

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA
GAUTENG LOCAL DIVISION, JOHANNESBURG
TUESDAY 19TH MAY 2026**

THE DEFAULT MODE OF HEARING OF MATTERS IS IN PHYSICAL COURT

**EVEN THOUGH THE DEFAULT MODE OF HEARINGS IS PHYSICAL, JUDGES
MAY ELECT TO PROCEED VIRTUALLY**

**LITIGANTS ARE TO CONFIRM THE MANNER IN WHICH THE HEARING WILL BE
CONDUCTED WITH THE SECRETARY OF THE PRESIDING JUDGE**

**IN VIRTUAL HEARINGS, THE LINK WILL BE CREATED BY THE SECRETARY
OF THE PRESIDING JUDGE AND CIRCULATED TO THE LITIGANTS**

OPPOSED MOTION

9C BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE OPPERMAN J

TBA BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE DLAMINI J

9F BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE WILSON J

8F BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE MOGOTSI AJ

11D BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE S JOHNSON AJ

INSOLVENCY COURT

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE M VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN AJ

11E BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE MILOVANOVIC-BITTER AJ

SUMMARY JUDGMENT COURT

1A BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE TWALA J

GA BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE MOTHA J

UNOPPOSED MOTION

4E BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE MALI J

GD BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE CRUTCHFIELD J

GE BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE MVUBU AJ

URGENT APPLICATIONS

9A BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE ADAMS J

2B BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE S VAN NIEUWENHUIZEN AJ

9B BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE CARELSE AJ

INCOME TAX COURT

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE NOKO J

FAMILY COURT

11B BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE MAHOMED J

11C BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE NAIDOO AJ

SPECIAL INTERLOCUTORY COURT

Video-link BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE MAIER-FRAWLEY J

GB BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE MAHOSI J

RAF DEFAULT JUDGMENT COURT

8A BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE S KRUGER AJ

8B BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE RYNEVELDT AJ

EQUALITY COURT

11A BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE WRIGHT J
2025-005244; EQ26/2024

FULL COURT APPEALS: CIVIL

11F BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE FISHER J
AND BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE MOULTRIE J
AND BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE WENTZEL J
A2022-060819

PART-HEARD CIVIL TRIAL

6E BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE MOLAHLEHI JP

GENERAL CIVIL TRIALS

6A BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE KUMALO J

GC BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE WANLESS J

6B BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE LIEBENBERG AJ

TBA BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE MAMANYUHA AJ

TBA BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUDGE VAN ASWEGEN AJ

THE CIVIL TRIAL ROLL BEFORE MODIBA ADJP

THERE SHALL BE NO PHYSICAL TRIAL ROLL CALL.

PARTIES MUST COMPLY STRICTLY WITH THE PROVISIONS OF PARAGRAPH 19 OF THE REVISED CONSOLIDATED PRACTICE DIRECTIVE 01 OF 2024 (With effect from 26 February 2024 and amended on 12 June 2024)

LITIGANTS' ATTENTION IS DRAWN TO PARAGRAPHS 16 – 19 OF THE MEDIATION DIRECTIVE WHICH CAME INTO EFFECT ON 22 APRIL 2025 AS AMENDED ON 27 OCTOBER 2025

Regarding Practice Notes:

1. *What is envisaged is a practice note filed **shortly before the trial** after a last check on whether a trial is necessary at all, and if so, how expeditiously can it be conducted. Axiomatically this assessment can only be made shortly before trial.*
2. *In several instances, a practice note is filed months before the trial date. This is of **no value** in declaring the status quo on the eve of trial. When matters are struck off because no recent practice note was filed, parties are understandably disappointed. The **recent** practice note is critical to the optimal utilisation of court time, and it must therefore be so that it must indeed be recent.*

3. Litigants' attention is drawn to paragraphs 19.3, 19.4 and 19.5 of Practice Directive 01 of 2024 which came into effect from 26 February 2024 and which were amended on 12 June 2024. The practice note, prepared in accordance with the practice note templates annexed to the Directive must be uploaded not earlier than **7 court** days and not later than **5 court** days before the hearing set-down. If no practice note is timeously uploaded (or uploaded after the cut-off date), the matter shall automatically be removed from the roll, and the date forfeited. If the practice note is non-compliant with the practice manual or Practice Directive 01 of 2024, the matter shall be automatically removed and similarly the date forfeited. The provision shall be strictly applied.

4. LAST DATE TO SUBMIT PRACTICE NOTES: **TUESDAY, 12 MAY 2026**

JUDGES, ACTING JUDGES AND LITIGANTS ARE REMINDED OF CHAPTER 6.9 OF THE PRACTICE MANUAL DATED OCTOBER 2018

WHICH DEALS WITH THE PROCEDURE TO ENROLL PART-HEARD CIVIL TRIALS

NOTE ON CIVIL TRIALS WHERE ON THE DAY IT IS CALLED THE PARTIES ANNOUNCE A DESIRE TO SETTLE

1. Judges and Acting Judges serving in the civil trial court must be circumspect when confronted by parties who seek a stand-down to settle.
2. Valuable judicial time is squandered whilst waiting on an agreement to be produced, if at all.
3. The standard procedure is that if a trial is not ready to run at 10h00 on the set down date it should be removed with no costs order. The judge is then available to take the next case.
4. In a case where the parties do settle in that week, an agreement can be brought to the judge who was presiding for it to be made an order. If settled later, the opportunity to re-enrol it on the settlement roll on one weeks' notice remains available
5. The cases awaiting a judge's attention must not be left to linger and risk being crowded out.

The abuse by parties is particularly prevalent in RAF cases.

NUMBER ON ROLL	CASE NO	PARTIES	DATE TRIAL DATE APPLIED FOR	DATE TRIAL DATE GRANTED	ALLOCATION/ORDER GRANTED
PART A: GENERAL CIVIL TRIALS					

1.	2020/43478	SKYPROPS 54 (PTY) LTD VS CITY OF JHB METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY Plaintiff: Adv B Bhabha Defendant: Adv C van der Linde Referral to oral evidence Skyprops 54 (Pty) Ltd ("Skyprops") is the owner of a property situated at Prolecon Road, Stand 12, Prolecon, Johannesburg (<i>"the property"</i>). Skyprops became owner of the property on 18 June 2007. The property was originally owned by Proudfoot Property Investment (Pty) Ltd (<i>"Proudfoot"</i>) who then sold it to Chelete Inv (Pty) Ltd who later sold the property on to Skyprops. During June 2007, Skyprops opened an account with the City under account number 505125040. When the property was purchased – unbeknownst to Skyprops – two water meters were installed at the property, one which was replaced during September 2019. There is a dispute of fact whether the replacement meter was linked to Skyprops or Proudfoot's municipal	12/02/2026	30/03/2026	S VAN ASWEGEN AJ Secretary: Ms M Rammutedi Email: MRammutedi@judiciary.org.za
----	------------	--	------------	------------	--

		account. Proudfoot had a municipal account with the City with account number 500112143. The City's version is that since 23 September 2019 both meters have correctly been charged to Skyprops' account. Skyprops' version is that its account with the City is up to date, however, on 9 October 2020 it received a letter of demand addressed to Proudfoot for an outstanding amount of R211,711.19. The City has failed to provide Skyprops with: - a breakdown of how the amount of R211,711.19 has been calculated as well as the period over which the charges were incurred; and - an explanation as to why there are two meters on the property and why the second meter was not included on Skyprops' account when it was opened in June 2007. Skyprops brought an application in two parts. In Part A it sought interdictory relief against the City preventing it from disconnecting services to the property as a result of the disputed account and calling on the City to investigate the matter and provide a properly reconciled statement of account.			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		On 18 October 2021 the parties agreed to a consent order in respect of the relief sought by Skyprops in Part A of its application. Bezuidenhout AJ granted the consent order calling on the City to investigate and reconcile the Skyprops (505125040) and Proudfoot (500112143) accounts within 90 days. The City was also ordered to provide Skyprops with an update as to what steps were taken in accordance with the above prayers within 95 days of the date of the order. The City eventually – after ultimatums – provided a response to Skyprops on 7 March 2022. This response relied on the City’s by-laws and recalculated the alleged amount outstanding as being R214,916.48. In response to the City’s claim, Skyprops indicated: - that it rejects the method of calculation of Skyprops’ water consumption; - that it at no stage made payments towards the Proudfoot account; and - that the City had incorrectly applied the prescription periods when it sought to rely on the payment of 20 March 2020 as having interrupted prescription. Skyprops denied this payment was a tacit or explicit acknowledgement of			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		debt because the payment was made in respect of Skyprops' account with account number 505125040 and in accordance with Skyprops' water meter number 19767216 (the replacement meter) for the period 2019/09 to 2020/02/27. Although during March 2020 the replacement meter was apparently linked to Skyprops' account, the City failed to provide Skyprops with a consolidated account in respect of the water consumption preceding March 2020 setting out how the water consumption was calculated and over which period consumption had taken place, as well as which proportion of the arrears consisted out of consumption by previous owners. Skyprops alleges that the City is not entitled to any payment in respect of the Proudfoot account, <i>alternatively</i> it would only be entitled to payment of charges charged to Skyprops' account for the period of three years immediately preceding the finalisation of the application. The City's position is that Skyprops liable for unpaid water usage at the property, regardless of whose name appears on the accounts. The City launched a counter-application for arrear water consumption charges on 26 April			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		2023. This was after the applicant had enrolled Part B of the application on 28 February 2023 for hearing on the opposed motion roll on 1 May 2023. This counter-application resulted in the matter being postponed. Part B of the application as well as the counter applications was argued before Van Aswegen AJ on 20 March 2024. Judgment was handed down on 6 June 2024. In her judgment, Van Aswegen AJ held that after hearing argument there were clear discrepancies and inconsistencies in respect of the water meters on the property. Van Aswegen AJ found that certain questions arose which remained unanswered by the City. - The reason for the presence of two water meters on the property; - Which water meters were linked to which accounts and at what stage; - Why the water consumption was not included in Skyprops' account when it was opened during 2007. The City was also criticised for not being able to explain the entries on the supporting documents provided to the Court and that despite having been ordered to do so by Bezuidenhout AJ, the City failed to place adequate information relating			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		to the reconciliation of Skyprops and Proudfoot's account before the Court. Importantly, Van Aswegen AJ held that: <i>"[30] This matter is clearly one where the respondent ought to have prior to the hearing of Part B of this application spared sufficient time and energy to set up a round table with the applicant to canvass and explain all relevant documentation relating to the applicant's queries."</i> This particularly in regard to the City providing an explanation for the period over which the water consumption took place, the backdating to 23 September 2019, the explanation for the existence of two water meters on the property and which one was replaced and why there are two distinct municipal accounts under two different names. Van Aswegen AJ also acknowledged that Skyprops has a definite right to accurate and correct accounts and billing with the appropriate correct tariffs and service charges. The Court eventually concluded, however, that certain distinct issues need to be referred to oral evidence: - The difference and distinction between Skyprops (505125040) and Proudfoot's (500112143) municipal account;			
--	--	--	--	--	--

		- The reason for the existence of two water meters on the property; - Which water meters were linked to which municipal account and from which dates; - Over which period of time was water consumed and on which water meter; - The computation and calculation of the water consumption in respect of Skyprops' and Proudfoot's municipal accounts. The Court held that there was a dispute of fact but specifically held that: <i>"[54] . . . The said disputes arise mostly I believe as a result of improper and imprecise pleading by the respondent as well as the fact that the court order by Bezuidenhout AJ was not fully complied with. The respondent's half-hearted way of dealing with the applicant's dispute now culminates in disputes irrevocable on affidavits."</i> Minutes of pre-trial conference filed: 20 August 2024 Estimated duration: 2 – 3 days			
2.	2025/088212	GRAIG MTHOMBENI VS DISCOVERY INSURE LTD	30/03/2026	30/03/2026	Matter is removed from the trial roll by notice

3.	2011/35545	MAPATLE P KGATLA VS MINISTER OF POLICE	18/03/2023	25/10/2023	No practice note (as set out in paragraphs 19.3, 19.4 and 19.5 of the Judge President's Practice Directive 01 of 2024 as amended on 12 June 2024) was uploaded to the electronic file. No mediation report (annexure "D1") and Joint Minutes (annexure "D2") as set out in the Mediation Directive and Mediation Protocol of 22 April 2025 has been uploaded to the electronic file – Matter is struck off from the trial roll.
4.	2020/12150	ZANELE DITEBE OBO NGOBILE DIBETLE VS MINISTER OF POLICE	26/10/2023	31/10/2023	No practice note (as set out in paragraphs 19.3, 19.4 and 19.5 of the Judge President's Practice Directive 01 of 2024 as amended on 12 June 2024) was uploaded to the electronic file. No mediation report (annexure "D1") and Joint Minutes (annexure "D2") as set out in the Mediation Directive and Mediation Protocol of 22 April 2025 has been uploaded to the electronic file – Matter is struck off from the trial roll.

5.	2022/34625	JACOB KABAI VS MINISTER OF POLICE	19/10/2023	31/10/2023	No practice note (as set out in paragraphs 19.3, 19.4 and 19.5 of the Judge President's Practice Directive 01 of 2024 as amended on 12 June 2024) was uploaded to the electronic file. No mediation report (annexure "D1") and Joint Minutes (annexure "D2") as set out in the Mediation Directive and Mediation Protocol of 22 April 2025 has been uploaded to the electronic file – Matter is struck off from the trial roll.
6.	2022/25066	CHRISTO JACOBS VS MINISTER OF POLICE	26/10/2023	04/12/2023	Matter is removed from the trial roll by notice
7.	2016/17132	AYANDA VALENTINE TYAM VS MINISTER OF POLICE	14/08/2023	31/10/2023	Matter is removed from the trial roll – matter is settled and the settlement agreement was sanctioned on a previous occasion

8.	2024/040667	MATSHIDISO ANNAH DLAMINI-SEKGANTSHO VS ROAD ACCIDENT FUND Plaintiff: Adv Z Nyezi Defendant: Ms P Nziyanziya Estimated duration: 1 day Quantum (past and future loss of support; contingencies) Pre-trial conference: 11 October 2024; 26 February 2026	26/02/2026	08/04/2026	WANLESS J Secretary: Mr T Manganyi Email: TManganyi@judiciary.org.za
PART B: ROAD ACCIDENT FUND					
MATTERS REMOVED FROM THE ROLL BY NOTICE					
MATTERS NOT ON THE ROLL, COURT FILES ARE NOT WITH ROLL CALLING JUDGE					
1.	The civil trial roll is submitted to the Office of the Deputy Judge President by the Registrar approximately nine (09) court days before the trial date and was correct when it reached the Secretary of the Deputy Judge President.				
2.	The roll received from the registrar's office is then posted on the website of the Johannesburg Society of Advocates approximately five (05) court days before the trial date, where litigants may inspect the roll.				
3.	The failure of the registrar to include matters on the roll must be taken up with the Registrar <u>by no later than five (05) court days before the trial date</u> . For that purpose, kindly approach the registrar, Ms N Mvumbi (NMvumbi@judiciary.org.za / 010 494 8399) timeously to enquire about the enrolment.				
4.	If the registrar approves the enrolment, the matter may be enrolled and dealt with. If the registrar declines the enrolment, the parties may apply for a new trial date in terms of the existing Practice Directives.				
5.	Last-minute enquiries will not be accommodated.				