

ADV. BRINK

H

HE IS AN ADVOCATE, HE APPLIED TO
LASH (LEGAL ADV) FOR ONE ADVISORY POSITION
2 WERE AVAILABLE. HE WAS SHORTLISTED
W/ 4 OTHER CANDIDATES. ONE CANDIDATE
GOT 1 DURBAN POST, AND SOMEHOW HE
WAS OF 1 IMPRESSION HE HAD GOTTEN 1
PILTLER MERTZBURG POSI. 1 2 OTHER
CANDIDATES RECEIVED REGRET LETTERS. ADV
BRINK RECEIVED A LETTER NOT EXPLAINING
WHY HE WAS REJECTED.

- HE REQ REJCTG LETTERS SENT 2 OTHER
CANDIDATES

- RECRUITMENT POLICY DOCUMENT.

- HE HAS A CASE AT LABOR CRT AGAINST
LASH FOR UNFAIR DISCRIMINATION.

- 10 - VEDAVANKAR - DIO - NAIR

- ADV. BRINK 100% PROVINCIAL OFFICE TO
INTERNAL APPEAL FOR CUBING HIS FILE ON 1 VLEW
THAT IT FELL OUTSIDE 1 SCOPE OF 1
COMMISSION.