



IN THE COMPANIES TRIBUNAL OF SOUTH AFRICA

CASE NO: CT01093ADJ2022

Ex Parte Application

Pro Events Security Services CC

APPLICANT

Presiding Member: Dr. M A Chicktay
Date of Decision: 31st July 2022

DECISION

1. INTRODUCTION

[1] The Applicant is Pro Events Security Services CC (“the Applicant”), with its principle place of business at 6 Karoo Street Belville Cape Town

2. THE APPLICATION

2.1 This is an *ex parte* application brought, on behalf of the Applicant by Caroldene Beeka, in terms of Section 72(5) (b) of the Act for an exemption from the requirement to appoint a Social and Ethics Committee.

3. THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE ACT

- 3.1. Section 72 (4) provides for the Minister to prescribe, by way of Regulation, those companies which shall be required to appoint a Social and Ethics Committee.
- 3.2. Section 72 (5) provides that, notwithstanding a requirement to appoint a Social and Ethics Committee, a company may apply to the Tribunal in the prescribed manner and form for an exemption from that requirement, and the Tribunal may grant such an exemption if it is satisfied that (a) "...the company is required in terms of some other legislation to have, and does have, some form of formal mechanism within its structures that substantially performs the function that would otherwise be performed by the social and ethics committee;" or (b) "it is not reasonably necessary in the public interest to require the company to have a social and ethics committee, having regard to the nature and extent of the activities of the company."
- 3.3. Regulation 43 (1) (c) of the Act requires "... any other company that has in any two of the previous five years, scored above 500 points in terms of Regulation 26 (2)".
- 3.4. Regulation 43 (2) (a) of the Act requires that a "company to which this regulation applies must appoint a social and ethics committee unless – (a) it is a subsidiary of another company that has a social and ethics committee, and the social and ethics committee of that other company will perform the functions required by this regulation on behalf of that subsidiary company; or (b) it has been exempted by the Tribunal in accordance with section 72 (5) and (6)."
- 3.5. Regulation 26 (2) sets out the methodology of a company calculating its "public interest score".

4. THE FACTS

4.1. The Applicant confirms in the supporting affidavit filed that

4.1.1. The Applicant scored more than 500 PI Score and therefore is applying for the relief to establish a Social and Ethics Committee,

4.1.2. The Applicant indicates that the nature of its business and the internal structures are such that there is no need for a Social and Ethics Committee.

4.1.3. It thus requests that it be exempted from having a social and Ethics Committee

5. ANALYSIS OF THE FACTS

5.1. A company that has over 500 PI Score is required to have a Social and Ethics Committee unless it is exempted to do so in terms of the Companies Act

5.2. The two conditions for exemption¹ stated in the Act are:

5.2.1. if the company is already required by another law to have an existing structure in place that actually performs the functions prescribed by the Act to the Social and Ethics Committee; or

5.2.2. If the nature and extent of the company's activities are such that it does not have any significant impact on the public interest.

5.3. Having read the supporting affidavit I am not satisfied that the Applicant has made out a proper case that it is not reasonably necessary to require the Applicant to appoint a Social and Ethics Committee. The Applicant indicates that it already has measures in place that perform the same function as the Social and Ethics Committee. The Applicant does not

¹ The Social and Ethics Committee Handbook – Guidebook for South African Companies P9, compiled by Prof Deon Rossouw, The Ethics Institute of South Africa (2012)

indicate in the Affidavit as to who they are and what they do. There is no explanation provided in the affidavit with regard to documents that are attached. The Applicant also indicates that its line of business does not require a Social and Ethics Committee. The Applicant again does not give an explanation for this. There is thus no explanation and reasoning given as to why the Applicant should be exempt from having a Social and Ethics Committee.

6. ORDER

In the circumstances I make the following Order:

- 6.1 The Application for being exempt from having a Social and Ethics Committee is dismissed.

Dr. M A CHICKTAY