

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

S v Mpenyane (115/2015) [2015] ZAFSHC 144 (24 July 2015) [2015] ZAFSHC 144

COURT

Free State High Court, Bloemfontein

BEFORE

C Van Zyl

CASE / FILE NUMBER

115/2015

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

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA

FREE STATE DIVISION, BLOEMFONTEIN

Special Review No.: 115/2015

DATE: 24 JULY 2015

In the matter between:

THE STATE.....Appellant

And

MVOYO MPENYANE

JUDGMENT BY: VAN ZYL, J

DELIVERED ON: 24 JULY 2015

[1] This matter was sent on special review in terms of section 304(4) of the Criminal Procedure Act, 1977, by the Control Magistrate, Bloemfontein, with an accompanying letter stating the following:

“1. The accused appeared before an Acting Magistrate on a charge of contravening section 11(2) of Act No. 13 of 2002 - conducting work without worker’s permit.

2. His rights regarding legal representation were not explained.
3. He pleaded guilty to the charge and the Magistrate invoked section 112(1)(a) of the Criminal Procedure Act, 1977 (Act No. 51 of 1977) and convicted and sentenced the accused as follows:

‘R600.00 fine or 6 months imprisonment wholly suspended for 3 years on the condition that accused is not found guilty of the offence of Hawking in the period of suspension.’

4. Upon regular checks by the Control Magistrate the following irregularities were detected:

4.1 The manner in which the sentence was phrased is incorrect as the words ‘not convicted of contravening section 11(2) of Act 13 of 2002’ and ‘committed during the period of suspension’ were omitted and the reference to ‘Hawking’ is very vague.

4.2 Review and Appeal rights were not explained to the accused whereas the proceedings are subject to automatic review by virtue of the sentence imposed.

4.3 The accused’s rights before sentencing were not explained to him and the accused was not given the opportunity to give evidence, address the court and to call witnesses on sentence.

4.4 The Prosecutor was not given the opportunity to address the court before sentence.

5. In light of the above gross irregularities, it is submitted that the proceedings were not in accordance with justice.

6. The Honourable Reviewing Judge is requested to set aside the proceedings and to order that the case should start de novo.

7. The defects in these proceedings have been brought to the attention of the Magistrate in question and we hope that similar mistakes will not be committed in future.

8. The record of proceedings is forwarded herewith.”

[2] It is evident that the issues raised by the Control Magistrate indeed constitute gross irregularities. I therefore agree that the proceedings were not in accordance with justice and should be set aside.

[3] The following orders are made:

1. The conviction and sentence are set aside.

2. The matter is referred back to the Court a quo for the accused to be prosecuted de novo before a different presiding Magistrate.

C VAN ZYL, 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/ZAFSHC/2015/144.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/s-v-mpenyane-unknown-topic-afshc-2015>

Prepared on 10 October 2026 · Esheria