



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

- (1) REPORTABLE: No
(2) OF INTEREST TO OTHER JUDGES: No
(3) REVISED.

SIGNATURE

DATE: 1 June 2026

Case No. 2022-036448

In the matter between:

HITJEVI OBAFEMI TJIROZE

Applicant

and

SOUTH AFRICAN LEGAL PRACTICE COUNCIL

First Respondent

JOHANNESBURG SOCIETY OF ADVOCATES

Second Respondent

CORAM: MIA J and WILSON J

JUDGMENT

WILSON J (with whom MIA J agrees):

- 1 The applicant, Mr. Tjiroze, seeks leave to appeal against our decision of 13 April 2026, which refused his application to rescind an order declining to admit him as an advocate. In that decision, we found that Mr. Tjiroze's rescission application was little more than an attempt to repackage an earlier failed attempt to appeal the judgment refusing him admission. The issues Mr. Tjiroze sought to revive were *res judicata*. We could not appropriately revisit them.

Besides, we concluded that, even if we were to overlook that insurmountable obstacle, the rescission application itself was stillborn, since it met none of the well-known requirements for a rescission of judgment.

- 2 In motivating his application for leave to appeal, Mr. Tjiroze canvassed old ground at some length. He repeated his arguments *a quo*, but did not set out a basis on which our rejection of them might be revisited on appeal. Bearing in mind our heightened duty to Mr. Tjiroze as a lay litigant, we did what we could to encourage him to focus on the relevant questions, and to develop arguments that might assist his case. We gave him significantly more than the time he could reasonably have needed to persuade us that we might have taken a wrong turn in our judgment *a quo*.
- 3 That notwithstanding, there was nothing in Mr. Tjiroze's arguments that constituted anything more than a repetition of submissions we dealt with fully in our judgment *a quo*; an unhelpful preoccupation with peripheral or irrelevant matters; or a straightforward, unreasoned repudiation of our conclusions. None of that amounts to an outline of a rational basis on which a court of appeal might reverse our judgment. The application must fail. As in the court *a quo*, Mr. Tjiroze will pay the costs of the application on the appropriate scale.
- 4 The application for leave to appeal is dismissed with costs on the scale as between attorney and client.




S D J WILSON
Judge of the High Court

This judgment was prepared by Judge Wilson, with whom Judge Mia agrees. It is handed down electronically by circulation to the parties or their legal representatives by email, by uploading it to the electronic file of this matter on Caselines, and by publication of the judgment to the South African Legal Information Institute. The date for hand-down is deemed to be 1 June 2026.

HEARD ON: 29 May 2026

DECIDED ON: 1 June 2026

For the Applicant: H Tjiroze in person

For the First Respondent: M Steenkamp
Instructed by Rooth and Wessels Inc

For the Second Respondent: B Gilbert SC
N Deeplal
Instructed by Webber Wentzel