

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

E.K v P.K and Others (Leave to Appeal) [2023] ZAGPPHC 257; - (4 April 2023)

[2023] ZAGPPHC 257

COURT

North Gauteng High Court, Pretoria

BEFORE

M Mojaelo

CASE / FILE NUMBER

53105/2021

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

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:53105/2021

- (1) REPORTABLE: YES/NO
- (2) OF INTEREST TO OTHER JUDGES: YES/NO
- (3) REVISED: YES/NO

DATE: 04/04/2023

SIGNATURE:

In the matter between:

E[...] K[...]

Applicant

(Identity Number: 7[...])

And

P[...] K[...] & OTHERS

Respondents

JUDGMENT:**LEAVE TO APPEAL****MOJAPELO AJ**

1. This is an application for leave to appeal against the judgment that I handed down and which was transmitted through caselines to the parties on 09 February 2023. I will refer the parties as they appear in the main application.
2. Following a finding that the first respondent was in contempt of an order of this Court that was granted by Molefe J on 11 May 2022, the first respondent was conditionally incarcerated provided he complies with that Court Order of Molefe J within 72 hours. This is an application for leave to appeal that judgment and order.
3. The main grounds upon which the first respondent relied on for its application for leave to appeal was that the finding of contempt and the incarceration of the first respondent based on his failure to pay for, amongst others, maintenance is unconstitutional. In that regard the first respondent's Counsel relied on two Constitutional Court judgments, that is, *Coetzee v Government of the Republic of South Africa* [1995] ZACC 7; 1995 (4) SA 631 CC and *Riley v Riley* [2023] ZACC 5 to support the contention that an incarceration of this nature is unconstitutional.
4. Unfortunately, the abovementioned two judgements did not deal with the obligation to pay maintenance. The Constitutional Court has dealt with contempt application in relation to the obligation to pay maintenance in the matter of *Bannatyne v Bannatyne* (Commission of Gender Equality, as Amicus Curiae) 2003 2 (2) SA 363. In that judgment the Constitutional Court confirmed that; "Although money judgments cannot ordinarily be enforced by contempt proceedings, it is well established that maintenance orders are in a special category in which such relief is competent".
5. It is not the first respondent's case that the Constitutional judgment in *Bannatyne* has been overruled. Under the circumstances I am of the view that there are no reasonable prospects of success in the Court of Appeal. I have considered the other grounds of appeal and I have unfortunately, come to the same conclusion that there are no reasonable prospects of success in the Court of Appeal.
6. I therefore make the following order.
 - (a) Leave to appeal is refused.
 - (b) The first respondent (the applicant in this application for leave to appeal) is ordered to pay the costs of this application for leave to appeal.

MM MOJAPELO AJ**ACTING JUDGE**

HIGH COURT GAUTENG DIVISION, PRETORIA

Counsel for the Applicant: Adv. Juan Schoeman Attorneys for the Applicant: Waldick Inc Counsel
for the First Respondent: Adv. F Botes SC Attorneys for the Respondent: Manley Incorporated

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/2023/257.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/ek-v-pk-and-others-maintenance-orders-agpphc-2023>

Prepared on 12 October 2026 · Esheria