



## JUTA'S ADVANCE NOTIFICATION SERVICE

### THE NAMIBIAN LAW REPORTS

**Dear law reports subscriber,**

Herewith the table of cases and flynotes for the Namibian Law Reports 2013(3), which is now available.

Should you be interested in a full set of the Namibian Law Reports, there is currently a 15 % discount on offer. For more information, please click on the link below.

<http://www.jutalaw.co.za/products/3584-namibian-law-reports-1990-to-2010>

#### **WE WELCOME YOUR FEEDBACK**

Please forward comments regarding any of the law reports series to [lawreports@juta.co.za](mailto:lawreports@juta.co.za)

Kind Regards

**The Juta Law Reports Team**

## THE NAMIBIAN LAW REPORTS

**2013 (3)**

### TABLE OF CASES

- S v Goabab and Another 2013 (3) NR 603 (SC)
- Shalli v Attorney-General and Another 2013 (3) NR 613 (HC)
- S v Guruseb 2013 (3) NR 630 (HC)
- Management Science For Health v Kandungure and Another 2013 (3) NR 632 (LC)
- S v Tashiya 2013 (3) NR 637 (HC)
- Oehl NO v Nolte and Others 2013 (3) NR 643 (HC)
- Maletzky v Zaaluka 2013 (3) NR 649 (HC)
- Katjizeu and Others v Government of the Republic of Namibia and Others 2013 (3) NR 652 (HC)
- Classic Engines CC v Nghikofa 2013 (3) NR 659 (HC)
- Rally for Democracy and Progress and Others v Electoral Commission for Namibia and Others 2013 (3) NR 664 (SC)
- S v Kandowa 2013 (3) NR 729 (HC)
- Namibia Development Corporation v Mwandingi and Others 2013 (3) NR 737 (LC)

- University of Namibia and Others v Kaaronda and Others 2013 (3) NR 747 (HC)
- S v Silas 2013 (3) NR 760 (HC)
- Keya v Chief of the Defence Force and Others 2013 (3) NR 770 (SC)
- Meatco v Namibia Food & Allied Workers Union and Others 2013 (3) NR 777 (LC)
- Nufesha Investments CC v Namibia Rights and Responsibilities Incorporated and Others 2013 (3) NR 787 (HC)
- S v Shipuata 2013 (3) NR 800 (NLD)
- Attorney-General of Namibia v Minister of Justice and Others 2013 (3) NR 806 (SC)
- Katjujanjo v Willemse and Others 2013 (3) NR 850 (HC)
- S v Malumo and Others 2013 (3) NR 868 (HC)
- Lida Marie CC v O'Portuga Restaurant CC 2013 (3) NR 895 (HC)

## FLYNOTES

### **S v GOABAB AND ANOTHER (SC)**

SHIVUTE CJ, MARITZ JA and MAINGA JA  
2012 JUNE 27; NOVEMBER 15

**Criminal law**—Corruption—Public officer—Using office or position for gratification—Anti-corruption Act 8 of 2003—Meaning of 'corruptly'—Striking down of definition of 'corruptly' in s 32 as unconstitutional by full bench—Word should be given ordinary grammatical meaning—Respondents as public officers obtaining discounts at rental car company—First respondent also allocating government vehicle to himself for private use—Court, in appeal against discharge of respondents, holding that sufficient prima facie evidence against respondents—Appeal against discharge of respondents upheld.

### **SHALLI v ATTORNEY-GENERAL AND ANOTHER (HC)**

SMUTS J and GEIER J  
2012 OCTOBER 19; 2013 JANUARY 16

**Constitutional law**—Human rights—Right to a fair trial—Forfeiture of property under ch 6 of Prevention of Organised Crime Act 29 of 2004 (POCA)—Whether ch 6 violating presumption of innocence—Such forfeiture constituting civil proceedings—Presumption of innocence in criminal proceedings thus not arising—Chapter also not violating right to fair trial—Even though s 51(2) of POCA in peremptory terms, court should grant rule nisi to afford person affected opportunity to be heard.

**Constitutional law**—Human rights—Right to property—Forfeiture of property under ch 6 of Prevention of Organised Crime Act 29 of 2004 (POCA)—Protection of property under art 16 of Constitution—Such protection not absolute—Article not protecting ownership or possession of proceeds of crime—Even if ch 6 infringes upon art 16, it would be proportionate response to fundamental problem which it addressed, ie that no one should be allowed to benefit from their wrongdoing.

**Constitutional law**—Human rights—Right to dignity—Forfeiture of property under ch 6 of Prevention of Organised Crime Act 29 of 2004 (POCA)—Whether ch 6 violating human dignity protected by art 8 of Constitution—Proceedings would result in indignity—However, because proceedings themselves constitutionally permissible, indignity would be constitutionally sanctioned—Thus provisions not violating art 8(1).

### **S v GURUSEB (HC)**

HOFF J and SMUTS J  
2012 MAY 15

**Criminal procedure**—Sentence—Correction of—Conditions of suspension—Should only refer to offence with material connection to nature and circumstances of offence of which accused convicted.

### **MANAGEMENT SCIENCE FOR HEALTH v KANDUNGURE AND ANOTHER (LC)**

PARKER AJ  
2012 OCTOBER 19; NOVEMBER 15

**Labour law**—Dismissal—Fairness of—Respondent dismissed after meeting with appellant to discuss her absence without permission—Meeting not constituting disciplinary process—Court dismissing appeal by employer against arbitrator who held that respondent unfairly dismissed.

**S v TASHIYA (HC)**

LIEBENBERG J and MILLER AJ  
2012 DECEMBER 5

**Criminal procedure**—Trial—Irregularities in—What constitutes—Section 118 of Criminal Procedure Act 51 of 1977—Where judicial officer was not available to continue with trial after accused pleaded and no evidence had been adduced yet, trial may be continued before another presiding officer—In casu after evidence was adduced case was heard by different magistrate—Case should have been heard by original magistrate—Irregularities in proceedings justifying review.

**Criminal procedure**—Trial—Mental state of accused—Trial court receiving psychiatric report—Court discharging accused—Court on review remitting matter to magistrate—Matter ought to have been heard by same magistrate throughout—Psychiatric report containing contradictions to be clarified by oral evidence—Court accordingly entitled to review case in terms of its inherent powers—Irregularities in proceedings justifying such review.

**OEHL NO v NOLTE AND OTHERS (HC)**

SMUTS J  
2013 JANUARY 16, 24

**Practice**—Intermediate proceedings—Security for costs—In what cases—Plaintiff executor of deceased estate instituting action against first defendant—Court granting security for costs on grounds that estate would have insufficient funds to cover first defendant's costs should he be successful in litigation.

**MALETZKY v ZAALUKA (HC)**

DAMASEB JP  
2013 JANUARY 18

**Legal practitioners**—Unauthorised practice as legal practitioner—Law prohibits persons not admitted as such, to act on behalf of others—Such persons therefore not under discipline of Law Society or court, since they are not officers of court.

**KATJIZEU AND OTHERS v GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA AND OTHERS (HC)**

NDAUENDAPO J  
2011 JANUARY 10–23; JUNE 8–17; JULY 11–22 2012; MARCH 12–13; SEPTEMBER 17–18;  
2013 JANUARY 29

**Practice**—Applications and motions—Affidavits—Admissions—Withdrawal of admissions—Withdrawal of admissions only permitted where explanation for such admission reasonable and where party would not suffer prejudice.

**CLASSIC ENGINES CC v NGHIKOFA (HC)**

PARKER J  
2012 JUNE 18; JULY 25

**Court**—High court—Jurisdiction—Plaintiff suing for damages for breach of employment contract—Defendant raising point in limine that high court lacked jurisdiction—Defendant relying on s 86 of Labour Act 11 of 2007—Court holding that s 86 did not apply—Alternative dispute resolution providing for award of compensation—Compensation different from damages—High court accordingly having jurisdiction in present case.

**RALLY FOR DEMOCRACY AND PROGRESS AND OTHERS v ELECTORAL COMMISSION FOR NAMIBIA AND OTHERS (SC)**

SHIVUTE CJ, MARITZ JA, MAINGA JA, CHOMBA AJA and MTAMBANENGWE AJA

2011 OCTOBER 3–5; 2012 OCTOBER 25

**Appeal**—Lapsed appeal—Reinstatement of—In election litigation—Appellants seeking reinstatement of appeal and condonation for late filing of record and powers of attorney—Purpose of rules of court to further and secure procedures for inexpensive and expeditious institution, prosecution and completion of litigation in interest of administration of justice—Court would not readily countenance non-adherence to rules, unless compelling reasons to do so—But rules not end in themselves to be observed for their own sake—Court will take into account extent of breach of rules; importance of case; prospects of success and prejudice to respondents—In present case, record filed five days late—Court condoning breach of rules and reinstating appeal—Case important for public and respondents not unduly prejudiced.

**Practice**—Applications and motions—Application to supplement papers—In election litigation—Court a quo refusing such application—On appeal, court recognising that such refusal constituting exercise of judicial discretion and value judgment by court a quo—Court on appeal would not easily interfere unless discretion exercised with bias or capriciously—Court would also not interfere merely because court on appeal would have made different value judgment—Court satisfied that discretion exercised judicially.

**Election law**—Elections—Validity of—National Assembly elections on 27 and 28 November 2009—Appellants raising various complaints against election process, viz voter registration card numbers not entered on ballot paper counterfoils; results announced were of verification process and not polling station results; reconciliation between ‘Elect 20(b)’ and ‘Elect 16’ forms—Court holding that evidence adduced by appellants not making out case for any of these complaints—However, court finding that certain administrative errors did occur—Such errors not justifying setting aside of election, nor proving fraud on part of first respondent—In the light of these errors, court holding that first respondent, despite success on appeal, not entitled to costs.

**S v KANDOWA (HC)**

HOFF J and VAN NIEKERK J

2009 SEPTEMBER 18; 2012 NOVEMBER 29

**Criminal procedure**—Evidence—Assessment of—Identification—Alibi—No burden on accused to prove alibi—Court will assess reliability of alibi on totality of evidence—Value of alibi defence adversely affected where accused raising defence for first time when testifying.

**NAMIBIA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION v MWANDINGI AND OTHERS (LC)**

SMUTS J

2012 NOVEMBER 23; DECEMBER 3

**Labour law**—Dismissal—Constructive dismissal—First respondent lodging complaint of constructive dismissal seven years after complaint had arisen—Extinctive prescription—Prescription Act 68 of 1969 applying to labour disputes—Appellant’s raising of prescription upheld on appeal.

**UNIVERSITY OF NAMIBIA AND OTHERS v KAARONDA AND OTHERS (HC)**

SMUTS J

2012 NOVEMBER 5–16; 2013 JANUARY 16

**Defamation**—Who may sue and be sued—Defamation of a class or group of persons—Newspaper article accusing senior management of UNAM of certain irregularities—Plaintiffs in action for defamation alleging that article making specific reference to them as senior management—Defendants admitting same in plea—Defendants at close of plaintiffs’ case applying for absolution on grounds that plaintiffs not proving specific reference to themselves in article—Nature of enquiry first a legal question and then a factual one—Objective test to be applied in such enquiry—Defendants seeking to amend plea by withdrawing admission—Court not prepared to grant such amendment—Court satisfied that words reasonably capable of referring to plaintiffs—Application for absolution dismissed with costs.

**S v SILAS (HC)**

VAN NIEKERK J and UEITELE J

2013 JANUARY 30

**Criminal law**—Stock theft—Offences—Possession of stock in contravention of s 2 of Stock Theft Act 12 of 1990—Elements of offence—Offence consisting of: (i) found in possession; (ii) stock or produce; (iii) reasonable suspicion; (iv) unsatisfactory account; (v) mens rea.

**Criminal procedure**—Indictment and charge—Charge sheet—Formulation of—Charge where accused allegedly contravened s 2 of Stock Theft Act 12 of 1990—Incorrect to allege that reasonable suspicion 'is' in existence in present tense, ie at trial—As charge-sheets usually refer to past conduct, allegation under discussion, read in context, should state that accused was found in possession of stock in regard to which there was reasonable suspicion that it had been stolen.

**Criminal procedure**—Plea—Plea of guilty—Questioning in terms of s 112(1)(b) of Criminal Procedure Act 51 of 1977—Provisions of s 112(1)(b) applicable to charge of contravention of s 2 of Stock Theft Act 12 of 1990—Admissibility of admission by accused that reasonable suspicion existed in someone's mind at time when he was found in possession—Such admission admissible if court satisfied that admission reliable.

**KEYA v CHIEF OF THE DEFENCE FORCE AND OTHERS (SC)**

MAINGA JA, STRYDOM AJA and O'REGAN AJA

2012 NOVEMBER 5; 2013 MARCH 19

**Review**—Delay in instituting review proceedings—Whether delay was unreasonable—Appellant launching review proceedings seven months after his discharge from Defence Force—Despite question of delay having been raised in respondents' answering papers, appellant offering no explanation—On appeal, court upholding decision of trial court not to condone delay—Appellant's failure to give explanation and fact that had been legally represented throughout, militating against condonation—Appeal dismissed with costs.

**MEATCO v NAMIBIA FOOD AND ALLIED WORKERS UNION AND OTHERS (LC)**

SMUTS J

2013 APRIL 17, 19

**Court**—Labour Court—Jurisdiction—Jurisdiction of Labour Court to grant urgent interdictory relief—Labour Court not having jurisdiction to grant urgent interdict in absence of pending dispute between parties.

**NUFESHA INVESTMENTS CC v NAMIBIA RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES INC AND OTHERS (HC)**

UEITELE J

2012 DECEMBER 24, 28

**Spoliation**—Mandament van spolie—When available—Applicant entering into agreement to renovate first respondent's premises—Second respondent accusing applicant of poor workmanship and barring access to premises—Applicant seeking spoliation—Court holding applicant having both ius possidendi and ius possessionis and that premises under applicant's lawful control—Second respondent taking law into his own hands and illicitly ejecting applicant from premises—Spoliation order granted.

**S v SHIPUATA (NLD)**

LIEBENBERG J and TOMMASI J

2013 JANUARY 21, 23

**Criminal procedure**—Appeal—Application for hearing of further evidence—Party wishing to lead further evidence must bring substantive application—Where possible, applicant must annex statements of witnesses to be called or recalled—Applicant to give reasons for application—Application will only be granted in exceptional circumstances—Tension between ensuring that innocent persons not punished and public interest that cases must be finalised.

**ATTORNEY-GENERAL OF NAMIBIA v MINISTER OF JUSTICE AND OTHERS (SC)**

SHIVUTE CJ, MARITZ JA and STRYDOM AJA

2010 JULY 9; 2013 APRIL 4

**Constitutional law**—Human rights—Right to a fair trial—Namibian Constitution, art 12—Essential content and substratum of art 12 right to fair trial—List of specific rights embodied in art 12(1)(b)–(f) do not purport to be exhaustive of requirements of fair criminal hearing—Courts may expand thereon in their important task to give substance to overarching right to fair trial—Constitution not having general limitation clause restricting scope of some or all fundamental rights and freedoms entrenched therein—Certain rights inviolable, while others subject to limitation—In between two extremes were rights qualified ‘according to law’—Phrase in art 12(1)(d) allowing by implication for limitation of right presumption of innocence and implying measure of flexibility to allow legislature to determine substantive and procedural frameworks in public interest in terms of which person may be proved guilty ‘according to law’—Implicit flexibility necessary if balance to be struck between rights of individual to be presumed innocent and state’s obligation to protect interest of public.

**Constitutional law**—Human rights—Right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty—Constitutionality of s 245 of Criminal Procedure Act 51 of 1977—Statute containing reverse onus provision not per se unconstitutional—Mandatory presumption created by s 245 significantly alleviating prosecution’s evidential burden under common law to prove accused’s guilt in offences of which false representation was element—Section casting reverse onus on persons prosecuted for crimes to disprove essential element of those crimes—Once prosecution proving that they made alleged representations and that representations were false, accused required to establish on preponderance of probability that they were ignorant of falsity of representations at time when made—Objective of section to alleviate difficulties experienced by state in prosecutions of that nature to prove what mindsets of accused persons were regarding veracity or falseness of representations at time of their making—Presumption in s 245 relating to important element of type of offences referred to therein—Once operative threshold for presumption met by prosecution, accused required to disprove that element on balance of probabilities—Element which state otherwise would have had to prove beyond reasonable doubt to secure conviction—Shifting of onus from state to accused in respect of such important element of offences in question, significant departure from evidential norm applying in criminal law and procedure—If reverse onus in s 245 retained, real danger that even if accused able to persuade court that was reasonable possibility that he did not know that representation was false at time when made, but failing to prove it on balance of probabilities, court would be constrained to convict if state proved all other elements—No sufficient justification for reverse onus presumption in s 245 to warrant limitation of fundamental right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty—Section 245 accordingly unconstitutional.

**Constitutional law**—Human rights—Right to be presumed innocent until proven guilty—Constitutionality of s 332(5) of Criminal Procedure Act 51 of 1977—Section creating new form of liability for corporate crimes—Legislature choosing to mitigate what would otherwise have been harshness of provision by permitting accused director or servant to escape liability upon proof, on balance of probabilities, of two exempting factors—Could not be said with any degree of conviction that provision meaning to ameliorate what would otherwise have been harshness of strict vicarious liability could for that reason be unfair or unconstitutional—However, words ‘or servant’ overbroad—Provision unconstitutional on this ground alone—Remainder of section not violating any other constitutional rights.

#### **KATJIUANJO v WILLEMSE AND OTHERS (HC)**

GEIER J

2012 JULY 12; SEPTEMBER 26

**Execution**—Sale in execution—Powers of sheriff—Sheriff acting as executive of law, concluding agreement with purchaser at judicial sale—Sheriff and purchaser are parties to agreement—Sheriff will have to institute eviction proceedings against occupiers—Plaintiff as purchaser cannot institute eviction proceedings—Exception to claim in present case upheld with costs.

#### **S v MALUMO AND OTHERS (HC)**

HOFF J

2012 SEPTEMBER 3–6, 10–14, 17–18, 24–27; OCTOBER 12; 2013 FEBRUARY 11

**Criminal procedure**—Trial—Discharge at end of state’s case—Criminal Procedure Act 51 of 1977, s 174—Test is whether there is evidence upon which reasonable court may convict accused—Advent of Constitution not changing test to be applied—Court must weigh up all factors—Credibility of witnesses playing limited role in applications of this nature.

**LIDA MARIE CC v O’PORTUGA RESTAURANT CC (HC)**

VAN NIEKERK J

2012 NOVEMBER 29, 30; 2013 APRIL 23

**Landlord and tenant**—Lease—Written lease agreement—Agreement providing that no variation permissible unless reduced to writing—Defendant relying on oral consent of plaintiff that it be substituted as tenant—In principle court no discretion to refuse to enforce valid contractual provision—Defendant accordingly ejected from premises.