

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

Louwerivier Plase (Edms) Bpk and Others v Paulse and Others (LCC18R2018, 3498/2017) [2018] ZALCC 6 (17 April 2018)

[2018] ZALCC 6

COURT
Land Claims Court

BEFORE
Y.S Meer

CASE / FILE NUMBER
LCC18R2018, 3498/2017

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

Source record

IN
THE LAND CLAIMS COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA
RANDBURG
CASE NUMBER: LCC
18R/2018
MAGISTRATES
COURT CASE NUMBER: 3498/2017
In
Chambers: Judge Meer
In

the review proceedings in
the case between:

LOUWERIVIER
PLASE (EDMS) BPK
1ST
APPLICANT
JD
KIRSTEN (EDMS) BPK
2ND
APPLICANT
HENDRIK
ALBERTYN LOUW N.O
3RD
APPLICANT
JACOB
DANIEL KIRSTEN N.O
4TH
APPLICANT
HESTER

JOSINA KIRSTEN N.O
5TH
APPLICANT
and
JOHANNA
PAULSE
1ST
RESPONDENT
ELZAAN
PAULSE
2ND
RESPONDENT
IVAN
PAULSE
3RD
RESPONDENT
TASWILL
PETER KAROLESEN
4TH
RESPONDENT
ALLE
ANDER PERSONE WOONAGTIG SAAM OF ONDER
DIE
EERSTE TOT VIERDE RESPONDENTE TE
HUISNOMMER
03, IRENE PLAAS
5TH
RESPONDENT
DRAKENSTEIN
MUNISIPALITEIT
6TH
RESPONDENT
DEPARTMENT
VAN LANDELIKE ONTWIKKELING EN
GRONHERVORMING
7TH
RESPONDENT

JUDGMENT

DELIVERED 17 APRIL 2018

MEER AJP

- [1] This matter comes before me on automatic review in terms of section 19(3) of the Extension of Security of Tenure Act No 62 of 1997 (“ESTA”). I am required to review the eviction order of the Third to Fifth Respondents from the farm Irene, being Erf 7 in Paarl, Western Cape which order was granted in the Paarl Magistrate’s Court on 15 March 2018. These Respondents reside in House No 3 with the First and Second Respondents whose eviction is

not sought. The Respondents did not oppose the application for their eviction in the Court a quo.

- [2] I am unable to confirm the eviction order in respect of the Fifth Respondent who, although described in the founding affidavit as “all other persons residing with or under the First to Fourth Respondents on Irene Farm”, is a reference to the Second Respondent’s minor children. The founding affidavit of Mr Valentin, the person in charge of the farm Irene and its manager, in fact states appropo the Fifth Respondent, that he is only aware of this being the Second Respondent’s minor children and no other person. He also refers to a minor child of the Second Respondent attending the crèche on the farm. The order granted if carried out, would thus separate minor children from their mother. Such an order would in no uncertain terms be a violation of the right to family life provided for at Section 6 (2)(d) of ESTA and the rights of children to family and parental care guaranteed at Section 28(1)(b) of the Constitution, Act 108 of 1996.
- [3] In terms of section 6(2)(d) of ESTA, the Second Respondent as an occupier is entitled to the right to family life, as indeed are her children. The section states, inter alia, that an occupier shall have, balanced with the rights of the owner or person in charge, the right to family life in accordance with the culture of the family.
- [4] In *Hattingh and Others v Juta* 2013 (3) SA 275 CC, the Constitutional Court at paragraph 35 gave content to this right. There it was stated that the purpose of the conferment of right was to ensure that despite living on the land of others, vulnerable persons would be able to live a life as close as possible to the life they would lead if they lived on their own land, having regard to the landowner’s rights. At paragraph

37 the Court said if the occupier were to live with one or more of their children, or other members of the extended family, and this would not result in any injustice, unfairness and inequity to the owner of the land, the occupier will be entitled to live with those members of his or her family. There is no evidence that the second respondent’s continued residence with her minor children on the farm would result in any injustice, unfairness and inequity to the applicants. The Second Respondent and her children’s right to family life under section 6(2)(d) of ESTA accordingly entitle the Second Respondent to reside on the farm with her children and they in turn to reside with her. It would be unconstitutional, preposterous, inequitable and a grave injustice if the Second Respondent’s minor children were evicted from the farm and separated from their mother.

- [5] I note that the same does not apply in respect of the Fourth Respondent an adult male, who although described in the founding

affidavit as the “saamleefmaat” of the Second Respondent has refused to abide by the rule on the farm that he pay an

“inslaapfooiheffing” which is applicable to persons like him who are living on the farm but working elsewhere. His continued residence on the farm without an agreement on his part to pay the fee would in my view be an injustice and unfair to the owner of the farm.

- [6] With regard to the Third Respondent, the evidence suggests that he is not an occupier, does not have consent to reside on the farm, is employed elsewhere and has refused to pay the fee for staying on the farm, when requested by the Applicant to do so.
- [7] In view of all of the above it is only the evictions of the Third and Fourth Respondents that can be confirmed on review.
- [8] I accordingly substitute the following order for the order granted by the Magistrate, Paarl on 15 March 2018.
1. The Third and Fourth Respondents are ordered to vacate the property known as House No.3, Irene Plaas, Erf 7 Paarl, Western Cape on or before 30 June 2018.
 2. In the event of the Third and Fourth Respondents failing to vacate the said property by the aforementioned date, the Sheriff is hereby authorised to carry out their eviction on 1 July 2018.
 3. There is no order as to costs.

Y.S Meer

Acting Judge President

Land Claims Court

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/ZALCC/2018/6.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/louwerivier-plase-edms-bpk-and-others-v-pause-unknown-topic-alcc-2018>

Prepared on 11 October 2026 · Esheria