

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

Jazzspirit 101 (Pty) Ltd v Cole (38801/2012) [2012] ZAGPPHC 348 (7 December 2012) [2012] ZAGPPHC 348

COURT

North Gauteng High Court, Pretoria

BEFORE

Makgoka

CASE / FILE NUMBER

38801/2012

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

Source record

NOT

REPORATBLE

IN

THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA (NORTH GAUTENG, PRETORIA)

CASE

NO: 38801/2012

DATE:07/12/2012

In

the matter between:

JAZZSPIRIT

101 (PTY)

LTD.....Plaintiff

and

MILLER

RORY

COLE.....Defendant

JUDGMENT

MAKGOKA, J:

- [1] This judgment has taken inordinately long to deliver. A number of factors led to this, mostly my personal circumstances, well beyond my control. Any hardship and inconvenience to the parties is deeply regretted.

[2] The defendant has excepted to the plaintiff's particulars of claim on the ground that the particulars are vague and embarrassing,

and/or lack the averments which are necessary to sustain a cause of action. The defendant had invited the plaintiff in terms of Rule 23(1) of the Uniform Rules of Court, to remove the cause of the complaint, which the plaintiff declined to do. The plaintiff opposes the exception.

[3] The parties concluded a written building contract (the contract) on 19 October 2004 in terms of which the plaintiff was to construct and complete the interior of a unit in a sectional title scheme, on behalf of the defendant, for a contract sum of R239 000, which was to be paid in monthly instalments, in accordance with the value of the work as certified by a quantity surveyor. Clause 12.2 of the contract provides:

'A certificate signed by the quantity Surveyor specifying the amount due by the purchaser to the developer shall be sufficient proof of any amount due to the developer in terms of this agreement and may be used by the developer for the purposes of obtaining judgment whether by default or otherwise, summary judgment or provisional sentence against the purchaser.

[4] The plaintiff issued summons against the defendant, claiming an interim payment of R119 500 in terms of the contract. It based its claim on a document titled 'Payment Certificate Issued in terms of 13.0 of the JBCC Minor Works Agreement'. In terms of clause 2.8 of the building contract, the quantity surveyor is identified as a certain C.P. De Leeuw. However, in the document relied on by the plaintiff, the name of the "principal agent" is recorded as 'De Leeuw Johannesburg (Pty) Limited'.

[5] The gravamen of the defendant's exception is that the document referred to above, is not a quantity surveyor's certificate. It was submitted that the document contradicted the plaintiff's allegations, resulting in the particulars of claim also not setting out a complete cause of action. Mr. Nel, counsel for the defendant, contended that not only do the contradictions go the very root of the respondent's claim, but that there can be no other possible interpretation, than that the allegations put forward by the plaintiff are contradictory and mutually exclusive.

[6] Pleadings must be read as a whole. In its exception the defendant conveniently omits to mention the plaintiff's allegation that not only was practical completion of the building works has been achieved, but the plaintiff had finally completed the works. To this extent, the plaintiff alleges that the defendant had not given notice of any defect in the building works requiring such to be rectified. On the contrary, the defendant notified the plaintiff in writing on 30 January 2009 of his satisfaction with the works. In a document titled 'Letter of Satisfaction' (annexure "RCM3") the defendant states in paragraph 4 thereof that 'Building operations and improvements in the section in terms of (the) building contract have been completed to my satisfaction'. In my view, this renders irrelevant, whether the impugned document qualifies as quantity surveyor's certificate in terms of the contract.

[7] The object of an exception is not to embarrass one's opponent or to take advantage of a technical flaw, but to dispose of the case or a portion thereof in an expeditious manner, or to protect oneself against an embarrassment which is so serious as to merit the costs even of an exception¹.

[8] I therefore conclude that the defendant is well in a position to plead to the plaintiff's particulars of claim. The defendant's

complaint relates to minor blemishes and unradical embarrassments. Those can be cured by further particulars². The defendant's exception does not raise any substantial question of law which may have the effect of settling the dispute

between the parties. As a result, the defendant had to make out a very clear case before his exception is allowed to succeed. In my view the defendant has not made such a clear case. I am also of the view that the defendant invites this court to adopt an over-technical

approach. This was cautioned against by the Supreme Court of Appeal in *Telematrix (Pty) Ltd t/a Matrix Vehicle Tracking v Advertising*

Standards Authority SA 2006 (1) SA 461 (SCA) at para 3.

[9] In the circumstances the exception falls to fail and it is dismissed with costs.

TM MAKGOKA

JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT

DATE OF HEARING : 27 JUNE 2012

JUDGMENT

DELIVERED : 7 DECEMBER 2012

FOR THE DEFENDANT (EXCIPIENT) : ADV GJ NEL

INSTRUCTED BY : KAREN SHAFER ATTORNEY AND

SERFONTEIN ATTORNEYS, PRETORIA

FOR THE RESPONDENT (RESPONDENT) : ADV RF DE VILERS

INSTRUCTED BY : FRONEMAN, ROUX & STREICHER

ATTORNEYS, PRETORIA

¹Barclays Bank International Ltd v African Diamond Exporters (Pty) Ltd (2) 1976 (1) SA 100 (W).

²Owens v Bramwell-Jones and Others 1998 (1) SA 836 (W).

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/2012/348.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/jazzspirit-101-pty-ltd-v-cole-unknown-topic-agpphc-2012>

Prepared on 12 October 2026 · Esheria