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**JUDGMENT: APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPEAL**

**POTTERILL J**

[1] I read the arguments before Tolmay J, the judgment, the applicant’s leave to appeal and the written heads submitted pertaining to the application for leave. I have also listened to argument.

[2] In terms of s17 of the Superior Courts Act 10 of 2013 leave to appeal may only be given where a Judge is of the opinion that the appeal would have a reasonable prospect of success, or there is some other compelling reason why the appeal should be heard.

[3] There is no compelling reason why the appeal should be heard; I find no important points of law that warrant a consideration by a higher court.

[4] I am also unpersuaded that the appeal would have a reasonable prospect of success.

[5] The application for leave to appeal is dismissed with costs, including the costs of two counsel if so employed. Costs pertaining to work done after 1 April 2024 are awarded on scale C.
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