

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

## Modisane v Modisane and Another (10061/2018) [2018] ZAGPPHC 382 (13 March 2018) [2018] ZAGPPHC 382

COURT

North Gauteng High Court, Pretoria

BEFORE

Tuchten

CASE / FILE NUMBER

10061/2018

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

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA

GAUTENG DIVISION, PRETORIA

(1) NOT REPORTABLE

(2) NOT OF INTEREST TO OTHER JUDGES

CASE NO: 10061/2018

13/3/2018

In the matter between:

HLEKIWE ANNIE MODISANE

Applicant

and

MOTSEOSE KOOS MODISANE

First Respondent

MOMENTUM

Second Respondent

JUDGMENT (Reason)

Tuchten J:

1 This is a request for reasons for having dismissed the applicant's urgent application.

2 The applicant brought an urgent application to interdict the second

respondent from paying out the first respondent's pension pending a maintenance enquiry, which is presently pending, into the first

respondent's obligation to pay maintenance for two minor children born of their relationship..

3 I characterised the relief sought by the applicant as an anti-dissipation interdict. I concluded that there was no evidence that the first respondent intended to dissipate his pension when it was paid out to him.

4 I accordingly dismissed the application.

NB Tuchten

Judge of the High Court

13 March 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/2018/382.html>

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

Prepared on 10 October 2026 · Esheria