

DJ Pienaar
17 Van Bruggen Street
Parow North
7500
20 November 2025

The ADJP
WCHC (Cape Town)

Dear Madam Chief Justice

Re: The opportunity of your email of 19 November 2025 Refers.

1. I wish to truly thank you for this opportunity to ventilate my views of this Judgment, received today, based on the aftermath of Mr Zwane's letter dated 24 October 2025. (I believe you have a copy of this judgment)
2. This opportunity gives me a ray of hope for our Justice system. It to a certain extent restores my faith in righteousness, which I have through my experience of litigation, almost lost.
3. I personally have been incarcerated, as far as physically possible in a legal and civil manner. (sic) This court has gagged a whistle blower and unfairly changed my identity into a vexatious litigant who is now finally sequestered. This court has violated my Constitutional rights to act on behalf of members of the public, whose Bill of Rights have been infringed.

The CIPC Letter dated 24 October 2025.

4. This letter makes it very clear that I'm part of the planned Section 41 of the Constitution inquisition, insofar I filed the original complaint that the CIPC should investigate the implosions and capture of the PSPC industry which has left approximately 80 000 victims of this crime, and to the value of approximately R15bn in 2009 values.
5. The main message I take from this letter, is the attempt of the CIPC to portray me as a whistle blower, contrary to the court view of seeing me as a vexatious litigant.
6. More important, this letter does not request any special favours on my behalf, but in public interest and in the interest of justice, asks for the court just to recognise this process and request for abeyance of proceedings. This is not a personal letter from Mr Zwane, but a letter representing an organ of State. To receive a letter from the State, introducing your cause to a court of law, is very extraordinary. In

paragraph 8 of the said letter, the CIPC confirm that the averments and allegations made by me about the conduct of the SARB and/or its former officials, are not farfetched nor baseless. This in itself is a very special circumstance, omitted by the court. It has much to say about the basis on which my rescission application was dismissed on the Plascon Evans rule.

7. Only when I recognised, that neither the court, the SARB, the FSCA and/ or the liquidators recognised this Section 41 process, from even before Justice van Zyl's hearings, I was forced to file interlocutory applications to lead the court to consider this Constitutional right. The true causation of PSPC implosions must be established, before finally sequestering me for cost orders, after I tried to establish the causation of the implosions, in courts like this without success. The CIPC will now be able to establish causation of the PSPC implosions via this Section 41 of the Constitution process, which I was not able to do via litigation.
8. My litigation was not without success, since it was the only method we could use, to get evidence. It is this evidence, which now forms the basis of the CIPC investigation on which the Section 41 of the Constitution inquisition, can now rely on. I had not only litigated against the SARB, PwC, liquidators, and FSCA, but on every occasion where I could assist a person who was part of litigation, where he was not aware of the role these colluders were playing. I wanted the cause to be ventilated, and did not do so on condition that I'm paid or not.
9. This letter, albeit before court, was totally ignored by Justice Salie. I had placed it before court as annexure to my documents, as did the SARB, as annexure to their affidavit placed before court on 17 November 2025. Not to be aware of this letter, is reckless of a judge to say the least. This letter is very relevant to these proceedings, but the court just ignored and omitted its existence. How is common law promoted on bias judgments, which ignore the other side? Justice Salie placed great reliance on previous judgments, which I said could be "influenced" if preceding fraudulent misrepresentation can be shown. Exactly as the case of this judgment, and that of Justice van Zyl AJ. The CIPC confirm this narrative in their letter.

Other evidence before Court

10. Section A of the CIPC report was also placed before court, and Annexure F was provided to your offices, which clearly supports the reason for the Section 41 of the Constitution process.
11. Such a process complements the justice system, since legal and factual disputes can be addressed in alternative forums, instead of long trial proceedings.
12. Neither Justice van Zyl AJ or Salie J were prepared to recognise and/ or consider this process seriously enough to support it in their judgments. In both cases, I tried hard during the hearing to explain the necessity and importance of such a process, but was just ignored. It is reckless to ignore this Constitutional process, which is very relevant to the case on hand.
13. From July 2022, the CIPC have asked the court just to recognise this Section 41 of the Constitution process and request for abeyance of proceedings. Despite

requests to adhere to this, the CIPC have been ignored and I have been prejudiced in the process. Despite knowing the material affects of these investigations, the organs of state or professionals under government oversight, continued with their litigation against me. The CIPC, despite supporting my narrative, could not intervene in fear of contravening Section 41 of the Constitution in the process. I had to stand alone, knowing that in fact I had the support of the State, which was just ignored.

14. My complete chronologies I placed before court; the fact I wrote a letter to the AJP on 15 September 2023 complaining of a rule nisi not giving me the opportunity to defend my case; my notice in terms of Rule 6(5)(g) on 30 September 2024 which was ignored; my Notice to ask permission to review Justice van Zyl's judgment on 18 March 2025; my affidavit to the ADJP on 8 April 2025 giving reasons as to why I should not be sequestered (I did not know if I could defend myself because of the vexatious litigant order); my letter to ADJP on 18 August 2025 complaining about the misapplication of law; and my Rule 45A complaining about the miscarriage of justice;- I have given this court enough evidence that as layman in law and unrepresented, this court is not accessible to members of the public with legal disputes. Not one of these grievances was addressed.
15. Today, I as whistle blower have been prejudiced by this court, knowing at any minute the officers of court can come and discriminate against me, take my possessions, and I have no guardian, as a court to turn to. Who will believe me, and or assist me, after being declared a vexatious litigant twice?

The hearing of 18 November 2025.

16. On receipt of the transcript, this court will have evidence of how radically the hearing and papers before court, differ from the Judgment.
17. My papers placed before court lawfully are not read, because if they have been read; no fair, impartial and/or independent court will just be able to ignore what I had said, without trying to address these red flags during the hearing. Admissions of such red flags should at least be mentioned in the judgment, for which I am charged and now sequestered. They are ignored, because had the judgments done so, I would have had opportunities to appeal judgments. Judgments are written in such a manner, not to make appeals possible.
18. In both hearings (Justices van Zyl AJ and Justice Salie J), I as layman in law and unrepresented was ambushed and denied a fair, impartial and independent hearing. Not only was I denied a fair opportunity to give my inputs with the Practice Notes when the hearing was set down, but none of the points I made in the proceedings were considered at all by the Judges in the restricted time. I could not prepare documents for a hearing, if I did not even know how much time will be allocated to me to make my points.
19. In both cases, I could not rely on my Heads of argument, because my Heads of argument had been restricted with the time limit's I was given just before addressing the court. In fact, in Chambers when we were introduced to the judge, I was given a ray of hope that the hearing would not necessarily be restricted to

today only. When I stood before court, a new arrangement was made, and I was asked how much time I will need. I asked for two hours, to read my prepared Heads, considering questions by the Judge, which was disallowed, I then asked for 1 and a half hours, but was told I only had an hour to speak. I was thus forced to address the court, unprepared on this occasion, as in every other occasion. I had to address as much as possible, knowing the Judge is not considering my papers before her. The Judgment was given ex tempore, and I added the bundle of supplementary and amended heads of argument, just before proceedings. If I was not allowed to read it into the records, how could these heads of argument have been considered? The judgment is evidence that nothing I had stated, was mentioned in the judgment.

20. Both Judges kept me busy indiscriminately, knowing before hand what they would report, and without leading me to address points of dispute they had gathered, if they had read my papers. This is a miscarriage of justice, especially when the court abuses the rules of court to restrict a restricted party even further. Rules of court should not be abused as a tool to discriminate against people who are not officers of the court.

The Judgment of 18 November 2025 delivered ex tempore

21. Be as it may, this judgment was not read out ex tempore, and we were basically just informed what the headings will be, and the final order was read. It was presented to us at 14h22 on 19 November 2025.
22. The biggest defence I could rely on for the rule nisi final sequestration order was to show special circumstances. Justice Salie makes it very clear, that I gave no such evidence. Not in all of my papers, the intervention of the SARb/FSCA vs CIPC in this case, the interlocutory applications, and the hearing she was able to consider one special circumstance? Is this the norm of proceedings for a final rule nisi sequestration application?
23. Justice Salie J, reprimanded both the Counsel of the FSB and the SARb which were present, as to the amount of correspondence and Notices which were filed by the opposing CIPC and the SARb/ FSCA. Despite this, this is omitted of mention in the Judgment. When organs of state try and influence/assist the court in terms of Section 165(4) of the Constitution, but have opposing views on an individual one considers a vexatious litigant, and another that he is a whistle blower. Surely this is an exceptional circumstance?
24. Full counsel of the FSCA were present, which includes Mr Koen, as well as Adv Theron SC for the SARb as well as other counsel from Gildenhuys Malatji were present at the hearing. This especially after the urgency of the correspondence and Notices to try and influence Justice Salie J, with respect of what evidence Mr Zwane presented to court, should be considered relevant or not.
25. Justice Salie J omits to mention that these parties made great effort to attend the proceedings of an alleged vexatious litigant who was facing final sequestration. Page 12 of the Judgment makes mention the SARb appeared before Court, but Adv Theron SC did not say one word at this hearing, before court. I suspect if he did appear, it would have been outside this court. Justice Salie J made no mention

of Adv Theron SC, albeit robed in the benches of Counsel? What will the costs for these institutions be, to send their Senior Counsel to the hearing of the final sequestration of an alleged vexatious litigant, and then the Judge makes it very clear in the Judgment, that there are no special circumstances to my defence?

26. Be as it may, not only is the proposed Section 41 of the Constitution dispute between the SARB and the CIPC related to this case, special circumstances, but also the presence of this Counsel where they were not even party to the proceedings.
27. It is not these events and circumstances which are exceptional, but the Judgments' omissions to address this as irrelevant or relevant, which creates further exceptional circumstances. Omissions like this take on the integrity and reliance of courts, of common law. I as layman in law, see the courts in the eyes of the public, and have no reason not to ventilate my concerns in the public spectrum, because I have hope for a fairer system to protect the rule of law.
28. My wings have now been clipped, because I as whistle blower was obliged to challenge the very system I had to rely on for assistance, and did not get. Why would an alleged vexatious litigant want to attack the very institution it will want to rely on for assistance when allegedly misusing the judicial system. A dog does not bite the hand which feeds it.

The oral evidence

29. The main reason I sought oral evidence was because my facts had been ignored/ dismissed in my motion papers based on the Plascon Evans Rule because my adversaries had unfairly influenced the court to believe that my narrative was far-fetched, vexatious, frivolous and a conspiracy theory.
30. A narrative of a vexatious litigant and that of a bona fide whistle blower differ radically.
31. The court did not give any acknowledgment of my narrative and/ or facts, and thus I had a right to rely on Rule 6(5)(g) of the Rules of court to seek oral evidence.
32. I regarded this as an interlocutory application, and had to rely on the relief to be granted, before I could join them as parties, exactly as we did with Mr Adrian King. I had to apply for leave of the court, before they could be joined, and thus Justice Salie's J selective application confined to Mr Anderson is unfair and unfounded.
33. If the court had been impartial, and at least made the effort to consider my narrative, then as whistle blower reporting alleged crimes of 2008/2009 of the historic disputes between the FSCA and Kings Group is not irrelevant to my relief I seek in establishing dismissal of the provisional order which had not considered this fraudulent misrepresentation. The CIPC investigation confirms the relevance of the evidence concerning these historic disputes, which have not prescribed.

The A King intervening Application

34. Similarly, if my provisional order was not a fraudulent misrepresentation of the truth, then Justice van Zyl AJ would have acknowledged the supporting and confirmatory affidavits of Mr King and Ms de Ridder in the applications before her.
35. Then, the court would not have considered me a vexatious litigant with my own conspiracy theory and Mr King would be able to testify first hand and confirm what the court previously just ignored. The ADJP is fully aware of my disputes regarding the Justice van Zyl AJ judgment and I'm still waiting for permission since 18 March 2025, to do a judicial review on the Judgment.
36. It is absurd to aver that Mr King cannot demonstrate a direct and substantial interest in the subject matter. After 14 years and 84 appearances in the Bellville Commercial Crimes Unit, Mr Kings' 26 criminal charges have been provisionally withdrawn. At least now with my efforts, Mr Adrian King was able to at least ventilate his voice in a court, after his Group of Companies Estates to the value of R1.1bn was captured via liquidation, and he is now dependent on State pension, lives in a container at the age of 72, and did not receive 1 cent dividend from the liquidators,(Applicant). He makes it very clear, only I had tried to present this fraud, corruption and money laundering to court, on his and the other victims of crimes behalf. Now, this court gags me as if I'm a vexatious litigant for trying to ventilate these crimes?
37. Mr King was considered the owner of the Group, and biggest shareholder, and had not committed any crimes, yet he has not received one cent dividend compared to the other investors who have received 14c on every rand dividend on the free residue. On this basis alone, he does have a direct and substantial interest on the current proceedings against the very applicant who is seeking my final sequestration, as they unfairly did his. This court now states in the Judgment that he does not assert a direct and substantial interest in the sequestration. This would be true if I was a vexatious litigant, but certainly not true if I am recognised as a whistle blower. To gag the only whistle blower Mr King could rely on, certainly prejudices him, and thus the reason for intervention.
38. Further, if the court reconsiders the applications, based on new and correct evidence, and it is proven, that the FSCA had acted unlawfully, ultra vires and male fides, then all actions after this will be void and null, including orders and judgments which will have to be rescinded. Yes, applications will be filed to rescind these orders/ judgments, but it will be supported with strong evidence to do so. Exactly like the FSB Report and Gerry Anderson affidavit which was used to liquidate all the companies of the King Group. Mr King certainly has a direct interest to intervene and confirm this fraud, and especially after the court recklessly ignored his previous supporting and confirmatory affidavits.
39. The court is bias and unfair, to consider all merits on the vexatious litigant narrative only, and not to consider any merits on the whistle blower narrative.

The Rule 45A application

40. In effect, the Rule 45A suspension of orders has the same effect as the Section 41 of the Constitution abeyance of litigation. In both cases, the temporary stoppage depends on certain conditions being met, before proceeded with.

41. Both the oral evidence I sought, would require suspension of proceedings until the oral evidence was heard, as the further litigation until the preliminary CIPC Report had been made final.
42. Not only is this applicable on making the provisional sequestration order final, but by ignoring this section 41 of the Constitution restrictions as well as the fraudulent misrepresentations, Justice van Zyl AJ had unfairly given orders out which have unfairly prejudiced my cause as whistle blower of these crimes.
43. I agree and dispute my locus standi as a vexatious litigant. What I have never disputed, as neither my adversaries can, is my locus standi as whistle blower. Every citizen, including myself, have not only a right but an obligation to be a whistle blower on crimes committed, as I have pointed out and now investigated by the CIPC.
44. In what manner will my adversaries be prejudiced, including the Applicant, if this case is suspended until the truth is established? The only reason that they wish to gag me as quickly as possible, is so that I do not incriminate them further. The creditors will not receive any benefit from the sale of the 50% share in my home. The costs of this litigation far exceed the costs they hope to recover, and this is nothing to do about the costs, but all to do to make sure I'm gagged.

The rule nisi sequestration application

45. The court has ignored all my defences mentioned in my papers. The court admits that there are no disputes regarding the jurisdictional requirements which requires resolve via Plascon Evans. The court is thus unfair to dismiss any of my arguments, which they omit to address in the judgment. The court cannot use the Plascon Evans Rule as an excuse to dismiss my papers on face value.
46. I filed 36 points in limine, which the court did not only fail to address, but even failed to mention in order to give reason why they had been omitted.
47. The court only allowed me one hour to address all my merits, and for this reason I had decided to focus on the Section 41 of the Constitution and interlocutory applications, before I would address these in limine points. One hour was not only insufficient time, but clearly a very unfair restriction on a layman in law who was unrepresented.
48. An example of an argument addressed during the hearing, was the alleged letter of demand on which they rely which was issued years before the finalisation of the Kings rescission application was made, allegedly making the Kings case res judicata.
49. Similarly, is the alleged PwC debt in the Realcor matter, which Pieters has considered her claim against me, despite not being party in the Realcor matters. For example, is she allowed to sequester the BBC in lieu of Donald Trumps alleged claim against them as well? Certainly, one requires some kind of authorisation to do so, which has not been presented to court, yet Justice van Zyl

AJ has a judgment referring to various aspects of Realcor, without one Realcor file before her.

50. So too, how can the Realcor saga be considered res judicata if there is an order by Justice Kusevitsky J on 19 March 2021, that the rescission application must be stayed?
51. Conveniently for the Applicant, Justice Salie has now removed the claim from PwC, by omission in the judgment, to rectify the fraud of the Applicant. The PwC and other debts are now only shown to support the argument, where in fact it was part of the reason for my provisional sequestration.

Gagging a whistle blower versus rule nisi final sequestration order.

52. If there were one or two fraudulent misrepresentations, I could easily address them. My papers illustrate numerous points of fraudulent misrepresentation, and in fact, the in limine points I have set out every legal dispute of fraud, in point form as required to prove fraud.
53. The problem however that has arisen, is that now not only the original fraudsters are being accused, but all liquidators, officers of the court and the courts themselves that are informed of this fraud, by me as a whistle blower, and have chosen to collude to conceal and integrate these proceeds of crime, into an alleged lawful result.
54. It is for this reason, these very officers of the court, liquidators and others I have accused, have chosen now to gag me, in fear of being exposed. The CIPC investigations will confirm most of these officials/ professionals I have identified, and thus they have chosen to gag me according to the tools the law provide.
55. I have been accused of being a vexatious litigant, and all my litigation has been ignored by the courts, as a result of this fraudulent misrepresentation by the officers of the court. Despite my papers being ignored, I was provided cost orders each time, and it is these cost orders for which I am now being sequestered.
56. Not only have I been deprived of fair, independent and impartial litigation in courts of law, but I'm held accountable for costs of this abuse. Ponzi schemes will have to be more ingenious to compare to this fraud, to prejudice members of the public, who consider to be whistle blowers of these crimes. I have lawfully been gagged, and the courts have not even realised what they have done.

Conclusion

57. For the second time, I have become a victim of a miscarriage of justice.
58. As I explained in the hearing, the Applicant will not be prejudiced in any manner, should the court have acted cautiously and suspended the litigation pending the Section 41 of the Constitution process and/ or given oral evidence in order to establish the correct narrative.

59. Only when true causation of the PSPC implosions are established, a correct narrative can be verified. Either my adversary's narrative will be fraudulent, or mine. They are the only two narratives that are being disputed.
60. It cannot be further from the truth, for Justice Salie to aver that no special or unusual circumstances have been shown. The omissions in the judgment itself, should be considered an unusual circumstance for a justice system.
61. As this court now avers, I'm hopelessly insolvent, so it had averred that the Kings Group was hopelessly insolvent. When fraud becomes a norm, and the basis to apply common law and common cause on, then such averments become accepted. How will this omission of truth I present, ever be revealed in this judgement of 18 November 2025. Is this not relevant to the case on hand?
62. Common sense, the truth, as well as the principle of legality are not the attributes of my adversaries, and because we are polar opposites, I'm not insolvent as a result of bona fide taxed orders, but rather refusing to pay for the proceeds of fraudulent misrepresentations.
63. There will be no benefit for alleged creditors, and my cases are not res judicata, and my adversaries fear to be incriminated with further litigation against me. For this reason, they are desperate to gag me, and in the process miscarriages of justice like this judgment is given, because the court allows itself to be bullied by these officers of the court who fraudulently misrepresent the court.

I trust and believe this court realises what prejudice I have now suffered, and that unless this court acts fairly and quickly to rectify its own wrongs of the past, I have no other option than to continue seeking help elsewhere, to assist and protect my family and myself. I will also continue to seek justice for these tens of thousands of victims of crime, despite my incarceration. My incarceration will not stop my plight to seek justice, but it will only make my already difficult task, more difficult, but the Lord providing, we will succeed.

I have only tried to add new points of concern and disputes to my existing complaints before the ADJP, but appreciate this opportunity. I believe, hope and trust that the CIPC will also be giving their views to these proceedings.

Kind regards, and I hope my views are seen in the seriousness of which they are written. I apologise if my views are seen as arrogant and as too strong, it is not my intention. I wish to address the merits as they are, and not abuse this opportunity of your kindness and duty in giving my views, thank you.



Deon Pienaar