OFFICE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE

(REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA)

GAUTENG LOCAL DIVISION, JOHANNESBURG

UNOPPOSED MOTION ROLL FOR 23rd NOVEMBER 2021.

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

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.

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.

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…..'

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.

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.

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.

1.	ALI ZAMANPOUR VS ADRIENNE SHARON HAREBOTTLE	2021/42881
2.	BOTHMA LOUIS VS DU TOIT PIETER CHRISTIAAN & DU TOIT ALIDA	2021/7311

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.	CAPITAL PROPFUND 2 (PTY) LTD VS BLACKLIGHT HARDWARE AND FACTORY (PTY) LTD	20210/43838
4.	NEDBANK LIMITED VS DUMISANI MANDLAZI	2021/38347
5.	THE STANDARD BANK OF SOUTH AFRICA LIMITED VS PATIENCE MADIKA MOKGOTLOA	2020/37454
6.	THE STANDARD BANK OF SOUTH AFRICA LIMITED VS THE TRUSTEES FOR THE TIME BEING OF THE GREEN TRUST & TWO OTHERS	26469/2020
7.	BRIDGE TAXI FINANCE NO 06 (PTY) LTD VS KOBAI; JUSTICE, RHULANI	2021/32842
8.	BRIDGE TAXI FINANCE GJ (PTY) LTD VS NDABANA; WELLINGTON, ANDILE	2021/39061
9.	NEDBANK LTD VS KHESWA K I & CHALALE M J	2021/43842
10.	NEDBANK LTD VS MAHLONOKO M D & SOXA N	2021/43845
11.	NEDBANK LTD VS SELALA H K & D J	2021/43840
12.	NEDBANK LTD VS VAN NIEKERK M & L E	2021/43846
13.	SB GUARANTEE COMPANY (RF) PROPIETARY LIMITED VS MLUNGISI MHLUNGU	2020/39404
14.	SB GUARANTEE COMPANY (RF) PROPIETARY LIMITED VS SUMIT SATHINARAIN AND TAMARA OLIVIA MARTHA SATHINARAIN	2020/41258

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.	TRENJIL INVESTMENTS (PTY) LIMITED VS MONTECARLO MAGS AND TYRES (PTY) LTD AND OTHERS	2020/18832
17.	UNOPPOSED MOTION (SUMMARY JUDGMENT) FIRST NATIONAL BANK VS MBANA	2019/43962
18.	MOKOENA T S & M P	2017/40218
19.	NEDBANK LIMITED V DANIEL PETRUS JOHANNES VAN DER BERG (ROA)	2021/33141
20.	MOLEFI, MASABATA SARAH VS MUTLAGOMANG, REBECCA NTONG & OTHERS	2018/42470
21.	BRIDGE TAXI FINANCE GJ (PTY) LTD VS NDABANA; WELLINGTON, ANDILE	2021/39061
22.	ADV. CHARMAIN LANGUAGE N.O IN HER CAPACITY AS CURATOR AD LITEM TO FANISA ELSY MDAKA VS THE ROAD ACCIDENT FUND	2016/6796
23.	SA TAXI IMPACT FUND (RF) (PTY) LTD VS DARRIES GUSTAV RANDAL VICTOR	2020/40866
24.	SA TAXI IMPACT FUND (RF) LTD VS MANYISI, CARLITO	2020/27250
25.	POTPALE INVESTMENTS (PTY) LTD VS TSOTETSI, THAYI JOSEPH	2020/30376
26.	SA TAXI FINANCE SOLUTIONS (PTY) LTD VS NDEBELE, CHRISTOPHER DUMISANI	2020/43207
27.	ANDREW MOLATLHEGI RAMOKAKA VS THE MINISTER OF POLICE	2016/37698
28.	HLABANGANI, BELMONT SIKHUMBUZO VS THE MINISTER OF POLICE	2016/16592
29.	WILLIAM RAMONYAFI MABOKE VS THE MINISTER OF POLICE	2016/37699
30.	THE COUNCIL FOR SCIENTIFIC AND INDUSTRIAL RESEARCH VS KWAGGA HOLDINGS (PTY) LTD	2021/23495
31.	NEDBANK LIMITED VS SAAIMAN: CORNELIUS JANSEN HERMANUS AND SAAIMAN: ELAINE	2021/34328

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.

32.	NORMAN KLEYNHANS AND OLGA KLEYNHANS VS BELINDA BOSCH (PREVIOUSLY KLEYNHANS) REFERENCE	2021/30472
33.	STANDARD BANK VS JOSEPH FLAYSER	2020/27565
34.	MILAROMAX (PTY) LTD VS DSM COMMODITIES (PTY) LTD	2021/21983
35.	THE TRUSTEES FOR THE SECTIONAL TITLE KNOWN AS 108 GREENWAY VS THE CITY OF JOHANNESBURG METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY	2021/25562
36.	THEUNIS FRANS KRUGER T/A KRUGER ATTORNEYS AND CONVEYANCERS VS CHRISTINA PETRONELLA HERRMANN	2020/8447
37.	DE KLERK GE & OTHERS VS LOCKIE G & OTHERS	2021/20251
38.	ABSA BANK LIMITED VS MOLELEMANE, MAIMELA JOHANNES	2021/17383
39.	VAN NIEKERK T T/A BEARING BROTHERS VS HARRIS M	2021/6284
40.	ABSA BANK LIMITED VS MOROBE, PONTSO IRIS	2021/369
41.	ABSA BANK LTD VS PIETER JACOBUS MEIJER N.O. & 3 OTHERS	2019/17933
42.	PULEREWITZ BROTHERS AND FOUR OTHERS VS THE UNLAWFUL OCCUPIERS OF ERF 267 DOORFONTEIN TOWNSHIP	2021/37330
43.	VICKERS SHARE BLOCK COMPANY (PTY) LTD (REGISTRATION NUMBER: 1947/025172/07) VS DUBE, THEMBISILE MARTHA & TWELVE OTHERS	2021/32017
44.	ROODT, J V ROODT, T V D AND LOOTS, A	2021/21609

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.