



4th Floor
Riverwalk Office Park
Block A, 41 Matroosberg Road
Ashlea Gardens, Extension 6
PRETORIA
SOUTH AFRICA
0181

P.O. Box 580, **MENLYN**, 0063
Tel: 012 346 1738 / 748 4000
Fax: 086 693 7472
E-Mail: enquiries@pfa.org.za
Website: www.pfa.org.za

Please quote our reference: **PFA/EC/00092037/2022/YVT**

REGISTERED POST

Dear Madam,

DETERMINATION IN TERMS OF SECTION 30M OF THE PENSION FUNDS ACT, 24 OF 1956 (“the Act”): NP MANANGA (“complainant”) v OLD MUTUAL SUPERFUND PROVIDENT FUND (“fund”) AND OLD MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE (SA) LIMITED (“administrator”)

[1] INTRODUCTION

1.1 This complaint concerns the delay in the payment of a death benefit by the fund following the death of its member, Mr CM Mananga (“the deceased”).

1.2 The complaint was received by the Adjudicator on 30 October 2022. On 08 November 2022, a letter was sent to the complainant, notifying her that the complaint was forwarded to the respondents. On the same date, a notification of the complaint was sent to the respondents

affording them until 08 December 2022 to resolve the complaint. A response was received from the fund on 08 December 2022. On

The Office of the Pension Funds Adjudicator was established in terms of Section 30B of the Pension Funds Act, 24 of 1956. The service offered by the Pension Funds Adjudicator is free to members of the public.

Centralised Complaints Helpline for Other Financial Ombud Schemes 0860 OMBUDS (086 066 2837)

14 December 2023, a letter acknowledging receipt of the complaint was sent to the complainant. On the same date, the respondents were requested to submit their responses by 27 January 2023. No further submissions were received from the parties. On 14 December 2022, the fund's response was forwarded to the complainant requesting a reply by 27 January 2023. The fund made further submissions on 10 February 2023. On 24 May 2023, the fund's further submissions were forwarded to the complainant requesting her reply. No further submissions were received from the parties.

- 1.3 Having considered the written submissions before the Adjudicator, it is considered unnecessary to hold a hearing in this matter. As the background facts are well known to all the parties, only those facts that are pertinent to the issues raised herein shall be repeated. The determination and reasons therefor appear below.

[2] FACTUAL BACKGROUND

- 2.1 The deceased was a member of the fund until he passed away on 22 August 2020. The complainant is the spouse of the deceased.
- 2.2 Upon the death of the deceased, a lumpsum death benefit of R288 082.89 became available for distribution to his dependants in terms of section 37C of the Act. On 25 November 2022, the board of management of the fund ("the board") resolved to allocate the entire death benefit to the complainant.

[3] COMPLAINT

- 3.1 The complainant is aggrieved with the delay in the payment of the deceased's death benefit. She submitted that on 27 June 2021, she provided all the death claim documents to Assemblies of God

("employer"). The latter advised her that it submitted same to the fund and that nothing was outstanding.

3.2 The complainant submitted that after three months she followed-up with the employer and was advised that the death claim documents were not submitted. However, same has now been submitted. Further that, the matter is now with the fund for payment. The complainant submitted that she approached the fund to enquire about the payment of the death benefit and was advised that it is investigating the death claim. The complainant stated that she was the only dependant of the deceased. However, the fund enquired about other beneficiaries of the deceased and advised her that it is still investigating the case. The complainant is aggrieved with the delay in the payment of the death benefit.

3.3 The complainant requests the Adjudicator to investigate the matter and order the payment of the deceased's death benefit.

[4] RESPONSE

Fund

4.1 The fund submitted that the deceased was registered as its member from 01 September 2019 until he passed away on 22 August 2020. On 18 January 2021, the fund was notified of the death of the deceased.

4.2 The fund submitted that on 22 April 2021, it sent the death claim to an external service provider, Facilitating, Investigating & Consulting Services ("FICS") to investigate. The investigation was concluded on 16 November 2022. On 25 November 2022, the board resolved to allocate the entire death benefit to the complainant as the sole legal and factual dependant of the deceased.

- 4.3 The fund submitted that payment will be made within 10 to 15 business days.

Further submissions

- 4.4 On 10 February 2023, the fund confirmed that payment of R288 082.89 was made to the complainant on 29 December 2022.

[5] **DETERMINATION AND REASONS THEREFOR**

Introduction

- 5.1 The issues for determination are whether or not there was an unreasonable delay in the allocation and distribution of the deceased's death benefit by the fund.
- 5.2 The payment of a death benefit is regulated in terms of section 37C of the Act, which provides as follows:

“37C. Disposition of pension benefits upon death of member

- (1) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in any law or in the rules of a registered fund, any benefit (other than a benefit payable as a pension to the spouse or child of the member in terms of the rules of a registered fund, which must be dealt with in terms of such rules) payable by such a fund upon the death of a member, shall, subject to a pledge in accordance with section (19)(5)(b)(i) and subject to the provisions of section 37A(3) and 37D, not form part of the assets in the estate of such a member, but shall be dealt with in the following manner:
- (a) If the fund within twelve months of the death of the member becomes aware of or traces a dependant or dependants of the member, the benefit shall be paid to such dependant or, as may be deemed equitable by the board, to one of such

dependants or in proportions to some of or all such dependants.

(b) ...

5.3 It is the board's responsibility when dealing with the payment of death benefits to conduct a thorough investigation to determine the beneficiaries, to thereafter decide on an equitable distribution and finally to decide on the most appropriate mode of payment of the benefit payable. Their duties in this regard were summarised in *Sithole v ICS Provident Fund and Another* [2000] 4 BPLR 430 (PFA), at paragraph 24 and 25, as follows:-

“When making an “equitable distribution” amongst dependants the board of management has to consider the following factors:

- the age of the dependants – younger, minor children may need to be allocated larger amounts of the benefit, as they may need a longer period of dependency before they are capable of supporting themselves;
- the relationship with the deceased – the board must ensure that it does not fetter its discretion by favoring legal dependants over factual dependants without justification;
- the extent of dependency – the board must consider whether a beneficiary was totally or partially dependent on the deceased. The person's dependency in relation to other beneficiaries should also be compared. Those who were more dependent would probably need greater assistance and therefore a greater benefit;
- the wishes of the deceased placed either in the nomination form and/or his last will – this is merely one of the factors to be considered by the board when effecting an equitable distribution and the board must ensure it does not fetter its discretion;

- financial affairs of the dependants including their future earning capacity potential – the board should consider the beneficiaries, this includes income expenses and other assets and liabilities. The board should examine any bequest made to the beneficiaries by the deceased, the standard of living and life insurance proceeds paid to any beneficiary;
- future earning capacity – the board must look at the beneficiaries' employment prospects and consider if they are in financial difficulties and whether the financial hardship is of a temporary nature and the prospects of securing gainful employment;
- amount available for distribution – benefits available for distributions may not be enough to cover the maintenance needs of all beneficiaries forcing the board to consider other factors when determining an equitable distribution. This may lead to awarding a benefit which is less than maintenance needed of a dependant or a nil benefit in certain circumstances.

5.4 Section 1 of the Act defines a dependant as follows:

“Dependant, in relation to a member, means –

- (a) a person in respect of whom the member is legally liable for maintenance;
- (b) a person in respect of whom the member is not legally liable for maintenance, if such person –
 - (i) was in the opinion of the board, upon the death of the member in fact dependent on the member for maintenance;
 - (ii) is the spouse of the member,
 - (iii) is a child of the member, including a posthumous child, an adopted child and a child born out of wedlock.
- (c) a person in respect of whom the member would have become legally liable for maintenance, had the member not died.”

- 5.5 The fact that a person qualifies as a legal or factual dependant does not automatically give them the right to receive a portion of a death benefit (see *Varachia v SA Breweries Staff Provident Fund and Another* [2015] 2 BPLR 314H-I (PFA)). The deciding factor is financial dependency (see *Morgan v SA Druggists Provident Fund and Another* (1) [2001] 4 BPLR at 1890G-H (PFA)).
- 5.6 The complainant is aggrieved with the delay in the payment of the deceased's death benefit.
- 5.7 The death benefit must be distributed and paid without any unreasonable delay (see *Dobie NO v National Technikon Retirement Pension Fund* [1999] 9 BPLR 29 (PFA)). Where there is a delay in the payment of a death benefit, such a delay must be reasonable and justifiable. It should be noted that the board has 12 months within which to trace and identify the possible beneficiaries that might share in the benefit. However, this is not a hard and fast rule as everything depends on whether or not the board has conducted a proper investigation within a reasonable time. If the board is satisfied that it has taken all reasonable steps to trace and identify the dependants, it does not have to wait for the 12 months to lapse before making payment. There is also no duty on the board to make payment after the 12 months period has lapsed if it is of the opinion that there is a need for further investigation (see *Mthiyane v Fedsure Life Assurance Ltd and Others* [2002] 5 BPLR 3460 (PFA)).
- 5.8 The deceased passed away on 22 August 2020. The fund was notified of the death of the deceased on 18 January 2021. The board decided on the allocation of the death benefit on 25 November 2022. In terms of section 37C of the Act, the board has twelve-months from the date it became aware of the death of the deceased to finalise its investigation. Therefore, the fund decided on the allocation of the death benefit, almost two years after it was notified of the death of the deceased. The

complainant was paid the entire death benefit on 29 December 2022. The fund previously admitted in the case of *NR Mvakwendlu EC/00092151/2022* that the excess deaths brought by the Covid-19 Pandemic had overrun its capacity to adequately deal with the high influx of new death claims, which caused a backlog of claims. In this instance however, the fund appointed a service provider, ostensibly to speed up the investigation. The service provider continues to sit on the investigation for more than twelve months, whereafter the benefit was awarded to the complainant in full. The level of service experienced by the complainant at her time of need from the fund is completely below par and unacceptable. It does not even seem as if the fund offered any apology for its lacklustre performance. Therefore, the Adjudicator finds that the fund unduly delayed the allocation of the death benefit. The deceased's beneficiary suffered prejudice due to the conduct of the fund (see *Mohatla v Metal Industries Provident Fund [2004] 6BPLR 5797 (PFA)*).

- 5.9 Had the Adjudicator been clothed with powers to grant compensation, this matter would certainly have qualified. On 13 February 2023, the investigator attempted to contact the complainant to confirm receipt of payment of the death benefit. However, her phone went to voicemail. On 24 May 2023, the complainant was requested to confirm in writing whether she is satisfied that the matter has been resolved. However, no further submissions were received from the complainant. The Adjudicator is satisfied that the complainant was paid the death benefit from the fund. Therefore, the complaint should be dismissed.

[6] **ORDER**

- 6.1 In the result, the complaint cannot succeed and is hereby dismissed.

DATED AT PRETORIA ON THIS 31ST DAY OF MAY 2023

**MA LUKHAIMANE
PENSION FUNDS ADJUDICATOR**

Section 30M Filing: High Court
Parties unrepresented