

SOUTH AFRICA / JUDGMENT

Vombe v Road Accident Fund (2019/39788) [2023] ZAGPJHC 467 (12 May 2023) [2023] ZAGPJHC 467

COURT

South Gauteng High Court, Johannesburg

BEFORE

GC Wright

CASE / FILE NUMBER

2019/39788

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

IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA

GAUTENG DIVISION, JOHANNESBURG

CASE NO: 2019/39788

NOT REPORTABLE

NOT OF INTEREST TO OTHER JUDGES

REVISED

12.05.23

In the matter between:

VOMBE, CARLITOS VASCO PLAINTIFF and ROAD ACCIDENT FUND DEFENDANT

Neutral Citation: Vombe Carlitos Vasco v Road Accident Fund (Case No: 39788/2019) [2023]
ZAGPJHC 467 (12 May 2023)

JUDGMENT – WRIGHT J

WRIGHT J

1. The plaintiff seeks default judgment at trial, the defence of the RAF having been struck out. Ms Steyn appears for the plaintiff and Ms Makhathini for the RAF.
2. I allowed Ms Makhathini to address me as in my view, I need to consider various questions. Both Ms Steyn and Ms Makhathini presented helpful argument.

3. Ms Makhathini seeks a postponement. The plaintiff, she says is a foreigner and this may well impact on the question of what he may claim. There appears to be pending, the case of Adam Mudawo v Minister of Transport and the RAF. Such a case appears on caselines as a case in Pretoria under number 11795/22. The issue seems to be the legality of a directive issued by the RAF concerning foreigners.
4. Ms Makhathini suggests that there is case, possibly between the same parties pending in the Constitutional Court. I could not find such a case on the Constitutional Court website, but Ms Makhathini may well be correct. In my view, it does not matter for present purposes whether or not the Mudawo case, or a similar case is before the High Court in Pretoria or the Constitutional Court.
5. I am told that my brother, Baqwa J postponed recently a similar case in the Johannesburg High Court for this reason. That case appears to be Chola v RAF 4182/19.
6. In my view, it would be wise to postpone the present case pending a decision on the matter.
7. A judge faced with a request for judgment at trial following a striking out of the defence still needs to consider the evidence and the law before granting an order.
8. There seems to be disagreement between the parties as to the factual circumstances surrounding the plaintiff's status and in the circumstances, even if the matter were to proceed now, I would want clarification, from both sides, as to the correct factual situation.

ORDER

1. The trial is postponed sine die.
2. Costs reserved.

GC Wright

Judge of the High Court

Gauteng Division, Johannesburg

HEARD : 11 and 12 May 2023

DELIVERED : 12 May 2023

APPEARANCES :

PLAINTIFF Adv Lindi Steyn steyn.lindi@vdelaw.co.za 082 264 0068 Instructed by Van Der Elst Attorneys 011 731 0000 rhino@vdelaw.co.za DEFENDANT State Attorney Phindile Makhathini 073 689 4920 phindilem1@raf.co.za

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/ZAGPJHC/2023/467.html>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/south-africa/vombe-v-road-unknown-topic-agpjhc-2023>

Prepared on 10 October 2026 · Esheria