CORPORATE & COMMERCIAL ALERT

IN THIS ISSUE >

Expert determinations - "final and binding"?

The resolution of disputes by way of expert determination has for long been a useful and common contractual provision inserted in commercial agreements. Expert determination is an entirely consensual process in terms of which the parties to a contract agree to refer certain types of disputes that may arise between them for adjudication to an independent third party. The independent third party is typically, but not necessarily, an expert (but not an arbitrator) with recognised expertise in the relevant subject matter and is required to utilise his or her own industry knowledge and skills to adjudicate on the dispute.

FOR MORE INSIGHT INTO OUR EXPERTISE AND SERVICES

CLICK HERE @



It is common for commercial agreements to provide for the use of both expert determination and other dispute resolution processes (such as negotiation, mediation and arbitration) conjunctively.

Expert determinations – "final and binding"?

The resolution of disputes by way of expert determination has for long been a useful and common contractual provision inserted in commercial agreements. Expert determination is an entirely consensual process in terms of which the parties to a contract agree to refer certain types of disputes that may arise between them for adjudication to an independent third party. The independent third party is typically, but not necessarily, an expert (but not an arbitrator) with recognised expertise in the relevant subject matter and is required to utilise his or her own industry knowledge and skills to adjudicate on the dispute.

And given the recent Supreme Court of Appeals (SCA) judgment of Seale and Others v Minister of Public Works and Others (899/2019) [2020] ZASCA 130 (15 October 2020) which confirms that "agreements to agree" or to "negotiate in good faith" will essentially only be enforceable if there is a deadlock-breaking mechanism in the agreement, the use of expert determinations will no doubt continue to feature very prominently in this context.

The use of expert determination has gained considerable attraction due to the fact that it is generally a practical, informal and inexpensive way of resolving disputes between contracting parties whereby the parties are able to determine the nature of the disputes to be resolved as well as the procedure thereof. The inherent benefit of expert determination is that the parties are able to reach commercial certainty on a range of commercial and technical issues that could have otherwise resulted in the parties having to exhaust a considerable amount of funds and time

in referring those disputes to a more formal adjudication process. However, it is common for commercial agreements to provide for the use of both expert determination and other dispute resolution processes (such as negotiation, mediation and arbitration) conjunctively.

Parties will generally cater for a precise and narrow set of valuation or technical issues to be referred to the expert for determination. One such example can be found in commercial transactions whereby the parties agree that the valuation of shares sold under pre-emptive, forced sale or put/call options shall be referred to an independent expert for determination. Another example can be found in property related assessments whereby the parties agree that the market and/or fixed rental assessments shall be referred to an expert valuer for adjudication.

However, consider then what would happen where (i) an expert valuer or umpire is jointly appointed by parties to a contract and (ii) one of the parties is not happy with the expert determination and wants to have that determination set aside? Put differently, in light of the fact that the parties specifically catered for and elected to refer such dispute for adjudication to an independent expert, is it permissible for the courts to interfere with and set aside that determination? This was one of the more interesting questions dealt with in the recent SCA decision of Transnet National Ports Authority v Reit Investments (Pty) Limited and Another (1159/2019) [2020] ZASCA 129 (13 October 2020).

The facts applicable to the case are complex but essentially boiled down to a dispute between the parties as to the valuation of the rental property payable by



The facts applicable to the case are complex but essentially boiled down to a dispute between the parties as to the valuation of the rental property payable by Reit to Transnet in terms of five long-term lease agreements entered into between them and Reit's attempt to set aside the valuation of the property made by the independent expert valuator who was jointly appointed by them.

Expert determinations – "final and binding"?...continued

Reit to Transnet in terms of five long-term lease agreements entered into between them and Reit's attempt to set aside the valuation of the property made by the independent expert valuator who was jointly appointed by them. Reit argued that 'instead of determining the market value of the land, to which [the independent expert valuator] had to apply the contractually stipulated fixed percentage to establish the annual rental, [the independent expert valuator] determined (contrary to the terms of the contact) the market-related rental in respect of the properties'.

The clause central to the dispute between the parties that provided for a deadlock-breaking mechanism in relation to the determination of the rental by Transnet was worded as follows –

"If [Reit] is not prepared to accept [Transnet's] determination of the market value, it shall forthwith notify [Transnet] accordingly, whereupon the value shall be determined by sworn appraisement... Such appraisement shall be undertaken by a sworn appraiser to be selected by the parties jointly. If the parties cannot agree on one sworn appraiser, each party shall appoint one sworn appraiser to undertake the valuation jointly with the one appointed by the other party, and if these two appraisers cannot agree on their valuation, they shall jointly select a third as umpire, whose valuation shall be final and binding on the parties."

On the facts and evidence of the case, the SCA rejected Reit's arguments and noted the following by restating previous precedents –

- I. '...a valuer...reaches his decision based on his own knowledge, independently or supplemented if he thinks fit by material (which need not conform to the rules of evidence) placed before him by either party. Whenever two parties agree to refer a matter to a third for decision, and further agree that his decision is to be final and binding on them, then, so long as he arrives at his decision honestly and in good faith, the two parties are bound by it...'
- II. '...the power of the courts to interfere with an expert's decision in review proceedings is severely circumscribed'
- III. '...a valuation can be rectified on equitable grounds where the valuer does not exercise the judgment of a reasonable man, that is, his judgment is exercised unreasonably, irregularly or wrongly so as to lead to a patently inequitable result...This is also the position in respect of the referee's report it can only be impugned on these narrow grounds'

The crux of the dispute, the SCA stated, was fundamentally whether the independent expert had acted in accordance with his mandate from the parties and, if so, whether his



The crux of the dispute, the SCA stated, was fundamentally whether the independent expert had acted in accordance with his mandate from the parties and, if so, whether his determination was otherwise manifestly unjust.

Expert determinations – "final and binding"?...continued

determination was otherwise manifestly unjust. The SCA confirmed that the mandate given to the independent expert was in accordance with what both parties had ultimately agreed to and found it untenable for a court to interfere with the determination of the valuation in the absence of the independent expert straying outside of his mandate, acting in bad faith, dishonesty or in any other improper manner and reiterated that 'it is now well established that an expert's bona fide determination or award will not be lightly interfered with by the courts'.

Where a party challenges a decision by an independent expert, the standard for setting aside such determination should be high, and rightly so. Ultimately, it was the parties, who by consensus and their own volition, elected to cater for the referral of such dispute for adjudication to an independent expert and must therefore

rely on the expert to decide on the matter and abide by that decision. Given this reminder in the Transnet case of the very high threshold that an aggrieved party needs to cross in order to set aside an expert determination, and the fair degree of subjectivity to which any valuation is susceptible (as also referenced in the Transnet case), parties should consider the extent to which their agreement needs to provide for exceptional circumstances under which either or both of them may "back out" of an expert determination which would otherwise be binding. and to have an ability to rescind the transaction, for instance by having caps and floors in the context of put and call option agreements. Absent such a provision, the expert's determination would be binding save only for a patently inequitable valuation.

Boipelo Diale and Yaniv Kleitman





2019 THE LEGAL DEALMAKER OF THE DECADE BY DEAL FLOW

M&A Legal DealMakers of the Decade by Deal Flow: 2010-2019.

2018

- by BEE M&A Deal Value by BEE M&A Deal Flow.
- Lead legal advisers on the Private Equity
 Deal of the Year.

- ¹ by M&A Deal Value. by General Corporate Finance Deal Flow
- for the 6th time in 7 years. 1st by General Corporate Finance Deal Value. 2nd by M&A Deal Flow and Deal Value (Africa,
- excluding South Africa). 2nd by BEE Deal Flow and Deal Value.

DealMakers

2016

- 1²¹ by M&A Deal Flow. 1²¹ by General Corporate Finance Deal Flow. 2²² by M&A Deal Value. 3²³ by General Corporate Finance Deal Value.

2015

- 1st by M&A Deal Flow. 1st by General Corporate Finance Deal Flow

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.

Lilia Franca 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.

CDH's Investment Funds practice is ranked in Tier 3 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.













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

T +27 (0)11 562 1878

M +27 (0)82 826 9055 E jenni.darling@cdhlegal.com

André de Lange

Sector head

Director

Agriculture

T +27 (0)21 405 6165 M +27 (0)82 781 5858

E andre.delange@cdhlegal.com

Werner de Waal

T +27 (0)21 481 6435

M +27 (0)82 466 4443

E werner.dewaal@cdhlegal.com

Emma Dempster

Director

+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

Sector head

Director

Private Equity

T +27 (0)21 405 6004

M +27 (0)82 330 4902

E john.gillmer@cdhlegal.com

Jay Govender

Sector Head

Projects & Energy

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

+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

T +27 (0)11 562 1800 M +27 (0)82 579 5678 E verushca.pillay@cdhlegal.com **David Pinnock** Director

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

E david.pinnock@cdhlegal.com

Allan Reid

Sector head Director Mining & Minerals

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

E allan.reid@cdhlegal.com

Megan Rodgers

Sector Head Director Oil & Gas

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

T +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

 ${\sf E} \quad roxanna.valayathum@cdhlegal.com\\$

Roux van der Merwe

Director

T +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.

PLEASE NOTE

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 cdhstellenbosch@cdhlegal.com

©2020 9461/OCT













