

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

Adewale v Department of Social Development Gauteng Province (J1046/23)

[2025] ZALCJHB 267 (20 May 2025)

[2025] ZALCJHB 267**COURT**

Labour Court Johannesburg

BEFORE

M T M Phehane

CASE / FILE NUMBER

J1046/23

Source: saflii.org · Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified.

Source record**THE****LABOUR COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA, JOHANNESBURG****Not Reportable****Case No: J1046/23****In the matter between:**

EVA
ADEWALE
Applicant/Plaintiff
and
DEPARTMENT
OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT
GAUTENG
PROVINCE
Respondent/Defendant

Decided:

In Chambers

Delivered:

20 May 2025 January 2025(This judgment was handed down electronically by circulation to the parties' legal representatives by email, publication on the Labour Court website and release to SAFLII. The date and time for handing-down is deemed to be 10h00 on 20 May 2025.)

JUDGMENT

PHEHANE, J

[1] This is a default judgment application in which the plaintiff seeks maximum damages for unfair discrimination.

[2] The plaintiff has not made out a case of unfair discrimination on the pleadings.[1]

[3] In her pleadings, the plaintiff states that she has been subjected to harassment. However, she does not set out on which one of the prohibited grounds of discrimination the harassment she complains about is related to. She has also not demonstrated that the

harassment she complains about was a result of an arbitrary ground which has impaired her dignity as a human being or affects her in a comparable serious manner.[2]

[4] The plaintiff has not placed any facts before this Court that demonstrate that she is diagnosed with a mental illness, is treated differently because of that mental illness, and such different treatment has impaired her dignity. Further, the plaintiff does not plead the quantum of damages she seeks.

[5] The distress that the plaintiff avers is not minimised. She has alternative remedies she may pursue in the form of an unfair labour

practice or a delictual claim for damages, where she is able to quantify her damages.[3]

[6] In view of the afore-going, the following order is made:

Order:

1. The default judgment application is dismissed.

M. T. M. Pehane

Judge of the Labour Court of South Africa

[1] Section 6(1) of the Employment Equity Act 55 of 1988 (EEA) prohibits discrimination on the specified grounds listed in that subsection,

or any arbitrary ground. The Constitutional Court in *Harksen v Lane* NO [1997] ZACC 12; 1998 (1) SA 300 (CC) at para 48 sets out a two-legged test to establish discrimination. The first leg of the test is to answer objectively, whether there is discrimination on a specified or unspecified ground. If answered in the affirmative, the second leg of the test is to answer whether the discrimination is unfair. Fairness is presumed if discrimination on a listed ground is established; unfairness must be established if discrimination is on an unspecified or arbitrary ground. The plaintiff has not passed the first leg of this test.

[2] Items 4.1 read with 4.8 of the Code of Good Practice on the Prevention and Elimination of Harassment in the Workplace published

in GN R1890 in GG 46056 of 18 March 2022 defines harassment as unwanted conduct which impairs the dignity of an employee and

creates a hostile or intimidating work environment and is related to one of the prohibited grounds of discrimination set out in the EEA.

[3] See: *Tshazibane v Montego Pet Nutrition*

(2022) 43 ILJ 2610 (LC).

Source & reproduction note

Judgment wording, source notices and original paragraph numbers are retained. Esheria supplies the layout and this PDF's page numbers; these are not the source pagination. This is a research copy, not an official or certified court document. Check quotations, citations and publication restrictions against the original source before relying on it.

ORIGINAL SOURCE <https://www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZALCJHB/2025/267.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/adewale-v-department-unknown-topic-alcjhb-2025>

Prepared on 9 October 2026 · Esheria