

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA
LIMPOPO DIVISION, POLOKWANE

CASE NO: 2025/249463

- (1) REPORTABLE: YES/NO
 (2) OF INTEREST TO THE JUDGES: YES/NO
 (3) REVISED.

DATE 2026/01/05 SIGNATURE.. [REDACTED]

In the matter between:

UNITED ZEBEDIELA TAXI ASSOCIATION**Applicant**

and

MASOGA TSHEPHO**First Respondent****PHALANE JOHN****Second Respondent****MATHIBELA ABEL KEKANA****Third Respondent****TLAKE ABEL MMAMPEPE****Fourth Respondent****TEMA TSHEPHO****Fifth Respondent****RAMASEHLA TSHEPHO****Sixth Respondent**

UNKNOWN PERSONS

Seventh Respondent

NATIONAL COMMISSIONER OF POLICE

Eighth Respondent

PROVINCIAL COMMISSIONER OF POLICE, LIMPOPO

Ninth Respondent

STATION COMMANDER: - ZEBEDIELA POLICE STATION

Tenth Respondent

JUDGMENT

BURNETT, AJ

INTRODUCTION

[1] The matter was enrolled for hearing on the urgent court roll on Tuesday, 30 December 2025.

[2] The Applicant seeks a final interdict against the First to Seventh Respondent as follows: -

[2.1] *"The First to Seventh Respondents are hereby interdicted and prohibited from operating their minibus taxis along the Applicant's routes without a valid operating permit and/or any other routes allocated to the members of the Applicant by the Department of Transport and Community safety."*

- [2.2] *The First to Seventh Respondents are interdicted and restrained from ferrying passengers within other routes falling within the operational jurisdiction of the Applicant and its members.*
- [2.3] *The First to Seventh Respondents are hereby interdicted, restrained and prohibited from preventing and/or obstructing members of the Applicant and their drivers from engaging in their normal business of transporting passengers along their designated routes.*
- [2.4] *Interdicting and restraining the First to Seventh Respondents individually and/or together with any individual and/or organisations and/or persons from intimidating, threatening or threatening to harm members of the Applicant, their employees and further ordered to desist unlawfully from interfering with the Applicant's business operations in any way.*
- [2.5] *Directing that service of the order on the First to Seventh Respondents be affected by hand delivery by the Sheriff of the Court and by loud-speaker notification at Disco Taxi Rank, Moletlane Village and by affixing a copy of the order at the entrance of Disco Taxi Rank, Moletlane Village."*
- [3] The application has not been served on the Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Respondents and accordingly the relief sought against them shall not be considered by this court. The Seventh Respondent is referred to as "*Unknown Persons*". One cannot obtain an order against an unidentifiable person or persons and accordingly no relief sought against "*Unknown Persons*" will be considered

- [4] The application was properly served on the First to Sixth Respondent (“the Respondents”), whereafter they filed a Notice of Intention to Oppose and appeared on the date of hearing. Both parties advanced oral arguments however neither filed a Heads of Argument. The Respondent’s counsel uploaded case law on Caselines for the Honourable Court to consider.

BACKGROUND

- [5] In order to understand the nature of the dispute, it is important to know the history of taxi operations in the Zebediela region. The court had to extract the background from the limited information in the papers. It is important that practitioners are diligent in preparing their papers. Background information is essential to placing a dispute in context. It is very difficult for a court of law to make an expeditious and accurate decision if all the relevant information is not placed before it in the appropriate affidavits (not from the bar).
- [6] In 2003 there were several violent clashes between various taxi associations. These clashes emanated from disputes regarding the entitlement to operate along certain routes in the area. To bring an end to the violence, some taxi associations agreed to merge with one another.
- [7] The ZEBEDIELA TAXI ASSOCIATION and the MAJANENG TAXI ASSOCIATION merged with one another to form the ZEDEDIELA PIETERSBURG TAXI ASSOCIATION. A short while later the MANDEBELE TAXI ASSOCIATION joined them and then formed the UNITED ZEBEDIELA ASSOCIATION (also known as “UZETA”).

- [8] The Applicant contends that the ZEBEDIELA TAXI ASSOCIATION and the MAJENG TAXI ASSOCIATION ceased to exist when they merged with one another and became the ZEBEDIELA PIETERSBURG TAXI ASSOCIATION. When MANDEBELE TAXI ASSOCIATION merged with the ZEBEDIELA PIETERBURG TAXI ASSOCIATION to become the UZETA, both those associations ceased to exist. UZETA is the Applicant and according to them, they are the only properly constituted association of all the others.
- [9] The Respondents contend that when the final merger took place, it would be in name only. By this the Respondents mean that the MAJANENG TAXI ASSOCIATION, MANDEBELE TAXI ASSOCIATION and the ZEDEDIELA PIETERSBURG TAXI ASSOCIATION would all operate under the umbrella of UZETA, but they would continue to operate their original routes under the old associations. The three associations continue to conduct their affairs separately as if they are separate associations. In other words, it was not a merger in the full sense.
- [10] It is not in dispute that the MAJANENG TAXI ASSOCIATION, the MANDEBELE TAXI ASSOCIATION and the ZEDEDIELA PIETERSBURG TAXI ASSOCIATION are no longer active associations in name. Their registration status, if any, is unknown. It is also not in dispute that UZETA is the holder of the operating licenses, with each of the original three taxi associations being assigned licenses under UZETA's umbrella. It is not clear how many operating licenses were issued to UZETA. It is not known whether these licenses were issued in the names of MAJANENG TAXI ASSOCIATION, the MANDEBELE TAXI ASSOCIATION and the

ZEDEDIELA PIETERSBURG TAXI ASSOCIATION and then transferred into the names of UZETA, or if they were issued afresh under the name of UZETA, with the original licenses cancelled. It is also not known when these licenses were issued and under what conditions and how they were issued.

- [11] The Respondents contend that UZETA has effectively collapsed and became redundant. Despite the redundancy of UZETA, all the operating licenses remain under their name. It appears the Respondents were members of MAJANENG TAXI ASSOCIATION and the MANDEBELE TAXI ASSOCIATION.
- [12] The Applicant says that at some stage is met with the Respondents and the LEBOWAKGOMO TAXI ASSOCIATION whereby they agreed that only the associations in possession of valid licenses would be permitted to operate within the Zebediela area. The LEBOWAKGOMO TAXI ASSOCIATION had nothing to do with the merger but are another taxi association operating in the area. According to the Applicant, they are operating unlawfully. The exact nature of the agreement, and the precise terms thereof have not been pleaded. The Applicant states in its founding affidavit that a copy of the agreement is attached thereto, however it has not been and is accordingly not before this court.
- [13] Another meeting was held in November 2025 between the Department of Transport (Limpopo) and members of all the relevant associations. The LEBOWAKGOMO TAXI ASSOCIATION was also present at the meeting. It is in dispute as to what transpired at this meeting.

- [13.1] The Respondents say that it was agreed that the three different associations would operate their original routes with the operating licenses under UZETA 1, UZETA 2, UZETA 3. The three associations would be MAJANENG TAXI ASSOCIATION the MANDEBELE TAXI ASSOCIATION and the remaining members of UZETA.
- [13.2] The Applicant says that an agreement was not reached and that the meeting was nothing more than mediation at which time the Department of Transport (Limpopo) merely recommended that the three different associations operate under UZETA 1, UZETA 2 and UZETA 3 according to their original routes but remain under the umbrella of UZETA. The Applicant says that this proposal was formally rejected by it on 8 December 2025.
- [14] The LEBOWAKGOMO TAXI ASSOCIATION is an association that operates within the area, however according to the Applicant, it does so without operating licenses. Conflict has been escalating between the Applicant, the Respondents (acting under the guise of the MAJANENG TAXI ASSOCIATION and the MANDEBELE TAXI ASSOCIATION) and the LEBOWAKGOMO TAXI ASSOCIATION. The conflict led to the death of three drivers employed by UZETA in January and February 2024. On 27 March 2024 four people were shot dead during the conflict between the taxi associations in Zebediela and its surroundings. This was when the Department of Transport (Limpopo) became involved in the affairs of these Taxi Associations. They held meetings with them to resolve their disputes. The last meeting was the November 2025 meeting. The conflict remains unresolved.

- [15] The Respondents contend that the application should, *inter alia*, fail on the basis that the Department of Transport (Limpopo) was not joined as a party to the proceedings.

LEGAL QUESTIONS

- [16] Does the Department of Transport (Limpopo) have a material and substantial interest in the matter, and accordingly should the MEC for Transport (Limpopo) have been joined as a party to the proceedings? If so, should the court dismiss the application or strike it from the roll?

- [17] If the answer to the above question is negative, has the Applicant met the requirements to obtain a final interdict, namely: -

[17.1] There must be a clear right, which right has been violated.

[17.2] The violation of the right has caused harm to the bearer of the right, or harm to the bearer is imminent.

[17.3] There is no other remedy available to the bearer of the right.

THE LAW

Non-Joinder

- [18] The Appellant Division held in ***Amalgamated Engineering Union v Minister of Labour*** 1949 (3) SA 637 A at page 659 that: -

“Indeed it seems clear to me that the Court has consistently refrained from dealing with issues in which a third party may have a direct and substantial interest without either having that party joined to the suit or if the circumstances of the case admit of

such a course, taking other adequate steps to ensure that its judgment will not prejudicially affect that party's interests."

- [19] In the matter of **Stonehill Property Fund Proprietary Limited v Shongwe and Another** (20421/2024) [2024] ZAWCHC 311 (16 October 2024) at paragraph 20, 27 and 28 it was held that: -

"It should be observed that it is important to remember that when a court pronounces a judgment it should do so without prejudice to the rights and interests of persons who were not parties before it. In that context, it is peremptory that the issue of prejudice must be considered in the determination of necessary non-joinder....the non-joinder of a necessary party is a defect in a pleading that can simply be remedied by a joinder. Accordingly, a deficiency in pleadings had nothing to do with the merits but is related to procedure. Put differently, a non-joinder cannot defeat the merits, as it may be a reversible error dependant of course, upon circumstances. To hold otherwise would be to extend the scope of and effect of a non-joinder. In the circumstances, it seems entirely reasonable to suppose that, in an application, if the court finds there is a non-joinder of a necessary party, it is competent for the court to strike the matter from the roll. In any event, nothing prevents this Court from striking the matter from the roll due to non-joinder. This is even the case as the matter is not an action but an application. In this matter, it is however significant to note that the respondents are not applying for joining of the parties, but they are rather objecting to the non-joinder of parties."

- [20] In the matter of **Turner and Another v Ntintelo and Another** (A248/22) [2023] ZAWCHC 51 (8 March 2023) at paragraph 63 in relaying on *Skhosana and Others v*

Roos t/a Roos se Oord and Others 2000 (4) SA 561 (LCC) at paragraph 19 it was held that:-

“The difference between striking a matter off the roll and dismissal is that in the case of dismissal, the matter is disposed of and can no longer be set down on the roll again. If the applicant wishes to proceed with the matter, he will have to start the matter *de novo*. While on the other hand, striking the matter off the roll has nothing to do with the merits of the case. It is not aimed at terminating the proceedings but merely suspends the hearing pending an application for reinstatement.”

- [21] In Herbstein & Van Winsen ***“The Civil Practice of the High Courts of South Africa”*** 5th edition (2009) at page 208, the learned author stated that following: -

“Apart from considerations of convenience, however there are circumstances in which it is essential to join a party because of the interest that party has in the matter. When such an interest becomes apparent the court has no discretion and will not allow the matter to proceed without joinder or the giving of judicial notice of the proceedings to that party. The reason for this is that it is a principle of our law that interests parties should be afforded an opportunity to be heard in matters that they have a direct and substantial interest....A third party who has, or may have, a direct and substantial interest in any order the court might make in proceedings or if such an order cannot be sustained or carried into effect without prejudicing that party, is a necessary party and should be joined in the proceedings....A direct and substantial interest has been held to be an interest in the right which is the subject matter of litigation and not merely a financial interest in such litigation. It is a legal interest in the subject matter of litigation, excluding an indirect commercial interest

only. The possibility of such an interest is sufficient, and it is not necessary for the court to determine that in fact it exists. For a joinder to be essential, the parties to be joined must have a direct and substantial interest not only in the subject matter of litigation, but also in the outcome of it. It is important to remember that a constitutionally protected right is legally enforceable and gives rise to a legal interest which may require a joinder. Thus, whenever an order which may infringe upon the constitutional rights of any person, those persons should be joined or given judicial notice of the proceedings.”

[22] **Section 91 of the National Transport Act 5 of 2009** states that:

*“(1) If in any area in the relevant province the MEC considers that, **because of violence, unrest or instability in** any sector of the public transport industry in the area or between operators in the area, the safety of—*

- (a) passengers using the relevant services; or*
- (b) residents; or*
- (c) any other person entering the area,*

has deteriorated to an unacceptable level, the MEC may, after consulting relevant planning authorities, by notice in the Provincial Gazette, define the area and declare it to be an area in respect of which the notification prescribing the extraordinary measures contemplated in subsection (2) may be made.

(2) The MEC may, by giving notice in the Provincial Gazette, give notice that—

- a) one or more or all the routes or ranks in such a declared area are closed for the operation of any type of public transport service, for the period stated in the notice.*

(b) any operating license or permit authorising any of the services referred to in paragraph (a) on a closed route or routes or at a closed rank or ranks in the declared area are suspended for the relevant period.

(c) subject to subsection (6), no person may undertake any of the services referred to in paragraph (a) on a closed route or routes or at a closed rank or ranks in the declared area or in terms of an operating license or permit suspended as contemplated in paragraph (b) for the relevant period.

(3) Before making the notice in terms of subsection (2), the MEC must cause a notice to be published in the prescribed manner, stating

(a) in summary the nature and purpose of the proposed regulations.

(b) the route or routes and ranks which are proposed to be closed, or that it is proposed to close all routes and ranks in the declared area.

(c) the period for which the proposed regulations will be in force.

(d) that interested or affected parties may request reasons for the proposed regulations.

(e) that any interested or affected person is entitled to make representations.

(f) the time within which representations may be made, which may not be less than 24 hours.

(g) the address to which representations must be submitted.

(h) the manner in which representations must be made

(4) The MEC must consider any representations received under subsection (3) before making a regulation under subsection (2).

(5) The notification contemplated in terms of subsection (2) may provide that a contravention thereof or a failure to comply therewith constitutes an offence and may

prescribe penalties in respect thereof which may be a fine, or imprisonment for a period not exceeding six months.

*(6) The notification **may provide for the issuing of temporary permits to operators of motor vehicles** of specified types, to operate services on a closed route or routes or at a closed rank or ranks for the period of their closure in substitution of the forbidden services.*

(7) After giving notice as contemplated in subsection (3), the MEC may, by notice in the Provincial Gazette, temporarily suspend any operating license or permit insofar as it authorises public transport in a declared area on a route or routes or at a rank or ranks not closed in terms of the notice contemplated in terms subsection (2), for the period the MEC considers appropriate.”

Clear right

[23] **Section 50 of the National Transport Act 5 of 2009** states that: -

“(1) No person may operate a road-based public transport service, unless he or she is the holder of an operating license or a permit, subject to sections 47,48 and 49, issued for the vehicle concerned in terms of this Act.”

[24] **Section 51 of the National Transport Act 5 of 2009** states that: -

“An operating license must only be issued on application made in terms of this Act by the National Public Transport Regulator, a Provincial Regulatory Entity or a municipality to which the operating license function has been assigned, as the case may be, after considering all the factors mandated by this Act.”

[25] **Section 57 of the National Transport Act 5 of 2009** states that: -

“(1) Where an application is made to the National Public Transport Regulator for the granting, renewal, amendment or transfer of an operating license in respect of a non-contracted service other than a tourist transport service, it may grant or refuse it after having considered—

(a) in the case of a service shown in an integrated transport plan, the directions of the planning authority submitted in terms of section 55.

(b) whether the vehicle or type of vehicle by means of which the service is operated, is suitable for that purpose.

(c) the availability of ranks, terminals or other facilities, based on the recommendations of the relevant planning authority or other information at its disposal.

(d) the existence of any relevant by-law, regulation, prohibition, limitation or restriction.

(e) whether the applicant has any previous conviction for an offence relevant to the operation of public transport services, or of a prescribed type; and

(f) the ability of the applicant to operate the service for which the operating license is sought, in a manner satisfactory to the public.

(3) Where an application is made to a Provincial Regulatory Entity for the granting, renewal, amendment or transfer of an operating license in respect of a non-contracted service, it—

(a) must refuse the application, if granting it would be contrary to the directions of the relevant planning authority or authorities based on their integrated transport plan; or

(b) may grant or refuse it after having considered the matters listed in subsection (2)(b).

(6) *Such a condition may state a maximum number of passengers that may be carried in the vehicle, even if the capacity of the vehicle is greater.*

[26] **Section 58 of the National Transport Act 5 of 2009** states that: -

“(1) The holder of an operating license issued by a regulatory entity, may apply to whichever of those entities that issued the license for renewal, amendment or transfer of the operating license.

(2) Where an operating license or permit was issued by a provincial operating licensing board or other competent entity before the date of commencement of this Act, the holder may apply for renewal, amendment or transfer thereof to the relevant entity contemplated in section 54, but, in the case of a permit, an operating license must be issued if the application is granted.

(3) Where amendment of the operating license or permit only involves substituting a different vehicle with the same capacity or less, section 73 applies.

(4) A person applying to take transfer of an operating license or permit must have the written consent of the current holder of the operating license or permit, or of that holder's executor.”

[27] **Section 90 of the National Transport Act of 2009** states that: -

“(1) A person is guilty of an offence—

(a) if that person operates a public transport service in contravention of section 50 (meaning without an operating license).

(b) if the person operates a public transport service contrary to the terms and conditions of an operating license or permit.

(c) if, being the holder of an operating license or permit or the agent or employee of such a holder, the person allows someone else to use that operating license or permit for a vehicle other than the vehicle specified therein.

(2) Where a person is convicted of any one of the offences mentioned in—

(a) paragraphs (a), (b), (d), (e) or (o) of subsection (1), a term of imprisonment not exceeding two years, or a fine not exceeding R100 000, may be imposed.”

Dispute of fact

[28] **Rule 6 (5) (g) of the Uniform Rules of Court** provides that: -

“Where an application cannot properly be decided on affidavit the court may dismiss the application or make such order as to it seems meet with a view to ensuring a just and expeditious decision. In particular, but without affecting the generality of the afore going, it may direct that oral evidence be heard on specific issues with a view to resolving any dispute of fact and to that end may order any deponent to appear personally or grant leave for him or any other person to be subpoenaed to appear and be examined and cross-examined as a witness or it may refer the matter to trial with appropriate directions as to pleadings or definition of issues, or otherwise.”

ANALYSIS

Non-joinder

[29] The taxi industry currently operates under the National Land Transport Act, No. 5 of 2009, which regulates and governs the transportation of passengers for reward and whose objective is to provide for the transformation and restructuring of the national

land transport system. The National Road Traffic Act, No. 93 of 1996, which provides for road traffic matters and applies uniformly throughout the Republic and for matters connected therewith, also governs the taxi industry.

- [30] The Department of Transport is responsible for the regulation and coordination of transportation (including taxi transportation) in South Africa. The South African National Taxi Council (SANTACO) is the governing structure of the taxi industry.
- [31] South Africa has experienced a great deal of conflict and instability in the taxi industry over the last decades, which has resulted in violence on many occasions across different provinces. It is clear from the history provided for by the Applicant, that Zebediela and its surrounding areas have been hit by this violence several times. The Applicants reiterate the fear of further violence in its founding affidavit when it states: -

"In the meantime, the respondents and their cohorts are contravening the law, creating fear amongst members of the applicants and threats to the safety of the passengers, threatening the livelihood and economic benefits of the members of the applicants. The respondents have vowed to operate their minibus taxis in our allocated routes without operating licenses and/or permits. They started by invading our routes, followed by illegal operations thereby stealing our customers and depriving our members of their income.....as this will lead to bloodshed and innocent passengers will also be affected. It is also in public interests that this behaviour and/or action by the respondents be interdicted. Our province, more specifically the residents of Zebediela and the surrounding villages, have experienced serious taxi violence in the past in which people lost their lives, including innocent bystanders and it is of paramount importance that this Honourable Court intervene and interdict the unlawful actions by the respondents to avoid unnecessary taxi violence."

- [32] It is not in dispute that the Department of Transport (Limpopo) has already become involved in the quarrel between the parties and has attempted to resolve it. From the Applicant's founding affidavit, it appears that the situation has become unstable

and that unrest and violence may be imminent. This may fall under the ambit of section 91 of the National Transport Act 5 of 2009 and require the MEC for Transport (Limpopo's) intervention. Section 91 implies that the MEC for Transport, through her department, may mediate the disputes giving rise to the instability and/or unrest and/or violence and issue temporary operating licenses during a temporary closure referred to in the section.

[33] Section 91 of the National Transport Act 5 of 2009 suggests that the MEC for Transport (Limpopo) has a direct and substantial interest in the taxi industry in instances where there is instability. An order made in terms of the Notice of Motion prefixed to the application may result in further taxi unrest within the Zebediela region, in which event that MEC for Transport (Limpopo) may implement the provisions of Section 91.

[34] Furthermore, the relief sought and prayer 3 of the Notice of Motion may prejudice the LEBOWAKGOMO TAXI ASSOCIATION. In terms of prayer 3, the Applicant seeks an order that: -

"That the First to the Seventh Respondents are interdicted and restrained from ferrying passengers from any other routes falling within the operational jurisdiction of the applicant and its members."

[35] The Seventh Respondents refer to *"Unknown Persons"*, which imply *"any other person operating a taxi that is not the First to the Sixth Respondent."* This would be LEBOWAKGOMO TAXI ASSOCIATION. Prayer 3, in essence, calls for exclusivity or a monopoly over certain taxi routes. If this order is made, it would prevent the Department of Transport (Limpopo) from issuing any other licenses in respect of

certain routes, or other taxi operators from applying for licenses for those routes. This would violate the right of other operators to trade, and the Department of Transport's duty of fulfilling their mandate in terms of the National Transport Act 5 of 2009. A failure to join the LEBOWAKGOMO TAXI ASSOCIATION and the MEC for Transport (Limpopo) have a direct interest in the outcome of the litigation and it is prejudicial to them if they are not joined.

- [36] The Department of Transport (Limpopo) must be joined as a party to the proceedings as well as the LEBOWAKGOMO TAXI ASSOCIATION and any other taxi association operating within the Zebediela Region. Having regard to the principle embodied in *Turner and Another v Ntintelo and Another* and *Skhosana and Others v Roos t/a Roos se Oord and Others* should accordingly be struck from the roll and not dismissed. The Constitution of the South African National Taxi Council (SANTACO) was not made available to this court and does not seem to be easily accessible, however the parties may want to obtain a copy thereof and consider it to ascertain to what extent it may have a real and substantial interest in the matter and if so, also join them as a party to the proceedings.

Clear right

- [37] Even if this court did not find that there was a non-joinder; I am not convinced that the Applicant has established a clear right. This is the first element that needs to be proven in applications for a final interdict. If a clear right cannot be established, the application cannot succeed and stands to be dismissed.

[38] As per the National Transport Act 5 of 2009, a taxi driver may not operate a taxi without an operating license, and it is an offence to do so. The problem that the Applicant has is that it has not attached the operating licenses on which it relies to its affidavit. The Applicant refers to the operating licenses that are attached to its affidavit and marked "UZT2", however no such document is attached. Without a copy of the licenses depicting the name, date of issue, designated route, ect, the Applicant cannot be said to have proven that it has a clear right. This was probably an oversight on the part of the Applicant; however, it will have to rectify this if the matter is to be heard again.

Dispute of fact

[39] There is a dispute of fact between the parties insofar as the agreement emanating from the merger and the discussions with the Department of Transport (Limpopo) is concerned. If the matter is enrolled for hearing, the matter may need to be dealt with in accordance with **Rule 6 (5) (g) of the Uniform Rules of Court.**

ORDER

[40] I accordingly make the following order: -

[40.1] The application is struck from roll due to the non-joinder of the MEC for Transport and Community Safety (Limpopo) and the LEBOWAKGOMO TAXI ASSOCIATION and any other taxi association operating within the Zebediela Region.

[40.2] That the applicant pay for the wasted costs on Scale B.


BURNETT, E J
ACTING JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT,
POLOKWANE; LIMPOPO DIVISION

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPLICANT: - Mr. J L Rahlagane

INSTRUCTED BY: - J.L RAHLAGANE ATTORNEYS

FOR THE RESPONDENTS:- Mr. A A Milazi

INSTRUCTED BY:- MILAZI A INCORPORATED

DATE OF HEARING: - 30 DECEMBER 2025

DATE OF JUDGMENT: - 5 JANUARY 2026