

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

S v Mabe (A32/2016) [2016] ZAGPPHC 6 (21 January 2016) [2016] ZAGPPHC 6

COURT

North Gauteng High Court, Pretoria

BEFORE

S Potterill, A J Bam

CASE / FILE NUMBER

A32/2016

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)

A32/2016

Date:

21/01/2016

NOT

REPORTABLE

NOT

OF INTEREST TO OTHER JUDGES

REVISED

High

Court Reference No: 553/15

Magistrates

Serial No: 33 / 2015

Case

No: 6584 / 2015

MAGISTRATE

TSHWANE

NORTH (held at PRETORIA NORTH)

THE

STATE V BRIAAN MABE

REVIEW

JUDGMENT

POTTERILL J

- [1] The accused was convicted of theft in the Pretoria North Magistrates Court on his plea of guilty in terms of section 112 (1) (b) of Act 51 of 19 77. He was sentenced to a fine of R4 000 or 12 months imprisonment of which half was suspended for a period of three years on certain conditions.
- [2] In the accused's guilty plea he explained that he was in actual fact only borrowing the goods and did not have the intention
- to permanently deprive the complainant thereof.
- [3] I was of the view that the accused had not pleaded guilty as he had pleaded that he had no intention and therefore I referred the matter back to the Magistrate. The Magistrate however persisted that the finding of guilty was correct in that the accused had admitted that he would normally take the clothes in the absence of the complainant and when the complainant came back from Johannesburg unexpectedly found that his clothes were not where they were and that some were missing. This according to the Magistrate proves the intention to steal.
- [4] I referred the matter to the Director of Public Prosecutions for their comment. The Director of Public Prosecutions by means of Senior State Advocate A.P. Wilsenach and Deputy Director of Public Prosecutions G.D. Baloyi commented as follows:

"The magistrate, unfortunately, both makes and then misses the point completely when he states in his reasons and judgment that the accused did not admit the required element of intent and then nevertheless convicted him of theft. The conviction is clearly not in accordance with justice and must be set aside. The magistrate was obliged in terms of section 113(1) to have recorded a plea of not guilty and required the prosecutor to proceed with the prosecution. "

It is then submitted by that officials of the DPP that the conviction and sentence be set aside and the matter referred to the Magistrate

to be further dealt with in terms of section 113 (1) of the Criminal Procedure Act. Act 51 of 19 77.

- [5] I agree with this view as it is trite that intention must be admitted for a plea of guilty to stand. The Magistrate must take cognisance hereof as it is trite in our law.
- [6] I accordingly make the following order:
- 6.1. The conviction and sentence are set aside.

S. POTTERILL

JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT

I agree

A. J. BAM

A.J. BAM JUDGE OF THE HIGH 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/2016/6.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/s-v-mabe-unknown-topic-agpphc-2016>

Prepared on 9 October 2026 · Esheria