OFFICE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE

(REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA)

GAUTENG LOCAL DIVISION, JOHANNESBURG

UNOPPOSED MOTION ROLL FOR 8th MARCH 2022.

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE: OPPERMAN J **JUDGES' SECRETARY: ZTwaku@judiciary.org.za**

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE OPPERMAN

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PRESIDING JUDGE HAS DIRECTED AS FOLLOWS:

Practitioners are advised to have their case types properly classified (refer to paragraph 96 of C/D) in date requests forms & computerized notices of set down. No case type must be classified as ''Other" without specifying in line with the Uniform Rules of Court.

1. Practice Notes required in terms of paragraph 130 of the Revised – 18 September 2020 Consolidated Directive ('*the Consolidated Directive'*) and Draft Orders, in word format, must be e-mailed to ZTwaku@judiciary.org.za and to ingatwaku@gmail.com by no later than one full court day before the allocated date of the hearing.

2. All legal representatives must be available on the day of the hearing to enable the Judge to make contact about an oral hearing by video conference. In such event there must be compliance with the Unauthorised Recording Directive at the foot hereof. Should a legal representative not be contacted/released prior to 10h00 on the allocated date of the hearing, they should appear virtually at 10h00 on the allocated date.

3. All files have been frozen. The reason for freezing the files is to have control over the documents presented for filing after the cut off date. Should a party wish to file further papers before the hearing date, they are to seek the permission of the Judge via her Registrar who will, after the permission is granted, unfreeze the file to permit the uploading of the further documentation. Any party breaching this procedure may, amongst other consequences, be visited with a punitive costs order for such transgression.

4. Legal representatives are to access their Caselines files and are to ensure that a complete set of papers has been uploaded. If the papers are incomplete, the procedure set out in paragraph 3 hereof is to be followed.

5. The Judge may communicate with the parties' representatives via widely shared notes posted on the electronic file. Legal Representatives are to look out for these communications and are requested to respond to such communications.

6. Strict compliance with paragraph 6 of the Consolidated Directive will be demanded.

Unauthorised Recording Directive

7. Attention is drawn to the provisions of chapter 10.5 of the Gauteng Local Division Johannesburg Practice Manual dated October 2018 ('*the High Court Practice Manual*'), and in particular paragraph 1 thereof which provides:

> 'It is hereby emphasised that no person may film or electronically record judicial proceedings without the prior permission of the presiding Judge. The granting and the terms of any such permission is within the discretion of the presiding Judge…..'

8. Attention is further drawn to the provisions of paragraph 245 of the Consolidated Directive dealing with media access to virtual court hearings and which expressly provides that such Directive does not replace the provisions set out in the High Court Practice Manual unless a deviation is specified and then only for the duration of the national state of disaster.

Practitioners are advised to have their case types properly classified (refer to paragraph 96 of C/D) in date requests forms & computerized notices of set down. No case type must be classified as ''Other" without specifying in line with the Uniform Rules of Court.

9. In order to ensure compliance with chapter 10.5 of the High Court Practice Manual during virtual hearings and to locate potential transgressors, any person to whom access is given to participate in a virtual hearing (or who is present at a virtual hearing) (‘*the linked participant’*) is: (a) to provide a list of all who are present with them during the virtual hearing; and, (b) the linked participant is to undertake not to record or to permit any other person to record any part of the proceedings without prior thereto, obtaining the leave of the Judge in the manner prescribed in chapter 10.5 of the High Court Practice Manual.

10. Should any transgression occur in the presence of the linked participant, the linked participant is to disclose this to Judge Opperman forthwith.

11. Failure to comply with chapter 10.5 of the High Court Practice Manual may, as recorded in paragraph 7 thereof, lead to contempt of Court charges.

12. The list and undertaking contemplated in paragraph 9 hereof, is to be provided to Judge Opperman’s registrar no later than 2 hours prior to the commencement of any virtual hearing presided over by her at ztwaku@judiciary.org.za or ingatwaku@gmail.com.

13. Failure to comply with this Directive may result in the matter being removed from the roll.

Microsoft Teams meeting

Join on your computer or mobile app

Click here to join the meeting

Learn More | Meeting options

Practitioners are advised to have their case types properly classified (refer to paragraph 96 of C/D) in date requests forms & computerized notices of set down. No case type must be classified as ‘’Other” without specifying in line with the Uniform Rules of Court.

1.	NKOSINATHI KHUMALO VS THE CITY OF JOHANNESBURG METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY & THE MINISTER OF POLICE AND THE NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS	2018/28428
2.	NTHABISENG PEARL MODIADIE VS THE SOUTH AFRICAN BROADCASTING CORPORATION SOC LIMITED AND ANTHONY SOGLO	2021/37517
3.	THAPELO DAVID VS ROAD ACCIDENT FUND	2018/39025
4.	AMARAVA INNOVATION PROJECTS COACHES CC AND TWO OTHERS VS MEMBER OF THE EXECUTIVE COUNCIL GAUTENG DEPARTMENT OF SPORTS, ARTS, CULTURE AND RECREATION	2021/53726
5.	FIRSTRAND BANK LIMITED V.S GOVENDER; A	2021/7121
6.	FIRSTRAND BANK LIMITED V.S MODISE; W & MSIBI; F.M	2021/24064
7.	FIRSTRAND BANK LIMITED VS. HLUBI; C.	2021/27930
8.	FIRSTRAND BANK LIMITED VS. MNCUBE; B	2021/6595
9.	FIRSTRAND BANK LIMITED VS. SHOBA; D.J.	2021/27102
10.	NEDBANK LIMITED VS. MALAPANE; T.S.	2021 / 5378
11.	NEDBANK LIMITED VS. MPILA; K	2021/16095
12.	NEDBANK LIMITED VS. PRINSLOO; C	2021/20559
13.	NEDBANK LIMITED VS. RADASI; P	2020/5031
14.	NEDBANK LIMITED VS. VAN ZYL; R	2021/27932

Practitioners are advised to have their case types properly classified (refer to paragraph 96 of C/D) in date requests forms & computerized notices of set down. No case type must be classified as ‘’Other” without specifying in line with the Uniform Rules of Court.

15.	BRIDGE TAXI FINANCE NO 06 (PTY) LTD VS GWAYIZA; KHAYAKAZI, NOSICELO	2021/43989
16.	BRIDGE TAXI FINANCE NO 06 (PTY) LTD VS NKUNA; NYIKO, VANROY	2021/41411
17.	ABSA BANK LIMITED VS HYND JAMES MAXWELL	2019/24511
18.	TSHWANE REFINERIESS (PTY) LTD VS MANVIN RESOURCES (PTY) LTD & 6 OTHERS	2021/44820
19.	ZELPY 2058 (PTY) LTD VS WATERSRAND COMPUTER AND BUSINESS COLLEGE (PTY) LTD AND ANOTHER	2021/25269
20.	HELEN TRACY BRITZ VS GLAM DISTRIBUTION (PTY) LTD & ANMARI VAN DER WESTHUIZEN	2020/34384
21.	KOSMOS RIDGE HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION NPC VS. MODIPA N.O. & 2 OTHERS	2021/43927
22.	THE STANDARD BANK OF SOUTH AFRICA LIMITED VS WALTER JOMIYANE MOGANE	2021/47163
23.	ABSA BANK VS ABRAHAMS A	2020/33280
24.	D ABSA BANK VS M & B K NDABA	2020/1816
25.	ABSA BANK VS ALBLAS R & J V	2020/6832
26	ABSA BANK LIMITED VS JABULANI SHAUN NQINI	2020/8821
27.	ROYALE ENERGY GROUP (PTY) LTD VS N THELEDI & OTHERS	2021/40953
28.	CITY OF JOHANNESBURG METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY & ANOTHER VS BALVEST CC AND NUVUE INVESTMENTS (PTY) LTD	2021/51915
29.	EKURHULENI METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY VS GOVENDER, SIVAGAMI AND THE UNLAWFUL OCCUPIERS OF A202 DENEYS CONRADIE, BENONI	2021/36746

Practitioners are advised to have their case types properly classified (refer to paragraph 96 of C/D) in date requests forms & computerized notices of set down. No case type must be classified as ‘’Other” without specifying in line with the Uniform Rules of Court.

30.	MOGS (PTY) LTD & MOGS INTERNATIONAL (PTY) LTD VS AFRICORE ENERGY LIMITED	2021/45138
31.	JESSICA GRACE TASKER VS EBEBU PATRICK MOBWANO & ANOTHER	2021/41494
32.	TSIE, MODISAOTSILE VS BRENNER,ELINOR AND 2 OTHERS	2020/4783
33.	SBSA VS GOSANI JTJ AND 1 OTHER	2020/38651
34.	NORTHERN WHOLESALE TILES CC VS WATERSHED PROPERTIES (PTY) LTD	2021/26937
35	JUMBO PROJECTS (PTY) LTD VS MOTION SUPPLY CHAIN SOLUTIONS (PTY) LTD	2021/12620
36.	DWIGHT OGILVIE ROSSLEE/ SIPHO MAKHASANA AND GO RECOVERY (PTY) LTD	2021/18467

.

..

Practitioners are advised to have their case types properly classified (refer to paragraph 96 of C/D) in date requests forms & computerized notices of set down. No case type must be classified as ‘’Other” without specifying in line with the Uniform Rules of Court.