OFFICE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE

(REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA)

GAUTENG LOCAL DIVISION, JOHANNESBURG

UNOPPOSED MOTION ROLL FOR 17th NOVEMBER 2021.

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

PLEASE NOTE THAT THE PRESIDING JUDGE HAS DIRECTED AS FOLLOWS:

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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

1.	PHILEMON M SERAGE VS THE NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS AND TWO OTHERS	2021/24628	O
2.	MARIA MAMANGISE MOTSHEGWA VS MALESELA ISAAC MOTSHEGWA AND THE REGISTRAR OF DEEDS OFFICE PRETORIA	2021/ 44679	O
3.	OMVULA MTHEMBU VS LINDIWE NDEBELE & 5 OTHERS	2021/13400	I
4.	NCN HOLDINGS (PTY) LTD VS MICRA MINING SUPPLIES(PTY) LTD	2020/42548	O

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.

5.	NEDBANK LIMITED VS SITOLE NOMALANGA	2020/19186	O
6.	NTOMBEKHAYA KHENKHE	2021/29047	O
7.	BOTHA : IVAN vs BOTHA : ANNELISE	2018/29374	T
8.	CAPE GATE (PTY) LTD & OTHERS VS ESKOM HOLDING SOC LTD & OTHERS	2018/27317	O
9.	PHILLIP CLOETE GREYLING vs PHEIN PROJECTS (PTY) LTD and 1 OTHER	2021/6731	O
10.	THE RESIDENT OF ELTRUDA COURT 64 YEOVILLE STREET,CORNER KENMERE JOHANNESBURG VS LANDSEC PROPERTY MANAGEMENT AND RENTALS	2021/45108	O
11.	SIZANIA GENERAL TRADING (PTY) LIMITED VS SEELA'S INDIAN RESTAURANT TAKEAWAY AND SPICE CAFE (PTY) LIMITEDAND SARVESH NAIDOO	2021/44840	O
12.	NEDBANK LIMITED VS MOKEFANE SIMON MOHLALA / TAPA MOHLALA	2021/01031	O
13.	JARDTAL PROPERTIES (PTY) LTD VS TSOTETSI, PROMISE THEMBISILE	2021/6106	I
14.	NEDBANK LIMITED VS GARETH HENRY THOMAS	2021/37460	O
15.			
16.	NEDBANK LIMITED V PIERE ANTHONY VAN DER MERWE	2021/30618	O

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.

17.	ABSA BANK LIMITED VS SITHEBE : ALETTA	2016/39140	O
18.	ORANGE BINS CC VS MALEBOMOSIA TRADING & PROJECTS & CIPC	2021/29268	O
19.	ORANGE BINS CC VS ENERGISE PETROLEUM (PTY) LTD & CIPC	2021/29266	O
20.	ORANGE BINS CC VS NKHI TRANSPORT CC & CIPC	2021/29267	O
21.	VUSILELA INVESTMENTS (PTY) LTD VS THE CITY OF JOHANNESBURG METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY	2020/31934	O
22.	SCHEEPERS, ELZE INGEBORG	2021/47982	B
23.	ABSA BANK LIMITED V DE KLERK, SONJA RYE	2012/29015	O
24.	ABSA BANK LIMITED V HOLA RECRUITMENT & SELECTION SERVICES (PTY) LTD	2011/21483	O
25.	ZAME JOHN CHUKWU, JOHANNA NYEMBE VS ALL UKNOWN OCCUPIERS OF THE IMMOBALE PROPERTY KNOWN AS PORTION 1 OF ERF 21, LINDEBERG TOWNSHP AD ANOTHER.	2021/24292	O
26.	ABSA BANK LIMITED V MDLALOSE, SIBUSELAPHI ERIC & ANOTHER	2014/00680	O
27.	ABSA BANK LIMITED V MIA, MOHAMMED IQBAL & ANOTHER	2009/24961	O
28.	ANDERSON, MICHAEL STUART VS CHIMUCHERE, GIDEON WILLIAM CHATAIKA	2021/20852	I

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.

29.	KEKANE LETTA NTILI VS UNLAWFUL OCCUPIERS DORIS MONARENG AND ANOTHER	2020/016	O
30.	GUNTHER BECKER VS BRENDA MAY STERN AND 2 OTHERS	2021/43060	O
31.	LUTENDO CYNTHIA MPFUNI VS SEGWAPA INC AND ANOTHER	6574/2021	O
32.	VANESSA DE JAGER (HEREIN REPRESENTING CHRIST EMBASSY) VS FOUZI BACHIRI & M.T BACHIRI AND REGISTRAR OF DEEDS	2021/30138	O
33.	SB GUARANTEE COMPANY (RF) PROPRIETARY LIMITED VS MOYO: MOSIMA MOSES	2021/14612	O
34.	SCOREPROPS 25 (PTY) LTD (REGISTRATION NUMBER: 1995/013676/07) VS MASHITISHO, JOSEPH	2021/43965	I

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.

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.