

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA
(GAUTENG DIVISION, PRETORIA)**

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

16 March 2026; 9 April 2026



DATE

SIGNATURE

Case No: 2025/061551

In the matter between:

LIBERTY FIGHTERS NETWORK

1st Applicant

REYNO DAWID DE BEER NO

2nd Applicant

and

**REGISTRAR OF THE HIGH COURT GAUTENG DIVISION,
PRETORIA**

1st Respondent

**COURT MANAGER OF THE HIGH COURT GAUTENG
DIVISION, PRETORIA**

2nd Respondent

In Re:

Case No: 2022/30280

LIBERTY FIGHTERS NETWORK

1st Applicant

REYNO DAWID DE BEER

2nd Applicant

and

SOUTH AFRICAN HEALTH PRODUCTS REGULATORY AUTHORITY Respondent

In Re:

Case No: 2022/030165

LIBERTY FIGHTERS NETWORK

1st Applicant

REYNO DE BEER

2nd Applicant

NICOLE CANDICE LAWRENCE

3rd Applicant

BROTHERSIT CC

4th Respondent

and

SOUTH AFRICAN RESERVE BANK

1st Respondent

MINISTGER OF FINANCE

2nd Respondent

NATIONAL TREASURY DEPARTMENT

3rd Respondent

PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA

4th Respondent

FIRST NATIONAL BANK

5th Respondent

JUDGMENT: APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL: CLARIFIED

(The matter was heard in open court on 13 March 2026. Judgment was reserved and uploaded onto the electronic file of the matter in CaseLines and the date of the judgment is deemed to be the date of uploading thereof onto CaserLines).

BEFORE: HOLLAND-MUTER J:

[1] A party aggrieved by a judgment granted in a high court may apply for leave to appeal to the court in terms of section 17(1)(a) of the Superior Court Act 10 of 2013 (the "Act").

[2] The provisions of section 17(1)(a) states that Leave to Appeal may only be given where the Judge concerned is of the view that:

(a)(i) the appeal would have a reasonable prospect of success; or

(b) (ii) there is some other compelling reason why the appeal should be heard, including conflicting judgments on the matter under consideration.

[3] Having heard the representatives on behalf of all the parties involved and perusing the application for leave to appeal, the court is of the view that there is no reasonable prospect of success in another court and that there is no compelling reason why the appeal should be heard by another court.

[4] The court has again considered all relevant issues regarding costs and remains of the view that the granted cost order be retained. There is the court's view no constitutional aspect involved and therefore no reason to consider the ***Biowatch Principle*** and that there is no reason why costs should not follow success. The court remains further of the view that the scale of the costs order should remain on an attorney and client scale, the costs to include the costs of two counsel where appointed.




HOLLAND-MUTER J

Judge of the Pretoria High Court

16 March 2026

The application for leave to appeal was heard on Friday 13 March 2026 and judgment was uploaded onto CaseLines on Monday 16 March 2026.

Appearances:

Applicants: Mr R De Beer (in person)

SARB: Adv E Kromhout

SAHPRA: Adv J Berger & Adv Y S Ntloko

POST SCRIPT: 9 April 2026: CLARIFICATION OF JUDGMENT:

[5] The judgment was forwarded to the court by registrar E van der Merwe at the high court with the request to clarify par [3] of the judgment where it is clearly stated that the court is of the view that there is no reasonable prospect of success in another court. To clarify par [3] is to state that the following is ordered:

ORDER:

The application for leave to appeal is refused with costs to be paid by the first and second applicants on an attorney and client scale including the costs of two counsel where appointed and employed.

Signed at Pretoria on 9 April 2026.



A handwritten signature in blue ink is written over a solid black rectangular redaction box. The signature consists of a large, loopy initial 'H' followed by a surname. Below the signature and redaction box is a horizontal dashed line.

HOLLAND-MUTER J

Judge of the Pretoria High Court.

9 April 2026