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**JUDGMENT**

**[LEAVE TO APPEAL]**

**DLAMINI J**

[1] This is an application for leave to appeal an order that I handed down on 18 January 2022.

[2] The appellant is the City of Johannesburg Metropolitan Municipality (CoJ).

[3] The respondents are the owners of various immovable properties falling within the municipal jurisdiction of the CoJ, the appellant in its capacity as the Local Governing Municipality.

[4] The numb of the issue is whether the appellant has correctly charged the respondents using the correct tariff for services the CoJ delivered to the respondents.

[5] The effect of my order was that the appellants are directed to engage and interrogate the respondent's various municipal accounts to ensure that the respondents have been correctly billed.

[6] The test for granting leave to appeal is now a higher one.

[7] The trial court may now only grant leave to appeal if it is of the opinion that the appeal would have a realistic chance of success and not may have a reasonable prospect of success. The legislator’s use of the would in section 17(1)(a)(i) of the Superior Court Act imposes a most stringent and vigorous threshold.

[8] This concept was captured thus by the court in **Member of the Executive** **Council of Health Eastern Cape v Mikhita** **and another**[[1]](#footnote-1) where the court held that a court may now only grant leave to appeal if it is of the opinion that the appeal would have a realistic chance of success not may have a reasonable chance of success. A mere possibility of success or even an arguable case is not enough.

[9] Having read the applicant's reasons to appeal and heard both Counsels during argument, I am of the view that no court will come to a different conclusion that the one that I have reached.

[10] No other Court would give a contrary decision from the order which I granted on 18 January 2022.

In all the above circumstances the appllant has failed to make out its case.

**ORDER**

1. The application for leave to appeal is dismissed with costs.
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