

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

Muller and Others v Gomes and Another (8699/2020) [2021] ZAGPPHC 361 (18 May 2021)

[2021] ZAGPPHC 361

COURT

North Gauteng High Court, Pretoria

BEFORE

van der Westhuizen

CASE / FILE NUMBER

8699/2020

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

Source record

IN

THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA

GAUTENG

DIVISION, PRETORIA

CASE

NO.: 8699/2020

REPORTABLE

OF

INTEREST TO OTHER JUDGES

REVISED

In

the matter between:

JOHANNES

ZACHARIAS HUMAN MULLER N.O First

Applicant

AVIWE

NTANDAZO NDYAMARA N.O.

Second

Applicant

MANTLA

PROFESSOR MADLALA N.O. Third

Applicant

(In

their capacities as the joint liquidators of

SWIFAMBO

RAIL LEASING (PTY) LTD: Registration
No. 2010/007968/07)
AVIWE
NTANDAZO NDYAMARA N.O. Fourth
Applicant
NICHOLAS
TIMKOE N.O.
Fifth
Applicant
(In
their capacities as joint liquidators of SWIFAMBO
RAIL
HOLDINGS (PTY) LTD: Registration No. 2011/109702/07)
And
DOMINGOS
FRANCISCO ANTONIO GOMES
First
Respondent
MARIA
CAETANO DA CRUS GOMES
Second Respondent

JUDGMENT

van der Westhuizen, J

- [1] This is an application for leave to amend particulars of claim in an action instituted by the applicants, as plaintiffs in their respective capacities as joint liquidators of two companies in liquidation, against the respondents, as defendants in the action. This application for leave to amend is opposed.
- [2] On being served with the combined summons issued by the applicants, the respondents filed a notice of intention to defend the action against them. In response to the summons, the respondents served a
- notice in terms of the provisions of Rule 23(1) calling upon the plaintiffs to remove a cause of complaint, on the grounds that the particulars of claim are vague and embarrassing and/or lack averments to sustain a cause of action. Having received no response to the Rule 23(1) notice, the respondents filed an exception to the applicants' particulars of claim.
- [3] The applicants thereupon gave notice of an intention to amend their particulars of claim. A notice of objection by the respondents was filed in response to the notice of the intention to amend. The applicants filed a formal application for leave to amend their particulars of claim. The formal application for leave to amend was supported by an affidavit. The respondents filed an opposing affidavit to which the applicants replied.

- [4] For the purposes of this judgment, it is required to restate the requirements when a party intends to amend its pleadings and those when such application is objected to.
- [5] Rule 28 of the Uniform Rules of Court stipulates the provisions that apply when a party intends to amend its pleading. These are:
- (a) A party who desires to amend a pleading, excluding a sworn statement, shall give notice of such intention to all parties;
 - (b) The said notice shall state that unless written objection to the proposed amendment is delivered within a stipulated time, the amendment would be effected;
 - (c) An objection to a proposed amendment shall clearly and concisely state the grounds upon which the objection is founded;
 - (d) If an objection that complies with the stipulated requirements is received within the prescribed time period, the party wishing to amend may, within a stipulated time period, lodge an application for leave to amend;
 - (e) Should no objection to the proposed amendment be delivered, every party who received the notice of intention to amend shall be deemed to have consented to the amendment and the party wishing to proceed with the amendment shall effect the amendment in the prescribed manner;
 - (f) Where a court has granted an order for amendment, the amendment shall be effected in the prescribed manner within a stipulated time period;
 - (g) A party affected by the amendment may within a stipulated time period make any consequential adjustments to its pleading, and may take the steps contemplated in Rules 23 and 30 of the Uniform Rules of Court;
 - (h) A party giving notice of an amendment shall, unless a court otherwise direct, be liable for the costs occasioned by the amendment.
- [6] The respondents lament the applicants' approach to this application for leave to amend. First and foremost, the respondents submit that the proposed amendment does not address the grounds of objection, and in the event that the amendment is granted, their objections would remain. The respondents secondly lament, in the form of a point in limine taken in their opposing affidavit, that the applicants did not deliver their application for leave to amend within the prescribed time period and hence fell foul of the provisions of Rule

30. However, the respondents did not proceed with the steps to be taken as provided in Rule 30. No notice in terms of Rule 30(2) was delivered, and furthermore, the respondents filed their opposing affidavit in lieu thereof, thus taking a further step as contemplated in Rule 30. Nothing turns on that issue and the point in limine stands to be refused. It is to be recorded that the opposing affidavit is deposed to by the respondents' attorney of record, no confirming affidavit from either of the respondents was filed.

[7] The respondents' exception in terms of Rule 23, as uploaded on CaseLines, is illegible. It appears as an attachment to the opposing affidavit. The applicants have summarised the grounds in their founding affidavit in support of their application for leave to amend. The respondents do not appear to dispute that summary.

[8] The applicants state in their application for leave to amend that the proposed amendment is pursued, not in acknowledgement of the complaints, but in an endeavour to obtain a proper ventilation of the

dispute between the parties, so that justice may be done.

[9] In their exception, the respondents raised 7 grounds. Those are: paragraph 4 of the particulars of claim was vague and embarrassing, lacking sufficient particularity to sustain the allegation; paragraph

5.5 of the particulars of claim was vague and embarrassing, lacking sufficient particularity to support the allegation; a failure to plead a connection between Railpro and Swifambo, and Railpro and Prasa respectively, having pleaded in paragraph 1 (sic) read with paragraphs 3.5 and 3.6 of the particulars of claim that Railpro and Swifambo are separate entities; issue is taken with the misnumbering in the particulars of claim at paragraph 7 thereof; a failure to disclose a cause of action for the purposes of section 26 of the Insolvency Act, 24 of 1936 by failing to disclose who had made the disposition; a failure to disclose a cause of action for the purposes of section 31 of the Insolvency Act by failing to plead the conduct of the respondents amounting to collusive and/or fraudulent conduct; a failure to disclose a cause of action for the purposes of the Actio Pauliana by failing to plead which entity's estate was diminished and in what manner. Railpro and Swifambo are the two entities that are in liquidation.

[10] Having delivered the exception following on the notice to remove the cause of complaint, the respondents failed to enrol the exception, presumably due to the filing of the notice of intention to amend the particulars of claim. The respondents hold the view that that exception remains and would be enrolled for adjudication, once this application for leave to amend the applicants' particulars of claim has been dealt with.

- [11] The exception is directed at the applicants' particulars of claim as un amended. The objection raised in terms of Rule 28(3) is aimed at the proposed amendment of the particulars of claim. In their opposing affidavit, the respondents raise grounds of objection, which allegedly differ from those stipulated in their notice to remove the cause of complaint in terms of Rule 23. In their opposing affidavit the respondents rely on 5 grounds of opposition.
- [12] A copy of the notice of objection filed in response to the application for amendment was attached to the answering affidavit and was not uploaded separately on CaseLines. When documents are not uploaded onto CaseLines in an appropriate manner, navigating through a maze of documents bundled together, makes it extremely difficult to adjudicate upon the matter. What further complicates the adjudication of this matter is the fact that the respondents did not upload onto CaseLines their notice calling for the removal of the cause for complaint in terms of the provisions of Rule 23(1).
- [13] The respondents' notice of objection in terms of Rule 28(3) does not comply with the requirements of the said Rule. Apart from an oblique reference to the notice filed in terms of Rule 23(1), the specific grounds of objection are not clearly determinable. This is more so where the objector raises different grounds in its opposing affidavit. The primary objection raised in the Rule 28(3) notice is a lamentation of apparent noncompliance on the part of the applicants with regard to prescribed time periods in respect of an application for leave to amend. This complaint would provide a basis for a Rule 30 notice. It does not form a basis for objection as contemplated in Rule 28(3). The Rule 30 approach was glaringly not followed by the respondents.
- [14] As recorded earlier, the complaint raised in the notice of objection relating to the proposed amendment, obliquely records that the proposed amendment would not address the issues raised earlier in the notice in terms of Rule 23(1). The grounds of objection are thus to be determined with reference to a different document (which is not accessible), and clearly does not comply with the requirements of Rule 28(3). If that process is to be followed, then it is not understood why different, and less, grounds were raised in the opposing affidavit, particularly when no indication is given which of the initial 7 grounds have become resolved. The notice of objection in terms of Rule 28(3) does clearly not comply with the requirements of being "clear and concise". An oblique reference to a different document is not "clear and concise" .
- [15] Furthermore. the respondents in their opposing affidavit record emphatically that the "majority of the proposed amendments are uncontroversial and merely address a number of drafting errors in the particulars of claim". The respondents then state that having regard to the exception and the Rule 28(1) notice, "there are a number of causes of complaint which arise and render the proposed particulars of claim excipiable for the purposes of Uniform Rule 23."

- [16] What is then pled, are grounds of objection that relate to different paragraphs in the particulars of claim, with oblique reference to the initial particulars of claim in its unamended form. The focus is diverted to different complaints.
- (a) In ground one, and with reference to paragraphs 5, and 8 of the proposed amendment, the focus is on payment of amounts that apparently do not implicate the respondents;
 - (b) Ground two is directed at paragraph 7 of the proposed amendment. The complaint is that the proposed amendment lacks clarity as to what money was "disbursed" by the defendants due to further lacking allegations of what moneys they had received. This ground is linked to the first ground;
 - (c) In ground three it is alleged that an increase of the amount initially claimed is sought in the proposed amendment. The complaint raised is that no allegations are pleaded to support any alternative amount claimed as proposed to be amended. The complaint is directed at an alleged "no connection" between Railpro and the respondents;
 - (d) Ground four is directed at a lack of support for alternative claims, either in respect of amounts, or parties;
 - (e) The fifth ground relates to proposed paragraphs 9,10 and 11 of the proposed particulars in its amended form that relate to the claims under sections 24 and 31 of the Insolvency Act and it is stated that those paragraphs remain excipiable. The complaint in a nonspecific manner being apparently one of lack of particularity.
- [17] From the opposing affidavit, read as a whole, it appears that the only connecting theme between the exception (which is accessible) and the Rule 28(3) objection is that of a lack of particularity. That issue is insufficient to determine what the precise complaint of the respondents is.
- [18] Considering the respondents' objections, one apparently has to read the exception (which is accessible) together with the complaints set out in the opposing affidavit, despite not being clearly stated, or a request, to do so. The respondents in their opposing affidavit fail to deal with the grounds raised in the Rule 23(1) notice to remove the cause of complaint, or the exception. The court is now required to wade through the exception and the opposing affidavit to ascertain the "clear and concise" objections supposedly raised by the respondents in their non specific Rule 28(3) notice. That clearly does not comply with the requirement of "clearly and concisely".
- [19] It is clear from a purposive reading of the respondents' exception and their subsequent Rule 28(3) objection, that the respondents pick on specific passages in the particulars of claim as unamended and the proposed amendment. However, the respondents fail to read those passages in their respective own contexts and fail to read same within the respective contexts of the two documents as a whole.[1]

- [20] When reading the initial particulars of claim as a whole, and in conjunction with the proposed amendment as a whole, in my opinion, the particularity pled is sufficient to enable the respondents to plead thereto. The applicants are not obliged to plead the *facta probantia*, but only the *facta probanda* in support of the particular cause of action. From the aforementioned lamentations of the respondents, they seek detailed allegations in regard to the pled causes of actions. The respondents are not entitled to that. That much would be revealed by the evidence, such of which the applicants may be able to present to the court.
- [21] Mr Eagon, who appeared on behalf of the respondents, readily conceded that the respondents required "more flesh to the skeleton". The submission was not that the "skeleton" was indeed lacking in itself, which may have altered the position in respect of any objection raised. The said concession implied "some flesh" having been pled, i.e. that at least the skeletal averments in respect of the cause of action were pled. The "more flesh" required relates to *facta probantia* to support the *facta probanda* pled.
- [22] What is required of a party is to either admit, or to deny, or to confess and avoid the allegations pled.[2] This, in my view, the respondents can do. From the foregoing there is no merit in the oblique objection raised to the proposed amendment. It follows that the application to amend stands to be granted.
- [23] There remains the issue of costs. The applicants seek an indulgence and in terms of the provisions of Rule 28, the applicant should bear the costs occasioned by the amendment. However, the applicants seek a punitive costs order on the ground that the opposition was frivolous. On the other hand, the respondents also seek a punitive costs order.
- [24] In my view, both parties have been remiss in following and complying with the stipulated requirements relating to amendment of pleadings and the opposition thereto as recorded earlier. A fair and reasonable order in this matter would be one that each party is to pay its own costs.

I grant the following order:

1. The plaintiffs' particulars of claim are to be amended in terms of the plaintiffs' Notice of Amendment dated 30 June 2020 and annexed hereto marked NOA1NOA18;
2. The plaintiffs are directed to deliver the amended pages of their particulars of claim within 10 days from the date of this order;
3. The normal Court Rules will apply for the delivery of any subsequent pleading by the defendants;
4. Each party is to pay its own costs.

CJ VAN DER WESTHUIZEN

JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT

On behalf of Applicant: P

J Greyling

Instructed by: Schabert

Potgieter Attorneys

On behalf of Respondent: G R Eagon

Instructed by:

Chris Greyvenstein Attorney

Case number: 8699/2020

JOHANNES ZACHARIAS HUMAN MULLER N.O. FIRST PLAINTIFF

AVIWE NTANDAZO NDYAMARA N.O. SECOND PLAINTIFF

MANTLA PROFESSOR MADLALA N.O. THIRD

PLAINTIFF

SWIFAMBO RAIL LEASING (PTY) LTD

Registration number 2010/007968/07, in liquidation)

AVIWE NTANDAZO NDYAMARA N.O. FOURTH

PLAINTIFF

NICHOLAS TIMKOE N.O.

FIFTH PLAINTIFF

SWIFAMBO RAIL HOLDINGS (Pty) Ltd

Registration number 2011/109702/07, in liquidation)

DOMINGOS FRANCISCO ANTONIO GOMES FIRST

DEFENDANT

MARIA CAETANO DA CRUS GOMES SECOND

DEFENDANT

NOTICE OF AMENDMEND

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Claimants intend to amend its Particulars of Claim dated the 4th of February 2020.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that the Claimants intend to amend its Particulars of Claim in the following respects:

1.

By inserting a new paragraph 1.3.1 which reads as follows:

"1.3.1 The First to Third Plaintiffs will collectively be referred to as the "Swifambo liquidators".

2.

By inserting a new paragraph 1.7.1 which reads as follows:

"1.7.1 The Fourth and Fifth Plaintiffs will collectively be referred to as the "Railpro liquidators"

3.

By deleting the word "Applicant" and substituting it with the word "Plaintiff" where it appears in paragraphs 1.6 and 1.7 respectively.

4.

By correcting the name of the First Defendant where it appears in paragraph 2.1 by substituting "Anotnio" with "Antonio".

5.

By deleting the content of paragraph 3.8.3 and substituting it with the following:

3.8.3 "did not have a BBBEE plan for the procurement of goods and services for the duration of the contract;"

6.

By deleting the words "the insolvent company" in paragraph 3.10 and substituting it with the word "Swifambo".

7.

By inserting the words "by Swifambo," after the words "On appeal to if" in paragraph

3.15. so that the amended paragraph 3.15 reads as follows:

8.

By deleting the current paragraph 4 in toto.

9.

By renumbering paragraphs 5.1 to 5.4 to 4.1 to 4.4.

10.

By inserting a new paragraph 4.5 which reads as follows:

"4.5 Knew Mr Auswell Mashaba;

11.

By deleting the current paragraph 5.5 in toto and substituting it with a new paragraph 5 which reads as follows

"5. Swifambo, Railpro and Mr Auswell Mashaba (being both entities' only director), together with Mr Makhensa Mabunda, Mr Lucky Montana and the Defendants knew that the tender process was irregular, as set out in paragraph 3 supra and conspired to a fraudulent scheme to utilize this irregular process to ensure that Swifambo is awarded the tender and subsequent contract HO/SCM/223/11/2011 and in so doing to defraud PRASA by;

5.1 Using the position of Mr Lucky Montana at PRASA during the relevant period as the GCEO to ensure that the tender and subsequent contract is awarded to Swifambo;

5.2 Using Makhensa Mabunda to assist Swifambo, Railpro and Auswe/1 Mashaba in preparing and setting up the tender process and fraudulent scheme;

5.3 Using Railpro as an agent and payee of monies authorised to be paid to Swifambo by PRASA under the above tender and subsequent awarded contract so as to sypher monies away from Swifambo;

5.4 Using the Defendants and their company Similex to act as a conduit to orchestrate the flow of monies syphered away from Swifambo

to Railpro and onwards to Simile x;

5.5 Using the monies paid to Simi/ex for their personal benefit;

5.6 Using Simi/ex to further sypher monies to other thirdparty beneficiaries;

5.7 Acting as aforesaid, the Defendants knew that Swifambo will never be in a position to honour its obligations towards PRASA in terms of the awarded tender and subsequent contract HO/SCM/223/11/2011 and defrauded PRASA.

12.

By deleting the current paragraphs 5.6 to 5.6.7 in toto.

13.

By deleting the first sentence of the current paragraphs 6 and replacing it with the following:

"6.

In furtherance of the fraudulent scheme, set out in paragraph 4 and 5 above, PRASA was instructed to make payment of the first and second amounts payable in terms of the contract HOISCM/223/11/2011 to

Railpro, instead of Swifambo and PRASA paid to Railpro the following amounts:"

14.

By amending the amount set out in paragraph 6.2 to R444 565 613.96.

15.

By inserting a new paragraph 7 which reads as follows:

"7.

In furtherance of the fraudulent scheme, set out in paragraph 4 and 5 above, and after PRASA effected the payments, as set out in paragraph 6 above, the Defendants:

7.1 used AM Consulting Engineers (Pty) Ltd to redistribute monies so received;

7.2 used AM Investments (Pty) Ltd to redistribute monies so received;

7.3 used Nkosi Sabelo Incorporated Attorneys to redistribute monies so received;

7.4 used Knowles Hussain Lindsay Incorporated Attorneys to redistribute monies so received;

7.5 used Moyo Incorporated Attorneys to redistribute monies so received;

7.6 used Similex to redistribute monies so received.

16.

By renumbering the old paragraph 7 to 8 and by deleting the content in toto and substituting same with the following:

"8.

In furtherance of the 'fraudulent scheme, set out in paragraphs 4, 5, and 7 above, and after PRASA effected the payments, as set out in paragraph 6 above, the Defendants paid out monies as follows:

8.1 AM Investments (Pty) Ltd R31246859.88 (Attached hereto as annexure "C" is a detailed breakdown of the payments made and the amounts so paid on each occasion as if it was specifically incorporated and pleaded herein);

8.2 AM Consulting Engineers (Pty) Ltd R29 845 745.72; (Attached hereto as annexure "D" is a detailed breakdown of the payments made and the amounts so paid on each occasion as if it was specifically incorporated and pleaded herein);

8.3 Nkosi Sabela Inc:

8.3.1 R14 300 000.00 on 11 March 2013;

8.3.2 R14 200 000.00 on 22 March 2013;

8.4 Knowles Hussain Lindsay Inc R10 400 000.00;

8.5 Moyo Attorneys R10 400 000.00;

8.6 Simi/ex (Pty) Ltd as follows:

8.6.1 R14 100 000.00 on 10 January 2014;

8.6.2 R14 500 000.00 on 20 January 2014;

8.6.3 R9 400 000.00 on 6 May 2014;

8.6.4 R2 050 000.00 in cash (The Plaintiffs are unaware who withdrew or handed over the cash payments and who received same);

8.6.5 R90 000.00 in cash (The Plaintiffs are unaware who withdrew or handed over the cash payments and who received same).

8.7 All the payments made from Railpro and set out in paragraphs 8 to 8.6.5 above to the Defendants, Similex and the other entities in the furtherance of the fraudulent scheme, as set out in paragraphs 4, 5 and 7 above, constitutes "dispositions" in terms of section 2 of the Insolvency Act, Act 24 of 1936.

17.

By renumbering the old paragraph 8 to 9 and by deleting the content in toto and substituting same with the following:

"CLAIM 1

.CONTRAVENTION OF SECTION 26 OF ACT 24 OF 1936:

The dispositions:

9.1 Set out in paragraph 6 above and made in consequence to the fraudulent scheme; set out in paragraphs 4, 5, and 7 supra, from PRASA to Railpro, of monies belonging to Swifambo, were made not for value;

9.2 Set out in paragraph 8 (and subparagraphs there) above and made in consequence to the fraudulent scheme, set out in paragraphs 4, 5, and 7 supra, from Railpro to the entities listed in paragraph 8, were made not for value;

9.3 Were all made within two years before the liquidation of the estates of:

9.3.1 Swifambo, in circumstances where the liabilities of Swifambo exceeded its assets immediately thereafter;

9.3.2 Railpro, in circumstances where the liabilities of Railpro exceeded its assets immediately thereafter;

9.4 Alternatively, were all made more than two years before the liquidation of:

9.4.1 Swifambo, in circumstances where the liabilities of Swifambo exceeded its assets immediately thereafter;

9.4.2 Railpro, in circumstances where the liabilities of Railpro exceeded its assets immediately thereafter;

9.5 As a result each and every disposition must be set aside in terms of section 32(3) of the Insolvency Act, 24 of 1936."

18.

By renumbering the old paragraph 9 to 10 and by deleting the content in toto and substituting same with the following:

"CLAIM 2

CONTRAVENT/ON OF SECTION 31 OF ACT 24 OF 1936:

10.1 As a result of the fraudulent scheme, as set out in paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 supra, the Defendants acted collusively and fraudulently in conjunction with Swifambo, Railpro, Auswell Mashaba , Makhensa Mabunda and Lucky Montana prior to liquidation of Swifambo and Railpro;

10.2 The collusive and fraudulent actions of the Defendants, as set out in paragraphs 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8 supra, have prejudiced the creditors of Swifambo and Rai/pro to the extent that no recipient of these monies were ever a creditor of Swifambo and Railpro or had any other entitlement to receive payment of these monies;

10.3 As a result each and every of these transactions must be set aside in terms of section 31(1) of the Insolvency Act;

19.

By renumbering the old paragraph 10 to 11 and by deleting the content in toto and substituting same with the following:

"CLAIM 3

ACTIO PAULIANA:

As a result of the fraudulent scheme, set out in paragraphs 4, 5, and 7 supra and as a further result of the payments made subsequent thereto in terms of paragraphs 6 and 8 supra:

11.1 The insolvent estates of Swifambo and Railpro were diminished by the Defendants' actions;

11.2 The Defendants were first receiver of the monies, as set out in paragraphs 6 and 8, albeit only as a conduit in certain instances, and that the monies were those of the insolvent estates;

11.3 The Defendants' scheme had the intention to defraud;

11.4 The Defendants' fraud had its effect;

11.5 Alternatively, that the Defendants received the monies ex titulo lucrative (as a donation or any other lucrative dealing) and in circumstances where Swifambo, Railpro or their directors, committed and or knew about the fraud or acted ma/a fide, knowing that Swifambo and Railpro were insolvent.

11.6 As a result all these transactions must be set aside."

20.

By renumbering the old paragraph 11 to 12 and to substitute it with the following:

WHEREFORE the Plaintiffs pray for judgement against the Defendants, jointly and severally, the one to pay the other to be absolved as follows:

- (1) A declarator that all the payments made to the persons and/or entities listed in paragraph 8 be set aside;
- (2) The Defendants be ordered to pay to the Swifambo liquidators the amount of R905 091 929.75, alternatively the amount of R150 532 605.60 together with any reasonable penalty the court may impose in terms of Section 31 of the Insolvency Act, Act 24 of 1936;
- (3) Alternatively, the Defendants be ordered to pay to the Railpro liquidators the amount of R905 091 929.75, alternatively the amount of R150 532 605.60 together with any reasonable penalty the court may impose in terms of Section 31 of the Insolvency Act, Act 24 of 1936;
- (4) Interest a tempora mora at 10% interest from date of judgment to date of payment thereof;
- (5) Costs of this action on the scale as between attorney and own client.

PLEASE TAKE FURTHER NOTICE that you are required to within 10 (ten) days of receipt hereof lodge your notice of objection to the said amendments and in the absence whereof the proposed amendments will be affected.

Signed and dated at Pretoria on this 30th day of June 2020.

SCHABORT POTGIETER ATTORNEYS

ATTORNEYS FOR THE PLAINTIFF

189 SOUTPANSBERG ROAD

RIVIERA

PRETORIA

TEL 012 329 0179

EMAIL admin@schabortpotgieter.co.za

REF K SCHABORT/S9/20(K)

TO: THE REGISTRAR OF THE HIGH COURT

GAUTENG DIVISION, PRETORIA

AND TO: THE DEFENDANTS

CHRIS GREYVENSTEIN ATTORNEYS

804 TERBLANCHE STREET

RIETFontein

Swifarnbo Rail Holdings (Pty) Ltd

Payments to AM Investments from Standard Bank account 202538117

No Date Description Amount 1 2016/03/07 AM INVEST

- 2 380 000,00 202538117 2 2016/04/14 AM I AM INVESTMEN
- 2 280 000,00 202538117 3 2016/04/15 AM I AM INVESTMEN
- 2 280 000,00 202538117 4 2016/05/06 AM I AM INVESTMEN 114 000,00 202538117 5 2016/06/06 AM I AM INVESTMEN
- 2 280 000,00 202538117 6 2016/06/23 AM I AM INVESTMEN 190 063,36 202538117 7 2016/07/14 AM INVESTMENTS
- 3 500 000,00 202538117 8 2016/08/12 AM INVEST 190 068,36 202538117 9 2016/08/12 AM INVEST
- 2 280 000,00 202538117 10 2016/08/18 AM INVESTMENTS
- 1 083 000,00 202538117 11 2016/09/08 AM I AM INVESTMEN
- 2 280 000,00 202538117 12 2016/09/22 AM I AM INVESTMEN 53 737,31 202538117 13 2016/09/22 AM I AM INVESTMEN 190 068,36 202538117 14 2016/09/22 AM I AM INVESTMEN 53 737,31 202538117 15 2016/09/27 AM I AM INVESTMEN
- 2 280 000,00 202538117 16 2016/10/04 AM I AM INVESTMEN
- 3 420 000,00 202538117 17 2016/10/06 AM I AM INVESTMEN 570 000,00 202538117 18 2016/11/18 AM INVESTMENTS 88 531,59 202538117 19 2016/11/08 AM INVESTMENTS 190 068,36 202538117 20 2016/11/08 AM INVESTMENTS 190 068,36 202538117 21 2016/11/08 AM INVESTMENTS 289 186,87 202538117 22 2016/11/30 AM INVESTMENTS 570 000,00 202538117 23 2016/12/05 AM INVESTMENTS 587 100,00 202538117 24 2017/01/23 AM I AM INVESTMEN 763 230,00 202538117 25 2017/02/07 AM INVESTMENTS
- 1 140 000,00 202538117 26 2017/03/09 AM I AM INVESTMEN 570 000,00 202538117 27 2017/06/21 AM I AM INVESTMEN 750 000,00 202538117 28 2017/09/07 AM I AM INVESTMEN 570 000,00 202538117 29 2017/10/31 AM I AM INVESTMEN 57 000,00 202538117 30 2017/11/23 AM I AM INVESTMEN

- 57 000,00 202538117 Total
- 31 246 859,88

Swifambo Rail Holdings (Pty) Ltd

Payments to AMCE from Standard Bank account 202538117

No Date Description· Amount Bank Account 1 2013/04/08 Loan to AMCE

- 5 000000,00 202538117 2 2013/04/09 Loan to AMCE
- 3 000 000,00 202538117 3 2013/08/07 Refund
- 4 000 000,00 202538117 4 2014/02/14 AM CONSULTING ENG
- 91 660 , 00 202538117 5 2014/03/04 Refund
- 699 ·360, 28 202538117 6 2014/06/09 Refund
- 114 000,00 202538117 7 2014/06/09 Refund
- 1 692 000,00 202538117 8 2014/10/23 Payment to AM C 570000,00 202538117 9 2014/10/24
Payment to AM C
- 159 500,00 202538117 10 2015/01/28 AM CONSULTING ENG
- 89 500,00 202538117 11 2015/04/09 Loan to AMCE
- 3 000 000,00 202538117 12 2015/08/25 AM CONSULTING ENG
- 29 725,44 202538117 13 2015/09/30 AM CONSULTING
- 11 400 000,00 202538117 Total
- 29 845 745,72

[1] Nel et al NNO v McArthur et al 2003(4) SA (T0 at 149BFG ; Troskie v Von Holdt et al (2704/2012)

[2013] ZAECGHC 31 (11 April 2013) at [20]

[2] Rule 27(2) of the Uniform Rules of 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/ZAGPPHC/2021/361.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/muller-and-others-v-gomes-unknown-topic-agpphc-2021>

Prepared on 10 October 2026 · Esheria