

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

S v Nyalunga (A 256/09) [2009] ZAGPPHC 241 (31 March 2009) [2009] ZAGPPHC 241

COURT

North Gauteng High Court, Pretoria

BEFORE

B.R. du Plessis, E. Jordaan

CASE / FILE NUMBER

A 256/09

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

NOT REPORTABLE

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA

(NORTH GAUTENG, PRETORIA)

DATE:31/03/2009

CASE NO:A256/09

Magistrate's Serial No: 86/08

Case No: A990/08

Supreme Court Ref No: 114

THE STATE v MTHOKOZISI DONALD NYALUNGA

REVIEW JUDGMENT

DU PLESSIS. J:

The two accused in this automatic review case were convicted of housebreaking with the intent to steal and theft. They were both

sentenced to a fine of R3000 or 12 months imprisonment. In addition they were both declared unfit to possess a firearm.

The state's case against the two accused is, apart from inadmissible hearsay, exclusively reliant upon confessions that the

accused respectively made to Captain Mbuyani of the SAPS. When they respectively cross-examined him, each of the accused put it to Mbuyani that they had been assaulted in order to make the confession. When the accused did so, the question whether the confessions were freely and voluntarily made, was put in issue.

Where an accused contends that a confession was not made freely and voluntarily, he is placing in issue the admissibility of the

confession as evidence. It is settled law that the issue of admissibility of a confession is an issue distinct from the merit of

the case against the accused. Justice therefore requires that the issue of admissibility be tried and resolved separately from the other issues. In our law that is done by way of a trial within a trial. (See *S v De Vries* 1989 (1) SA 228 (A) at 233H to 234B) A court that fails in such circumstances to conduct a trial within a trial commits an irregularity. (*S v Mdyogolo* 2006 (1) SACR 257 (E) at 261g to h and at 263c to g). It is an irregularity that ordinarily constitutes an injustice and renders the trial unfair.

I have pointed out that the state's case against the accused is completely reliant on the admissibility of the confessions. Without the confessions, there is no evidence that proves the case against the accused. Had a trial within a trial been conducted, the accused might have been able to show that the confessions were inadmissible without at the same time exposing themselves to cross examination on the merits of the case against them. The irregularity cannot be condoned.

In the result the following order is made:

1. The convictions and sentences of both the accused are set aside.
2. The orders declaring both the accused unfit to possess a firearm are set aside.

B.R. du Plessis

Judge of the High Court

I agree

E. Jordaan

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/2009/241.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/s-v-nyalunga-unknown-topic-agpphc-2009--6a3ea51e3b1caa9129814cf4>

Prepared on 9 October 2026 · Esheria