

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: 2023-071722

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

11 May 2026
DATE

SIGNATURE

In the matter between:

C[...] J[...] T[...] (G[...])

Applicant

and

D[...] M[...] G[...]

Respondent

In re:

D[...] M[...] G[...]

Plaintiff

and

C[...] J[...] T[...] (G[...])

Defendant

Minor child B G

JUDGMENT

CRUTCHFIELD J

[1] On 6 May 2026 I delivered judgment in an application brought urgently before me in the family court.

- [2] The orders granted by me arose in terms of the notice of motion in the context of the application as a whole.
- [3] The orders granted in terms of the judgment are interim in nature, pending the outcome of a report from the office of the family advocate.
- [4] The applicant, C[...] J[...] G[], now seeks clarification in terms of rule 42(1)(b), of paragraph [50] 1 of the orders granted by me on 6 May 2024. The respondent, D[...] M[...] G[], opposes the request for clarification and raises a technical point of failure to comply with rule 30A.
- [5] These proceedings concern a child of approximately five years of age. The respondent's conduct in raising a technical point in the face of the substantive issues concerning the child herein, is not to be tolerated.
- [6] It is not in the interests of justice to permit this request for clarification in terms of rule 42(1)(b) to escalate into a full blown opposed application and I do not intend to allow that to take place. It is in the best interests of the child that the orders granted by me on 6 May 2026, be implemented in the terms granted without further ado.
- [7] The orders, set out in paragraph [50] of the judgment, provide as follows:
1. The interim court order issued by the Randburg children's court under matter number 14/1/42-547/2024 in so far as the order provides for supervised contact between the applicant and the child, is suspended pending the filing of the Family Advocate's report.
 2. Supervision of the contact between the applicant and the child is suspended pending the filing of the Family Advocate's report.
 3. The services of the appointed parenting coordinator, Ms Kriel are suspended pending the filing of the report of the Family Advocate.
 4. The Family Advocate's office is requested to finalise its report in this matter urgently.
 5. There is no order in respect of the costs of the application.

[8] In short, the orders mean what they say, being:

- a. The primary care position of the child is subject to the outcome of the investigation and report of the family advocate's office. The family advocate is to complete that report urgently.
- b. Pending the delivery of the Family Advocate's report, the contact currently being exercised between the applicant and the child is not to be subject to supervision.

[9] There is no order in respect of the costs of the rule 42(1)(b) request for clarification.

CRUTCHFIELD J
JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT
JOHANNESBURG

For the Applicant:	Attorney I Vorster instructed by Isa Vorster Attorneys
For the Respondent:	Adv N Riley instructed by Fairbridges Attorneys
Date of the request in terms of rule 42(1)(b):	8 May 2026
Date of the judgment:	11 May 2026