

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

Mthembu v Minister of Police (45040/2018) [2021] ZAGPJHC 878 (22 December 2021) [2021] ZAGPJHC 878

COURT

South Gauteng High Court, Johannesburg

BEFORE

Senyatsi ML

CASE / FILE NUMBER

45040/2018

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

Source record

REPUBLIC
OF SOUTH AFRICA
IN
THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA
GAUTENG
LOCAL DIVISION, JOHANNESBURG
CASE
NO: 45040/2018

REPORTABLE: NO
OF
INTEREST TO OTHER JUDGES: NO

REVISED: NO
22-12-2021
In

the matter between: MTHEMBU
 SYDNEY
 XOLANI
 Plaintiff
 and
 MINISTER
 OF
 POLICE
 First Defendant
 NATIONAL
 DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS
 Second Defendant

JUDGMENT

Delivered: By transmission to the parties via email and uploading onto Case Lines the Judgment is deemed to be delivered. The date for hand-down

is deemed to be 22 December 2021

SENYATSI J:

INTRODUCTION

- [1] This case highlights the importance of applying for condonation of late filing of prescribed notice in terms of the rules of court when litigation is launched against certain organs of the State.
- [2] In a suit for damages for wrongful arrest and malicious prosecution of the Plaintiff, at hearing the parties applied to separate the issues for determination. The special pleas filed on behalf of the Defendants were ordered by court to be dealt with and if the pleas were not successful then the merits would be dealt with at a later date.

BRIEF

BACKGROUND

- [3] The Plaintiff was arrested without a warrant by police on 27 July 2015. He remained in custody until 3 December 2015 when charges of robbery were withdrawn against him.
- [4] Summons was issued and served on the National Commissioner of the South African Police Service on 25 January 2019 and on the second Defendant on 12 February 2019.
- [5] On 8 March 2019 notice of intention to defend was filed on behalf of the Defendants by the State Attorney.

- [6] On 25 May 2020 summons was served on the Provincial Commissioner of South African on the State Attorney on 5 October 2021.
- [7] Before summons was issued and served, notice of intention to institute legal action had been sent on behalf of the Plaintiff on the National Commissioner and the Provincial Commissioner of the South African Police Services on 8 November 2018. On 9 November 2018 the Plaintiff served another notice of intention to institute legal proceedings on the National Director of Public Prosecutions.
- [8] In the plea, the Defendants raised the following special plea:
- (a) The Plaintiff's claim has prescribed as contemplated in the Prescription Act 68 of 1969 ("the Prescription Act");
 - (b) Non-compliance with section 2(2) of the State Liability Act 20 of 1957 ("State Liability Act") read with section 3 of Judicial Matters Amendment Act 8 of 2017 ("the Judicial Matters Amendment Act") by the Plaintiff;
 - (c) Non-compliance with section 3 of the Institution of Legal Proceedings Against Certain Organs of the State Act 40 of 2002 ("the ILPACOS Act");
- [9] As already stated, these special pleas were ordered to be separated from the merits and be dealt with at the hearing of the matter.
- [10] At the hearing of the matter the court was not provided with a formal application for condonation of late filing of section 3 notice in terms of the ILPACOS Act. The submissions were made on behalf of the Plaintiff through heads of argument.

ISSUES

- [11] The issues to be determined was whether the claim has prescribed as contended by the Defendants and whether non-compliance with section 3 of the ILPACOS Act without a formal condonation application is fatal to the case.

LEGAL PRINCIPLES, THE APPLICATION THEREOF TO THE FACTS AND REASONS FOR THE

JUDGMENT

PRESCRIPTION

- [12] I first deal with the applicable principles on prescription. Prescription as a defence is part of our law and is recognised in our democratic dispensation.
- [13] The time lines within which actions must be instituted are regulated by the Prescription Act sections 12(1), (2) and (3) of which provide as follows:

"When prescription begins to run

- (1) Subject to the provisions of subsections (2) and (3), prescription shall commence to run as soon as the debt is due;
- (2) If the debtor wilfully prevents the creditor from coming to know of the existence of the debt prescription shall not commence to run until the creditor becomes aware of the existence of the debt.
- (3) A debt which does not arise to have such contract shall not be deemed to be due until the creditor has knowledge of the identity of the debtor and of the facts, from which the debt arises. Provided that a creditor shall be deemed to have such knowledge if he could have acquired it by exercising reasonable care.”

[14] Our Constitutional Court has dealt with prescription on a number of cases where it was recognised as part and parcel of our law. In *Road Accident Fund and Another v Mdeyide*[1] the court emphasised the principle on the timelines imposed by the Prescription Act and said the following:

“the vital role time limits play in bringing, certainty and stability to social and legal affairs and maintaining the quality of adjudication. Without prescription periods legal disputes would have the potential to be drawn out for indefinite periods of time bridging about prolonged uncertainty to the parties to the dispute. The quality of adjudication by courts is likely to suffer as time passes because evidence may have become lost, witnesses may no longer be available to testify, or their recollection of events may have likely to suffer as time passes because evidence may have become lost, witnesses may no longer be available to testify, or their recollection of events may have faded. The quality of adjudication is central to the rule of law. For the law to be respected, decisions of courts must be given as soon as possible after the events giving rise to disputes and must- follow from sound reasoning based on the best available evidence.”

[15] Section 11 (1)(a) of the Prescription Act provides that prescription shall be three years in respect in respect of ordinary debts unless any other legislation provided differently.[2]

[16] In cases where a special plea of prescription is raised each cas must be decided on its own merits.[3] It is also irrelevant, for the prescription period to start running, that the creditor must have knowledge of his or her actionable

claim.[4]

[17] The facts from which a debt arises will differ from case to case or from debt to debt. The facts from which a debt arises in case of, for example, a claim for defamation and the facts from which a debt arises from a claim for wrongful arrest will differ.[5]

[18] The Plaintiff’s counsel referred this court to the case of *Makate v Vodacom*[6] where the court said the following in relation to section 12 of the Prescription Act:

[25] It cannot be denied that despite not having complied with the provisions of section 2(2) of the State Liability Act, the defendants are not alleging that the summons was never served to the Minister of Police, the National Commissioner and the Provincial Commissioner of the

South African Police Service. Service was effected and the parties were duly represented by the State Attorney. No prejudice was alleged to have been suffered by such non-service to the Minister. Accordingly, the non-compliance with section 2(2) of the State Liability Act has not caused any prejudice to the defendant. Even if the court is incorrect in holding that view, in any event, the Plaintiff served a copy of summons on 5 October 2019 on the State Attorney who was as already stated, representing both defendants prior to the service of the summons. It follows that the special plea on this ground should fail.

NON-COMPLIANCE WITH SECTION 3 OF ILPACOS ACT

[26] I now deal with the third defence of special plea based on non-compliance with the provisions of section 3 of ILPACOS Act which I consider to be of significant importance in this judgment.

[27] It is important to restate the provisions of section 3 of the ILPACOS Act which provide as follows:

“Notice of intended legal proceedings to be given to the organ of state

3(1) No legal proceedings for the recovery of a debt may be instituted against an organ of state unless-

- (a) the creditor has given the organ of state in question notice in writing of his or her or its intention to institute the legal proceedings in question, or
 - (b) the organ of state in question has consented in writing to the institution of that legal proceedings
- (i) without such notice; or
- (ii) upon receipt of a notice which does not comply with all the requirement set out subsection (2).
- (2) A notice must-
- (a) within six months from the date on which the debt became due, be served on the organ of state in accordance with section 4(1); and
 - (b) briefly set out-
- (i) The facts giving rise to the debt; and
 - (ii) Such particulars of such debt as are within the knowledge of the creditor.
- (3) For purposes of subsection (2)(a)

- (a) a debt may not be regarded as being due until the creditor has knowledge of the identity of the organ of state and of the facts giving rise to the debt, but a creditor must be regarded as having acquired such knowledge as soon as he or she or it could have acquired it by exercising reasonable care, unless the organ of state wilfully prevented him or her or it from acquiring such knowledge; and
- (b) a debt referred to in section 2(2)(a), must be regarded as having become due on the fixed date.”

[28] The creditor who fails to comply with the provisions of section 3(1)(2) and (3) is afforded an opportunity if the defendant relies on non-compliance with the notice, to approach court by way of motion proceedings in terms of section 3(4)(9) and ask for condonation for non-compliance with the notice requirements.

[29] Section 3(4) of ILAPACOS Act provides as follows:

“(a) If an organ of state relies on creditor’s failure to serve a notice in terms of subsection 2(9), the creditors may apply to a court having jurisdiction for condonation of such failure.

(b)The court may grant an application referred to in paragraph (a) if it is satisfied that:

- (i) the debt has not been extinguished by prescription;
 - (ii) good cause exists for the failure by the creditor; and
 - (iii) the organ of state was not unreasonably prejudiced by the failure.
- (c) If an application is granted in terms of paragraph (b), the court may grant leave to institute the legal proceedings in question, on such condonations regarding notice to the organ of State as the court may deem appropriate.”

[30] Section 3(4)(b) sets out the factors which the court must be satisfied with to decide whether to grant condonation for the failure to serve a notice in accordance with the requirements set out in section 3(2). Numerous judgments have dealt with the interpretation of these provisions and found that these factors need to be read conjunctively.[10]

[31] In line with section 3(2)(a) and the principles related in the various judgments the time limits for filing the notice in terms of section 3(2) against the organ of state is six months. If the creditor is out of time, condonation, as already stated must be sought in terms of section 3(4).[11]

[32] It is a misdirection for the court to consider condonation application which is not supported by a formal application which is before it.

[33] In the present case, there is no application for combination within the prescripts of section 3(4). No submissions were made on behalf of the Plaintiff as to why such an application was never sought. Counsel for the Plaintiff relied on the notices issued during October and November 2018 As well as the relief for condemnation directed to the Defendants which was

never responded to. In accordance with his submission, Counsel for the Plaintiff simply states that for reasons of interpreting The provisions in accordance with section 39(2) of the constitution the special plea on noncompliance with the notice requirements in terms of Section 3(2) must be dismissed. This submission has no legal and factual basis.

- [34] A submission was made on behalf of the painting that the notices dated 18 October 2018 which should be regarded as being incorporated in the papers in where it is stated:

“Insofar as this notice/demand has been launched outside the prescribed 6 (six) months period, kindly let us have your indulgence herein”.

This is not enough. In fact, the Plaintiff in his replication to special plea that there has been non-compliance with section 3, simply states that the defendants have failed to notice that the notices were attached to the summons when service day off was effected. This is not valid ground for dealing with non-compliance with section 3.

- [35] The rules of this court make it plain how a notice for condonation must be filed. For completeness sake, I will restate the Rule 6 of the Uniform Rules which provides as follows:

“Application

- (1) Save where proceedings by way of petition are prescribed by law, every application must be brought on notice of motion supported by an affidavit as to the facts upon which the applicant relies for relief.
- (2) When relief is claimed against any person, or where it is necessary or proper to give any person notice of such application, the notice of motion must be addressed to both the registrar and such person, otherwise it must be addressed to the registrar only
- (3) Every petition must conclude with the form of order prayed and be verified upon oath by or on behalf of the petitioner.”

- [36] In this case, attaching a notice in accordance with section 3 of the ILPACOS Act is not compliance with rule 6 of the uniform rules of this court because the notice is not an application for condonation.

- [37] It is my considered view that the legal representatives of the Plaintiff failed to act in the best interest of the Plaintiff by not seeking condonation of non-compliance with section 3(2) of ILPACOS Act in a separate motion application. Having regard to such failure, there is as correctly submitted on behalf of the Defendants, no application before the court for condonation of non-compliance with section 3 of ILPACOS Act. Therefore, it follows that the special plea on this point must succeed.

ORDER

- [44] The following order is made:

- (a) The special pleas on prescription and the non-compliance with section 3 of ILPACOS Act are upheld with costs.
- (b) The special plea on failure to comply with section 2 of the State Liability Act is dismissed with costs.
- (c) The defendant therefore succeeded with their special pleas save as stated in (b) above.

SENYATSI ML

Judge of the High Court of South Africa

Gauteng Local Division, Johannesburg

REPRESENTATION

Date of hearing: 02 August 2021

Date of Judgment: 22 December 2021

Applicants Counsel: Adv Moloi

Instructed by: LP Molope Attorneys

First Respondent's Counsel: Adv Sikhakhane

Instructed by: The State Attorney

[1] 2011(2) SA 26 ()

[2] See *Mtokonya v Minister of Police* [2017] ZACC 33; 2017 (11) BCLR 1443 (CC); 2018 (5) SA 22 (CC)

[3] *Trinity Asset Management (Pty) Ltd v Grindstone Investment 132 (Pty) Ltd* [2017] ZACC 32; 2017 (12) BCRRR 1562 (CC); 2018 (1) SA 94 (CC) para 36

[4] See *Mtokonya v Minister of Police*, supra para 36.

[5] See *Kruger v National Director of Public Prosecutions* [2019] ZACC 13; 2019 (6) BCLR 703 (CC) para 19.

[6] (CCT 52/15) [2016] ZACC 13; 2016 (6) BCLQR 709 (CC); 2016 (4) SA 121 (CC);

[7] (CCT/29/15) [2016] ZACC 10; 2016 (5) BCLR 656 (CC); 2016 (4) SA 414 (CC)

[8]

[1978] 2 All SA; 1978(1) SA821 (A): *Drennan Maud and Partners v Town Board of the Township of Pennington* [1998] 2 All SA 132 (SCA)

[9]

[2021] ZAGPPHC 402 at para 17 (Unreported)

[10] See Minister of Agriculture and Land Affairs v CJRabice (Pty) Ltd

[2010] ZASCA 27, 2010 (4) SA 109 (SCA); [2010] 3 All SA 537 (SCA) para 11, and Minister of Safety and Security v De Witt [2008] ZASCA 103; 2009 (1) SA 457 (SCA) para 13.

[11] See Madinda v Minister of Safety and Security [2008] ZASCA 34; 2008

(4) SA 312 (SCA); [2008] 3 All SA 43 (SCA) para 8.

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/ZAGPJHC/2021/878.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/mthembu-v-minister-unknown-topic-agpjhc-2021>

Prepared on 30 October 2026 · Esheria