

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

Mohlala v Road Accident Fund (13129/2022) [2024] ZAGPJHC 1276 (29 November 2024)

[2024] ZAGPJHC 1276

COURT

South Gauteng High Court, Johannesburg

BEFORE

Weideman

CASE / FILE NUMBER

13129/2022

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

Source record

IN

THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA

GAUTENG

LOCAL DIVISION, JOHANNESBURG

CASE

NO: 13129/2022

DATE:

29-11-2024

(1)

REPORTABLE: NO.

(2)

OF INTEREST TO OTHER JUDGES: NO.

(3)

REVISED.

DATE:

29/11/2024

SIGNATURE

In

the matter between

MOHLALA,

SINAH M

Plaintiff

and

THE

ROAD ACCIDENT FUND

Defendant

JUDGMENT

WEIDEMAN, AJ: This matter was number 36 on the roll for the week of 8 October 2024. The minor involved in the accident was born on 9 November 2009 and the accident from which this claim arose occurred on 1 June 2020. The minor was 10 years old at the time and rebuttable doli incapax.

The statutory Section 19(f) affidavit was attested to by the plaintiff and who was not present at the time of the accident. The content of her affidavit takes the matter no further.

The only other document relating to the circumstances of the accident is the officer's accident report form and which is to be found at CaseLines 010-100. On page 2 of the OAR under the heading "accident sketch" it merely states "as per sketch plan", but there is no sketch plan.

Lower down on the same page and under the heading "description of the accident" it merely states "as per A1", but there is no A1 uploaded.

The only suggestion of a possible explanation of how the accident may have occurred is to be found on page 4 of the OAR where someone, identity unknown, and under the heading "pedestrians and cyclists only" marked the following blocks with "X";

1. Roadway;
2. Within 50 metres of crossing;
3. Under "pedestrian action" - "running";
4. Under "colour of clothing" - "light".

To summarise: the unknown author records that the accident occurred on the roadway, within 50 metres of a crossing, whilst a pedestrian in light clothing was running.

I would venture to guess that most, if not all, children in South Africa at the age of 10 and a half know how to safely cross a road. However, even if the child is given the benefit of the doubt as being rebuttable doli incapax, with no knowledge of how to cross a road, and in this regard the Court took cognisance of the information in the medical reports that the child was prematurely born and had pre-existing learning vulnerabilities. Even then, the summary above is not above to visit the driver of the vehicle with any negligence. It confirms a factual situation, but it does not speak to the question of negligence.

My order is accordingly as follows:

1. The application for default judgment is refused;
2. No order as to costs.

I hand down the judgment.

WEIDEMAN, AJ

JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT

DATE: 11/12/2024

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/ZAGPJHC/2024/1276.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/mohlala-v-road-unknown-topic-agpjhc-2024>

Prepared on 9 October 2026 · Esheria