

CANDIDATE: **COLLEEN JANE COLLIS**

COURT FOR WHICH CANDIDATE APPLIES: **GAUTENG DIVISION**

1. The candidate's appropriate qualifications

1.1. The candidate holds a BProc degree (University of Pretoria), awarded in 1997.

1.2. The candidate is appropriately qualified.

2. Whether the candidate is a fit and proper person

2.1. There is nothing in the candidate's application or the judgments we have considered that suggests that the candidate is not a fit and proper person.

3. Whether the candidate's appointment would help reflect the racial and gender composition of South Africa

3.1. The candidate is a Coloured woman.

3.2. Her appointment will assist in reflecting the racial and

gender composition of South Africa.

4. The candidate's knowledge of the law, including constitutional law

4.1. The candidate was a regional court prosecutor in Johannesburg for just under four years. During this time, the candidate conducted prosecutions of serious offences, with a specialisation in sexual offences committed against women and children.

4.2. The candidate then completed her articles of clerkship and was admitted as an attorney. The candidate practiced as an attorney for approximately six months.

4.3. In September 2002, the candidate was appointed as a magistrate in Johannesburg (in the civil court) and has occupied that position since then. The candidate has, during this time, in her capacity as a magistrate, dealt almost exclusively with civil litigation including presiding over cases brought in the Equality Court.

- 4.4. The candidate has held acting appointments in the Gauteng and Limpopo Divisions of the High Court. The candidate reports that she has held acting appointments for a total of 54 weeks, intermittently, between May 2012 and March 2017 in the Civil Courts.
- 4.5. The candidate does not, as yet, appear to have had the opportunity to adjudicate issues that are particularly complex and it is, therefore, not possible to assess from these judgments whether the candidate possesses the necessary skills to deal with complex issues of law and fact. However, on the strength of the judgments considered, we have no reason to doubt that she is able to do so.
- 4.6. The candidate's experience (particularly as a magistrate) and her judgments in the High Court suggest that she has a good knowledge of the law.
- 4.7. We were unable to find any reported judgments authored by the candidate. The candidate does however have 33 unreported judgments that we were able to find on SAFLII

and Juta's unreported law reports series, which are reviewed below. The four unreported judgments which form part of the candidate's application are also reviewed below.

4.8. *ABSA Bank v Joubert and another*:¹ this was an application for summary judgment. The judgment is written in a clear and concise style.

4.9. *Fabrinso v Road Accident Fund*² and *Nkwanyana v Road Accident Fund*:³ in these cases, the plaintiffs instituted claims for damages sustained in motor vehicle collisions. In the latter case, the issue of quantum and merits were separated and the candidate considered the issue of liability only. The candidate displayed an understanding of the law in these matters.

4.10. *Xaba v The State*:⁴ this was an appeal against the conviction and sentence imposed by the Regional Court.

¹ (100/2016) [2016] ZAGPPHC 721 (1 April 2016): 2016 JDR 0614 (GP)

² (3676/11) [2016] ZAGPJHC 242 (9 September 2016): 2016 JDR 1709 (GJ)

³ (10937/15) [2016] ZAGPJHC 241 (9 September 2016): 2016 JDR 1710 (GJ)

⁴ (A283/2012) [2013] ZAGPPHC 110 (3 May 2013). : 2013 JDR 0993 (GNP)

The candidate prepared the judgment, with Fabricius J concurring. This judgment could have been more logically and lucidly written.

- 4.11. *Anastasiou and another v Jordaan*⁵ this was an application to rescind a costs order. The judgment correctly records the legal principles applicable to the granting of an application in terms of Rule 42(1). However there remains a question as to whether the order was “erroneously granted” as contemplated in the Rule.
- 4.12. *Nimeng Beleggings (Pty) Ltd v Everdure Services and Technologies CC*:⁶ this was an application for the rescission of a default judgment. The candidate set out the legal principles clearly and concisely and applied them to the facts of the case. The judgment is well reasoned.
- 4.13. *Body Corporate of Galloway v Van Dyk*:⁷ A case involving final sequestration. The candidate considered an act of insolvency and whether there was an advantage to

⁵ (18524/2015) [2016] ZAGPJHC 288 (31 October 2016) : 2016 JDR (GJ)

⁶ 2017 JDR 0610 (GP)

⁷ 2015 JDR 1603 (GP)

creditors. The candidate interpreted the meaning of “advantage to creditors”. The candidate’s judgment considered several cases and the order was well founded on the applicable legal principles.

4.14. *Lynnwood Forum (Pty) Ltd v Danton Pub CC and Others*:⁸

This was an application for summary judgment. The defendant in the matter opposed the summary judgment on the basis of a counterclaim that was not sufficiently pleaded or disclosed as the Rule required. The candidate correctly reasoned that the defence was not sufficiently pleaded and granted summary judgment. The candidate further dealt with issues pertaining to the annexed contract which the plaintiff relied on. The candidate correctly found that the defence which the defendant asserted was without merit as the document it (the defendant) relied on was substantially the same as that relied upon by the plaintiff.

4.15. *De Wet v South African Securitization Programme (RF) Limited*:⁹ This was an application for the rescission of a

⁸ (65945/2013): 2014 JDR 1163 (GP)

⁹ 2016 JDR 1882 (GJ)

default judgment. The Defendant in the matter submitted that the default order granted in favour of the applicant was done erroneously. The candidate appropriately found that there was no service of the summons. When she evaluated the evidence before her, she found that the applicant for rescission made allegations that no service was effected, and the respondent failed to deal with the allegations or submit any evidence which was contrary to the allegations made by the applicant. The candidate found that there was an onus on the respondent to submit such evidence. The reasoning of the judgment is well founded.

- 4.16. *Rasikhinya v District Senior Manager Department of Education Limpopo Province and Others*:¹⁰ This was an application for a declaratory order for the unlawful dispossession of a motor vehicle as well as a *rei vindicatio* application for the return of the vehicle. The candidate appropriately applied the legal principles and considered the facts in relation to those principles. The candidate appropriately found that the applicant was not entitled to the return of the vehicle, as he could not prove ownership

¹⁰ (85/2015): 2017 JDR 0609 (GP)

thereof.

4.17. *SDV South Africa (Pty) Limited v Lucas Macintyre Jele Construction (Pty) Limited*:¹¹ This matter dealt with an exception to the plaintiff's particulars of claim. The matter concerned the application of a permission clause as well as a surety agreement. The candidate correctly interpreted the particulars of claim as a whole and the attached annexures. The candidate appropriately reasoned that the particulars of claim were not excipiable and dismissed the application.

4.18. *Masuku v the Minister of Safety and Security Police Official*:¹² the court was called upon to decide the lawfulness of the arrest and subsequent detention of the plaintiff. The judgment deals with both the facts and the legal principles in detail. It appears to be a well-reasoned judgment.

4.19. *New Urban Plumbing CC v Carrim*:¹³ this was an exception. The candidate set out the legal principles clearly

¹¹ 2017 JDR 0609 (GP)

¹² 49587/09: 2016 JDR 1931 (GJ)

¹³ 32677/14: 2015 JDR 1987 (GP)

and concisely and applied them to the facts of the case. The judgment is well reasoned.

4.20. *Cooper v Standard Bank of South Africa Ltd*:¹⁴ this was an application for the rescission of a default judgment. The candidate set out the legal principles clearly and concisely and applied them to the facts of the case. The judgment appears to be well reasoned.

4.21. *Mendelsohn NO v Vondo*:¹⁵ this was an application in terms of Rule 30. The judgment deals with both the facts and the legal principles in detail. It appears to be a well-reasoned judgment.

4.22. *Gafoor v Lakewood Homeowners Association*:¹⁶ this was an application in terms of the Promotion of Access to Information Act, 2 of 2002. The judgment appears to be well reasoned. It appears that the candidate reached the correct conclusion on both the facts and the law.

¹⁴ (370/2016) [2017] ZAGPPHC 97

¹⁵ (18925/2015) [2016] ZAGPJHC 339

¹⁶ (23709/2015) [2016] ZAGPJHC 337

4.23. *Ruiters KG v the Body Corporate of Vierhof*.¹⁷ this was an application and counter application for final interdicts. The candidate provided a thorough exposition of the facts, reaching a well-reasoned outcome.

4.24. *Lanseria Airport 1993 Proprietary Limited v Member of the Executive Council for Local Government, Gauteng Province and Three Others*.¹⁸

4.24.1. This matter involved an application to review and set aside the decision of the Member of the Executive Council for Local Government, Gauteng Province (“first respondent) by Lanseria Airport 1993 Proprietary Limited (“the applicant”).

4.24.2. In essence, the matter had to do with an objection, in terms of section 50(1)(c) of the Local Government: Municipality Property Rates Act 6 of 2004 against the valuation of a property belonging to the applicant on a

¹⁷ 46178/14: 2015 JDR 1887 (GP)

¹⁸ 2016 JDR 2298 (GJ): (07725/2015) [2016] ZAGPJHC 322 (29 November 2016)

valuations roll which recorded the relevant property valuations and covered the period of 1 July 2008 to 30 June 2013.

4.24.3. The underlying facts of this case were that the property belonging to the applicant had, in the view of the applicant, been significantly over-valued, which had the consequence that the rates payable on the property were significantly higher than they should have been.

4.24.4. A further important point was that when the property was subsequently valued, it was valued at an amount of R192 million less than the initial value attributed by the Municipal Valuer on the same property three years earlier. Notwithstanding this the respondents did not adjust the rates levied on the property for the period 1 July 2008 to 30 April 2010.

4.24.5. In this matter the candidate was called upon to deal with aspects of administrative law, the

principle of mootness in that the general valuation roll against which the applicant had raised its objection had lapsed, and was replaced by a new one in 2013.

4.24.6. Because of various reviewable aspects of the conduct of the first respondent, the candidate granted an order in favour of the applicant reviewing and setting aside the decision of the first respondent on condonation and referring the matter back to the first respondent for the first respondent to duly consider the merits thereof, before making a decision on the applicant's condonation application.

4.24.7. The case demonstrates a careful thought process, understanding, and application of the relevant legal principles as well as a mastery of the facts. The order made by the candidate was, with respect, a pragmatic one.

4.25. *Mphefhedzi Business Enterprise CC* (“the applicant”) v

Members of the Executive Council Responsible for the Department of Health, Limpopo (“first respondent”) and *The Minister of Health*¹⁹ (“second respondent”). This was an urgent application in terms of which the applicant sought a stay of execution of an order granted by the High Court. The order was in relation to a contract for the rendering of laundry services to various hospitals falling under the auspices of the Member of the Executive Council, Limpopo. The candidate looked, in detail, at the provisions of Uniform Rule 45A of the Rules of the High Court and dealt extensively and thoroughly with those provisions. The candidate further considered the law relating to urgency which, once again, was comprehensively dealt with. Finally, the candidate considered the question of the jurisdiction of the Court and dealt with the relatively complex provisions relating to jurisdiction, once again in a thorough manner, before concluding that the Court lacked jurisdiction to hear the matter. Importantly, the candidate dealt with the relatively new Government Gazette in terms of which the areas of

¹⁹ (2016/22705) [2016] ZAGPPHC 248:

jurisdiction of the Limpopo and Mpumalanga Divisions were set out, in relation to the impact this had on the question of jurisdiction. Accordingly the candidate found that the Court lacked the necessary jurisdiction to adjudicate the application.

4.26. *Mokwana NO v Fakunde*:²⁰ this was an application for eviction. The candidate's judgment is well reasoned and applies the applicable legal framework.

4.27. *Brenton Graham Gray v Firstrand Bank*:²¹ this was an application in terms of Uniform Rule 41(1)(c). The candidate set out the legal principles and applied them to the facts of the case. The judgment appears to be well reasoned. It also appears that the candidate reached the correct conclusion.

4.28. *Felix v Firstrand Bank Limited*:²² this was an application for rescission of summary judgment. The candidate's judgment set out the applicable legal principles succinctly,

²⁰ 2015 JDR 1245 (GP):

²¹ (1436/12) [2017] ZAGPPHC 98

²² 2015 JDR 1560 (GP): (63062/2013) [2015] ZAGPPHC 915

and its application to the facts of the case is well reasoned.

4.29. *Swanepoel v Van Zyl*:²³ this was an application for rescission of default judgment. The candidate provided a thorough exposition of the facts, reaching a well-reasoned outcome.

4.30. *Botes v Road Accident Fund*:²⁴ this was an action for damages against the RAF. The judgment provides a thorough analysis of evidence, including expert actuarial evidence.

4.30.1. Similarly thorough was the candidate's judgment in *Adams v Road Accident Fund*,²⁵ which merits some attention. The plaintiff had suffered head and lower limb injuries in a motor vehicle collision, and the only head of damage remaining in the dispute was the loss of future earning capacity. To determine this, the candidate examined the extensive factual and

²³ 2014 JDR 0984 (GNP): (6145/1994) [2014] ZAGPPHC 268

²⁴ 2014 JDR 2435 (GJ): (09479/2013) [2014] ZAGPJHC 310

²⁵ 31049/2011

expert evidence concerning the plaintiff's pre- and-post accident career prospects.

4.30.2. What merits attention, is the manner in which the candidate assessed and evaluated the evidence presented by expert witnesses called on behalf of the plaintiff and the defendant respectively. The candidate did not simply prefer one witness to the other, but subjected the evidence to rigorous testing, at times reaching a conclusion which struck a balance between the opposing views. The resultant award of damages appeared to reflect the true impact of the injuries, and recognised the primary aim of the governing legislation, which is to award adequate compensation to victims of motor vehicle collisions.

4.31. *S v Mhlanga*:²⁶ this was an appeal against a sentence imposed by the Magistrates Court for theft. The accused was sentenced to 12 years imprisonment for theft of a

²⁶ 2013 JDR 0987 (GNP)

wallet. On appeal, the candidate held that the sentence imposed was excessive, and instead imposed a sentence of 4 years imprisonment. The candidate's judgment demonstrates a sound appreciation for the legal principles of sentencing. The same is so in respect of another unreported judgment of the candidate dealing with an appeal on sentence in *S v Ntshingila*.²⁷

4.32. *Vilakazi v Minister of Safety and Security*:²⁸ this was an action for damages for unlawful arrest and detention. Although the candidate ultimately found that the plaintiff's arrest and detention was justified, she suggested a development of the common law to the extent that, in appropriate cases, complainants in criminal matters ought to be joined as co-defendants in civil claims against the police for unlawful arrest and detention. That would require a drastic development of the ordinary requirements of delictual liability. In addition, the risk of civil liability attaching to a complainant may have a dampening effect on members of the public, discouraging the reporting of

²⁷ 2013 JDR 0994 (GNP).

²⁸ 2013 JDR 1102 (GNP)

criminal activity.

4.33. *Ashwin v The State*:²⁹ this was a criminal appeal against conviction and sentence. The candidate's judgment gives a thorough analysis of the evidence and properly applies the legal principles of its evaluation, including in relation to hearsay evidence. Judges Nicholls and Claassen concurred with the candidate's judgment.

4.34. *Vox Telecom Limited v Tobias Jermyn and others*:³⁰ this was a review of an interlocutory ruling made by an arbitrator. The candidate's judgment demonstrates a good understanding of the legal framework governing judicial review of arbitral awards. This judgment shows that the candidate is able to sit as a reviewing court, and her ability to do so is likely to be easily transferable to, for example, reviews of administrative decisions.

4.35. *Jillian Glynis Pearsal-Jones* ("the applicant") *v* *William Edwin Jones and Others*³¹ ("the respondents"): This

²⁹ A354/13

³⁰ 2012/24420

³¹ (28070/2015) [2016] ZAGPJHC 261

matter had to do with a dispute between siblings over the estates of their late parents. The applicant, being one of the siblings, brought an application, *inter alia*, to remove her brother as the Executor of the two deceased estates. The applicant also sought relief in relation to the bequests in her father's will, sought the appointment of a new Executor and various ancillary relief. The first respondent, being the applicant's brother and effectively the main respondent, consented to all of the relief in the application save for the *de bonis propriis* costs order sought against him. In the judgment the candidate dealt, comprehensively, with the requirements for the dismissal of an Executor; the requirements for the making of a costs order *de bonis propriis* and the various factual issues which were required to be dealt with in order to make the determination as to whether such a costs order should be made against the first respondent. Ultimately the candidate came to the conclusion that given both the manner in which the first respondent conducted himself and, having made a detailed analysis of this, and the fiduciary position which he occupied, that he was not liable for costs at all and ordered

the applicant to pay all of the costs associated with the application after the date of delivery of the answering affidavit, which costs included the costs for the filing of heads of argument and the hearing of the application. The judgment is, with respect, well reasoned and demonstrates an appreciation of the relevant law as referred to above.

- 4.36. *FirstRand Bank* (“the plaintiff”) *v Ntaka Leginah Ndileka*³² (“the defendant”): In this matter the defendant sought rescission of a summary judgment. She had obtained a loan from the plaintiff and a mortgage bond was passed as security for the said loan. The candidate went through various points *in limine* raised by the defendant such as the failure by the bank to annex its registration certificate with the National Credit Regulator, the personal knowledge of the deponent to the founding affidavit in the summary judgment application, and the requirements in respect of what would be required to be raised in order to succeed in those points *in limine*. The candidate then went on to consider the claim in terms of the common law dealing with the defendant’s explanation for her default in bringing

³² (48765/2010) [2012] ZAGPJHC 128

the rescission application and her prospects of success on the merits. The applicant dealt comprehensively with the relevant provisions of the National Credit Act 34 of 2004, and ultimately found that the defendant had demonstrated that she had prospects of success on the merits and accordingly granted the rescission application together with costs and ancillary relief. The relevant legal principles relating to the various issues referred to above were, with respect, comprehensively and thoroughly dealt with by the candidate.

- 4.37. *Gift Sigmango v The State*:³³ This was an appeal against a rape conviction of the appellant in the Magistrates Court. The appellant was found guilty of three counts of rape in contravention of section 3 of the Criminal Law (sexual offences and related matters) Amendment Act 32 of 2007. The candidate was one of two Judges on the bench in this matter. R E Monama J being the other Judge, who agreed with the judgment of the candidate. The candidate carefully analysed the factual and forensic evidence including the evidence of the appellant and the victim of

³³ Unreported case A74/16

the rapes and found that the appellant had been correctly convicted in the Magistrates Court. The candidate examined the various legal principles on appeal as well as the principles relating to the evidence of a single witness in a criminal trial. The forensic evidence was then evaluated. The candidate placed significant emphasis on the severity of the crime of rape and referred in this regard to *DPP North Gauteng v Tibete*.³⁴ In light of the candidate's consideration of the severity of the crime of rape and the absence of remorse of the part of the applicant, she confirmed the Magistrate's sentence of imprisonment for life.

5. **The candidate's commitment to the values of the Constitution**

5.1. There is nothing in the judgments of the candidate or in any publicly available information which suggests that the candidate is not committed to the values of the Constitution.

5.2. It is notable that the candidate appears to make a concerted

³⁴ 2011 (2) SACR 567 (SCA)

effort to deliver her judgments timeously. The judgments considered during this review were delivered within a matter of weeks. The candidate's expediency is admirable, and is a vital contribution to the proper administration of justice.

6. Whether any judgments have been overturned on appeal

6.1. The candidate reports that one of her judgments was overturned on appeal: *Old Edwardian Society v South African Securitisation Programme (RF) Ltd.*³⁵ We were unable to find a copy of the appeal judgment.

7. The extent and breadth of the candidate's professional experience

7.1. As appears from the candidate's CV, she has experience as a prosecutor and approximately 13 years' experience on the bench in the Magistrates Court. Her unreported judgments reflect a relatively wide experience of matters faced by judges and her judgments show a keen and diligent intent to deal properly and thoroughly with each

³⁵ A5021/2013 GSJ

matter before her.

7.2. The candidate is also a member of the Black Lawyers Association and the South African Chapter of the International Association of Women Lawyers. In the past, she occupied an executive role in the Judicial Officers Association of South Africa at a provincial and national level, including an appointment as National Treasurer. Her participation in these organisations demonstrates an interest in the judiciary and its racial and gender transformation.

7.3. The candidate, during May 2015, took office as the Acting Senior Magistrate and Head of Office in Roodepoort, and became Chairperson of the Advisory Board for the Small Claims Court.

8. **The candidate's linguistic and communication skills**

8.1. The judgments written by the candidate appear lucid, considered and reasoned.

9. The candidate's ability to produce judgments promptly

9.1. As already indicated, it appears that the candidate produces her judgments with admirable expediency. The majority of her unreported judgments have been delivered within days or weeks of the hearing.

10. The candidate's fairness and impartiality

10.1. There is limited material included in the application which permits of a comprehensive consideration of the candidate's fairness and impartiality. The content of the application and the judgments previously delivered by the candidate give no indication that the candidate would not act fairly and impartially as a judge.

11. The candidate's independent mindedness

11.1. There is nothing in any of the material reviewed to suggest that the candidate does not bring an independent mind to bear on cases that come before her.

12. The candidate's ability to conduct court proceedings

12.1. It is likely that with 13 years of experience on the bench in the magistrate's court and 57 weeks of acting appointments in the High Court, the candidate has the ability to conduct court proceedings.

13. The candidate's administrative ability

13.1. The candidate appears to have the necessary administrative ability.

14. The candidate's reputation for integrity and ethical behaviour ‘

14.1. Nothing in the material suggests any adverse criticism of the candidate's reputation.

15. The candidate's judicial temperament

15.1. The information reviewed supports the conclusion that the candidate has the appropriate judicial temperament.

15.2. Several advocates who have appeared before the candidate were interviewed and uniformly stated that the candidate has a good, if somewhat (justifiably) stern, approach in Court.

16. The candidate's commitment to human rights, and experience with regard to the values and needs of the community

16.1. There is nothing in the judgments of the candidate or in any publicly available information which suggests that the candidate is not committed to the advancement of human rights.

17. The candidate's potential

17.1. Based on the information and material reviewed, the candidate has potential to make a valuable contribution to the Gauteng Division of the High Court. The bench will be strengthened by a judge who has experience in trials, and who delivers her judgments with admirable expedition.

18. The message that the candidate's appointment would send to the

community at large

- 18.1. The candidate's appointment will send a positive message to the community at large, especially in light of her efficiently in delivering judgments and the greater representivity of women on the bench.

ANNEXURE: LIST OF JUDGMENTS CONSIDERED

Reported decisions

None were found

Unreported decisions

Xaba v S (A283/2012) [2013] ZAGPPHC 110 (3 May 2013)

Anastasiou and Another v Jordaan (18524/2015) [2016] ZAGPJHC 288 (31 October 2016)

Fabrinso v Road Accident Fund (3676/11) [2016] ZAGPJHC 242 (9 September 2016)

Nkwanyana v Road Accident Fund (10937/15) [2016] ZAGPJHC 241 (9 September 2016)

Masuku v The Minister of Safety and Security Police Official 49587/09: 2016 JDR 1931 (GJ)

Nimeng Beleggings (Pty) Ltd v Everdure Services and Technologies CC 2017 JDR 0609 (GP)

New Urban Plumbing CC v Carrim 32677/14: 2015 JDR 1987 (GP)

Cooper v Standard Bank of South Africa Ltd: (370/2016) [2017] ZAGPPHC 97

Mendelsohn NO v Vondo (18925/2015): [2016] ZAGJHC 339

Gafoor v Lakewood Homeowners Association: (23709/2015) [2016] ZAGPJHC 337

Ruiters KG v The Body Corporate of Vierhof: 46178/14: 2015 JDR 1887 (GP)

Lynwood Forum (Pty) Ltd v Danton Pub CC and Others: (65945/2013): 2014 JDR 1163 (GP)

De Wet v South African Securitization Programme (RF) Limited: 2016 JDR 1882 (GJ)

Rasikhinya v District Senior Manager Department of Education Limpopo Province and Others: (85/2015): 2017 JDR 0609 (GP)

SDV South Africa (Pty) Limited v Lucas Macintyre Jele Construction (Pty) Limited: 2017 JDR 0609 (GP)

Lanseria Airport 1993 Proprietary Limited v Member of the Executive Council for Local Government, Gauteng Province and Three Others: 2016 JDR 2298 (GJ): (07725/2015) [2016] ZAGPJHC

Mphefhedzi Business Enterprise CC v Members of the Executive Council Responsible for the Department of Health, Limpopo, and the Minister of Health: (2016/22705) [2016] ZAGPPHC 248

Brenton Graham Gray v Firstrand Bank: (1436/12) [2017] ZAGPPHC 98

Jillian Glynis Pearsal-Jones v William Edwin Jones and Others: (28070/2015): [2016] ZAGPJHC 261

Firstrand Bank v Ntaka Leginah Ndileka: (48765/2010): [2010] ZAGPJHC 128

Gift Sigmango v The State: Unreported case A74/16

Mokwana NO v Fakunde 2015 JDR 1245 (GP)

Felix v Firstrand Bank Limited 2015 JDR 1560 (GP)

Body Corporate of Galloway v Van Dyk 2015 JDR 1603 (GP)

Swanepoel v Van Zyl 2014 JDR 0984 (GNP)

Botes v Road Accident Fund 2014 JDR 2435 (GJ)

Adams v Road Accident Fund 31049/2011 (GJ)

S v Mhlanga 2013 JDR 0987 (GNP)

Vilakazi v Minister of Safety and Security 2013 JDR 1102 (GNP)

Ashwin v The State A354/13 (GJ)

Vox Telecom Limited v Tobias Jermyn and others 2012/24420 (GJ)

S v Ntshingila 2013 JDR 0994 (GNP)

ABSA Bank v Joubert and another (100/2016) [2016] ZAGPPHC 721 (1 April 2016): 2016 JDR 0614 (GP)

Judgments upheld on appeal

None were found

Judgments overturned on appeal

None were found, but the candidate reports that one of her judgments was overturned on appeal: *Old Edwardian Society v South African Securitisation Programme (RF) Ltd* A5021/2013 GSJ. We were unable to find the appeal judgment.