

SAFLII Note: Certain personal/private details of parties or witnesses have been redacted from this document in compliance with the law and [SAFLII Policy](#)

**REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA
IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA
GAUTENG DIVISION, JOHANNESBURG**

Case Number: 2025-029872

(1)	REPORTABLE: YES / NO
(2)	OF INTEREST TO OTHER JUDGES: YES/NO
(3)	REVISED: YES/NO

DATE

SIGNATURE

In the matter between:

AFRICA ABLAZE MINISTRIES

Applicant

And

REDEMPTION HILL MINISTRIES

1st Respondent

**CITY OF JOHANNESBURG METROPOLITAN
MUNICIPALITY**

2nd Respondent

JUDGMENT

STRYDOM, J

[1] The applicant is the registered owner of the immovable property known as Plot [...], R[...] Road, M[...], R[...], Gauteng. Ownership is common cause.

[2] The first respondent occupied the property under a written lease agreement concluded on or about 31 January 2023, which was later amended to extend the leased premises and increase the rent. It is undisputed that the first respondent failed to pay rent in accordance with the lease agreement. As a result, the applicant validly cancelled the lease.

- [3] Following the cancellation, the first respondent remained in occupation. Its continued occupation is unlawful. Proper notice in terms of section 4(2) of the Prevention of Illegal Eviction from and Unlawful Occupation of Land Act 19 of 1998 ("PIE") was served and is not challenged.
- [4] The defences raised by the first respondent do not affect the applicant's right to eviction. The authority of the applicant's representative was accepted by the first respondent throughout the lease's subsistence and cannot now be challenged to avoid the consequences of non-payment. Any issues relating to repairs, improvements, or separate proceedings between the parties do not confer a right to remain in occupation following a lawful cancellation.
- [5] The first respondent is a juristic person occupying the premises for commercial purposes. No evidence has been presented to this court by any natural person alleging that the eviction will render them homeless or identifying circumstances that would justify refusing an eviction order. Allegations made on behalf of unidentified third parties who have not been joined to these proceedings cannot be sustained.
- [6] Having regard to all the relevant circumstances, including the nature of the occupation, the absence of any valid defence, and the balancing exercise required by PIE, it is just and equitable to grant an eviction order. Fairness dictates that the first respondent be afforded a reasonable period to vacate the property.
- [7] Order
- a. The first respondent and all persons occupying the property known as Plot [...], R[...] Road, M[...], R[...], Gauteng, through or under the first respondent, are evicted from the property.
 - b. The first respondent and such occupiers shall vacate the property within 30 (thirty) days of the date of this order.

- c. Failing compliance with paragraph 2, the Sheriff is authorised and directed to evict the first respondent and such occupiers and to remove their possessions from the property.
- d. The first respondent is ordered to pay the costs of the application.

R. STRYDOM
JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT
GAUTENG DIVISION, JOHANNESBURG

Heard on: 22 January 2026

Delivered on: 9 February 2026

Appearances:

For the Applicant:	Adv. L. Seapela
Instructed by:	Yakopi Attorneys Inc.

For the 1 st Respondent:	Mr. H. Collins
Instructed by:	In person