

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

Carrim N.O and Others v BP Southern African Proprietary Limited and Others (Leave to Appeal) (2023-098436) [2025] ZAGPPHC 221 (3 March 2025)

[2025] ZAGPPHC 221

COURT

North Gauteng High Court, Pretoria

BEFORE

E van der Schyff

CASE / FILE NUMBER

2023-098436

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

Source record

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH

AFRICA

IN THE HIGH COURT OF

SOUTH AFRICA

GAUTENG DIVISION,

PRETORIA

CASE NO.: 2023-098436

(1)

REPORTABLE: NO

(2) OF

INTEREST TO OTHER JUDGES: NO

(3)

REVISED: NO

Date: 3 March 2025

E van der Schyff

In

the application for leave
to appeal:

AHMED
CARRIM N.O.
First Applicant
MUSTAFA
MOHAMED
N.O.
Second Applicant
BP
JEAN AVENUE CC (in
liquidation)
Third Applicant
and
BP
SOUTHERN AFRICA PROPRIETARY LIMITED
First Respondent
VEECO
HOLDINGS PROPRIETARY LIMITED
Second Respondent
CITY
OF TSHWANE METROPOLITAN MUNICIPALITY
Third Respondent

JUDGMENT

Van der Schyff J

- [1] The applicants apply for leave to appeal against the judgment and the orders handed down on 20 January 2025. The applicants in the application for leave to appeal were the applicants in the main application.
- [2] The applicants contend that I erred in finding that the jurisdictional requirements of section 341(2) of the Companies Act 61 of 1973 (“Companies Act”) were not met when I dismissed the main application.
- [3] They submit that section 341(2) of the Companies Act had to be interpreted to align with the provisions of section 227 of the 1948 Act on which the 1973 Companies Act was premised and the previous 1955 South African Companies Act.
- [4] The applicants contend that this matter and the court’s finding raise a novel point and that the Supreme Court of Appeal should have the opportunity to interpret section 341(2) of The Companies Act.
- [5] The principles that a court of law must apply in considering whether leave to appeal stands to be granted are trite and need not be repeated here. I set out the reasons for my findings in the written judgment, and these also need not be revisited. The legislature’s language is unambiguous and clear. The legislature deliberately refrained from repeating or re-inserting the previous statutory provisions verbatim in section 341(2) of the Companies Act. Where the legislature chose not to uphold the status quo preceding the promulgation of a new Act,

a contextual interpretation of the ‘new’ statutory provision in its current form in the context of the 1973 Companies Act will not benefit the applicants. I am not of the opinion that the appeal would have a reasonable prospect of success, and the application for leave to appeal stands to be dismissed with costs.

[6] The complexity of the application does not justify the costs of two counsel.

ORDER

In the result, the following order is granted:

1. The application for leave to appeal is dismissed with costs on scale B.

Judge of the High Court

Delivered: This judgment is handed down electronically by uploading it to the electronic file of this matter on CaseLines.

For the applicants: Adv. J. Hershensohn SC With: Adv. R. de Leeuw Instructed by: Barnard & Patel Inc. For the first respondent: Adv. A. Govendor Instructed by: Edward Nathan Sonnenbergs Inc.
Date of the hearing: 25 February 2025 Date of judgment: 3 March 2025

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/2025/221.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/carrim-no-and-others-v-bp-unknown-topic-agpphc-2025>

Prepared on 8 October 2026 · Esheria