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**Introduction**

1. The Plaintiff, Msiza Miria Nadima an adult female person who is currently

45 years of age residing at No 446 Wolvekop Verena, Mpumalanga Province

who sues herein in her personal capacity and in a representative capacity

as a mother and natural guardian of the minor children.

2. At all times relevant hereto, the deceased, Skosana Shelby Kleinboy,

a South African National, who resides in the Republic of South Africa prior

to his death in 2019, with ID no 780810 6130 0 80 as a driver at the time of

the said accident. [1]

3. The matter came before me on the default judgment roll on 22nd September

2023. There was no appearance on behalf of the RAF. The trial in the matter

proceeded only with regard to the issues relating to the merits. The issues

relating to quantum are to be postponed sine die. After listening to brief oral

submissions by Mr Thumbathi I reserved this judgment. Mr Thumbathi also

filed Heads of Argument or submissions for which I am grateful.

**Onus**

4. The plaintiff has to prove on a “balance of probabilities” involvement of the

Insured motor vehicle which was driven negligently in that a reasonable

driver would not have driven in the same manner under the circumstances.

5. It is noted that the deceased lost control of his motor vehicle because he was

dazzled by the shining bright lights of the Insured motor vehicle which came

from the opposite direction as it failed to dim its lights for him.

6. What requires to be decided is whether the accident was caused by the

negligent conduct of the insured driver or whether the plaintiff is the sole

cause of the accident.

7. For the Plaintiff to succeed he must show that there was an insured motor

vehicle involved and he needs to prove only 1% negligence on the part of

such a driver.

8. In the case of *Odendaal v Road Accident Fund [3]* the court said -

(a) The Plaintiff’s are “innocent third parties” and for them to succeed, they

bear the *onus* of establishing on the balance of probabilities that Dlamini

was guilty of some negligence which was causally connected to the

collision and therefore to the damages suffered by them. No question of

apportionment of fault or of damages arises here since there was no

contributory negligence on their part”

(b) That any causal negligence on the part of Dlamini, whatever the degree

thereof in relation to the collision would render the defendant liable, as the

insurer under the Road Accident Fund Act for the full amount of the

damages suffered by each plaintiff.

9. It is noted that the Plaintiff amended the Particulars of Claim in terms of

Rule 28 as follows: “On the 21st April 2019 at between Modderfontein

Road, Bronkhorstspruit, Gauteng Province, the accident occurred between

unknown motor vehicle bearing unknown registration letters and numbers

there and then driven by unknown driver collided with a vehicle with

registration letters and numbers BKN 028 GP driven by the deceased”. [2]

10. The Accident Report (AR) form has a brief description of the accident and

also a portion of accident sketch plan and both do not indicate involvement

of any car other than that of the Plaintiff. [4]

11. The conduct of the alleged insured driver failing to dim bright lights is a

material fact which ought to have been in mind of the passenger when

making statements to the police.

12. Moses Emanuel Masombuka stated that he was a front seat passenger in a

Mazda Rustler bantam bakkie with registration number BKN 028 GP. It was

dark and the condition of the road was wet since it did rain earlier and there’s

no street lights. The driver was traveling at a high speed when approaching

the curve there was an oncoming vehicle.The driver tried to avoid the

collision and lost control of the vehicle and overturned. They were thrown out

the bakkie and the driver was trapped inside the vehicle”

13. In application of the reasonable man test, I find that the deceased was

driving at a high speed and could have acted in avoiding to lost control of his

own vehicle. A driver will be negligent if the unreasonable conduct is

generally foreseeable and he/she does not take reasonable preventative

action to avoid a collision.

14. Yekiso J in the matter of Denissora v Heyns Helicopters [5] said “What I

have before me, for purposes of making the required determination, is the

uncontested evidence of Steynberg which would normally in the absence of

any contradictory evidence, be accepted as being *prima facie* true. It does

not, however, follow that because evidence is uncontested, therefore it is

true. The evidence may be so impossible in the light of all other evidence

that it cannot be accepted (*see in this regard Meyer v Kirner) (6).* The fact

that evidence stands uncontradicted does not relieve the party from the

obligation to discharge the onus resting on him (See Minister of Justice v

Saernetso 1963 3 SA 530 (A) at 5340-H).

15.In civil matters the onus is discharged upon a balance of probabilities but, no

doubt, this simplistic statement must be used with caution since, even if the

onus-bearing party puts into his “pan of the scale of probability ” slender

evidence, as against no counter-balance on the part of the opponent, and

although the scale would therefore automatically go down on the side of the

onus bearing party the court may still hold that the evidence tendered is not

sufficiently cogent and convincing (see *Ramakulukusha v Commander, Venda*

*National Force 1989 2 SA 813 (V) at 838H and other authorities cited therein).*

**Order:**

In the result I make the following order:

16. In the result I make the following order:

16.1 Absolution from the instance is ordered.

16.2 Leave is granted for the Plaintiff to proceed on his/her claim on the

same papers duly amplified should he be so inclined.

16.3 No order as to costs.
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