

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

Masilo N.O and Others v Betterbridge (Pty) Limited (37/2015) [2016] ZASCA 73 (25 May 2016) [2016] ZASCA 73

COURT

Supreme Court of Appeal

BEFORE

Cachalia, Seriti, Willis, Mbha, Victor

CASE / FILE NUMBER

37/2015

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

THE SUPREME COURT OF APPEAL OF SOUTH AFRICA

JUDGMENT

Case No: 37/2015

DATE: 25 MAY 2016

Not Reportable

In the matter between:

MICHAEL MMATHOMO MASILO NO.....FIRST APPELLANT

PHILIPPUS GIOVANNI TORRE NO.....SECOND APPELLANT

MONICA COWIN NO.....THIRD APPELLANT

And

BETTERBRIDGE (PTY) LIMITED.....RESPONDENT

Neutral citation: Masilo v Betterbridge (37/2015) [2016] ZASCA 73 (25 May 2016)

Coram:Cachalia, Seriti, Willis and Mbha JJA and Victor AJA

Heard: 16 May 2016

Delivered: 25 May 2016

Summary: Prescription – extinctive prescription – delay in completion – debt object of claim filed against company in liquidation – claim withdrawn after ‘admitted to proof’ under s 44 of the Insolvency Act 24 of 1936. Whether prescription delayed in terms of s 13(1)(g) of the Prescription Act 68 of 1969.

ORDER

On appeal from: North Gauteng Division of the High Court, Pretoria (Unterhalter AJ sitting as court of first instance), judgment

reported sub nom as Betterbridge (Pty) Ltd v Masilo & others 2015

(2) SA 396 (GP):

The appeal is dismissed with costs.

Cachalia JA (Seriti, Willis and Mbha JJA and Victor AJA concurring)

- [1] This is an appeal from the North Gauteng Division of the High Court, Pretoria (Unterhalter AJ) rejecting a special plea by the defendants that the plaintiff’s claim had prescribed. Instead, it upheld the plaintiff’s contention that the completion of prescription was delayed in terms of s 13(1)(g) of the Prescription Act 68 of 1969.
- [2] The facts and the reasoning of the learned judge are set out fully in his judgment, which has now been reported sub nom as Betterbridge (Pty) Ltd v Masilo & others 2015
- (2) SA 396 (GP). I agree fully with the judgment. No purpose will be served by rehashing the facts or repackaging the reasoning.
- [3] Before us the appellants raised a new argument, one that the court a quo was not asked to consider. They now contend that if a claim is withdrawn before the presiding officer at the meeting of creditors decides whether to admit or reject the claim, as in this case, the claim will not be the ‘object of a claim filed’ as s 13(1)(g) envisages. This is because a creditor, who wants the benefit of a delay in the completion of prescription, must participate in the process provided for in s 44 of the Insolvency Act until completion. A creditor, who lodges a claim with the Master, and then withdraws it from the adjudication process provided for in s 44, does not make his claim the object of a claim filed against the company in liquidation. And therefore cannot gain the benefit of the delay of prescription. A withdrawn claim, so it is contended, is as good as no claim at all.
- [4] There is no merit in this contention. Apart from the fact that this defence was not pleaded in the rejoinder, it is apparent from the judgment of the court a quo that the impediment becomes operative as soon as the claim is ‘admitted to proof’. This occurs when the presiding officer at the meeting of creditors accepts the claim as filed in terms of s 13(1)(g); the adjudication process need not be completed. This is precisely what happened in this case.

[5] Mr Pye properly accepted that if the court a quo was correct in coming to this conclusion, the appeal could not succeed. The appeal must therefore fail.

[6] I make the following order:

‘The appeal is dismissed with costs.’

A CACHALIA

JUDGE OF APPEAL

APPEARANCES

For Appellant: W B Pye

Instructed by: Harvey Nossel Attorneys, Johannesburg

Lovius-Block, Bloemfontein

For Respondent: G Nel

Instructed by: Neil Esterhuysen Attorneys, Pretoria

Kramer Weihmann & Joubert Attorneys, Bloemfontein

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/ZASCA/2016/73.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/masilo-no-and-others-v-betterbridge-unknown-topic-asca-2016--6a3ea5123b1caa9129809b90>

Prepared on 9 October 2026 · Esheria