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| URL | <https://lawlibrary.org.za/za/judgment/special-tribunal-south-africa/2022/33> |
| Citations | (MP 3 of 2021) [2022] ZAST 33 |
| Date of judgment | 15 June 2022 |
| Keyword(s):[[1]](#footnote-0) | Application for postponement of trial, reasons for postponement, prejudice, balance of convenience |
| Case type[[2]](#footnote-1) | Application |
| Result | Granted with costs reserved |
| Flynote[[3]](#footnote-2) | **Court procedure** – application for a postponement of trial – reasons for postponement and consideration of prejudice |
| Legislation and International Instruments[[4]](#footnote-3) | N/a |
| Cases cited as authority[[5]](#footnote-4) | * *State Information Technology Agency SOC Ltd v Gijima Holdings (Pty) Ltd* 2018 (2) SA 23 (CC) * *Department of Transport and Others v Tasima (Pty) Ltd* 2017 (2) SA 622 (CC) (2017 (1) BCLR 1; [2016] ZACC 39) |
| Facts[[6]](#footnote-5) | The applicant sought a postponement of a trial relating to the review of a contract awarded to the respondent for the supply of personal protective equipment. The applicant submitted that a postponement was necessary in order to secure necessary witness statements and the attendance of witnesses at trial. The respondent opposed the application and submitted that the applicant had not met all the requirements for a postponement, and also contended that it would be prejudiced by a postponement order.  The applicant had failed to file its witness statements within the time period prescribed by the Tribunal’s directive and did not provide the tribunal with a full explanation for this delay. The respondent, in turn, had failed to bring an application to compel the applicant to file its witness statements when the applicant had failed to do so. |
| Summary[[7]](#footnote-6) | The tribunal considered whether the applicant had met all the requirements for a postponement and whether the applicant was able to show that its application was *bona fide*. The tribunal also considered whether either party would suffer prejudice if an order for postponement was granted. |
| Decision/ Judgment[[8]](#footnote-7) | The tribunal granted the application for postponement of trial, and the issue of costs was reserved for determination at the trial. |
| Basis of the decision[[9]](#footnote-8) | Although the tribunal found that the applicant had failed to provide a full explanation for not filing its witness statements timeously, its application for postponement was found to be *bona fide* because the applicant had displayed an undisputed intention to proceed with the action throughout the proceedings. However, the tribunal found that the respondent had been complacent when it failed to compel the applicant to file its witness statements timeously, and therefore the prejudice that the respondent complained of could not be sustained. |
| Reported by  Date | African Legal Information Institute ([AfricanLII](https://africanlii.org/))  15 June 2022 |
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