

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

S v Malenza (A 223/14) [2014] ZAGPPHC 331 (28 March 2014) [2014] ZAGPPHC 331

COURT

North Gauteng High Court, Pretoria

BEFORE

D. S. Molefe, M.G. Phatudi

CASE / FILE NUMBER

A 223/14

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)
High Court Reference
No: 251/14
Magistrate's
Serial No: 2/14
Magistrate's
Case No: L955/13

Case number: A223/2014
Date: 28 March 2014
Not reportable
Not of interest to
other judges
In the matter

between: THE STATE
And
ISAAC MALENZA
REVIEW

JUDGMENT

MOLEFE J:

[1] This is a special review which came before this court in terms of section 304(4) of the Criminal Procedure Act 51 of 1977 (“the CPA”).

In this matter the accused was found guilty of contravention of section 49 (1) (a) read with section 9 (3) (a) of the Immigration Act, Act 13 of 2002 and was sentenced to a: “Fine of 40 days imprisonment, a further 50 days suspended for five years on condition that you are not charged guilty of contravening section 49 (1) (A), Act 13 of 2002 during your time of suspension The accused was legally represented during the trial.

[2] The Acting Senior Magistrate, Ms A. Du Preez, sent the matter on special review under a cover of a letter dated 11 February 2014 which read as follows:

“Met die oorhoofse nagaan van die betrokke saak om judisiele kwaliteitsbeheer uit te oefen is gemerk dat die saak in terme van artikel 112(1) (a) Wet 51/1977, afgehandel is.

Die betrokke landdros het egter direkte gevangenisstraf opgele. In die lig van die bepalings van artikel 112(1) (a) is die vonnis derhalve onreëlmatig.

Daar is vasgestel dat die betrokke beskuldigde steeds in die gevangenis is en is hy deur die klerk van die strahof gerekwiseer vir verskyning op 13 February 2014.

U word derhalwe respekvol versoek om die opgelegde vonnis tersyde te stel en na die landdros terug te verwys vir die oorweging van ‘n gepaste vonnis”.

[3] Section 112 (1)

(a) of the CPA reads as follows:

“(1) 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 the charge and the prosecutor accepts that plea -a) The presiding judge, regional magistrate or 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 the option of a fine or of a fine exceeding the amount determined in the Gazette, convict the accused in respect of the offence to which he or she has pleaded guilty on his or her plea of guilty only and -

i) 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; or

ii) Deal with the accused otherwise in accordance with law;”

- [4] The magistrate, Ms Du Preez correctly pointed out that the sentence imposed is not competent as the fine is not in an amount of money in accordance with section 112(1) (a). I agree with Ms Du Preez's submission.
- [5] In the circumstances, the accused's sentence is set aside and the matter is referred back to the court a quo for the magistrate to impose a competent sentence in compliance with section 112 (1) (a).

D. S. MOLEFE

JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT

I agree.

M.G. PHATUDI

ACTING 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/2014/331.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/s-v-malenza-unknown-topic-agpphc-2014>

Prepared on 13 October 2026 · Esheria