

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

Williams v CCMA and Others (C 267/2024) [2025] ZALCCT 17 (7 March 2025)

[2025] ZALCCT 17**COURT**

Labour Court Cape Town

BEFORE

B Whitcher

CASE / FILE NUMBER

C 267/2024

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

Source record**IN THE LABOUR COURT OF****SOUTH AFRICA****(HELD IN CAPE TOWN)****Case No: C 267/2024****Not Reportable****In**

the matter between:

DOMINIC
IVOR WILLIAMS
Applicant
and
CCMA
First Respondent
COMMISSIONER
S CHRISTIANSEN
Second Respondent
ACEPAK
AUTOMATION (PTY) LTD
Third
Respondent

Heard:

4 March 2025
Judgment
delivered: 7 March 2025

JUDGMENT

WHITCHER J

- [1] The applicant wishes to review the commissioner's ruling[1] which dismissed his application for condonation for the late referral of his dispute to the CCMA.
- [2] When considering applications for condonation, commissioners enjoy a wide discretion. Accordingly, a reviewing court should be cautious when interfering with such rulings. The test for a review is whether it can be said that the discretion was not exercised judicially: it was exercised 'capriciously, or upon a wrong principle, or in a biased manner, or for insubstantial reasons with no regard to the principles applicable to condonation applications.
- [3] In this case, it is evident from the award that the commissioner was alive to the correct enquiry in condonation applications. The commissioner correctly summarised the factors for consideration as set out by the Constitutional Court in *Grootboom v NPA* and another[2] and considered each factor with reference to the evidentiary material and submissions that was before him, namely the applicant's condonation application and the opposing affidavit.
- [4] In this regard, the commissioner found that the degree of lateness was considerable. No fault can be found with this finding. 173 days out of time is objectively excessive given the 30-day statutory time-period and that the LRA is designed to afford both parties a right to expeditious resolution of labour disputes.
- [5] The commissioner also found wanting the applicant's explanation for the delay. On the evidence before the commissioner, it cannot be said that this finding is one to which no reasonable commissioner could come. On the evidence, the applicant had been aware of the existence of the CCMA, he had sought legal advice in September 2023 which was still within the 30-day period and his averments regarding his attorneys and his claim that he was bedridden from December and thereafter required rehabilitation are significant by their lack of relevant information and evidence.
- [6] In any event, the most formidable obstacle for the applicant was his prospects of success. Here too, it cannot be said that the finding of the commissioner is one to which no reasonable commissioner could on the evidence before him. The documentary and other evidence furnished by the company in its opposing affidavit substantiated outright their claim that the applicant was employed as an independent contractor, and the 'factors' relied upon by the applicant in his claim that he was an employee were all reasonably explained away by the company.

[7] Ultimately, it cannot be said the commissioner did not exercise his discretion judicially on a consideration of all relevant factors. There was no justifiable reason to require the company to put itself through a time- consuming arbitration process in circumstances where the applicant's application disclosed no prospects of success in the main hearing.

[8] In the premises, I make the following order:

The application to set aside the condonation ruling issued by the commissioner on 20 May 2024 under case number WECT 5240-24 is dismissed.

B Whitcher

Judge of the Labour Court of South Africa

APPEARANCES:

For the Applicant: The Applicant

For the Third Respondent: No appearance

[1] Dated 20 May 2024: Case Number WECT 5240-24.

[2]

(2014) 35 ILJ 121 (CC).

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/ZALCCT/2025/17.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/williams-v-ccma-and-others-unknown-topic-alcct-2025>

Prepared on 10 October 2026 · Esheria