1274



# THE HIGH COURT OF SWAZILAND

#### **PAULOS E. DAVISON**

1<sup>st</sup> Applicant

#### MARGARET MABUZA

2<sup>nd</sup> Applicant

### PETER J. DAVISON

3<sup>rd</sup> Applicant

#### MICHAEL P. DAVIDSON

4<sup>th</sup> Applicant

## WILLIAM T. DAVIDSON

5<sup>th</sup> Applicant

# SIBIMBI INVESTMENTS (PTY) LTD

6<sup>th</sup> Applicant

And

#### JANNIE DAVIDSON

1st Respondent

#### MASWAZI NSIBANDZE N.O

2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent

In re:

#### JANNIE DAVIDSON

Petitioner

#### And

#### **PAULOS DAVIDSON**

1<sup>st</sup> Respondent

#### MARGARET MABUZA

2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent

#### PETER J. DAVIDSON

3<sup>rd</sup> Respondent

#### MICHAEL P. DAVIDSON

4<sup>th</sup> Respondent

#### WILLIAM T. DAVIDSON

5<sup>th</sup> Respondent

## SIBIMBI INVESTMENTS (PTY) LTD

6<sup>th</sup> Respondent

Civil Case No. 1237/2003

Coram

S.B. MAPHALALA - J

For the Applicants

MR. SHONGWE

For the Respondents

MR. L. MAMBA

# RULING (06/06/2003)

The Applicants filed an urgent application for an order in the following terms:

- 1. Condoning the non-compliance with the usual requirement of the Rules of Court regarding the notice and service of the application and hearing the matter as one of urgency.
- 2. Setting aside the writ of execution of immovable property issued by 1st Respondent in the above Case Number the 8th day of April 2003.
- 3. Staying the execution of the above stated writ pending the hearing and finalization of this matter.

- 4. That a rule *nisi* do hereby issue calling upon Respondents to show cause, on a date to be determined by the Honourable Court why an order in terms of paragraph 2 and 3 should not be final.
- 5. That the orders sought in terms of paragraphs 2 and 3 hereof operate with immediate effect as an interim relief.
- That the Applicants be granted the costs of this application in the event of unsuccessful opposition by the Respondents.
- Such further and/or alternative relief which may appear fit and proper to the above Honourable Court.

The founding affidavit of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Applicant is filed in support thereto. A confirmatory affidavit of the 1<sup>st</sup> Applicant is also filed. A number of annexures pertinent to the Applicant's case are filed in support thereto.

Mr. Mamba for the Respondent filed a Notice of Intention to oppose on the 28<sup>th</sup> May 2003. He thereafter on the 30<sup>th</sup> May 2003, filed an opposing affidavit deposed to by himself.

The matter came before me in the uncontested roll of the 30<sup>th</sup> ultimo where I heard brief submissions and I then reserved my ruling. The issue revolves around the affidavit filed by Mr. Mamba. Mr. Shongwe for the Applicant challenged this affidavit on a number of points. On the other hand Mr. Mamba took the view that the averments raised therein disposes of the matter.

I have considered the affidavit and I am of the considered view that in order for this issue to be fully ventilated the Respondents are to file a proper answering affidavit in the normal way. This is a complicated matter which touches on a number of vexed questions of fact and law.

In the premise, I rule that the matter take its normal course and the rule *nisi* issued on the 30<sup>th</sup> May 2003 extended to a date to be agreed to by the parties.

I make no order as to costs.

SÆ MAPHALALA JUDGE