# Article information:

Two Zuma-appointed provincial NPA bosses take the fight for their jobs to ConCourt
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# Article summary:

1. Two Zuma-appointed provincial NPA bosses are taking their fight for their jobs to the Constitutional Court.

2. At the heart of the case is the question of when a presidential order becomes final.

3. The Presidency argues that Ramaphosa was acting within the law by cancelling the appointments, while Mncwabe and Mathenjwa argue that their appointments should be considered final because Zuma signed a presidential minute.

# Article rating:

Appears moderately imbalanced: The article provides some useful information, but is missing several important points or pieces of evidence that would be required to present the discussed topics in a balanced and reliable way. You are encouraged to seek a more balanced perspective on the presented issues by exploring the provided research topics and looking at different information sources.

# Article analysis:

This article provides an overview of two Zuma-appointed provincial NPA bosses taking their fight for their jobs to the Constitutional Court. It presents both sides of the argument, providing details on why each president acted as they did and what legal implications this has. The article is well-written and provides a comprehensive overview of the situation, however there are some potential biases present in its reporting.

Firstly, it does not explore any counterarguments or other points of view which could provide further insight into this issue. This means that readers may not be presented with all available information on this topic, potentially leading to one-sided reporting or partiality in favour of one side over another. Additionally, there is no mention of any possible risks associated with either president's decision, which could lead to an incomplete understanding of the situation for readers.

Furthermore, there is no evidence provided to support some of the claims made in this article, such as Mncwabe's assertion that his appointment should be considered final because Zuma signed a presidential minute. Without evidence to back up these claims, readers may find it difficult to assess whether they are reliable or not. Additionally, some statements made by Baleni are presented without any context or further explanation which could help readers better understand them and make informed decisions about them.

In conclusion, while this article provides an informative overview of two Zuma-appointed provincial NPA bosses taking their fight for their jobs to the Constitutional Court, it does have some potential biases present in its reporting which could lead to one-sidedness or partiality in favour of one side over another. Furthermore, there is no evidence provided to support some claims made in this article and some statements are presented without any context or further explanation which could help readers better understand them and make informed decisions about them.

# Topics for further research:

* Constitutional Court rulings on presidential appointments
* Legal implications of presidential appointments
* Risks associated with presidential appointments
* Evidence for presidential appointments
* Context of presidential appointments
* Counterarguments to presidential appointments
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