Editorial note: Certain information has been redacted from this judgment in compliance with the law.



# IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA GAUTENG LOCAL DIVISION, JOHANNESBURG

CASE NO: 41962/2021

(1) (2) (3)	REPORTABLE: NO OF INTEREST TO OTHER JUDGES: NO REVISED.				
25 July 2023					
Dat	te ML TWALA				

In the matter between:

SEAN RIST DAVIDSON APPLICANT And

### BRENDA MEGAN COUGH N.O. RESPONDENT

FIRST

(Cited in her capacity as the Executrix in The estate late David Cough)	
BRENDA MEGAN COUGH RESPONDENT (Identity No: [])	SECOND
STAND 1231 LEISURE BAY CLOSE CORPORATION (Registration No: 1999/023523/23)	THIRD RESPONDENT
STAND 1232 LEISURE BAY CLOSE CORPORATION (Registration No: 1998/012901/23)	FOURTH RESPONDENT
THE COMPANIES AND INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY COMMISSION	FIFTH RESPONDENT

#### JUDGMENT

**Delivered:** This judgment was prepared and authored by the Judge whose name is reflected and is handed down electronically by circulation to Parties / their legal representatives by email and by uploading it to the electronic file of this matter on Case Lines. The date of the judgment is deemed to be the 25<sup>th</sup> of July 2023.

#### TWALA J

[1] For the sake of convenience, in this judgment I shall refer to the parties as they are referred to in the main application and in the judgment.

- [2] The first and second respondents brought this application for leave to appeal against the whole of the judgment and order of this Court handed down electronically on the 20<sup>th</sup> of December 2022. It is worth noting that the third and fourth respondents are not participating in this application for leave to appeal as they did not participate in the main application.
- [3] It is a trite principle of our law that leave to appeal may only be given where the Judge or Judges concerned are of the opinion that the appeal would have a reasonable prospect of success or where there is some other compelling reason why the appeal should be heard, including conflicting judgments on the matter under consideration. *(See section 17 (1)(a)(i) and (ii) of the Superior Courts Act, 10 of 2013).*
- [4] The grounds for the leave to appeal are succinctly stated in the notice of application for leave to appeal and I do not intend to repeat them in this judgment. Furthermore, I am grateful to both counsel for the parties for the submissions made at the hearing of this application for leave to appeal.
- [5] I am satisfied that I have covered and considered all the issues raised in the application for leave to appeal in my judgment. I am therefore not persuaded by the respondents that there are reasonable prospects of success in this appeal. Put differently, I am of the view that there is no prospect that another Court would come to a different conclusion in this case. Therefore, the application for leave to appeal the judgment falls to be dismissed with costs.

[6] In the circumstances, the following order is made:

The application for leave to appeal is dismissed with costs.

TWALA M L

# JUDGE OF THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA

## GAUTENG LOCAL DIVISION

Date of Hearing:2	20 <sup>th</sup> of July 2023
-------------------	-------------------------------

Date of Judgment: 25<sup>th</sup> of July 2023

For the Applicant:	Advocate S Meyer
--------------------	------------------

Instructed by:	Harris Billings Attorneys
	Tel: 011 784 1910
	<u>megan@hbattorneys.co.za</u>

For the Respondents:	Advocate R Willis
Instructed by:	Denzil Michael Fryer Attorneys Tel: 011 675 5320
	<u>denzil@dmfa.co.za</u>