DERASSING-197071-2500 12.74" In the Supreme Court of South Africa In die Hooggeregshof van Suid-Afrika (In the Supreme Court of South Africa In the Supreme Court of South Africa In die Hooggoregshof van Suid-Afrika (· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·).)~			11_	• ~
In die Hooggeregshof van Suid-Afrika	In die Hooggeregshof van Suid-Afrika	G.PS.59968-1970-71-2 500	Ŧ			J 219	2
ATTERNATION Provincial Division) Provincial Ardeling) Appeal in Civil Case Appellant Sivele Saak ITTED TAKE ITTED (ITY) IT Appellant, Versus B. L. HILLS & TUC CALLES Respondent Appellant's Attorney togendorf, Ventor Bispondent's Attorney rickureur vir Appellant, H R Soch 72 Met Society vir Respondent I Statement Appellant's Advocate Of Respondent's Attorney rickureur vir Appellant, H R Soch 72 Met Society vir Respondent I B rocurster Appellant's Advocate Of Statement of Statement of Statement Appellant of Statement of Statement of Statement of B rocurster II IS Statement of Sta	Appeal in Civil Case Appeal in Siviele Saak DITEST ATAT ITES (ITY) IT. Appellant, versus B HILLS & TSC OTHERS Respondent Appellant's Attorney in Secondent's Attorney Producer wir Appelland, IS-LINES & TSC OTHERS Respondent Appellant's Attorney in Secondent's Attorney Producer wir Appelland, IS-LINES STATES Respondent Appellant's Attorney in Secondent's Attorney Producer wir Appelland, IS-LINES STATES Secondent Statement Appellant's Attorney in Secondent's Attorney Producer wir Appelland, IS-LINES STATES Secondent's Attorney In the Sech in Second Statement's Attorney Ison Born Hotors Standardivekaat vir Respondent Statement's Attorney Ison Born Hotors Standardivekaat vir Respondent Statement's Attorney Ison Born Hotors Standardivekaat vir Respondent Statement's Attorney ISON Hotors Standardivekaat vir Respondent Statement's Attorney Ison Born Hotors Standardivekaat vir Respondent Statement's Attorney ISON Hotors Standardivekaat vir Respondent Statement's Attorney ISON Hotors Standard, Constand Statement's Attorney ISON Hotors Statement's Constand Milis taxd-Rosterekenings genaseer Bills taxd-Rosterekenings genaseer P.I.C Bills taxd-Rosterekenings genaseer P.I.C						
Appeal in Civil Case Appèl in Siviele Saak UTPED MART ITRO (LTX) LT. Appellant, versus B. MILLS & TAC OTHERS Respondent Appellant's Attorney Respondent's Attorney Produced wir Appelland, Venter & Respondent's Attorney Sections for hearing on Sections for hearing on Data State of the Section of the Section of the Section Appellant's Attorney Respondent's Attorney Produced wir Appelland, Venter & Respondent's Attorney The Section of the Se	Appeal in Civil Case Appeal in Siviele Saak TITED MAIL ITRI (ITV) IT Appellant, versus B. L. HILLS & TWO OT	In die Hoogge	eregshof va	n Suid-Afr	rika		
Appèl in Siviele Saak DITED ITANT ITRE (ITY) IT. Appellant, versus B. L. HILLS & TOC OTHERS Respondent Appellant's Attorney Tochardon's Attorney Tocharden vir Appelland, S. I. Misco Provident vir Respondent Internet in Birge uncless Appellant's Attorney Tochardon's Advocate of address in a frame Appellant's Attorney Tochardon's Advocate of address in a frame Appellant's Advocate of Respondent's Attorney The Soft of Respondent's Attorney Tocharden vir Appelland, S. I. Misco Provide and vir Respondent I Birge uncless Set down for hearing on Dr die rol geplaas vir verhoor op To Set Tom Holem of Jonno Am, Cone bett J. J. A. Geodgest et Katz A. J.J. A (D.O.I.D.) G. 4 n Com II. ISC Rom 2. I.S. Pin Me Cant photometer for Condonation Multh costs the Batter Ko Multh Costs the	Appèl in Siviele Saak ITTPO TANT ITRE (ITY) IT. Appellant, versus B. L. HILLS & TAC CTILIES Respondent Appellant's Attorney Too bear of Respondent's Attorney Produceur vir Appelland, F. L. Misco 2008 Andrew Stranger Appellant's Advocate Vir Respondent Stationey H R Sich 72 Stranger Stationey Concerned and and the France H R Sich 72 Stranger Stationey Stationer Stati	(AFIEL					
Appèl in Siviele Saak DITED ITANT ITRE (ITY) IT. Appellant, versus B. L. HILLS & TOC OTHERS Respondent Appellant's Attorney Tochardon's Attorney Tocharden vir Appelland, S. I. Misco Provident vir Respondent Internet in Birge uncless Appellant's Attorney Tochardon's Advocate of address in a frame Appellant's Attorney Tochardon's Advocate of address in a frame Appellant's Advocate of Respondent's Attorney The Soft of Respondent's Attorney Tocharden vir Appelland, S. I. Misco Provide and vir Respondent I Birge uncless Set down for hearing on Dr die rol geplaas vir verhoor op To Set Tom Holem of Jonno Am, Cone bett J. J. A. Geodgest et Katz A. J.J. A (D.O.I.D.) G. 4 n Com II. ISC Rom 2. I.S. Pin Me Cant photometer for Condonation Multh costs the Batter Ko Multh Costs the	Appèl in Siviele Saak ITTPO TANT ITRE (ITY) IT. Appellant, versus B. L. HILLS & TAC CTILIES Respondent Appellant's Attorney Too bear of Respondent's Attorney Produceur vir Appelland, F. L. Misco 2008 Andrew Stranger Appellant's Advocate Vir Respondent Stationey H R Sich 72 Stranger Stationey Concerned and and the France H R Sich 72 Stranger Stationey Stationer Stati		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
Appèl in Siviele Saak DITED ITANT ITRE (ITY) IT. Appellant, versus B. L. HILLS & TOC OTHERS Respondent Appellant's Attorney Tochardon's Attorney Tocharden vir Appelland, S. I. Misco Provident vir Respondent Internet in Birge uncless Appellant's Attorney Tochardon's Advocate of address in a frame Appellant's Attorney Tochardon's Advocate of address in a frame Appellant's Advocate of Respondent's Attorney The Soft of Respondent's Attorney Tocharden vir Appelland, S. I. Misco Provide and vir Respondent I Birge uncless Set down for hearing on Dr die rol geplaas vir verhoor op To Set Tom Holem of Jonno Am, Cone bett J. J. A. Geodgest et Katz A. J.J. A (D.O.I.D.) G. 4 n Com II. ISC Rom 2. I.S. Pin Me Cant photometer for Condonation Multh costs the Batter Ko Multh Costs the	Appèl in Siviele Saak ITTPO TANT ITRE (ITY) IT. Appellant, versus B. L. HILLS & TAC CTILIES Respondent Appellant's Attorney Too bear of Respondent's Attorney Produceur vir Appelland, F. L. Misco 2008 Andrew Stranger Appellant's Advocate Vir Respondent Stationey H R Sich 72 Stranger Stationey Concerned and and the France H R Sich 72 Stranger Stationey Stationer Stati	A					
TIPED TAKE ITRE (ITY) IT. Appellant, versus B. L. HILLS & TJC OTTIRES Respondent Appellant's Attorney to sendorf, Ventor & Respondent's Attorney Prokureur vir Appelland, IE I. Misao starkhdvokaat vir Respondent III Produce in a Francisco Advokaat vir Appelland, IE I. Misao starkhdvokaat vir Respondent J B roduce in a Francisco Advokaat vir Appelland, IE I. Misao starkhdvokaat vir Respondent J B roduce in a Francisco Advokaat vir Appelland, IE I. Misao starkhdvokaat vir Respondent J B roduce in a Francisco Advokaat vir Appelland, IE I. Misao starkhdvokaat vir Respondent J B roduce in a Francisco Set down for hearing on Dr die rol geplaas vir verhoor op I I. D Schruss Take (D. 3. I. J. Year Sum Jaco, Conclust, J. J. A. Geologist et Kata A. J.J. A. (D. 3. I. J. Year Sum Jaco, Conclust, J. J. A. (D. 3. I. J. Year Sum Jaco, Conclust, J. J. A. Me Caust provide The Sum Jacob Strandow Mich costs the latter for Michaele Me Astornation for Michaele Me Astornation for Millis taxed Kosterekenings getakseer P.7. Bills taxed Kosterekenings getakseer Datum Bedrag Baraal at and initials	HIPED TAKE ITRS (1TY) LT Appellant, versus B. L. MILLS & TJC CTLES Respondent Appellant's Attorney Respondent's Attorney rokureur vir Appelland, H. R. Sch resin Respondent's Attorney topellant's Advocate H. R. Sch resin Respondent's Attorney topelland V. I. Macon content Respondent's Advocate address vir verhoor op J. D. Sch resin Respondent's Attorney To Set down for hearing on Dp die rol geplaas vir verhoor op I. Sonson Holemes France Samoeten Contested vir J. A. Geodesist et Katze A. S.T. A. (D. 3. I. J. G. 4 A Perm II. B. O. Samo II. I.S. Perm II. B. O. Samo II. I.S. Perm II. B. O. Samo M. C. & M Me Caunt persons the Pattor To Multh costs the latter To Multh Costs the Patant Person Multh Costs the latter To Multh Costs the latter To Multh Costs the latter To Multh Costs the Patant Person Multh Costs the latter To Multh Costs the Patant Person Multh Costs the Patant To Multh Costs the Parson Multh Costs The Parson		_			,	
Versus B. L. HILLS & TIC CTLERS Respondent Appellant's Attorney 10.6 endorf, Yentar & Respondent's Attorney Prokureur vir Appelland II. Sch 12 in Respondent's Advocate B. I. Maan Sch 12 in Respondent's Advocate Appellant's Advocate II. Sch 12 in Respondent's Advocate B. I. Maan Sch 12 in Respondent II. In the second sch 12 i	Persus B. L. MILLS & TJC OTTURS Respondent Appellant's Attorney to Seridor ?, Venter & Respondent's Attorney prokureur vir Appelland, D.S. L. Misco rock Respondent's Advocate of Browney for Respondent I Browney for the formation to the persus of the series of the				_		
B. L. HILLS & THE OTHERS Respondent Appellant's Attorney Hospendorf, Venter & Respondent's Attorney prockureur vir Appelland VI. Interson Respondent's Advocate & Brander to a Friend Appelland S. Advocate H. Sch respondent's Advocate & Brander to a Friend Appelland VI. Interson Contraction of Brandent of Brander to a Friend Set down for hearing on Dr die rol geplaas vir verhoor op I To I a Sch respondent of Advocate & Drawella. Set down for hearing on Dr die rol geplaas vir verhoor op I to I a Sch respondent of Advocate & J. D. Sch us we Asson Rom Holmon Stramoson, Conclust J. J. A. Gendgent & Katzi A. J.J. A. (D. 3. I. D.) G. H. A Sum II. D. O Sum I II. IS From I2. 1955 pm 2. IS Pm 3. Respondent for Machine for Concluster for Multh costs the latter for Multh costs the Parad	B. L. HILLS & TIC CTILTS Respondent Appellant's Attorney to sendorf, Venter & Respondent's Attorney Prokureur vir Appelland V. I. Misco 2005 Midvokaat vir Respondent I B 10 Used - 5, idvokaat vir Appelland V. I. Misco 2005 Midvokaat vir Respondent I B 10 Used - 5, idvokaat vir Appelland V. I. Misco 2005 Midvokaat vir Respondent I B 10 Used - 5, idvokaat vir Appelland V. I. Misco 2005 Midvokaat vir Respondent I B 10 Used - 5, idvokaat vir Appelland V. I. Misco 2005 Midvokaat vir Respondent I B 10 Used - 5, idvokaat vir Appelland V. I. Misco 2005 Midvokaat vir Respondent I B 10 Used - 5, iset down for hearing on p die rol geplaas vir verhoor op I I I I S Torn 240, Conclust I I. A. (D.3.I.D.) G. 4 A Curr II. B 0 Carrier II I I S Torn II. B 0 Carrier II I I S Torn II. B 0 Carrier II I I S Torn II. B 0 Carrier Me Caust performent the Misco Midvokaat Vir Respondent I Me Caust performent the Misco II. Muith costs the latter to Muith costs the latter to Muith costs the latter to Muith Costs The Paraaf Bills taxed - Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.0 Bills taxed - Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.0 Bills taxed - Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.0	Cot IIII	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	(1°TY) L	<u>م در 17</u>	Appellant,	
Appellant's Attorney to send or f. Venter A Respondent's Attorney rokureur vir Appellant H R Sch 192 in Respondent's Attorney H R Sch 192 in Respondent's Advocate Order in a - Known divokaat vir Appelland, E. I. Miscor rachadvokaat vir Respondent I B rockuster ist down for hearing on D die rol geplaas vir verhoor op I a Son 2. M Holman Jram DAM, Carlby, tt J J. A. Godgent & Kalge A. JJ. A (D.O.I.D.) G. 4. A Sum II. B O sam II. IS From I2. 4. 4 pm 2. 1. 1. 1. 1. pm C. la. 11 Me Cant performent the Matter to Multh costs the latter to Multh costs the latter to Multh costs the Ratter for Multh Costs for Respondents' Costs Multh Costs for Respondents' Costs Bills taxed Respondents' Costs Bills taxed Respondents' Costs Bills taxed Respondents' Costs for Respondents' Costs Bills taxed Respondents' Costs for Respondents' Costs Bills taxed Respondents' Costs for Respondents' Costs Bills taxed Respondent	Appellant's Attorney to ser do rf. Ver tor Perspondent's Attorney rokureur vir Appellant. HR Sch re respondent's Advocate and ber i the From the the Sch re respondent's Advocate and ber i the From the Sch respondent's Advocate and the From the Sch respondent. The down for hearing on John Sch down and vir Respondent. J. D. Sch respondent police rol geplaas vir verhoor op John Sch down and vir Respondent. J. D. Sch respondent Set down for hearing on John Sch down and vir Respondent. J. D. Sch respondent Set down for hearing on John Sch down and vir Respondent. J. D. Sch respondent Set down for hearing on John Sch down and vir Respondent. Set down for hearing on John Sch down and the Sch respondent of the set of geplaas vir verhoor op John Sch as the Sch respondent of the Sch	B. L. H		0401.2 RS		Passondant	
S. D. Schule at De die rol geplaas vir verhoor op I - A So vom Holmes Jamoson, Conclust, J.J.A. Gestguit et Katze A. J.H. (D.C.I.D.) G. 4 N Com 11. 15 Pm 12. 4 N Pm 2. 1.5 Pm 3. Rea pm C. R. 11 Me Caut profises the M application for. Condensation With costs the latter to Method costs the latter to Mills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7. Bills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.	J. D. Schner of J. D. Schner of J. D. Schner of the optical of the former of the star of t	an air na 1999 an 1999 an 1999 an 1997 an 1997 An 1997 an 1997	in son a saidh a saidhead a agus bhlionna a a a saidh ann an a' bha a nanada a dao			-	
iet down for hearing on Dp die rol geplaas vir verhoor op I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	J. D. Schner op J. J. J	Prokureur vir Appellant	Prokur	eur vir Respo	ndent	The from	 l
S. D. Schule at Some of the period of the some of the	J. D. Schner of J. D. Schner of J. D. Schner of the of geplaas vir verboor op J. T. T. A. J. J. J. J. A. J.	Appellant's Advocate Idvokaat vir Appelland É. I. NIcc	Respondent	ident's Advoca at vir Respond	te o J.B.	rouch	5
in som Holmes Jampan, Conclutt J.J.A. Galgest et Katze A.J.J.A. (D.O.I.D.) G.H.N Sum II. DO CAMP II. 15 From I2. 445 pm 2 1.5 pm 3 Rece pm C. R. 11 The Caust performent the Market of the Market of the Market of the States of the Market of the Marke	in rom Holmes Jermoun, Conclutt J.J.A. Geologist et Katze A.J.A. (D.O.I.D.) G. 4 N rom II. DO SAMM II. IN ROM II. DO SAMM C. R. II The Court performent of M Application for, Condonation With costs the latter to Mills taxed Kosterkenings getakseer P.T.C Bills taxed Kosterkenings getakseer P.T.C Bills taxed Kosterkenings getakseer P.T.C	Set down for hearing on			J.D	1 Schret a	sc r
(D.O.I.D.) G. 4 N mm II. D.O. S.M. (D.O.I.D.) G. 4 N mm II. D.O. S.M. 11. IN From I2. 4 N pm 2. 1. pm I2. 4 N pm 2. 1. pm I2. 4 N pm C. R. 11 The Caut performent the M application for. Condonation with costs the latter to Mills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7. Bills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.	(D.O.I.D.) G. 4 A SUM (I). DO SAMT (D.O.I.D.) G. 4 A SUM (I). DO SAMT 11 15 Pm (I). DO SAMT 12 .4 - pm (I). DO SAMT 2 15 pm (I). DO SAMT 2 .4 - pm (I). DO SAMT 2 .4 - pm (I). DO SAMT 2 .4 - pm (I). DO SAMT 3 .4 - pm (I). DO SAMT 2 .4 - pm (I). DO SAMT 3 .4 - p	p are rot geptaus vir vernoor op		- 1. 161999 - 11.12 ay 1912 and 1919		#1144111177499 + +++19689 + 7 + 4 ++4 + 4 + 4 + 4 + 4 + 4	
(D.O.I.D.) G. 4 N mm II. D.O. S.M. (D.O.I.D.) G. 4 N mm II. D.O. S.M. 11. IN From I2. 4 N pm 2. 1. pm I2. 4 N pm 2. 1. pm I2. 4 N pm C. R. 11 The Caut performent the M application for. Condonation with costs the latter to Mills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7. Bills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.	(D.O.I.D.) G. 4 A SUM (I). DO SAMT (D.O.I.D.) G. 4 A SUM (I). DO SAMT 11 15 Pm (I). DO SAMT 12 .4 - pm (I). DO SAMT 2 15 pm (I). DO SAMT 2 .4 - pm (I). DO SAMT 2 .4 - pm (I). DO SAMT 2 .4 - pm (I). DO SAMT 3 .4 - pm (I). DO SAMT 2 .4 - pm (I). DO SAMT 3 .4 - p	·		C b		· /A -	
(D.C.I.D.) G. H. N Com II. B C Sur 7 11. 15 Pm 12. 45 pm 2. 15 pm 3. Re & pm C. & . 11 Me Cant performent the A application for. Condonation With costs the latter to Mills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7. Bills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.	(D.O.I.D.) G. H. A Sum II. DO GAMAT 11. IN Sum I2, 44 - pm 2. IN pm 3. Go CA pm C. A. JI The Caut professor the M application for. Condomation With costs the latter to Mills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.C Bills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.C	• •		-			
11. IN Rom 12, 4, J- pm 2 IN pm 3 Rect pm C. R. JI The Court performention application for, condomation with costs the latter to with costs the latter to methode the performants' costs Bills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7. Bills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.	11. 15 from 12, 40 pm 2 15 pm 3 & or pm C. e. 11 The Caunt performent of the A application for. Condonation with costs the latter to with costs the latter to Millis taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.0 Bills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.0 Bills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.0	Jand grade	<u>I navzi</u>	A. 11	A- í	(» + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	
11. 12 Pm 12, 42 pm 2 12 pm 3 Rect pm C. R. JI The Caurt December the A application for, condonation with costs the latter to with costs the latter to methode the respondents' costs P.7. Bills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7. Bills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.	11' INT From 12, 40- pm 2 IN pm 3 rock pm C. R. II The Court performent of the A application for. Condomation with costs the latter to with costs the latter to Mills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.C Bills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.C	(D.O.I.D.) 9.4.1	- mu		1.00	(1.17) - J	
The Caunt performent the My application for, condonation with costs the latter to with costs the latter to michae' the performants' costs include the performants' costs P.7. Bills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.	The Caunt performent the A application for condomation with costs the latter to with costs the latter to include the performants' costs Bills taxed-kosterekenings getakseer P.7.0 Bills taxed-kosterekenings getakseer Date Datum Bedrag Paraaf	11.12	Run -		12, 40	- 12 227	
The Caunt performent the M application for condomation with costs the latter to with costs the latter to Michide the perpendents' costs Bills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7. Bills taxed-Kosterekenings getakseer P.7.	The Caunt performent the Margin of the Count performent of the Amount of the section of the sect	2 15	pm -		3 900	+ jom	
rit issued usbrief uitgereik Date Amount Initials ate and initials	rit issued usbrief uitgereik P7.0 Bills taxed Kosterekenings getakseer Date Amount Initials Bedrag Paraaf		C. E			۰ ۵	
rit issued usbrief uitgereik Date Date Amount Initials ate and initials Paraaf	rit issued usbrief uitgereik Date Amount Initials ate and initials	h,	11	net.	200	the M	
rit issued usbrief uitgereik Date Date Amount Initials ate and initials Paraaf	rit issued usbrief uitgereik Date Amount Initials ate and initials	The l	ant C	Cignetic -	d mai	tion !!	
P.7. Bills taxed_Kosterekenings getakseer Date Datum Bedrag Paraaf	Machael Machael Machael Machael Machael Machael PTC Bills taxed - Kosterekenings getakseer Date Amount Initials Date and initials Datum Bedrag Paraaf	with	costs	the I	atter	to ,	
rit issued usbrief uitgereik Date Date Datum Bedrag Paraaf	rit issued usbrief uitgereik Date Amount Initials ate and initials PT C	Andu	ere the	e rest	onden	to' cool	0
rit issued asbrief uitgereik Datum Bedrag Paraaf	rit issued asbrief uitgereik Datum Date Amount Initials Bedrag Paraaf					P.:	ĩ.C
asbrief uitgereik Paraaf	asbrief uitgereik Datum Bedrag Paraaf	· · · · ·	Date An	·····			
			Datum Be	edrag			
		ate and initials					
	atum en paraaf						
u i i							

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA.

(APPELLATE DIVISION)

In the matter between :

UNITED PLANT HIRE (PTY). LTD. ... Applicant

and

BRIAN HILLS... First RespondentTREVOR RUPERT HOWARD... Second RespondentANTHONY JOHN SWABY... Third Respondent

Coram: HOLMES, JANSEN, CORBETT, JJ.A.,

et GALGUT, KOTZÉ, A.JJ.A.

Heard: 17 November 1975

Delivered: 27 November 1975

JUDGMENT.

HOLMES, J.A., -----

This is an application for condonation, brought under Rule 13 of the Rules of this Court, which reads in

part -

/"The •••

į

. . . .

....

"The Court may, for sufficient cause shown, excuse the parties from compliance with any of the aforegoing rules"

The applicant, a company, was the unsuccessful respondent in an opposed motion in the Durban and Coast Local Division. Judgment was given against it on 6 December 1974. Appeal was noted direct to this Court by consent.

The Rules which have not been complied with are -

Rule 5 (4) (b), which required the present applicant to lodge six copies of the record with the registrar of this Court within three months of the date of the judgment, <u>i.e.</u>, on or before 6 March 1975.

Rule 6 (2), which required the applicant, before lodging the said copies of the record, to "enter into good and sufficient security______ for the respondent's costs of appeal".

2

/The ...

The copies of the record were lodged only on 29 May 1975 - a delay of nearly three months.

As to security, the applicant's Bloemfontein attorneys, on the day after they had lodged/the copies of the record with the registrar of this Court, sought to deposit a cheque for R2500, made out in favour of the registrar, representing the amount of the security fixed by the registrar of the Court a quo. The applicant's attorneys say that the registrar of this Court declined to accept the cheque on the grounds that his office had no banking account, and suggested that the instructing attorney deposit the cheque in his trust account. This the attorney did on 2 June 1975. However, the attorneys for the respondent only came to hear of this early in November, and they requested that the R2500 be transferred to their trust account. This was done on 11 November 1975.

It is well settled that, in considering appli= cations for condonation, the Court has a discretion,

.

3

/to be ...

to be exercised judicially upon a consideration of all of the facts; and that in essence it is a question of fairness to both sides. In this enquiry, relevant considerations may include the degree of non-compliance with the Rules, the explanation therefor, the prospects of success on appeal, the importance of the case, the respondent's interest in the finality of his judgment, the convenience of the Court, and the avoidance of unnecessary delay in the administration of justice. The list is not exhaustive.

These factors are not individually decisive but are interrelated and must be weighed one against the other; thus a slight delay and a good explanation may help to compensate for prospects of success which are not strong. See <u>Liquidators, Myburgh, Krone, and Co</u>. <u>Ltd. v. Standard Bank of S.A. Ltd., and Another, 1924 AD.,</u> 226 ("The merits of the appeal may in some cases be very important" - per Innes C.J. at page 231); <u>Melane v.</u> (4.D) <u>Santam Ins. Co. Ltd</u>., 1962 (4) S.A. 531 at page 532;

/Federated ...

Federated Employers Fire and General Insurance Co. Ltd., and Another v. McKenzie, 1969 (3) S.A. 360 (A.D.); N.O., and <u>Glazer v. Glazer</u>, 1963 (4) S.A. 694 (A.D.) per Steyn C.J. at page 707 E -

レ

"In my view, for the reasons stated above, her prospect of success on the merits, if there is one at all, is so slender that condonation would not be justified."

I proceed to consider the relevant factors. After the appeal had been noted, there were negotiations by correspondence between the attorneys on both sides with a view to fixing the amount of the security to be lodged. The director of the applicant was overseas. Before the figure had been finalised, the time ran out for the lodging of the record. The respondent's attorney thereupon took up the attitude on 11 March 1975 that the appeal must be deemed to have been withdrawn, in terms of Rule 5 (4) <u>bis</u> (b) which reads -

/"If an ...

"If an appellant has failed to lodge the record within the period prescribed and has not within that period applied to the respondent or his attorney for consent to an extension thereof and given notice to the registrar that he has so applied, he shall be deemed to have withdrawn his appeal."

The applicant's attorney asked for the respondents: attorneys consent for an extension of time under Rule 5 (4) (c) which reads -

> "within such further period as may be agreed to in writing by the respondent".

This was refused on the ground that a consent could only be given before the time had elapsed. The amount of security was then fixed at R2500 by the registrar of the Court <u>a quo</u> on 19 March 1975.

/In my ...

In my view the respondents: attorney might well have given the consent sought, seeing that the parties were in the course of negotiating about security when the guillotine fell. Rule 5 (4) (c) and 5 (4) <u>bis</u> (b) must not be read so rigidly as to exclude the restorative balm of consent to an extension in a case such as this one. This Court has already indicated that it is only if such an agreement is not forthcoming that an application to condone need be made; see <u>A.A. Mutual Insurance Association Ltd. v.</u> <u>Van Jaarsveld and Another</u>, 1974 (4) S.A. 729 (A.D.) at page 731 D. Hofmeyr, J.A., went on to say -

> "The plain purpose of the present provision is to avoid the need for such applications and to save the costs of them, and parties should obviously be encouraged to make full use of this useful measure."

Thereafter, however, there was some dilatori=

ZAs to

ness on the part of the applicant and its attorney, to which when I shall now refer.

As to the applicant's dilatoriness, its director was still overseas and it was only towards the end of April that its attorney was belatedly put in funds in the matter of the R2500 required as security for costs. In this the applicant was remiss. Litigation is a serious matter and, once having put a hand to the plough, the applicant should have made arrangements to see the matter through.

And so the application for condonation had to be made; and there has been an exchange of recrimina= tory niceties in the matter of each attorney suggesting an order that the other pay the costs of any such appli= cation <u>de bonis propriis</u>. Was it not Caesar who bdieved in carrying the war into the enemy's camp?

As to the dilatoriness of the applicant's attorney, he candidly accepts responsibility for the delay of three weeks in making the application for con= donation. He says that normally it would not have taken him more than a week to prepare it. However, -

____/due

"due to extreme pressure of work, including the preparation for two Supreme Court Trials and the attendances at Court and the necessity to deal with four urgent applications to the Supreme Court, these papers have not been prepared until now".

The result was that the application for condo= nation was filed and served only on 26 May 1975. As to that, as a matter of humanity one has a measure of sympathy with any overworked practitioner; but as a matter of justice, there is scant reason why this should be allowed prejudicially to set the other side's teeth on edge; see <u>Kgobane and Another v. Minister of Justice and</u> <u>Another</u>, 1969 (3) S.A. 365 (A.D.) at page 369 B.

I turn now to the applicant's failure to "enter into good and sufficient security for the respondents' costs of appeal" in terms of Rule 6 (2) of this Court. An appellant is not required to lodge this security with the registrar of this Court. Its form is left to the

/field

field of negotiation between the attorneys. For example, a bank or building society guarantee might be agreed upon and furnished. In the present case, it was agreed in November 1975 that the applicant's attorney should send a cheque to the respondents attorneys who were to deposit it in trust; and this was done. But it should have been done in May, when the record was required to be lodged. Why the delay? The applicant's attorney says that he did tender a cheque to the registrar of the Court in May and, when it was pointed out that this was inappropriate, he paid it But he did not tell the into his trust account. respondent's attorney about this: it only came to light early in November. Nevertheless it was argued that this unilateral act constituted the entering into of good and sufficient security. I have no doubt but that it did not. The integrity of the attorney is not questioned for a moment; but with what assurance can a respondent embark on the costly business of re=

/sisting ...

sisting an appeal, when he has no knowledge whether the appellant has entered into security for the costs? In my view the applicant breached Rule (2) by several months.

And so to the prospects of success on the merits of the appeal, for these, if strong, could carry the day despite an inauspicious dilatoriness and explanation. In this regard I must refer to the factual background.

In the Durban and Coast Local Division the applicant had sued the three respondents, who were then practising in partnership as accountants, for sub= stantial damages alleged to have been caused by their professional negligence. The upshot of the case that was.on 22 October 1973 the trial Judge, Shearer, J., granted absolution, with costs on the attorney and client scale.

In due course the resultant bills of costs was presented to the Taxing Master of the Durban and Coast Local Division. The attorney for the present

1 - --

applicant, however, made representations to the Taxing - Master against the taxation of the bill (not, be it noted, for the disallowance of any or all of the many items therein). The applicant's attorney relied upon the facts that in the relevant litigation the present respondents had at all material times been covered by an Accountants' Indemnity Policy, which had been issued to them by the Commercial Union Assurance Company of South Africa; and that the insurance com= pany, as it was entitled to do, took over and conducted the defence in the name of the insured. Accordingly, so it was urged upon the Taxing Master by the applicant's attorney, the costs reflected in the bills were not incurred by the present respondents but by the insurance company; and the present applicant was therefor not That was the basic point. liable to pay such costs. There were also ancillary points, arising from the fact that the company instructed its Johannes= burg attorneys as well as a firm in Durban. It was

12

/contended

contended that both firms acted only for the insurance company or at any rate that there was a limited attorney and client relationship with the respondents; alternatively, that the Johannesburg firm was not the attorney of record and was not included in the power of attorney and was not necessarily engaged in the perfor= mance of any services connected with the defence of the action: hence its bill of costs could not be taxed under Rule 70 (3).

Faced with these contentions, the harassed Taxing Master refused to tax the bills, holding that the issue was a matter for the court to decide.

So the present respondents applied to the Durban and Coast Local Division for a mandamus ordering the Taxing Master to tax the bills. The present applicant was cited. Howard, J., granted the order. It is against that order that the present applicant seeks to appeal, via this application for condonation for noncompliance with the Rules. In my view the application

الا المحمد المربية

13

---- /for a

for a mandamus had to succeed. Shearer, J., had granted absolution with costs (on the attorney and client scale) in the litigation between the very Standing that order, when the bills of parties. costs were submitted to the Taxing Master, it was his plain duty to tax them, even if, in the exercise of . his discretion, he were to tax off many an item. However, Howard, J., in a helpful judgment (since the Taxing Master would welcome the guidance provided) decided the matter by rejecting the contentions which the attorney for the present applicant had advanced, as aforementioned. I therefore set out the relevant The insurance company provisions in the Indemnity. agreed (subject inter alia to the conditions) to indem= nify the insured -

(a) against loss arising from any claim
in respect of breach of professional
duty as chartered accountants in
public practice, by reason of any
neglect, omission or error;

14

·/(b) .

 (b) against all costs charges and expenses incurred with the written consent of the company in relation to the matters aforesaid.

It is clear that, in any litigation to enforce any claim referred to, the insured would be the defen= dants. And the policy indemnifies them against any judgment and costs. Then there is a condition (numbered No. 2) as follows -

> "The insured shall not admit liability for nor settle any claim nor incur any costs or expenses in connection therewith without the written consent of the Company who shall be entitled to take over and conduct in the name of the Insured the defence or settlement of any claim." (My italics).

In my view words which I have italicised have the effect of giving the company a power of attorney to conduct the defence. The insured remain

/the

the defendants. The company conducts the litigation in their name. The company does not become the defendant. When Shearer, J., granted costs (on the attorney and client scale) he granted them to the defendants, i.e., the present respondents. He did not grant them in favour of the insurance company, and the latter cannot present any bill for taxation in its Furthermore, the fact that the defendants (the name. present respondents) were indemnified by insurance as to costs, is irrelevant as between plaintiff and defen= dants. The fact that the defendants were indemnified in regard to costs does not mean that the defendants cannot claim them from the plaintiff who was ordered to pay them. The basis of the contention on behalf of the plaintiff (the applicant for condonation) before the Taxing Master and in the Court a quo is therefore unsound.

It is not necessary in this application for condonation to discuss the judgment of Howard, J., in detail. We are not hearing an appeal against it.

المراز ويستركم

What I have said above was the basis of it. That (coupled with what I said earlier about the inevitable success of the application for a <u>mandamus</u>) indicates that the applicant's prospects of success are minimal. Bearing in mind the element of dilatoriness discussed earlier, the result is that condonation cannot be granted.

As to the ancillary points raised, (<u>supra</u>), these are referred to in the judgment of Howard, J. The learned Judge was careful, however, not to curtail the discretion of the Taxing Master. The relevant part of the order was as follows -

> "(a) The first respondent, (<u>i.e.</u>, the Taxing Master) is directed to tax on the attorney and client scale the bills of costs (copies of which are annexures ^AD^A, and ^GE^A to the affidavit of the first applicant) and, subject to the due exercise of any function or dis= cretion conferred upon him in terms of Rule 70, to allow the costs reflected in the said bills on the said scale."

> > /In the ...

In the result, the application for condonation cannot be granted, and is refused with costs. As to the latter, each side was represented in this Court by two counsel, the merits of the appeal being regarded as important, novel, and of much interest to the legal profession as well as to the insurance field. We consider that the costs of two counsel should be allowed. In addition, as the merits of the appeal were canvassed by consent because of their bearing on the prayer for condonation, the respondents should have their costs in relation to the appeal; see Federated Employers Fire and General Insurance Co. Ltd., and Another v. McKenzie; 1969 (3) S.A. 360 (A.D.) at page 364 D.

بالتراج المتحالية فيتشف سيوا

/To sum ...

To sum up -

The application for condonation is refused with costs, the latter to include the respondents' costs in relation to the appeal. Costs occasioned by the employment of two counsel are sanctioned throughout.

Holmes G.N. HOLMES.

JUDGE OF APPEAL.

JANSEN, J.A.) CORBETT, J.A.) GALGUT, A.J.A.) KOTZÉ, A.J.A.)