

**REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA** 

Not reportable Of interest to other judges

# THE LABOUR COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA, CAPE TOWN

## JUDGMENT

Case no: C 665/11

In the matter between:

SOUTH AFRICAN BREWERIES LTD

and

ССМА

TARIQ JAMODIEN N.O.

**CEDRIC KARSTENS** 

Heard: In chambers

Delivered: 25 July 2012

Applicant

**First Respondent** 

Second Respondent

**Third Respondent** 

## **RULING ON LEAVE TO APPEAL**

## STEENKAMP J

## Introduction

1] The applicant seeks leave to appeal against my judgment of 24 May 2012 in which I dismissed its application for review with costs.

#### The applicable test

2] It is trite that the applicable test is whether there is a reasonable prospect that another court may come to a different conclusion.<sup>1</sup> To this is sometimes added the interests of justice.

#### Evaluation / Analysis

- 3] On of the issues addressed in my judgment is the appropriate test on review, especially as regards the role of the commissioner in deciding whether the sanction of dismissal was fair.
- 4] Despite the apparently clear articulation of the test by Navsa J in Sidumo<sup>2</sup> and the subsequent dictum of the Labour Appeal Court in Wasteman Group v SAMWU & Others<sup>3</sup>, there still appears to be some confusion about the commissioner's role in this regard.
- 5] In my view, it is in the interests of justice that the Labour Appeal Court should once again provide clear guidance on this aspect of the test on review.

#### <u>Order</u>

6] Leave to appeal is granted. Costs of this application are to be costs in the appeal.

Steenkamp J

Judge of the Labour Court of South Africa

<sup>1</sup> Karbochem Sasolburg (a division of Sentrachem Ltd) v Kriel (1999) 20 ILJ 2889 (LC) 2890D.

<sup>2</sup> Sidumo & another v Rustenburg Platinum Mines Ltd & others (2007) 28 ILJ 2405 (CC) para [75].

<sup>3</sup> Unreported, CA 6/2011 (8 March 2011).