OFFICE OF THE CHIEF JUSTICE

(REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA)

GAUTENG LOCAL DIVISION, JOHANNESBURG

UNOPPOSED MOTION ROLL FOR 25th 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.	SIPHO MTSHALI VS THE ROAD ACCIDENT FUND	2020/42425
2.	EDEMO NAHOM TEGEGN ASSISTED BY HIS MOTHER – GEBREWOLD HIRUT BIRHANU VS. THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS & 3 OTHERS	2021/39890
3.	EDEMO NAOD TEGEGN ASSISTED BY HIS MOTHER – GEBREWOLD HIRUT BIRHANU VS. THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS & 3 OTHERS.	2021/39889

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.

4.	EDEMO NATHAN TEGEGN ASSISTED BY HIS MOTHER – GEBREWOLD HIRUT BIRHANU VS. THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS AND THREE OTHERS.	2021/39888
5.	MUGHAIL QAISER ABBAS ; ASSITED BY HIS WIFE: SABIR SAMRA VS THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS & 2 OTHERS	2020/44249
6.	NEDBANK V THEMA, FRANK	2019/9762
7.	NEDBANK V THEMA, FRANK	2019/28887
8.	BUFFET INVESTMENT SERVICES(PTY)LTD V COUNTER ACT DEVELOPMENT (PTY) LTD	2019/31234
9.	ALINA LERATO TLALE VS LERATO ANGELA KOKI AND IRENE MARLENE WELLING- BEKKER AND MASTER OF THE HIGH COURT JOHANNESBURG AND MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS	2020/21535
10.	ELIZABETH JEAN BARNES (NEE WARREN) VS TAMSIN GRAY AND 2 OTHERS	2020/15823
11.	SA TAXI DEVELOPMENT FINANCE (PTY) LTD VS MALAHLELA MASEDI BRONID	2021/15826
12.	DAXIWARE CC VS MJS TURBO SERVICES (PTY) LTD & 2 OTHERS	2021/43486
13.	ERNEST MKHWANAZI VS MINISTER OF POLICE AND NDPP	2019/34116
14.	ERICA GOEHRE (BORN NEASHAM) V BJORN GOEHRE	2021/38856
15.	:FIRSTRAND BANK LIMITED TRADING AS WESBANK VS SHEMBE, KEVIN ZOLA	2021/13093
17.	POTPALE INVESTMENTS (PTY) LTD VS MAKGAREETSE, MORANCHI ALAN	2021/1627
18.	POTPALE INVESTMENTS (RF) (PTY) LTD VS MASOABI, MMATEBOGO LISBET	2021/12793

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.

19.	MOTINGOE, STEPHEN TEBOHO AND MOTINGOE, SIBONGILE VICTORIA PATRICIA VS MATUMBA, MASHUDU AND MEMADZIVHANANI, LUVHENGO AND UNLAWFUL OCCUPIERS OF ERF 3966 CHIAWELO EXTENSION 2 TOWNSHIP, AND CITY OF JOHANNESBURG	2019/43920
20.	EX PARTE THANGELANE, BUYISWA THELMA	2020/1053
21.	THE BODY CORPORATE OF LOS ALAMOS NORTE VS MASHILO, SHADRACK SEBOLA & OTHERS	2020/30469
22.	FIRSTRAND AUTO RECEIVABLES (RF) LTD VS MANI JEREMIA KUMALO	2021/26494
23.	FIRSTRAND BANK LIMITED T/WESBANK VS. BLACK, WALTER DANILO FONSECA	2021/18909
24.	FIRSTRAND BANK LIMITED VS KHUMALO NTOMBI VALENCIA	2020/21320
25.	FIRSTRAND BANK LIMITED VS ZULU CHRISTOPHER	2020/9632
26.	GIFT MAPHOSA VS MINISTER OF POLICE AND NATIONAL PROSECUTION AUTHORITY	2019/12100
27.	GORDON JOHANNES CHRISTOFFEL VS RAF	2020/18548
28.	ABSA BANK LIMITED VS ENASNI EXPRESS (PTY) LTD AND TERTIUS BART KUIJERS	2021/44094
29.	ABSA BANK LIMITED VS INTERCON CIVILS (PTY) LTD AND ANELISA UITHALER	2021/44092
30.	ERNST & YOUNG ADVISORY SERVICES (PTY) LTD VS TSING CAPITAL (AUSTRALIA) (PTY) LTD	2021/46511
31.	SIDWELL NGUZWANA VS MARTHINUS JOHANNES FEREIRA AND OTHERS	2017/27807
32.	MEYBURGH, WILLEM VS 331 UKHWAKHA PROJECTS (PTY) LTD & ANOTHER	2021/44300
33.	BVB GROUP (PTY) LTD VS LEONARD, WERNER EDWARD	2021/50794

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.

34.	PETER L RABOLELE & ANOTHER VS MRS M S BAYAS & ANOTHER	2014/45269
35.	STEFAN MILLS VS MARIA ELIZABETH MILLS	2020/7990
36.	THE STANDARD BANK OF SA LIMITED VS TAKALANI COLLEN TSILIGI AND MALITABA ALINA TSILIGI	2019/32154
37.	WIEDERHOLD, JFA VS DALBY, SM	2021/52444
38.	NOKUTLA LUCY NTINTILI VS CITY OF JOHANNESBURG METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY	2015/00788
39.	ABSA BANK LTD VS LOMBAARD, L	2020/27947
40.	MONDLI PEABOY LUTHULI VS TRUIU MARGARET MTSHWENI & MARIA MTSHWENI & PHILLEMON BOY MTSHWENI	2021/36155
41.	ABSA BANK LTD & ANOTHER VS CARLSON, JUAN & ANOTHER	2020/6206
42.	XITEREKA NOEL MAKHUBELE -APPLICANT VS VOLUNTARY SURRENDER OF HIS ESTATE	2021/41523

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.