

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

Ringane v Road Accident Fund (Leave to Appeal) (31655/2022) [2025] ZAGPPHC 266 (17 March 2025) [2025] ZAGPPHC 266

COURT

North Gauteng High Court, Pretoria

BEFORE

Mooki

CASE / FILE NUMBER

31655/2022

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

Source record

REPUBLIC

OF SOUTH AFRICA

IN

THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA,

GAUTENG DIVISION,

PRETORIA

Case

No: 31655/2022

Reportable: No

Of interest to other

Judges: No

Revised: No

SIGNATURE

Date: 17 March 2025

In the matter between:

OBED

RINGANE

Applicant (Plaintiff)

and

ROAD ACCIDENT

FUND

Respondent (Defendant)

JUDGEMENT**– APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL**

MOOKI J

1

The plaintiff seeks leave to appeal the order in which the court apportioned negligence and applied particular contingencies in relation to his claim against the Road Accident Fund.

2

The application is based on the following grounds, namely that the court erred:

2.1 In finding that the plaintiff was towing a trailer;

2.2 In finding that the plaintiff was not allowed to have a passenger;

2.3 In apportioning liability at 20%;

2.4 In applying a 25% contingency deduction in relation to past and future pre-morbid earnings, and

2.5 In applying a 15% contingency deduction in relation to future post-morbid earnings.

3

The court made its order on 23 April 2024. I asked counsel why the application was not brought earlier. Counsel informed the court that the plaintiff had to obtain a transcript of the proceedings.

4

There was also a notice in terms of Rule 49(6)(a), which was served on the Road Accident Fund on 19 February

2025. The court enquired about this notice, given that there was no decision on the application for leave to appeal. Counsel informed the court that the notice was issued pre-maturely.

5

The plaintiff did not seek a written judgement before making his application. The record shows that the matter came before court in the unopposed roll. The plaintiff gave evidence. The court requested the plaintiff to furnish certain documents, with the plaintiff later giving evidence on those documents. The court then determined liability, including the bases thereof, from the Bench. The court also determined contingencies, having debated with counsel. The court then made its order accordingly.

6

The plaintiff was injured whilst riding a motorcycle. The court accepts that there was no evidence that the plaintiff was hauling a trailer. The evidence was that the plaintiff was carrying a load at the back of the bike. The court held that a motorcycle was not intended for conveying passengers or for hauling a trailer and that it was probable that the plaintiff would otherwise have been able to control the motorcycle differently but for the passenger and the trailer. The court erred in finding that the plaintiff was hauling a trailer. I accept that another court may find differently on whether there is to be any apportionment given the absence of evidence that the plaintiff was hauling a trailer.

7

Contingencies are a measure by the court to assess claims by a plaintiff. I am not persuaded that the court erred in its determination of contingencies. The plaintiff's evidence on earnings was wholly unreliable. He told his experts that he earned R9000,00 per month, and supplied payslips showing that amount. These payslips formed part of the record.

8

The court requested the plaintiff to furnish copies of his bank statements. That was done. The plaintiff informed the court that he was paid either on the last day of a month or on the first day of a month. The bank statements by the plaintiff did not reflect payments in the amount of R9000.00. The plaintiff, when the court drew this to his attention, gave evidence that customers paid the business that employed the plaintiff in cash, and that is how the plaintiff was paid. This evidence was at odds with the plaintiff's case before the court requested bank statements.

9

I agree that the court erred as stated above.

10 I make the following order:

- (1) Leave to appeal is given to the Full Bench.
- (2) Leave is given only in relation to the court having apportioned liability to the plaintiff.
- (3) The costs of the application will be costs in the appeal.

O MOOKI

JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT

Appearance:

On behalf of the applicant A K Maluleka Instructed by: Muchesa Attorneys On behalf of the respondent (No appearance) Heard: 4 March 2025 Decided: 17 March 2025

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/2025/266.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/ringane-v-road-unknown-topic-agpphc-2025>

Prepared on 9 October 2026 · Esheria