



JUDGES MATTER

Judicial Service Commission interviews

05 October 2017.

Western Cape Division of the High Court

Interview of Advocate M L Sher SC

DISCLAIMER: These detailed unofficial transcripts were compiled to the best of the abilities of the monitor. However due to capacity constraints they have not been fully edited. We have therefore made the video recordings available that were taken during the interviews available. Those wishing to cite or quote from the transcript are encouraged to check accuracy with reference to the video file.

Chief Justice Mogoeng: Good afternoon, Advocate Sher.

Advocate Sher: Good afternoon, Chief Justice.

Mogoeng: You have been a practitioner of the law for a long time, haven't you?

Sher: I have indeed.

Mogoeng: For how many years were you a junior advocate?

Sher: Chief Justice, for 26 years. I got silk in October, November 2015, letters patent in December 2015.

Mogoeng: Yes and have you acted as a Judge and if so, for how many months if you put together the acting stints?

Sher: Chief Justice, the full term appointment started in April last year and this one that I have now completed is my fifth full term. I also had a number of adhoc appointments from 2004 onwards.

Mogoeng: And have you struggled with the preparation of a judgment to the point where you took longer than is acceptable to deliver?

Sher: Chief Justice -

Mogoeng: Before you could deliver?

Sher: I have two judgments that exceeded the three month period. Both were in the first term in April to June 2016. The one exceeded it by two weeks and the other one by a month and three weeks. They were both allocated and heard in the same week, and both of those feature in the judgments that I have included. The one is the *Ahmed* matter, which is the immigration dispute and the other one is the *Coastal Links* matter, the fishing rights dispute. Both involved complex issues and the record in the *Coastal Links* matter was in the order of about 3000 pages. There were about six or seven scientific studies and about seven or eight policies that had to be examined very carefully as well as legislation, a whole battery of legislation. That matter concerned the artisanal fishermen of Langebaan and their rights to fish on the Langebaan lagoon, and there were complicated issues of policy and law in regard to that one. In regard to the *Ahmed* matter, it was a matter concerning failed asylum seekers, and the question there was whether failed asylum seekers in our law may apply for a visa in terms of the Immigration Act, and that was a very difficult issue for me to wrestle with. There were – not much help, if I can put it that, given by the parties to the matter. I had to do a fair amount of research myself, involving a complete analysis of both the Immigration Act and the Refugees Act as well as a directive. In addition, Chief Justice, in that period I think on the 8th of July, I also handed down the judgment in the *Harbour Terrace* matter which is also in the bundle that, of judgments that I included. And that matter involved sectional title issues. There is also a reference in the bundle to a *Masuku* matter which I heard on the 24th – handed down a judgment on the 24th of June. So all of those factors together

resulted in the delays. I accept that nonetheless that is not the way it should be done. It should be done within three months. But I would, in mitigation, put forward an argument that there were exceptional circumstances in regard to those two.

Mogoeng: Have you ever kept litigants waiting for a judgement for as long as six months?

Sher: Chief Justice, I have not had litigants waiting formally for a judgement for six months. As I recall there was a judgement in 2010 where I took six months to deliver in a criminal matter; a criminal appeal in 2010. But I can't say that the litigants waited as such but obviously, not acceptable to have six month's period. That was in 2010.

Judge President Hlophe: Thank you very much, Chief Justice. Good afternoon, Mr Sher. I would like again, similarly to place on record that Mr Sher and I have a fairly cordial relationship. In fact, last term when he acted he occupied Judge Mantame's chambers, which is right next to mine and we used to have coffee together almost every morning ,and that is a fact. We are human beings. Mr Sher, the judgment you are speaking about, just to kick off with what you said in response to the question by Chief Justice. This was in 2010, and you reserved this judgment in a criminal matter for about six months.

Adv. M. Sher: That is indeed so.

Hlophe: Right, is that something you are proud of, sir?

Sher: No I am not, JP. It is something that I am embarrassed to this day about. It should not have happened, and I can only say that it's not acceptable. I got caught up in the matter. I think I made more of a thesis of it than a judgment. It could have been a lot shorter. I have learnt from that and I hope that I will not – and trust and believe I will not repeat such a mistake.

Hlophe: What would you say to those who say acting judges who reserve judgments longer when, while they are still acting, only get worse when they have now been permanently appointed?

Sher: Judge President, if I were to answer having regard for the state of our reserved judgment list in the Cape, then unfortunately, that does appear to be correct. In certain instances, not in all, but there are certain instances, which do cause embarrassment to the division.

Hlophe: Right, thank you, Mr Sher. Let's talk about racism. There is racism at the Cape Bar. To my mind, it is one of the most conservative Bars in the country. What would you or what steps would you take if you were to be recommended by this Commission for a permanent appointment? Would you assist the leadership of the Judiciary to address issues of racism, particularly skewed briefing patterns?

Sher: Yes, Judge President. I would make every attempt that I could to assist. I want to place on record that obviously, racism is unacceptable in whatever form and however manifested, directly or in whichever way it is manifested. If it were to be noticed and seen, then I would consider it my duty to bring it to the attention of my Judge President or the Deputy Judge President and to report such conduct, and to expect that it be dealt with appropriately by the Judge President and the Deputy Judge President. As far as the Bar itself is concerned, if there were such an issue or an instance of such conduct, I would in conjunction with the Judge President expect that the matter be referred to the Bar Council for immediate action against whoever was guilty of such conduct.

Hlophe: Right. Mr Sher, you have been a member of the Cape Bar for a number of years. What in your opinion, why in your opinion has it taken so long for the Cape Bar to be truly transformed and be representative of the demography in the area or in South Africa as whole? Why has it taken so long?

Sher: Judge President, I think there are a number of reasons for that. I think that historically the number of graduates coming out of Law School that went to the Bar or who were prepared to go the Bar has always been on the low side. The – there

are many barriers for advocates to come to the Bar, particularly if I must speak of the Cape Bar. The Johannesburg Bar, I understand, has a system where there are big groups where they fund deserving juniors that struggle. The Cape Bar is not structured like that. The Cape Bar, as I have, the figures that I got are in the order of 466 advocates and the advocates are spread in a number of buildings. Many years ago the idea was that those advocates would be divided in terms of skills, race and gender so that there would be a balance. That rearrangement has never taken place. So historically, what happens is that junior members, black members that come to the Cape Bar do not get assistance as far as rental is concerned, is one of the big issues at the Cape Bar. They pay pro-rata per square metre the same rental as senior advocates would pay.

That's the one issue. There is and there have been attempts to give them some rebates as far as Bar dues are concerned and that has helped. But there are many barriers to the profession. One of the barriers was also the fee rule, the sixty day fee rule, which the Chairman of the Bar Council, Vuyani Ngalwana has highlighted and indicated is unacceptable and for young members who are coming to the Bar, it is particularly difficult if you have to wait 60 days or 90 days to get payment. It shouldn't happen. There are skewed briefing patterns still in existence although that has to a large extent been addressed or they're in the process of being addressed. There have been meetings between the Side Bar and the Bar and also the Junior Bar. There is a Junior Bar that is now looking after junior Bar members' interests. I know Jutas is also subsidising certain of the younger members in regard to laptops and IT assistance. All these things have helped. There is a transformation levy, which the Bar Council has instituted and that has also helped. But yes, it is so that the numbers are not encouraging. If one looks at them, there is a very slow progress. I think if I may be permitted, just to look at the numbers, which I have, the Cape Bar currently is 466 members of which as at the 3rd of October there were in the order of 355 white members and 111 black members.

Hlophe: Can we unpack black?

Sher: Yes.

Hlophe: With reference to Africans, Coloureds and Indians do you have -

Sher: I've got those figures, Judge President.

Hlophe: Right.

Sher: The figures that I have in total for African members currently, 26. Coloured members, 69 and Indian members, 16.

Hlophe: Right.

Sher: That is as I have the figures. I can give you a break down also in regard to senior and junior counsel if you wish.

Hlophe: No, carry on. I don't think it's necessary but the point is it is abundantly clear that there is still a long way to go in terms of transforming the Cape Bar.

Sher: There is a long way to go. It does seem as if there has been an improvement, if I consider what the Minister of Justice put in 2015 and the figures that he had available in 2015, when he was at interviews. There has definitely been an improvement. There has been an attrition rate particularly in older white males and there have been definitely been an improvement in regard to women coming to the Bar. That has been noticeable but we still have a long way to go.

Hlophe: Thank you. So you agree with me that there is still a long way to go. The Cape Bar is still generally very conservative?

Adv. M. Sher: It is indeed. I think one of the candidates described it as not necessarily racist in deliberate sense but there is definitely racial exclusion in effect. If one looks at the numbers there's clearly a problem. I believe the Bar is making a concerted, solid attempt at trying to deal with the issue and there are, as I say, a number of groups. There's the Junior Bar Council. There is also a number of interactions between other groups, AFT, BLA, NADEL and the Bar [inaudible 13:15], all with the view to trying to redress this problem.

Hlophe: Right. Thank you, Mr Sher. Just one more question, Chief Justice. Excuse me. Mr Sher, I believe each and every Judge at the High Court level must have case flow management skills such as presiding over pre-trials, court based mediation, continuous roll and so on. Do you believe those are effective? Do you believe that those are some of the most effective tools of managing cases in order to alleviate the backlog?

Sher: I do, Judge President, and under your stewardship, the Cape Division as I understand it, we are running a semi-urgent role, which is in the order of two months. So the numbers have come down. At one stage our numbers were so good that there was talk that we would in fact, not need to have a semi-urgent role and it is largely because of the case flow management system that you have instituted in the division and in my experience it works well. I have been exposed to that. I was asked last year to participate as one of the Acting Judges in that and generally, I find that it is a worthwhile system. One has to sit on practitioners otherwise there can be people that take advantage but by and large, my experience of it is that it does work. It does push people towards settlement. It does push people towards reducing issues and only matters that have to go trial are going to trial.

Hlophe: Finally, would you like to comment on the issue of dual citizenship? I see you are also a citizen of Italy.

Sher: Yes, Judge President. My – I have dual citizenship because my mother is Italian and I have that by birth. I do not understand that as being a barrier to me applying for this position. I am a South African citizen. I consider this country to be my home and I have no intentions of going to Italy other than on a visit and that is my only view – thank you. Thank you, Judge President.

Commissioner Stewart: Advocate Sher, I just have one question. It's about your approach to matters. If – my understanding is judges in the Western Cape High Court, some judges prefer to express a view on a matter after they've read the papers in Chambers. Some judges prefer to express a view on a matter in court before the matter is heard and some judges prefer not to express a view at all until

after the matter has been argued. Do you think there's an advantage to expressing a view before a matter is argued and what would that advantage be?

Sher: Commissioner, it is – I would say very dangerous to express views without, certainly without having read the papers and having been party to the evidence and most probably having been asked by the parties. It can happen that you are prompted, if I might use that word, during the course of a trial or an application to express a view and that's implicit, with the implicit consent of both parties. Obviously, in such a situation, if parties are really saying to you, we're not holding you to it; could you give us a prima facie view at this stage of the proceeding? I cannot see anything wrong with that provided it happens openly with consent and with the cooperation of both parties. But it is a very dangerous, I think personally, my view is that I don't like doing that and I try not to do that. I have found that one can be surprised that in the dying moments of a trial or an application, someone will tell you something that in fact, changes the matter radically in the opposite direction. You might not have picked it up or there's some evidence that comes to light, which drives the matter off in another direction. So I do not believe that unless invited, I do not believe that is generally a practice that should be followed; certainly not by just looking at the paper.

Commissioner Motshekga: Sher, are you admitted to practice law in any other country other than South Africa?

Sher: No, Commissioner I am not, only in South Africa.

Motshekga: Do you speak Afrikaans?

Sher: I do Commissioner.

Commissioner Nyambi: It is the question of Commissioner JP Hlophe. The issue of citizenship. According to your questionnaire you were born in Namibia?

Sher: I was.

Nyambi: But a dual citizenship, it's Italy and South Africa. I thought you will touch on the issue of Namibia.

Sher: I have never applied or for been granted Namibian citizenship. I was born there, came to South Africa and was given a South African ID book, and as I understand it, I have registered in the Department of Home Affairs as being a South African citizen. So I do not consider myself and I haven't applied ever for a Namibian citizenship. I understand in Namibia if you apply for a Namibian citizenship you may not hold citizenship of another country. But I was born in Windhoek in Namibia, and went to school there, and then for some of the time was at school here. But since the age of about 16, have been living in this country and have been issued with identity documents in which I am reflected as being a South African citizen.

Nyambi: You came to South Africa when you were 16?

Sher: I came to South Africa when I was 13, in fact, 13 to 16, for three years to school, went back to do – when I was 17 and 18 years old to do Standard 9 and then Standard 10. And then went to study at the then University of Port Elizabeth and later at UCT. And since that time I have never been living or resident in Namibia. Basically from the time that I completed my schooling, I've never lived there.

Nyambi: Then how is Italy coming in? -- of Italy because you are explaining the part of Namibia now?

Sher: No, no. I have – my mother is Italian. My mother is Italian, and I have Italian citizenship by birth, by being the son of an Italian citizen.

Commissioner Didiza: It's just a clarity on this matter.

Mogoeng: Oh, is it follow up, Commissioner Didiza?

Didiza: Yes, it's just to clarify, Commissioner Nyambi, that Home Affairs have actually opened up for Namibians in particular who were in Namibia prior to

independence, to actually apply for South African citizenship if they wish to, because South Africa was actually – actually Namibia was a protectorate of South Africa at that time. So I just wanted to clarify.

Mogoeng: Thank you, was yours follow up, Commissioner Malema, or to be enlisted like Judge President Molemela? All right, okay. President Maya.

President Maya: Thank you, Chief Justice, a quick question. I'm just worried by the answer you gave when the Chief Justice, asked you about a criminal judgment you delayed for six months. Did I hear you right? I think you were of the attitude that you didn't really keep the litigants waiting?

Sher: No, Madam President. It did keep the litigants waiting. I was not asked by the litigants about it. But I did keep them waiting, yes.

Maya: Okay, thank you.

Commissioner Mpofo: Thank you. No, mine is a very short one. I see that in one of the – one of your judgements, a criminal one the *State versus Masuku*, is it anyone we know?

Sher: Thank you, Commissioner. No, it's not anyone here.

Mogoeng: Well, that was an unnecessary but enlightening question. Minister.

Minister Masutha: Well, talking about Masuku, it's my understanding that the latest submission of the Cape Bar Council of candidates for silk does include the Masuku that's sitting with us. But it appears to be the only black or at least, African in that list. I am raising this because two years ago when a list was submitted of 17 candidates, only one was African generic. And we had to clarify whether – no, not African, black generic and we even had to clarify whether indeed we were correct that that candidate was actually black. Are you a member of the Cape Bar Council or have you ever been?

Sher: Minister, I am a member of the Cape Bar and I serve on one of the sub-committees of the Cape Bar Council. I am not on the Council as such.

Masutha: Dealing with?

Sher: It's the Arbitration Mediation and Alternative Dispute Resolution Sub-Committee.

Masutha: I see. There has been a problem in terms of that bar, not only producing black counsel, but actually producing black silk. Are you aware of any concrete steps, because if we are still getting lists where only one – well, this time it's out of six, last time it was out of seventeen, are we ever going to make any significant dent in transforming that Bar and what do you know of efforts concretely by that Bar to change that situation?

Sher: Minister, as I understand the present situation, white advocates are barred from applying for silk if they haven't served 14 years. So that already was intended to serve some limitation as a break, as it were, on the numbers that apply. As - opposed to that, there is an understanding if I may put it that black counsel are not restricted by that rule. I am not aware of any formal requirement as to years. It would obviously depend on each application. But certainly the 14 year rule, as it was one of the rules that the Bar has instituted in an attempt to put a brake on the number of white candidates applying so that there are less of them and encouraging black counsel to apply after as many years as they think. If they think they're ready after five years or three years or four years, it certainly seems, from what I understand, an encouragement in that regards.

Masutha: I will not refer to the other criteria, which seem to be further exclusionary when it comes to those that have been excluded in the past. You've mentioned one. Would you and in your opinion, would you think that the Bar would have serious objections if government intervened and actually introduced policies – I will not refer to laws at this stage, which would set government-set criteria for qualification, which by the way, we are currently working on? Do you think that there would be serious resistance in favour of self-regulation as a matter of principle, do you think?

Sher: Minister, as I understand it's a difficult question for me to answer. I cannot speak fairly and properly on behalf of the Bar, but I think there is a situation at the moment where with the Legal Practice Bill coming into operation, that is going to change the landscape quite considerably. There is a survey that has just done the rounds at the Bar, where members have been asked to indicate whether they see this necessity to have to keep Chambers within – currently the Cape Bar insists that Chambers must be kept within, I think it is a kilometre or two kilometres from the court. That rule, there has now been a request or a survey to ask members whether they think it is necessary still to continue with that or not and there seems to be some idea that possibly with the new Legal Practice Bill coming into operation, it is there – members are going to start opting for –

Masutha: New Practice Act, my apologies. It's no longer a bill.

Sher: Yes.

Masutha: My apologies.

Sher: Yes, the Legal Practice Act. I've used the incorrect word. But certainly, the impression I get is that many members, white members of the Bar will be possibly, probably leaving and practicing either from home or not in the same situation that they are in and I cannot see that the Bar would have any problem in the interests of transformation, I cannot see that the Bar would have any problem if government were to come forward with proposals or if necessary legislating in that regard.

Judge President Molema: Chief Justice, just one question. I have read paragraph 5 of your -

Mogoeng: It's difficult to hear you, JP.

Molemela: Oh sorry.

Mogoeng: Maybe the mic should come closer to you.

Molemela: Sorry, CJ. Advocate Sher, I have read your questionnaire in particular paragraph 5 thereof, on the – your commitment to the values of the constitution. It's quite commendable, the contribution that you have made. But the question that I want to ask you has to do with briefing patterns. You have lamented like so many other candidates, the skewed briefing patterns. My question to you is that are you personally doing about it?

Sher: President, what I have done is before taking silk, I made attempts and not only attempts, I did what I could to get black senior counsel to lead me in matters because I saw the transformation as working both ways, not only from my side downwards, but from black, senior counsel down to me. So I made attempts and did bring in black seniors when I could. I also brought in women and black and white juniors when I could. The difficulty that I had with my practice is that a lot of the time I am acting for the little man against either government or corporates and often, I would do matters on the basis that if we won, I would get paid by the other side. If we didn't then I wouldn't get paid. So the – it's very difficult to invite people in to that sort of arrangement because obviously no-one is going to want to work for free. So I would be working with attorneys that were also largely working for indigent clients, and it is very difficult in that situation to ask somebody or get somebody. And there were instances where people were prepared to do that, but a lot of the matters that I'm involved in took six, seven years before they were finalized, and I had to run those largely on my own. But those were the efforts that I have made.

Commissioner Masuku: A very short question. In fact, it's a clarity question. You mentioned that one of the transformation measures that have been adopted by the Bar Council in relation to increasing the pool of black silks is that they have reduced the number of years that white silks have to take before they are considered for silk. I am not aware of that rule and I'm a member of the Bar Council. Sorry, I'm a member of that Bar as well.

Sher: It's not a rule in relation to – there's a rule that as far as white candidates are concerned, you are not expected to – it's not a fixed rule but you're not expected to apply or to be able to apply, having served less than 14 years.

Masuku: No, I am not familiar with that rule. I'm aware of counsel as far back as maybe six year, who were less than 14 years who nonetheless applied and were recommended silk.

Sher: White counsel?

Masuku: Yes.

Sher: Well, I'm sorry. [Cross talk] I was one –

Masuku: One of them is – [Cross talk].

Sher: I was one of those that was told about the rule. I cannot give you a reference to it being in writing and I cannot say where it is but there is a rule in that regard that generally, as far as white advocates are concerned, there is a 14 year rule, if I may put it like that.

Masuku: I am not familiar with it.

President Maya: Have you finished Commissioner Masuku? All right. Is it a follow up?

COMM. D. Mpofo: Yes, I just wanted to clarify. I don't know what the practice is in the Cape. But for what it's worth at the Johannesburg Bar there is an indicative rule of 12 years. But it's not strictly applied. But it's actually written. It's a written rule to say ... No, that is for everybody.

Commissioner Nkosi - Thomas: We have received as a Commission, feedback from the Society of Law Teachers of Southern Africa. Have you seen what they have had to say about you?

Sher: I have, Commissioner.

Nkosi - Thomas: Yes, and perhaps for the benefit of those that have not seen what the comment is. They say that there are other candidates who are more suited for the appointment than yourself from a transformation perspective. Would you like to comment on that, please?

Sher: Commissioner, if I may comment on their comments as a whole, they say that having read my application, they don't see that I have done enough as far as transformation goes and they say that they also haven't seen that evidenced in my work as a Judge and I haven't made contribution to changing. I think they used the reference to communities and you know, in the sense that I have made law or helped people previously disadvantaged.

Now with respect, if I may deal with that. Firstly, I've dealt with the issue in relation to my own personal contribution as a member of the profession. I have, as I've said earlier, made many attempts and have brought in black juniors, black seniors, women, black and white. And as far as my contribution on the bench goes, my understanding is that it isn't limited to necessarily helping to transform the profession that if I help in transforming, if I help in changing attitudes and law that is unfair to poor people, who are largely black in this country, if that is what I achieve then I see that as being affecting transformation. Now in that regard, I would refer you to some of the judgments, which I have written, which in my view do constitute a positive and very worthy contribution to transformation. The one is the judgement which I handed down in the *Coastal Links Fishing* matter, which as I indicated concerned artisanal trek-net fishermen, who have been deprived of fishing rights although their ancestors, going back to the Dutch colonists, had fished and had been fished - the colonists established an outpost there. In my judgment, I found that the refusal to allow those trek-net fishermen to fish on a certain portion of the lagoon, amounted to racial discrimination and in my view, in doing so, I contributed to redressing wrongs. I contributed to transforming a wrong, which was existing because there was a policy – there is a policy in place that provides that residential adjacency is necessary under the one policy, in order for you to obtain a permit. Now the idea was a laudable one, the idea was that you don't want people from other provinces perhaps coming to poach on your waters or perhaps from foreign countries. But in practice the rule meant that people who had been removed from Langebaan, black people

who had been moved to Langebaan North, now no longer lived next to the Langebaan Lagoon and perversely because of that they weren't – they didn't qualify for a residential adjacency to the waters of the Langebaan Lagoon and couldn't get a permit. Whereas, white landowners that were there were able to qualify for a permit. And I addressed that and said that I believed that was unjust, constituted indirect discrimination on the grounds of race. And I see that as a contribution towards transformation.

I would also if I may, sorry, if I may also make reference to the judgment which the Bar referred to, which I handed down on the 16th of August in the matter of *S v Jacobs and six others*, you will have perhaps seen that. It's a judgment that deals with automatic reviews which come to the High Court, where people who have been sentenced to imprisonment above six months or three months depending on the magistrate's seniority, and children who have been sentenced to imprisonment, their cases are automatically sent on review. And we experienced a huge delay in these reviews. In practice, those reviews come from outlying magisterial districts in the Cape Province where poor black people not able to afford legal representation appear before magistrates that do not have the seniority that they need and impose sentences of incarceration. And what we found that was in numerous instances, it was those matters that were delayed. We had some delayed for three years, two years. After, in one instance, the sentence had already been served and in dealing with those systemic problems, I suggested that there should be an outstanding reviews list, like there is an outstanding reserve judgement list that that should be – something should be taken up, by the Provincial Efficiency Enhancement Committee with the office of the Chief Justice and the Judge President. I also directed that there should be an audit held by the Department of Justice into resource issues at those local courts and we directed the Department of Justice, the Regional Head to report back to the court and that will occur in three months' time. Now in doing that I see that as another contribution on my part to transforming an obvious injustice, which affects people on the grounds of race because the reality is that the people in the outlying areas are not serviced as well as the people in the towns by Legal Aid and by and large, the people that are getting these sentences are poor, black, unrepresented people. It can only be unrepresented people. If you're represented you cannot get automatic review. Those, I would submit, Madam Commissioner, are

important instances of where I in my, discharging my duties on the bench, have made an attempt, a very serious attempt on my part to try and move transformation forward.

President Maya: I'm sorry, Mr Sher, for harping on the same issue. It's – I've remembered now what bothered me about that answer you gave on the delayed judgement and it's the statement that the litigants had not asked for it. You know, I am sure you will agree with me that delivering judgments speedily is a critical, critical – excuse me, component of the administration of justice. What does it matter that the litigants had not asked for this judgment? Did you not have obligation to deliver it as quickly as possible, especially in light of the norms and standards which require judges to deliver judgments within a period of three months?

Sher: I did, Madam President, I did have that obligation. I was answering the Judge President's question as to whether or not litigants had ever – I had to produce the judgment after litigants had asked me. I understood the question as being whether I had produced it only after I had been had asked.

Maya: I misunderstood you again. I'm sorry for that. Thank you. I'm satisfied.

Sher: No, no I accept that one has – that is unacceptable, one has a duty to render a judgment as soon as possible.

Mogoeng: Advocate Sher, thank you for coming. You are excused.

Sher: Thank you, Chief Justice, and Commissioners and thank you for the opportunity.

Mogoeng: Thank you so much.