

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

S v Chose (A132/2012) [2012] ZAGPPHC 26 (2 March 2012) [2012] ZAGPPHC 26

COURT

North Gauteng High Court, Pretoria

BEFORE

M Legodi, N Ranchod

CASE / FILE NUMBER

A132/2012

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

Source record

IN

THE NORTH GAUTENG HIGH COURT,
PRETORIA

Case

no: A132/2012

Date

delivered: 02/03/2012

TO:

MAGISTRATE: BLOEMHOF
High
court ref no. 1350
Magistrate
serial no. 06/2011
Case
no.A 338/2011
In

the review matter:

STATE
v PIET CHOSE
REVIEW

JUDGMENT

LEGODI J,

This matter was laid before me on automatic review, the accused was arraigned in the Bloemhof Magistrate's Court on a charge of theft.

He pleaded guilty to the charge and was found guilty as charged without being questioned in terms of section 112 of the Criminal Procedure Act. He was then sentenced to R2000.00 or 12 months imprisonment.

Section 112 (1) (a) (i) provides that where an accused at a summary trial in any court pleads guilty to the offence charged, or to an offence of which he may be convicted on another charge, and the prosecutor accepts that plea, the Magistrate may, if he or she is of the opinion that the offence does not merit punishment of imprisonment or any other form of detention without an option of fine or of a fine exceeding the amount determined by the Minister from time to time by notice in the Gazette convict the accused in respect of the offence to which he or she has pleaded guilty and impose any competent sentence, other than imprisonment or any other form of detention without the option of a fine or a fine exceeding the amount determined by the Minister from time to time by notice in the Gazette.

I raised the issue with the Director of Public Prosecutions as to whether the sentence imposed was competent. The amount determined in the Gazette is R1500.00 and therefore the imposition of a sentence with the alternative fine of R2000.00 was incompetent and it ought to be set aside. There is nothing wrong with the conviction as the Prosecutor accepted the accused's plea as envisaged in section 112(1) (a).

I would therefore make the order as follows:

1. The conviction is confirmed.
2. The sentence of R2000.00 or 12 months imprisonment is set aside.
3. The matter is remitted to the Magistrate to impose sentence afresh.

M LEGODI

JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT

I AGREE, IT IS SO ORDERED

N RANCHOD J

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/2012/26.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/s-v-chose-unknown-topic-agpphc-2012>

Prepared on 9 October 2026 · Esheria