




REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA
(GAUTENG DIVISION, PRETORIA)

28/01/2016
CASE NO: 23846/2014

(1)	REPORTABLE: YES / <u>NO</u>
(2)	OF INTEREST TO OTHER JUDGES: YES / <u>NO</u>
(3)	<u>REVISED</u>
	
SIGNATURE	DATE
	29/1/2016

In the matter between:

MOGABUDIMA TRANSPORT SERVICES CC
SE MOGOWE
J MOGOWE
ME NCHABEENG
JM SEPHEU
MP NCHABEENG
GJ MTHOBENI
MF NTSOANE
SD RANALA
OL MOTAU
RS SELLO
ME LEPELLE
KT CHOMA
MJ KGATUKE
MB PHASHA

1st Applicant
2nd Applicant
3rd Applicant
4th Applicant
5th Applicant
6th Applicant
7th Applicant
8th Applicant
9th Applicant
10th Applicant
11th Applicant
12th Applicant
13th Applicant
14th Applicant
15th Applicant

And

THE GAUTENG PROVINCIAL REGULATORY ENTITY	1 st Respondent
THE LIMPOPO PROVINCIAL REGULATORY ENTITY	2 nd Respondent
THE REGISTRAR OF TRANSPORT, GAUTENG PROVINCE	3 rd Respondent
THE REGISTRAR OF TRANSPORT, LIMPOPO PROVINCE	4 th Respondent
BOSEKA BOEJA TAXI ASSOCIATION	5 th Respondent
MASEMOLA TAXI ASSOCIATION	6 th Respondent
MV SEPHEU	7 th Respondent
SEFOKA MAKUWE ADAM	8 th Respondent
NCHABELENG DITEDI MAXWELL	9 th Respondent
TLADI FRANS	10 th Respondent
MA MOKGWADI	11 th Respondent

J U D G M E N T

MALI AJ

[1] This is an application for an order to rescind, alternatively to declare void and unenforceable the verdict issued by the third and fourth respondents on 18 July 2012. The application further seeks the following:

- 1.1 an order directing the third respondent to reinstate the First applicants as members of the fifth respondent; and
- 1.2 an order directing the third respondent to reinstate the applicants as members of the fifth respondent and to renew their permits which they were entitled to as members of the fifth respondent.


[2] There was no appearance on behalf of all the applicants. I am satisfied that the notice of set down was served upon the applicants on 12 October 2015.

[3] Counsel, Mr Gwarha appeared on behalf of the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th respondents. Counsel, Mr Morare appeared on behalf of 5th and 11th respondent.

[4] There was no appearance on behalf of 6th, 7th, 8th, 9th and the 10th respondent.

[5] Having heard Counsel the application is dismissed with costs.

5.1 Applicants are ordered to pay costs of 1st, 2nd, 3rd, 4th 5th and 11th respondents on attorney and client scale.



MALI AJ

ACTING JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT

Counsel for the Applicants: No appearance

Instructed by: No appearance

Counsel for 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th Respondents: MR GWARHU

Counsel for 5 and 11th Respondents: RAMUSHU MORARE INC.

Date of Hearing: 14 October 2015

Date of Judgment: 29 January 2016