DISPUTE RESOLUTION ALERT 8 FEBRUARY 2022 INCORPORATING **KIETI LAW LLP, KENYA**

IN THIS ISSUE

Piecemeal adjudication of an interim order undesirable unless dismissal thereof is a threat to interests of justice

The question relating to whether an interim order can be subject to an appeal and the circumstances under which an interim order is appealable has resurfaced in the recent Supreme Court of Appeal (SCA) decision in *The City of Cape Town v The South African Human Rights Commission* (Case no 144/2021) [2021] ZASCA 182 (22 December 2021).



DISPUTE RESOLUTION ALERT

Piecemeal adjudication of an interim order undesirable unless dismissal thereof is a threat to interests of justice

The question relating to whether an interim order can be subject to an appeal and the circumstances under which an interim order is appealable has resurfaced in the recent Supreme Court of Appeal (SCA) decision in The City of Cape Town v The South African Human Rights Commission (Case no 144/2021) [2021] ZASCA 182 (22 December 2021).

In this judgment the SCA was called upon to hear an appeal against an interim order granted by the Western Cape Division of the High Court, Cape Town, in favour of the South African Human Rights Commission (SAHRC), following an urgent application brought by SAHRC preventing the City of Cape Town from evicting persons and demolishing structures during the national state of disaster without a court order.

As set out by the SCA in Zweni vs Minister of Law and Order 1993 (1) SA 523 (a) it is trite that for an order to be susceptible to appeal, "the decision must be final in effect and not susceptible to alteration by a court of first instance, it must be definitive of the right of the parties, and it must have the effect of disposing of at least a substantial portion of the relief claimed in the proceedings." To this, the SCA has held that in determining whether to grant leave to appeal, the courts must consider whether allowing the appeal would lead to piecemeal adjudication and prolong the litigation leading to the wasteful use of judicial resources.

An interim order prima facie fails on all grounds to satisfy the test set out in Zweni vs Minister of Law and Order 1993 (1) SA 523 (a). However. the court in the Zweni vs Minister of Law and Order 1993 (1) SA 523 (a), rightly considered further the decision in National Treasury and Others vs Opposition to Urban Tolling Alliance and Others [2012] ZACC 18; 2012 (6) 223 (CC) where the Constitutional Court confirmed that the interests of justice are paramount in assessing the appealability of an interim order. The Constitutional Court held that although it is important to consider whether an interim order has a final effect or disposes of a substantial portion of the relief sought in a pending review, it is just as important to consider whether 'the harm that flows from the interim order is serious. immediate, ongoing, and irreparable."

The court in the Zweni vs Minister of Law and Order 1993 (1) SA 523 (a) found that the appeal in regard to payment of compensation by the City of Cape Town to persons who suffered loss of personal belongings

a result of the eviction and the demolishing of their informal dwelling succeeds.

However, the court considered the appeal against the interim orders preventing the City of Cape Town from evicting persons and demolishing structures, whether occupied or unoccupied, during the national state of disaster, without a court order. The court found that there could be no irreparable harm if the City of Cape Town is compelled to seek a court order before evicting persons during the national state of disaster. The court found that the relief sought in the interim orders were not final in effect, nor was any irreparable harm or grave injustice likely to occur should the interim orders remain unaltered until the final relief is determined. The interests of justice would not be served by allowing the appeal of the interim orders and the appeal against the interim orders were therefore dismissed.

DISPUTE RESOLUTION ALERT

CONTINUED

Piecemeal adjudication of an interim order undesirable unless dismissal thereof is a threat to interests of justice

Generally, our courts have held that the court will only interfere in pending proceedings in the lower courts in cases of great rarity, where grave injustice threatens, and where intervention is necessary to attain justice. The 'interests of justice' standard will inevitably involve a consideration of irreparable harm. As was held in Machele and Others vs Mailula and Others [2009] ZACC 7; 2010 (2) SA 257 (CC), to appeal an interim order successfully an applicant will have to show that it will suffer irreparable harm if the interim appeal is not granted.

It appears that the common law test for appealability has been stripped of its inflexible nature. Appealability no longer depends primarily on whether the interim order appealed against has final effect or is dispositive of a substantial portion of the relief sought in the main application. The test now is the constitutional 'interest of justice' standard.

EUGENE BESTER AND ALPHA ZUNGU





OUR TEAM

For more information about our Dispute Resolution practice and services in South Africa and Kenya, please contact:



Tim Fletcher
Practice Head
Director
T +27 (0)11 562 1061
E tim.fletcher@cdhlegal.com



Thabile Fuhrmann

Chairperson Joint Sector Head Government & State-Owned Entities 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

Jackwell Feris

Sector Head Industrials, Manufacturing & Trade Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1825

BBBEE STATUS: LEVEL ONE CONTRIBUTOR

E jackwell.feris@cdhlegal.com

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

Anja Hofmeyr

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1129

E anja.hofmeyr@cdhlegal.com

Tobie Jordaan

Sector Head
Business Rescue, Restructuring
& Insolvency
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

Directo

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

Rishaban Moodley

Sector Head Gambling & Regulatory Compliance 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

Desmond Odhiambo

Partner | Kenya

T +254 731 086 649

+254 204 409 918

+254 710 560 114

E desmond.odhiambo@cdhlegal.com

Lucinde Rhoodie

Director

T +27 (0)21 405 6080

E lucinde.rhoodie@cdhlegal.com

Clive Rumsey

Sector Head Construction & Engineering

T +27 (0)11 562 1924

E clive.rumsey@cdhlegal.com

Belinda Scriba

Director

Director

T +27 (0)21 405 6139

E belinda.scriba@cdhlegal.com

NAIROBI

Merchant Square, 3rd floor, Block D, Riverside Drive, Nairobi, Kenya. P.O. Box 22602-00505, Nairobi, Kenya. T +254 731 086 649 | +254 204 409 918 | +254 710 560 114 E cdhkenya@cdhlegal.com

STELLENBOSCH

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

Tim Smit

Director

T +27 (0)11 562 1085

E tim.smit@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

Jonathan Witts-Hewinson

Executive Consultant

T +27 (0)11 562 1146

E witts@cdhlegal.com

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.

















