# **EMPLOYMENT ALERT**



## IN THIS ISSUE >

### A clear message sent - do not abuse the section 189A(13) procedure

In NUMSA obo Members v CBI Electric Telecom Cables (Pty) Ltd (a matter in which CDH successfully represented the respondent), the Labour Court was faced with the task of determining whether a dispute regarding the disclosure of relevant information could be entertained in terms of section 198A(13) of the Labour Relations Act 66 of 1995 (LRA).

FOR MORE INSIGHT INTO OUR **EXPERTISE AND SERVICES** 

CLICK HERE @



In January 2020, a section 189(3) notice calling upon the relevant parties to consult was issued by the respondent.

## A clear message sent - do not abuse the section 189A(13) procedure

In NUMSA obo Members v CBI Electric Telecom Cables (Pty) Ltd (a matter in which CDH successfully represented the respondent), the Labour Court was faced with the task of determining whether a dispute regarding the disclosure of relevant information could be entertained in terms of section 198A(13) of the Labour Relations Act 66 of 1995 (LRA).

In January 2020, a section 189(3) notice calling upon the relevant parties to consult was issued by the respondent. NUMSA requested a raft of documentation which would "enable it to meaningfully carry out its task" as contemplated by section 189 (2) of the LRA. The respondent obliged but at that time, the Alert Level 5 lock down was imposed and the consultation process was interrupted. The consultation process was re-established in July/August 2020. During these consultations, NUMSA quibbled whether all relevant information had been disclosed to it. Further meetings were arranged to discuss various issues including the possible alternative placement of affected employees and the principles that would underpin applications for voluntary severance packages. NUMSA refused to participate in these meetings on the basis that the information it had received was inadequate for the purpose of a meaningful consultation.

NUMSA instituted urgent proceedings alleging that the employer had not complied with a fair procedure as it had not disclosed the audited and signed off financial statements. At that juncture, the unsigned financials were available, and the employer was prepared to make them available for inspection by NUMSA's expert financial advisor provided a non-disclosure undertaking was provided first. On this point, and in passing, it was the view of the Labour Court that what may be relevant to the employer may not be relevant to NUMSA, and vice-versa. The Labour Court found that in any consultation process facilitated by a commissioner, item 5 (2) of the Facilitation Regulations would apply thereby allowing the commissioner to hear representations from the parties and to make a ruling governing disclosure and apply relevant dispute resolution provisions contained in the LRA if it was found necessary to do so. There was no need for NUMSA to approach the court for this relief when it could have brought its complaint at an earlier stage in the process before the facilitator.

The Labour Court said it was for the "umpteenth time" that it had to pronounce on the purpose of section 189A(13) which was designed to deal with matters involving compliance by the employer with its statutory obligations. The Court

# CDH'S EMPLOYMENT LAW PRACTICE CONTINUES TO BLAZE ITS TRAIL, expanding on its strong offering to clients by attracting a new suite of esteemed employment law experts to the team. CLICK HERE for further detail regarding each expert and their areas of expertise.



The Court noted how it is increasingly clear that the section was being abused and even relied upon inappropriately to challenge substantive aspects of a large-scale retrenchment.

# A clear message sent - do not abuse the section 189A(13) procedure...continued

is not there to determine disputes about the procedural fairness of retrenchments as this was not within its purview in "mass retrenchments". This is a case where the application was dismissed with costs.

In Tawusa obo G N Mothibedi and 81 Others v Barloworld Transport (Pty) Ltd (a matter in which CDH also successfully represented the respondent), the Labour Court again emphasized the purpose of the section 189A(13) process and the role of the Labour Court in such an application. The Court noted how it is increasingly clear that the section was being abused and even relied upon inappropriately to challenge substantive aspects of a large-scale retrenchment.

It is not the duty of a Judge in an urgent motion court to resolve disputes about what is relevant and what is not. The commissioner or facilitator must engage about whether the information is relevant and take account issues of confidentiality if there was a basis to order disclosure.

The Labour Court held that a dispute over relevant information is not a dispute that resides within the section 189A(13) process. The Labour Court took extreme exception to NUMSA abusing the process and found that it was unreasonable for parties to deliberately ignore other available statutory remedies, and instead opt to come before the Labour Court on truncated time periods. Due to the vexatiousness and frivolity of the application, the Labour Court made a cost order against NUMSA.

In conclusion, the Labour Court has sent a clear message, rightly so, that where the section 189A(13) procedure is abused, it will allow costs to follow the result.

Fiona Leppan, Bheki Nhlapho and Kgodisho Phashe







# COVID-19 WORKPLACE HEALTH AND SAFETY ONLINE COMPLIANCE TRAINING

Information. Education. Training.

We have developed a bespoke eLearning product for use on your learning management system, that will help you strengthen your workplace health and safety measures and achieve your statutory obligations in the face of the COVID-19 pandemic.

To purchase or for more information contact OHSonlinetool@cdhlegal.com.

Our Employment practice is ranked as a Top-Tier firm in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020. Fiona Leppan is ranked as a Leading Individual in Employment in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020. Aadil Patel is recommended in Employment in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020. Gillian Lumb is recommended in Employment in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020. Hugo Pienaar is recommended in Employment in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020. Michael Yeates is recommended in Employment in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020. Jose Jorge is recommended in Employment in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020. Imraan Mahomed is recommended in Employment in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020.



CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2014 - 2020 ranked our Employment practice in Band 2: Employment.

Aadil Patel ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2015 - 2020 in Band 2: Employment.

Fiona Leppan ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2018 - 2020 in Band 2: Employment.

Gillian Lumb ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2020 in Band 3: Employment.

Imraan Mahomed ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2020 in Band 3: Employment.

Hugo Pienaar ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2014 - 2020 in Band 2: Employment.

Michael Yeates ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2020 as an up and coming employment lawyer.





## RETRENCHMENT GUIDELINE

CLICK HERE for the latest thought leadership and explanation of the legal position in relation to retrenchments, temporary layoffs, short time and retrenchments in the context of business rescue.



#### **OUR TEAM**

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



Aadil Patel National Practice Head Director

+27 (0)11 562 1107

E aadil.patel@cdhlegal.com



+27 (0)21 481 6319 E jose.jorge@cdhlegal.com



Fiona Leppan

+27 (0)11 562 1152

E fiona.leppan@cdhlegal.com



Gillian Lumb



T +27 (0)21 481 6315

E gillian.lumb@cdhlegal.com



**Imraan Mahomed** 

Director Employment

+27 (0)11 562 1459

E imraan.mahomed@cdhlegal.com



Bongani Masuku

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1498

E bongani.masuku@cdhlegal.com



Phetheni Nkuna

Director

+27 (0)11 562 1478 E phetheni.nkuna@cdhlegal.com



**Hugo Pienaar** 

Director T +27 (0)11 562 1350

hugo.pienaar@cdhlegal.com



**Thabang Rapuleng** 

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1759

E thabang.rapuleng@cdhlegal.com



Hedda Schensema

Michael Yeates

Mohsina Chenia

Faan Coetzee Executive Consultant

Jean Ewang

Consultant

Consultant

**Executive Consultant** 

T +27 (0)11 562 1299

+27 (0)11 562 1600

M +27 (0)73 909 1940

Avinash Govindjee

M +27 (0)83 326 5007

E jean.ewang@cdhlegal.com

E avinash.govindjee@cdhlegal.com

E faan.coetzee@cdhlegal.com

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1487

T +27 (0)11 562 1184

E hedda.schensema@cdhlegal.com

E michael.yeates@cdhlegal.com

E mohsina.chenia@cdhlegal.com



Anli Bezuidenhout Senior Associate

T +27 (0)21 481 6351

E anli.bezuidenhout@cdhlegal.com



T +27 (0)11 562 1296

E sean.jamieson@cdhlegal.com



Bheki Nhlapho

T +27 (0)11 562 1568

E bheki.nhlapho@cdhlegal.com



Asma Cachalia

T +27 (0)11 562 1333

E asma.cachalia@cdhlegal.com



**Jaden Cramer** 

Associate

T +27 (0)11 562 1260 E jaden.cramer@cdhlegal.com



Jordyne Löser

Associate

T +27 (0)11 562 1479

E jordyne.loser@cdhlegal.com



Tamsanqa Mila

Associate

+27 (0)11 562 1108 E tamsanqa.mila@cdhlegal.com





Professional Support Lawyer T +27 (0)11 562 1748

E riola.kok@cdhlegal.com

## BBBEE STATUS: LEVEL TWO CONTRIBUTOR

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

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

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

@2020 9453/OCT















