

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA
(GAUTENG DIVISION, PRETORIA)**

In the matter between:

Case number: 51546/2021

**DAVID CHRISTIAAN BOTHA
(ID 631007 5105 087)**

Applicant

and

SHERIFF PRETORIA SOUTH EAST

First Respondent

**THE STANDARD BANK OF SOUTH AFRICA
LIMITED**

Second Respondent

CITY OF TSHWANE

Third Respondent

VELILE TINTO INCORPORATED

Fourth Respondent

CYNTHIA DU PLESSIS

Fifth Respondent

LEGAL PRACTICE COUNCIL

Sixth Respondent

WANDEL PARK BODY CORPORATE

Seventh Respondent

COMMUNITY SCHEMES OMBUD SERVICES

Eighth Respondent

PASTOR TOM JOOSTE

Ninth Respondent

NICO FRANCOIS BOTHA

Tenth Respondent

REVEREND PETER MALAN

Eleventh Respondent

FINANCIAL SECTOR CONDUCT AUTHORITY

Twelfth Respondent

HENDRIK SAAYMAN	Thirteenth Respondent
NG MORELETA KERK	Fourteenth Respondent
NG KERK	Fifteenth Respondent
MOIRA ELIZABETH RETIEF	Sixteenth Respondent
LEON MALAN	Seventeenth Respondent
MIRIÉ TALJAARD	Eighteenth Respondent
SURITA KILIAN MARAIS	Nineteenth Respondent
ADV BERTI BLOM	Twentieth Respondent
HELENA VAN EMMENIS	Twenty-first Respondent
CHRISTELIKE MAATSKAPLIKE RAAD	Twenty-second Respondent
COMMISSIONER SARIE SNYMAN	Twenty-third Respondent
MAGISTRATE COMMISSION	Twenty-fourth Respondent
PRETORIA BAR	Twenty-fifth Respondent
CAPE TOWN BAR	Twenty-sixth Respondent
AFRIFORUM	Twenty-seventh Respondent
REGISTRAR OF DEEDS	Twenty-eighth Respondent

FOUNDING AFFIDAVIT

I, the undersigned,

DAVID CHRISTIAAN BOTHA

do hereby declare under oath as follows:

1.

1.1 I am an adult male, business owner and the legal owner of residential property known as Unit No 1, Wandel Park, 522 Alsatian Drive, Garsfontein Extension 8, Pretoria.

1.2 The facts deposed to in this affidavit fall within my personal knowledge save where the context indicates otherwise and are both true and correct and I respectfully submit that I am competent to make this affidavit.

2.

THE APPLICANT:

2.1 The Applicant is **DAVID CHRISTIAAN BOTHA**, an adult male and insurance broker who practices as such at Unit No 1, Wandel Park, 522 Alsatian Drive, Garsfontein Extension 8, Pretoria.

3.

RESPONDENTS:

3.1 The First Respondent is the **SHERIFF PRETORIA SOUTH EAST** is an impartial and independent official of the Court appointed by the Minister of Justice and Correctional Services and sited at 1281 Stanza Bopape Street, Hatfield, Pretoria, 0028. Its official email address according to its website is contacts@sheriffs.org.za.

3.2 The Second Respondent is **THE STANDARD BANK OF SOUTH AFRICA LIMITED**, a financial services provider in terms of the Financial Advisory and Intermediary Services Act and a registered credit provider in terms of the national credit act, **registration number NCRCP 15** and is sited at 5 Simmonds Street, Selby, Johannesburg, 2001. Its official email address according to its website is Reportfraud@standardbank.co.za and information@standardbank.co.za

3.3 The Third Respondent is the **CITY OF TSHWANE METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY** and is classified as a Category A municipality by the Municipal Demarcation Board in terms of Section 4 of the Local

Government: Municipal Structures Act, 1998 (Act 117 of 1998) and forms the local government of Northern Gauteng Province, South Africa and is sited at Tshwane House, 320 Madiba Street, Pretoria. Its official email address according to its website is customercare@tshwane.gov.za and bylawenforcementcenter@tshwane.gov.za and selbyb@tshwane.gov.za and azwhangwisim@tshwane.gov.za and katlegomathebe@tshwane.gov.za and maureenmo@tshwane.gov.za and bantihoilem@tshwane.gov.za.

3.4 The Fourth Respondent is **VELILE TINTO & ASSOCIATES INCORPORATED** is a law firm which offers an extensive range of attorney and conveyancing services to banks, property owners, insurance companies, and buyers and is sited at Tinto House, Disselboom Avenue, Wapadrand, Pretoria East, 0050. Its official email address according to its website is info@tintolaw.co.za.

3.5 The Fifth Respondent is **CYNTHIA DU PLESSIS** is an adult female attorney whom currently practices as an Associate at VFV Attorneys in the conveyancing department which is sited at Corporate Place, Block A, 39 Selati Street, Ashlea Gardens, Pretoria. Its official email address according to its official website is info@vfv.co.za. Cynthia du Plessis' official email address according to the website of VFV Attorneys is cynthia@vfv.co.za.

- 3.6 The Sixth Respondent is the **LEGAL PRACTICE COUNCIL**, a national statutory body established in terms of section 4 of the Legal Practice Act, Number 28 of 2014 and is sited at Thornhill Office Park, Building 20, 94 Bekker Road, Vorna Valley, Midrand, 0002. Its official email address according to its website is info@lpc.org.za.
- 3.7 The Seventh Respondent is **WANDEL PARK BODY CORPORATE**, a residential sectional title scheme and registered in terms of section 29 of the Sectional Titles Act 95 of 1986 and is cited at 522 Alsatian Drive, Garsfontein, Pretoria. The residential complex exists of 10 (ten) unit and is managed by an Executive Management Agent, Mr Riaan Oosthuysen Attorneys Incorporated, trading as OPROPSA Attorneys whom is sited at 10 Humpata Street, Erasmuskloof, Pretoria, 0181. Its official email address according to its website is riaan@lawyersa.com, anesh@lawyersa.com and ester@lawyersa.com.
- 3.8 The Eighth Respondent is the **COMMUNITY SCHEMES OMBUD SERVICES**, a national, statutory body and established in terms of section Community Schemes Ombud Service Act 9 of 2011 and sited at Building 4, Berkley Office Park, 8 Bauhinia Street, Highveld Techno Park, Centurion. Its official email address according to its official website is info@csos.org.za.

- 3.9 The Ninth Respondent is **PASTOR (Dr) T.I.M JOOSTE**, a Reverent at Novus Vita Christian Church and sited at 893 Tiptol Street, Silverton, Pretoria, 0184. His official email addresses according to the Novus Vita Christian Church website are timjooste@webmail.co.za and tim.jooste@novuvita.co.za.
- 3.10 The Tenth Respondent is **NICO FRANCOIS BOTHA** and the eldest brother of the Applicant and currently dwelling in Pretoria. His personal email address is nico.botha.954@gmail.com.
- 3.11 The Eleventh Respondent is **REVEREND PETER MALAN** is employed as an estate agent by Index Property Solutions and sited at Elaleni Coastal Forest Estate, Sheffield Beach, Ballitoville, Kwa Zulu Natal. His official email addresses according to the Novus Vita website is peter@3d-acts.com and Index Property Solutions is info@indexproperty.co.za.
- 3.12 The Twelfth Respondent is the **FINANCIAL SECTOR CONDUCT AUTHORITY** is a financial regulatory body and is established in terms of the Financial Sector Regulation Act 9 of 2017 and is sited at 41 Matroosberg Road, Ashlea Gardens, Pretoria. 0002. Its official email

addresses according to its website is fscacommunications@fsca.co.za and fsca@behonest.co.za.

3.13 The Thirteenth Respondent is **REVEREND HENDRIK SAAYMAN** is an adult male and employed by NG Moreleta Kerk and sited at 1353 De Villaboys Mareuil Avenue, Moreletapark, Pretoria. Its email address according to its official website is info@moreleta.co.za.

3.14 The Fourteenth Respondent is the **NEDERDUITSE GEREFORMEERDE MORELETA KERK** and is sited at 1353 De Villaboys Mareuil Avenue, Moreletapark, Pretoria. Its email address according to its official website is info@moreleta.co.za.

3.15 The Fifteenth Respondent is the **NEDERDUITSE GEREFORMEERDE KERK** and is the governing body of all NG Kerke and sited at the corner of Shoba and Pretorius Streets. Its email addresses according to its official website are algemenesinode@ngkerk.org.za and info@ngkerk.org.za.

3.16 The Sixteenth Respondent is **MOIRA ELIZABETH RETIEF** is an adult female and residing at Lion Street, Monument Park, Pretoria. Her official email address is not available.

- 3.17 The Seventeenth Respondent is **LEON MALAN** is an adult male attorney whom currently practices at Malan & Mohale Attorneys and is sited at 462 Julius Jeppe Street, Waterkloof, Pretoria, 0181. Its official email address according to its website is leon@malanmohalelaw.co.za.
- 3.18 The Eighteenth Respondent is **MIRIÉ TALJAARD** is an adult female practicing as a child psychologist. Her official email address is leon@malanmohalelaw.co.za.
- 3.19 The Nineteenth Respondent is **SURITA KILIAN MARAIS** is an adult female attorney whom currently practices at Surita Marias Attorneys sited at 755 Park Street, Sunnyside, Pretoria, 0002. Her official email address according to her website is admin@suritamarais.co.za.
- 3.20 The Twentieth Respondent is **ADV BERTI BLOM** is an adult male advocate practicing under the Cape Town Bar and sited at Ground Floor, Huguenot Chambers, 40 Queen Victoria Street, Cape Town, 8001. Its official email address according to its official is cbc@capebar.co.za.

- 3.21 The Twenty-first Respondent is **HELENA VAN EMMENIS** is an adult female social worker stationed at NG Moreleta Kerk. Her email address is info@cmroos.co.za and henda@cmroos.co.za.
- 3.22 The Twenty-second Respondent is the **CHRISTELIKE MAATSKAPLIKE RAAD** and a national statutory body and sited at 430 Quebec Street, Faerie Glen, Pretoria, 0043. Its official email address according to its website is info@cmroos.co.za and henda@cmroos.co.za.
- 3.23 The Twenty-third Respondent is **COMMISSIONER SARIE SNYMAN** and had retired. Her address is MiNiewoudt@justice.gov.za.
- 3.24 The Twenty-fourth Respondent is the **MAGISTRATE COMMISSION** is a national statutory body and sited at 5th Floor, 266 Center Walk Building (West Tower) corner of Thabo Sehume & Pretorius Streets, Pretoria. Its official email address according to its website is MiNiewoudt@justice.gov.za.
- 3.25 The Twenty-fifth Respondent is the **PRETORIA BAR** is sited at Ground Floor, Brooklyn Bridge Office Park, Stevens House, 570 Fehrsen Street,

Pretoria. No official email address according to its website is available and therefore will the court notice be delivered by hand.

3.26 The Twenty-sixth Respondent is the **CAPE TOWN BAR** is sited at Ground Floor, Huguenot Chambers, 40 Queen Victoria Street, Cape Town, 8001. Its official email address according to its website is cbc@capebar.co.za.

3.27 The Twenty-seventh Respondent is **AFRIFORUM** is a civil rights movement and cited at 58 Union Avenue, Kloofsig, Centurion. Its official email address according to its website is afriforum@afriforum.co.za.

3.28 The Twenty-eighth Respondent is the **REGISTRAR OF DEEDS** is a national statutory body and sited at Merino Building, 140 Pretorius Street, Pretoria, 0001. No official email address according to its website is available and therefore will the court notice be delivered by hand.

THE NATURE AND PURPOSE OF THIS APPLICATION:

4.1 In this application, the Applicant seeks the following *interim* interdicts:

4.1.1 restraining the Twenty-eighth Respondent from approving the transfer of the immovable property of the Applicant under the warrant of execution and sale in execution orders of 13 SEPTEMBER 2022, Case Number 51546/2021, and the foreclosure sale on 28 FEBRUARY 2023 over the immovable property of the Applicant as described in the Notice of Motion application, as attached hereto under annexure 'A';

4.1.2 restraining the Second Respondent and their legal representatives:

- (i) from conspiring against the Applicant;
- (ii) from subjecting the Applicant to fraudulent legal actions;
- (iii) from lessening or preventing enterprises of the Applicant;

4.1.3 restraining the Third Respondent and their legal representatives:

- (i) from interrupting or disconnecting the electricity supply to the dwelling of the Applicant;
- (ii) from conspiring against the Applicant;

- (iii) from subjecting the Applicant to fraudulent legal actions;
- (iv) from lessening or preventing enterprises of the Applicant;

4.1.4 restraining the Fourth Respondent and its legal representatives:

- (i) from conspiring against the Applicant;
- (ii) from lessening or preventing enterprises of the Applicant;

4.1.5 restraining the Fifth Respondent and their legal representatives:

- (i) from conspiring against the Applicant;
- (ii) from subjecting the Applicant to fraudulent legal actions;
- (iii) from lessening or preventing enterprises of the Applicant;

4.1.6 restraining the Seventh Respondent and their legal representatives:

- (i) from conspiring against the Applicant;
- (ii) from subjecting the Applicant to fraudulent legal actions;
- (iii) from breaching or tampering with the security at their premises;

- (iv) from obstructing the Applicant to gain access to his dwelling;
- (v) from tampering with the electricity and water supply to the dwelling of the Applicant;
- (vi) from invading the privacy of the Applicant;
- (vii) from lessening or preventing enterprises of the Applicant;

4.1.7 restraining the Ninth Respondent:

- (i) from conspiring against the Applicant;
- (ii) from invading the privacy of the Applicant;
- (iii) from lessening or preventing enterprises of the Applicant;

4.1.8 restraining the Tenth Respondent:

- (i) from conspiring against the Applicant;
- (ii) from invading the privacy of the Applicant;
- (iii) from lessening or preventing enterprises of the Applicant;

4.1.9 restraining the Eleventh Respondent:

- (i) from conspiring against the Applicant;

- (ii) from invading the privacy of the Applicant;

4.1.10 restraining the Sixteenth Respondent:

- (i) from conspiring against the Applicant;
- (ii) from invading the privacy of the Applicant;
- (iii) from lessening or preventing enterprises of the Applicant;

4.1.11 restraining the Twentieth Respondent:

- (i) from conspiring against the Applicant;
- (ii) from invading the privacy of the Applicant;
- (iii) from lessening or preventing enterprises of the Applicant;

pending the outcome of Part B of the Notice of Motion in this application.

- 4.2 As a result of the degree of urgency service for purposes of this application is effected by email and delivery by hand on the respondents. Where email addresses are used, the email addresses of responsible persons concerned were established by the Applicant.

- 4.3 The events which give rise to this application occurred against the background of certain earlier events.

Virtual Hearing

- 4.4 On 8 SEPTEMBER 2022 at 10h00, the Applicant had for the first time responded, in attending the virtual court hearing, of the uncontested by the Applicant, court action brought by the Second Respondent, since FEBRUARY 2019, after the Applicant had been abstaining to engage in the fraudulent legal actions by the Second Respondent, since the Second Respondent had conspired with the Fourth and Fifth Respondents on or about 2009. During the virtual court hearing, the Applicant had, at the High Court Pretoria, met with the council for the Second Respondent, Advocate H Marais, whom had seemed to the Applicant, to be unable to suppress his the almost childlike excitement, from the Applicant whom had finally responded, after having abstained since FEBRUARY 2019, to engage in the fraudulent litigation and deceitful bargaining by the Second Respondent and that the Council Marais had finally been the man to conclude the fraudulent intent by the Second Respondent since 2009.
- 4.5 The sale in execution order granted to the Second Respondent on 8 SEPTEMBER 2022, over the immovable property of the Applicant, as

described in the Notice of Motion application hereto under paragraph 2.1, had fraudulently been obtained in that:

Fraud and Perjury

4.5.1 the Second Respondent had committed fraud and perjury in having declared under oath, that a telephone conversation had taken place on, 17 MARCH 2022, between the Applicant and Lucinda Jones, the secretary of Vesi & De Beer Incorporated on record of the Second Respondent and that the Applicant had said: “he (the Applicant) is aware of the arrears on his bond account, however cannot commit to an arrangement at this moment. He (the Applicant) is aware of the court date being 5 APRIL 2022 – he (the Applicant) advised that we (the Second Respondent) should proceed & do what we (the Second Respondent) need to do”. Both declarations are false and constitute perjury, as declared in the Supplementary Affidavit by Nicolette Crous-Nel and Confirmatory Affidavit by Lucinda Jones, respectively attorney and secretary of Vesi & De Beer Incorporated, as noted per Default Judgement application on 11 FEBRUARY 2022, per Notice of Set Down application, Case Number 51546/2021, on 15 JULY 2022, as attached hereto under annexure ‘B’.

Fraud and Perjury

4.5.2 the Second Respondent had also committed fraud and perjury in having misrepresented the, 204 (two hundred and four) telephone calls, the 3 (three) attempts by their legal representatives and the 81 (eighty one) email messages, since on or about 06 AUGUST 2008, between the Second Respondent and the Applicant, as noted per Default Judgement application on 11 FEBRUARY 2022, per Notice of Set Down application, Case Number 51546/2021, on 15 JULY 2022, to stand as proof of the sincere attempts by the Second Respondent to assist the Applicant in bringing his arrears up to date. To the contrary and apart from the element of harassment that many calls had been made, by the Second Respondent as creditor, had the Applicant always answered all telephonic calls, since 2009, from the Second Respondent or had returned to all telephonic calls made by the Second Respondent and had the Applicant often drove from Pretoria, without having arranged an appointment, to the offices of the Second Respondent in Johannesburg, until FEBRUARY 2019, from the sincere attempts by the Applicant, to bring his arrears up to date and to protect his property against the fraudulent actions by the Second Respondent, as the Founding Affidavit to the technically flawed Notice of Motion application brought by the Applicant on 23 MAY 2016, as attached hereto under annexure 'C', stand as proof, which had the Second Respondent to withdraw the fraudulently obtained sale in

execution order in APRIL 2006 and had the Second Respondent replaced Vesi & De Beer Incorporated, as legal representative of the Second Respondent, with Van Hulsteyns Attorneys in 2017, concurrently with Hulsteyns Attorneys being furnished with a fraudulent briefing report which had disguised the true state of event which had led to the withdrawal by the Second Respondent and the replacement of Vesi & De Beer Incorporated, as described in paragraphs 6.46, to follow.

Declined to Furnish Call Log Record

4.5.3 On 21 SEPTEMBER 2022 at 11h15, the Applicant had by email, requested attorney Nicolette Crous-Nel, from Vesi & De Beer Incorporated, to furnish the Applicant with the call log record of the alleged telecon on 17 MARCH 2022, as described in the preceding paragraph 4.5.1, as attached hereto under annexure 'D'. Attorney Nicolette Crous-Nel whom had declined the request by the Applicant, had also informed the Applicant that he had his chance during the said virtual court hearing on 8 SEPTEMBER 2023, to have questioned or to have requested prove of the alleged telephonic conversation. The response by attorney Nicolette Crous-Nel to the request by the Applicant had not only constituted fraud, from being obliged by law to provide records upon request, but had just been another example of the multiple fraudulent legal actions by the Second Respondent.

Fraudulent Intent

- 4.6 The sale in execution order granted to the Second Respondent on 8 SEPTEMBER 2022, had fundamentally constituted fraud, as the following allegations by Council Marais, in response to the claims made by the Applicant during the virtual court hearing, had intended to conceal the fraudulent intent of having conspired with the First, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Eighth, Ninth, Tenth, Eleventh and Twelfth Respondents by the Second Respondent to lessen and prevent the Applicant, since on or about 2009, to debilitate the Applicant to grow the National property Database the Applicant had launch in MAY 2008 which also had to debilitated the Applicant to meet his obligation towards his bond repayments to the Second Respondent:

No Valid Causes

- 4.6.1 Council Marais had fraudulently claimed that the Applicant had no valid cause for his non-payment of his bond and bonds arrears, as the Second Respondent had known to be the cause, from them having conspired with other respondents, to result in performing various fraudulent actions since 2009 and in particular their fraudulent action in 2016 to result in the withdrawal of Vesi & De Beer Incorporated, their fraudulent action in 2017 with the appointment of Van Hulsteyns Attorneys

to conceal their fraudulent action in 2016 which had resulted in the abstention by the Applicant in FEBRUARY 2019, their fraudulent action in 2021, with their fraudulent reappointment of Vesi & De Beer Incorporated and the opening of a fourth lawsuit in 2021 to conceal their fraudulent actions prior to FEBRUARY 2019;

Nothing Stand in Way - Fraudulent Methodology

4.6.2 Council Marais had fraudulently claimed that nothing had stand in the way of the Applicant to pursue legal action against the respondents, whom had defrauded the Applicant for not having reimbursed the Applicant, or had fraudulently taken trust funds belonging to the Applicant to undermine the ability of the Applicant to meet his obligations, in that the Second Respondent had been fully aware that all attempts made by the Applicant had been undermined from the conspiring by the Second Respondent with the respondent and others, in hindering the investigation or prosecution of the fraudulent respondents since 2009, therefore had the claim by Council Marais, intended to disguise their methodology in having conducted a sadistic and ruthless witch hunt against the Applicant with the mutual purpose of costing the Applicant opportunities to generate income and to prohibit the Applicant from receiving relief from the successful prosecution of those whom had defrauded the Applicant;

4.6.3 Council Marais had also fraudulently claimed that in the event that fraud had been committed by the Seventh Respondent it had nothing to do with the Second Respondent or had effected the ability of the Applicant to pay his arrears as the alleged fraud had involved separate legal entities;

4.6.4 Council Marais had also fraudulently claimed that in the event that theft had been committed by the Fifth Respondent, it had nothing to do with the Second Respondent or that the theft had not effected the ability of the Applicant to pay his arrears as it had been a civil matter as had been opinionated by Advocate Phyllis Vorster;

Not Denying Arrears

4.6.5 The claim by Council Marais, that the Applicant had not denied being in arrears, had serve no purpose other than to disguise the fraudulent intent by the Second Respondent to financially debilitate the Applicant and to have the Applicant to focus on his arrears, as their claim had accused the Applicant of what they had intended.

4.7 It is of importance to note that there should be differentiated between the following 2 (two) periods over which the arrears on the bond account of the Applicant had accumulated:

4.7.1 The first period had occurred on or about JULY 2008, during the time that the Applicant had been subjected to a witch hunt, orchestrated by the Fourth and Fifth Respondents whom had conspired to prevent the competition the National Property Database held, which the Applicant had launched in APRIL 2008, as attached hereto under annexure 'E', as duly registered under Purlieu Properties Pty (Ltd), number 2007/000217/07, Purlieu Décor Pty (Ltd), number 2007/000225/07 and Purlieu Bonds Pty (Ltd), number 2005/024934/07 and after the fraudulent interference by Mr Eddie de la Pierre with the investor of the Applicant, the late Mr Piet Venter, had resulted in the breach of the agreement between the Applicant and the late Mr Piet Venter, after which the conspiring between the Fourth and Fifth Respondents had led to conspire with the Second Respondent, since 2009 and the other respondents since 2010, in pursuit of their mutual goal to undermine the National Property Database business, in subjecting the Applicant to a witch hunt, during which time every possible aspect of the Applicant's life had been disrupted, amidst the sincere efforts by the Applicant to bring his bond arrears up to date, of which this application bares proof;

4.7.2 The second period had occurred since FEBRUARY 2019, from the abstention by the Applicant to engage in the fraudulent litigation and deceitful bargaining with the Second Respondent, after the Applicant had become aware of the conspiring among the Second Respondent and the other respondents.

4.8 During the virtual court hearing, the Applicant had given Honourable Justice Nyathi, a short background of the 17 (seventeen) year witch hunt the Applicant had been subjected to at the hands of the Second Respondent and the other respondents, during which the Applicant had made mention of the following aspects:

4.8.1 The Seventh Respondent had been owing an organisation own by Applicant more that R500, 000, 00 (five hundred thousand rand);

4.8.2 The Fourth and Fifth Respondents had taken unlawful possession of trust funds owned to the Applicant after which the Fourth and Fifth Respondents had conspired with the Second Respondent;

4.8.3 The Second Respondent had ignored the notice given by the Applicant of proof of them having conspired with the Fifth Respondent, after the Fifth Respondent, also the director of the Fourth Respondent, had acted as Commissioner of Oath in the Default Judgement and Notice of Set Down application by the Second Respondent, Case Number 70861/2010, on 5 AUGUST 2011, against the Applicant, as attached hereto under annexures 'F' and 'G' and described in paragraph 6.18 to follow;

4.8.4 The urgent Notice of Motion application brought by the Applicant on 23 MAY 2016, as attached hereto under annexure 'H' and as described in paragraphs 6.40 to 6.42 to follow, upon which the Second Respondent had withdrawn their fraudulent obtained sale of execution order and had Vesi & De Beer Incorporated replaced with Van Hulsteyns Attorneys, after which Van Hulsteyns Attorneys had been furnished with a fraudulent briefing report, as described in paragraph 6.51 to follow, to conceal the true causes of the replacement of Vesi & De Beer Incorporated and as described in paragraph to follow;

4.8.5 That the Applicant, upon the discovery of the fraudulent intent of Van Hulsteyns Attorneys, had informed the Second Respondent, in FEBRUARY 2019, that the Applicant would no longer engage in the fraudulent litigation and deceitful bargaining by the Second

Respondent and that the Applicant would turn to the media and that the Applicant would report the fraud committed by the Second Respondent, as described in paragraph 6.54 to follow;

4.8.6 The Applicant had produced and published a 7 (seven) series video, exposing the fraud committed by the Second Respondent and other respondents, as described in paragraph 6.55 to follow;

4.8.7 The Applicant had requested the Twenty-seventh Respondent for assistance which had been declined by Advocate Phyllis Vorster whom had claimed that theft committed by Fifth Respondent was a civil matter, as described in paragraph 4.15.3 to follow;

4.8.8 The Twenty-seventh Respondent had failed to make mention of the Seventh Respondent;

4.8.9 That crimes which had been committed during the divorce and child custody applications by the Applicant in 1995 until 1998, the Applicant had received no assistance from the National Prosecuting Authority after having reported the crimes, as described in paragraphs 6.149 to 6.220 to follow;

4.8.10 Every attempt made by the Applicant to seek for the investigation or prosecution of the fraudulent respondents since 2009, had been undermined from the conspiring by the respondents with their individual governing bodies as this application bares proof.

4.9 In response to the claims made by the Applicant, Honourable Justice Nyathi had responded that he bared no reference thereof or the powers to act upon the claims, upon which the Applicant had indicated to Honourable Justice Nyathi that the Applicant would be opposing the sale in execution order and would seek an order from the honourable High Court to bring an end to the fraudulent actions by the Second Respondent and the other respondents, to which Honourable Justice Nyathi had responded in emphasizing and repeating that the Applicant would be opposing the sale in execution order.

4.10 After Honourable Justice Nyathi had ordered the sale in execution over the immovable property of the Applicant, as described in the Notice of Motion to this application in paragraph 2.1 and had closed the court proceedings, Council Marais still in his state of excitement, had informed the Applicant that he would be furnishing the Applicant with a copy of the sale in execution order over the immovable property of the Applicant by email within 5 (five) minutes, upon which the Applicant had asked Council Marais what the time span had been since he had received instructions from the Second Respondent and whether he had

bared any knowledge regarding the 16 (sixteen) year history to this matter, to which Council Marais had responded that he had been instructed by the Second Respondent, 2 (two) months prior to the virtual hearing on 8 SEPTEMBER 2022 and that he had bared no knowledge other than the information noted in the Default Judgement application on 5 APRIL 2022, upon which the Applicant had provided Council Marais with 3 (three) pages, containing a bullet version of this application, as attached hereto under annexure 'I'. It had seemed to the Applicant, that Council Marais had either not been fully briefed by the Second Respondent and their legal representatives or had been fraudulently briefed as had been the situation in 2017, after a fraudulent briefing report had been provided to Van Hulsteyns Attorneys, which could explain the excitement of Council Marais.

Discovering Conspiring

- 4.11 On or about FEBRUARY 2019, after the third fraudulent replacement by the Second Respondent of their legal representative, concurrently with the opening of the fourth new lawsuit, under case number 51546/2021, on the same matter against the Applicant and after more than 14 (fourteen) years of the Applicant having faced the fraudulent legal actions by the Second Respondent, in alignment with the fraudulent legal actions by the other respondents, the Applicant had realized his attempts to meet his obligations were futile from the conspiring by the

Second Respondent, in contravention of section 21(b) of the Prevention and Combating of Corrupt Activities Act 12 of 2004, since 2009 with:

4.11.1 the Fourth Respondent, whom had fraudulently and unlawfully withheld to pay trust funds owed to the Applicant on 30 NOVEMBER 2006, in contravention of section 78(7) of the Attorneys Act 53 of 1979, after the Fourth Respondent had conspired with the Fifth Respondent, an employee of the Fourth Respondent at the time, whom had been in breach of contract with the Applicant, in their mutual attempt to prevent the competition the National Property Database project, developed by the Applicant, had held, in contravention of section 4(1)(a) of the Competition Act 89 of 1998,

after which the conspiring between the Second, Fourth and Fifth

Respondents had led to the:

4.11.2 conspiring with the Third Respondent, as municipal service provider, whom had fraudulently installed three consecutive faulty electricity meters in 2010, 2011 and 2012,

during which the conspiring between the Second, Third, Fourth and

Fifth Respondents, had led to the:

4.11.3 conspiring with the Seventh Respondent, as Body Corporate of the Applicant in 2010, whom had fraudulently been avoiding to pay an organisation owned by the Applicant, an amount of more than R500, 000, 00 (five hundred thousand rand), for emergency maintenance performed, after the fraudulent management by the Seventh Respondent had contributed to manslaughter and armed assault to take place on the premises of the Seventh Respondent,

after which the conspiring between the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth and Seventh Respondents, had led to the:

4.11.4 conspiring with the Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Respondents, as missionary trustees, whom had committed Elder Fraud Abuse against the parents of the Applicant, before and during the time that the Applicant had stepped up to protect his healthy aging parents, from 2013 to 2017, until the time of their unexpected death,

during which the conspiring between the Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, Seventh, Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Respondents, had finally led to the:

4.11.5 intimidation of the Twelfth Respondent, as financial licensing authority, to withdraw the extension the Twelfth Respondent had given the Applicant to write 2 (two) exams and to complete a workshop, to result in the suspension of the financial license of the Applicant for more than 10 (ten) month during 2014 and 2015 and during the time that the Applicant had stepped up to protect his aging parents to consequently had led to the inability of the Applicant to continue to protect his parents, to result in the unexpected death of the parents of the Applicant, 10 (ten) days apart under questionable circumstances,

upon which, the Applicant had informed the Second Respondent on or about FEBRUARY 2019 of his intention to turn to the media to expose their fraudulent conduct and to seek assistance.

The Twenty-seventh Respondent Report

4.12 On 27 JULY 2019, after various inquiries by the Applicant, the Applicant had coincidentally met with Advocate Gerrie Nel from the Twenty-seventh Respondent, the organisation of which the Applicant had been the chairperson of the Pretoria East Youth League, for a period of two years, during 2015 and 2017.

4.13 The Applicant had enquired from Advocate Gerrie Nel if the Twenty-seventh Respondent, whom had been promoting to protect the rights of Afrikaners, had any future plans to address the fraudulent actions by Afrikaner legal and church officials leading to the destruction of Afrikaner families and businesses, upon which Advocate Gerrie Nel had provided his email address and had requested the Applicant to provide him with particulars regarding his request.

4.14 On 5 SEPTEMBER 2019, the Applicant had presented Advocate Phyllis Vorster, at the office of Advocate Gerrie Nel, with a 150 (hundred and fifty) page document containing a summary of the various ordeals the Applicant had been facing for the past 26 (twenty six) years, similar in content to this application.

4.15 On 27 SEPTEMBER 2019, in response from the Twenty-seventh Respondent, the Applicant had received a single page email from Advocate Phyllis Vorster, as attached hereto under annexure 'J', which noted the following:

4.15.1 Comment made by Advocate Phyllis Vorster in declining the request by the Applicant:

- (i) **“Ek (Advocate Phyllis Vorster) het al die dokumentasie soos deur u (the Applicant) per hand afgelewer**

bestudeer en moet u ongelukkig meedeel dat hierdie kantoor se mandaat van so aard is dat ons u nie behulpsaam kan wees nie”;

The Second Respondent

4.15.2 Comment made by Advocate Phyllis Vorster regarding the Second Respondent whom had contravened several acts legal actions from them having conspired with the Fourth and Fifth Respondents whom had unlawfully taken possession of trust funds payable to the Applicant in their attempts to prevent the competition the National Property Database project, developed by the Applicant, holds for the monopoly holders in the property sales, décor advertising and bond origination industries:

- (i) **“Die verband by die bank (the Second Respondent) en herhaalde dagvaar is na my mening nie strafregtelik van aard”;**

The Fourth and Fifth Respondents

4.15.3 Comment made by Advocate Phyllis Vorster regarding the Fifth Respondent, whom, as an employee of the Fourth Respondent had, after the breach of a loan agreement with the Applicant and after having been instructed by the Applicant to register a bond extension over the property, as described in the Notice of Motion

application in the preceding paragraph 2.1, of the Applicant with Absa Bank Limited, had fraudulently and unlawfully taken possession of the amount of R100 000.00 (one hundred thousand rand) from the proceeds of the bond extension payable to the Applicant, from the trust fund account of the Fourth Respondent, on 30 NOVEMBER 2006:

- (i) **“Cynthia (the Fifth Respondent) se optrede blyk voort te spruit uit kontrak tussen julle wat sivielregtelik van aard is”;**
- (ii) No mention had been made of the Fourth Respondent, whom as the employer of the Fifth Respondent, had conspired with the Fifth Respondent in their mutual goal to prevent the competition the National Property Database project, developed by the Applicant, held for the monopoly holders in the property sales, décor advertising and bond origination industries;

The Seventh Respondent

4.15.4 No mention had been made by Advocate Phyllis Vorster regarding the Seventh Respondent, as Body Corporate of the Applicant, whom after having committed trustee minute fraud from 2002 until 2005 and their fraudulent mismanagement had contributed to manslaughter in 2004, had conspired with the

Second Respondent and other respondents since 2010, during which various fraudulent legal actions had been taking place, including the misuse of the services of the sheriff several times against the Applicant, in the attempt by the Seventh Respondent to evade paying the Applicant or the organization owned by the Applicant, NSA Developments CC, trading as Interveners Management Consultants, CK Number 1995/041792/23, the amount of R500, 236, 00 (five hundred thousand two hundred and sixty three rand), for having delivered emergency safety and maintenance services to the Seventh Respondent, from the neglect by the Seventh Respondent to provide for maintenance and to maintain their common property, as described in paragraph 6.69 to follow.

The Ninth to Twelfth Respondents

4.15.5 Comment by Advocate Phyllis Vorster regarding the ordeal the Applicant had faced in protecting his aging parents, during which elder abuse, fraud, undermining and intimidation, at the hands of the Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Respondents, had taken place, followed by the suspension of the financial license of the Applicant by the Twelfth Respondent:

- (i) **“Wat die ‘finansiele voordeel’ by Internasionale Eilande aanbetref is u (the Applicant) nie die klaer nie en kan dus nie klagtes lê nie, want u is nie direk**

benadeel nie. “Ek kan ook nie enige kriminele elemente bewys met die afsterwe van u bejaarde ouers nie”.

The Thirteenth to Twenty-sixth Respondents

4.15.6 Comment by Advocate Phyllis Vorster regarding the ordeal the Applicant had faced during his divorce and child custody applications between 1995 and 1998, during which fraud, intimidation and child abuse had been concealed and the Attorney General had failed to prosecute a child abuser, after various crimes had been reported by the Applicant to the South African Police Services:

- (i) **“Privaatvervolging word slegs oorweeg indien daar kriminele klagtes by die SAPD gelê is, dit ondersoek is en waar die NVG weier om te vervolg. Kriminele klagtes verval ook na 20 jaar en dit blyk dat meeste van u (the Applicant) klagtes voortspruit uit voorvalle 1997 en 1998”;**

4.15.7 The shocking reality is that, the Prescription Act 68 of 1969 seems to be designed to protect those who will violate various human rights of young and old, to result in the offender to be

acquitted after a period of time, during which time more violations might need to be performed to prevent prosecution.

4.15.8 Confirmation by Advocate Phyllis Vorster of declined request:

- (i) **“Dit is baie duidelik dat die afgelope jare se gebeure vir u (the Applicant) baie traumaties was maar ongelukkig kan hierdie kantoor u nie behulpsaam wees nie en is ook van mening dat daar nie enige meriete is vir strafregtelike vervolging nie”.**

4.16 Shortly after the said email, the Applicant had another coincidental meeting with Advocate Gerrie Nel during which the Applicant had informed Advocate Gerrie Nel of his disappointment in the response from the Twenty-fourth Respondent upon which Advocate Gerrie Nel had informed the Applicant that the Twenty-seventh Respondent cannot take action against the Second Respondent.

4.17 The response the Applicant had received from the Twenty-seventh Respondent, as per said email by Advocate Phyllis Vorster, is not only disappointing in that not all aspects had been addressed and in particular the ordeal the Applicant had been facing with the Seventh Respondent and the that aspects which had been addressed, had been portrayed to bare no potential to resolve the conflict the Applicant had

been facing and therefore that the Applicant had reached a dead end and that it is all over for the Applicant whom had to accept the losses the Applicant and his family had been suffering, at the hands of unscrupulous Afrikaans legal and church officials and others and that despite having been reported to their authorities for their crimes, had got off scot-free.

4.18 The Applicant had also not received any reply from Advocate Gerrie Nel, on whether the Twenty-seventh Respondent, as organisation who claims to be known for protecting and promoting Afrikaner rights and interests, had any future plans to address the fraudulent actions, by specifically Afrikaner legal and church officials, resulting in the destruction of Afrikaner families and businesses, of which the 150 (hundred and fifty) page document, delivered to the Twenty-seventh Respondent by the Applicant on 5 SEPTEMBER 2019, portraying the 26 (twenty six) years the Applicant had been facing at the hands of especially Afrikaner legal and church officials, is a perfect example of the variety and intensity of ordeals many other parties are facing during a divorce and child custody application and the undermining of their businesses, orchestrated by especially Afrikaner legal and church officials.

The Sixth Respondent

4.19 The disappointing response by the Twenty-seventh Respondent had created an awareness by the Applicant of the intimidation of corporations and of the self-reliance of the Applicant to pursue justice, upon which the Applicant had approached the Sixth Respondent, on 11 DECEMBER 2019, to request for the investigation and prosecution of the Fourth and Fifth Respondents, whom had conspired and had unlawfully withheld trust funds payable to the Applicant, on 30 NOVEMBER 2006, to prevent the Applicant to launch the National Property Database project the Applicant had developed, as described in paragraph 6.3 to 6.13 to follow, as attached hereto under:

4.19.1 annexure 'K', request by the Applicant;

4.19.2 annexure 'L', response by the Fifth Respondent;

4.19.3 annexure 'M', reply by the Applicant to the response by the Fifth Respondent;

4.19.4 annexure 'N', email and 'WhatsApp' correspondence between the Fifth Respondent and the Applicant;

4.20 In response from the Sixth Respondent, had the Sixth Respondent only requested the Fifth Respondent to respond to the claims made by the Applicant and after the Sixth Respondent had received the response by the Fifth Respondent, had the Sixth Respondent informed the Applicant

that no misconduct could be found on the part of the Fifth Respondent, as attached hereto under annexure 'O'.

The Sixth and Twenty-seventh Respondents

- 4.21 Both the Sixth and Twenty-seventh Respondents had failed to respond to the request by the Applicant to investigate the fraudulent action by the Fourth Respondent, whom had without written consent and therefore unlawfully and fraudulently withheld trust funds payable to the Applicant, despite the deceitful claim by the Fifth Respondent to have withheld the trust funds, in that the trust fund account had been held by the Fourth Respondent and therefore had the Sixth Respondent intentionally neglected their Constitutional obligation to investigate and prosecute the Fourth and Fifth Respondents.

The Fourth Respondent

- 4.22 On 10 FEBRUARY 2023, had the Applicant unexpectedly visited the offices of the Fourth Respondent, upon which the Applicant had met with Mr Martin Vorster and Mr Danie Swanepoel for more than two hours during which the Applicant had informed both Mr Vorster and Mr Swanepoel of his intention to approach the High Court with an Urgent Notice of Motion application to which the Fourth Respondent had been added as a party to the case, to apply for an order for the Fourth Respondent to declare the reasons behind their notion to have withhold

the trust funds payable to the Applicant. Upon which Mr Danie Swanepoel had claimed that he had bare no knowledge of the actions by the Fifth Respondent, but could not explain why their annual trust fund audit had not revealed evidence of such actions by the Fifth Respondent, except for Mr Danie Swanepoel whom had mentioned that the Fifth Respondent, as a director of the Fourth Respondent, might have practiced for her own trust fund account or that Absa Bank Limited as bond holder of the Applicant, might have paid the trust funds directly to the Applicant on 30 NOVEMBER 2006.

- 4.23 It is evident that Mr Danie Swanepoel had fraudulently attempted to disguise the involvement and accountability of the Fourth Respondent, as the following publication in De Rebus on 1 JULY 2017, as attached hereto under annexure 'P', had stated that section 19(3) of the Companies Act 71 of 2008, clearly provides that: 'If a company is a personal liability company, as is the case with an incorporated law practice, the directors and past directors are jointly and severally liable, together with the company, for any debts and liabilities of the company as are or were contracted during their respective periods of office' and that ignorance provides no defence to their personal liability in terms of section 53(b) of the Companies Act and therefore whether Mr Danie Swanepoel and Mr Martin Vorster had been aware of the theft of the trust funds by the Fifth Respondent or not, is questionable, as neither Mr Danie Swanepoel nor Mr Martin Vorster had attempted contact the Applicant by 16 FEBRUARY 2023, to attempt to resolve the matter with

Applicant and to prove the non-awareness or non-involvement by the Fourth Respondent in the matter.

The Eighth Respondent

4.24 Immediately after the delivery of the request to the Sixth Respondent, as described in the preceding paragraph 4.19 and in paragraphs 6.110 to 6.112 to follow, had the Applicant started to compile a report on the fraudulent actions performed by the Seventh Respondent and had the Applicant on 4 MARCH 2020, delivered a 260 (two hundred and sixty) page report to the Eighth Respondent, requesting for their intervention in resolving the dispute between the Seventh Respondent and the Applicant, as obliged by them under section 2(c) of the Sectional Title Act 95 of 1986. Due to the volume of the document, a copy thereof is available on request and a summary of the services and fee structure is hereto attached under annexure 'Q'.

4.25 In response from the Eighth Respondent, had the Applicant received a single page email on 12 MARCH 2020, which had notified the Applicant that the matter falls outside the mandated jurisdiction of the Eighth Respondent, as attached hereto under annexure 'R', without the Eighth Respondent having substantiated their claim, as the Eighth Respondent had mediated in the past on various similar claims by owners residing at the Seventh Respondent.

Failure by Sixth and Eighth Respondents

4.26 From the failure by the Sixth and the Eighth Respondents to comply with their Constitutional obligations to investigate the matters which had been reported to them by the Applicant, to ensure that law abiding members of the public are being protected against lawless members of the public and lawless officials and in that the Twenty-fourth Respondent had offered no aid to the Applicant, the Applicant has no other equitable remedy than to approach the honourable High Court on an urgent basis, as the various responses and non-responses by the Sixth, Eighth and Twenty-seventh Respondents serve as proof that the various and continuous efforts by the Applicant to seek justice, had been futile.

Awareness Shock

4.27 Since 26 MARCH 2020, shortly after the Applicant had received the disappointing responses from the Sixth, Eighth and Twenty-seventh Respondents and the first national lockdown had come into effect, the Applicant had done intensive research to gain a more accurate and deeper understanding of the fraudulent nature of the respondents, with whom the Applicant had entered into presumably ethical and professional credit agreements to have resulted in the creditors undermining the ability of the Applicant to meet his obligations in having

conspired with the other respondents whose lives the Applicant had protected and enhanced.

4.28 From the awareness by the Applicant of the unscrupulous actions performed by deceitful system officials, had the Applicant witnessed the metamorphosis of their pretentious characters, into the flagrant demonstration of their despicable characters which derives from the support from their corrupt network.

4.29 From the deeper understanding by the Applicant that pathological and compulsive liars will use the emotionally unstable and those who are suffering from neuropsychological disorders to exploit the delusional and the naïve, had enable the Applicant to produce and publish a series of 7 (seven) videos, available on: www.interveners.co.za , exposing the contraventions by the respondents during the 27 (twenty seven) year witch hunt the Applicant had been subjected to, referred to as 'The Case', as well as offering assistance to others whom would be facing similar sadistic treatment from system officials.

4.30 From the awareness by the Applicant that criminals will always return to the crime scenes in their attempts to conceal their crimes, had led the Applicant to reopen prior ordeals, over the time span of 27 (twenty seven) years, since the divorce and child custody applications by the

Applicant in 1995, as some of the same officials, family members, neighbours and colleagues whom had been responsible for the destruction of the family and business structures of the Applicant, had been caught in the act of attempting to conceal their past crimes and are again in the process of destroying what the Applicant had been able to rebuilt since.

Leading Party

4.31 From the abstention by the Applicant since FEBRUARY 2019, to engage in the fraudulent litigation and deceitful bargaining by the respondents, had the Applicant witnessed, amidst the increasingly flagrant fraudulent actions by the Second and Seventh Respondents, whom had been the leading party among the Second, Third and Seventh Respondents.

LOCUS STANDI OF THE APPLICATION:

5.

5.1 The subject matter of this application and the action taken by the Second Applicant involves the infringement of constitutional, civil,

criminal and personal rights and obligations, including rights in terms of the Bill of Rights.

- 5.2 The Applicant brings this application by virtue of section 38(a) of the Constitution by acting in its own interest and in accordance of its objectives directed at the protection of constitutional and civil rights.

SALIENT FEATURES AND FACTUAL BACKGROUND OF THE APPLICATION:

6.

- 6.1 In this application the Applicant seeks interim relief pending the outcome of Part B of the Notice of Motion in this application. The honourable court also has the power to grant a just and equitable remedy in terms of section 172(1)(b) of the Constitution.
- 6.2 This application is illustrative of how governmental systems are infiltrated by those who suffer from neuropsychiatric disorders, from their high levels of intellect but zero correlation with conscientiousness, for whom deception is the pathway to exploitation and will conspire with like-minded parties to undermine adversaries and will exploit the

emotionally unstable and the naïve, in dividing families and undermining business and career incomes.

The Fifth Respondent

- 6.3 On or about MARCH 2006, the Fifth Respondent, whom had been a director of the Fourth Respondent, as well as an insurance client of the Applicant at the time, had been informed by her deeds typist, Ms Dot Meiring, whom also had been a client of the Applicant at the time, of the National Property Database project the Applicant had developed.
- 6.4 The Fifth Respondent whom immediately had shown interest, had offered to invest in the National Property Database project developed by the Applicant and had also indicated that the Fourth Respondent would also be keen to invest, from the knowledge the Fifth Respondent had claimed to have of the Fourth Respondent, whom had invested in other marketing ventures in amounts of over R2000, 000, 00 (two million rand), after which the Fifth Respondent had indicated that the Fourth Respondent would easily be willing to invest at least R1400, 000, 00 (one million four hundred thousand rand), in the National Property Database project, upon which the Applicant had indicated that he would prefer to contract with the Fifth Respondent as a loan giver for the purposes of getting the project off the ground, after which the Applicant would approach the Fourth Respondent, as an investor.

6.5 On or about APRIL 2006, the Fifth Respondent, whom had become house friends with the Applicant, had instigated the Applicant to purchase a new Jeep Wrangler, shortly after the Applicant had purchased a new Toyota Yaris for his 18 (eighteen) year old daughter, upon which the Applicant had responded to the Fifth Respondent in having said that it would not be an economical wise decision in the view of the Applicant whom had intended to launch the National Property Database project shortly, to which the Fifth Respondent had responded that the Applicant could have peace of mind, as the Fourth and Fifth Respondents would be backing the Applicant, upon which the Fifth Respondent had offered to sponsor a weekend away for herself, the Applicant and the lady friend the Applicant had been in a relationship with, together with the 2 (two) children of the Applicant. The reason for the Applicant to make mention of these incidents, is to provide background of the questionable actions and conversations and fraudulent intent of the Fifth Respondent.

6.6 On 13 JULY 2006, the Applicant and the Fifth Respondent had come to an agreement and had signed a Mortgage Loan Agreement in the amount of R600, 000, 00 (six hundred thousand rand) payable as a lump sum, as attached hereto under annexure 'S'. Immediately after the signing of the agreement and without having made the lump sum payment, the Fifth Respondent had started to demand that the

Applicant, whom had been a highly successful broker at the time, stop practicing insurance and start applying his devoted attention to the completion of the marketing material of the National Property Database project, upon which the Applicant had questioned the failure by the Fifth Respondent to have made to lump sum payment. The Fifth Respondent had informed the Applicant that she had been experiencing difficulty in obtaining the full amount and had offered to start making monthly payments in the amounts of R50, 000, 00 (fifty thousand rand) to cover the monthly expenses of the Applicant until the Fifth Respondent would be able to provide the full outstanding loan amount.

The Fourth Respondent

- 6.7 On or about OCTOBER 2006, the Fifth Respondent had informed the Applicant that she had arranged for the Applicant to present the National Property Database project to the chief operating officer of the Fourth Respondent. During the presentation, the Applicant had become aware that the chief operating officer of the Fourth Respondent, had been distracted by activities on his cellular device instead of paying much attention to the presentation by the Applicant, after which the Applicant had questioned the Fifth Respondent for the lack of attention by the chief operating officer, upon which the Fifth Respondent had made mention to the Applicant that the chief operating officer had allegedly been awaiting a disciplinary hearing regarding an office affair.

6.8 Immediately after the presentation by the Applicant to the chief operating officer of the Fourth Respondent, the Fifth Respondent had requested the Applicant to loan an amount of R58, 000, 00 (fifty eight thousand rand) back to her, as the Fifth Respondent allegedly had temporarily been experiencing financial difficulties, upon which the Applicant, whom had no knowledge of the fraudulent intent of the Fifth Respondent, had indicated that he would be able to extend his Absa Bank Limited bond on his property, in an effort by the Applicant to finalize the marketing material of the National Property Database project and to bridge the period until the Fifth Respondent could make payment again, as the Fifth Respondent had mentioned that she would, upon which the Fifth Respondent as conveyancer, had offered to handle the conveyancing of the Absa Bank Limited bond extension for the Applicant.

Trust Fund Theft to Prevent Competition

6.9 On 30 NOVEMBER 2006, upon the registration of the Absa Bank Limited bond extension on behalf of the Applicant, for the amount of R215, 533, 27 (two hundred and fifteen thousand five hundred and thirty three rand and twenty seven cents), had the Fifth Respondent informed the Applicant that she had withhold an amount of R100, 000, 00 (one hundred thousand rand) from the proceeds of the Absa Bank Limited bond extension payable to the Applicant, from the trust fund account of the Fourth Respondent, to recover the funds the Fifth Respondent had

already paid to the Applicant as loan giver, as attached hereto under annexure 'T'.

Dreyer & Dreyer Attorneys

- 6.10 On 26 JANUARY 2007, had the late legal representative of the Applicant, Mr Willie Dreyer, from Dreyer & Dreyer Attorneys, notified the Fourth Respondent, that Fifth Respondent, as director, had fraudulently and unlawfully withheld the amount of R100 000.00 (one hundred thousand rand) from the proceeds of the Absa Bank Limited bond extension payable to the Applicant, to which the Applicant had received no response from the Fourth Respondent, as attached hereto under annexure 'U'.

Nothling Attorneys

- 6.11 On or about FEBRUARY 2007, attorney Mr Rosé Nöthling, whom had been appointed by the Fifth Respondent, had met with the Applicant and had attempted to convince the Applicant to acknowledge owing the Fifth Respondent, the amount of R142 000, 00 (one hundred and forty two thousand rand), to have represented the sum total of the funds the Fifth Respondent already paid to the Applicant, as a portion of the lump sum amount according to the loan agreement between the Applicant and the Fifth Respondent, after the Fifth Respondent had deducted the amount of R100 000.00 (one hundred thousand rand) which she had

withhold from the proceeds of the Absa Bank Limited bond extension payable to the Applicant, upon which the Applicant had pointed out to attorney Mr Rosé Nöthling that the Fifth Respondent had breached the loan agreement with the Applicant and had fraudulently and unlawfully taken possession of the trust funds of the Applicant from the trust fund account of the Fourth Respondent and that the Applicant would oppose any legal action by the Fifth Respondent.

The Fourth and Fifth Respondent

Conspiring

- 6.12 Since 20 JANUARY 2020, from the misrepresentations, contradictions and false claims made by the Fifth Respondent, in her reply to the Sixth Respondent and the failure by the Sixth Respondent to investigate any of the accusations made by the Applicant against the Fourth and Fifth Respondents, as mentioned in the preceding paragraphs 4.19 to 4.21, had the Applicant become aware that the breach of the loan agreement by the Fifth Respondent, after the Applicant had presented the National Property Database project to the chief operating officer of the Fourth Respondent, had been in collaboration with the Fourth Respondent, for the potential competition the National Property Database project had held for the monopoly role players in the property sales industry, upon which the Fourth Respondent had assisted and conspired with the Fifth Respondent to prevent the competition the National Property Database project developed by the Applicant had held or the , to fraudulently

withhold the amount of R100 000.00 (one hundred thousand rand) from the proceeds of the Absa Bank Limited bond extension payable to the Applicant, after which the conspiring by the Fourth and Fifth Respondent had led to them to conspire with the other respondents against the Applicant, whom had now been subjected for the past 17 (seventeen) years to a witch hunt, as described in the preceding paragraph 4.11 and of which this application stand to prove from the multiple contraventions by the respondents and their governing bodies whom had failed their obligations to investigate, resolve or prosecute the respondents.

The Fifth and Sixth Respondents

6.13 The following misrepresentations, contradictions and false claims by the Fifth Respondent had been made in her reply to the enquiry by the Sixth Respondent on 20 JANUARY 2020, as mentioned in the preceding paragraph 4.19 to 4.21 and attached hereto under annexure 'L':

6.13.1 Ad paragraph 2.3:

“Our chief operating officer informed me that our firm then would be interested to advertise ...and not to invest”.

(i) The following question arises: Why would the chief operating officer have mentioned that the Fourth Respondent would not be willing to invest, unless the

enquiry had been made by the Fifth Respondent, as the purpose of the presentation by the Applicant had been to seek an investment from the Fourth Respondent and that the National Property Database project developed by the Applicant had not been ready to sell advertising space;

6.13.2 Ad paragraph 2.7:

“Mr Botha and I had a verbal agreement that at least fifty percent of the proceeds of the loan...”

- (i) Firstly, this claim by the Fifth Respondent constitutes fraud, as the Fifth Respondent as conveyancer, would have requested the Applicant to provide her with a signed letter, authorising the Fifth Respondent to withhold or claim an amount from a trust fund account, as the law requires; and
- (ii) secondly, would the Applicant not have taken out a second loan to repay a previous loan which the Applicant had specifically acquired from the Fifth Respondent to finance the launch of his new project; and
- (iii) thirdly would the Applicant not have been loaning back any funds to the Fifth Respondent if the Applicant had been aware of the fraudulent intent of the Fifth

Respondent whom had been concealing her breach of the loan agreement with the Applicant from her conspiring with the Fourth Respondent to undermine the National Property Database project of the Applicant;

- (iv) the Fifth Respondent, as practising conveyancer with a Masters in Contractual Law, had been fully aware of the legal requirement that any withdrawal from the trust funds of a client needs to be in writing;

6.13.3 Ad paragraph 2.9:

“I discussed the matter with the other directors and... it was decided that I (the Fifth Respondent) should appoint independent legal representative as the matter was personal.”

- (i) For the Fourth Respondent as law firm, to have declared that their action of having unlawfully and fraudulently taken possession of trust funds without written consent, is a personal matter and to request for a so-called independent legal representative to mediate, is evident of the fraudulent intent by the Fourth and Fifth Respondents to conceal their fraudulent actions;

6.13.4 The various fraudulent and nonsensible legal actions by the Fifth Respondent, as noted by the Fifth Respondent in her reply to the Sixth Respondent in sub paragraphs 2.11 to 2.13, 2.15 to 2.19, as attached hereto under annexure 'L', serve as proof of the first tactics by the Fifth Respondent to subject the Applicant to a witch hunt to distract the Applicant from discovering the fraudulent intent by the Fourth and Fifth Respondents and to prevent the Applicant to finalise the marketing material for the National Property Database project as well as to lessen the attempts by the Applicant to generate income in from his insurance practice;

6.13.5 Ad paragraph 3.4:

“Mr Botha (the Applicant) did not have a successful insurance brokerage and admitted that to me in person...looking to earn extra income.”

- (i) The Fifth Respondent is either a psychopathic or compulsive liar in having misrepresented the success the Applicant had obtained in his brokerage, in that the Applicant had literally started from nothing in 2003 after having lost 2 (two) businesses during his divorce and child custody ordeals, as described in the paragraphs 6.143 to 6.220 to follow and had by 2006 acquired and renovated the property, as described in the Notice of Motion application in paragraph 2.1 and had financially qualified

to purchase two new and one used luxury motor vehicle, during which time the applicant also developed the National Property Database concept and had never missed any payment towards the mentioned purchases, until the Applicant had been defrauded by the Fourth and Fifth Respondents;

- (ii) It is also significant that the Fifth Respondent had referred to the National Property Database project to only had possess the potential to provide for an 'extra income' to the Applicant, in considering that the past 16 (sixteen) years, during which the conspiring by the Fourth and Fifth Respondents, had moved them to be willing to risk their reputation, in having committed trust fund theft, had spiralled to all respondents having contravene multiple acts, legislation, rules and codes of conduct, which this application stand to prove;

6.13.6 Ad paragraph 3.7.3:

“Mr Botha was also in breach...no share certificate of 49%...”

- (i) The notion by the Fifth Respondent to 'receive' a 49% shareholding had come as a shock to the Applicant upon his first sight of the loan agreement which the Fifth Respondent had drafted, as such condition had never

been discussed between the Applicant and the Fifth Respondent;

6.13.7 Ad paragraph 3.7.4:

“Witnessing Mr Botha spending all the monthly instalments on his private dwelling and himself...”

- (i) The Fifth Respondent had misrepresented her breaching of the loan agreement of having to make a lump sum payment of R600 000,00 (six hundred thousand rand), which had led to R50 000,00 (fifty thousand rand) monthly payments instead, as the Applicant had made it clear to the Fifth Respondent what his monthly expenses had been and of which the Fifth Respondent had been aware as she had become a ‘house friend’ whom had visited the Applicant regularly at his property which he had been renovating;

6.13.8 Ad paragraph 3.8:

The denial by the Fifth Respondent that she never would have said anything with regards to Mr Peet Viljoen, had constituted another blatant lie, in that the Fifth Respondent had openly questioned why the Legal Practice Council had never prosecuted Mr Peet Viljoen for his alleged trust fund theft at the time in 2006

and had the Fifth Respondent even questioned, after having pointed out to the Applicant, a picture of a for sale property which had a red Ferrari parked in front of the advertised property, whether the property did not belong to Mr Peet Viljoen, therefore is it more than likely that the Fifth Respondent would have raised such a question, in that the Fifth Respondent had afterwards conspired with the Fourth Respondent to commit trust fund theft, herself;

6.13.9 The following email and 'WhatsApp' correspondence had also occurred between the Fifth Respondent and the Applicant to serve as proof of the various misrepresentations, contradictions and false claims by the Fifth Respondent, as attached hereto under annexure 'N'.

The First, Second, Fourth and Fifth Respondents

First Replacement of Legal Representative

6.14 After the Applicant had fallen in arrears on his bond payments towards the Second Respondent in 2008, the Applicant had made arrangements with the legal representative of the Second Respondent, Haasbroek & Boezaart Incorporated, to pay his arrears on his bond with the Second Respondent.

- 6.15 On or about 2009, the Second Respondent had informed the Applicant of the replacement of their legal representative, Haasbroek & Boezaart Incorporated with Vesi & De Beer Incorporated, soon after which the latter had engaged in subjecting the Applicant to witch hunt.
- 6.16 From the multiple fraudulent legal actions taken by the Second Respondent, had the Applicant mainly become aware of such actions from debt collectors whom had informed the Applicant that a legal action had been taken by the Second Respondent and published in the Government Gazette, as the following bares proof, as well as to bare prove of the witch hunt the Applicant had been subjected to by the Second Respondent as creditor of the Applicant, amidst the witch hunts by the Third, Fifth and Seventh Respondents: (Due to the volume of this application, the Applicant had attempted to limit the annexures hereto attached and are available on request)

Second Respondent Witch Hunt:

First Legal Representative appointment

Haasbroek & Boezaart Incorporated

First Case 18578/2009

- | | | |
|--------|-------------|-----------------------------------|
| 6.16.1 | 30/03/ 2009 | Summons application by the Second |
| | | Respondent, as attached hereto |

under annexure 'V';

6.16.2	04/06/2009	Notices by private entities of legal action taken;
--------	------------	---

6.16.3	24/02/2010	Debt Collector's offer;
--------	------------	-------------------------

Second Legal Representative appointment

Vesi & De Beer Incorporated

Second Case 70861/2011

6.16.4	02/02/2011	Notices by private entities of legal action taken;
--------	------------	---

6.16.5	10/05/2011	Notice by sheriff of Attachment of Movable Property;
--------	------------	---

6.16.6	27/05/2011	Attachment of Movable Property;
--------	------------	---------------------------------

6.16.7	05/08/2011	Default Judgement with the Fifth
--------	------------	----------------------------------

		Respondent having signed Affidavit;
6.16.8	22/08/2011	Debt Collector notice of legal action;
6.16.9	06/09/2012	Notice by Applicant to Vesi & De Beer Inc. of the conspiring with the Fifth Respondent;
6.16.10	07/09/2012	Reply by Vesi & De Beer Inc. denied conspiring with the Fifth Respondent;
6.16.11	28/09/2011	Notice of Sale in Execution order;
6.16.12	10/09/2012	Notices by private entities of legal action taken;
6.16.13	10/09/2012	Letter of Cancellation of Sale in Execution;
6.16.14	14/01/2014	Second Respondent letter declining to

stop legal action;

6.16.15 04/03/2014 Notice of Sale in Execution order;

6.16.16 04/03/2014 Notices by Private Entities of legal
action taken;

6.16.17 18/05/2015 Notice of Sale in Execution order;

6.16.18 28/07/2015 Letter of Cancellation of Sale in
Execution;

6.16.19 17/07/2015 Notices by Private Entities of legal
action taken;

6.16.20 16/05/2016 Notices by Private Entities of legal
action taken;

6.16.21 18/05/2016 Delayed notice by Sheriff of Sale in

Execution;

Third Legal Representative appointment

Van Hulsteyns Attorneys

Third Case 40871/2019

6.16.22	19/10/2017	Discovery by Applicant of fraudulent Report and request of Transcript of recorded meeting;
6.16.23	01/06/2018	Applicant enquired at High Court for assistance to order Van Hulsteyns Attorneys to furnish the Applicant with Transcript of recorded meeting;
6.16.24	15/06/2018	Request by Applicant for withdrawal of Van Hulsteyns Attorneys;
6.16.25	21/06/2018	Notice by Van Hulsteyns Attorneys of opening new law suit against Applicant “in avoidance of doubt”;

6.16.26 07/06/2019 Default Judgement application;

Fourth Legal Representative appointment

Reappointment of Vesi & De Beer Inc

Fourth Case 51546/2021

6.16.27 13/10/2021 Combined Summons application;

6.16.28 22/02/2022 Default Judgement application;

6.16.29 05/04/2022 Default Judgement reapplication;

6.16.30 10/05/2022 Default Judgement reapplication;

6.16.31 13/09/2022 Warrant of Execution and Sale in
Execution order.

- 6.17 Since the appointment of Vesi & De Beer Incorporated by the Second Respondent in 2009, had the Applicant faced a hostile approach by Ms Louise Harmse, an employee at Vesi & De Beer Incorporated.

Fourth Respondent Director's Signature

- 6.18 After the Applicant had noticed that the Fifth Respondent, also the director of the Fourth Respondent, had acted as Commissioner of Oath in the Default Judgement and Notice of Set Down application by the Second Respondent, Case Number 70861/2010, on 5 AUGUST 2011, against the Applicant, from the appearance of the signature of the Fifth Respondent together with a vague stamp, had the Applicant telephonically, on 6 SEPTEMBER 2012, contacted Ms Louise Harmse, the employee at Vesi & De Beer Incorporated on record for the Second Respondent, to question why the Fifth Respondent had acted as Commissioner of Oath, to which Ms Louise Harmse had replied by emailed on 7 SEPTEMBER 2012 in saying: "...this is nothing of the bank's business and is a personal matter between yourself and Cynthia". "...neither will we get involved in the matter between yourself and Cynthia", as attached hereto under annexure 'F' and 'G'.

Urgent Notice of Motion by Applicant

Fraudulent Sale in Execution Order

- 6.19 On 23 MAY 2016, the Applicant had opposed the sale of execution order which the Second Respondent had fraudulently obtained, which had also involved the intentional delay by the Sheriff of Pretoria South East to deliver the notice of the sale of execution, as had been admitted by them, as attached hereto under annexure 'W'.
- 6.20 The Second Respondent had no *bona fides* to have instituted the sale in execution, due to the Applicant whom had acted upon instructions and had entered into a telephonic agreement with the Second Respondent's employee, Mr Howard Olkers, on 15 APRIL 2016 at 11h52, as attached hereto under annexure 'H'.
- 6.21 At 11h52 on 15 APRIL 2016, during the tele conversation with Mr Howard Olkers, telephone number, 021 441 4074, the Applicant had been informed that due to his inability to meet his previous agreement of paying three consecutive reduced bond payments of R10 000-00 (ten thousand rand) per month, his account had been referred back to the Legal Department of the Second Respondent and that the Applicant will have another opportunity to prevent his property from being sold in execution if he could make six (6) consecutive full bond payments of R12000-00 (twelve thousand rand) over the following 6 (six) months.

6.22 The Applicant had requested that Mr Howard Olkers provide him with a contact person at the Legal Department of the Second Respondent to have it confirmed in writing, upon which Mr Howard Olkers had advised the Applicant not to contact the Second Respondent from the fact that his account had not yet been allocated to a specific person. Mr Howard Olkers had also specifically pointed out to the Applicant, not to deal with any random person of the Legal Department of the Second Respondent, due to the sensitivity of his account.

6.23 Mr Howard Olkers had requested the Applicant to contact him again on 18 APRIL 2016, by which date Mr Howard Olkers had reckoned that he would be able to inform the Applicant of whom the appropriate person would be to deal with at the Legal Department of the Second Respondent. At 12h10 on 20 APRIL 2016, the Applicant had contacted Mr Howard Olkers' office, but had received no reply.

MacRoberts Incorporated Co-appointed

6.24 At 12h13 on 20 APRIL 2016, the Applicant had called Ms Ronal Naidoo at MacRobert Incorporated, on 012 940 6600, whom had informed the Applicant that his file had been returned to the Legal Department of the Second Respondent. Ms Ronal Naidoo had also mentioned that she could not understand why the file of the Applicant had been send back to the Legal Department of the Second Respondent, as no motivation or

instruction notes were to be found on the system, upon which Ms Ronal Naidoo had confirmed that no legal action had been taken or instructed against the Applicant. The Applicant had never been informed by the Second Respondent of the withdrawal of their legal representative, Vesi & De Beer Incorporated or their replacement by MacRobert Incorporated and it did seemed that the latter had been co-appointed by the Second Respondent to disguise the fraudulent actions taken by Vesi & De Beer Incorporated.

6.25 The question that arises is, how it came about that MacRobert Incorporated had been appointed by the Second Respondent during the time that Vesi & De Beer Incorporated had been on record of the Second Respondent and had the appointment of MacRobert Incorporated been one of the tactics by the Second Respondent to harass the Applicant.

Full Payment

6.26 On the instructions of Mr Howard Olkers, the Applicant had made a payment of R17000-00 on 27 APRIL 2016 and another payment of R2000 on 10 MAY 2016 in provision of the interest rate increase.

Private Investor

6.27 At 15h21 on Friday 13 MAY 2016, the Applicant had for the first time become aware that the Second Respondent had obtained a sale in execution over the property of the Applicant, scheduled for 24 MAY 2016, in that the Applicant had received a 'SMS' from a private investor data centre, number 087 085 0300 00216, whom had informed the Applicant that the auctioning of his property can be prevent, as well as that the Applicant could receive an amount of R100 000-00 (one hundren thousand rand) in cash, as a relocation fee. The 'SMS' had also indicated that the Applicant could contact a Mr Kelvin M Otto on 074 529 3845 or 081 575 5767, with no further details been given.

6.28 At 16h38 on the same day, Friday 13 MAY 2016, the Applicant had received a call from the abovementioned cellular number 081 575 5767, with a certain Mr Michael, from Inex Construction, whom had informed the Applicant that the auctioning of his property had been published in the Government Gazette that same day.

Vesi & De Beer Incorporated

6.29 At 08h22 on Monday 16 MAY 2016, the Applicant had contacted the offices of the Second Respondent, on telephone number 086 010 2270. The call centre assistant, Simbani, advised the Applicant that his account had already been assigned on 18 APRIL 2016 to Vesi & De Beer Incorporated, to arrange for his property to be auctioned.

Contradicting confirmation.

6.30 The statement as described in the preceding paragraph 6.29, had contradicted the confirmation received from both the employee of the Second Respondent, Mr Howard Olkers and the legal representative for the Second Respondent, Ms Ronal Naidoo, in that no legal action had been instituted by 20 APRIL 2016, as described in the preceding paragraphs 6.24 and 6.26.

6.31 At 09h18 on Monday 16 MAY 2016, had the Applicant again contacted the employee of the Second Respondent, Mr Howard Olkers, who had informed the Applicant that he had no idea why Standard Bank had taken legal action. Mr Howard Olkers had offered to investigate the motivation for the Second Respondent to have instituted legal action without notifying the Applicant as account holder, in particular due to the fact that the Applicant had always answered all phone calls from the Legal Department of Second Respondent. Mr Howard Olkers furthermore had confirmed that he would determine who the appropriate contact person was that the Applicant should deal with at the Legal Department of Second Respondent.

6.32 The same day, at 10h48, on 16 MAY 2016, had the Applicant telephonically contacted Mr Howard Olkers whom had informed the

Applicant that he had been extremely busy and therefor didn't had the opportunity to investigate whom the appropriate contact person was that the Applicant should speak to.

- 6.33 Due to the urgency of this matter, had the Applicant insisted that Mr Howard Olkers provide him with the details of the correct contact person, to which Mr Howard Olkers had confirmed that the Applicant should speak to Ms Nthabiseng Letompa.

Legal Department

- 6.34 At 10h54, on 16 MAY 2016, had the Applicant telephonically contacted Ms Nthabiseng Letompa whom had confirmed that she was dealing with the Applicant's account, but that she had no reference of Mr Howard Olkers and why he had previously been dealing with the account of the Applicant.
- 6.35 Ms Nthabiseng Letompa had mentioned to the Applicant that she had noticed two different sale in execution dates which had corresponded with the account of the Applicant, one date being 24 MAY 2016 and another for 28 AUGUST 2016.

6.36 Ms Nthabiseng Letompa had confirmed that she will contact their legal representative on record to receive clarity with regards to which date the correct auction date was.

6.37 At 15h36, on 16 MAY 2016, had the Applicant received an email from Ms Nthabiseng Letompa, which had indicated that sale in execution of the property of the Applicant had been scheduled for 24 MAY 2016 at 10h00.

The First Respondent

Pretoria Sheriff South East

6.38 Two days later, on 18 MAY 2016, had the Applicant received a document in his street mail box, 'NOTICE OF SALE IN EXECUTION', stamped on 26 APRIL 2016 by the Pretoria Sheriff South East.

6.39 On 20 MAY 2016 at 11h47, had the Applicant received confirmed by the Pretoria South East Sheriff, during a tele communication, that they had delayed the delivery of the "NOTICE OF SALE IN EXECUTION" with twenty three (23) days.

Notion of Motion 2016 - Withdrawal by Second Respondent

Fraudulent Sale in Execution

- 6.40 On 23 MAY 2016, had the Applicant approached the High Court with an Urgent Notice of Motion application. Before the court proceedings had been opened by Honourable Lady Justice Thlapi, had Lady Justice Thlapi informed the council on record for the Second Respondent that although the Urgent Notice of Motion, Case Number 70861/2011, brought by the Applicant was technically flawed, whether the Second Respondent would stand their ground having considered the merits of the application, to which the council on record for the Second Respondent had insisted for the court proceedings to be opened.
- 6.41 Before the opening of the court proceedings, had Honourable Lady Justice Thlapi indicated to the Applicant that the court would be open until 22h00 that day if the Applicant consider bringing a new corrected Urgent Notice of Motion. After the court proceedings had been opened, the Urgent Notice of Motion application by the Applicant was dismissed as 'not urgent', as attached hereto under annexure 'H.
- 6.42 At approximately 16h30 the same day, on 23 MAY 2016, had the Applicant received a telecon from the office of Vesi & De Beer Incorporated, to enquire whether the Applicant had intended to approach the court with a corrected application. Upon the confirmation

given by the Applicant, had the Applicant been informed that the Second Respondent withdraw the sale in execution order.

Technically Flawed Format – Window to Past Events

- 6.43 From the nature of this application which fundamentally deals with the multiple contraventions committed by members of the financial, juridical and clerical system, the Applicant had been facing to for the past 26 (twenty six) years and in particular the contraventions during the witch hunt the Applicant had been subjected to for the past 16 (sixteen) years since 2009, had the technically flawed format of the urgent Notice of Motion application which the Applicant had used on 23 MAY 2016, opened a window on past events during which the Applicant had initially used the technically flawed format, as had been provided to the Applicant by an advocate on his own legal team, for custody over his 2 (two) minor children on 10 DECEMBER 1998, with a different outcome.
- 6.44 The window on past events, had also revealed that officials whom had not only failed to protect the Applicant and his family, during the divorce and child custody applications by the Applicant between 1995 and 1998, but had also exploited them, had been caught in their acts to conceal their fraudulent actions of the past.

6.45 In contrast to the manner in which Honourable Lady Justice Thlapi had dealt with the technically flawed application on 23 MAY 2016, whether the Second Respondent would stand their ground having considered the merits of the application, had Justice Swart and the Twentieth Respondent, as defence council, made no mention of the technically flawed format and had the Twentieth Respondent, whom had appeared without having been briefed by an attorney, fraudulently informed Justice Swart that the High Court had no jurisdiction over the case, as described in paragraphs 6.205 to 6.212 to follow.

Second Replacement of Legal Representative

Fraudulent Report 2017

6.46 After the withdrawal on 23 May 2016, of the fraudulently obtained sale in execution order, by the Second Respondent, with Vesi & De Beer Incorporated on record for the Second Respondent, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.42, had the Applicant notify the legal department of the Second Respondent in 2017, that the Fifth Respondent had acted as Commissioner of Oath, to the Default Judgement application on 5 AUGUST 2011 by the Second Respondent, with Vesi & De Beer Incorporated on record for the Second Respondent, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.18, upon which the Second Respondent had replaced Vesi & De Beer Incorporated, with Van Hulsteyn Incorporated.

- 6.47 On 17 OCTOBER 2017, during the first meeting between the Applicant and Mr Daniel Raath, upon the appointment of Van Hulsteyn Incorporated as legal representative for Second Respondent, had Mr Raath requested for the meeting to be voice recorded.
- 6.48 During the said meeting, had Mr Daniel Raath verbally shared a summary of the briefing report received by Van Hulsteyn Incorporated upon their appointment as legal representative for the Second Respondent, which had been a fraudulent version of the true state of events which had led to the Second Respondent to withdraw the sale in execution order on 23 MAY 2016.
- 6.49 After the Applicant had informed Mr Daniel Raath that he had been misinformed, Mr Daniel Raath had fetched the briefing report and had read the section of the briefing report which had fraudulently indicated that the Applicant had paid his arrears towards his bond to have resulted in the urgent Notice of Motion application by the Applicant on 23 MAY 2016, to be dismissed.
- 6.50 The request by the Applicant to view the briefing report had been declined by Mr Daniel Raath, upon which the Applicant had enquired regarding the origin of the report to which Mr Daniel Raath replied that he had not been permissioned to disclose the identity of the third party

whom had compiled the report, upon which the Applicant had requested to be furnished with a copy of the transcription of the voice recording of the meeting.

- 6.51 After the meeting on 17 OCTOBER 2017, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.47, between the Applicant and Mr Daniel Raath, the Applicant and the Second Respondent had come to an agreement that the Applicant would make three consecutive monthly payments, in the amounts of R20 000.00 (twenty thousand rand) on or before the 20th of each month, after which the Second Respondent would restructure the arrears on the bond account of the Applicant over an extended term, as attached hereto under annexure 'X'.

The Turning Point

- 6.52 After the Applicant had made the first two bond payments of R20, 000, 00 (twenty thousand rand) upon the agreed time, the Applicant had telephonically contacted Mr Daniel Raath, a few days prior to the date that the third payment was due, to inform Mr Daniel Raath, that although he had been able to generate more than R200, 000, 00 (two hundred thousand rand) worth of commission income by means of his insurance practise, of which the Applicant had been willing to provide proof of to the Second Respondent, the majority of the commission generated would only be released by the insurance company a few

days after the third bond payment was due, to which Mr Daniel Raath had informed the Applicant that the Second Respondent was proceeding with legal action against the Applicant. The threat by Mr Daniel Raath had raised suspicion, in that:

6.52.1 the Applicant whom had just been able to achieve success in having generated over R200, 000, 00 worth of commission income, did not correspond with the agenda of the Second Respondent;

6.52.2 the Applicant had become aware of the mala fides of the Second Respondent, whom as creditor of the Applicant, had together with the other respondents with whom the Second Respondent had conspired since 2009, contravened every possible section of various Acts, to debilitate the Applicant to meet his obligation towards his home loan and in particular in them having conspired with the Fourth and Fifth Respondents, whom are responsible for more than R543, 552, 00 (five hundred thousand rand), calculated at a 10% interest rate, of the outstanding arrears on the home loan of the Applicant in them having unlawfully taking possession of R100, 000, 00 (one hundred thousand rand) rand on 30 NOVEMBER 2006;

6.52.3 the replacement of Vesi & De Beer Incorporated with Van Hulsteyns Attorneys by the Second Respondent had been mala fide and to conceal the fraud committed by Vesi & De Beer Incorporated since 2009 until 2017 with the furnishing of the fraudulent briefing report to Van Hulsteyns Attorneys;

6.52.4 the Second Respondent as creditor of the Applicant had been fooling the Applicant since 2009 with their fraudulent bargaining to debilitate the Applicant to honour his obligation towards his home loan agreement.

12 Month Delay

6.53 On 18 OCTOBER 2018, 12 (twelve) months after the request by the Applicant to be furnished with a copy of the transcription of the voice recording of the meeting, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.47, the Applicant had received a copy of the transcription and of which the delay had been a further proof of the mala fides of the Second Respondent, as attached hereto under annexure 'Y'.

Approaching the Media

- 6.54 From the notice by the Second Respondent to proceed with legal action against the Applicant, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.52, the Applicant had informed Mr Daniel Raath, on record for the Second Respondent, that the Applicant no longer will engage in the fraudulent litigation and deceitful bargaining by the Second Respondent and that he would approach the media to expose their fraud.

Seven Video Series

- 6.55 After the Applicant had requested for the assistance by the Sixth, Eighth and Twenty-seventh Respondents, between SEPTEMBER 2019 and MARCH 2020, had the Applicant produced 7 (seven) videos in a series, @ www.interveners.co.za, exposing the fraudulent actions the Applicant had been facing for the past 26 (twenty six) years, after which the Applicant had made various respondents aware of the published 7 (seven) videos and upon which the Applicant had witnessed how the disguised fraudulent actions by the respondents, had undergone a metamorphosis, in flagrantly demonstrating their power from the corrupt network they had created.

The Third Respondent

Three Faulty Electricity Metering Instruments

- 6.56 During the course of 2010, the Applicant became aware of the sudden increase and inconsistent electricity meter readings, as had been

indicated by the Third Respondent in comparison with the previous 6 (six) year meter readings for the Applicant, without the Applicant having increased his usage of electricity.

6.57 After the investigation by the Applicant, involving numerous unsuccessful conversations in person with employees of the Third Respondent, a new electricity metering instrument had been installed on 20 MAY 2010 on request by the Applicant. After the installation, the inconsistent electricity meter readings had continued, as the following statements by the Third Respondent bares proof, as attached hereto under annexure 'Z':

6.57.1	10 MAY 2010	Amount due: R 5 518.87
6.57.2	27 JULY 2010	Amount due: R14 703.99
6.57.3	27 SEPT 2010	Amount due: R17 633.66
6.57.4	25 JAN 2011	Amount due: R23 751.46

6.58 After the continuation of faulty readings, as indicated by the Third Respondent, a second electricity metering instrument had been installed on 21 MAY 2011 on request by the Applicant and it might be concerning to note the second electricity metering instrument had been installed exactly 12 (twelve) months after the first electricity metering

instrument had been replaced. After the installation of the second metering instrument, the inconsistent electricity meter readings had significantly increased with the arrears almost double from a year ago, including legal costs and penalty interest, as the following statement by the Third Respondent bares further proof, as attached hereto under annexure 'AA:

6.58.1 03 OCT 2012 Amount due: R41 068.80

6.59 The increased and inconsistent electricity meter readings had continued after which the Applicant had requested for a third meter to be installed with the Applicant insisting to be present during the installation thereof. Upon the arrival of the arranged installation, the two technicians from the Third Respondent had unlocked the metering cabinet and to the surprise of everyone, had the electricity metering instrument indicating the usage by the Applicant, not been moving, even though the geyser and fridge of the Applicant had been switched on. Upon the hitting of the metering instrument by one of the technicians, had the metering instrument suddenly start spinning at a high speed.

6.60 Both technicians had agreed that the metering instrument was faulting, upon which the Applicant had revisited the Third Respondent offices in person to demand for the installation of a prepaid metering instrument, to which the Third Respondent had insisted that the Applicant would

have to pay his arrears in full in order for them to install a prepaid metering instrument.

Prepaid Metering

- 6.61 After the Applicant had indicated that he would pursue legal action against the Third Respondent for fraud, the Third Respondent immediately agreed and had a prepaid metering instrument installed for the Applicant on 26 OCTOBER 2012 after which the Third Respondent had requested the Applicant to keep records of his electricity usage, to serve as proof of his real usage upon which the Third Respondent would waive the faulty arrears.

Continuous Threats by Third Respondent

- 6.62 On 5 JANUARY 2015, after the Applicant had been informed by the Third Respondent that he still owes the arrears accumulated prior to the installation of the prepaid metering instrument and had been threatened to have his electricity disconnected, had the Applicant met with Mr Joe Moloto, at the offices of the Third Respondent, upon which the Applicant had shown the records he had been keeping of his electricity usage, to which Mr Joe Moloto had responded that he will investigate the matter and that he will inform the Applicant once he had finished investigating.

6.63 After not having received any response from Mr Joe Moloto, the Applicant had visited the offices of the Third Respondent in FEBRUARY 2015 and again in JULY 2015, to follow up whether the Third Respondent had been able to resolve the matter, where the Applicant had met Letta, whom had referred the Applicant to Silvia, whom had then referred the Applicant to Milly, whom after seeing the records kept by the Applicant of his electricity usage, indicated that Amanda will investigate the matter and that she will inform the Applicant once she had resolved the matter.

6.64 On 7 JUNE 2019, at 14h00 until 15h32, after the Applicant had been informed by the Third Respondent that he still owes the arrears accumulated prior to the installation of the prepaid metering instrument, had been threatened to have his electricity disconnected, the Applicant had met with Nonhlahla to whom the Applicant had shown the records he had kept of his electricity usage, upon which Nonhlahla had indicated that she will investigate the matter and that she will inform the Applicant once she had resolved the matter.

6.65 On 17 OCTOBER 2019, at 11h35 until 13h20, the Applicant had met with Pulanie and after almost a two hour meeting, had referred the Applicant to Melissa, whom the Applicant had met the same day at 14h00, whom also had indicated that she will investigate the matter and that she will inform the Applicant once she had finished investigating.

6.66 It is clear that the Third Respondent has no intention to admit to having fraudulently installed three faulty electricity metering instruments consecutively from their continuous threats to have the electricity supply to the Applicant disconnected and to have formed part of the conspiring between the Second, Fourth, Fifth and Seventh Respondents, as the following and latest statement by the Third Respondent in the amount of, serves as proof thereof, as attached hereto under annexure 'BB':

6.66.1 02 MAR 2023 Amount due: R53 044.21

Municipal Rates

6.67 During the corresponding period that the Applicant had started to experience the sudden increase of his electricity usage readings in 2010, the municipal rubbish bin of the Applicant had mysteriously disappeared and after the fraudulent resignation of the full board of trustees of the Seventh Respondent in JANUARY 2020, with the appointment of the law firm, Riaan Oosthuysen Attorneys Incorporated, trading as OPROPSA Attorneys, being appointed as Executive Management Agent (EMA) for the Seventh Respondent on 1 MAY 2020, as described in paragraphs 6.95 and 6.96 to follow, had the decision been made during the course of 2022 to have the bins of all the units at the premises of the Seventh Respondent replaced, as part of the efforts by the Seventh Respondent, since 2010, to disguise their

lack of maintenance prior to the management by the Applicant and his organisation, NSA Developments CC, since 2003, as described in paragraphs 6.68 to 6.113 to follow. It is also important to note that the Applicant had fallen in arrears on his monthly municipal rates, from being subjected to the fraudulent witch hunt and conspiring by the Seventh Respondent, upon which the Third Respondent had also been continuously threatening to have the electricity supply to the Applicant disconnected.

The Seventh Respondent

Debt Evasion

6.68 On or about SEPTEMBER 2010, after the Applicant had fallen in arrears on his monthly residential levies, had the Second, Fourth and Fifth Respondents, conspired with the Seventh Respondent whom had seen the opportunity to evade their obligation to pay, an organization owned by the Applicant, NSA Developments CC, trading as, Interveners Management Consultants, CK Number 1995/041792/23, the amount of R500, 236, 00 (five hundred thousand two hundred and sixty three rand), as calculated in FEBRUARY 2023 at 18% (eighteen) per annum, unlike the 24% (twenty four) per annum the Seventh Respondent had been charging the Applicant on his arrear monthly residential levies, as described in the fee structuring, calculated in MARCH 2020, as attached hereto under in annexure 'Q'.

6.69 The amount payable by the Seventh Respondent was for emergency security and maintenance services, which had been performed by NSA Developments CC, trading as, Interveners Management Consultants, CK Number 1995/041792/23, during the period from OCTOBER 2003 until JUNE 2007, after the fraudulent mismanagement by the Seventh Respondent had contributed to an armed assault and the fatally wounding of an intruder, at the premises of the Seventh Respondent, of which the shooting had been in contravention with section 49 of the Criminal Procedure Act 51 of 2003.

The First and Seventh Respondents

6.70 The conspiring by the Second, Fourth and Fifth Respondents with the Seventh Respondent, had resulted in the removal of the Applicant as chairperson for the Seventh Respondent in OCTOBER 2010, with the appointment of Mr Derik Grobler, as chairperson, upon which law firm, Rorich Wolmarans & Luderitz Incorporated, directed by Mr Reynault Meintjis, had immediately been instructed to institute legal action against the Applicant for his arrear residential levies, during which the fraudulent use of the services of the First Respondent had taken place several times.

6.71 Since the appointment of Rorich Wolmarans & Luderitz Incorporated in OCTOBER 2010, had the Applicant now for the past 13 (thirteen) years been subjecting to a witch hunt, instructed by the Seventh Respondent whom had been in debt with the Applicant and his organisation, NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, for the amount of R500, 236, 00 (five hundred thousand two hundred and sixty three rand), as described in the preceding paragraph 6.69, with the following legal actions having taken place:

Seventh Respondent Witch Hunt:

Rorich Wolmarans & Luderitz Incorporated

First Case No 129344/2010

- | | | |
|--------|------------|---|
| 6.71.1 | 14/12/2010 | Combined Summons for the amount

of R22 608,76; |
| 6.71.2 | 08/03/2011 | Sale in execution order by the

Seventh Respondent; |
| 6.71.3 | 18/03/2011 | Notice by Sheriff of sale in execution

order; |

6.71.4 30/03/2011 Notice by Sheriff of sale in execution
order;

6.71.5 11/04/2011 Notice by Sheriff of sale in execution
order;

Rorich Wolmarans & Luderitz Incorporated

Second Case No 30421/2012

6.71.6 07/05/2012 Combined Summons for the amount
of R21 727,37;

Rorich Wolmarans & Luderitz Incorporated

Third Case, No 17384/2013

6.71.7 02/04/2013 Combined Summons for the amount
of R22 120,57;

6.71.8 14/05/2013 Summary Judgement application;

6.71.9 03/07/2013 Notice of Set Down;

6.71.10	18/07/2013	Summary Judgement granted;
6.71.11	31/07/2013	Warrant of execution order against the movable property of the Applicant;
6.71.12	16/08/2013	Attachment of movable property of the Applicant;
6.71.13	18/11/2013	Round table meeting requested by the Applicant;
6.71.14	26/11/2013	The Applicant had reported Mr Reynault Meintjes to the Law Society upon which Mr L.J.E. (Ras) Beyers had been appointed from the same law firm;
6.71.15	28/11/2013	The Applicant reported the Seventh

Respondent to the Estate Agency
Affairs Board;

By the Applicant

New Case No 35668/2013

- | | | |
|---------|------------|--|
| 6.71.16 | 08/07/2013 | <p>Combined Summons application,</p> <p>Case Number 35668/2013, by NSA</p> <p>Developments CC, CK Number</p> <p>1995/041792/23, for the claim amount</p> <p>of R82 986,27 (eighty two thousand</p> <p>nine hundred and eighty six rand and</p> <p>twenty seven cents) against the</p> <p>Seventh Respondent;</p> |
| 6.71.17 | 17/07/2013 | <p>Notice by the Seventh Respondent of</p> <p>opposing Combined Summons</p> <p>application, Case Number</p> <p>35668/2013, by NSA Developments</p> <p>CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23;</p> |

- | | | |
|---------|------------|---|
| 6.71.18 | 18/03/2014 | The Seventh Respondent requested

taxation of R3913,55 as costs for

opposing Combined Summons

application, Case Number

35668/2013 by NSA Developments

CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23; |
| 6.71.19 | 18/12/2013 | Application by the Seventh

Respondent to remove the Combined

Summons application, Case Number

35668/2013 by NSA Developments

CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23,

with costs; |
| 6.71.20 | 09/01/2014 | The Applicant received reply from

Law Society whom had claimed that

their hands were tied; |

- | | | |
|---------|------------|--|
| 6.71.21 | 05/02/2014 | Round table meeting requested by

Applicant with only Mr Ras Beyers attending – turned out to be a waste of time; |
| 6.71.22 | 07/02/2014 | The Applicant had received reply from

the Estate Agency Affairs Board whom had acknowledged that the Seventh Respondent had breached their agreements with the Applicant and NSA Developments CC's and had advised the Applicant to institute legal action; |
| 6.71.23 | 18/06/2014 | Warrant of execution order in the

amount of R7758,78 against NSA Developments CC's for legal costs by the Seventh Respondent to have opposed the action by NSA Developments CC; |

Fourth Case No 9465/2016

6.71.24 05/03/2016 Combined Summons by the Seventh
Respondent;

Rorich Wolmarans & Luderitz Incorporated

Fifth Case No 41562/17

6.71.25 20/10/2017 Combined Summons by the Seventh
Respondent for the amount of
R28 167,72;

6.71.26 23/08/2019 Threat by Mr Reynault Meintjies to
institute legal action against the
Applicant, in having reported him to
the Law Society, unless the Applicant
would apologise for allegedly having
defamed the character of Mr Reynault
Meintjies, which the Applicant had
ignored;

Rorich Wolmarans & Luderitz Incorporated

Sixth Case No 86793/19

6.71.27 16/11/2019 Combined Summons by the Seventh Respondent for the amount of R28 349,65;

6.71.28 26/09/2019 Final notice by the Seventh Respondent demanding payment of arrear residential levies;

South African Police Service Fraud Charges laid by the Applicant against the Seventh Respondent

6.71.29 27/01/2020 Unsuccessful attempt by the Applicant to lay fraud charges against the Seventh Respondent;

Riaan Oosthuysen Attorneys Incorporated

trading as **OPROPSA Attorneys**

Seventh Case No 7233/22

6.71.30 18/11/2021 Attempt by the Seventh Respondent to attach movable property of the Applicant;

6.71.31 27/01/2022 Notice to institute legal action by the
Seventh Respondent;

6.71.32 15/08/2022 The Seventh Respondent fraudulently
attempt to attach the movable
property of the Applicant.

First Warrant of Execution

6.72 After more than 2 (two) years of legal harassment by the legal representatives of the Seventh Respondent, had the Seventh Respondent obtained, on 31 JULY 2013, a warrant of execution order against the moveable property of the Applicant, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.71.11.

6.73 During the attempt by Sheriff to seize the moveable property of the Applicant, had the Applicant telephonically informed, Ms Rentia de Villiers, secretary for Mr Reynault Meintjies, from Rorich Wolmarans & Luderitz Incorporated, that the Applicant had been in possession of a legal contract which had prevented the Sheriff to seize the moveable property of the Applicant.

6.74 Ms Rentia de Villiers had refused to accept the legal contract and had demanded an affidavit to confirm the validity of the contract, to which the Applicant had confirmed his willingness to arrange for an affidavit.

6.75 Ms Rentia de Villiers had informed the Applicant that they had instructed the sheriff to seize the moveable property by force due to the lack of an affidavit on that day.

6.76 Upon the threat by the Applicant that he would report the law firm, Rorich Wolmarans & Luderitz Incorporated, to the Sixth Respondent, had Ms Rentia de Villiers instructed the sheriff not to seize the moveable property, after which Ms Rentia de Villiers had informed the Applicant that they will continue to pursue to seize the immovable property of the Applicant.

Malpractice Reported

6.77 After the Applicant had reported Mr Reynault Meintjies, from Rorich Wolmarans & Luderitz Incorporated to the Sixth Respondent, had Mr Reynault Meintjies withdrawn from the case after which Mr Ben Vorster from the same law firm had been appointed.

Second Warrant of Execution

- 6.78 On 18 June 2014, had the Seventh Respondent again attempted to seize the moveable property of the Applicant after having obtained a second warrant of execution order against the moveable property of the Applicant.

Third Warrant of Execution

- 6.79 On SEPTEMBER 2022, had the Seventh Respondent again attempted to seize the moveable property of the Applicant after having obtained a third warrant of execution order against the moveable property of the Applicant.

Fraudulent Prescription Claim

6. 80 In JANUARY 2013, amidst the aligned fraudulent legal actions by the Second, Third and Seventh Respondents against the Applicant, had the Applicant stepped up to protect his healthy elderly parents, against the Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Respondents, whom had committed elder fraud abuse against the elderly parents and whom had attempted to have the elderly parents taken in by an unregistered Dementia and Alzheimer facility, as described in the paragraphs 6.114 to 6.148 to follow, during which the Applicant had experienced how the aligned fraudulent legal actions by the Second, Third and Seventh Respondents had intensified and in particular by the Seventh Respondents, upon

which the organization owned by the Applicant, NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, trading as Interveners Management Consultants, had brought a Combined Summons application, Case Number 35668/2013, against the Seventh Respondent on 8 JULY 2013, from the failure by the Seventh Respondent to reimburse NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, for having delivered emergency security and maintenance services to the Seventh Respondent, as described in the preceding paragraphs 6.68 and 6.69, as attached hereto under annexure 'CC'.

- 6.81 After the Seventh Respondent had opposed the Combined Summons application brought by NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, in having fraudulently claimed that the claim by NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, against the Seventh Respondent, had prescribed, as attached hereto under annexure 'DD', had the Seventh Respondent, due to the delayed response by NSA Developments CC CK Number 1995/041792/23, to answer to the false Prescription Plea by the Seventh Respondent, from the Applicant's involvement to protect his elderly parents, had the Seventh Respondent brought an application in terms of Rule 60(2) to apply for an order in terms of Rule 60(3) to strike out the action by NSA Developments CC CK Number 1995/041792/23, as attached hereto under annexure 'EE'.

6.82 On the day of the hearing of the application in terms of Rule 60(3) to strike out the action by NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, had the Applicant appeared in persona and had informed the Magistrate on record that the Seventh Respondent had, in contravention of the Sectional Titles Act:

6.82.1 neglected to make provision for the repair of a communal border wall;

6.82.2 neglected to make provision to raise their street front border walls and to keep up security;

6.82.3 failed make provision for future maintenance of services to buildings, buildings and recreational land;

6.82.4 failed to borrow money or to raise a special levy to remunerate the Applicant's organisation, NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23;

6.82.5 neglected to maintain their common property or to keep it in a state of good and serviceable repair;

6.82.6 fraudulently claimed that the claim by NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, against the Seventh Respondent had prescribed, in that the previous chairman and secretary of the Seventh Respondent, Mr Duncan Smith, had committed trustee minute fraud in having misrepresented or failed to note the various verbal agreements the Seventh Respondent had entered into with NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, since OCTOBER 2003, from the fraudulent nature of Mr Duncan Smith, whom had acted as both chairman and secretary for the Seventh Respondent, as he had also defrauded the Seventh Respondent, in having received a monthly income for more than 12 (twelve) months, in exchange for his fraudulent mediation with the neighbouring complex, La-Bri, regarding an unstable and unsafe communal border wall, to which NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, had bring an end in having removed the border wall and trees, in OCTOBER 2003, as attached hereto under annexure 'FF'.

6.83 The Applicant also had informed the Magistrate that he had approached the South African Police Services whom had refused to open a fraud

docket against the Seventh Respondent, to which the Magistrate had responded that the court do not have time to wait for the South African Police Services. The name of the Magistrate on record is unknown to the Applicant due to the court docket allegedly being lost.

6.84 In the Defendant's Plea and in the Defendant's Plea on Merits, on 26 AUGUST 2013, the Seventh Respondent had pleaded as follows, as attached hereto under annexure 'DD':

6.84.1 in the Defendant's Plea under paragraphs 1.3 to 1.5, that the claim by the NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, against the Seventh Respondent had prescribed, which in itself had been an acknowledgement by the Seventh Respondent of the existence of the claim by NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, on which account the Seventh Respondent is guilty of an offence in their failure to have paid the claim by NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23 and as such, is the Seventh Respondent also guilty of an offence in their failure to have corrected their fraudulent trustee minutes noted by Mr Duncan Smith in the neglect to have noted the agreements between the Seventh Respondent and NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, since 2003;

6.84.2 in the Plea on Merits, under paragraph 3, that no agreement was ever entered into by the Seventh Respondent with NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, which had instituted fraud in:

(i) their denial of the existence of an agreement between the Seventh Respondent and NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, after having pleaded that the claim by NSA Developments CC had prescribed, which had given proof of the existence of an agreement and therefore a claim, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.84.1;

(ii) the neglect by the Seventh Respondent to have noted the agreement with NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, for the provision of amenities and services to the Seventh Respondent;

6.84.3 as noted in the Defendant's Plea on Merits, under ad paragraph 6.1, that no mention had been made of NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, (the Plaintiff), which had instituted fraud in the failure by the

Seventh Respondent to have noted the agreement with NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23 to provide services to the Seventh Respondent;

6.84.4 as noted in the Defendant's Plea on Merits, under ad paragraph 6.2, that NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, (the Plaintiff), had not been a trustee of the Seventh Respondent (the Defendant), which had been another example of the fraudulent attempts by the Seventh Respondent to evade their legal obligation towards NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, (the Plaintiff), in that:

(i) NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, had been legally represented by the Applicant;

(ii) the Seventh Respondent had for all obvious reasons claimed the legitimacy of the their fraudulent trustee minutes;

6.84.5 as noted in the Defendant's Plea on Merits, under ad paragraph 7, that no emergency services or maintenance

had been provided by NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, which had instituted fraud in that 90% of the emergency services and maintenance provided by NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, are still observable, despite the fraudulent attempts by the Seventh Respondent to disguise the emergency services and maintenance provided by NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, in having unnecessary repainted parts thereof;

6.84.6 as noted in the Defendant's Plea on Merits, under ad paragraph 8, in denying owing NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, (Plaintiff), the amount of R82, 986, 27, in 2013, which had instituted fraud, in that the Seventh Respondent had:

- (i) either fraudulently denied owing NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, (Plaintiff), from their prescription plea: or
- (ii) fraudulently denied the observable emergency services and maintenance provided by NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23;

6.84.7 as noted in the Defendant's Plea on Merits, under ad paragraph 9, in denying to have paid NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, which had instituted fraud in the fraudulent attempt by the Seventh Respondent to deny having partly honoured their obligation towards NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, although the Seventh Respondent had also fraudulently attempted to disguise their obligation in having misrepresented the fee amount of R2, 800,00 (two thousand eight hundred rand) as delivered by NSA Developments CC , CK Number 1995/041792/23 on 29 JANUARY 2004, as attached hereto under annexure 'GG':

- (i) as a 'honorarium' and in having initially only paying the amount of R2, 000, 00 (two thousand rand) as per fraudulent trustee minutes by Mr Duncan Smith on 20 APRIL 2004, as attached hereto under annexure 'HH';
- (ii) until after the Applicant had threatened the Seventh Respondent with legal action by NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, after which the Seventh Respondent had paid another amount of R750, 00 (seven hundred and

fifty rand), also misrepresented as a 'honorarium', as per fraudulent trustee minutes by Mr Duncan Smith on 21 OCTOBER 2004, as attached hereto under annexure 'II';

6.85 It is of importance to note that the Seventh Respondent had intentionally neglected to rectify the fraudulent trustee minutes by their chairman and secretary, Mr Duncan Smith, to enable the Seventh Respondent to fabricate the date that the claim by NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, fell due to enable the Seventh Respondent to plea prescription.

6.86 During the term that Mr Duncan Smith had fraudulently served as both chairman and secretary of the Seventh Respondent, Mr Duncan Smith had continuously committed trustee minute fraud, upon which the Applicant had threatened the Seventh Respondent with legal action by NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, to have resulted in Mr Duncan Smith fraudulently obtaining a medical certificate in 2 (two) different handwritings, claiming he was suffering from 'MAJOR DEPRESSION', as attached hereto under annexure 'JJ', after which he resigned as secretary and had relocated after he had sold his residential unit on the premises of the Seventh Respondent, after which the Applicant had been appointed as chairperson of the Seventh Respondent in 2005.

6.87 It had then been agreed that the Seventh Respondent would remunerate NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, as soon as they had recovered from their lack of funds, as had been admitted by Mr Rag Smit, in 2011, the previous owner of unit no 2 at the premises of the Seventh Respondent,.

Warrant of Execution

6.88 It is significant to note that soon after the Seventh Respondent had the claim by NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, removed from the court roll, they had applied for the taxation of their opposing action upon which the Seventh Respondent had obtained a Warrant of execution order on 18 JUNE 2014, for the amount of R7758,78 (seven thousand seven hundred and fifty eight rand and seventy eight cents) against NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, as attached hereto under annexure 'KK'.

Financially Recovered

6.89 Since the Applicant had been removed as chairperson in OCTOBER 2010, the Seventh Respondent had financially recovered to the extent that they could remunerate NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, instead had fraudulently been spending funds on specific items which had been renovated by NSA Developments CC,

CK Number 1995/041792/23, in the efforts by the Seventh Respondent to disguise the maintenance done by NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, and avoid remunerating NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23.

- 6.90 Since 2010, the Seventh Respondent had contravened various building regulations together with allowing an owner, Ms Katharina Benade, to conduct private services to men for several years.

Electricity Disconnected

- 6.91 Amidst the various forms in which the undermining of the peaceful stay of the Applicant had taken place at the premises of the Seventh Respondent, after the Applicant had stepped up to safeguard the lives and assets of the owners at the premises of the Seventh Respondent and to ensure their peaceful stay, from OCTOBER 2003 until OCTOBER 2010, had an incident occur on the afternoon of 3 JUNE 2017, that the electricity supply to the dwelling of the Applicant at the premises of the Seventh Respondent, had been disconnected, in that the connection wires had been loosened, during the stay of the Applicant's brother from Canada, during preparations of the funeral of their mother.

- 6.92 This incident had been an indication of the alignment of the conspiring between the owners at the premises of the Seventh Respondent and outsiders, whom had knowledge of the death of both parents of the Applicant, 10 (ten) days apart.

Crimen Injuria and Defamation of Character

- 6.93 On 15 JANUARY 2020, the Applicant had attended the Annual General Meeting of the Seventh Respondent, during which the Applicant had attempted to resolve the conflict between himself and the Seventh Respondent.

- 6.94 In response, the chairperson, Mr Wessel Van Wyk, committed Crimen Injuria and defamed the character of the Applicant, in calling the Applicant “Koekoes” for alleging that NSA Developments CC, CK Number 1995/041792/23, had a legitimate claim against the Seventh Respondent, in the attempt by Mr Wessel Van Wyk to provoke the Applicant to commit an offence, as attached hereto under annexure ‘LL’.

Full Trustee Board Resignation

- 6.95 In response to the charges laid at the South African Police Services by the Applicant against Mr Wessel Van Wyk for having committed Crimen Injuria and Defamation of character, had:

- 6.95.1 Mr Wessel Van Wyk resigned;
- 6.95.2 Mr Wessel Van Wyk sold his unit and relocated;
- 6.95.3 Mr Wessel Van Wyk uttered the following statement towards the owner of unit 5, Ms Katharina Benade: “I am done with you playing games”;
- 6.95.4 the full board of trustees of the Seventh Respondent resigned.

Executive Management Agent (Law Firm)

- 6.96 Upon the resignation of the full board of trustees, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.95, had law firm, Riaan Oosthuysen Attorneys Incorporated, trading as OPROPSA Attorneys, been appointed as Executive Management Agent (EMA) for the Seventh Respondent on 1 MAY 2020.
- 6.97 With the appointment of OPROPSA Attorneys, the Applicant had requested the director, Mr Riaan Oosthuysen, to answer to his obligations, as Executive Management Agent, in investigating the minute fraud committed by the Seventh Respondent which had led to their debt evasion. The Applicant had received no reply from Mr Riaan Oosthuysen, but had shortly after, been subjected to the continuation of

the witch hunt by the Seventh Respondent, which had involved the vindictive misuse of the services of the First Respondent.

Water meters

6.98 During January 2020, the Seventh Respondent had installed two water meters per residential unit on their premises, differentiating between home and garden use, the Seventh Respondent only installed one water meter for home use at the unit of the Applicant, resulting in the garden water usage by the Applicant being calculated together with the communal water usage.

6.99 This wilful act by the Seventh Respondent, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.98, under, had been admitted by Mr Wessel van Wyk, chairman at the time, during the personal attacks towards the Applicant by Mr Wessel van Wyk, during the AGM held on 15 January 2020.

6.100 The Applicant had become aware of the Seventh Respondent whom had been petty to disguise the scale of their deceit, as the incidents described in the paragraphs 6.101 to 6.103 bares proof thereof.

6.101 All outside taps had been locked, resulting in no watering of the communal garden and consequently all small garden plants died from draught, which had been planted during the chairmanship of the Applicant.

6.102 More than two and a half years after the water meter for home use had been installed at the unit of the Applicant, a second water meter for garden use, had been installed and apart from leaking, the water meter had indicated an existing reading upon installation. This notion by the Seventh Respondent had been nothing other than fraud.

6.103 Since the appointment of OPROPSA Attorneys, as Executive Management Agent for the Seventh Respondent, after the resignation of the full board of trustees had, 30% (thirty) of the owners have sold their units and relocated, with more than 30% (thirty) abstaining from engaging in the fraudulent actions by the Seventh Respondent, it has become evident that a small minority have made it possible for the legal representatives of the Seventh Respondent, to subject the Applicant to a witch hunt, in alignment with the Second, Fourth and Fifth Respondents, whom had undermined the National Property Database business the Applicant had launched.

Gate Entrance Tampering

6.104 Also since the appointment of OPROPSA Attorneys, as Executive Management Agent (EMA) for the Seventh Respondent, regular incidents had occurred regarding main entrance to the premises of the Seventh Respondent which had varied, from the gate being left open unattended, to the total dysfunction of the gate motor for the period 16 JULY 2022 until 3 OCTOBER 2022, during which several repairs had taken place, to the replacement of the gate motor after the theft thereof, after which the tampering with the new gate motor had occurred, followed by the fitment of a gate motor cage, without access keys to the gate motor cage been given to the Applicant.

Defamation Claim Threat – OPROPSA

6.105 From the awareness by the Applicant regarding the devious intent by the Seventh Respondent and their cowardliness in having appointed a law firm, as Executive Management Agent (EMA), to manage a sectional title complex consisting of only 10 (ten) units, which the Applicant single-handedly managed for more than 5 (five) years, the Applicant requested for the immediate resignation of OPROPSA Attorneys, as EMA, on 22 JULY 2022 by email, by which the Applicant also notified, Mr Riaan Oosthuysen, director of OPROPSA Attorneys, together with various media houses, the Legal Practice Council and the Community Schemes Ombud Services of the existence of the www.interveners.co.za website and videos the Applicant had created

regarding the 26 (twenty six) year witch hunt the Applicant had been subjected to.

6.106 In response to the email as described in the preceding paragraph 6.105, had Mr Riaan Oosthuysen threatened the Applicant with a crimen injuria and defamation claim, in the event of the Applicant not removing all references to Mr Riaan Oosthuysen Attorneys Incorporated, trading as OPROPSA Attorneys, from the videos or publications made by the Applicant within 7 (seven) days, upon which the Applicant had replied in questioning whether the true character of Mr Riaan Oosthuysen had been defamed or revealed, after which the openly sadistic and fraudulent actions by the Third, Second and Seventh Respondents had become evident.

Continuous Misuse of Sheriff

6.107 On 15 AUGUST 2022, the Seventh Respondent had, again attempted to attach the immovable property of the Applicant, despite Mr Riaan Oosthuysen admitting to have had insight into the litigation docket compiled by, Rorich Wolmarans & Luderitz Incorporated, the previous legal representative of the Seventh Respondent, therefore Mr Riaan Oosthuysen had been fully aware the Applicant possessed a legal contract prohibiting the First Respondent to attach the immovable property of the Applicant.

Burglary at Applicant's Residential Unit

6.108 It is furthermore of significance to note that during the period in which the main entrance gate motor had been out of order and the loadshedding had significantly been increased, the Seventh Respondent had fitted solar security lighting at all residential units, with the exception of the residential unit of the Applicant and on or about 25 or 26 SEPTEMBER 2022 a burglary had occurred at the residential unit of the Applicant, after which the gate motor had been functioning perfectly.

Communal Post Box

6.109 Further proof of the fraudulent intent by the Seventh Respondent is that, since 2003, the request by the Applicant to have 10 (ten) individual post boxes installed for each residential unit, at the main entrance of the premises of the Seventh Respondent, to prevent the interference with private postal delivery, had been fervently opposed by the Seventh Respondent until this day.

The Eighth Respondent

Jurisdiction Claim

6.110 After the Twenty-seventh Respondent had failed to comment, on 27 SEPTEMBER 2019, on the ordeal the Applicant had been facing with the Seventh Respondent, as described in the preceding paragraph 4.15, the Applicant had approached the Eighth Respondent to enquire whether the Eighth Respondent could assist in resolving the dispute between the Applicant and the Seventh Respondent and to receive payment from the Seventh Respondent. After several attempts made by the Applicant, he had received advice from a senior official of the Eighth Respondent whom had confirmed that the Applicant and the organization owned by the Applicant had a legitimate claim against the Seventh Respondent, in that the Applicant as a sectional title holder at the Seventh Respondent, had delivered services, whether in own capacity or as an organization owned by the Applicant.

6.111 On 4 MARCH 2020, the Applicant had presented a 260 (two hundred and sixty page) report on the Seventh Respondent to the Eighth Respondent, seeking their intervention regarding the fraud and mismanagement committed by the Seventh Respondent and having subjected the Applicant for orchestrating a witch hunt to conceal their obligation towards NSA Developments CC, as described in the preceding paragraphs 4.24 and 4.25.

6.112 From the reply by the Eighth Respondent, on 12 MARCH 2020, the Eighth Respondent had contravened section 2(c) of the Community

Schemes Ombud Services Act 9 of 2011, in having claimed the lack of jurisdiction to investigate the allegations made by the Applicant against the Seventh Respondent, as attached hereto under annexure 'R'.

Curator-ad-Litem

6.113 The honourable high Court has the authority to appoint a *Curator-ad-Litem* in the *interim* over the Seventh Respondent or until such time that an agreement had been reached between the Seventh Respondent and the Applicant and to bring an end to the fuelling and conducting of the inhumane actions by Second and the Seventh Respondents whom had been orchestrating their actions in sequence which had intensified since the Applicant had informed the various parties of the publishing of the 7 (seven) video series.

The Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh, Twelfth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Respondents

Elder Fraud Abuse

6.114 On 7 JANUARY 2013, amidst the devastating onslaught caused by the conspiring between the Second, Fourth, Fifth and the Seventh Respondents, the Applicant had stepped up to protect his aging parents, respectively 89 and 87 of age, against the Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Respondents, as trustees of the International Islands Mission, whom after having exploited the elderly missionary couple financially,

had attempted to have the elderly couple taken in by AD Care, an unregistered Dementia and Alzheimer facility without the elderly couple being diagnosed to suffer from such conditions.

6.115 The AD Care had been operated by Mr As Botha, whom had been struck off the roll as attorney, according to persons whom previously had dealt with the fraudulent actions by Mr As Botha.

The Twelfth Respondent

Financial License Suspension

6.116 Amidst the ordeal the Applicant had been facing to protect his parents, the Twelfth Respondent had notified the Applicant in AUGUST 2014, of the withdrawal of the extension of the deadline the Twelfth Respondent had been giving the Applicant, to write 2 (two) exams and to complete a workshop, resulting in the suspension of the financial license of the Applicant for more than 10 (ten) months, from 11 JUNE 2014 until 2 APRIL 2015, as attached hereto under annexure 'MM', during which time the Applicant had to provide proof of his competency after being in the insurance industry for more than 27 (twenty seven) years.

Income loss - Tragic death

6.117 The one of the most inhumane actions performed by those whom had conspired, had been to prevent the Applicant to generate an income, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.116, in that the loss of income had debilitated the Applicant to protect his healthy elderly parents and consequently led to the relocation of the elderly couple, from the Willows Retirement Village to the Silverton Old Age Home in DECEMBER 2014, where the Ninth Respondent had regularly been paying visits to one of his retired congregation members and where the parents of the Applicant had tragically died, under questionable circumstances, 2 (two) and a half years later, 10 (ten) days apart.

Proving Competence

6.118 It is of importance to note, that the requirements which had been set by the Twelfth Respondent:

6.118.1 apart from the annual requirements of having to provide financial statements; and

6.118.2 the paying of levies;

6.118.3 originated from the insurance industry being freshly regulated and had bared little significance to the Applicant

from him being in the insurance industry for more than 27 (twenty seven) years at the time, during which the Applicant had been practising as an independent broker in his own brokerage for more than 19 (nineteen) years at the time.

Lessening Competition

6.119 It is important to note that the reason for the Applicant having requested an extension of the deadline from on or about 2011 to 2014 to meet the requirements of having to write 2 (two) exams and to complete a NQF 5 workshop, had been from the attempt by the Applicant to relaunch the National Property Database, together with the balanced lifestyle workshops for singles and couple, the Applicant had been developed, during the time that the Applicant had also offered family and business mediation, simultaneously with the unscrupulous onslaught from the conspiring by the Second, Fourth and Fifth Respondents, whom had been contravening almost every possible Act, regulation and rule of their various industries in their mutual pursuit to prevent the potential competition, the National Property Database, developed by the Applicant, held and to prevent the Applicant to reinter the property industry in 2014.

Alleged Suicide and Sudden Death

6.120 Two years after the elderly couple had been taken in by Silverton Old Age Home, on or about FEBRUARY 2017, the matron, Ms Marina, accompanied by the Christian social worker, Ms Rina, had attempted to inform the Applicant of the alleged suicidal tendencies his father had been showing, during which the matron had stuttered to such an extent that the Applicant could not figure out what it was she had attempted to say, which the Applicant never from before had experienced, upon which the social worker had interrupted the matron's stuttering, to inform the Applicant that they had been of the plan to put the father of the Applicant on medication for his alleged tendencies.

6.121 Ms Marina soon afterwards had resigned. To those whom had known the father of the Applicant during his lifetime, would confirm that the father, Reverent Francois Botha, had on a daily basis been telling everyone that he had been expecting the 'second coming of Jesus' any day and therefore that he would not have attempted anything that might have disqualify him from 'meeting his Jesus'.

6.122 It is therefore till today, a question to many, how it came to that, that soon after the father of the Applicant had been put on the said medication, had become extremely ill with him passing away, on 30 MAY 2017, with the mother of the Applicant passing away on 9 JUNE 2017, 10 (ten) days later.

The Ninth Respondent

Defamation and Crimen Injuria

6.123 On 30 MAY 2017, at 11h19, approximately three hours prior to the passing of the father of the Applicant, during an conversation between the Ninth Respondent and the Applicant, at the Silverton Old Age Home and in the presence of, Ms Mariette, also a social worker, had the Ninth Respondent falsely accused and threatened the Applicant in various ways, of which the video and voice recording made by the Applicant during the conversation, bares proof and can be viewed on www.intervenors.co.za/the-case/ . The Ninth Respondent had admitted baring knowledge of the suspension of the financial license of the Applicant, in that the Ninth Respondent had claimed to have been informed by an attorney, Mr Steve Bester, that the Applicant had been conducting his financial brokerage under a 'false financial license' and that the Twelfth Respondent allegedly had no reference of the whereabouts of the Applicant, as attached hereto under annexure 'NN'.

6.124 This revelation by the Ninth Respondent, serves as proof that the Second, Fourth and Seventh Respondents, had conspired with the Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Respondents, with the Ninth Respondent whom had openly admitted thereto as per said video recording and the Tenth Respondent by email, as attached hereto under annexure 'NN',

which had consequently led to the intimidation of the Twelfth Respondent to withdraw the extension of the deadline the Twelfth Respondent had given the Applicant, resulting in the suspension of the financial license of the Applicant, as described in the preceding paragraph.

Unauthorized Funds

6.125 During the said conversation, on 30 MAY 2017, at 11h19, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.123, had the Ninth Respondent accused the Applicant of utilizing the funds donated by NG Suider Strand Kerk, as described in paragraph 6.136 to follow, which constituted a blatant lie in that the Applicant had only become involved with International Islands Mission after the Eleventh Respondent had secretly utilized the funds from NG Suider Strand Kerk, after which all donations by NG Suider Strand Kerk had been stopped, as attached hereto under annexure 'NN'.

Fraudulent Arrest Threat

6.126 Upon the request by the Applicant to gain access to the financial statements of the International Islands Mission, which had been declined by the trustees, had the Ninth Respondent informed the brother of the Applicant, residing in Canada, that the Ninth Respondent will have the Applicant falsely arrested if the Applicant would make any

further demands to have access to the financial statements, as attached hereto under annexure 'OO'.

Medical Aid Cancellation

6.127 During the same conversation between the Ninth Respondent and the Applicant, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.123, had the Applicant enquired regarding the cancellation by the trustees of the medical aid of his elderly parents, prior to their attempt to have the elderly parents taken in by the unregistered Dementia and Alzheimer facility, upon which the Ninth Respondent had denied having any knowledge of and had accused the Applicant to allegedly have conspired with the Tenth Respondent to cancel the medical aid of their parents, as attached hereto under annexure 'NN'.

The Ninth Respondent

Signing Rights Interference

6.128 Upon the intervention by the Applicant, had the full board of 6 (six) trustees of the International Islands Mission resigned in one day, after which the signing rights of the bank account of the father of the Applicant had been signed over to the Applicant, after which the Tenth Respondent had attempted several times to intimidate their father in the efforts by the Tenth Respondent to have the rights signed over to himself, upon which the Tenth Respondent had succeeded once from

having accused their father of committing a sin in him allowing the Applicant to manage his affairs as it had been forbidden by their 'Holy Scripture' to 'pull in the same yoke with a non-believer', which had derived from the Applicant's divorced status, as been used by the Fourteenth Respondent and as described in paragraph 6.141 to follow, as attached hereto under annexure 'RR'.

6.129 Ironically had the Fourteenth Respondent also used the same scripture to influence their father to withdraw the support their father had been giving the Applicant during his child custody application, 15 (fifteen) years later, as described in paragraph 6.141 to follow.

6.130 It had seemed that, the Tenth Respondent whom had been suffering financially since on or about 1994, after his spouse, Ms Lorraine, had arranged, for a 'prophet' to prophesize over the Tenth Respondent, that God would make the Tenth Respondent a billionaire if the Tenth Respondent would resign from a senior position at Absa Bank Limited as auditor, had upon his appointment of as treasurer of the International Island Mission on 2 DECEMBER 2010, discovered the fraudulent attempt by the Ninth Respondent to take over the donators of the International Islands Mission and the misuse of funds by the Eleventh Respondent and therefore had been targeted by both the Ninth and Eleventh Respondents in fraudulently providing the Tenth Respondent with funding, as it had been expressed by the Eleventh Respondent

towards the Applicant that he had felt guilty in that the father of the Applicant had provided better to him and his family, than towards the father's own family as attached hereto under annexure 'NN'.

6.131 This statement by the Eleventh Respondent had been self-justification in disguise, in that the funds the Eleventh Respondent had fraudulently received, had not originated from the father's salary income and therefor would never have been available to the father's family, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.125, as attached hereto under annexure 'NN'.

6.132 It had also been discovered that the Tenth Respondent had fraudulently and unlawfully, sold the pottery oven and wheel, as hobby tools of his mother, approximately 3 (three) years prior, as everything had indicated that the Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Respondents had been planning their wicked actions prior to 2010, in that the International Islands Mission had been affiliated with Novus Vita Christian Church, operated by Ninth Respondent, on 2 DECEMBER 2010.

The Applicant's Mother

Sculptor Age 90

6.133 A year prior to the ordeal the Applicant had with the Ninth, Tenth and Eleventh Respondents in 2012, had the Applicant encouraged his mother to start practicing her sculpting talent again, after 60 (sixty) years of her absence for being prohibited by the father of the Applicant, whom had been of the belief that sculpting was forbidden by the second commandment. The following, year after the Applicant had relocated his elderly parents to the Willows Retirement Village, the Applicant had been taking on Saturdays, his mother to a pottery and sculpting studio and his father to the Willows Hospital for pastoral visits. The next year, in MAY 2014 the Applicant had arranged for his mother to appear on the National Television program, KykNet Kwela, as a 90 (ninety) year old sculptor, during which a complete interview had been conducted with her, which had served as proof of the false accusations by her eldest son, the Ninth Respondent, that the mother had been suffering from Dementia, as can be viewed on www.interveners.co.za/the-case/.

Conversations with mother

6.134 From the various conversations the Applicant had with his mother regarding the betrayal by the Tenth Respondent as her eldest son and the co-trustees, she had expressed her distrust in the Ninth Respondent from his pretentious concern regarding their retirement and in him having started to accompany the father of the Applicant when visiting donators in his attempts to win the donators over.

The Eleventh Respondent

Unauthorized funds

6.135 The mother of the Applicant had requested the Applicant to enquire whether NG Suider Strand Kerk would be willing to contribute towards their retirement in the view of them having donated towards the International Island Mission for several years, from which the Eleventh Respondent and his family of 5 (five) had been living from for more than 2 (two) years, as described in paragraph 6.136 to follow.

6.136 Upon the enquiry by the Applicant, had the Eleventh Respondent admitted to him and his family of 5 (five) having fraudulently receiving funds from the International Islands Mission, for a period of more than 2 (two) years, in that NG Suider Strand Kerk as donator, had designated their donations exclusively for missionary work in Indonesia, as attached hereto under annexure 'NN'.

6.137 The Applicant had also made contact with Reverend Abri Botha from NG Suider Strand Kerk whom had confirmed that he bared knowledge that the Eleventh Respondent and his family had been living form the donations by NG Suider Strand Kerk but that it had been done in secrecy due to the NG Suider Strand Kerk board having designated the donations for missionary work in Indonesia specifically. Reverend Abri Botha had further mentioned that NG Suider Strand Kerk would not be

able to contribute towards the elderly parents of the Applicant, from the International Islands Mission not having an association with the NG Kerk. It seems that International Islands Mission, whom had no association with the NG Kerk, had been used by the NG Kerk as vehicle for overseas funding.

The Thirteenth and Fourteenth Respondents

6.138 From the said conversations with his mother, had the Applicant also been requested by his mother to enquire from the Thirteenth Respondent, whether the Fourteenth Respondent would be willing to contribute towards the retirement of parents of the Applicant, from the Thirteenth Respondent, whom as head of mission work, had made a donation to the International Island Mission during the child custody application by the Applicant in 1998, even though it had been the only donation ever made by the Thirteenth Respondent towards the Mission. The Applicant's mother had also indicated that the Eleventh Applicant had bared knowledge of the said donation.

6.139 From the enquiry made by the Applicant, had the Eleventh Respondent admitted baring knowledge of the said donation made by the Thirteenth Respondent during the child custody application by the Applicant, after which the Eleventh Respondent had warned the Applicant not to make

any enquiries regarding the donation, which had raised suspicion by the Applicant.

6.140 From the enquiry made by the Applicant to Mr Pieter Breytenbach, as chief operating officer of the Fourteenth Respondent regarding the donation made by the Fourteenth Respondent to the International Islands Mission, had the Applicant received a hostile response from the Fourteenth Respondent and an unchristlike unwillingness to assist the elderly couple, declaring that they had no obligation towards the elderly couple, as attached hereto under annexure 'PP'.

6.141 The Applicant had questioned his father regarding the donation made by the Fourteenth Respondent, upon which the father had admitted that the donation had been made to the International Islands Mission in exchange for the withdrawal of his support he had been giving the Applicant during the child custody application by the Applicant, as the father of the Applicant had been forbidden to be 'pulling in the same yoke as a non-believer'. The Applicant's father had also added that, the Applicant had no idea with whom the Applicant was dealing. As mentioned in the preceding paragraph 6.128, had the Tenth Respondent attempted several times to intimidate the father of the Applicant to have the signing rights of the bank account signed over to the Tenth Respondent, having used the same scripture.

The Fourteenth and Fifteenth Respondents

6.142 After the Applicant had enquired from the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Respondents, on 11 FEBRUARY 2014, regarding the unlawful donation made and the marriage concluded by the Thirteenth Respondent for the father of the Applicant to withdraw his support and the unauthorized fund utilized by the Eleventh Respondent, the Applicant had become aware that the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Respondents had been fully aware of the actions performed by the Eleventh, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Respondents and that their involvement to divide families and destroy businessmen, are in cooperation with like-minded social workers and family lawyers, as attached hereto under annexure 'QQ'.

Untwisting the Fabric of Reality

Window to the Past 15 Years Later

6.143 The shocking discovery by the Applicant of the deceitful and unlawful actions by the Twelfth and Thirteenth Respondents, as representatives of the largest Afrikaans Christian church at the time, had opened a window to the past, the period from 1995 until 1998, during the divorce and child custody applications by the Applicant, during which the father of the Applicant, the Ninth, Thirteenth and Fourteenth Respondents had played a devastating role, in that their unchristlike actions had not only been an attempt to conceal child abuse, but had warrant child abuse to

continue and the tragic irony had been that the father whom the Applicant had been protecting, had been the one whom had stabbed the Applicant in the back years 15 (fifteen) years from before.

Unlawful Donation Concealing Child Abuse

Marriage with Child Abuser

6.144 The unlawful donation by the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Respondents for the withdrawal of the support the father of the Applicant had been giving the Applicant during his child custody application during 1997 and 1998, had been to prevent the father of the Applicant from pursuing disciplinary action against the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Respondents whom had concluded the marriage between the Sixteenth Respondent and a self-admitted child abuser, Mr Henk Janse van Vuuren, which consequently had led to the forced contact between the child abuser and the 2 (two) minor children of the Applicant, which had been prohibited by 2 (two) High Court orders obtained by the Applicant, to result in the fourth removal of the 2 (two) minor children, whom had already severely been traumatized, from the custody to the Sixteenth Respondent, whom had sworn that she had no more contact with her child abuser friend.

6.145 The first relevance of this period to this application, is the similarity between the numerous respondents the Second Respondent had

directly or indirectly conspired with, all of whom had a history of fraud and corruption and those serving in religious institutions, from whom one would least expect, to destroy families and businesses, as the fraudulent actions by the Second Respondent in conspiring, had exploited every possible opportunity, regardless the effect it had on the Applicant and his family, in their attempts to prevent and eliminate the competition the National Property Database held.

6.146 The second relevance of this period to this application serves to manifest the scale of corrupt officials whom are positioned in powerful positions in the religious system and judiciary, whom initially network from a powerbase of pretence until being discovered or fear thereof, to flagrantly act in reliance on the scale of their corrupt network as powerbase, to intimidate those they had been attempting to destroy.

The Tenth Respondent

6.147 The Tenth Respondent, whom had been unemployed for the lengthy periods of his adult life, had been a key role player in the exploitation of the elderly parents, as described in the preceding paragraphs 6.128 to 6.131, as attached hereto under annexure 'PP' and had also been a key role player in the support he had given the Sixteenth Respondent, during the course of 1997 and 1998, the time of the application by the Applicant to obtain custody over his two minor children after having

witnessed the sadistic and psychopathic actions by the Sixteenth Respondent, whom as later discovered, had been suffering from a brain tumour as described in paragraph 6.163 to follow.

6.148 The Tenth Respondent had together with the Sixteenth Respondent, interfered and harassed family members, friends, business colleagues and partners of the Applicant and had in particular influence the father of the Applicant to withdraw the support the father had given the Applicant, with his accusation that their father had been 'pulling in the same yoke as a non-believer', deriving from the Applicant's divorce status, as attached hereto under annexure 'RR'.

Divorce from Sadistic Psychopath

Child Abuse

6.149 In JULY 1984 the Applicant, age 21 (twenty-one), had taken on a 6 (six) month employment after having completed the 2 (two) year National Service in the South African Air Force, after which the Applicant had been accepted by the University of the Free State to study Architecture at and having met their requirements.

6.150 In OCTOBER 1984, had the Applicant met the Sixteenth Respondent, age 28 (twenty eight) at his employer's workplace whom had just ended

her first and 7 (seven) year marriage, from which 2 (two) children had been born, whom the Sixteenth Respondent had alienated from their father.

Neuropsychiatric Disorder

6.151 From the Applicant's naïve and extreme religious background and having had no past experience of those who suffer from neuropsychiatric disorders and their persistent antisocial deviance and criminal behaviour, the Applicant had fallen prey and had been convinced by the Sixteenth Respondent to study Law at the University of Pretoria in 1985, after which 5 (five) suicidal threats by the Sixteenth Respondent and her accusation that the Applicant could not 'throw her and her children back in God's face', had led to the marriage between the Applicant and the Sixteenth Respondent in May 1986.

'The Perfect Plot'

6.152 From the 9 (nine) year unstable and destructive marriage, which had been characterized by the constant gas lighting by the Sixteenth Respondent and accusations of the Applicant having extramarital affairs, as per her famous quote: 'Having affairs with unknown parties'.

6.153 From the Sixteenth Respondent whom had constantly informing family members, friends and colleagues how bad the Applicant had been treating her, had the Applicant discovered 'The Perfect Plot' by the Narcissist to capture the naïve Empath, from them having fabricated a 'God commanded holy matrimony', that God 'brings parties together forever' and declaring divorce as sinful as premarital sex.

6.154 This ensures that the naïve Empath whom bares no knowledge of the deceitful nature of the Narcissist, can be 'imprisoned for life' and having to live under constant mental and often physical abuse.

Parental Alienation

6.155 In MAY 1995, after having escaped from the delusions from his religious background, the Applicant had filed for divorce, after which the Sixteenth Respondent had alienated her 2 (two) children from her previous marriage from the Applicant, whom the applicant had treated and brought up as if they were his own children.

6.156 During the divorce, the Sixteenth Respondent had also attempted to alienate the 2 (two) children, respectively ages 7 (seven) and 2 (two) at the time, born from the 9 (nine) year marriage between the Applicant and the Sixteenth Respondent, in that several incidents of child abuse, harassment and assaults had been performed by the Sixteenth

Respondent and the self-admitted child abuser, Mr Henk Janse van Vuuren, during which the Applicant had requested for the intervention by a child psychologist, as attached hereto under annexure 'SS`.

The Seventeenth and Eighteenth Respondents

6.157 The Seventeenth Respondent, on record of the Sixteenth Respondent, whom had been fuelling conflict in his support of the irrational maintenance claims and actions by the Sixteenth Respondent, had referred the Eighteenth Respondent, upon the request by the Applicant for the assistance of a child psychologist.

6.158 Upon the second appointment with the Eighteenth Respondent, had the Applicant become aware of that the Eighteenth Respondent had no intention to protect his 2 (two) minor children but to conceal the child abuse and to promote the irrational maintenance claims by the Sixteenth Respondent, resulting in the Applicant to dismiss the appointment with the Eighteenth Respondent after the Applicant had indicated his disappointment with her lack of integrity and concealment of the parental alienation and child abuse by the Sixteenth Respondent and the child abuser.

6.159 After months of continuous child abuse, harassment and assaults by the Sixteenth Respondent and her the child abuser friend, had the Applicant

witnessed, the then married Seventeenth Respondent and then unmarried Eighteenth Respondent, whom had engaged in a romantic act at JD Blonds restaurant on or about 22h00 one evening on or about JANUARY 1996, upon which the Applicant had approached the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Respondents at their table and had informed them of his intention to report them the following day for mal practising.

6.159.1 On 16 SEPTEMBER 1997 and again on 11 SEPTEMBER 2014, the Applicant had reported and requested for the investigation of the mal practising of the Seventeenth Respondent by the Sixth Respondent with no success, as attached hereto under annexure 'AAA'.

The Twentieth Respondent

6.160 The following morning before 07h00, had the Applicant received a telephonic call from the Twentieth Respondent whom had offered to the Applicant to arrange for the acceptance of the settlement offer by the Sixteenth Respondent within 2 (two) days at no costs on condition that the Applicant would not report the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Respondents for their mal practices.

The Sixteenth Respondent

Parental Alienation, Child Abuse and Assaults

6.161 After the acceptance of the divorce settlement offer by the Sixteenth Respondent, had the interference and harassed family members, friends, business colleagues and partners of the Applicant by the Sixteenth Respondent and the child abuser, Mr Henk Janse van Vuuren, continued, with the participation of the Tenth Respondent and his spouse, Ms Lorraine.

6.162 From the numerous sadistic and psychopathic actions performed by the Sixteenth Respondent and the child abuser, Mr Henk Janse van Vuuren, had the following incidents been reported to the South African Police Services by the Applicant during the period 1995 to 1997, to serve as prove that the officials whom had been involved in the divorce and child custody applications by the Applicant, had not only intentionally neglected to enforce measures to prevent and minimize the sadistic and psychopathic actions by the Sixteenth Respondent and the child abuser, but had fuelled and exploited the actions in having protected the Sixteenth Respondent and the child abuser and to forcefully expose the 2 (two) minor children of the Applicant to extreme mental abuse, as hereto attached under annexures 'SS':

- 6.162.1 1 JANUARY 1995 Applicant discovered at 06H00 the affair between Sixteenth Respondent Mr Andre Smit;
- 6.162.2 15 JANUARY 1995 Applicant discovered at 17H00 the affair between Sixteenth Respondent Mr Andre Smit continued;
- 6.162.3 MARCH 1995 Applicant discovered the affair between Sixteenth Respondent and a Sanlam manager, Mr Ben Snyman;
- 6.162.4 2 JUNE 1995: Harassment and intimidation of colleagues by the Sixteenth Respondent to affect disruption of income;
- 6.162.5 2 JUNE 1995: Assault of Applicant by Mr Henk J van Vuuren;
- 6.162.6 SEPTEMBER 1995: False medical assault certificate by the Sixteenth Respondent;

- 6.162.7 16 OCTOBER 1995: Fraudulent protection order by the Sixteenth Respondent against Applicant set aside by court;

- 6.162.8 Continuous contempt by the Sixteenth Respondent of the Applicant's protection order against the Sixteenth Respondent;

- 6.162.9 OCTOBER 1995: Undermining of Sanlam practice in harassing and intimidation of managers: Mr Alwyn Prinsloo, Mr Ben Snyman, Mr Piet Craven, Mr Willie de Coning by the Sixteenth Respondent to affect disruption of income and loss of the Applicant's practice;

- 6.162.10 7 JANUARY 1996: Damage to vehicle of Applicant by the Sixteenth Respondent;

- 6.162.11 12 JANUARY 1996: Assault of Applicant by the Sixteenth Respondent;

- 6.162.12 MARCH 1996: Undermining of Sunny Side City Lake Flea Market by harassing and intimidation of business partner Mr Pierre Joubert by the Sixteenth Respondent to result in loss of business;
- 6.162.13 21 APRIL 1996: Assault of Applicant by Mr H J van Vuuren and the Sixteenth Respondent;
- 6.162.14 6 SEPTEMBER 1996: Harassment of Applicant by Mr H J van Vuuren and the Sixteenth Respondent;
- 6.162.15 19 SEPTEMBER 1996: Contempt of child visitation by the Sixteenth Respondent;
6. 162.16 20 SEPTEMBER 1996: Assault of Applicant by Mr H J van Vuuren and the Sixteenth Respondent;
- 6.162.17 20 SEPTEMBER 1996: Death threat by Mr H J van Vuuren;

- 6.162.18 28 FEBRUARY 1997: Fire arm taken by SAPS from
Mr H J van Vuuren after death threat;

- 6.162.19 2 MARCH 1997: Damage to vehicle by Mr H J van
Vuuren in kicking and throwing of rock at vehicle, with the
son of the Applicant inside the vehicle;

- 6.162.20 30 APRIL 1997: Fraudulent hospitalisation of the son
of the Applicant by the Sixteenth Respondent;

- 6.162.21 AUGUST 1997: Physical assault of the daughter of the
Applicant by Mr H J van Vuuren;

- 6.162.22 SEPTEMBER 1997: The Sixteenth Respondent
manipulated the daughter of the Applicant to give
contradicting physical assault report;

- 6.162.23 29 SEPTEMBER 1997: Assault of Applicant by Mr H J
van Vuuren;

6.162.24 15 NOVEMBER 1997: Fraudulent use of maintenance for cosmetic surgery by the Sixteenth Respondent to result in fraudulent warrant of arrest of the Applicant;

Brain Tumour

6. 163 On or about SEPTEMBER 2010, had the Sixteenth Respondent undergone surgery to remove a brain tumour, the size of golf ball, which had provided prove that the Sixteenth Respondent had been suffering from a neuro-psychiatric disorder and had explained her sadistic and psychopathic actions towards her children and the Applicant, which had largely been exploited by system officials.

Cosmetic Surgery - Maintenance Misuse

6.164 After the Sixteenth Respondent had fraudulently use of the child maintenance for plastic surgery, in having silicon prosthesis implanted to enhance her calves and to neglect to pay the school fees and medical aid of the 2 (two) minor children, had the Applicant approached the maintenance court, on or about NOVEMBER 1996 to apply to reduce the monthly child maintenance payable to the Sixteenth Respondent, to enable the Applicant to pay the school fees and medical aid of the 2 (two) minor children himself.

The Nineteenth Respondent

6.165 From the decline of the application to reduce the child maintenance by the Applicant, by the maintenance court, had the legal representative on record of the Applicant, Mr Gerhard H Dreyer, from Dreyer and Dreyer Attorneys, on advice from Advocate Mark Haskins, notified the Nineteenth Respondent, as legal representative of the Sixteenth Respondent, an apprentice attorney at the time, whom had been appointed to replace the Seventeenth Respondent, from the same law firm, Malan and Van Wyk Attorneys, after the withdrawal by the Seventeenth Respondent after having been discovered by the Applicant to conceal child abuse, that the Applicant will be deducting the school fees and medical aid amounts from the child maintenance payable to the Sixteenth Respondent and would pay the school fees and medical aid premiums directly to the organisations.

6.165.1 On 16 SEPTEMBER 1997 and again on 11 SEPTEMBER 2014, the Applicant had reported and requested for the investigation of the mal practising of the Nineteenth Respondent by the Sixth Respondent with no success, as attached hereto under annexure 'BBB'.

Child Custody

6.166 From the constant child abuse incidents and harassment the Applicant and his family members, friends and colleagues had endured, had the Applicant notified the Sixteenth Respondent of his intension, on or about MAY 1997, to approach the High Court to apply for the custody over the 2 (two) minor children.

Fraudulent Arrest Order

6.167 Upon the notification received of the intent by the Applicant to apply for the custody over the 2 (two) minor children, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.166, had the Sixteenth Respondent approach the court for a order to demand the Applicant to pay the child maintenance in accordance with the divorce settlement order, upon which the Sixteenth Respondent had obtained a warrant of execution of the moveable property of the Applicant and a warrant of arrest of the Applicant issued, as attached hereto under annexure 'TT'.

Magistrate Placed on Record and Revision

6.168 After the fraudulent criminal charges laid by the Sixteenth Respondent against the Applicant, after the Sixteenth Respondent had fraudulently use child maintenance for plastic surgery, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.164, had the Applicant appeared in court for the imprisonment of the Applicant. On the day of the court appearance of the Applicant, prior to the proceedings, had the legal representative on

record of the Applicant, Mr Gerhard H Dreyer, notified the prosecutor that the Applicant had been fraudulently prosecuted by the Sixteenth Respondent and that the Applicant is not in arrears in having paid the school fees and medical aid premium directly to the organisations.

6.169 The prosecutor, whom had been in a conversation with the Sixteenth Respondent, had ignored the notice by Mr Gerhard H Dreyer and had indicated to Magistrate Mr Van Der Merwe that she intend to prosecute the Applicant.

6.170 Upon the opening of the court, had Mr Gerhard H Dreyer requested for Magistrate Mr Van Der Merwe to be placed **on record**, after which Magistrate Mr Van Der Merwe had asked the prosecutor if she still wished to continue with her prosecution of the Applicant upon which the prosecutor had confirmed for the magistrate to continue.

6.171 Upon the opening of the court, had Mr Gerhard H Dreyer placed Magistrate Mr Van Der Merwe **on revision** to prevent the magistrate to continue and close the case against the Applicant.

Child Custody

Legal Aid Application

6.172 On 9 JULY 1997, had the Applicant applied for legal aid due to the loss of income from the insurance practise of the Applicant caused by the continued interferences and harassment of family members, friends, colleagues and partners of the Applicant by the Sixteenth Respondent, which had also forced the Applicant to sell his 50% shareholding in the Sunny Side City Lake Flea Market the Applicant had initiated and developed.

6.173 Upon the legal aid been granted to the Applicant, Mr Gerhard H Dreyer, the legal representative on record for the Applicant, had notified, the Nineteenth Respondent, the legal representative on record for the Sixteenth Respondent, thereof and had the Applicant started preparing an application for custody over his 2 (two) minor children.

6.174 Amidst the said preparation had the Applicant been notified by a member of the South African Police Services, in SEPTEMBER 1997, that his 9 (nine) year old daughter had been physically assaulted by Mr Henk Janse van Vuuren, the friend of the Sixteenth Respondent, but that the Sixteenth Respondent whom had reported the physical assault, had immediately afterwards requested the SAPS office to withdraw her report thereof.

6.175 Immediately after having been informed of the physical abuse of his daughter, had the Applicant driven to the Monument Park Primary School to comfort his daughter and to determine the emotional and physical condition of his daughter. Upon arrival, had the Applicant gone directly to his daughter's class room and upon walking into the class room, had his daughter ran towards the Applicant. After the Applicant had informed his daughter of his knowledge of the incident, had the Applicant informed Ms Christelle Van Zyl, the teacher and had requested her to have a conversation with his daughter regarding the incident and to provide him with the version of the incident told by his daughter to her.

6.176 After the Applicant had received the version by Ms Christelle Van Zyl of the physical abuse incident and had informed the legal representative on record for the Sixteenth Respondent, had the Sixteenth Respondent manipulated her daughter to write a fabricated version of the physical abuse incident which later had fraudulently been used to prevent the prosecution of Mr Henk Janse van Vuuren, in claiming that it cannot be determined beyond reasonable doubt what really had happened.

High Court Order

6.177 Immediately had physical abuse incident, had the Applicant a High Court order obtained which had restrained the Sixteenth Respondent to

bring the child abuser in contact with the daughter and had ordered the mother of the Sixteenth Respondent, the legal representative of the Sixteenth Respondent and the Nineteenth Respondents, as social worker at the offices of the Thirteenth Respondent, to report in the event that the Sixteenth Respondent would contempt the court order.

6.178 A few days after the Sixteenth Respondent had informed all the relative parties that she had ended her relationship with the child abuser, Mr Henk Janse van Vuuren, on 28 SEPTEMBER 1997, during a country side outing the Applicant together with his 2 (two) children, came across the Sixteenth Respondent and the child abuser Mr Henk Janse van Vuuren.

6.179 It had become evident that all the parties whom had been ordered by the High Court, as described in the preceding paragraph 6.177, had been conspiring in that all the parties had knowingly been in contempt of the High Court order, as the mother of the Sixteenth Respondent, the legal representative of the Sixteenth Respondent, the Nineteenth Respondent had a history of contempt in this matter together with the Twenty-first Respondent, as the social worker from the Fourteenth Respondent, whom the latter had been the party to intimidate the father of the Applicant from their unlawful donation and as the following paragraphs stand to prove.

6.180 During the weekend of 14 NOVEMBER 1997, the Applicant become aware that the Sixteenth Respondent had vacated her residence upon which the Applicant had contacted the Nineteenth Respondent, whom had informed the Applicant that the Sixteenth Respondent, together with the 2 (two) minor children and the child abuser, Mr Henk Janse van Vuuren, had relocated to Boknesstrand in the Eastern Cape Province.

Legal Aid Cancellation

6.181 Shortly after the Applicant had been granted legal aid, Advocate Trudie Weyers from the Legal Aid Board, had notified the Applicant of the cancellation of his legal aid due to the allegation by the Sixteenth Respondent to Advocate Trudie Weyers that the Applicant had lied about his income.

First and Second Urgent Notice of Motion

6.182 On 21 NOVEMBER 1997 the Applicant had obtained a High Court order which had placed his 2 (two) children in the custody of the Applicant, *pendent lite* a report by the Family Advocate. On arrival in Boknesstrand the following day, the Applicant had approached the Sixteenth Respondent, whom had refused to let the 2 (two) children into the custody of the Applicant, in claiming that the Twentieth Respondent had advised the Sixteenth Respondent, that due to the interdict the

Sixteenth Respondent had fraudulently obtained earlier had prevented the Applicant to gain access to the 2 (two) children for as long the Sixteenth Respondent, would keep the 2 (two) children in her custody.

First Placement of Children

6.183 On 24 NOVEMBER 1997 the Applicant had obtained a second High Court order, ordering the Sheriff to obtain access and place the 2 (two) children in the custody of the Applicant.

Second Placement of Children

6.184 On 21 JANUARY 1998 the Twenty-first Respondent, as the social worker at the offices of the Thirteenth Respondent, had fabricated a child report leading to the removal of the 2 (two) children from the custody of the Applicant and the placement of the 2 (two) children in the custody of the mother of the Sixteenth Respondent, where the Sixteenth Respondent, had resided, upon which had the Twenty-first Respondent refused the Applicant access to take his children to engage in extracurricular activities.

Third Placement of the Children

6.185 On 20 MAY 1998 the Twenty-first Respondent had with the aid of another fraudulent report removed the 2 (two) children from the custody

of the mother of the Sixteenth Respondent and had placed the 2 (two) children in the custody of the Sixteenth Respondent.

Secretive Marriage by NG Moreleta Kerk

6.186 On 18 JUNE 1998, upon the unexpected visit by the Applicant to the office of the Twenty-first Respondent, the Applicant had enquired regarding the whereabouts of the 2 (two) children, upon which the Twenty-first Respondent at first had asked the Applicant to state the reason for his enquiry to which the Applicant had replied that he cannot make any contact with his 2 (two) children.

The Family Advocate Child Psychologist

6.187 In response the Twenty-first Respondent informed the Applicant that the Thirteenth Respondent, as Reverend of the Fourteenth Respondent, had concluded a marriage, on 16 JUNE 1998, between the Sixteenth Respondent, and the child abuser, Mr Henk Janse van Vuuren, upon which the Applicant had immediately contacted the Family Advocate psychologist, Mr Colyn Schutte, telephonically to inform him of the said marriage, upon which Mr Colyn Schutte had informed the Applicant within 15 (fifteen) minute that the 2 (two) children will again be placed in the custody of the mother of the Sixteenth Respondent.

6.188 The Twenty-first Respondent had failed to report her knowledge of the planned marriage between the child abuser and the Sixteenth Respondent in that she had been present during the consultation between the couple and the Thirteenth Respondent after which the Twenty-first Respondent had failed to report the conclusion of the said marriage.

Fraudulent Child Report File

6.189 On 18 JUNE 1998, after the Applicant had reported the conclusion of the said marriage to the Family Advocate psychologist, Mr Colyn Schutte, the Applicant then returned to the office of the Twenty-first Respondent upon which the Applicant had picked up the file containing the reports the Twenty-first Respondent had complied regarding the 2 (two) minor children, from the office desk of the Twenty-first Respondent, upon which the Applicant had walked out the office of the Twenty-first Respondent with the said file upon which the Twenty-first Respondent had called for assistance, to result in four employees of the Fourteenth Respondent, preventing the Applicant to leave the premises with the filed reports after which they had demanded the return of the said file.

Child Reports Destroyed

6.190 On or about FEBRUARY 2014, upon an enquiry by the Applicant, the Twenty-first Respondent had informed the Applicant that she had destroyed the said child custody reports she had compiled, as the law had allow her to do so.

Fourth Placement of the Children

The Twenty-third Respondent

6. 191 On 22 MAY 1998, the Twenty-third Respondent, as Children Court commissioner, had placed the 2 (two) minor children in the custody of the mother of the Sixteenth Respondent.

Third Urgent Notice of Motion

6. 192 On 12 AUGUST 1998 the Applicant had approached the High Court with an Urgent Notice of Motion application to gain custody over the 2 (two) children due to the continuous traumatisation of the 2 (two) children by the Sixteenth Respondent and her restriction of access to the Applicant to the 2 (two) children. The application had been dismissed from the objection by the Twentieth Respondent in that the Children Court had not been added as party to the case, as attached hereto under annexure 'UU'.

Fifth Placement of Children

6. 193 On 5 OCTOBER 1998 the Twenty-third Respondent, as Children Court commissioner, had placed the 2 (two) severely traumatised children in the custody of the Sixteenth Respondent and forcefully in the presence of the child abuser.

6. 194 The Twenty-third Respondent had motivated her decision in that the Attorney General, now the National Prosecuting Authority, had not prosecuted the child abuser and that it had become practise to reunite a sex offender with the victim.

Intimidation by Children Court Commissioner

6. 195 The dreadful truth is that, after the Applicant had demanded for the child abuser to be prosecuted and after the fourth replacement of his 2 (two) children on 22 MAY 1998, the Twenty-third Respondent had intimidated the Applicant in that the Twenty-third Respondent will place his 2 (two) children in an orphanage if the child abuser, Mr Henk Janse van Vuuren, would be prosecuted.

The Twentieth Respondent

Fourth Urgent Notice of Motion

6. 196 On 10 DECEMBER 1998 the Applicant had brought an Urgent Notice of Motion application in person to apply for custody over the 2 (two) minor children.
6. 197 After Justice Swart had **not** indicated to the Applicant that his application will **not** be heard that day, the clerk of the High Court had approached the Applicant whom was sitting in court and had informed the Applicant that he may leave the court due to the court role being full and therefore that his case would stand over to the following day, upon which the Applicant had asked the clerk if he was the Judge, upon which the clerk had walked away.
6. 198 At 16h00 the same day and after all other applications had been heard, had Justice Swart requested Verbatim to leave the court room, upon which Justice Swart had asked the Twentieth Respondent why he had been in court, whom had also been sitting in court the whole day.
6. 199 The Twentieth Respondent had informed Justice Swart that the Applicant's application should not be heard claiming that the High Court had lacked the jurisdiction to hear the application due to children court procedures not being finalized, upon which the Applicant had informed Justice Swart that the Twentieth Respondent had attempted to mislead the court, as attached hereto under annexure 'SS`.

6.200 In response had Justice Swart replied that an advocate could not mislead a court for being briefed by an attorney, upon which the applicant had replied that the Twentieth Respondent had not been briefed by an attorney to appear in court and upon which the Twentieth Respondent had admitted to not been briefed.

6.201 Justice Swart had then instructed the Twentieth Respondent to appear with instructions from an attorney and had requested the Applicant to reapply in JANUARY 1999 due to the court recess over December.

6.202 Upon the discussion the Applicant had with his legal representative on record, Gerhard H Dreyer, regarding the mentioned court events on 10 DECEMBER 1998 and had questioned how the Applicant could obtain proof of the court events, Gerhard H Dreyer replied that Justice Swart had to give his version in a written affidavit upon request, to which the Applicant had indicated that he had intended to request Justice Swart for a written affidavit, upon which Mr Gerhard H Dreyer had said to the Applicant that he would be 'going too far' in doing so.

Honourable Lady Justice Thlapi and Justice Swart

6.203 As the nature of this application serves to prove that members of the public are depending on the integrity of the judicator, of which the two non-related Notice of Motion applications by the Applicant in this application are clear examples, as described in the preceding paragraphs 6.40 as heard by Honourable Lady Justice Thlapi on 23 MAY 2016 and in the preceding paragraphs 6.206 as heard by Justice Swart in 1998.

Extracurricular Activities

6. 204 On or about FEBRUARY 1999 the Applicant again requested permission from the Twenty-first Respondent to have access to his 2 (two) minor children to have them engage in extracurricular activities, whom again had denied the Applicant access from her believe that the children did not need to engage in extracurricular activities after which the Twenty-first Respondent had accused the Applicant of him intending to inflict conflict in doing so, upon which the Applicant had approached the children court whom had granted the Applicant permission.

The Twenty-second Respondent

6. 205 On 16 NOVEMBER 1998 the Applicant reported the Twenty-first Respondent to Dr SF Lombaard from the Twenty-second Respondent for her contempt of two high court orders during SEPTEMBER and NOVEMBER 1997 and her failing to have reported the marriage

concluded which had caused the fourth removal of the 2 (two) minor children from the custody from the Sixteenth Respondent, upon which Dr SF Lombaard had defended the Twenty-first Respondent from his belief that the Twenty-first Respondent had not been aware of all the whereabouts of the Sixteenth Respondent, as attached hereto under annexure 'VV'.

The Twenty-fourth Respondent

6. 206 On 4 JUNE 1999, four months after the Applicant had reported the Twenty-third Respondent to the Twenty-fourth Respondent for her intimidation towards the Applicant to have his 2 (two) minor children placed in an orphanage in the event that the Applicant would seek for the prosecution of the child abuser, Mr Henk Janse van Vuuren, had the Twenty-fourth Respondent replied that they had found nothing fraudulent from the intimidation by the Twenty-third Respondent, as attached hereto under annexure 'WW'.

The Family Advocate

6. 207 As the High Court order which had placed the two children in the custody of the Applicant, on 21 NOVEMBER 1997, had been *pendent lite* a report by the Family Advocate, the Applicant had been requested by the Family Advocate to obtain written affidavits from family members

and friends whom had been in support of the Applicant maintaining custody over his two minor children.

Intimidation of Support

6. 208 It later had come to the knowledge of the Applicant that the majority of the authors of the supportive affidavits the Applicant had received, had been intimidated to withdraw their support from the Applicant as the following examples serve as prove, as attached hereto under annexure 'XX':

6. 208.1 After Ms Christelle Van Zyl, the school teacher of the daughter of the Applicant, at Monument Park Primary School, had given her version of the child abuse incident after the teacher had been in conversation with the daughter, the teacher had been prohibited by the head master of the school to provide any further information or to engage with the Applicant;

6. 208.2 After the father of the Applicant had given his support in writing, the Fourteenth Respondent had donated an amount of R80 000.00 (eighty thousand rand) to the International Island Mission in 1998 for the withdrawal of his support;

6. 208.3 After Ms Linda Boshoff had given her support in writing, the Sixteenth Respondent, had told Ms Linda Boshoff that the suicide of her son was what she had deserved;
6. 208.4 After Pierre Joubert, as business partner of the Applicant, had given his the support in writing, the Sixteenth Respondent had contacted and told Mr Pierre Joubert, whom the Applicant had given 50% shareholding in the Sunny Side City Lake Flea Market the Applicant had initiated and developed, that the Applicant had called Mr Pierre Joubert a 'Jail Bird' and that the Applicant had intended to send Mr Pierre Joubert back to jail, after which the Sixteenth Respondent had advised Mr Pierre Joubert to force the Applicant to sell his 50% shareholding to Mr Pierre Joubert. Mr Pierre Joubert then had confronted the Applicant regarding the said conversation upon which the relationship had deteriorated to such an extent that the Applicant had agreed to engage in a private auctioning between them with the purpose to buy Mr Pierre Joubert out. During the auctioning the Applicant had become aware that Mr Pierre Joubert had no intention to sell his share in that he had continued to top the offer by the Applicant to the point that would make any offer

impossible for the newly started business viable to continue, upon which the Applicant had sold his 50% shareholding. Soon after the sale, Mr Pierre Joubert had closed the Flea Market and had turned it into a squatter camp;

6. 208.5 After Ms Cecile Venter had given her support in writing, the Sixteenth Respondent had also insulted her after which Ms Cecile Venter had given the applicant a second detailed letter declaring the admittance by the Sixteenth Respondent that she had an affair with Mr Ben Snyman while still being married to the Applicant;

6. 208.6 Mr Ben Snyman as Sanlam branch manager, had also told the Applicant if he would continue with his divorce, the Applicant would have to find a new branch after which the Applicant had become an independent broker;

6. 208.7 Mr Alwyn Prinsloo as the Sanlam representative branch manager, had told the Applicant if he would file for a divorce, the Applicant would not be welcome to stay in his branch after which the Applicant had moved to Centurion;

6. 208.8 Various other friends and clients whom had given their support in letters to the Applicant, had later moved their business away from the Applicant.

The Twenty-fifth Respondent

6. 209 In SEPTEMBER 1996 the Applicant reported the mal practice by the Twentieth Respondent to the Twenty-fifth Respondent whom had failed to investigate the Twentieth Respondent in having, as attached hereto under annexure 'YY':

6. 209.1 contacted the Applicant directly to arrange for the acceptance of the divorce settlement to conceal the mal practices by the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Respondents;

6. 209.2 consulted directly with the Applicant to gain information after which he had twisted the information to prosecute the Applicant;

6. 209.3 consulted directly with the Sixteenth Respondent as client without the instructions from an attorney;

6. 209.4 conspired with the SAPS on or about JULY 1997 to prevent the prosecution of the child abuser, Mr Henk Jansen Van Vuuren;

6. 209.5 conspired with the Sixteenth Respondent on 22 NOVEMBER 1997 to refuse the Applicant access to the 2 (two) minor children after the Applicant had obtained a High Court order providing the Applicant custody over the 2 (two) minor children.

The Twenty-sixth Respondent

6. 210 In FEBRUARY 2014 the Applicant had reported the mal practice by the Twentieth Respondent to the Twenty-sixth Respondent, of the relocation by the Twentieth Respondent to the Western Cape Province, whom had also failed to investigate the Twentieth Respondent, as attached hereto under annexure 'ZZ`.

6. 211 Amidst efforts by the Applicant to protect his 2 (two) minor children, the undermining of his businesses and the inciting and protection of the psychopathic Sixteenth Respondent had triumphed, through the conspiring by system officials to conceal the contraventions of various Acts and orders by the Sixteenth Respondent and system officials.

RELEVANT STATUTORY AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISION:

7.

7.1 The statutory and constitutional provisions referred to further herein are not exhaustive and the Applicant reserve his to deal with such statutory provisions and constitutional provisions in more detail during argument. Therefore the Applicant confine himself to an overview of the relevant statutory and constitutional provisions.

7.2 In that the urgent Notice of Motion application fundamentally compacts the infringement of the constitutional rights of the Applicant and that of various other legislation for the past 27 (twenty seven) years, it primarily compacts the witch hunt the Applicant had been subjected to for the past 16 (sixteen) years, during which the Fourth and Fifth Respondents had conspired since 2006, to undermine the horizontal competition the National Property Database, developed the Applicant, had held for the monopoly holders in the property industry and had led to the Fourth and Fifth Respondents to conspire, after the Applicant had successfully launched the National Property Database in APRIL 2008, with the Second Respondent since 2009, after which the Second, Fourth and Fifth Respondents had conspired with the First, Third and Seventh

Respondents in subjecting the Applicant to a witch hunt and to cause the financial ruin and inability of the Applicant to repay his home loan held by the Second Respondent and to pay his monthly residential levies to the Seventh Respondent and to pay his monthly residential rates and taxes to the Third Respondent.

- 7.3 From the witch hunt the Applicant had been subjected to since 2009, with the Second Respondent as the main driving force and to have taken the final action in fraudulently obtaining the sale in execution order on 28 FEBRUARY 2023, had the Applicant not only been subjected to the harassment by the Second and Fifth Respondents as creditors and the Seventh Respondent as debt evader, but the following constitutional and basic human rights of the Applicant had been infringed and stand to be further infringed in the event that the Second Respondent would continue to enforce the sale in execution on 28 FEBRUARY 2023, described as follows:

- 7.3.1 The constitutional right of equality before the law and to enjoy equal protection and benefit of the law, had been infringed by the numerous misuse of the services of the First Respondent by the Second and Seventh Respondents and the multiple fraudulent litigation and fraudulent actions by the Second, Third, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Respondents;

7.3.2 The right to be provided with basic municipal services in the form of electricity, despite the fact that the Applicant had paid and is currently paying for his use of electricity, to which the Third Respondent had adhered to, whom as governmental institution and municipal service provider had fraudulently installed three consecutive faulty electricity metering equipment at the premises of the Applicant, during the course of 2010, 2011 and 2012, with the purpose to accelerate the financial ruin of the Applicant;

7.3.4 The distribution of electricity by municipalities is one of the most common and basic municipal services that has become virtually indispensable in modern society. The provision of basic municipal services in the form of electricity is one of the fundamental constitutional functions of local government in order to meet the basic needs of all the inhabitants of South Africa. It is a matter of public and constitutional duty;

7.3.5 The infringement of constitutional rights to dignity, (section 10) had been infringed by the First to Twelfth Respondents;

7.3.6 The infringement of constitutional rights to the practice of profession, (section 22), had been infringed by the Second,

Fourth and Fifth, Sixth, Seventh, Ninth, Tenth and Twelfth Respondents;

7.3.7 The infringement of constitutional rights to housing and property, (section 25 and 26), stand to be infringed by the First, Second, Fourth, Fifth, Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Respondents;

7.3.8 It furthermore infringed the legality principle and the rule of law for reasons stated further herein.

7.4 As mentioned in the preceding paragraph 7.2, had the Applicant prior to the witch hurt since 2009, been subjected to a similar witch hurt between 1995 and 2002, during the divorce and child custody applications by the Applicant, during which the Applicant had dealt with the undermining of his Sanlam Insurance practice and the Sunny Side City Lake Flea Market business he had opened, during which the severe traumatization of his 2 (two) minor children, had taken place, with the concealment of the child abuse of his children by the Thirteenth to Twenty-sixth Respondents during which the following constitutional and basic human rights of the Applicant had been infringed:

7.4.1 equality before the law and to enjoy equal protection and benefit of the law, had been infringed by the numerous misuse of the services of the First Respondent by the Sixteenth Respondent and the multiple fraudulent litigation and fraudulent actions by the Seventeenth, Nineteenth and Twentieth Respondents;

7.4.2 dignity, (section 10) had been infringed by the Thirteenth to Twenty-sixth Respondents from their lack of empathy, integrity, compassion;

7.4.3 the practice of profession, (section 22), had been infringed by the Tenth and Sixteenth Respondents in them having harassing various managers, colleagues, business partners, family members and friends of the Applicant;

7.5 Section 165(2) of the Constitution provides for the law to be impartially and without fear, favour and prejudice applied, which had not been adhered to by the First to the Twenty-sixth Respondents.

7.6 Section 165(4) of the Constitution provides for organs of state to assist and protect the courts to ensure independence, impartially, dignity, accessibility and effectiveness of the court, which had not been adhered

to by the Sixth, Eighth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, Twenty-second to Twenty-sixth Respondents.

7.7 Section 41(1) of the Constitution provides that all spheres of Government and all organs of state within its sphere must, *inter alia*, secure the well-being of the people of the Republic and cooperate with one another in mutual trust and good faith, which also had not been adhered to by the Sixth, Eighth, Fourteenth, Fifteenth, Twenty-second to Twenty-sixth Respondents.

7.8 The various ordeals the Applicant and his family had been subjected to for the past 27 (twenty seven) years at the hands of unscrupulous family and civil law practitioners and their associates in religious organisations, would not have gone this far in the event that the various relevant governmental institutions had not failed their obligations to assist the Applicant and his family in their quest for justice, since the first encounter of the Applicant in 1995 during his divorce, with corrupt officials.

7.9 I do not intend to traverse the provisions of the Act in detail and it will be referred to in further argument, safe to say that it provides for the honourable High Court to grant the various *pendente lite* interim orders in order to obtain clarity to enforce the necessary penalties and to bring

an end to the injustices the Applicant and his family had been facing from the failure to apply the rule of law by system officials.

REQUIREMENTS FOR AN INTERIM INTERDICT:

8.

Prima Facie Right:

8.1 Considering the interests and rights which the Applicant seeks to protect, having regard to section 38(a) of the Constitution and the direct interest of the Applicant a *prima facie* right considering the right to basic Municipal services in the form of provision of electricity which stand to be infringed in view of the Third Respondent whom had been the cause of the arrears in respect of the electricity account of the Applicant in that the Third Respondent had fraudulently installed 3 (three) consecutive faulty electricity metering instruments with the purpose to create false arrears, where after the Third Respondent had fraudulently refused to rectify their fraud and are continuing to threaten the Applicant to disconnect the electricity supply to the premises of the Applicant. Furthermore had the installation of 3 (three) consecutive faulty electricity metering instruments by the Third Respondent contributed to the financially ruin of the Applicant to fall in arrears on his rates and taxes account, upon which the Third Respondent also now are

continuing to threaten the Applicant to disconnect the electricity supply to the premises of the Applicant due to the arrears on his rates and taxes account.

- 8.2 Considering the interests and rights which the Applicant seeks to protect, having regard to section 38(a) of the Constitution and the direct interest of the Applicant and having regard to section 9 of the Constitution, a *prima facie* right considering the right to equal protection and benefit of the law which stand to be infringed in view of the Second Respondent whom had fraudulently obtained the sale in execution order, after the Second Respondent and other respondents had conspired in subjecting the Applicant to a witch hunt to cause the financial ruin of the Applicant, in the mutual goal of the Second, Fourth and Fifth Respondents to undermine horizontal competition.

Irreparable Harm:

- 8.3 It is submitted that there is a well-grounded apprehension of the irreparable harm in the *interim*, if the *interim* relief is not granted, it will be the end to everything that the Applicant had sincerely attempted to build in his life and that the Second Respondent will get away with fraud, together with the other respondents with whom the Second Respondent had conspired for the past 16 (sixteen) years. This urgent application ultimately serves the purpose to bring an end to the past 16

(sixteen) years of fraud and corruption the Applicant and his family had been facing at the hands of unscrupulous officials and individuals whom disrespect the law and disrespect others. It also seeks to provide in the *interim* the opportunity to the respondents to provide evidence to the contrary of the claims by the Applicant and in their failure to do so, will provide the opportunity to the Applicant to rebuild his life after years of harassment and the destruction of almost every aspect the life of the Applicant.

Balance of Convenience:

8.4 It is submitted that the balance of convenience favours the interest of the Applicant in that the constitutions rights of the Applicant will be protected.

URGENCY:

9.

9.1 The misconduct of the Second Respondent and the other respondents forces the Applicant to approach the High Court on an urgent basis as the Applicant stands to lose his only and primary residence which hosts a study from where the Applicant conducts his administrative duties. The Applicant is mindful of the need to give the Respondents a

reasonable opportunity to defend this application. The Notice of Motion has therefore been structured so as to give the Respondents that opportunity, whilst Parts A and B of the application is adjudicated in the normal course.

9.2 The Applicant had no other option, as a result of the urgency created by the Respondents, to approach the Court on this urgent basis and cannot obtain such *interim* relief in the ordinary course.

9.3 With all indications at this stage pointing towards the destructive mutual goal of the Respondents, whom are predominantly from legal and religious institutions and others proclaiming to serve the public and to live with integrity, the Respondents are determined to proceed with their repetitive and diverse contraventions in their attempts to conceal their multiple transgressions to interrupt the family support network and business operation of the Applicant, which they have already accomplished to a large extent. There is therefore no substantial redress in the *interim* other than to seek an *interim* interdict on an urgent basis. If this matter is not dealt with as a matter of urgency, the lawless and unscrupulous actions by the Respondents which had started in a systemic manor, had now escalated to blatant transgressions to cause the total devastation of the Applicant and businesses.

SERVICE OF THE APPLICATION IN THE LIGHT OF THE URGENCY:

10.

10.1 The Applicant have ascertained email addresses of senior persons in the employment of the Respondent. Insofar as it was possible to do so under the severe time constraints. The copies of the applications were also delivered by hand to the other respondents.

10.2 To the extent that it may be necessary the Applicant of record will produce a service Affidavit in confirmation of service to be effected in this manner for purposes of the urgent application.

CONCLUSION:

11.

11.1 In the circumstances the Applicant pray for the relief on an urgent basis in terms of the Notice of Motion.

DEPONENT

SIGNED AND SWORN TO before me at PRETORIA on this ____ day of _____ 2023, the Deponent having declared that he knows and understands the contents of this Affidavit, and that it is true and correct. I also certify that the requirements as contained in Government Gazette No. R2158 dated the 21st July 1972 have been complied with.

COMMISSIONER OF OATHS

FULL NAMES AND CAPACITY