

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

Kopano Bus Service CC v Maruma (A620/2012) [2013] ZAGPPHC 112 (6 May 2013) [2013] ZAGPPHC 112

COURT

North Gauteng High Court, Pretoria

BEFORE

T.V. Ratshibvumo, H. Ebersohn

CASE / FILE NUMBER

A620/2012

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

Source record

IN THE NORTH GAUTENG HIGH COURT,
PRETORIA

(REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA)

CASE NUMBER: A620/2012

DATE:06/05/2013

In

the matter between:

KOPANO BUS SERVICE

CC.....APPELLANT

And

MATSIMELA

LYDIA

MARUMA.....RESPONDENT

JUDGMENT

RATSHIBVUMO AJ:

1. This is an appeal against a decision by a magistrate who dismissed a special plea raised by the appellant against the respondent's

action. The respondent, as plaintiff, had instituted action against the appellant, as defendant, following bodily injuries sustained when she was in the process of alighting from a bus driven by the appellant's employee. The driver closed the door before she had completely alighted, which pushed her to the ground, during which she sustained injuries. For the sake of convenience, I refer to the parties as the plaintiff and the defendant, respectively.

2. The defendant raised a special plea that the plaintiff's action was barred by s 21 of the Road Accident Fund, Act 56 of 1996, which provides,

"No claim for compensation in respect of loss or damage resulting from bodily injury to or the death of any person caused by or arising from the driving of a motor vehicle shall lie—

- (a) against the owner or driver of a motor vehicle; or
- (b) against the employer of the driver."

The defendant pleaded that, in those circumstances, the plaintiff lacked locus standi to institute the action. The learned magistrate

dismissed the special plea without considering its merits, on the basis that the point should have been raised by way of an exception.

The appeal is against that ruling. The crisp issue before us is therefore whether a statutory bar can competently be raised by way of a special plea and if not so raised, whether the court is entitled to ignore it for that reason.

3. Although the learned magistrate did not consider the merits of the special plea for the reasons stated above, he devoted much focus in his judgment criticising the defendant's allegation that the plaintiff lacked locus standi. This was an irrelevant side issue. The pertinent issue before court was the defendant's plea that the plaintiff's action was statutorily barred. I now turn to consider the relevant principles that should have informed the learned magistrate's judgment. The difference between a special plea and exception is that whereas a special plea raises some special defence, not apparent ex facie the claim and which either destroys or postpones the operation of the cause of action; exception has the same result but it is usually raised if the defence is apparent from the claim.¹
4. From an overview of the authorities, it is clear that it is competent for a statutory bar to be raised by way of a special plea. In *Sanan v Eskom Holdings Ltd*², the defendant raised a statutory bar, by way of an exception. The plaintiff contended that the point should have been raised by way of a special plea. While the court accepted that proposition in principle, it considered the merits of the exception as it accepted that there was overlapping between usage of exceptions and special pleas³. The court referred to several authorities in which a statutory bar was raised either by way of exception or by special plea without

criticism by the courts since it did not render the defence fatal.⁴

5. Whether there is merits in the special plea raised is a different question altogether. The court would have to interpret if the conduct by the defendant's employee amounted to driving or not and also whether the plaintiff was a passenger (being conveyed) or not. There are enough authorities that can guide the court in this regard.⁵ The appeal is not before us on merits of the special plea, but on the order by the magistrate dismissing it.
6. It follows therefore that the learned magistrate misdirected himself in taking a narrow view of the issue before him, and in the process ignoring the relevant. The appeal should succeed.
7. In the result the following order is made:
 1. The appeal is upheld with costs.

T.V. RATSHIBVUMO

ACTING JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT

I agree,

H .EBERSOHN

25 April 2013

Date Heard: 23 April 2013

Judgment

Delivered: 06 May 2013

For the Appellant: Adv. R Raubenheimer

Instructed by: De Bruin Oberholzer Inc

Polokwane

Du Plessis & Eksteen ING/INC Pretoria

For the Respondent: Adv. M Mohale

Instructed by: Ratshoene Attorneys

1 See Brown v Vlok 1925 AD 56 and Viljoen v Federated Trust Ltd 1971 2 All SA 107 (O)

2 2010

(6) SA 638 (GSJ).

3 This could be blamed on writers like Voet. In Voet "AD PANDECTAES" 46.1, exceptions are discussed in great detail. It appears, however, that Voet termed as exceptions, both "exceptions" in the way we understand it as well as "special defences" or "special

pleas". In several places he refers to exceptions in the wider sense of the word as if it did not matter whether it is an "exception" in the true sense of the word or a "special plea" - See *Sanan v Eskom Holdings Ltd* supra at p 643.

3 This could be blamed on writers like Voet. In Voet "AD PANDECTAES" 46.1, exceptions are discussed in

great detail. It appears, however, that Voet termed as exceptions, both "exceptions" in the way we understand it as well as "special defences" or "special

pleas". In several places he refers to exceptions in the wider sense of the word as if it did not matter whether it is an "exception" in the true sense of the word or a "special plea" - See *Sanan v Eskom Holdings Ltd* supra at p 643.

4 See also *Mankayi v Anglogold Ashanti Ltd* 2011 (3) SA 237 (CC).

5 See for example *Wells and Another v Shield Insurance Co Ltd and Others*

[1965] 3 All SA 132 (C). *A A Mutual v Sibothobotho* 1981 4 SA 593 (A) and *Aetna Insurance v Minister of Justice* 1960 3 SA 273 (A)

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/ZAGPPHC/2013/112.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/kopano-bus-service-cc-v-maruma-unknown-topic-agpphc-2013>

Prepared on 9 October 2026 · Esheria