

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

S v K T (255/2013) [2013] ZAGPPHC 470 (15 November 2013) [2013] ZAGPPHC 470

COURT

North Gauteng High Court, Pretoria

BEFORE

Ismail, Jordaan E

CASE / FILE NUMBER

A935/12

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
(NORTH GAUTENG,
PRETORIA)
CASE
NO: A935/12

DATE:	1 NOVEMBER 2013 In the matter
between:	THE STATE And ASEITSIWE JOHANNES LEGONG

JUDGMENT

Ismail J:

- [1] This matter was referred to this court by means of a special review at the request of the presiding magistrate.
- [2] The magistrate in the letter to the reviewing judge stated the following:

“During the sentence procedure the magistrate realized that the accused was incorrectly charged and convicted of the provisions of section 1 (a) of the Corruption Act, Act 94 of 1992, repealed by The Prevention of Combating of Corrupt Activities Act 12 of 2004...

...as the charge on which the accused was convicted differs drastically from The Prevention of Combating of Corrupt Activities Act 12 of 2004 that will render the application of section 270 of the Criminal Procedure Act 51 of 1977 impossible.”

- [3] Initially the accused pleaded guilty to the contravention of section 1(1) (a) read with section 3 of the Corruption Act 94 of 1992.
- [4] After questioning the accused in terms of section 112 of the Criminal Procedure Act (CPA) the magistrate altered the plea to not guilty in terms of section 113 of the CPA.
- [5] Evidence was led of two policemen who testified that the accused left money on the bonnet of his car, as the police officer took out the book to give him a traffic violation ticket. He was told “do you know what you are doing is illegal” the accused was consequently arrested and charged.
- [6] Pursuant to the traffic officers testifying on behalf of the state and the accused also giving evidence during the trial, the accused was convicted of the charge.
- [7] The matter was then sent on review with the request as set out in paragraph
- [2] above.
- [8] It is clear that the accused was charged and found guilty of an offence in terms of the repealed Act, accordingly I am of the view that the conviction should be set aside as he cannot be sentenced in terms of that Act.
- [9] In the circumstances I make the following order:
 - [9.1] the conviction is set aside;
 - [9.2] the accused may be charged de novo in terms of the current Act;
 - [9.3] the trial should proceed before a different magistrate than the one who presided during a final trial.

ISMAIL MHE

JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT

I agree

JORDAAN E

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/2013/470.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/s-v-k-unknown-topic-agpphc-2013>

Prepared on 10 October 2026 · Esheria