GAUTENG DIVISION OF THE HIGH COURT, JOHANNESBURG
Chambers of Du Plessis J | Office No: 1107
Tel: (010) 494 8556 | Email: MMoolman@judiciary.org.za

DIRECTIVE: URGENT COURT BEFORE DU PLESSIS J

URGENT WEEK: 24 TO 31 JULY 2026

All practitioners appearing in the urgent court during this week are required to familiarise themselves with the terms of this directive, read together with the Practice Manual of this Division and any directives issued by the Judge President or the Deputy Judge President governing the urgent court.

1. UNOPPOSED MATTERS

- All unopposed matters enrolled on the urgent roll will be heard in open court on Tuesday, 28 July 2026, at 10h00, unless the roll or the court directs otherwise.
- Practitioners must ensure that all papers are properly issued, served, and fully uploaded onto CaseLines before the hearing.
- A draft order, in an editable (Word) format, must be filed electronically and emailed to **mmoolman@judiciary.org.za**, and a hard copy must be available at the hearing.
- Where a matter becomes opposed after enrolment, this must be communicated without delay to **mmoolman@judiciary.org.za**. The matter will then be allocated a hearing slot in accordance with paragraph 2 below.

2. OPPOSED MATTERS

- Opposed urgent matters will be allocated specific hearing times during the week, as reflected in the roll at paragraph 4. All matters will be heard in open court, unless a party seeks, and is granted, leave for a matter to be dealt with otherwise.
- Every opposed matter must be accompanied by a concise practice note and a draft order, both filed on CaseLines and emailed to **mmoolman@judiciary.org.za**. The practice note must, at minimum, set out:
  - the nature of the relief sought;
  - a brief summary of the material facts and the principal legal issues;
  - the basis upon which urgency is alleged, addressed with express reference to Uniform Rule 6(12)(b);
  - an indication of which parts of the record the court should read;
  - the estimated duration of argument; and
  - the names and full contact details of all legal representatives.

3. CASELINES / COURT ONLINE TECHNICAL PROBLEMS

Practitioners requiring technical assistance with Court Online or the CaseLines evidence-management system should contact the Court Online Helpdesk on 010 493 2600. Training material and FAQs are available on the Judiciary's official Court Online website.

4. ROLL: URGENT MATTERS – WEEK OF 24 TO 31 JULY 2026

The matters enrolled for hearing before Du Plessis J for this urgent week are set out below, and contain information as on Thursday 23 July 2026 at 20:00

No.	Case Number	Parties' Names	Date of Hearing	Comments
2 x	2026-170161	AGEZE KABADE V. THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No file on CaseLines
5 x	2026-169910	ARP RISK AVERSE (PTY) LTD V. KHASHANI COLLIERY (PTY) LTD	Wednesday, 29 July 2026 14:00	Wednesday, 29 July 2026 14:00 - 15:30
8 x	2026-173366	BINHAM EINDISAYS V. MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	Unopposed
11 x	2026-168537	BULKLINK SOLUTIONS (PTY) LTD V. SEBEGO MINERAL RECOVERY (PTY) LTD	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	Unopposed (Settlement)
14 x	2026-174225	CREDIT GUARANTEE INSURANCE CORPORATION OF AFRICA LIMITED	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No practice note (Ex Parte)
17 x	2026-168349	DANIEL PHAKATHI V. THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS AND OTHER	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No file on CaseLines
20 x	2026-099853	DUNISANI WINNIE MKHABELE V. ROAD ACCIDENT FUND	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	Notice of withdrawal
23	2026-174613	ERGUDO BEKELE AHSENATE V. THE DEPARTMENT OF HOME AFFAIRS	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No Practice Note
26 x	2026-173415	FON ZENO CHE V. THE IMMIGRATION OFFICER-IN-CHARGE (LINDELA REPATRIATION CENTRE)	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	Unopposed
29 x	2026-132726	GOSCOR FINANCE (PTY) LTD V. IS BUILDERS SUPPLIERS (PTY) LTD	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	Unopposed
32 x	2026-170180	JOHANNES ERJABO V. THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No file on CaseLines
35 x	2026-158967	KEYLOOP V. MARTHINUS PRINSLOO	Wednesday, 29 July 2026 10:00	Wednesday, 29 July 2026 10:00 - 13:00
38 x	2026-174639	LOBA DENESE FETABO V. THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	Removed by Notice
41 x	2026-174667	MAJARA CORNELL MONYAKE V. THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS AND OTHERS	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No file on CaseLines
44 x	2026-141161	MICOR A DIVISION OF SUPER GROUP TRADING (PTY) LTD T/A SG TRADE FINANCE V. BEARING SERVICES (AFRICA) (PTY) LTD	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	Ex Parte

47	2026-173319	NCEBA SIMPHIWE NOSENGA V. DUNCANVILLE INDUSTRIAL BODY CORPORATE	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No papers on Caselines
50	2026-166419	RENTA PLETT V. GARY ABKIN	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No papers on Caselines
53	2026-174896	SHUKRALA SAID TEMSGEN V. THE DEPARTMENT OF HOME AFFAIRS	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No Practice Note
56 x	2026-174889	TELESE BERSLY V. THE DEPARTMENT OF HOME AFFAIRS	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No file on CaseLines
59 x	2026-174999	THOMAS HAZIE V. DEPARTMENT OF HOME AFFAIRS	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No file on CaseLines
62 x	2026-174717	TSAKANE AMOS GUAMBE V. THE MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No file on CaseLines
65 x	2026-176088	DIGAFU KASSA V. DEPARTMENT OF HOME AFFAIRS	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No file on CaseLines
68	2026-176175	MARTINS ONYEKA MMOUNYILO V. THE DEPARTMENT OF HOME AFFAIRS	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No Practice Note
71	2026-175984	AMBER LEIGH FARBER V. THEODORE VAN DEN HEEVER	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	Opposed (NIO) No Practice Notes
74 x	2026-176298	ONAI MUPFUNGURI V. COMIT CAPITAL (PTY) LTD	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No practice note
77 x	2026-176397	MFANUFIKILE N/A DAZA V. MINE HEALTH AND SAFETY COUNCIL (MHSC)	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No file on CaseLines
80 x	2026-176500	EMMANUEL KALU V. MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No file on CaseLines
83 x	2026-176401	ADEWALE JACOB ODELABI V. MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No file on CaseLines
86 x	2026-176497	MOSHOPYADI MAJA V. GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES PENSION FUND	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No practice note
89 x	2026-176557	SOUTH HILLS COMBINED SCHOOL (PTY) LTD V. CALOVOX PROPERTIES (PTY) LTD	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No file on CaseLines
92 x	2026-176531	TIMOTHY CHUKWUOKE V. MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS	Tuesday, 28 July 2026 10:00	No file on CaseLines

5. URGENCY

This paragraph is issued to remind practitioners of the requirements governing the urgent roll, consistently with the Notice on behalf of the Deputy Judge President of this Division to the profession and with the authorities on Uniform Rule 6(12).

5.1 Is the matter genuinely urgent?

The discretion conferred by Uniform Rule 6(12)(a) to dispense with the forms and service prescribed by the Rules exists to ensure that a litigant who cannot obtain substantial redress at a hearing in due course is not left without recourse. It is not a convenience to be invoked because a party, or an anxious client, would prefer an earlier hearing (*Luna Meubel Vervaardigers (Edms) Bpk v Makin and Another (t/a Makin's Furniture Manufacturers)* 1977 (4) SA 135 (W) at 137B–F). The test is whether the applicant can be afforded substantial redress in an application in the ordinary course; if he or she can, the matter does not belong on the urgent roll (*East Rock Trading 7 (Pty) Ltd and Another v Eagle Valley Granite (Pty) Ltd* [2011] ZAGPJHC 196 paras [6]–[9]). This discipline is for practitioners to apply before enrolment; it is not the function of the urgent court to perform it for them.

No category of claim enjoys inherent urgency. As Wilson J held in *Volvo Financial Services Southern Africa (Pty) Ltd v Adamas Tkolose Trading CC* [2023] ZAGPJHC 846, save where a statute prescribes otherwise, urgency is determined by the circumstances in which an applicant seeks adjudication, not by the nature of the right asserted. The point applicable across this roll is that a matter is urgent because of the imminence and depth of harm the applicant will suffer absent relief, not because of the category of right asserted.

5.2 State the case for urgency explicitly

An applicant must, in a distinct portion of the founding affidavit, set forth explicitly the circumstances relied upon as rendering the matter urgent, and the reasons why substantial redress cannot be obtained in the ordinary course (Uniform Rule 6(12)(b); *Luna Meubel* supra at 137). Where there has been delay in approaching the court, that delay must be explained. Delay is not fatal in itself. It may, for example, reflect genuine attempts to settle, or the practical difficulties of obtaining instructions and evidence from a distance, but an unexplained delay will count heavily against the applicant (*East Rock Trading* supra paras [8]–[9]; *Twentieth Century Fox* supra at 586G–587B).

5.3 Enrolment

Enrolment on any other day than the Thursday-for-Tuesday, or filing after that deadline, requires the prior leave of a judge, sought and obtained on the basis of exceptional circumstances; it is not a matter of counsel's or the client's convenience. The degree of relaxation of the ordinary Rules and practice permitted must not exceed what the true exigency of the case demands, assessed on the graduated scale set out in *Luna Meubel* supra at 158–159.

5.4 Time frames imposed on the respondent

Applicants must allow the respondent a reasonable and realistic period within which to file answering papers, having regard to the nature and complexity of the relief sought. Where an abridged timetable is proposed, the founding affidavit must justify the particular truncation adopted; mere assertion of urgency does not justify any and every abridgement (*Luna Meubel* supra at 158).

Where answering papers reach the court only shortly before the hearing, the presiding judge is deprived of a proper opportunity to prepare, which materially prejudices the fair and efficient disposal of the roll for all litigants that week, not only the parties before the court.

5.6 The urgent roll as a queue to be jumped

Practitioners who enrol matters that are not genuinely urgent, who fail to justify the abridgement of time limits actually adopted, or who file papers that do not comply with this directive, expose their clients (and, in appropriate cases, themselves) to adverse costs orders, including costs *de bonis propriis* and orders precluding recovery of fees from the client. A matter that is not properly enrolled is liable to be struck from the roll for want of proper enrolment, leaving the applicant to enrol it afresh in the ordinary course (*Luna Meubel* supra at 160–161).