



THE SUPREME COURT OF APPEAL OF SOUTH AFRICA
MEDIA SUMMARY OF JUDGMENT DELIVERED IN THE SUPREME COURT OF
APPEAL

From: The Registrar, Supreme Court of Appeal

Date: 29 June 2026

Status: Immediate

The following summary is for the benefit of the media in the reporting of this case and does not form part of the judgments of the Supreme Court of Appeal

Ramdhin v Rondebosch Medical Centre (Pty) Ltd (084/2025) [2026] ZASCA 93 (29 June 2026)

Today, the Supreme Court of Appeal (SCA) dismissed an appeal by Dr Ganes Anil Ramdhin against an order of the Western Cape Division of the High Court, Cape Town, (the high court) which had dismissed his application for an interim interdict. The SCA held that Dr Ramdhin failed to establish a prima facie right to continue exercising admission privileges at the Rondebosch Medical Centre (RMC) following his suspension from practice by the Health Professions Council of South Africa (HPCSA).

As a specialist obstetrician and gynaecologist Dr Ramdhin had enjoyed admission privileges at RMC since 2019. In June 2023, he was found guilty of unprofessional conduct by the HPCSA and suspended from practice. After part of the suspension was lifted in June 2024, he sought to resume practising at RMC. The hospital informed him that he was required to apply afresh for admission privileges under its revised policy framework. RMC subsequently declined to grant him admission privileges.

The issue on appeal was whether Dr Ramdhin's admission privileges survived his suspension from practice and whether he had established a prima facie right entitling him to interim relief pending the determination of further declaratory and review proceedings.

The SCA held that admission privileges are dependent on a practitioner's legal entitlement to practise. It found that the agreement granting admission privileges was subject to an implied term that the privileges would terminate when the practitioner was no longer legally entitled to

practise. It concluded that Dr Ramdhin's suspension under the Health Professions Act 56 of 1974 resulted in the termination of the admission privileges by operation of law.

The SCA further held that even if no implied term existed, a tacit term to the same effect would arise from the nature of the agreement and the surrounding circumstances. The SCA rejected the argument based on temporary impossibility of performance, finding that it had not been properly raised and, in any event, could not assist Dr Ramdhin because the impossibility arose from his own admitted professional misconduct. The SCA also confirmed that no reviewable administrative action existed because the dispute concerned private contractual rights rather than the exercise of public power.

In the result, the SCA dismissed the appeal with costs.

-----oOo-----