IN THE LABOUR COURT OF LESOTHO

LC/REV/25/2007 A0856/2006

HELD AT MASERU

In the matter between:

FAHHIDA CASH AND CARRY (PTY) LTD APPLICANT

And

LEBOHANG MARUOA RAMOTHABENG SEMOKO THE DDPR

1st RESPONDENT 2nd RESPONDENT 3rd RESPONDENT

JUDGMENT

Date: 14th May 2013

Application for the review of the DDPR arbitral award in referral A0856/2006. 1st and 2nd Respondent applying for dismissal for want of prosecution. Application not being opposed and Applicant failing to attend the hearing. Hearing proceeding unopposed – Court granting application and dismissing this review application. No order as to costs being made.

BACKGROUND OF THE ISSUE

- 1. This is an application for the dismissal of this review application in LC/REV/25/2007 for want of prosecution. Parties herein are cited as appear in the main review application for purposes of convenience. This matter was heard on this day in default and a ruling was delivered immediately thereafter in Court. Our full written judgment on the matter is thus in the following.
- 2. Facts surrounding this matter are basically that 1st and 2nd Respondents referred a dispute for unfair dismissal with the DDPR under referral number A0856/2006. An award was thereafter issued in favour of the 1st and 2nd Respondents. Thereafter, on or around the 27th March 2007, Applicant herein referred a review application with this Court. It is this

application that the 1^{st} and 2^{nd} Respondents wish to have dismissed for want of prosecution.

SUBMISSIONS AND FINDINGS

- 3. Advocate Russell submitted on behalf of the 1st and 2nd Respondents that after the matter had been referred with this Court, Applicant was notified by the Registrar to collect the audio record of the DDPR proceedings in referral A0856/2207 for transcription. This letter was followed by another letter from Advocate Russell to remind Applicant about the record of proceedings. The two letters form part of the record as annexes "A" and B"". Notwithstanding the said notices, Applicant failed to collect same to date. She further submitted that this is causing great prejudice on the 1st and 2nd Respondents who are still waiting for the execution of their award.
- 4. Advocate Russell furthermore submitted that it is clear from the conduct of Applicant that it does not have the serious or solid intention of having the matter finalised. Advocate Russell argued that the conduct of Applicant is rather meant to frustrate and delay the execution of the DDPR award issued in favour of 1st and 2nd Respondents. Moreover, she submitted that the fact that Applicant has made appearance today, is an indication that it has also lost interest in the review application. She thus prayed that the review application be dismissed.
- 5. It is trite law that the right to be heard is only given to a party that is willing to utilise it (see *Lucy Lerata & others vs. Scott Hospital 1995-196 LLR-LB 6* at page 15). It is clear from the submissions of Advocate Russell that Applicant has been given all the opportunities to prosecute and finalise its case. As a result, it is Our opinion that in failing to exhaust the availed avenues, Applicant has by conduct demonstrated in clear and certain terms, its intension to waive its right to be heard. We agree with Advocate Russell that Applicant is clearly not interested in having the matter finalised. Consequently, the application for dismissal for want of prosecution is granted.

AWARD

We hereby make an award in the following terms:

- a) That LC/REV/13/2010 is hereby dismissed; and
- b) That there is no order as to costs.

THUS DONE AND DATED AT MASERU ON THIS 27^{th} DAY OF MAY 2013.

T. C. RAMOSEME DEPUTY PRESIDENT (AI) THE LABOUR COURT OF LESOTHO

Mrs. L. RAMASHAMOLE MEMBER I CONCUR

Mr. S. KAO MEMBER

I CONCUR

FOR APPLICANT: FOR 1ST RESPONDENT:

NO ATTENDANCE ADV. RUSSELL