

VACANCY: JUDGE OF THE LABOUR APPEAL COURT

Candidate: Judge Christina Prinsloo

1. The candidate's tertiary qualifications, professional admissions, honours, and permanent judicial appointments
--

1.1. The candidate holds the following tertiary qualifications:

- BLC, University of Pretoria (1993);
- LLB, University of Pretoria (1995);
- LLM (Labour Law), University of Pretoria (2005).

1.2. The candidate holds the following professional admissions and honours:

- admitted as an advocate in 2005.

1.3. The candidate was permanently appointed to the following judicial roles:

- Judge of the Labour Court on 1 January 2016.

2. The candidate's integrity and ethics
--

2.1. No circumstances are known to the reviewers that would suggest that the candidate is not a person of integrity with a reputation for ethical behaviour or is not a fit and proper person for appointment.

3. The racial and gender composition of the bench
--

3.1. As far as could be ascertained, there are currently 4 permanent judges of the Labour Appeal Court:

- 1 black woman (1 African)
- 1 black man (1 African)
- 1 white woman
- 1 white man

3.2. According to the questionnaire, the candidate is a white woman.

4. The maximum period the candidate could serve if appointed

- 4.1. At the time of the interviews, the candidate will be approximately 54 years and 3 months old and will have completed a period of approximately 10 years and 9 months of service as a judge. If appointed, the candidate would be eligible to serve as Judge of the Labour Appeal Court for a period of up to 15 years and 8 months.

5. The candidate's personal commitment to the values of the Constitution

- 5.1. While the candidate's judgments display a deep understanding of constitutional principles in so far as they relate to labour law jurisprudence, often examining the context and history of labour dispute resolution in South Africa (particularly the negotiation process that led to the drafting of the Labour Relations Act 66 of 1995 ("LRA")), there is little in her application that demonstrates a personal commitment to the values of the Constitution outside of any judicial or quasi-judicial role.
- 5.2. Judgments reviewed in which the candidate's commitment to the values of the Constitution is particularly clear include the following:
- *Naidoo and Others v Parliament of the Republic of South Africa* (2019) 40 ILJ 864 (LC);
 - *Association of Mineworkers and Construction Union (AMCU) and Others v Bafokeng Rasimone Management Services (Pty) Ltd and Others* (2017) 38 ILJ 931 (LC);
 - *National Union of Metal Workers of South Africa obo Members v SAA Technical (Pty) Ltd* (2023) 44 ILJ 2000 (LC); and
 - *Anglo Gold Ashanti Ltd t/a Anglo Gold Ashanti and Others v Association for Mineworkers and Construction Union and Others* (2019) 40 ILJ 1552 (LC).
- 5.3. These are discussed in more detail in the relevant sections below.

6. The candidate's knowledge of the law, including constitutional law

- 6.1. The candidate's judgments are thorough and thoughtfully considered. She has excellent knowledge of labour law and the rules and procedures of the Labour Court, and engages meaningfully with possible gaps in the law, with the history and principles underpinning South African labour law jurisprudence in mind.

- In *National Union of Metal Workers of South Africa obo Members v SAA Technical (Pty) Ltd* (2023) 44 ILJ 2000 (LC), the respondent had issued a notice in terms of 189(3) of the LRA to affected employees on 28 April 2021. The CCMA had facilitated the consultation process, which was finalised around 1 October 2021.
- On 18 October 2021, the respondent dismissed 1,193 employees for operational reasons, and on 16 January 2022, the applicant referred a statement of claim to the Labour Court challenging the substantive fairness of the dismissals.
- The candidate considered whether the Labour Court had jurisdiction to hear the matter given that the dispute had not been referred for conciliation before the applicant filed its statement of claim. She found that, on a proper interpretation of the LRA, the Labour Court did not have jurisdiction to hear the matter, given the non-referral to conciliation.
- This judgment is significant because there had been previous conflicting judgments on this issue. The candidate considered the issue afresh and came to a firm finding, which was upheld on appeal.

6.2. There are times when the candidate exercises her discretion (where that discretion is available) in the interests of justice. There are also times when she laments an unjust outcome because the letter of the law ties her hands. In doing so, she shows integrity to the rule of law and to justice.

- For example, in *Engen Basson's Service Station v Vanqa* (2014) 35 ILJ 1568 (LC), the candidate set aside a writ of execution obtained without a court order setting out the amount or an affidavit setting out the claim. In this case, she applied the letter of the law in circumstances where she was clearly unhappy about the outcome, as the employer had failed to re-employ the respondent despite the court having ordered it to do so.

6.3. In *Solidarity obo Putter v Anglo Black (Pty) Ltd and Another* (2024) 45 ILJ 1108 (LC), Mr Putter had been informed that his position had been made redundant without the first respondent having followed the proper consultation process provided for in sections 189 and 189A of the LRA, less than two months prior to going into business rescue. Business rescue had introduced a moratorium on legal proceedings against the first respondent in terms of section 133 of the Companies Act 71 of 2008 ("Companies Act"), and the business rescue practitioner argued that Mr Putter's urgent application

for reinstatement before the Labour Court was included in that moratorium. The candidate found that the Labour Court had no jurisdiction to lift the moratorium in accordance with s133(1)(b) of the Companies Act. In her judgement, the outcome is unsatisfactory and possibly caused by a legislative gap that was overlooked. But the candidate nonetheless struck the matter before her from the roll, only to be re-enrolled when leave is granted by the High Court in terms of s133(1)(a) or (b) of the Companies Act, or alternatively when the business rescue process is concluded.

- 6.4. On the other hand, in *Public Servants Association of South Africa on behalf of Mphlala v Minister of Home Affairs and Others* (2019) 40 ILJ 415 (LC), the candidate made a declaration that an employee's unfair dismissal dispute before the General Public Service Sectoral Bargaining Council ("GPSSBC") was still extant and ordered that the arbitration be set down for hearing. The employee's file had been closed, and a letter had been issued by the Administrator: Resident Panellist Unit to say that the GPSSBC was unable to process the employee's referral because he had been deemed to be dismissed in terms of s17 of the Public Service Act, 1994 which provides that an employee will be deemed to be dismissed where they have been absent without leave for over a month. There was clearly a dispute as to whether the employee had permission to be absent for a three-month period when he was in rehabilitation for heroin use, but the employee had taken almost two years to bring his application to the Labour Court. The candidate made the declaration and order despite the delay, as she determined it to be in the interests of justice to do so.
- 6.5. *General Industries Workers Union of South Africa and Another v Clover SA (Pty) Ltd and Others* [2022] ZALCJHB 229 involved a point *in limine* raised at the eleventh hour by the first respondent that the review application had lapsed due to non-service of the complete record during the 30-day period prescribed in a judgment reinstating the application. The transcribed portion of the record had been served in time, but certain documentary portions were served out of time. The candidate admonished both sets of legal practitioners for their tardiness in dealing with each other and with the court. Both sets of legal practitioners sought costs *de bonis propriis* against each other. The candidate made no order as to costs but declared that the review application remained reinstated despite a lack of strict adherence to the judgment's wording.
- 6.6. *Inxuba Yethembe Local Municipality v Msweli and Others* (2024) 45 ILJ 548 (LC) provides an example of the candidate favouring access to justice over strict compliance

with procedure. This judgment relates to several points *in limine* raised by the first respondent based on technicalities emanating from the practice manual. These points were not raised on the papers, but rather for the first time in the respondent's heads of argument. The candidate dismissed all these points, expressed her dissatisfaction with the conduct of the first respondent and ordered him to pay the applicant's wasted costs.

6.7. Where appropriate, the candidate has upheld the time periods specified in the LRA and the Rules, as those time periods themselves are designed to promote a just outcome – such as finality. In *Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality v SAMWU obo Bukula and Others* (2025) 46 ILJ 1990 (LC), for example, an employee waited more than six years before referring an unfair labour practice dispute to the bargaining council. The arbitrator at the bargaining council had heard the dispute without an application for condonation being before her.

- The candidate reviewed and set aside the arbitrator's award, substituting it with a ruling that the bargaining council lacked jurisdiction to adjudicate the dispute. In doing so, the candidate found that the arbitrator was wrong on both the facts and the law. On the law, the candidate stated that the wording of section 191 of the LRA is clear: the 90-day period for referral of a dispute starts running from the date the employee becomes aware of the alleged unfair labour practice, and following an internal dispute resolution mechanism does not suspend that period.
- The candidate found that an employee could not refer such a dispute to arbitration after six years without an application for condonation and a compelling explanation for the delay.

6.8. *Independent Municipal and Allied Trade Union obo Erasmus and Craukamp v City of Johannesburg and Another* (2017) 38 ILJ 2774 (LC) dealt with an application to compel compliance with a court order, as well as a counter application for rescission brought by the city, four years after the court order ordering the reinstatement of two firefighters. The city alleged that the order was obtained by fraud because the firefighters did not disclose that they had been struck off the roll.

- But the city had not opposed the original order, nor did it bring a condonation application for the late application for rescission. As such, the city did not show that the order had been obtained by fraud.

- The candidate also emphasised that the firefighters were entitled to finality in this matter, ordering the city to comply with the order and to pay costs.
- 6.9. In *Govender v Gauteng Provincial Government v Department of Roads and Transport* [2024] 3 BLLR 298 (LC), the applicant sought the variation of a court order previously granted by the candidate in which she had dismissed an application for an arbitration award to be made an order of court on the basis that there was ambiguity in the wording of one of the paragraphs of the award. During the previous proceedings, the candidate indicated to the applicant that she was minded to refer the matter back to the bargaining council to obtain clarity in the award. However, the applicant persisted that the award was not ambiguous and argued the merits before her, resulting in the application being dismissed.
- In this matter, the candidate considered the requirements for varying an order and found no merit in the variation application. The judgment examines the ambit of section 165 of the LRA, rule 16A(1)(a)(i) of the Labour Court Rules, as well as rule 42 of the Uniform Rules of Court.
 - After a thorough examination, the candidate concludes that the application for variation amounted to an abuse of court process and ought to be dismissed.
- 6.10. The candidate frequently expresses her distaste for the conduct of legal practitioners who prejudice their clients and waste court resources. This was clear in *Choko-Choko and Others v Tharisa Minerals (Pty) Ltd* (2025) 46 ILJ 2618 (LC), an urgent application to interdict disciplinary proceedings against the applicant where they had allegedly promoted participation in a strike that had been declared unprotected and interdicted by the court.
- By the time the matter was heard, the disciplinary hearing had already taken place, and the threat of the strike had dissipated.
 - The candidate admonished the applicant's legal representatives for bringing an application that was misguided and meritless. She ordered costs against the applicant's legal representatives *de bonis propriis*, but made it provisional, allowing the legal representatives seven days to make written submissions as to why the order should not be confirmed.

- 6.11. The candidate displayed a sound understanding of constitutional law in her decision in *Naidoo and Others v Parliament of the Republic of South Africa* (2019) 40 ILJ 864 (LC), in which 69 Parliamentary Protection Services (“PPS”) officers alleged discrimination on “*any other arbitrary ground*” in terms of section 6(1) of the Employment Equity Act 55 of 1998 (“EEA”).
- Following security incidents, parliament determined that PPS officers lacked the necessary skills and employed a further 37 individuals from the South African Police Service. The applicants alleged that these individuals had less experience and performed fewer functions but nonetheless earned more than them. In essence, the allegation was that the decision to employ these individuals was arbitrary and capricious, and an act of nepotism, resulting in wage discrimination for the purposes of section 6(4) of the EEA.
 - The candidate considered the interpretations given to “*arbitrary ground*” in previous conflicting judgments and determined that a narrow interpretation was most appropriate: an applicant would need to show a ground akin to those listed in section 6(1) that would potentially impair human dignity; arbitrariness in itself is not sufficient. Although the candidate’s interpretation was confirmed by the Labour Appeal Court (“LAC”), her order was overturned.
- 6.12. In *Association of Mineworkers and Construction Union (AMCU) and Others v Bafokeng Rasimone Management Services (Pty) Ltd and Others* (2017) 38 ILJ 931 (LC), the candidate grappled with whether the majoritarian model of collective bargaining (where a minority union could effectively be excluded from consultation) in the context of retrenchments was constitutional. After a thorough analysis, the candidate found that the constitutional challenge ought to fail in its entirety. In reaching this conclusion, she considered the extensive negotiation that preceded the LRA and concluded that courts should be cautious about upsetting the carefully negotiated balance between competing labour interests. Her findings were upheld on appeal by both the LAC and a majority of the Constitutional Court. This shows that the candidate is able to deal effectively with challenging constitutional issues.

7. Judgments of the candidate that have been overturned, upheld, or commented on, on appeal:
--

- 7.1. The candidate has disclosed that her judgment in *Nortje and Others v Regenesys Management (Pty) Ltd* was overturned by the LAC. In that judgment, she held that the Labour Court lacked jurisdiction to entertain the matter. The LAC disagreed. It upheld the appeal and decided the matter on the basis of procedural fairness.
- 7.2. However, the matter was taken on further appeal to the Constitutional Court, where the apex court upheld the candidate's judgment on jurisdictional grounds. The LAC judgment is reported as *Regenesys Management (Pty) Ltd t/a Regenesys v Nortje and Others* (2022) 43 ILJ 2745 (LAC), with the Constitutional Court judgment – under the same name – reported at 45 ILJ 1723 (CC) and 2024 (5) SA 593 (CC).
- 7.3. The following four judgments of the candidate were also upheld on appeal:
- *Association of Mineworkers and Construction Union (AMCU) and Others v Bafokeng Rasimone Management Services (Pty) Ltd and Others* (2017) 38 ILJ 931 (LC), upheld by the LAC in *AMCU v Bafokeng Rasimone Management Services (Pty) Ltd and Others* (2018) 39 ILJ 2205 (LAC), and by a majority of the Constitutional Court in *AMCU v Bafokeng Rasimone Management Services (Pty) Ltd and Others* (2020) 41 ILJ 555 (CC);
 - *LabourNet (Pty) Ltd v Jankielsohn and Another* [2016] SALCJHB 135, upheld by the LAC in *LabourNet (Pty) Ltd v Jankielsohn and Another* (2017) 38 ILJ 1302 (LAC);
 - *Anglo Gold Ashanti Ltd t/a Anglo Gold Ashanti and Others v Association for Mineworkers and Construction Union and Others* (2019) 40 ILJ 1552 (LC), upheld by the Constitutional Court in *Association of Mineworkers and Construction Union and Others v Anglo Gold Ashanti Ltd t/a Anglo Gold Ashanti and Others* (2022) 43 ILJ 291 (CC); and
 - *National Union of Metal Workers of South Africa obo Members v SAA Technical (Pty) Ltd* (2023) 44 ILJ 2000 (LC), upheld by the LAC in *National Union of Metalworkers of South Africa obo Members v SAA Technical SOC Ltd* (2024) 45 ILJ 2523 (LAC).

- 7.4. In *AMCU v Bafokeng*, the LAC upheld the candidate's finding that majoritarianism in collective bargaining is not unconstitutional, but with some qualifications. Most notably, the LAC found that, if the representative union acts unfairly, and that results in an employee being unfairly retrenched, that employee can challenge the unfairness of the individual dismissal. The Constitutional Court was divided, with five of nine judges agreeing with the candidate that section 189(1) of the LRA is constitutional. The majority found that there was no constitutional right to individual or parallel consultation, but, like the LAC, the majority found that individuals who allege the dismissal was substantively unfair still had a right to challenge that decision.
- 7.5. In *LabourNet*, the LAC upheld the candidate's decision in its entirety. The matter concerned a restraint of trade in which the applicant attempted to restrain a junior employee from moving to a competitor for a period of three years, in circumstances where that employee had only worked for the applicant for a year and a half. The LAC confirmed that the employee's experience, skills and knowledge learned at the applicant were not an interest of the applicant's that warranted protection. The restraint was therefore unreasonable and unenforceable.
- 7.6. In *Association of Mineworkers and Construction Union*, the majority decision of the Constitutional Court upheld the candidate's judgment. By the time the matter reached the Constitutional Court, the strike itself had been resolved, but the Constitutional Court considered the candidate's importation of the principle of proportionality into assessing the substantive lawfulness of a secondary strike – particularly consideration of the proportionality of the strike action on the secondary employer's business. The majority found that a proportionality assessment was appropriate. However, as to the factors to be considered in assessing proportionality, the majority found that these should be left to the courts to decide on a case by case basis.
- 7.7. In *National Union of Metalworkers of South Africa*, the LAC upheld the candidate's judgment. On appeal, NUMSA argued that, where a large scale retrenchment had been facilitated prior to the dismissal, referral to conciliation ought not to be required. The LAC quoted the candidate's reasoning regarding the distinction between facilitation and conciliation processes and upheld it in its entirety. After considering the candidate's reasoning and the provisions of the LRA in their historical context, the LAC concluded that, on a proper interpretation of the relevant provision of the LRA, notwithstanding

facilitation, a referral to conciliation is mandatory to confer jurisdiction on the Labour Court.

7.8. The candidate's judgment in *Naidoo and Others v Parliament of the Republic of South Africa* (2019) 40 ILJ 864 (LC) was overturned by the LAC in *Naidoo and Others v Parliament of the Republic of South Africa* (2020) 41 (ILJ) 1931 (LAC).

- The LAC endorsed the candidate's narrow interpretation of "any other arbitrary ground" in section 6(1) of the EEA. It further found that, while nepotism cannot be countenanced, it did not constitute an identifiable and unacceptable ground of discrimination that has the potential to impair human dignity for the purposes of section 6(1) of the EEA.
- However, the LAC also found that, because the respondent's exception was upheld, the applicants ought to have been afforded the opportunity to amend their pleadings. The candidate's order dismissing the applicant's claim was therefore overturned.

8. The extent and breadth of the candidate's professional experience

- 8.1. Prior to having been elevated to the bench in 2016, the candidate practised as a member of the Pretoria Society of Advocates for nine years. During her last four years at the bar, she acted in the Labour Court.
- 8.2. Prior to joining the bar, the candidate served as deputy director in the Department of Land Affairs for a period of nine years.
- 8.3. Collectively, the candidate has over 28 years of relevant professional experience.

9. The candidate's linguistic and communication skills

- 9.1. The candidate's judgments are written in English.
- 9.2. Nothing in the judgments and other writings considered by the reviewers indicates that the candidate's linguistic and communication skills are not adequate.

10. The candidate's ability to produce judgments promptly

- 10.1. The candidate indicated that one judgment was outstanding at the time of completing the questionnaire. It appears from the candidate's explanation in her application that this was a result of something out of her own control.

- 10.2. As far as could be ascertained at the time of completing this review, this judgment is still outstanding.
- 10.3. Of the 17 judgments of the candidate considered by the reviewers, one was handed down more than three months after hearing. The candidate took six months to write the judgment in *Association of Mineworkers and Construction Union (AMCU) and Others v Bafokeng Rasimone Management Services (Pty) Ltd and Others* (2017) 38 ILJ 931 (LC), a complex constitutional matter that went on appeal to the LAC and the Constitutional Court. The candidate's judgment is 47 pages long and was upheld by both the LAC and the Constitutional Court.
- 10.4. The remaining judgments considered were generally decided less than one month after hearing.

11. The candidate's ability to conduct court proceedings fairly, efficiently, and effectively
--

- 11.1. The reviewers received no adverse comments from colleagues relating to the candidate's ability to conduct court proceedings fairly, efficiently, and effectively.

12. The candidate's independent-mindedness

- 12.1. There is no reason to believe that the candidate, if appointed, would not bring an independent mind to bear on issues presented for judicial determination, nor that the candidate would be unduly influenced in any way, including by the executive or legislative branches of government.
- 12.2. All judgments reviewed were those of the candidate sitting as a single judge.
- 12.3. The candidate showed independent mindedness in dealing critically with conflicting judgments on issues before her. This is particularly clear in the candidate's judgment in *National Union of Metal Workers of South Africa obo Members v SAA Technical (Pty) Ltd* (2023) 44 ILJ 2000 (LC), where she found that, on a proper interpretation of key provisions of the LRA, the Labour Court did not have jurisdiction to hear a matter involving large-scale dismissal for operational requirements given the non-referral to conciliation, even though the matter had been facilitated prior to the dismissals. The candidate considered the issue afresh, and came to a firm finding on the issue, which finding was (as discussed above) upheld on appeal.

- 12.4. The candidate again showed independent mindedness in the matter of *Anglo Gold Ashanti Ltd t/a Anglo Gold Ashanti and Others v Association for Mineworkers and Construction Union and Others* (2019) 40 ILJ 1552 (LC). In this case, ten employers had approached the Labour Court to declare certain secondary strike action to be unprotected. In this matter, the candidate considered the reasonableness requirement in section 66(2)(c) of the LRA and formulated the factors to be considered in determining the reasonableness of secondary strike action. The candidate has cited this as one of her most significant judgments. It was confirmed on appeal to the LAC, and again by the Constitutional Court.
- 12.5. The candidate engages critically with authority presented to her by legal representatives and conducts her own analysis of the relevance of that authority. *Mashigo v Safety and Security Sectoral Bargaining Council and Others* (2022) 43 ILJ 2042 (LC), an application to review and set aside the award of an arbitrator where the dispute had already been heard, successfully reviewed, and then sent back to the bargaining council for a hearing *de novo*, provides a good example.
- 12.6. In the second bargaining council proceedings, the parties had agreed in their pre-arbitration minute that no oral evidence would be led, but the record of the disciplinary proceedings and the first arbitration proceedings would form part of the parties' common bundle to be placed before the arbitrator. The correctness of the contents of that bundle was admitted by both parties in the minute.
- 12.7. The primary ground for review of the second arbitration award was that the arbitrator allegedly committed a gross irregularity by not hearing oral evidence but rather placing reliance on the transcribed record of oral evidence that was heard in the previous proceedings. The argument of the applicant was that there ought to have been a stated case in the arbitration proceedings for the arbitrator to proceed on this basis.
- 12.8. In her judgment, the candidate distinguished authority referred to by the applicant from the facts of the matter before her and found that there was no merit in this ground of review.

13. The candidate's administrative ability (other than in relation to court proceedings)
--

- 13.1. It does not appear that the candidate has acted in an administrative role apart from her time as Deputy Director in the Department of Land Affairs.

14. The message that the candidate's appointment would send to the public at large

- 14.1. The candidate has shown herself to be an extremely competent judge in the Labour Court, serving as a judicial officer for over ten years. During this time, she has penned judgments that are thorough and thoughtfully considered.
- 14.2. Her elevation to the LAC should send a message to the public at large that hard work and competence are duly rewarded with promotion, and that the law developed by our appellate courts is in safe hands.

ANNEXURE: LIST OF JUDGMENTS CONSIDERED

Reported judgments

1. *National Union of Mineworkers v Commission for Conciliation, Mediation and Arbitration and Others* (2013) 34 ILJ 2913 (LC)
2. *Pikitup Johannesburg (SOC) Ltd v South African Municipal Workers Union and Another* (2014) 35 ILJ 188 (LC)
3. *Engen Basson's Service Station v Vanqa* (2014) 35 ILJ 1568 (LC)
4. *Independent Municipal and Allied Trade Union obo Erasmus and Craukamp v City of Johannesburg and Another* (2017) 38 ILJ 2774 (LC)
5. *Association of Mineworkers and Construction Union (AMCU) and Others v Bafokeng Rasimone Management Services (Pty) Ltd and Others* (2017) 38 ILJ 931 (LC)
6. *Anglo Gold Ashanti Ltd t/a Anglo Gold Ashanti and Others v Association for Mineworkers and Construction Union and Others* (2019) 40 ILJ 1552 (LC)
7. *Public Servants Association of South Africa on behalf of Mphlala v Minister of Home Affairs and Others* (2019) 40 ILJ 415 (LC)
8. *Mashigo v Safety and Security Sectoral Bargaining Council and Others* (2022) 43 ILJ 2042 (LC)
9. *National Union of Metal Workers of South Africa obo Members v SAA Technical (Pty) Ltd* (2023) 44 ILJ 2000 (LC)
10. *Inxuba Yethembe Local Municipality v Msweli and Others* (2024) 45 ILJ 548 (LC)
11. *Solidarity obo Putter v Anglo Black (Pty) Ltd and Another* (2024) 45 ILJ 1108 (LC)
12. *Govender v Gauteng Provincial Government v Department of Roads and Transport* [2024] 3 BLLR 298 (LC)
13. *Nelson Mandela Bay Municipality v SAMWU obo Bukula and Others* (2025) 46 ILJ 1990 (LC)
14. *Choko-Choko and Others v Tharisa Minerals (Pty) Ltd* (2025) 46 ILJ 2618 (LC)
15. *Naidoo and Others v Parliament of the Republic of South Africa* (2019) 40 ILJ 864 (LC)

Unreported judgments

16. *General Industries Workers Union of South Africa and Another v Clover SA (Pty) Ltd & Others* [2022] ZALCJHB 229

17. *LabourNet (Pty) Ltd v Jankielsohn and Another* [2016] ZALCJHB 135

Judgments upheld on appeal

18. *LabourNet (Pty) Ltd v Jankielsohn and Another* [2016] ZALCJHB 135 in *LabourNet (Pty) Ltd v Jankielsohn and Another* (2017) 38 ILJ 1302 (LAC)

19. *Association of Mineworkers and Construction Union (AMCU) and Others v Bafokeng Rasimone Management Services (Pty) Ltd and Others* (2017) 38 ILJ 931 (LC), upheld by the LAC in *AMCU v Bafokeng Rasimone Management Services (Pty) Ltd and Others* (2018) 39 ILJ 2205 (LAC), and by a majority of the Constitutional Court in *AMCU v Bafokeng Rasimone Management Services (Pty) Ltd and Others* (2020) 41 ILJ 555 (CC)

20. *National Union of Metal Workers of South Africa obo Members v SAA Technical (Pty) Ltd* (2023) 44 ILJ 2000 (LC) in *National Union of Metalworkers of South Africa obo Members v SAA Technical SOC Ltd* (2024) 45 ILJ 2523 (LAC)

21. *Naidoo and Others v Parliament of the Republic of South Africa* (2019) 40 ILJ 864 (LC) (in part) in *Naidoo and Others v Parliament of the Republic of South Africa* (2020) 41 ILJ 1931 (LAC)

Judgments overturned on appeal

22. *Naidoo and Others v Parliament of the Republic of South Africa* (2019) 40 ILJ 864 (LC) (in part) in *Naidoo and Others v Parliament of the Republic of South Africa* (2020) 41 (ILJ) 1931 (LAC)

Academic writings

23. *Principles and Practice of Labour Law* (LexisNexis)

24. *Law@Work* (LexisNexis)

25. *Labour Court Manual* (Juta)