

IN THIS ISSUE

JUDGMENT ON THE INTERPRETATION OF THE "DEEMING PROVISION": SOLE OR DUAL?

The Labour Court handed down judgment earlier today in a highly anticipated interpretation ruling relating to the recent amendments to the Labour Relations Act 66 of 1995 (LRA). More specifically, the judgment provides clarity on the interpretation of the "deeming provision" contained in s198A of the LRA. The judgment confirmed that the client does not become the sole employer, rather the court held that the TES continues to be the employer.



JUDGMENT ON THE INTERPRETATION OF THE "DEEMING PROVISION": SOLE OR DUAL?

There is much debate as to whether the deeming provisior means that the client of a TES becomes the sole employer or the dual employer of the TES employees.

The court stated that the true issue for determination was whether the TES continues to be the employer of the TES employees (notwithstanding the application of deeming provision) and, therefore, is concurrently vested with the rights/obligations and powers/duties generated by the LRA.

a TES becomes the sole employer or the dual employer of the TES employees. Prior to today's judgment, a number of decisions emanating from the CCMA and bargaining councils have declared the deeming provision to mean that the client becomes the sole employer of the TES employees after 3 months.

There is much debate as to whether the

deeming provision means that the client of

The Labour Court handed down judgment earlier today in a highly anticipated interpretation ruling relating to the recent amendments to the Labour Relations Act 66 of 1995 (LRA). More specifically, the judgment provides clarity on the interpretation of the "deeming provision" contained in s198A of the LRA, which provides that the client of a temporary employment service (TES) is deemed to be the employer of the TES employees earning less than the earnings threshold (currently R205 433.30 per

annum) who have been placed at the client for more than 3 months.

In Assign Services v CCMA and others (JR 1230/15; 8 September 2015), the court was tasked with determining whether the commissioner had erred in his interpretation of the deeming provision. The commissioner, too, found that the deeming provision meant that the client of the TES became the sole employer of the TES employees earning less than the earnings threshold who had been placed at the client for more than 3 months.

The court stated that the true issue for determination was whether the TES continues to be the employer of the TES employees (notwithstanding the application of deeming provision) and, therefore, is concurrently vested with the rights/obligations and powers/duties generated by the LRA.

The court found that the TES continues to be the employer of the TES employees, even after the application of the deeming provision. There is no reason, in principle or practice, why the TES should be relieved

of its statutory rights and obligations towards the TES employees merely because the client acquires a parallel set of such rights and obligations. The deeming provision does not invalidate the contract of employment between the TES and TES employee or derogate from its terms.

The court further made the important finding that the deeming provision is expressly made only to operate for the purposes of the LRA and that it therefore serves to amplify or expand the protections afforded to employees and not to substitute the TES employee's protections *vis-à-vis* the TES with protections *vis-à-vis* the client.

The current legal position is that TES employees remain the employees of the TES and, by virtue of the deeming provision, can now assert their rights against the clients of the TES as well. The finding of the Labour Court therefore supports the "dual employer" approach and TES employees do not transfer to the client as the sole employer.

The Labour Court has clarified the interpretation of the deeming provision to the satisfaction of TES and their client's alike. However, this is likely not to be end of the debate around this very contentious amendment to the LRA.

Aadil Patel and Kirsten Caddy





THE XXI WORLD CONGRESS OF THE INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY FOR LABOUR AND SOCIAL SECURITY LAW IS TAKING PLACE IN CAPE TOWN FROM 15 TO 18 SEPTEMBER 2015, HOSTED BY THE SOUTH AFRICAN SOCIETY FOR LABOUR LAW (SASLAW) AND PROUDLY SPONSORED BY CLIFFE DEKKER HOFMEYR.

The 21st World Congress promises to provide a platform for a stimulating discussion on labour and social security law in a global environment where sustained economic and social uncertainty appears to have become the norm.

The main keynote speakers are Professor Alain Supiot, Doctor in Law at the Collège de France in Paris and Professor Sir Bob Hepple, Emeritus Master of Clare College at the University of Cambridge.

VIEW FULL PROGRAMME HERE >





CLICK HERE FOR MORE INFORMATION.











CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2014 - 2015 ranks our Employment practice in Band 2: Employment.

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

Hugo Pienaar ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2014 - 2015 in Band 2: Employment.

Fiona Leppan ranked by CHAMBERS GLOBAL 2015 in Band 4: Employment.

Ranked In
CHAMBERS
GLOBAL
- 2015 Leading
Individual

PUTTING THE PIECES TOGETHER: LABOUR LAW AMENDMENTS
CLICK HERE TO FIND OUT MORE.







OUR TEAM

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



Aadil Patel National Practice Head Director T +27 (0)11 562 1107 E aadil.patel@cdhlegal.com

Regional Practice Head

+27 (0)21 481 6315

T +27 (0)11 562 1124 E johan.botes@cdhlegal.com

T +27 (0)11 562 1299 E mohsina.chenia@cdhlegal.com

T +27 (0)11 562 1152

Mohsina Chenia Director

Fiona Leppan

Director

E gillian.lumb@cdhlegal.com

Gillian Lumb

Johan Botes

Director

Director

Michael Yeates Director +27 (0)11 562 1184 E michael.yeates@cdhlegal.com



Faan Coetzee Executive Consultant T +27 (0)11 562 1600

E faan.coetzee@cdhlegal.com

Kirsten Caddy		
Senior Associate		
T +27 (0)11 562 1412		
E kirsten.caddy@cdhlegal.com		

Nicholas Preston		
Senior Associate		
Т	+27 (0)11 562 1788	
Ε	nicholas.preston@cdhlegal.com	

Lauren Salt Senior Associate T +27 (0)11 562 1378 E lauren.salt@cdhlegal.com

Ndumiso Zwane Senior Associate T +27 (0)11 562 1231 E ndumiso.zwane@cdhlegal.com

Associate T +27 (0)11 562 1586 E khanyisile.khanyile@cdhlegal.com

E anli.bezuidenhout@cdhlegal.com

Anli Bezuidenhout

T +27 (0)21 481 6351

Khanyisile Khanyile

Katlego Letlonkane

Associate

Associate		
T +27 (0)21 481 6319		
E katlego.letlonkane@cdhlegal.com		
Thandeka Nhleko		

As	ssociate
Т	+27 (0)11 562 1280
Ε	than deka.nhleko@cdhlegal.com

SII	nle Ishetlo
As	sociate
Т	+27 (0)11 562 1196
Ε	sihle.tshetlo@cdhlegal.com



Hugo Pienaar T +27 (0)11 562 1350 E hugo.pienaar@cdhlegal.com

E fiona.leppan@cdhlegal.com

BBBEE STATUS: LEVEL TWO CONTRIBUTOR

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

@2015 0677/SEPT

