

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

S v Ralepanyana (R193-2019) [2019] ZAFSHC 221 (28 November 2019)

[2019] ZAFSHC 221**COURT**

Free State High Court, Bloemfontein

BEFORE

AF Jordaan, M Opperman

CASE / FILE NUMBER

R193/2019

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

Source record

**IN THE HIGH COURT
OF SOUTH AFRICA,
FREE STATE
DIVISION, BLOEMFONTEIN**

Case number: R193/2019
In
the matter between: THE
STATE
and
MOEKETSI
PETRUS RALEPANYANE
CORAM: JORDAAN, J et
OPPERMAN,
J

JUDGMENT

BY: JORDAAN, J

DELIVERED ON: 28 NOVEMBER 2019

REVIEW JUDGMENT

[1] This matter was submitted for special review in terms of section 304 of the Criminal Procedure Act 51 of 1977.

[2] The accused was charged with stock theft in contravention of the

Stock Theft Act 57 of 1959, allegedly having stolen 14 sheep. He was legally represented and pleaded guilty of receiving stolen property in contravention of section 37 of the General Law

Amendment Act 62 of 1955. The plea was accepted by the prosecution on the basis of the plea explanation that was submitted. However, he admitted to receiving only 11 sheep.

[3] The presiding magistrate convicted the accused of contravention

of section 37(2) of the General Law Amendment Act and sentenced him to 6 years imprisonment, wholly suspended for a period of five years.

[4] First of all, a conviction of receiving stolen property contravenes

section 37(1) and not (2). Secondly, stock or produce as defined in the Stock Theft Act is explicitly excluded from the ambit of

section 37. The conviction was therefore irregular as correctly pointed out by the acting regional court magistrate who submitted the matter for special review.

[5] The learned regional court magistrate suggested that the charge should have been contravention of section 2 of the Stock Theft Act. However, on the basis of the plea explanation the accused knew that the sheep were stolen, which would have justified a conviction in terms of section 11(1)(b) of the Stock Theft Act.

[6] As aforesaid, the conviction was not competent and must be set aside.

[7] In the result the following orders are made:

1. The conviction and sentence are set aside.
2. The matter is remitted to the regional court to be dealt with de novo.

AF JORDAAN, J

I concur

M OPPERMAN, 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/2019/221.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/s-v-ralepanyana-unknown-topic-afshc-2019>

Prepared on 9 October 2026 · Esheria
