



Judicial Conduct Committee

In the matter between:

Deputy Judge President Patricia Goliath

Complainant

And

Judge Gayaat Sallie-Hlophe

Respondent

Decision pursuant to an investigation of a complaint in terms of section 17 of the Judicial Service Commission Act 9 of 1994

Dambuza JA:

[1] On 15 January 2020 the Deputy Judge President of the Western Cape Division of the High Court, Judge Goliath (the DJP), lodged a complaint of gross misconduct against the Judge President of that Division, Judge President John Mandlakayise Hlophe (the JP) and his wife, Judge Gayaat Salie-Hlophe, also a judge in the same Division. The essence of the complaint was that the JP and Judge Salie-Hlophe had engaged in conduct that compromised the proper functioning and integrity of the court, and seriously impinged on the court's dignity.

[2] More specifically, as against the JP, the allegations were that that he was engaged in a 'continuous and sustained' attack on the DJP's dignity; that he had withdrawn from her the duties that she used to perform in her capacity as the Deputy Judge President; that he had insulted her and referred to her in derogatory terms, and had generally made her work

environment unbearable. There were also allegations of hostility in the JP's relations with some of the judges of the Division and an assault by him on one of them, Judge Mushtak Parker.

[3] In relation to Judge Salie-Hlophe the allegations were that she had assumed 'enormous power' in the Division, resulting in some of the judges being afraid of her and being disinclined to raise openly any issues relating to her; that she was (improperly) participating in the management of the court, the allocation of cases and appointment of acting judges; that she chose which judges she would sit with on appeals, and that her (unwarranted) complaints about certain judges to the JP had resulted in strained relationships between the JP and the judges concerned and the assault referred to in the preceding paragraph.

[4] Having considered the complaint, the Acting Chairperson of the Judicial Conduct Committee (JCC), Deputy Chief Justice Zondo, formed the view that, in the event of the complaint being established, the appropriate remedial action against Judge Salie-Hlophe would be limited to one or more of those envisaged in section 17(8) of the Judicial Service Commission Act, 7 of 1994 (the JSC Act or the Act). Accordingly, on 6 March 2020, he designated me, as provided in section 17(1)(b) of the Act to inquire into the complaint by the DJP against Judge Salie-Hlophe. The complaint against Hlophe JP was referred for further consideration by the JCC in terms of section 16(4) of the Act.

[5] By the time the Chairman of the JCC designated me to conduct the section 17 inquiry two incidents had occurred in relation to the complaint. The first was a media statement released by Judge Salie-Hlophe on 28 January 2020, in which she denied the allegations made by the DJP in her complaint and suggested that she was 'collateral damage' in the DJP's attack on the JP.

[6] In that statement Judge Salie-Hlophe also remarked about what she considered to be an 'unhealthy obsession' of the DJP, with her marriage, to the extent that on some occasion the DJP told her to stop using her marital name, 'Hlophe', and warned her that if she did not 'exit' her marriage people would wonder why she was married to 'an old black man'. It was also alleged in the statement that the DJP had told Judge Salie-Hlophe that another colleague, Judge Andre Le Grange had commented that she had married the JP in order to 'wield some or other power over the Division'. Judge Salie-Hlophe also suggested that the DJP brought the

complaint because she had not been able to secure appointment to the Constitutional Court’, and she felt ‘aggrieved in regard to her powers’.

[7] The second event was a letter dated 6 February 2020 from Judge Salie-Hlophe’s attorneys to the Chairperson of the JCC, disputing the allegations made in the complaint and criticising them as bald, vague, frivolous, and lacking in substance, to the extent that Judge Salie-Hlophe was unable to properly reply thereto. It was contended that for those reasons the complaint should be dismissed because it did not meet the grounds set out in s14 of the JSC Act.

[8] Although I was in agreement with the contention that Judge Salie-Hlophe was entitled to a clearly formulated complaint in order to be able to respond thereto, I did not think that the lack of clarity complained of, which, in the main, related to the identity of the judges allegedly affected by the alleged misconduct, justified summary dismissal of the complaint. My sense was that although some of the allegations made in the complaint required clarification, the complaint was far from frivolous, or vague to the extent of being embarrassing. In any event section 17(2) of the JSC Act provides for an inquisitorial inquiry into a complaint where, unlike in civil proceedings, there is no onus on any person to prove or disprove any fact - the primary aim of the process being to facilitate accountability, and to assess fitness to continue holding office as a judge.

[9] For that reason I invited the DJP to respond to the issues raised on behalf of Judge Salie-Hlophe about the complaint and to provide further details about the allegations made in the complaint which I needed. These pertained to identities of the colleagues about whom allegations were made in the complaint.

[10] The evidence set out in the following paragraphs emanates from the DJP’s complaint affidavit together with two further affidavits in response to the queries raised. In essence the complaint, as separated from the one against the JP, related to Judge Salie-Hlophe’s alleged conduct in relation to management of the Division, the environment of fear and apprehension which she engendered amongst her colleagues, her complaints about colleagues to the JP and the preferential treatment she enjoyed in relation to performance of her duties. I deal with these in turn.

Management of the Division

Appointment of Acting Judges

[11] According to the DJP Judge Salie-Hlophe would divulge to her information about acting appointments for the upcoming term(s) before the JP disclosed this information to the rest of the judges. She ‘openly disclosed to [her] that she had seen the lists [of candidates provided by the profession] and the Judge President discussed the candidates with her. She would then without hesitation express her own views about candidates and inform [her] who she and the Judge President considered to be appropriate. From this the DJP concluded that Judge Sallie-Hlophe had ‘free reign to comment on and influence the Judge President to recommend a person to act in the Division’. Further, concerns were allegedly raised to her [DJP] by her colleagues about repeated appointment of certain acting judges. Although the allegation seemed to refer to many instances of irregular acting appointments, the only acting judge that was identified in this regard was Acting Judge Hack. The allegation was that he was Judge Salie-Hlophe’s friend whose student day politics were considered ‘extremely conservative’, and was appointed as an acting judge in the Division as a result of Judge Salie-Hlophe’s influence on the JP.

Allocation of cases

[12] According to the DJP Judge Salie-Hlophe would always be up to date with new criminal cases, particularly the high profile ones, and would openly discuss them with her. During August 2017 an issue arose in relation to the allocation of a criminal case, *State v Rhode*, which the JP had allocated to Judge Salie-Hlophe. At the time the practice was that the JP and DJP would do the case allocations jointly. According to the DJP this allocation caused rumblings amongst other judges in the Division as the case was ‘high profile’ and Judge Salie-Hlophe was one of the most junior judges at the time. The DJP would have allocated the trial to Judge Le Grange due to his seniority and experience in criminal cases. The JP’s allocation prevailed. A week later Judge Salie-Hlophe confronted the DJP seeking that she endorse the allocation. The DJP would not cooperate and remained firm in her view. The incident raised the JP’s ire with the result that he gave the DJP ‘the silent treatment’.

[13] The DJP also referred to Judge Salie-Hlophe’s ‘keen interest in various aspects of running the Division’. Judge Salie-Hlophe had confided to the DJP that the JP would like her to partner with him in the running of the Division. She advised the DJP of emails from other judges in the Division that she had seen. It ‘became clear’ to the DJP that Judge Salie-Hlophe

determined the responses to these emails. Judge Salie-Hlophe also enjoyed the privilege of choosing the judges that she would sit with on appeals. On a number of occasions Judge Salie-Hlophe would return the file allocated to her to the allocation room when she was paired with judges that she did not want to sit with. The DJP attached to her supplementary affidavit copies of appeal court rolls for the period starting from 2018 until 2020 to show that Judge Salie-Hlophe did not sit on appeals with Judges Ndita, Allie, Rogers, Bozalek, Binns-Ward, Le Grange, and Gamble during this period. According to the DJP Judge Salie-Hlophe had expressed her wish not to sit with the named Judges. Her wish was accommodated save where it was not possible to do so.

Complaints about colleagues

[14] The DJP referred to instances in which Judge Salie-Hlophe complained to the JP about certain colleagues. The complaints resulted in strained relations between the JP and the following judges:

[14.1] *Judge Le Grange* - The allegation was that Judge Le Grange who, at some stage, was responsible for allocation of parking bays to judges, refused to allocate a specifically requested parking bay to Judge Salie-Hlophe.

[14.2] *Judge Gamble* – A report by Judge Salie-Hlophe to the JP that Judge Gamble excluded her from a conversation that happened during lunch led to a strained relationship between him and the JP.

[14.3] *Judge Wille* – A report about his ‘inappropriate’ conduct towards Judge Salie-Hlophe resulted in successive circuit court allocations as punishment.

[14.4] *Judge Mushtak Parker* - His ‘inappropriate conduct’ towards Judge Salie-Hlophe was reported to the JP resulting in a physical assault by the JP on him.

[14.5] *Acting Judge Magona* - Judge Salie-Hlophe ‘took exception’ to the judge (who was an acting judge at the time) asking for the key to a toilet reserved for permanent judges. Thereafter the judge was never invited for an acting stint again.

Preferential treatment

[15] According to the DJP other judges complained to her about Judge Salie-Hlophe being allocated less Friday appeals than them. The JP and Judge Salie-Hlophe did not take the matter seriously when she raised it with them. In addition, Judge Salie-Hlophe worked irregular hours and sometimes took Fridays and Mondays off work with impunity. The DJP would not reveal the identities of the judges who complained to her about these matters.

Report by Judge Salie-Hlophe to the JP about the DJP

[16] The DJP stated that upon her return to the Division on 15 April 2019, following an extended acting stint at the Constitutional Court she discovered that her relationship with the JP had hit rock bottom. She had been stripped of the duties that she had been performing as the Deputy Judge President prior to her departure to the Constitutional Court.

[17] In a meeting held between her and the JP on 2 October 2019 the JP told her that he no longer wanted to work with her. The stated reasons were: that the JP did not require a deputy to run the Division anymore; that the DJP wanted to take over his position as JP; and, of relevance to this inquiry, that the DJP's involvement in the couple's domestic life, including her telling Judge Salie-Hlophe to divorce him and to stop using his surname.

[18] These allegations emanated from an incident during September 2017 when the DJP took Judge Salie-Hlophe to hospital, at the latter's instance, for treatment of an injury she had sustained on her hand following an incident at the JP's house. The JP was aggrieved by the DJP's involvement in this incident together with the reported suggestions she made to Judge Salie-Hlophe to end her marriage to him.

Evidence of the implicated judges

[19] My requests to the implicated judges for responses or comments to the DJP's affidavits did not yield much in support of the complaint. Some of the judges were oblivious to the fact that they were in the JP's bad books; they could not even recall the alleged offending incidents. Others, such as Judges Wille and Magona, were not interested entering this fray. Below is a summary of their responses.

- *Judge Gamble* could not recall the incident during which he allegedly excluded Judge Salie-Hlophe from a conversation.
- *Judge Rogers* had been unaware, prior to these proceedings, that Judge Salie-Hlophe did not want to sit with him on appeals. He knew of no reason for the alleged sentiment. According to his records only on three occasions had he sat with Judge Salie-Hlophe on appeals.
- *Judge Allie* pointed out that she had sat with Judge Sallie-Hlophe on an appeal in 2015, 2016 and on 1 February 2019. She too knew of no reason that would cause Judge Sallie-Hlophe not to want to sit with her on appeals. She denied having experienced any fear or intimidation during the period that she has served as a judge of the Western Cape Division.
- *Judge Ndita* was also not aware of Judge Sallie-Hlophe's aversion to being placed on the same appeal bench as her. She pointed out that on 28 July 2019 Judge Sallie-Hlophe sat with her on a full bench appeal.
- *Judge Wille's attorneys* advised that in view of his longstanding friendship with the JP he preferred not to respond to the allegations made by the DJP in her complaint.
- *Judge Le Grange* confirmed that his relationship with the JP had deteriorated, but he did not recall refusing to allocate a parking bay to Judge Salie-Hlophe. He was not aware of any complaint or report made by Judge Salie-Hlophe to the JP about him. Neither was he aware that she did not want to sit with him on appeal. The JP had since relieved him of the responsibility of allocating parking bays to his colleagues as his office would be assuming that responsibility. He remarked that the JP had used his prerogative to also change the system of allocation of chambers. He knew nothing about Judge Salie-Hlophe's involvement in the appointment of acting judges. His comment in that regard was only that the process of appointing acting judges was not transparent in their Division and that acting judges were being appointed from provinces outside the Western Cape. He also lamented the stopping of the judges weekly meetings, as this impacted negatively on the collegial discussions that the judges used to have. Regarding the allegations of fear and apprehension amongst the judges of the Division Judge Le Grange suggested that the Judicial Conduct Committee conducts confidential interviews with the judges of the Division.

- *Judge Bozalek's* response was the most extensive. However he too could not recall the incident referred to by the DJP. He had also not been aware that Judge Salie-Hlophe did not want to work with him. He could find only three appeals in which he had sat with Judge Salie-Hlophe – the first one having been in May 2014 when Judge Salie-Hlophe was still an acting judge, the second, in February 2015, and the last one in July 2016. He confirmed that there was a sense of 'apprehension' in the Division and that colleagues were reluctant to openly raise issues that related to the JP and Judge Salie-Hlophe. He also remarked about the change in the management style of the Division, making an example about routine judges meetings that had been stopped, leading to a decrease in meaningful interaction between the Judges of the Division.

He explained that previously areas of responsibility, such as practice rules and procedure, the allocation of chambers, parking, library matters, and internet technology, were delegated to committees and individuals nominated by the general body of judges. This had since been done away with, and the result was the absence of a forum to discuss matters of concern, including the 'disproportionate and irregular role played by Salie-Hlophe J in the management of the Division'.

Similar to the DJP, Judge Bozalek expressed the view that the marriage between a judge in a Division and the JP was inherently problematic, with potential conflicts of interests and dissatisfaction amongst colleagues. He explained that at some stage he raised with the JP, his reservations about the procedure used to appoint acting judges in the Division. However those concerns were never addressed. When he suggested a meeting of permanent judges only, the JP reacted angrily and sought the views of each judge to the proposal, to which there was no response. Thereafter the judges approached him privately, to justify their silence. He too suggested that confidential interviews with each judge in the Division could yield better results.

- *Acting Judge Hack* confirmed that his friendship with Judge Salie-Hlophe predated the latter's appointment to the Bench. He, however, denied that Judge Salie-Hlophe played a role in his appointment as an acting judge in the Western Cape Division. It was rather at the JP's instance that he was so appointed. His first acting stint was followed by many others, still at the instance of the JP. He explained that following the allegations

made by the DJP about his appointment, he met her and ‘addressed all her queries’ and had thought that she was satisfied with his explanation. He highlighted his experience of 15 years in the ‘commercial world’ followed by 25 years of legal practice. He knew nothing about the reservations allegedly expressed by the Cape Bar about his acting appointment.

- *The JP* raised a strong objection to my allowing the DJP to file further affidavits to supplement her complaint. As to the allegations made he criticised as baseless the inferences drawn by the DJP that because he and Judge Salie-Hlophe were married the latter had some influence on his performance of his duties.

[20] No response was received from Judge Parker. As stated, the DJP contends that it is Judge Salie-Hlophe who complained to the JP about Judge Parker’s conduct. Judge Salie-Hlophe responded, in general terms that her reports to the JP were justified. It is a matter of public knowledge that the allegations concerning him are also the subject of separate JCC proceedings in the complaint by the DJP against the JP. Whether Judge Salie-Hlophe complained about Judge Parker and whether that report resulted in an assault on Judge Parker is a matter that will be determined in the DJP’s complaint against the JP. Splitting the inquiry in this regard is undesirable.

Judge Salie-Hlophe’s response

[21] Judge Salie-Hlophe explained that whilst she understood the potential awkwardness of complaining about her to her husband she could do nothing about that. She did try, however, to keep her home life with the JP apart from their work life.

[22] She denied that her complaints to the JP about her colleagues were unsubstantiated and insisted that she had justifiably raised matters of concern about them. She denied the parking bay incident involving Judge Le Grange and pointed out that two years after the alleged incident Judge Le Grange attended her wedding (to the JP). She also denied involvement in the ‘toilet key’ incident’. With regard to Judge Wille she stated that any issues which ‘[might] have arisen’ between the two of them were resolved amicably. She considered this incident to be irrelevant to these proceedings, as was the incident during which the DJP took her to hospital. She expressed unhappiness with the DJP’s involvement in her marriage.

[23] All allegations of her involvement in the administration of the Court, including allocation of cases to judges, were denied by Judge Salie-Hlophe. She explained that her knowledge of upcoming criminal cases emanated from the lists received from the Director of Public Prosecutions and her participation in pre-trial meetings. She only assisted the JP in the same manner as other colleagues, when requested to do so. Her knowledge of prospective acting judges was the same as that of the other colleagues, as this was not confidential information. She also denied involvement in the appointment of acting judges, save to the same extent as other judges.

[24] According to Judge Salie-Hlophe the discussion between her and the DJP about the Rohde criminal trial was not confrontational. Albeit obliquely, Judge Salie-Hlophe denied that the judges meetings had been stopped; as proof thereof, she still served on the criminal pre-trial committee convened by Judge Henney and she had attended meetings convened by the JP 'from time to time'.

[25] The allegations describing her as a beneficiary of the JP's preferential treatment (e.g. being allocated less work and taking days off work), were strongly rebuffed by both Judge Salie-Hlophe and the JP, with the JP stating that Judge Salie-Hlophe always performed her allocated work. According to him reading from home was a practice enjoyed by other judges as well, and, as long as judges did their work, it was unnecessary to police the hours they spent at their workplace.

[26] Judge Salie-Hlophe referred to various instances to show that she was treated like all the other judges. For example, her request for a laptop was denied. On some occasion she had to sit on an appeals with the DJP whilst suffering from an eye disease and her request that she be allocated appeals on alternate weeks only, whilst recovering from an eye operation, was refused. According to her, the JP ensured that she made up for anytime lost as a result of her ongoing 'visual challenges'.

Discussion

[27] A consequence of the separation of the complaint against Judge Salie-Hlophe from that of the JP was that a significant portion of the allegations immediately became irrelevant to this

complaint. For example, even if it was true that Judge Salie-Hlophe received preferential treatment, her enjoyment thereof could not constitute misconduct on her part. It is therefore unnecessary to deal any further with such allegations. I may add that, in any event, the identity of the judges who allegedly complained to the DJP about the Judge Salie-Hlophe's reduced workload was never revealed. She disputed the allegations that she refused to sit with certain judges and it seems none of the judges concerned were even aware of this alleged attitude. Again, even if she did express dislike of some judges, it was for those in authority to ignore her preferences in that regard.

[28] Regarding the rest of the allegations made in support of the complaint, as foreshadowed earlier, the evidence does not make out a case for the alleged gross misconduct, let alone misconduct of the nature and gravity envisaged in section 14 of the JSC Act. The allegations of Judge-Salie-Hlophe's improper involvement boiled down to her knowledge of upcoming acting appointments and criminal cases. Apart from the fact that this does not relate to confidential management information, the explanation that her knowledge about upcoming trials derived from her participation in case management meetings was not in dispute. And there is nothing in the evidence to show that her access to information relating to prospective acting judges was irregular. Apart from the sentiment, as expressed by Judges Bozalek and Le Grange, that the process of appointing acting judges is not transparent, the only queried acting appointment was that of Adv Hack. The allegation that Mr Hack's appointment was attributable to Judge Salie-Hlophe's influence on the JP was disputed. And the practice of recommending practitioners to Judges President by other judges is well established in the Judiciary. Neither the friendship between Judge Salie-Hlophe and Mr Hack nor the latter's political history justify the conclusion that the acting appointment resulted from Judge Salie-Hlophe's improper influence.

[29] Similarly the allocation of high profile cases, such as the Rohde trial, to Judge Salie-Hlophe, even if contrary to the usual allocation patterns in the Division, could hardly constitute misconduct on her part.

[30] Apart from the case involving Mushtak J, the DJP's allegations about complaints made by Judge Salie-Hlophe to the JP about other judges and the negative effects thereof also hit a blank wall. The fundamental problems therewith were the absence of evidence regarding the content of the report and the fact that the implicated judges either did not recall the incidents

to which the alleged complaints related, or were not keen on participating in these proceedings. In the end the only conclusion I can make in this regard is that the relationship between the JP and some of the judges is strained.

[31] There may be rumblings of dissatisfaction about aspects of management of the Division. There may also be an environment of fear and apprehension among the judges of the Division or some of them. But I am unable to find that these emanate from misconduct on the part of Judge Salie-Hlophe. And, from the evidence given by the judges that were allegedly the victims of Judge Salie Hlophe's conduct I am not persuaded that a formal (oral) hearing would yield more concrete evidence and contribute to the determination of the merits of the DJP's complaint against Judge Salie-Hlophe.

[32] Lastly, in one of her reply in terms of section 17(3) of the Act in her complaint against the JP, the DJP denied having fabricated information regarding the JP and Judge Salie-Hlophe's marriage. She denied having made the statements that the JP and Judge Salie-Hlophe accused her of, particularly the racial statements and her alleged encouragement of Judge Sallie-Hlophe to divorce the JP. The DJP repeated these denials in one of her supplementary affidavits in these proceedings. She referred to the contents of the media statement made by Judge Salie-Hlophe in which the allegations of her having encouraged Judge Salie-Hlophe to leave her husband were made. Therein the allegation was that the DJP told Judge Salie-Hlophe that should she not exit her marriage 'others' would wonder why she was married to 'an old black man'. Judge Salie-Hlophe also alleged that the DJP had lied about the incident at the JP's house and that she had encouraged her (Judge Salie-Hlophe) to lay a false claim of assault against her husband.

[33] This is the only aspect in respect of which I am satisfied that a formal hearing would contribute to determining the merits of the complaint. As I have already stated, Judge Salie-Hlophe's response to the DJP's averments about the incident at the JP's house was that this was a private matter which is irrelevant to this inquiry. She expressed her displeasure at the DJP's raising the matter on a public forum. The DJP, however, insists that because Judge Salie-Hlophe has not responded pertinently to her denial of the contents of the media statement, the allegations made therein are unsubstantiated and that an inference must be drawn that Judge Salie-Hlophe fabricated the contents of the media statement to injure her reputation.

[34] I do not think the matter is irrelevant to these proceedings. It appears to be at the centre of the total collapse of the relationship between the JP and the DJP. In his response the JP says that:

‘44.1. The failure to delegate my duties to the DJP is based, *inter alia*, upon her breach of trust, but is also based on certain lacks in her competencies.

44.2 Importantly, quite apart from what she advised my wife to do (viz. divorce me, drop my name, report me for assault etc), the DJP reported on my whereabouts to my wife, which is a fundamental breach of trust, and thereby triggered the incident [at the JP’s home]. The betrayal was discussed at our meeting on 2 October but features nowhere in her account’.

[35] Judge Salie-Hlophe admits having told the JP about the DJP’s involvement in the ‘personal domestic incident. She says: ‘. . . I did advise the JP of what transpired that evening, in relation to the DJP, and the JP was not pleased with the DJP’s interference in our personal lives. Nothing I mentioned to the JP was a fabrication and any alleged behaviour or decision on the part of the JP towards the DJP cannot be attributed to me’.

[36] In the complaint by the DJP against the JP, the DJP’s alleged conduct and utterances in relation to the incident at the JP’s home is central to the JP’s counterclaim against the DJP, particularly in relation to racism. The JP has appealed against dismissal of that counterclaim. Whatever happens in those proceedings it seems to me that the alleged conduct by the DJP and the interaction between the DJP and Judge Salie-Hlophe, will remain at the centre of the complaint against the JP. The DJP insists that Judge Salie-Hlophe lied to the JP about all these allegations. It is therefore imperative that this issue be properly determined.

[37] If indeed the DJP made the alleged statements, particularly the act of urging Judge Salie-Hlophe to lay false criminal charges against the JP, it seems to me that that would *prima facie* be impeachable gross misconduct. Similarly, if Judge Salie-Hlophe falsely accused the DJP of having said these things, that too would be impeachable gross misconduct. These aspects of the complaint therefore fall to be investigated by a Tribunal.

[38] For these reasons my recommendation to the Committee is that it recommends to the Commission that:

[38.1] (a) In relation to Deputy Judge President Goliath’s alleged improper involvement in the incident at Judge President Hlophe’s home; and

- (b) the allegations made about the Deputy Judge President in the media statement, together with the allegations that she:
- (i) attempted to influence Judge Salie-Hlophe to lay false criminal charges against Judge President Hlophe;
 - (ii) encouraged Judge Salie-Hlophe to divorce Judge President Hlophe and to stop using his surname; and
 - (ii) referred to Judge President Hlophe as an ‘old black man’;

the complaint be investigated by a Tribunal;

[38.2] In relation to the allegations that Judge Salie-Hlophe:

- (a) is improperly involved in the management of the Western Cape Division;
- (b) enjoys preferential treatment;
- (c) makes unwarranted complaints against her colleagues (except the complaints or reports relating to Judge Parker and Deputy Judge President Goliath);

the complaint be dismissed.

Dambuza JA