CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL ALERT

IN THIS ISSUE

More time means more money – negotiating protections against the relaxation of time-bar clauses

The benefits of arbitration are well-known. It is often cheaper, quicker and allows the parties flexibility to a process that suits their needs. Moreover, the process, pleadings, agreements and rulings may also remain confidential, unlike the case in public court proceedings. As a result, many commercial agreements allow for disputes to be resolved by way of arbitration.





While the benefits of a time-bar clause are clear, parties should be aware that the enforceability of such provisions is not a foregone conclusion.

More time means more money – negotiating protections against the relaxation of time-bar clauses

The benefits of arbitration are well-known. It is often cheaper, quicker and allows the parties flexibility to a process that suits their needs. Moreover, the process, pleadings, agreements and rulings may also remain confidential, unlike the case in public court proceedings. As a result, many commercial agreements allow for disputes to be resolved by way of arbitration.

In addition, in order to promote finality and certainty in their contracting arrangements, parties will often include provisions in their agreements relating to the period of time within which disputes, differences or claims under an agreement may be referred to arbitration. This is known as a "time-bar clause". While the benefits of a time-bar clause are clear, parties should be aware that the enforceability of such provisions is not a foregone conclusion.

Under section 8 of the Arbitration Act 42 of 1965 (Arbitration Act), a party to arbitration proceedings may approach a court to extend the time stipulated in a timebar clause for commencing arbitration proceedings. Courts have the power under this section to extend the time fixed by an agreement for referrals to arbitration if it is of the opinion that, in the circumstances of a case, undue hardship would otherwise be caused. The application of section 8 of the Arbitration Act was discussed in the recent case of Samancor Chrome Holdings (Pty) Limited and Another v Samancor Holdings (Pty) Limited and Others [2019] ZAGPJHC 370 (Samancor Case).

The Samancor Case concerned a sale of shares agreement which contained indemnities in favour of the purchaser in respect of income tax to be paid by the target company to SARS. The parties agreed to a time limitation of six years for the institution of tax-related claims. It transpired that the target company's income tax returns were filed more than two years late and erroneously under-declared the company's taxable income, resulting in substantial claims by SARS against the target company for income tax (including penalties and interest). Due to the delays in lodging the income tax returns and SARS' investigations, the claim was instituted after the six-year time-bar period. Initially, the arbitrator found that while the purchaser's claim was well-founded, the time-bar clause prevented the claim from being instituted.

The purchaser then approached the Gauteng High Court (Johannesburg) to consider under section 8 of the Arbitration Act whether the strict application of the time-bar clause in the agreement would cause "undue hardship" to the purchaser. Drawing on English case law, the court decided that, notwithstanding the clear wording of the agreement between the parties, the time-bar should be extended to allow for the institution of arbitration proceedings. The reasons for this decision included, amongst other things, that (i) the purchaser's claim was almost certain to succeed on the merits (which was not disputed), (ii) the purchaser was unable to prevent the lapsing of the time-bar, (iii) the hardship on the purchaser would



The result of the Samancor Case makes it clear that time-bar clauses are not absolute.

More time means more money – negotiating protections against the relaxation of time-bar clauses...continued

be far greater than what the circumstances warranted, (iv) the purchaser had not unreasonably delayed in instituting the claim once it had materialised, and (v) the respondents had not been prejudiced by the delay in instituting the claim.

Therefore, even though the clear wording of the contract stipulated a six-year time-bar period, the court ruled that ordinary businessmen entering into the agreement would surely have agreed that a refusal to extend the time-bar period in exceptional circumstances such as those at hand would cause undue hardship.

The result of the Samancor Case makes it clear that time-bar clauses are not absolute and there may be instances where a court, on application, extends the period of time within which disputes and claims under an agreement may be made, notwithstanding what the parties may have agreed. The length of time by which such period may be extended will depend on a number of factors, including (i) the quantum of a claim, (ii) a party's fault in causing delays leading to an expiry claims period, (iii) the severity or degree of the fault of the delaying party, (iv) the length of the delay and (v) the degree of the prejudice suffered by the party seeking to institute the claim.

As a result of the Samancor Case, parties may wish to proactively seek to mitigate the effects of section 8 of the Arbitration Act where it is in their interest to do so. For example, a seller may seek to protect itself from the possibility of an extended time-bar period by:

- providing that an indemnity arises only in respect of a stipulated number of the past financial years of a target entity (for example, the past three years);
- 2. including a monetary cap on indemnity claims;
- providing for specific limitations or monetary caps which become applicable only in the instances where a time-bar is extended by a court under section 8 of the Arbitration Act; and/or
- 4. providing that if a court finds that a time-bar period should be extended in respect of an indemnity claim, there is nevertheless a second time-bar which kicks in: for example, the purchaser must nevertheless still bring its claim within 1 year after the earlier of (i) it learning of the cause of action or (ii) the date on which it ought to have known of the facts which comprise a cause of action.

In any event, parties would be well-advised to seek legal advice when drafting or seeking to enforce time-bar clauses included in arbitration provisions, as the enforceability, or unenforceability, of a time-bar clause could have very costly consequences.

Anita Moolman, Andrew Giliam and Josh Reuter





CDH's Corporate, Commercial and M&A practice is ranked as a Top-Tier firm in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020.

David Pinnock is ranked as a Leading Individual in Corporate, Commercial and M&A in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020.

Willem Jacobs is ranked as a Leading Individual in Corporate, Commercial and M&A in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020.

David Thompson is recommended in Corporate, Commercial and M&A in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020.

Johan Green is recommended in Corporate, Commercial and M&A in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020.

Johan Latsky is recommended in Corporate, Commercial and M&A in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020.

Peter Hesseling is recommended in Corporate, Commercial and M&A in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020.

Justine Krige is ranked as a Next Generation Partner in Corporate, Commercial and M&A in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020.

John Gillmer is recommended in Investment Funds in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020.

Wayne Murray is ranked as a Rising Star in Investment Funds in THE LEGAL 500 EMEA 2020.

EMEA





OUR TEAM

For more information about our Corporate & Commercial practice and services, please contact:



Willem Jacobs

National Practice Head

Corporate & Commercial T +27 (0)11 562 1555

M +27 (0)83 326 8971

E willem.jacobs@cdhlegal.com



David Thompson

Regional Practice Head Director

Corporate & Commercial T +27 (0)21 481 6335

M +27 (0)82 882 5655

E david.thompson@cdhlegal.com

Mmatiki Aphiri

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1087

M +27 (0)83 497 3718

E mmatiki.aphiri@cdhlegal.com

Roelof Bonnet

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1226

M +27 (0)83 325 2185

E roelof.bonnet@cdhlegal.com

Tessa Brewis

T +27 (0)21 481 6324

M +27 (0)83 717 9360

E tessa.brewis@cdhlegal.com

Etta Chang

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1432

M +27 (0)72 879 1281 E etta.chang@cdhlegal.com

Vivien Chaplin

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1556

M +27 (0)82 411 1305

E vivien.chaplin@cdhlegal.com

Clem Daniel

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1073

M +27 (0)82 418 5924 E clem.daniel@cdhlegal.com

Jenni Darling

Director

+27 (0)11 562 1878

M +27 (0)82 826 9055

E jenni.darling@cdhlegal.com

André de Lange

Director

T +27 (0)21 405 6165

M +27 (0)82 781 5858

E andre.delange@cdhlegal.com

Werner de Waal

Director

T +27 (0)21 481 6435

M +27 (0)82 466 4443

E werner.dewaal@cdhlegal.com

Emma Dempster

Projects & Energy

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1194

M +27 (0)79 491 7683

E emma.dempster@cdhlegal.com

Lilia Franca

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1148

M +27 (0)82 564 1407

E lilia.franca@cdhlegal.com

John Gillmer

Director

T +27 (0)21 405 6004

M +27 (0)82 330 4902

E john.gillmer@cdhlegal.com

Jay Govender

Projects & Energy Sector Head Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1387

M +27 (0)82 467 7981

E jay.govender@cdhlegal.com

Johan Green

Director

T +27 (0)21 405 6200

M +27 (0)73 304 6663

E johan.green@cdhlegal.com

Peter Hesseling

Director

T +27 (0)21 405 6009

M +27 (0)82 883 3131

E peter.hesseling@cdhlegal.com

Quintin Honey

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1166 M +27 (0)83 652 0151

E quintin.honey@cdhlegal.com

Kendall Keanly

Director

T +27 (0)21 481 6411

M +27 (0)83 645 5044

E kendall.keanly@cdhlegal.com

Rachel Kelly

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1165

M +27 (0)82 788 0367 E rachel.kelly@cdhlegal.com

Yaniv Kleitman Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1219

M +27 (0)72 279 1260

E yaniv.kleitman@cdhlegal.com

Justine Krige

Director

T +27 (0)21 481 6379

M +27 (0)82 479 8552

E justine.krige@cdhlegal.com

Johan Latsky

Executive Consultant T +27 (0)11 562 1149

M +27 (0)82 554 1003 E johan.latsky@cdhlegal.com

Giada Masina

T +27 (0)11 562 1221

M +27 (0)72 573 1909

E giada.masina@cdhlegal.com

Nkcubeko Mbambisa

Director

+27 (0)21 481 6352

M +27 (0)82 058 4268

E nkcubeko.mbambisa@cdhlegal.com

Nonhla Mchunu

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1228

M +27 (0)82 314 4297

E nonhla.mchunu@cdhlegal.com

Ayanda Mhlongo

Director T +27 (0)21 481 6436

M +27 (0)82 787 9543

E ayanda.mhlongo@cdhlegal.com

William Midgley

Director T +27 (0)11 562 1390

M +27 (0)82 904 1772

E william.midgley@cdhlegal.com

Tessmerica Moodley

Director T +27 (0)21 481 6397

M +27 (0)73 401 2488 E tessmerica.moodley@cdhlegal.com

Anita Moolman

Director T +27 (0)11 562 1376

M +27 (0)72 252 1079

E anita.moolman@cdhlegal.com

Jerain Naidoo

T +27 (0)11 562 1214

M +27 (0)82 788 5533 F ierain.naidoo@cdhlegal.com



OUR TEAM

For more information about our Corporate & Commercial practice and services, please contact:

Francis Newham

Executive Consultant T +27 (0)21 481 6326 M +27 (0)82 458 7728

E francis.newham@cdhlegal.com

Gasant Orrie

Cape Managing Partner Director

T +27 (0)21 405 6044 M +27 (0)83 282 4550

E gasant.orrie@cdhlegal.com

Verushca Pillay

Director

+27 (0)11 562 1800 M +27 (0)82 579 5678 E verushca.pillay@cdhlegal.com

Director

David Pinnock

T +27 (0)11 562 1400 M +27 (0)83 675 2110

E david.pinnock@cdhlegal.com

Allan Reid

Director

+27 (0)11 562 1222 M +27 (0)82 854 9687

E allan.reid@cdhlegal.com

Megan Rodgers

Oil & Gas Sector Head Director

T +27 (0)21 481 6429 M +27 (0) 79 877 8870

E megan.rodgers@cdhlegal.com

Ludwig Smith

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1500 M +27 (0)79 877 2891

E ludwig.smith@cdhlegal.com

Ben Strauss

Director

+27 (0)21 405 6063

M +27 (0)72 190 9071

E ben.strauss@cdhlegal.com

Tamarin Tosen

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1310 M +27 (0)72 026 3806

E tamarin.tosen@cdhlegal.com

Roxanna Valayathum

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1122 M +27 (0)72 464 0515

E roxanna.valayathum@cdhlegal.com

Roux van der Merwe

Director

+27 (0)11 562 1199

M +27 (0)82 559 6406

E roux.vandermerwe@cdhlegal.com

Charl Williams

Director

T +27 (0)21 405 6037 M +27 (0)82 829 4175 E charl.williams@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 9361/SEP













