefits and you should take advantage of the fact that attorneys have not (yet) been replaced by robots and you can simply call them up to ask for a quick view. Obviously that's not going to work if you want them to interpret a contractual provision, but if you're debating whether or not to respond to an aggressive email or to someone who might be setting you up to make some sort of admission – a quick call to your attorney could potentially save you a lot of management time and money later. Attorneys are there to advise on risk. Use them.

Teach your attorney about your business and its challenges

Your attorney should be curious about your business. Invite them to see your production line, visit the mine or watch the manufacturing process and show them where your challenges lie so that they understand your risks. Teach them some of your industry jargon. Not only will it give them something to brag about at their next pub night but it's a business development opportunity for your attorney that they should never pass up. It may well save you time in the long run because you hopefully won't need a four-hour long consultation, if and when a problem does arise, to teach your attorney about how your foo foo valve relies on the thingy that broke off the what-not on your machine.

Order your documents

It may sound lame, but this is a big one. When your attorney asks for "all the correspondence from X date to Y date", send the documents chronologically and clearly marked or ordered so that the attorney knows where to start. When attorneys prepare court papers, they need to tell a story and stories are best told from the beginning and in sequence. If an attorney has to spend hours trying to piece together what happened and the documents are unclear or poorly printed/scanned, there are going to be many emails coming your way asking for clarity and guess what - all of those emails add up to billable hours.

Look before you leap

Litigation is expensive, both in money and in time, but there are many situations where it is objectively the right decision. Bear in mind though that stopping the process half-way through does not mean that the attorney can't charge you for the work already done and that you won't be

Let's kill all the lawyers...continued

Decisions to litigate should be taken with the same level of measured calmness that should be applied to any investment decision.

liable for the other side's costs. If possible, rather take more time to consult with your attorney at the beginning of the matter so that you develop a strategy that is likely to give you the result you want, so that you understand all the risks before you start, and that you're happy to see this course of action through. Decisions to litigate should be taken with the same level of measured calmness that should be applied to any investment decision. Anger, revenge, pride and emotions of that ilk should not feature despite the fact that they are central in situations which usually give rise to litigation.

Sun Tzu was able to sum up the approach we advocate. *"To fight and conquer in all our battles is not supreme excellence; supreme excellence consists in breaking the enemy's resistance without fighting."* Donald Trump, not so much. *"Sometimes you need conflict in order to come up with a solution. Through weakness, oftentimes, you can't make the right sort of settlement, so I'm aggressive, but I also get things done, and in the end, everybody likes me."*

Megan Badenhorst and Tim Fletcher



As a leading African business law firm, Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr understands how to navigate the complexities of investment opportunities in Africa, the development of risk mitigation strategies and the resolution of disputes between private sector counterparts or between host governments and investors, including negotiation, mediation, remedies in domestic courts or international arbitration.

To illustrate our support of the development and strengthening of International Arbitration in Africa, CDH is a sponsor of the Hot Topics in Investment Arbitration Conference which will be held on Friday, 8 November 2019.

The conference will be hosted by Africa International Legal Awareness (AILA) with networking cocktails at CDH's Johannesburg office to end the day on a high note.

**AS A VALUED CLIENT OF CDH,
YOUR ATTENDANCE AT THE CONFERENCE IS FREE.**



PLEASE CLICK ON THIS LINK TO REGISTER AND VIEW THE CONFERENCE PROGRAMME.

[AILA JOHANNESBURG CONFERENCE 2019](#)

Careful how you cancel – a strict approach to following cancellation clauses in construction contracts

The issue before the court was whether the employer elected to follow the terms of the cancellation clause in the agreement and was therefore bound to follow the cancellation clause or whether the employer was entitled to rely on the contractor's repudiation of the agreement as a ground for cancellation (and thereby avoid the requirements of the cancellation clause).

The temptation to terminate a construction contract out of pure frustration can be difficult to resist. It all starts with the project falling behind schedule, an aggrieved party granting an extension to complete the works, only for the extension to be insufficient for the contractor to meet the new deadlines and the project costs increasing day by day. The case of *Hodgkinson v K2011104122 (Pty) Ltd and another* [2019] 2 All SA 754 (WCC) (*Hodgkinson*) is a caution to parties employing contractors to pause and carefully consider the cancellation clause contained in the construction contract before acting on the impulse to cancel.

Cancellation of a contract is a general remedy for breach of contract recognised in South African law and is often referred to as a drastic remedy as it brings the contract to an end. Terminating a contract may not always be the commercially sensible remedy for breach of contract as it may further delay the completion of the project, increase the project cost and even expose a contracting party to liability. In favour of prolonging the life of a contract, an aggrieved party may opt to offer a contractor an opportunity to remedy the breach and then in the event of non-compliance, cancellation and damages. *Hodgkinson* addressed the following question: Under what circumstances can such an election be exercised when the agreement governing the parties' obligations sets out precise requirements for cancellation?

The central facts in *Hodgkinson* were that the plaintiff (*Hodgkinson*) employed the first defendant as a contractor to complete certain construction works on the terms and conditions set out in an agreement entered into between the two parties.

The relevant clause in the agreement provided that the employer must deliver a notice setting out the contractor's default and if the contractor failed to take steps to remedy the default within 14 days after receipt of the first notice, the employer could issue a second notice given within a further 7 days to terminate the agreement.

A few months after the commencement of the works, the employer delivered a written notice to the contractor (first notice) recording its defaults and informing it that unless it took practical steps to remedy the defaults within a period of 7 days, the employer would cancel the agreement. The contractor failed to remedy the defaults within 7 days. Ten days after the delivery of the first notice, the employer delivered another notice (second notice) informing the contractor that he was cancelling the agreement.

Both the first and second notice fell short of the requirements of the cancellation clause which required the contractor first to be given 14 days to remedy, and then a further 7 days' notice prior to cancellation.

The issue before the court was whether the employer elected to follow the terms of the cancellation clause in the agreement and was therefore bound to follow the cancellation clause or

Careful how you cancel – a strict approach to following cancellation clauses in construction contracts

...continued

The court narrowed its inquiry to not deal with whether there was a valid repudiation by the contractor, but rather whether the employer forfeited his entitlement to rely on the repudiation as a ground for cancellation because he elected to invoke the terms of the cancellation clause (by delivering a first and second notice).

whether the employer was entitled to rely on the contractor's repudiation of the agreement as a ground for cancellation (and thereby avoid the requirements of the cancellation clause).

The grounds for cancellation put forward by the employer were twofold:

- The first ground was premised on the contractor failing to remedy the breaches set out in the first notice within a 7-day period and within the 14-day period contemplated in the cancellation clause. According to the employer, it did not matter that the period given to remedy the breach (7 days) was shorter than 14 days because the contractor in any event failed to remedy the default within the 14 day period.
- The second, alternative ground for cancellation, was that the contractor's conduct exhibited a deliberate and unequivocal intention not to be bound by the agreement - conduct that constituted repudiation of the agreement. The employer argued:
 - (i) the first notice constituted an offer to the contractor to remedy its default and not a notice in terms of the cancellation clause therefore the time frame to remedy the breach did not matter; and

- (ii) the second notice did not make reference to the cancellation clause and therefore the cancellation was on a different basis than the cancellation clause.

On this second ground, the court narrowed its inquiry to not deal with whether there was a valid repudiation by the contractor, but rather whether the employer forfeited his entitlement to rely on the repudiation as a ground for cancellation because he elected to invoke the terms of the cancellation clause (by delivering a first and second notice).

On the first ground for cancellation the court found that an aggrieved party cannot expect a defaulting party to read the first notice as if it conferred 14 days to remedy the breach instead of 7 days as stated in the first notice. The first notice was defective and consequently, the plaintiff was obligated to rectify its letter of demand to refer to 14 days in clear terms and in accordance with the cancellation clause.

On the second alternative ground for cancellation, the court held that the first and second notice conveyed an unclear message to the contractor because the notices complied substantially with the cancellation clause but the time periods did not comply with the time periods stipulated.

Careful how you cancel – a strict approach to following cancellation clauses in construction contracts

...continued

The aggrieved party must follow the clear route for cancellation prescribed by the cancellation clause. The defaulting contractor cannot be left to guess whether the cancellation clause is being invoked or not.

The court found that in the face of a defective letter of demand it would be “untenable” to allow the employer to fall back on the claim that he had in fact intended to allow the contractor an opportunity to remedy the default and if the response was unsatisfactory change his election and cancel the agreement.

The logic endorsed by the court is as follows: When a contract contains a cancellation clause which covers repudiation by the contractor and allows an employer to offer to the contractor to remedy its default and entitles an aggrieved party to issue a notice to cancel following a failure to remedy the default, the aggrieved party must follow the clear route for cancellation prescribed by the cancellation clause. The defaulting contractor cannot be left to guess whether the cancellation clause is being invoked or not.

This case endorses and gives guidance in regard to the fundamental principles of the right to cancel as it pertains to the process that aggrieved parties should follow to enforce their right to cancel a contract against defaulting/repudiating parties where there is a governing cancellation clause. The approach of considering whether an agreement entitles a party to cancel in a certain manner rather than focusing on a party’s expression of an intention to cancel evidences the South African courts’ welcome protection of the principle of certainty in contract.

Timothy Baker and Siviwe Mcetywa

CDH is a Level 1 BEE contributor – our clients will benefit by virtue of the recognition of 135% of their legal services spend with our firm for purposes of their own BEE scorecards.

CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2017 - 2019 ranked our Dispute Resolution practice in Band 1: Dispute Resolution.

CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2019 ranked our Public Law sector in Band 2: Public Law.

CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2018 - 2019 named our Corporate Investigations sector as a Recognised Practitioner.

CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2018 - 2019 ranked our Dispute Resolution practice in Band 2: Insurance.

CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2018 - 2019 ranked our Dispute Resolution practice in Band 2: Media & Broadcasting.

CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2017 - 2019 ranked our Dispute Resolution practice in Band 2: Restructuring/Insolvency.

Tim Fletcher ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2019 in Band 3: Dispute Resolution.

Lionel Egypt ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2019 in Band 2: Public Law.

Julian Jones ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2017 - 2019 in Band 3: Restructuring/Insolvency.

Pieter Conradie ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2019 as Senior Statespeople: Dispute Resolution.

Jonathan Witts-Hewinson ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2017 - 2019 in Band 2: Dispute Resolution.

Joe Whittle ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2016 - 2019 in Band 4: Construction.



CDH HAS BECOME THE EXCLUSIVE MEMBER FIRM IN AFRICA FOR THE:

Insuralex Global Insurance Lawyers Group
(the world's leading insurance and reinsurance law firm network).

[CLICK HERE TO READ MORE](#)



insuralex
GLOBAL INSURANCE
LAWYERS GROUP

BAND 2
Restructuring/Insolvency

Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr

RECOGNISED PRACTITIONER
Corporate Investigations

Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr

EMEA
2017-2019

Recommended us in

TIER 1
Dispute Resolution

DealMakers 2018

1ST BY M&A DEAL FLOW FOR THE 10TH YEAR IN A ROW.

2018 1st by M&A Deal Flow.
1st by M&A Deal Value.
2nd by General Corporate Finance Deal Flow.
1st by BEE M&A Deal Value.
2nd by BEE M&A Deal Flow.
Lead legal advisers on the Private Equity Deal of the Year.

BAND 1
Dispute Resolution

Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr

BAND 2
Public Law

Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr

BAND 2
Media & Broadcasting

Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr

BAND 2
Insurance

Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr

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



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

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

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

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

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

Zaakir Mohamed
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1094
E zaakir.mohamed@cdhlegal.com

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

Mongezi Mpahlwa
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1476
E mongezi.mpahlwa@cdhlegal.com

Kgosi Nkaiseng
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1864
E kgosi.nkaiseng@cdhlegal.com

Byron O'Connor
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1140
E byron.oconnor@cdhlegal.com

Ashley Pillay
Director
T +27 (0)21 481 6348
E ashley.pillay@cdhlegal.com

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

Belinda Scriba
Director
T +27 (0)21 405 6139
E belinda.scriba@cdhlegal.com

Tim Smit
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1085
E tim.smit@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

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

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

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

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

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

BBBEE STATUS: LEVEL ONE CONTRIBUTOR

Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr is very pleased to have achieved a Level 1 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

STELLENBOSCH

14 Louw Street, Stellenbosch Central, Stellenbosch, 7600.
T +27 (0)21 481 6400 E cdh Stellenbosch@cdhlegal.com

©2019 8382/OCT

