IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA (EASTERN CAPE LOCAL DIVISION, PORT ELIZABETH) ROLL CALL – CIVIL TRIALS Before Honourable Justice 28 OCTOBER 2021

Trial date: 01 NOV 2021

PUBLIC HOLIDAY

Trial date: 02 NOV 2021

1. 3879/17 Stebastian Kitas vs Ninister of Police +1 LHK van der Bank State Attorneys

- 2. 4239/17 Murray Crouse t/a Settlers Safaris vs Reel Magic Rushmere Noach Inc Friedman Scheckter
- 3. 1218/16 Nobuntu Dayimani vs RAF John B Scott Att RAF

4. 2926/19 Gideon Gerber vs August Evril Olivia Adams LHK van der Bank Goldberg & De Villiers

5. 3481/14 Monwabisi W Futshane vs RAF John B Scott Att RAF

Trial date: 03 NOV 2021

6. 1867/17 Argent Steel Group (Pty) Ltd vs Tenneco Pride Control SA Ltd JGS Pagdens

7. 3544/13 Olwethu Modlikyise Jona vs Minister of Police Morne Struwig Inc State Attorneys

8. 1743/18 Minshan Africa Holdings (Pty) Ltd vs African Skys (Pty) Ltd **T N & Associates** JGS 9. 1970/20 S Sibani obo C Sibani vs RAF PBK Attorneys RAF

10. 1204/20 Gradwell E Bees vs RAF Rayno Peo RAF

11.	2264/20	Stuart A Siljeur vs RAF	McWilliams & Elliott Inc
			RAF

Trial date: 04 NOV 2021

12. 1723/20 M Zurich vs H Zurich Anthony-Gooden Inc Annali Erasmus

13. 3502/18 Ndiviwe Sikukula vs RAF Gregory Clark & Ass RAF 14. 1967/19 John C Claude Frolick vs RAF Rayno Peo Att RAF

15. 3352/18 Mlamli Berry vs RAF L van der Walt RAF

16. 3936/16 Ameerudeen Fortuin vs Gregory Clark & Ass Jaco Hattingh Att Strauss Daly Att

17. 4250/17 Nomdiki G Vukapi vs RAF John B Scott Att RAF

18. 1510/20 Bridgette R Jaftha vs RAF Vic Skelton Att RAF

19. 2539/20 John E De Villiers vs RAF BBV RAF

Trial date: 05 NOV 2021

20. 3009/20 Lindiwe Edith Johnson vs RAF Rayno Peo RAF

21.	3504/13	Gobelana + 1 vs RAF	Goldberg & De Villiers
			RAF

22. 1382/20 Mathews A April vs RAF L van der Walt RAF

23 589/20 C Booysen vs RAF Gregory Clark & Ass RAF

24. 433/20 Sisanda Sinam vs RAF Matiwane Att RAF

PLEASE BE ADVISED THAT there will be no roll call in open court until further notice. The trial readiness of all civil trial matters enrolled for hearing will instead be determined by a Judge in chambers. In order to facilitate the decision of the roll call Judge the parties shall, by not later than 10 days before the allocated trial date, and after having held a telephonic or videoconference pre-trial meeting, file a joint practice note together with the requisite trial readiness checklist (Form 2), and written submissions, not exceeding two typed pages dealing with the trial readiness of the matter. In the practice note the parties shall address the following matters:

- 1.1 whether the matter is capable of settlement and should remain on the trial roll for that purposes;
- a clear and concise statement of any outstanding issues for determination;
- 1.3 whether the outstanding issues are capable of determination without the hearing of oral evidence, in which event, if the

parties agree that the matter be determined without hearing oral evidence, they shall be required to set out a statement of the agreed facts upon which oral argument is to be addressed by way of videoconference or other electronic means; and

- 1.4 in the event of the matter not being capable of a hearing as envisaged in paragraph 1.3
 - 1.4.1 the reasons therefor;
 - 1.4.2 the total number of witnesses; and
 - 1.4.3 the suggested logistics of conducting the trial by way of videoconference, alternatively where a trial by videoconference is not considered feasible or desirable, to state the reasons therefor and to set out the suggested arrangements with due consideration to the prevention of the spread of Covid-19 infection or contamination to litigants, legal practitioners, court staff and the other court attendees.
- Should any party fail or be unwilling to take part in the pre-trial meeting referred to in paragraph 1 –
 - 2.1 the other party may file the practice note together with reasonswhy the joint practice note could not be filed; and

- 2.2 the roll call Judge May-
 - 2.2.1 convene a pre-trial meeting by videoconference or any

other appropriate manner; or

2.2.2 where appropriate, grant a punitive costs order.