

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

Botha and Others v Mashishi and Another (22049/18) [2018] ZAGPPHC 842 (9 November 2018) [2018] ZAGPPHC 842

COURT

North Gauteng High Court, Pretoria

BEFORE

Brand

CASE / FILE NUMBER

22049/18

Source: saflii.org · Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified.

Source record

SAFLII

Note: Certain

personal/private details of parties or witnesses have been redacted from this document in compliance with the law and SAFLII

Policy

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA

GAUTENG DIVISION, PRETORIA

CASE

NO: 22049/18

In

the matter between:

HENDRIK
STEFANUS
BOTH
First Applicant
(Identity
number: [...])
HENDRIK
STEFANUS BOTH
NO
Second Applicant
JASMINE
BOTH
Third Applicant
and
DAVID

SENYANE
MASHISHI
First Respondent
ALL
THE UNLAWFULL OCCUPIERS OF ERF
Second
Respondent
231
RIVIERA, CITY OF TSHWANE METROPOLITAN
MUNICIPALITY,
BETTER KNOWN AS 113B
SOUTPANSBERGWEG,
MAIN HOUSE, PRETORIA

JUDGMENT

Brand AJ

Not reportable and Not of interest to other judges.

- [1] This matter came before this court as an application for the eviction of the first and second Respondents from the property of the HS Botha Trust (IT 1573/08) ('the Trust'), brought by the first Applicant, a trustee of the Trust, in his capacity as such.
- [2] At the hearing of the matter there was appearance for the Applicants only. Mr. Diamond, for the Applicants, informed me from the bar that the Respondents had two weeks prior to the hearing date voluntarily vacated the property in question, so that the matter had become moot.
- [3] Accordingly, it remained only to decide the issue of costs. Mr. Diamond moved for cost to be ordered against the first Applicant as between attorney and client.
- [4] In motivation of this punitive costs order he pointed to the dilatory fashion in which the first Respondent prosecuted its opposition to the application for his eviction and submitted that the first Respondent had opposed the application only in order to delay his eviction, without any intention to proceed to argue the matter at the hearing. In particular, he pointed to the fact that the answering affidavit initially filed by the Respondents had none of the attachments referred to in it indeed attached; that, once these attachments were indeed filed, those were signed neither by the Respondent nor the commissioning officer, so that they never formed part of the documents properly before court; that the answering affidavit was only eight paragraphs and five pages long and answered to none of the procedural or substantive allegations raised in the founding affidavit; and that the answering affidavit did not deal at all with the fact that the lease agreement on strength of which the Respondents occupied the property had been cancelled so that the Respondents no longer had any right of occupation.

- [5] In addition, Mr. Diamond pointed to a clause of the rental agreement concluded between the Trust and the first Respondent, in terms of which the first Respondent had agreed that, should any litigation ensue from the agreement, he would be liable for costs of such litigation as between attorney and client.
- [6] The determination of a costs order remains in the discretion of the court, despite the presence of the kind of costs agreement that Mr. Diamond relies on. Mr. Diamond submitted that, although in light of the court's discretion an agreement of this nature is not binding on a court, the importance of the principle of *pacta sunt servanda* in our law requires courts to enforce such an agreement absent very exceptional circumstances.
- [7] I agree. In this matter there are no exceptional circumstances that persuade me that a punitive costs order as prayed for is not

warranted.

- [8] Accordingly, I order as follows:

ORDER:-

The first Respondent shall pay all costs related to the application, as between attorney and client.

JFD BRAND

Acting Judge of the High Court

Appearances:

For the applicants - Mr. AC Diamond, instructed by Nelis Britz Attorneys

For the respondents - No appearance

Date of Hearing : 29 October 2018

Date of Judgment : 09 November 2018

Source & reproduction note

Judgment wording, source notices and original paragraph numbers are retained. Esheria supplies the layout and this PDF's page numbers; these are not the source pagination. This is a research copy, not an official or certified court document. Check quotations, citations and publication restrictions against the original source before relying on it.

ORIGINAL SOURCE <https://www.saflii.org/za/cases/ZAGPPHC/2018/842.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/botha-and-others-v-mashishi-unknown-topic-agpphc-2018>

Prepared on 12 October 2026 · Esheria