



# JUDGES MATTER

**Judicial Services Commission interviews  
2 October 2018**

**Gauteng Division of the High Court  
Interview of Adv JJ Strijdom**

**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 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.**

ADV JJ Strijdom: Good afternoon, Chief Justice.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Are you well?

ADV JJ Strijdom: I'm well thank you.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Is there any difference in pronunciation between the kind of Strijdom you are and the one with the y?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Ja.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Is it the same pronunciation.

ADV JJ Strijdom: No it's the same.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Okay, alright. And you were an Advocate in private practise for Junior Council for some 15 years, am I right? Before you became Senior Council?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

CJ M. Mogoeng: And you, you've been silk for over eight years, I think?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

CJ M. Mogoeng: What does your practise entail?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Well.

CJ M. Mogoeng: For the past eight years?

ADV JJ Strijdom: For the past eight years, about 80% criminal work and 20% civil work.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Yes and have you had occasion to rope in junior Council?

ADV JJ Strijdom: No.

CJ M. Mogoeng: You haven't been able?

ADV JJ Strijdom: No because he was in criminal cases most people cannot afford a senior and a junior Council.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Yes except of course for those complex one, the involving the millionaires or billionaires?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

CJ M. Mogoeng: They can afford it.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Yes. Have you had a problem with reserved judgements or have you been able to deliver them as expected?

ADV JJ Strijdom: No, I was able to deliver them within a reasonable time.

CJ M. Mogoeng: And how reasonable is your reasonable time?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Well.

CJ M. Mogoeng: I know I said it jokingly because there is what is called, "normale polisie spoed."

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

CJ M. Mogoeng: So the kind of normal speed is not every body's normal speed.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes. Mostly within a month or two.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Okay.

ADV JJ Strijdom: And in many cases I deliver, it's temporary judgements.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Yes. Does that extend to civil matters?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Civil and criminal.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Thank you. JP.

JP Mlambo: Thank you, CJ. Adv Strijdom, good afternoon.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Good afternoon JP.

JP Mlambo: All right, in your spread sheet that tells the Commission what you've been doing when you were acting, I see that the bulk of your acting stints have been in the criminal trial area.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

JP Mlambo: And that accords with your specialisation as an Advocate, am I correct?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Correct.

JP Mlambo: Right, but you've also dealt with other areas of the law, I've seen you've done seven weeks in the opposed motion court?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

JP Mlambo: Right. This is mostly in Pretoria, am I correct?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes mostly in Pretoria.

JP Mlambo: Ja, the Pretoria post motion load is heavier than that in Johannesburg?

ADV JJ Strijdom: It is.

JP Mlambo: Now didn't you have problems regarding reserved judgements, when you in the oppose motion court?

ADV JJ Strijdom: No.

JP Mlambo: How did you manage that?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Pardon.

JP Mlambo: How did you manage that? Not to have problems with reserved judgement?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Well, if you know my attitude is that justice delayed is justice denied. So I worked at night and I tried to finalise my judgements, as soon as possible.

JP Mlambo: Ja.

ADV JJ Strijdom: So I could cope with it.

JP Mlambo: I think I must thank you for availing yourself to come and act, assist the division. But what I'm curious about is how are you able to do this when as a JP we struggle to get Senior Council to give us more than. You're lucky if silk give you three weeks to come and act. But you've been able to give us a lot more than that. How are you able that, to do that?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes well, since I've started to act as a Judge, you know that your private practise, you get less briefs, because the attorneys tend to see you as, you know that you act on a, you know that the last two, three years I've been acting on a regular basis. So, then they start, you know, they stop to give you briefs.

JP Mlambo: Okay, so giving long periods as a silk tends to kill your practise.

C ADV JJ Strijdom: It do.

JP Mlambo: Yes.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

JP Mlambo: Okay, I see you've also done 11 weeks in appeals. You've sat in criminal appeals as well as in civil appeals?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

JP Mlambo: Right, I though you could have said in full court appeals as well?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes, I sat in full court appeals.

JP Mlambo: Did you wright any of those judgements?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes. You'll see that in that spread sheet, you'll see that I wrote full court judgements.

JP Mlambo: Yes. I saw Richard Mnisi, I see that's one of them.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes, Steenkamp matter it is another matter where I sat with the previous Judge President from the Court.

JP Mlambo: Yes, okay. Thank you very much CJ, no further questions.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Thank you JP. MEC.

MEC Mr Magadzi: Thank you so much CJ. I can see you reported the, amongst the significant cases that you were involved in the hoax email one and the old pay SASA one. Do you want to take us through why you felt those were two significant cases that you felt that need to be brought to our attention?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Can you just refer to those two cases again?

MEC Mr Magadzi: The hoax email one.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Hoax email one?

MEC Mr Magadzi: Yes.

ADV JJ Strijdom: No I'm not aware of it. Have you got this.

MEC Mr Magadzi: Page...

CJ M. Mogoeng: There are two Strydoms MEC.

ADV JJ Strijdom: That's a case of the other Strydom.

CJ M. Mogoeng: MEC.

MEC Mr Magadzi: I got the wrong Strydom?

CJ M. Mogoeng: Yes, the one with an i and a j.

MEC Mr Magadzi: Okay.

CJ M. Mogoeng: He's the one with an i and j.

MEC Mr Magadzi: Maybe because of the Hoax email. [intervene] Maybe CJ let me just sort, sorry about that.

CJ M. Mogoeng: No, no.

MEC Mr Magadzi: ADV really appreciate. Let's deal with the issue of transformation, Gauteng is one area that's a cosmopolitan that need to represent literally everyone and everyone need to get access to fair justice and other related matters. What's a single issue that you think that will bring that is related to transformation to the bench?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Well, I've got no problem what so ever and I agree that there must be gender equality and I also totally agree that there must be transformation, and, in my view, they can appoint more woman and black people to the bench.

MEC Mr Magadzi: I'm such a personal you, what is it that you think that will assist to ensure that this transformation, within the bench if you are successful candidate? Is there changes or support or programmes that you really believe need to be enhanced or supported? If you're a successful candidate?

ADV JJ Strijdom: I don't know on what basis I can answer you. On that, what contribution I can make as judge.

MEC Mr Magadzi: Yes.

ADV JJ Strijdom: To transformation. No I don't.

MEC Mr Magadzi: Maybe let me put it this way, in your current responsibilities have you appointed juniors that will enhance the transformation or gender representivity[sic]? Have you worked with juniors that represented the spectrum of society?

ADV JJ Strijdom: As an advocate?

MEC Mr Magadzi: Ja.

ADV JJ Strijdom: No, I haven't worked with juniors. All I've done was to, I was involved in the lecturing of peoples at the bar for many years.

MEC Mr Magadzi: So in your entire life there's nothing related to transformation or support to transformation or representivity that you involved obviously.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Well, I was involved in.

MEC Mr Magadzi: Except in golf.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Ja except for the training and training of pupils at the bar, I was in also involved in the old Bophuthatswana with the training that was before 1994, with the training of prosecutors and magistrates, black prosecutors and magistrates, where they had the opportunity to become prosecutors and magistrates.

MEC Mr Magadzi: Maybe sorry to ask, in your current.

ADV JJ Strijdom: I think in that way, I've made a contribution there.

MEC Mr Magadzi: In your current work place.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

MEC Mr Magadzi: Do you have people that are black or woman that are black that are working in, with you or assisting you or it's just an institution that remains un transformed?

ADV JJ Strijdom: No, I've got a lot of black colleagues at the bar and they use to approach me everyday to ask them for advice and to assist them.

MEC Mr Magadzi: Thank you CJ.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Thank you so much MEC. J SM Navsa.

J SM Navsa: Mr Strijdom, good afternoon.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Good afternoon.

J SM Navsa: I'm gonna put a series of question to you and you can put them down to bad experiences in the past. I see that you were involved prosecutorially[sic] in the magistracy.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

J SM Navsa: At really bad times during our country's history.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

J SM Navsa: One was during the years of student uprising, others were state of emergency and increased labour resistance to the apartheid state and you served as a prosecutor both in, from 75 and then later from 86 to 93.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

J SM Navsa: You know the experiences that we had, generally speaking there may have been exceptions, was that in those days there, it was very difficult to discern a division between the prosecutorial staff and the magistracy, I'd just like for you to explain to us how given that set up, what it was like for you at that time as a prosecutor and as a magistrate? And the seat change that has now had to occur when you were acting and let me say I except what Judge President put to you, you know that you're a silk that makes yourself available, so I'm willing to give you credit for that. I'd just like to have your response to that and how you've undergone this change and the commitment to the new constitution particularly given the past?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes well, you know it was difficult in those days as a prosecutor, you know. You had to prosecute people that you know for, there was perhaps a riot or the type of assemble people who assemble and that it was unlawful at that stage for people to assemble or to demonstrate so you had to prosecute those people. And but when I joined the bar you know, you came to a different conclusion you. When you look at our constitution you know that we've done a lot of wrong in the past and well I came to the view that things must change, we must all change for a better South Africa and I think since I started at the

bar, you see things different, from a different angle. And I've been magistrate, I've been on the side of the prosecution, I've been on the side of, I was a magistrate and when you sit as Judge, acting as Judge, you see things from a different perspective and then what is very important is our constitution. That one must comply with and promote the aims of our constitution.

J SM Navsa: Could I, you know what struck me in those days particularly was young children who were often public violence cases.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

J SM Navsa: And the sentences were particularly vicious.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

J SM Navsa: It always struck me as one of the big sins of the past. Did you have any experience of that? I'm just trying to figure out, whether, how it affected your psyche, whether you were involved in that and I understand that we all now have to change, and we have to accept it, we have a commitment to the constitution. But perhaps you could just talk about that a bit.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Well if you look at the retrospectively now, that you know, it was very difficult, you had to do a job as a prosecutor, you, if people brake the law you had to, you had to prosecute them. You haven't got a discretion, you had to follow the law and where as todays totally different. And one regret for what happened at the past but there's nothing I can change about that now. Fortunately we've got the constitution now and that we must follow the aims and we must promote the constitution. But it was for me as a prosecutor not always easy during those days to be a prosecutor.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Commissioner Mpofu.

C D Mpofu: Thank you, Mr Strijdom, I'm not sure if you were a prosecutor in the 80's, maybe we've met before [intervene]

ADV JJ Strijdom: In what capacity?

C D Mpofu: As a public violence accused. [intervene] No, but on a serious note, I'd like to, to find out you say that off course you right that one can not change the past and you did some regrettable things then maybe as a prosecutor or as a magistrate, what are those things?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Well to sentence someone that's been convicted, and you don't actually agree with the, well as a magistrate, you know, you don't agree someone who now got the right to assemble or to demonstrate, those days it was an offence and you had to prosecute them. You had to convict them, and you had to impose a sentence. So it was, it wasn't



that easy all though you know that you this is not fair, you had to impose a sentence cause according to the law. Depends on what type of sentence you impose, I mean one can always imposed a suspended sentence, you had to consider the circumstances off the client. His personal circumstances look at his age, all those aspects you must take into consideration.

C D Mpofu: Thank you, ja. And also, I think in the 80's and later in the 80's I had, I was able to as a young lawyer to do terrorism trials as they were called then, with the likes of Judge Navsa here and that's why we are asking you these questions. In those, in those did you do any of those terrorism trials?

ADV JJ Strijdom: No.

C D Mpofu: Public violence?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Public violence, yes in the regional court when I was a prosecutor in the regional court. Do you mean as a prosecutor or as.

C D Mpofu: Both?

ADV JJ Strijdom: or a magistrate?

C D Mpofu :Both?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes. As a prosecutor yes.

C D Mpofu: Okay, thank you very much.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Commissioner Mampuru.

Ms Mampuru: Le ke a leboga CJ. On book 1 of 1, page 86, paragraph 3.2 it says that candidate's appointment would not further their constitutional imperative that the judiciary reflected the racial and gender composition of South Africa. Vis a Vis, the qualifications and the experience that you have. Do you still regard yourself as the best candidate for appointment to be, to be a Judge? Number two, following onward Commissioner Mpofu has just said, how would you associate with yourself with JJ Strijdom of 1956? Thank you.

ADV JJ Strijdom: How would I associate myself with? [intervene] No, obviously I've never met him. [intervene]

Ms Mampuru: You don't have a knowledge, you don't have any

ADV JJ Strijdom: I know.

Ms Mampuru: Idea of who he was?

ADV JJ Strijdom: I know who he is, but I can not associate myself with, with his actions and ja. So, I think that's a bit difficult question.

Ms Mampuru: No, CJ I'm asking the question, because he says he has done some of the regrettable actions, that's why I'm asking the question. Do you know him, or do you have any relations with him? Because you are the same Strijdom, you share the same surname?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Ja I know, I don't know him. [intervene]

CJ M. Mogoeng: Commissioner Malema.

Ms Mampuru: Sorry CJ, he's not responded to.

CJ M. Mogoeng: I beg, you had not finished Commissioner? [intervene] He says he doesn't know him, maybe you'd want to put it again.

Ms Mampuru: The question is, on page 86 it says, the candidate's appointment would not further the constitutional imperative that the judiciary reflect the racial and gender composition of [inaudible 00:19:39] this is his qualifications, does he still regard himself as a best candidate for appointment?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes, I do see myself as a suitable candidate. However I've said that I'm in favour of gender equality and transformation and yes that's all I can say.

Mr J Malema: Thank you CJ, how many staff members do you have in your office? Not in the group, your office?

ADV JJ Strijdom: In my staff, in my office? Only one receptionist and I use a typist, that's not permanently in my service, we as a group use the typist.

Mr J Malema: So how many are you in the office? You're three? It's you, the PA and the typist?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes, the receptionist and the typist.

Mr J Malema: In your office?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

Mr J Malema: And then how many are black people?

ADV JJ Strijdom: The receptionist is a black woman.

Mr J Malema: Have you ever visited a township?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

Mr J Malema: Where?

ADV JJ Strijdom: When I was in Bophuthatswana, I, on many occasions we had to go into the townships.

Mr J Malema: Where, in which township?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Ga-Rankuwa, Winterveld.

Mr J Malema: Can you speak any indigenous?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Mabopane.

Mr J Malema: Can you speak any indigenous language?

ADV JJ Strijdom: No, no.

Mr J Malema: Why?

ADV JJ Strijdom: I cannot give you a reason for that.

Mr J Malema: I can't hear CJ?

ADV JJ Strijdom: I cannot give you a reason why I cannot speak it.

Mr J Malema: Have you ever seen any need to learn any indigenous languages?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes, I think it's need to, it will be a good thing to speak an African language.

Mr J Malema: But you still didn't see any need to learn it when you think it's a good thing to.

ADV JJ Strijdom: No I did not.

Mr J Malema: You didn't see any need to learn African language?

ADV JJ Strijdom: No sir.

Mr J Malema: Do judges have a roll to play when it comes to transformation?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

Mr J Malema: What roll will you play to transform society as a Judge?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Well sir maybe to give you an example, I've attached a letter or an email to my application form where a black woman appear

in my court in an opposed matter and she appear in person and I've guided her right through the proceedings. And at the end of day, I ruled in her favour and she wrote a comment to the JP, Judge President maybe I can, if I can refer to that document. It was a, the lady was Busiswe Madoena she wrote that Your Lordship, please allow me and this is a letter that was, email that was addressed to the Judge President, Your Lordship please allow me to extend my sincere gratitude to the High Court and in particular Judge JJ Strijdom for the assistance given in my legal case. This lady was not represented as I said, she appeared in person. By way of introduction I'm a layman, in terms of the law, but still represented myself at the High Court recently. I'm a black female and this was my first time defending myself in a court as a plaintiff. I certainly did not have the correct terminology or know how of when to even sit or stand, however the judge and his team guided me through. I was also grateful to some of the Advocates showing me Ubuntu and informing me of what to do and when to whispers and hand gestures. Judge JJ Strijdom was courteous on all accounts and then she end up by saying that I'm also great full that Judge JJ Strijdom allow me to represent myself as I could not afford to have council representation, this is the type of compassion that can make a significant contribution to making our society right in at least understanding that we can have access to resources such as the courts with neither fear nor retribution due to history of economic exclusion.

Mr J Malema: Do you support transformation?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Definitely yes.

Mr J Malema: How does your appointment help us to transform the judiciary?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Sir as I've already said, the, I'm in favour of transformation as you, but I can not say how my appointment will.

Mr J Malema: No, no.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Help transformation.

Mr J Malema: You support transformation.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes

Mr J Malema: Therefore you can't be subjective. In supporting transformation, you ought to tell us now, how does appointing you help to transform the judiciary since you're a supporter of transformation?

ADV JJ Strijdom: No sir, I don't know how.

Mr J Malema: It doesn't help us, right?

ADV JJ Strijdom: No.

Mr J Malema: Appointing you doesn't help us to transform the judiciary, am I right?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

Mr J Malema: Thank you.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Commissioner Nyambi.

Mr Nyambi: I'm covered CJ.

CJ M. Mogoeng: Thank you. Prof?

Professor N Ntlama: Thank you CJ. My question is a follow up to Commissioner Malema's one. [vernacular 00:26:29] on this letter, which makes reference to the concept of Ubuntu, cause I was going to ask, to what is your understanding of that concept, of Ubuntu and also how does that concept helps us to transform the judiciary in terms of it's functioning and also the Jurisprudence that comes out of the court? Thank you.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Commissioner I don't know what is the of concept Ubuntu.

CJ M Mogoeng: Commissioner Didiza.

Ms T Didiza: Thank you very much CJ and good afternoon Advocate. Yes, good afternoon. Afternoon.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Good afternoon.

Ms T Didiza: Yes. On your questionnaire on seven, you are asked apart from your practises as an advocate or attorney or employment in academic world, have you been involved in any activities. You say since 2008 I was involved in the training and lecturing of pupils at the Pretoria bar, I also resign, I think it's presided in oral examination. In the training and lecturing, given the past that we come from as a country and as you said in one of the answers from one commissioner that there were times where you had to do something that inwardly you know it was not fair and just. How have you brought that experience in the current training where you have to enable people to function in a constitutional democratic, democracy, particularly as judicial officers or legal practitioners?

ADV JJ Strijdom: I would say that to concentrate on our constitution, because that is so important that the constitution apply to the law, to the executive, to all of us, to the judiciary. So I concentrate on the constitution and when the lectures that I gave was more in a criminal procedure and there you concentrate on the rights of an accused

person of an, these rights to fair trials and all those aspects, where you bring the constitution in and yes on that basis I, that's how I've done it.

CJ M Mogoeng: Thank you Commissioner. Minister?

Min M Masutha: In relation to your contribution to jurisprudence you elude to a judgement in which you acted as a judge of a Modisane vs Road Accident Fund, 2013.

ADV JJ Strijdom: That's correct Minister.

Min M Masutha: Yes, the matter as [inaudible 00;30:00] related to your contribution toward the development of African customary law, specifically in relation to African customary adoptions?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

Min M Masutha: Yes. Now in this instance the question of whether a customary adoption existed thus confirming rights on the children following the marriage under customary law.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

Min M Masutha: With the mother of the children. What has been your experience deriving from that matter? Relating to African customary law? Was it an isolated matter firstly? Or was it something that you had over time had been exposed to?

ADV JJ Strijdom: No it is, I've dealt with a similar matters when I was sitting as a magistrate in the Bophuthatswana, where for instance there was a rape case where this child was raped and there was an attorney, white attorney from Pretoria who appear there and he start to cross examine this girl on the basis, the complainant by saying but you know this is impossible how can you wait two, three weeks to report this matter and then I interfere and said wait, listen what is your custom at home and this lady said well, I cannot, we cannot go to the police, I must first report this matter to my mother and then we must wait for my father cause he only come home every second week and then we must report the matter to my father and they discuss it and they will then decide whether to go to police or not. So, my experience is that injustice can be done if you're not aware of the customary law. Because if you do not apply if you are not aware of the procedures, you can, as I said, injustice can , because the court can come to the conclusion and say but listen this is highly improbable that you wait two to three weeks before you go to report this matter and that's why I say it is important to also promote because the customary law and the, our constitution in terms of Section 39, sub section 3, also accept the customary law as long as it's consistent with the constitution.

Min M Masutha: I'm a little bit confused.

ADV JJ Strijdom: so we must also promote the customary law.

Min M Masutha: I'm a little bit confused.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

Min M Masutha: With the example you giving.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

Min M Masutha: Are you condoning the fact that it would be right that's if indeed that's according to custom that a child who'd been raped, should wait for three weeks before

ADV JJ Strijdom: No.

Min M Masutha: The matters been reported? Am I missing something?

ADV JJ Strijdom: No, no.

Min M Masutha: Am I missing something?

ADV JJ Strijdom: No, what I'm saying is that you must understand there custom to understand the reason why the child did not report this matter.

Min M Masutha: Ja, how was that made out to be a matter of custom?

ADV JJ Strijdom: A matter of?

Min M Masutha: Of custom, that the child could only report once the father in three weeks' time became available?

ADV JJ Strijdom: I don't understand that question?

Min M Masutha: Well, maybe I misunderstood your example? You saying that the matter had to wait for three weeks before it's reported because the father was only going to be available in three weeks.

ADV JJ Strijdom: No, no, no, that's just to understand the way, why she did not report the matter for three, within three weeks. Today it's different, it doesn't matter whether she report it within, she can even report after a year, it's the law said it's not inadmissible.

Min M Masutha: Okay.

ADV JJ Strijdom: But during in that period that was a that law was not applicable.

Min M Masutha: Okay. The earlier response you gave to the question regarding whether you're aware of the concept Ubuntu, did you say that you were not aware of that concept or did I miss something?

ADV JJ Strijdom: Pardon.

Min M Masutha: Sorry, he did understand. He didn't understand the concept. Yes, that's the question I'm really asking. I just wanted to confirm if indeed you said you did not understand the concept Ubuntu.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

Min M Masutha: I'm just trying to understand your exposure to customary law, because it seems to be at a very core of the indigenous knowledge system in so far as you know, it's at the core of African customary law even, how did it escape you? Maybe I should ask the question differently, your exposure to indigenous customary law, is it only in relation to this two matters that we've just talked about? Because it seems to give me the impression that you've had exposure.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Yes.

Min M Masutha: To African customary law?

ADV JJ Strijdom: That's correct, yes.

Min M Masutha: I see, okay, thank you very much. Thanks CJ.

CJ M Mogoeng: Thank you so much Mr Strijdom.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Thank you.

CJ M Mogoeng: Thank you very much sir.

ADV JJ Strijdom: Thank you CJ.

CJ M Mogoeng: You're excused.