

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

Westrand Consulting (Pty) Ltd v Mantsopa Local Municipality (4728/2022) [2023] ZAFSHC 398 (19 October 2023) [2023] ZAFSHC 398

COURT

Free State High Court, Bloemfontein

BEFORE

P R Cronjé

CASE / FILE NUMBER

4728/2022

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

Source record

IN

THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA

FREE

STATE DIVISION, BLOEMFONTEIN

Case

no: 4728/2022

Reportable: YES/NO

Of

Interest to other Judges: YES/NO

Circulate

to Magistrates: YES/NO

In

the matter between:

WESTRAND
CONSULTING (PTY) LTD
Plaintiff
and
MANTSOPA
LOCAL MUNICIPALITY
Defendant

CORAM:

P R CRONJÉ, AJ
HEARD

ON:

28 JULY 2023
DELIVERED
ON: 19 OCTOBER 2023

JUDGMENT

BY: P R CRONJÉ, AJ

- [1] The Excipient excepts against the particulars of claim of the Plaintiff in respect of the averment that it duly completed the tender and procurement process after it was appointed by the Excipient but that no Service Level Agreement (SLA) was appended. The Plaintiff attached a copy of the appointment letter to the particulars of claim but not the SLA.
- [2] The Excipient also complains that the particulars of claim does not contain any allegations regarding what the contract price/value would be for rendering of the professional services or whether the services would be rendered at a base-rate and if so, what the base-rate would be.
- [3] On 5 April 2023, the Plaintiff filed a notice of intention to amend, which was received by the Excipient's attorneys on 5 April
2023. Therein the appointment letter, Plaintiff's acceptance of the appointment and the written and signed SLA was incorporated and, on its version, appended. To address the second complaint, the Plaintiff referred to Clauses 2, 5 and 6 of the SLA and addressed the remaining complaints.
- [4] The Plaintiff gave notice of a second intention to amend.
- [5] In the Excipient's Supplementary Heads of Argument it is stated that the Plaintiff purported to effect the amendment by delivering their amended pages of its particulars of claim on 24 April 2023. The Plaintiff however did not file the first SLA. The complaint was therefore not addressed.
- [6] Mr Roux for the Plaintiff states that the cause of complaint has been removed and the amendments properly effected. According to him, the amended particulars of claim contained the SLA.
- [7] From the submissions made before me by Mr Snellenburg SC and Mr Roux, I gathered that there appears to be an administrative oversight that occurred in respect of the Plaintiff's attachment of the SLA and Mr Roux submitted that the Plaintiff do not wish to impugn any oversight to any of the attorneys.
- [8] From what was submitted by both parties, it appears to me that the grounds for exception was properly addressed, albeit been complicated by the administrative oversight, and that it would be fair to both parties that each pay their own costs.
- [9] I therefore make the following order:

9.1 The Exception is dismissed.

9.2 Each party to pay its own costs.

P R CRONJÉ, AJ

For the Excipient/Defendant: Adv N Snellenburg SC Mohobo Attorneys Inc. Bloemfontein For the Plaintiff: Adv LA Roux MM Kruger 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/ZAFSHC/2023/398.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/westrand-consulting-pty-ltd-v-mantsopa-unknown-topic-afshc-2023>

Prepared on 9 October 2026 · Esheria