Employment Law

ALERT | 11 August 2025





In this issue

SOUTH AFRICA

The Labour Court does not have inherent jurisdiction over incomplete disciplinary proceedings



The Labour Court does not have inherent jurisdiction over incomplete disciplinary proceedings



The issue of the Labour Court's jurisdiction over incomplete disciplinary proceedings has now been authoritatively and definitively determined by the Labour Appeal Court (LAC).

In the recent judgment of *Chibane and Another v Premier of Province of KwaZulu-Natal* (DA15/2024) [2025] ZALAC 44, which was delivered on 15 July 2025, the court held that the Labour Court does not have inherent (general) jurisdiction to intervene and restrain any alleged illegalities, irregularities or unfairness in incomplete disciplinary proceedings. Its jurisdiction must be found in legislation, as it is, after all, a creature of statute.

This matter involved two senior provincial government employees who sought the intervention of the Labour Court to "quash" charges of misconduct and halt all disciplinary action brought against them, arguing that an unreasonable delay in the employer prosecuting the alleged waiver to discipline them had resulted in a 'bar' to the disciplinary proceedings.

The court dismissed the appeal, upheld continuation of the disciplinary proceedings, and provided important guidance on the jurisdiction of the Labour Court in the context of intervening in incomplete disciplinary hearings.

EMPLOYMENT LAW ALERT

The Labour Court does not have inherent jurisdiction over incomplete disciplinary proceedings

CONTINUED





Factual background

The employees, senior managers in the KwaZulu-Natal Premier's office, were implicated in a forensic report in 2017 that recommended disciplinary action for alleged breaches of the Public Finance Management Act 1 of 1999 and supply chain policies.

Despite the recommendations, disciplinary proceedings only commenced in July 2020.

The employees objected on grounds of unreasonable delay and alleged that the employer had waived its right to discipline.

The disciplinary chairperson dismissed these objections, which resulted in an urgent application to the Labour Court where the employees sought the following as relief:

- A declaration that there had been an unreasonable delay in instituting disciplinary proceedings and that the employer had thus waived its right to discipline.
- Quashing of the charges and permanent termination of the proceedings.

• Reviewing and setting aside the disciplinary chairperson's ruling.

The Labour Court, in dismissing the application, held as follows:

- The delay, while protracted and inadequately explained, did not justify a permanent stay of proceedings given the seriousness of the charges and the public interest.
- The employees did not demonstrate prejudice.
- Public authorities cannot waive rights introduced in the public interest without proper grounds.

On appeal, the employees contended that the Labour Court misapplied the test for reasonableness of delay and incorrectly considered the nature of the charges in assessing the delay. The employees submitted that the Labour Court's finding in respect of a waiver *vis-à-vis* the right to discipline was incorrect.

EMPLOYMENT LAW ALERT

The Labour Court does not have inherent jurisdiction over incomplete disciplinary proceedings

CONTINUED





Labour Appeal Court's findings

The LAC interrogated the jurisdiction of the Labour Court and held that:

- The Labour Court's jurisdiction is not inherent.
 It must be found in legislation, as it is a creature of statute.
- The employees did not identify any statutory basis for the declaratory relief sought regarding the delay or a waiver.
- The employees failed to rely on the relevant provisions of the Basic Conditions of Employment Act 75 of 1997, which confers jurisdiction over any disputes "concerning a contract of employment".
- The court clarified that the broad interpretation of the judgment in *Booysen v Minister of Safety and Security and Others* [2011] 32 ILJ 112 (LAC), which has been misinterpreted to suggested that the Labour Court had inherent jurisdiction to intervene in incomplete disciplinary proceedings, was inconsistent with recent Constitutional Court authority that held that the Labour Court does not have

- jurisdiction to declare dismissals unlawful or invalid unless specifically provided for in the Labour Relations Act 66 of 1995 (LRA).
- Outside the scope of any statutory provision that specifically confers jurisdiction on the Labour Court, the Labour Court has no jurisdiction, in any general sense, to make any determination of the unlawfulness of employer conduct.
- The Labour Court does not have jurisdiction simply because the dispute arose from, or in the context of, an employment relationship (e.g. if an employee assaults a customer, the Labour Court does not have jurisdiction over criminal liability). Any dispute must be grounded in specific statutory provisions to clothe the Labour Court with the necessary jurisdiction to intervene in disciplinary proceedings.
- Thus, the expansive reading of *Booysen* has been curtailed.

EMPLOYMENT LAW ALERT

The Labour Court does not have inherent jurisdiction over incomplete disciplinary proceedings

CONTINUED





Key takeaways

- Outside the scope of any statutory provision that specifically confers jurisdiction on the Labour Court, it has no jurisdiction, in any general sense, to make any determination of the unlawfulness of employer conduct.
- Thus, the Labour Court does not have an inherent jurisdiction to intervene in incomplete disciplinary proceedings because its jurisdiction must be found in legislation.
- Claims of delay or waiver in disciplinary proceedings must be grounded in the facts and specifically the conduct (inaction) of the employer, and the parties must identify the statutory basis for jurisdiction.
- The public interest in the adjudication of serious misconduct by senior public officials weighs against the permanent stay of disciplinary proceedings, even where there has been significant delay.
- Even where statute finds jurisdiction for the Labour Court to intervene
 in incomplete disciplinary proceedings, it would only accede to such
 a request in exceptional circumstances, which conforms with the
 LRA's objective of expeditious resolution of disputes.

This judgment provides important guidance for employers and employees regarding the jurisdictional boundaries of the Labour Court to intervene in internal disciplinary proceedings.

JJ van der Walt, Sashin Naidoo and Lynsey Foot





OUR TEAM

For more information about our Employment Law practice and services in South Africa, Kenya and Namibia, please contact:



Aadil Patel
Practice Head & Director:
Employment Law
Sector Head:
Government & State-Owned Entities
T +27 (0)11 562 1107
E aadil.patel@cdhlegal.com



Anli Bezuidenhout
Director:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)21 481 6351
E anli.bezuidenhout@cdhlegal.com



Fiona Leppan
Director:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)11 562 1152
E fiona.leppan@cdhlegal.com

Imraan Mahomed

Nadeem Mahomed

Director:



Director:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)11 562 1459
E imraan.mahomed@cdhlegal.com



Employment Law T +27 (0)11 562 1936 E nadeem.mahomed@cdhlegal.com



Yvonne Mkefa
Director:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)21 481 6315
E yvonne.mkefa@cdhlegal.com



Phetheni Nkuna
Director:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)11 562 1478
E phetheni.nkuna@cdhlegal.com



Desmond Odhiambo
Partner | Kenya
T +254 731 086 649
+254 204 409 918
+254 710 560 114
E desmond.odhiambo@cdhlegal.com



Njeri Wagacha
Partner | Kenya
T +254 731 086 649
+254 204 409 918
+254 710 560 114
E njeri.wagacha@cdhlegal.com



Jean Ewang
Counsel:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)11 562 1499
E jean.ewang@cdhlegal.com



Thabang Rapuleng
Counsel:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)11 562 1759
E thabang.rapuleng@cdhlegal.com



JJ van der Walt Counsel: Employment Law T +27 (0)11 562 1289 E jj.vanderwalt@cdhlegal.com



Ebrahim Patelia Legal Consultant: Employment Law T +27 (0)11 562 1000 E ebrahim.patelia@cdhlegal.com

OUR TEAM

For more information about our Employment Law practice and services in South Africa, Kenya and Namibia, please contact:

Biron Madisa



Daniel Kiragu
Senior Associate | Kenya
T +254 731 086 649
+254 204 409 918
+254 710 560 114
E daniel.kiragu@cdhlegal.com



Malesela Letwaba Senior Associate: Employment Law T +27 (0)11 562 1710 E malesela.letwaba@cdhlegal.com



Lee Masuku
Senior Associate:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)11 562 1213
E lee.masuku@cdhlegal.com



Leila Moosa
Senior Associate:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)21 481 6318
E leila.moosa@cdhlegal.com



Christine Mugenyu
Senior Associate | Kenya
T +254 731 086 649
+254 204 409 918
+254 710 560 114
E christine.mugenyu@cdhlegal.com



Senior Associate: Employment Law T +27 (0)11 562 1086 E kgodisho.phashe@cdhlegal.com



Taryn York
Senior Associate:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)11 562 1732
E taryn.york@cdhlegal.com



Chantell De Gouveia
Associate:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)11 562 1343
E chantell.degouveia@cdhlegal.com



Ayesha Karjieker Associate: Employment Law T +27 (0)11 562 1568 E ayesha.karjieker@cdhlegal.com



Associate: Employment Law T +27 (0)11 562 1031 E biron.madisa@cdhlegal.com



Lynsey Foot
Associate:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)11 562 1429
E lynsey.foot@cdhlegal.com



Shemonné Isaacs Associate: Employment Law T +27 (0)11 562 1831 E shemonne.lsaacs@cdhlegal.com



Thobeka Kalipa
Associate:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)11 562 1238
E thobeka.kalipa@cdhlegal.com



Kevin Kipchirchir
Associate | Kenya
T +254 731 086 649
+254 204 409 918
+254 710 560 114
E kevin.kipchirchir@cdhlegal.com



Thato Makoaba
Associate:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)11 562 1659
E thato.makoaba@cdhlegal.com



Thato Maruapula
Associate:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)11 562 1774
E thato.maruapula@cdhlegal.com



Sheilla Mokaya
Associate | Kenya
T +254 731 086 649
+254 204 409 918
+254 710 560 114
E sheilla.mokaya@cdhlegal.com



Sashin Naidoo
Associate:
Employment Law
T +27 (0)11 562 1482
E sashin.naidoo@cdhlegal.com



Billy Oloo
Associate | Kenya
T +254 731 086 649
+254 204 409 918
+254 710 560 114
E billy.oloo@cdhlegal.com



Melisa Wekesa
Associate | Kenya
T +254 731 086 649
+254 204 409 918
+254 710 560 114
E melisa.wekesa@cdhlegal.com

BBBEE STATUS: LEVEL ONE 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

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

NAMIBIA

1st Floor Maerua Office Tower, Cnr Robert Mugabe Avenue and Jan Jonker Street, Windhoek 10005, Namibia PO Box 97115, Maerua Mall, Windhoek, Namibia, 10020 T +264 833 730 100 E cdhnamibia@cdhlegal.com

STELLENBOSCH

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

©2025 14983/AUG

