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**INTERNAL QUESTION PAPER NUMBER: 25 - 2020**

**1457. Ms M E Sukers (ACDP) to ask the Minister of Social Development:**

(1) (a) What is the breakdown of the costs incurred by her department in theDemocratic Alliance court case and that of1000 Women Trust that was decided on 22 May 2020 in the Cape High Court over the enforced ban on soup kitchens and food distribution regulations and (b) how will these costs impact on her department;

(2) whether the legal action could have been avoided through the less expensive and more fruitful course of consultation with the litigating parties; if not, why not; if so, (a) was the course of consultation with the litigating parties pursued and (b) what are the relevant details? NW1828E

**REPLY:**

1. (a) The Department has not yet been invoiced for the applicant’s costs.

(b) The impact on the department will be that the legal costs are not budgeted for.

(2)  (a) No;

(b) The applicants launched an urgent court application based on internal document which were still being consulted. The department did engage the applicants but did not agree on the material facts. The applicants wanted to prevent the Minister from issuing directions of which she is empowered by the Constitution and by the relevant Disaster Management Act. The court had to pronounce on these fundamental issues and ordered that theMinister is entitled to issue directions in this regard and further that the applicants be afforded an opportunity to look at the final draft directions three days before gazetting.