

VACANCY: JUDGE OF THE COMPETITION APPEAL COURT

Candidate: Judge Mfuniselwa Elijah (Vusi) Nkosi

1. The candidate's tertiary qualifications, professional admissions, honours, and permanent judicial appointments
--

- 1.1. The candidate holds the following tertiary qualifications:
- B.Proc, University of Zululand (1988);
 - LLB, University of KwaZulu-Natal (1990).
- 1.2. The candidate holds the following professional admissions and honours:
- admitted as an attorney in 1994.
- 1.3. The candidate was permanently appointed to the following judicial roles:
- Judge of the High Court (KwaZulu-Natal Division) on 1 July 2021.
- 1.4. The candidate has acted in the following roles:
- Judge of the Competition Appeal Court from 2022 to date.

2. The candidate's integrity and ethics
--

- 2.1. No circumstances are known to the reviewers that would suggest that the candidate is not a person of integrity with a reputation for ethical behaviour or is not a fit and proper person for appointment.

3. The racial and gender composition of the bench
--

- 3.1. As far as could be ascertained, the current Competition Appeal Court judges, both permanent and acting, comprise:
- 4 black women (4 African)
 - 3 black men (3 African)
 - 2 white women
 - 2 white men

3.2. According to the questionnaire, the candidate is an African man.

4. The maximum period the candidate could serve if appointed

4.1. At the time of the interviews, the candidate will be approximately 62 years and 10 months old and will have completed a period of approximately 5 years and 3 months of service as a judge. If appointed, the candidate would be eligible to serve as Judge of the Competition Appeal Court for a period of up to 9 years and 9 months.

5. The candidate's personal commitment to the values of the Constitution

5.1. The material considered records meaningful pre-judicial service in institutions associated with access to justice and democratic transition. The candidate worked at the Community Law Centre as a paralegal trainer and later as a case coordinator. He was also seconded to the Adjudication Secretariat of the Independent Electoral Commission in preparation for the 1994 democratic elections. Those roles demonstrate a practical engagement with legal empowerment and the institutionalisation of the constitutional democratic order, although the application does not provide detail of his specific responsibilities or initiatives in either role.

5.2. The candidate's professional practice also included heading the Local Government and Administrative Law Department at Shepstone & Wylie from 2012 to 2021. That practice history is relevant to public-law experience, but the application does not identify particular transformation programmes, *pro bono* work, mentorship initiatives, community roles, or voluntary contributions directed at advancing the constitutional values outside the candidate's professional and judicial functions.

6. The candidate's knowledge of the law, including constitutional law
--

6.1. The three CAC judgments disclose a sustained engagement with the Competition Act 89 of 1998 ("Competition Act"), administrative law review under the Promotion of Administrative Justice Act 3 of 2000 ("PAJA") and legality, statutory interpretation, constitutional rights and remedial powers, and the interface between specialist competition adjudication and ordinary public law norms.

6.2. *Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd v Strategic Fuel Fund Association NPC and Others* [2022] ZACAC 11

- The candidate authored the unanimous judgment. It concerned the proper scope of a third party's participation in a large-merger proceeding involving the proposed acquisition of control over an LPG importer, storer and wholesaler. The appeal challenged the Competition Tribunal's refusal to permit the participant to lead evidence, question witnesses or make submissions on public-interest concerns, and its refusal to provide the participant's economic advisers with access to the confidential merger record.
- The judgment sets out a disciplined intervention framework. Under section 53(c)(v) of the Competition Act, the Tribunal has a wide but not unfettered discretion to recognise additional participants. The central question is whether the prospective participant can genuinely assist the Tribunal's section 12A inquiry; that prospective assistance must be balanced against expedition and the risk of an unproductive fishing expedition. This shows that merger intervention must be meaningful where warranted, but cannot be used to frustrate time-sensitive merger proceedings.
- Applying that framework, the candidate found that the Tribunal's restriction of public-interest participation was unjustified. The ownership profile – Sunrise being majority black-owned, the acquiring entity state-owned, and the target having no black ownership – required proper consideration of the statutory public-interest factors, including a greater spread of ownership by historically disadvantaged persons. He further held that allowing legal advisers access to confidential material while excluding economic advisers made no rational sense, given that the Tribunal had accepted that the participant might assist on market structure, competitive dynamics, and possible harm. The Court upheld the appeal, dismissed the cross-appeal, and expanded participation subject to procedural timetables and confidentiality undertakings.

6.3. *eMedia Investments (Pty) Ltd v MultiChoice (Pty) Ltd and Others* [2023] 3 CPLR 32 (CAC)

- The candidate sat as part of a full court and penned a unanimous judgment. It evidences the candidate's participation in a legally and commercially significant matter concerning interim relief for alleged abuse of dominance in the broadcasting market, the proper construction of section 49C(5) of the Competition Act, and the CAC's constitutional jurisdiction.

- The Court rejected a restrictive “*one extension*” understanding of section 49C(5). It used section 39(2) of the Constitution, section 34 access-to-courts considerations, the purpose of interim relief in a dynamic market, and the Interpretation Act’s singular/plural rule to conclude that the phrase “*a further period*” permits successive extensions, each for no longer than six months. The reasoning addresses the countervailing concern that repeated extensions could approximate final relief by emphasising the Tribunal’s recurring good-cause assessment and the non-automatic nature of further relief.
- The judgment also held that the court could decide the constitutional issue as a court of first instance under section 62(2) of the Competition Act and could grant just and equitable relief. It remitted the substantive question of a further interim-relief extension to the Tribunal while preserving the *status quo* for a limited period.

6.4. *Takata South Africa (Pty) Ltd v Competition Commission of South Africa and Others* [2025] ZACAC 1; [2025] 2 CPLR 12 (CAC)

- The candidate co-authored the judgment with Vally AJA, with Murphy AJA concurring. The matter concerned a simultaneous appeal and review from the Competition Tribunal’s dismissal of exceptions to 21 cartel complaint referrals. The judgment distinguished the different functions of appeal and review, located appealability in section 37 of the Competition Act and the interests-of-justice inquiry, and addressed PAJA and legality review.
- The judgment’s principal contribution is its insistence that, where appeal and review are brought simultaneously, the complaints in each proceeding must be genuinely distinct; otherwise, the litigant must elect one route. It reasoned that allowing an unsuccessful merits appeal to be re-run as a review founded on the same grievances would frustrate the law of appealability and duplicate the adjudicative exercise.
- The judgment also applied the Constitutional Court’s interests-of-justice approach to interlocutory appealability and treated the absence of finality, irreparable harm and the already lengthy duration of the proceedings as decisive against entertaining the appeal. It found that use of an overlapping review to overcome non-appealability would amount to an abuse of process.
- The judgment criticised the Tribunal’s 18-month delay in deciding the exceptions and linked that delay to the prolonged resolution of the matter. That observation is

relevant to the candidate's sensitivity to institutional delay and effective competition adjudication. The Constitutional Court has subsequently dismissed the challenge to this judgment, which is dealt with below.

6.5. *Cape Gate (Pty) Ltd v Competition Tribunal and Others; Cape Gate (Pty) Ltd v Competition Commission and Others* [2026] ZACAC 3

- This is the most pertinent judgment in the application for assessing the candidate's individual appellate reasoning. He wrote a separate judgment dissenting from the majority in the review. The majority nevertheless adopted his factual exposition. His judgment would have dismissed Cape Gate's review of the Competition Tribunal's decision and, had the review failed, dismissed its appeal against the cartel finding.
- The case raised unusually serious institutional questions: the Tribunal issued its decision about six years and two months after the hearing concluded. The candidate accepted that the delay was unreasonable and a matter of concern. His central legal conclusion was, however, that delay in taking an administrative decision should ordinarily be met by the statutory review remedy for a failure to decide while the failure persists; after a decision is made, the party seeking to set it aside must establish a recognised ground under section 6(2) of PAJA, rather than rely on delay alone. His reasons emphasise evidence, actual prejudice, remedial timing, and the consequences of setting aside a decision affecting historical cartel conduct.
- His approach is rigorous in separating the unreasonableness of the delay from the adequacy of the explanation for it, and in requiring evidence rather than suspicion before finding bias, procedural unfairness, irrationality or unreasonableness. He found that unchallenged affidavits from the Tribunal panel could not fairly be rejected in favour of unsworn correspondence, and characterised the case manager's contribution as research assistance rather than impermissible adjudication.
- The majority disagreed. It held that the delay, inconsistent explanations, fragmented preparation of the Tribunal's reasons, reliance on post-hearing authorities without affording the parties an opportunity to address them, and inadequate engagement with material evidence cumulatively rendered the Tribunal decision reviewable. It set the decision aside and remitted the matter to a differently constituted Tribunal panel. The result is therefore that the candidate's proposed disposition of the review did not prevail.

- On the merits of the contingent appeal, the candidate undertook a detailed analysis of section 4(1)(b)(i) of the Competition Act. He rejected the proposition that a price cannot be fixed by both sellers and buyers, reasoned that a buyers' cartel could indirectly fix the purchase price notwithstanding the sellers' collusive conduct, and distinguished authority involving ancillary horizontal restraints within unobjectionable vertical arrangements.

6.6. *Ntshongwana v S* (1304/2021) [2023] ZASCA 156

- The Supreme Court of Appeal ("SCA") dismissed the appeal from the KwaZulu-Natal full court judgment authored by the candidate. The appeal concerned a defence of pathological incapacity and diminished criminal responsibility. The SCA held that the trial court and full court had correctly rejected the defence: the appellant bore the onus under section 78 of the Criminal Procedure Act, the defence expert's evidence was deficient, and the proven conduct demonstrated planning, purpose and efforts to avoid detection. The SCA found no factual or legal misdirection by the full court and no basis to interfere with the conviction or sentence.
- The SCA's reasons confirm the analytical features of the full-court approach: scrutiny of competing psychiatric evidence, attention to the accused's onus and decision not to testify, and an evaluation of the evidence as a whole rather than in isolation.

6.7. *Shabalala v S* (AR332/2023) [2024] ZAKZPHC 114

- The candidate authored the unanimous full-court judgment dismissing an appeal against convictions for fraud, corruption, money laundering and contravention of the PFMA, with an effective 15-year sentence. The judgment engages with the treatment of a material affidavit, alleged impermissible additions to an *ex-tempore* judgment, documentary evidence, procurement irregularities, elements of fraud and corruption, and appellate restraint in sentencing.
- The reasoning is detailed and firm. It rejects technical and evidential complaints by relating them to the record, treats the failure to disclose a relationship and personal/party benefit in a procurement process as central to the fraud and corruption findings, and stresses that appellate interference with sentence requires a material misdirection or a sentence that is startlingly inappropriate.

6.8. *Consolidated Aone Trade & Invest 6 (Pty) Ltd (in liquidation) v Master of the High Court, KwaZulu-Natal Local Division, Durban and Others* (12054/2016) [2024] ZAKZDHC 7

- The candidate authored a review judgment setting aside the Master's expungement of two proved liquidation claims. He granted an extension where the review had been instituted one day late, invoked the *de minimis* principle in the interests of justice, applied the section 5(3) PAJA presumption arising from the Master's failure to provide reasons, and addressed the legal consequences of cession *in securitatem debiti*, prescription, and the correction of an overstated claim under section 45(3) of the Insolvency Act.
- The judgment reflects a practical, issue-specific approach. Rather than treating an incorrect quantum as a basis to expunge the whole claim, the candidate held that reduction was the appropriate statutory remedy; similarly, a potentially prescribed component would not justify expungement of the entire claim. The result supplies additional evidence of competence in insolvency, commercial law and administrative review.
- This matter was partially upheld on appeal, as appears below.

6.9. Additional High Court judgments of the candidate considered by the reviewers span commercial and insolvency work, interdict, contract, delict and legality review.

- The candidate's judgments are competent, clearly structured and practical: the facts are stated economically, the issues identified, and settled principle applied without unnecessary elaboration; the outcomes are generally sound, and several of the judgments are marked reportable or have since been reported.
- They are, however, predominantly unremarkable first-instance decisions. They apply established law rather than develop it, and the analytical sections tend to quote authority at some length with comparatively brief application to the facts. The strongest of them – the *Western Breeze* forfeiture judgment and the *uMgungundlovu* legality review (which was upheld on appeal) – show a capacity for sustained public-law analysis consistent with the CAC work discussed above.
- Two overarching observations arise. First, delivery is strikingly prompt: most of the candidate's judgments were delivered within three weeks of hearing, several within

a fortnight; the only outlier is *uMgungundlovu* (about five months, 2017 to 2018). Secondly, remedial drafting: the suspended declaration of invalidity in *uMgungundlovu* generated further litigation in the SCA purely on the meaning of the order, suggesting that precision in framing orders is an area commissioners may wish to explore.

- 6.10. On the material supplied, the candidate demonstrates strong and directly relevant knowledge of competition law and appellate public law. The judgments show capacity to engage with complex statutory schemes, procedural and jurisdictional questions, constitutional interpretation and remedies, and the evidential/economic context of cartel allegations. His authorship of the *Cape Gate* dissent demonstrates his individual analytical method, whilst the concurring/joint judgments establish substantial experience within the CAC but do not permit the same attribution of authorship.

7. Judgments of the candidate that have been overturned, upheld, or commented on, on appeal:
--

- 7.1. The candidate has disclosed that five judgments have been taken on appeal. On appeal, four judgments have been upheld, and one judgment has been overturned.
- 7.2. The judgments of the candidate upheld on appeal are:
- *PJ Ntshongwana v The State* (AR567/2018) (KwaZulu-Natal Division, Pietermaritzburg, 4 June 2021); *Ntshongwana v The State* (1304/2021) [2023] ZASCA 156 (21 November 2023)
 - The candidate wrote the unanimous full-court judgment, dismissing the accused's appeal against conviction and sentence. The SCA dismissed the further appeal. It did not criticise, qualify or correct the candidate's judgment. Rather, it held that the appellant had shown no misdirection by the full court on either facts or law, and no basis to interfere with the conclusion that he was criminally responsible and able to act in accordance with his appreciation of wrongfulness.
 - More specifically, the SCA held that the trial court had correctly rejected the defence psychiatrist's evidence and accepted the panel psychiatrists' evidence; the evidence supported the conclusion that the appellant's conduct during and after the offences was purposeful and consistent with

criminal capacity. It also held that the appellant's medical history did not establish lack of capacity at the relevant times, and found no basis to interfere with the full court's confirmation of sentence. Thus, the SCA's treatment of the judgment *a quo* was affirmatory both in result and reasoning.

- *uMgungundlovu District Municipality v Amaraka Investments 37 (Pty) Ltd and Others* [2020] ZASCA 52

- The court examined whether the candidate's order suspending a declaration of invalidity operates retrospectively. The court upheld that the suspension did indeed have retrospective effect regarding services already rendered in terms of a contract concluded between the private service provider (Amaraka Investments) and the municipality – which contract the court found in the court *a quo* failed to comply with constitutional procurement provisions.
- The judgment highlighted a critical dynamic in South African public procurement law, balancing public sector lawfulness with private sector equity.
- In his original judgment, the candidate reasoned that the declaration of invalidity should not divest the respondent of accrued rights, preventing the municipality from exploiting its own failures to avoid paying for received services. Legal analysts have praised the ruling for protecting innocent contractors against state self-review and affirming flexible section 172 remedies. Drafting ambiguities in the original order by the candidate have, however, been criticised.

- *Takata South Africa (Pty) Ltd v Competition Commission of South Africa and Others* [2025] ZACAC 1; [2025] 2 CPLR 12 (CAC)

- The CAC initially dismissed the application for two reasons: first, a ruling on an exception is interlocutory, not final. It accordingly does not meet the “*interests of justice threshold*”. This is particularly so given that the matter had been pending for more than twelve years, and further appeals would only have delayed it further. The second was that Takata had run identical

arguments as both an “*appeal*” and a “*review*” simultaneously, which the CAC had treated as an abuse of process.

- Given that framing, a Constitutional Court refusal of leave to appeal from that ruling would typically follow the same logic – that there are no arguable prospects of success on an interlocutory ruling with no independent constitutional issue – but the reviewers flag that this is an inference from the CAC judgment, not something that has been confirmed from the Constitutional Court's own order, since the reviewers were not able to locate same.
- *Shabala v S* [2024] ZAKZPHC 114
 - The candidate lists – in Annexure B of his application – that this matter was successfully upheld on appeal. However, the reviewers could not locate any further appeal in this matter.
- *Consolidated Aone Trade & Invest 6 (Pty) Ltd v Master of the High Court* was taken on appeal in *Gearwise Properties CC and Another v Consolidated Aone Trade and Invest 6 (Pty) Ltd* [2026] ZAKZPHC and was varied in part on appeal. The full court dismissed the appeal against the candidate’s review and setting aside of the Master’s expungement but varied his order: claim 4 was reinstated as lodged and approved, and claim 5 was remitted to the Master for a reasoned determination, with each party paying its own costs.
 - The variation concerned remedy rather than substance of the review findings.

7.3. The judgment of the candidate overturned on appeal is:

- *Sangweni and Another v S* (CCD12/2017) (KwaZulu-Natal Local Division, Durban, Nkosi AJ sitting as court of first instance); judgment was appealed in *Sangweni and Another v S* (AR362/22) [2025] ZAKZPHC 10 (KwaZulu-Natal Division, Pietermaritzburg, 31 January 2025).
 - The candidate’s trial judgment was overturned. The full court upheld both appeals and set aside the convictions and sentences of both accused.
 - The appeal court found that the trial court should have determined whether the appellants had been advised of their constitutional rights at the moment

of arrest. It held that the first appellant's purported confession was not shown to be freely and voluntarily made: the *pro forma* answers were contradictory, did not demonstrate that he had been afforded an election whether to exercise his rights, and raised concerns about interpretation. It also held that the candidate erred in taking judicial notice of a handwriting specimen to conclude that the first appellant had signed the statement.

- As to the second appellant, the appeal court found that the statement should have been excluded. It held that his asserted hope of obtaining bail supported the allegation of inducement, and that the officer who took the statement had participated in the investigation by conducting an identification parade, and the trial court should have found that this compromised the officer's independence and impartiality.
- The full court held that the trial court should not have relied on the first appellant's dock identification after the witness had identified a different person at the identification parade, and that it failed to apply the cautionary rule to the accomplice/single witness. Once the confessions were excluded, the remaining accomplice evidence was uncorroborated and unsatisfactory; no evidence was capable of sustaining the convictions.

8. The extent and breadth of the candidate's professional experience

- 8.1. The candidate has approximately three decades of legal and judicial experience. Before appointment to the High Court in 2021, he worked at the Community Law Centre, served articles and practised at Shepstone & Wylie, became a partner, and headed its Local Government and Administrative Law Department from 2012 to 2021. He was also seconded to the IEC's Adjudication Secretariat during the transition to democratic elections. That background gives him practical exposure spanning community-law work, civil and commercial legal practice, local-government and administrative law, and electoral adjudication support.
- 8.2. His judicial work includes permanent High Court service and repeated acting service in the CAC. His judgments show direct engagement with abuse-of-dominance interim relief, cartel enforcement, Tribunal review, PAJA, constitutional jurisdiction and competition remedies.

9. The candidate's linguistic and communication skills

- 9.1. The candidate's judgments are written in English.
- 9.2. Nothing in the judgments and other writings considered by the reviewers indicates that the candidate's linguistic and communication skills are not adequate.

10. The candidate's ability to produce judgments promptly

- 10.1. The candidate indicated that no judgments were outstanding at the time of completing the questionnaire.
- 10.2. Of the 20 judgments of the candidate considered by the reviewers, two were handed down more than three months after hearing: *Takata* (co-authored in the CAC, about five months over the year-end recess) and *uMgungundlovu v Amaraka* (delivered five months from date of hearing). The remainder were delivered within three months of hearing, and most within three weeks.

11. The candidate's ability to conduct court proceedings fairly, efficiently, and effectively

- 11.1. The reviewers received no adverse comments from colleagues relating to the candidate's ability to conduct court proceedings fairly, efficiently, and effectively.

12. The candidate's independent-mindedness

- 12.1. There is no reason to believe that the candidate, if appointed, would not bring an independent mind to bear on issues presented for judicial determination, nor that the candidate would be unduly influenced in any way, including by the executive or legislative branches of government.
- 12.2. His *Cape Gate* dissent is the most direct evidence of judicial independence in a multi-judge appellate panel. He differed from the majority on the legal consequences of the Tribunal's six-year delay and, notwithstanding acceptance that the delay was unreasonable, would not have set aside the Tribunal decision without sufficient proof of a distinct ground for review and actual prejudice. The majority expressly records that it had read his "*erudite judgment*" and agreed with his factual exposition, while differing on the application of the law and ultimate result.

13. The candidate's administrative ability (other than in relation to court proceedings)

- 13.1. The candidate's record demonstrates significant management responsibility in private practice. He was a partner at Shepstone & Wylie and headed its Local Government and Administrative Law Department from 2012 until his judicial appointment in 2021. He also held legal-organisation memberships disclosed in the questionnaire, including the Natal Law Society and the Legal Practice Council.
- 13.2. The absence of reserved judgments as at June 2026 also demonstrates a measure of administrative capacity.

14. The message that the candidate's appointment would send to the public at large

- 14.1. The candidate's appointment would signal the appointment of an African man with a substantial career in legal practice, local-government, and administrative law, and several years of acting experience in the CAC. The candidate demonstrates direct experience with central competition-law questions, including prohibited horizontal practices, abuse of dominance, interim relief, Tribunal jurisdiction and review, rather than merely general appellate experience.
- 14.2. The available judgments also present the candidate as a judge prepared to engage in constitutionally informed statutory interpretation, respect the Competition Tribunal's specialist role, and articulate an independent dissent where he differs from colleagues on questions of administrative justice.

ANNEXURE: LIST OF JUDGMENTS CONSIDERED

Reported judgments

1. *Berrange N.O. and Others v Master of the High Court, Pietermaritzburg and Others* [2023] ZAKZDHC 61
2. *Investec Bank Ltd v Personify Investments (Pty) Ltd* [2023] ZAKZDHC 60
3. *National Director of Public Prosecutions v Western Breeze Trading (Pty) Ltd* [2023] ZAKZDHC 64; [2023] JOL 60884 (KZD)
4. *Shabalala v S* [2024] ZAKZPHC 114; 2025 (1) SACR 201 (KZP)

Unreported judgments

5. *Sunrise Energy (Pty) Ltd v Strategic Fuel Fund Association NPC and Others* (211/CAC/Oct22) [2022] ZACAC 11
6. *eMedia Investments (Pty) Ltd v MultiChoice (Pty) Ltd and Others* [2023] ZACAC 4 (16 August 2023)
7. *Cape Gate (Pty) Ltd v Competition Tribunal and Others; Cape Gate (Pty) Ltd v Competition Commission and Others* (275/CAC/Sep25; 276/CAC/Oct25) [2026] ZACAC 3 (4 June 2026)
8. *BM and Another v MEC for Health* [2022] ZAKZDHC 43
9. *Chiliza and Another v Subramoney* [2022] ZAKZDHC 44; [2022] JOL 55526 (KZD)
10. *McCarthy (Pty) Ltd t/a Bidvest Audi Centre Wonderboom v Naidoo* [2026] ZAKZDHC 43
11. *uMgungundlovu District Municipality v Amaraka Investments 37 (Pty) Ltd and Others* [2018] ZAKZPHC 10; [2019] JOL 40935 (KZP)
12. *Nu-Shop Holdings (Pty) Ltd v Kasle Properties (Pty) Ltd* [2024] ZAKZDHC 51; [2024] JOL 66146 (KZD)
13. *Pick n Pay Retailers (Pty) Ltd v Abdoola and Another* [2024] ZAKZDHC 11
14. *Pietermaritzburg Community Development and AIDS Outreach Project v MEC for Health* [2023] ZAKZPHC 89; [2023] JOL 60702 (KZP)
15. *RGS Group Holdings Ltd v Tongaat Hulett Ltd (In Business Rescue) and Others* [2025] ZAKZDHC 8; [2025] JOL 68634 (KZD)

Judgments upheld on appeal

16. *PJ Ntshongwana v S* AR567/2018 (4 June 2021), upheld in *Ntshongwana v S* (1304/2021) [2023] ZASCA 156 (21 November 2023)
17. *uMgungundlovu District Municipality v Amaraka Investments 37 (Pty) Ltd and Others* [2020] ZASCA 52
18. *Takata South Africa (Pty) Ltd v Competition Commission of South Africa and Others* [2025] ZACAC 1; [2025] 2 CPLR 12 (CAC)

Judgments overturned on appeal

19. *S v Sangweni and Another* (CCD12/2017) (KwaZulu-Natal Local Division, Durban) overturned in *Sangweni and Another v S* (AR362/22) [2025] ZAKZPHC 10 (KwaZulu-Natal Division, Pietermaritzburg, 31 January 2025)

Judgment partially varied on appeal

20. *Gearwise Properties CC and Another v Consolidated Aone Trade and Invest (Pty) Ltd (In Liquidation)* [2026] ZAKZPHC 40

Academic Writings

21. None.