

**THE FINANCIAL SERVICES TRIBUNAL**

CASE NO.: PFA9/2023

**PROTOCOL PROTECTION SERVICES**

**APPLICANT**

**and**

**THE PENSION FUNDS ADJUDICATOR**

**FIRST RESPONDENT**

**PRIVATE SECURITY SECTOR PROVIDENT FUND**

**SECOND RESPONDENT**

**OCTAVIA NONDUMISO MAPASA**


**THIRD RESPONDENT**

**ORDER BY THE DEPUTY CHAIRPERSON**

APPLICATION FOR RECONSIDERATION IN TERMS OF SECTION 230 OF THE FSR ACT 9 OF 2017

The determination by the PFA is set aside by consent on the ground that due to an administrative error the audi rule was not complied with.

Questions that the PFA may consider are whether the present determination can be said to have been based on the complaint and whether the complaint was not time barred.



LTC HARMS

Deputy Chairperson

12 April 2023