

Interim Report of the Amnesty Committee

• INTRODUCTION

- 1 The Amnesty Committee (the Committee), one of three statutory committees of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission (the Commission), was established in terms of section 17 of the Act.¹ This provision was amended on three occasions in order to provide for the extension of the Committee. The principal function of the Committee is to decide applications for amnesty received from perpetrators of offences or delicts associated with a political objective within the mandate period.²
- 2 At the time of reporting the Committee consisted of seventeen members,³ whose principal function is to decide applications for amnesty either in chambers or at a public hearing, sitting in panels of at least three members, which is the statutory quorum.
- 3 At the time of reporting, a considerable part of the Committee's workload was incomplete.⁴ The life span of the Committee has been extended to enable these outstanding matters to be finalised, while the rest of the Commission was suspended on 31 October 1998. Provision has been made for a further report to be submitted after the finalisation of the outstanding amnesty applications. The present chapter is intended to give a broad overview of the Committee's activities in the interim and will be followed by a more detailed report which covers the rest of the period and will contain a full list of all matters decided by the Committee.

• FORMATION AND COMPOSITION

- 4 The head office of the Committee was established in Cape Town, which was also the seat of the Commission.
- 5 The various versions of section 17 reflect the changes effected to the composition of the Committee from time to time. In its original form, section 17 provided for a single entity consisting of five members under the chairpersonship of a serving or retired judge of the High Court.⁵ The section provided that two members of the Committee should be commissioners appointed in consultation with the Commission. The two commissioners nominated and appointed to the Committee are both qualified lawyers and legal practitioners.
- 6 The others were appointed by the President and no formal process for such appointments was provided for in the section. In exercising this prerogative, the President appointed three judges together with the two Commissioners nominated by the Commission, to the Committee. It is clear from a reading of the Act that the Committee is required to perform a largely judicial function. This made it expedient to appoint three judges to the Committee, although the section only explicitly made provision for the appointment of one judge to chair the Committee.
- 7 There were considerable delays in appointing the members of the Committee, which resulted in the loss of valuable time in putting the work of the Committee into operation.

• ESTABLISHING AN INFRASTRUCTURE

- 8 The Committee was faced with similar logistical problems as those experienced by the rest of the Commission. It had to set up offices and establish an infrastructure out of nothing. The Committee was initially allocated one whole floor in the building occupied by the Commission. This was converted into offices as well as a hearings room. Given the rapid expansion of the Committee, further accommodation was subsequently taken on another floor in the Commission offices.
- 9 The Committee also had to engage in the process of recruiting the requisite staff. The Act provides only for the office of an executive secretary for the Committee. In the absence of any specific guidelines, the Committee decided that, in order properly to perform its functions, it would be necessary to appoint a complement of suitably qualified lawyers and a complement of appropriate administrative staff. The professional services personnel were referred to as leaders of evidence, a term that reflects one of their principal functions – namely the leading of evidence at public hearings of the Committee. The Committee initially appointed a core staff consisting, *inter alia*, of an administrative secretary and two leaders of evidence, one of whom doubled as the executive secretary of the Committee, significantly increasing the workload of the chief leader of evidence who was called upon to perform these functions as well. Both the professional staff complement as well as the administrative staff complement was gradually expanded as the workload of the Committee increased. In view of the novelty of the process, considerable time had to be invested in the training of staff on an ongoing basis.
- 10 One of the other urgent tasks of the Committee was to formulate and publish an application form for the purpose of amnesty applications. Logistical delays were experienced in formulating the amnesty application form and having it considered, approved and printed by the government. This led to additional pressure on the amnesty process in that there was a twelve-month period calculated from 15 December 1995 within which amnesty applications had to be submitted. It was, of course, not possible to apply for amnesty until the prescribed application form became available.
- 11 In view of the time limitations for the submission of applications, as well as their confidential nature, it was necessary to exercise strict control over all applications received and to keep accurate records thereof. Some logistical problems were occasioned by the fact that applications were received in a decentralised fashion in that it was open to applicants to submit their applications at the various regional offices of the Commission. This was in fact done on a significant scale. It was an important aspect of making the process of the Commission in general and the Committee specifically, accessible to the public. In practice, however, this resulted in duplication and an added workload on the Commission in that records of applications submitted at the regional offices were kept at the relevant regional office, and again registered in the central register at the head office of the Committee. A more detailed exposition of the process followed in registering and processing applications, in both narrative and diagrammatic form, is contained in the administrative report of the Amnesty Committee in Volume One.
- 12 One of the early problems resulting from the absence of a full staff complement was that members of the Committee had to engage in analysing and processing applications for amnesty, in addition to their principal duty of considering and deciding on the applications.

• COMMUNICATION AND ACCESSIBILITY

- 13 In conjunction with the rest of the Commission, it was necessary to engage in a co-ordinated process of communicating the nature of amnesty and the process for submitting applications. The purpose was not only to publicise the process, but also to ensure that that proper applications were submitted, obviating the need for the Committee to spend time ensuring that applicants complied with the procedural requirements. The Commissioners on

the Committee assumed the responsibility of communicating the process and, in particular, the procedural requirements to the public. This entailed visiting various centres, including several prisons, and engaging in public talks. Particular emphasis was placed on issues such as who qualified for amnesty, how application forms should be completed and where assistance could be obtained in completing application forms. In general, this contributed towards the enhanced formal quality of applications received, although a large percentage of applications fell short of the formal requirements.

- 14 A further aspect of rendering the amnesty process more accessible was to design the application form in an easily understandable and user friendly format and to ensure that it was available in all of the official languages, in considerable supplies at accessible points. All of the Commission offices were in a position to respond adequately to any request for application forms.
- 15 In addition and as part of the communication campaign, an appropriate interpretation service was provided both to members of the public and to the parties participating in public hearings of the Committee. Steps were also taken to ensure that members of the media were given full access to hearings and were positioned so they could report fully on the proceedings. The Committee initially had some reservations concerning the presence of television cameras at the public hearings. It was feared that this might have an inhibiting effect on the proceedings and on the willingness of applicants to come forward and submit applications for amnesty. It was, however, accepted that it would amount to unfair treatment of the electronic media – and indeed an inconsistency in the process – if only the print media and radio had access. It was also accepted that there was an overriding necessity to communicate the process to everyone through every conceivable means. The original fears proved unfounded and television coverage became and remains a standard feature of all of the Committee's public hearings.
- 16 The issue of amnesty turned out to be a very controversial one in most of the public discussions concerning the Committee and the Commission in general. The immunity from criminal or civil proceedings that results from the granting of amnesty was one of the main reasons or grounds for opposition raised by direct victims of politically-motivated acts or their next of kin. One of the early legal challenges to the Commission was an attack upon the constitutionality of the amnesty provisions by the Azanian Peoples Organisations (AZAPO) and some prominent families who had suffered human rights violations at the hands of the security forces under apartheid. The Constitutional Court eventually decided this matter against the applicants, upholding the constitutionality of amnesty. This case is more fully discussed in the chapter on *Legal Challenges* in Volume One.
- 17 Most South Africans have, over time, come to accept the necessity of amnesty for the overall objective of national unity and reconciliation in the country.

• PRIORITISING APPLICATIONS

- 18 The Act enjoins the Committee, wherever possible, to give priority to the applications of people in custody and to prescribe procedures to give effect thereto. This was a further source of the initial delays that resulted from difficulties in formulating and publishing appropriate regulations in this regard. By far the majority of applications, particularly the initial ones, were received from prisoners. This category also constitutes the majority of applications rejected for falling outside of the mandate of the Committee.
- 19 It was, however, also important to deal with applications that gave a broader and more balanced perspective of the past political conflict – which is indeed the subject matter of the work of the Commission. There were initially very few applications from persons falling into this latter category. It was considered important to encourage as many of the

important role players in the conflict as possible to come forward and apply for amnesty. To serve this objective, at an early stage the Committee heard an important application from a group of security police members.⁶

- 20 For the above reasons, the Committee endeavoured as far as possible to maintain a balance between considering applications from those in custody and those who are not.
- 21 The above-mentioned approach of focussing on representative or window cases resulted in the receipt of a significant volume of amnesty applications from important role players in the conflict. This in turn assisted the Commission in pursuing its objectives of, inter alia, establishing the broadest possible picture of the past conflict and formulating recommendations to avoid such a situation from developing in future.
- 22 It is also important to point out that the Committee has been in contact and discussion with various leadership figures of the main political groupings and that considerable assistance was given to the Committee in this regard. This has been an ongoing process and the Committee has endeavoured to identify and respond to difficulties experienced by various groupings in order to facilitate their participation in the amnesty process. The Committee obtained valuable assistance and co-operation from the various submissions of political parties to the Commission and from individual leaders.

• PROCESS

- 23 Once most of the initial administrative and logistical problems had been overcome, the Committee was in a position to introduce a process for dealing with applications. One of the fundamental aspects which had to be attended to in this regard was the categorisation of applications into those it was compelled to deal with at public hearings and those which could be dealt with by the Committee in chambers. The categorisation of an application determined the various preparatory steps that had to be taken in order to render the application ripe for a hearing or decision (see further Volume One).
- 24 The other important step was to obtain all relevant information and material required to supplement omissions or outstanding aspects of the application. This required the obtaining of official records like court transcripts, judgements, charge sheets and the like. It was also necessary to obtain further particulars from the applicant where this was needed.⁷
- 25 Once all of the information and material had been obtained, it was taken into account in deciding whether the application would amount to a chamber matter or to a matter for public hearing. This was regulated by the provisions of the Act, which compelled the Committee to hear all applications concerning a gross violation of human rights (as defined), at public hearings and gave the Committee the discretion as to how it would deal with all other matters. In practice, most of the applications not involving gross human rights violations were dealt with in chambers. Chamber matters would then be allocated to a panel and a decision taken by a majority of the panel. In view of the fewer formalities involved in processing chamber matters, the majority of the early decisions of the Committee were taken in chambers. Consequently, all of the chamber matters had been finalised before the writing of this report.
- 26 A number of additional steps were necessary to prepare hearable matters for a public hearing. A lot of this entailed logistic work. First, a hearing date had to be allocated to the matter in consultation with all of the interested parties or their legal representatives. Included in this process was the issue of obtaining an appropriate venue for the hearing. In view of the importance of accessibility, every endeavour is made to obtain a venue that will be most convenient for most of the interested parties, particularly victims. In addition to this, it is also important that the most essential facilities should be available at the venue. Regard is also given to the issue of safety and security.

- 27 It is also necessary to give statutory notice of the hearing to all of the interested parties including victims. The Act explicitly entitles any party to the proceedings to have legal representation. A legal assistance scheme was created in terms of the Act to render assistance in appropriate cases to parties who are unable to afford legal representation. This is important issue in ensuring the fairness of the proceedings before the Committee and is linked to the question of accessibility.
- 28 Insofar as the hearing itself is concerned, the Act empowers the Committee either to promulgate rules of procedure which are generally applicable to hearings or alternatively to determine the procedure to be followed at a particular hearing. To avoid overly formalising the process and to retain the degree of flexibility necessary to ensure the fullest possible participation within the limited time available, the Committee decided against prescribing a set of generally applicable rules of procedure. This decision was partly based upon an acceptance by the Committee of the Commission's approach: that its process should not be equated to that of a court of law and should not be overly regulated. However, the proceedings of the Committee are largely judicial in nature and include in particular the right of cross-examination within reasonable bounds. All parties are allowed to adduce relevant evidence and to address argument to the hearings panel concerning all issues that have to be decided. The proceedings are recorded and the Committee gives reasoned decisions on each application. The Commission publishes these decisions. Within these parameters, the Committee endeavoured to conduct its proceedings in such a manner as to ensure that all parties are treated fairly.
- 29 A further important provision that assists in rationalising the work of the Committee is the provision of the Act, which allows the Committee to hear jointly all matters relating to the same incident. This is being used extensively by the Committee in order to expedite finalisation of its work.

• EXTENSION OF THE COMMITTEE

- 30 As the deadline for the submission of applications approached, the volume of amnesty applications dramatically increased.⁸ It became apparent that it would be impossible to finalise all of the applications within the limited life span of the Commission unless the number of members of the Committee was increased to allow for more than one hearings panel. Therefore, section 17 of the Act was amended to provide for the appointment of a larger number of committee members.⁹ Following this amendment, two further members were appointed to the Committee, creating the possibility of simultaneous hearings by two hearings panels.
- 31 After the extension of the cut-off date of the Commission's mandate period from 5 December 1993 to 10 May 1994, it became possible for persons involved in a whole range of matters not previously covered to apply for amnesty in respect of their conduct. This in turn led to a new influx of amnesty applications, further increasing the mounting pressure on the Committee to finalise an overwhelming workload within the limited life span of the Commission.
- 32 Further amendments of section 17 followed, allowing for the appointment of at first nineteen¹⁰ and finally of an unlimited number of Committee members.¹¹ The Committee was extended to its present number of seventeen members, following these amendments.
- 33 Notwithstanding all these measures, it was not been possible to finalise all of the hearable amnesty applications by the time of reporting. This has resulted in the extension of the life span of the Committee beyond 30 October 1998. On this date, the rest of the Commission goes into suspension, pending finalisation of its work by the Committee. No date has presently been specified for the completion of the work of the Amnesty Committee. Provision is made for the President to determine the date for completion of amnesty work by proclamation in the Gazette.

- 34 It should be noted in this regard that a great deal of time is required for the preparation, actual hearing and the deciding of hearable matters. It was not possible to anticipate any of the logistic and other delays and difficulties experienced in finalising hearable matters at the time when the Commission was formed. This necessitated all of the legislative amendments to cater for the realities and practicalities of administering the amnesty process.

• CHALLENGES

- 35 The main challenges that confronted the Committee were as follows:
- 36 One of the main challenges faced by the Committee was dealing with the various causes of delays in the process. Numerous difficulties are occasioned in this regard by the applications of prisoners and persons who are not legally represented. This resulted in the Committee taking various steps to ensure that the cases of such persons were properly and fully placed before the Committee. Some of the particular problems experienced were incomplete or improperly completed applications, difficulties in communicating with applicants and difficulties in investigating such cases. This meant that these cases took considerably longer to become ripe for a hearing or decision. In order to address this difficulty, the Committee has prevailed upon the Commission to ensure as far as possible that legal representation is provided to persons in these categories. This has been put into effect.
- 37 Considerable time is taken up by the actual hearing of applications, since it is open to affected or interested parties to participate in the proceedings to the extent of their interests therein. By the nature of things, opposed applications took much more time than other matters to complete. In many cases, interested parties and victims appeared but, rather than actively oppose the application, either kept a watching brief or abided by the proceedings. Following directions given by the Committee, it was also made possible for interested parties to submit written representations to the hearings panel or to place their views on record at the hearing through the services of the leader of evidence. The Committee has endeavoured to limit the time spent in sittings by controlling unnecessary and time-consuming cross-examination or argument, the submission of irrelevant documentation or the leading of irrelevant evidence. In appropriate cases, pre-hearing conferences are held in order to limit or properly define the issues to be decided at the hearing. This involves all the parties to the matter and is conducted by the Committee.
- 38 Other delays during hearings resulted from unforeseen circumstances like a lack of time to complete matters within the period for which they had been set down or the granting of postponements to parties so they could properly prepare new material or evidence or to enable them to attend the proceedings. The availability of a preferred legal representative often caused delays in finalising matters. In spite of all these circumstances, the Committee has largely succeeded in curbing any abuse of the process and streamlining the hearings with the assistance and co-operation of most parties.
- 39 A further cause for some concern is the inequality in legal representation afforded to various parties. This has a negative affect on victims particularly. This concerns the vexing question of severe constraints on public resources or even the lack of such resources. This affects the issue of legal representation because the Commission's legal assistance scheme operates on a very limited budget, which prescribes tariffs for legal services very much in line with the government's legal aid scheme. These tariffs are notoriously low compared to the fees lawyers are able to demand on the open market. The more highly skilled lawyers are thus not easily attracted to work involving such limited tariffs. Most of the victims who participate in hearings are compelled to rely on the Commission's legal assistance scheme, since they are unable to fund legal representation from their own resources. This also applies to indigent applicants for amnesty. On the other hand, present or former state employees or members of liberation movements qualify for legal assistance by the state in terms of a special dispensation. The appearance of such

persons before the Commission or its Committees is funded by the State and the State Attorney arranges their legal representation. Lawyers who appear on these instructions are allowed substantially higher tariffs than those provided for by the Commission's legal assistance scheme. These lawyers also have better resources at their disposal to prepare for hearings and represent their clients. In many instances, senior counsel handles these cases. The inherent inequality and unfairness of this situation is self-evident. Although the Committee is grateful to the many legal representatives who have, despite these hardships, rendered a splendid service to the indigent, particularly victims, it remains disturbing to realise that there may be instances where justice was not done in respect of indigent amnesty applicants or victims at amnesty hearings.

• CONCLUSION

- 40 In view of the judicial nature of the Committee's work and the fact that its decisions are subject to judicial scrutiny, it would be inappropriate for the Committee to comment on or indulge in an analysis of its decisions on the novel and interesting legal and other questions surrounding the amnesty process or the concept of amnesty in general. A list of all amnesty applications granted to date is contained in the appendix to this chapter. The Committee's decisions are made public. In order to avoid fragmentation, a full list of all decisions taken will accompany the report of the Committee that will be submitted upon completion of its work.

• APPENDIX

AMNESTIES GRANTED AT TIME OF REPORTING

AM	APPLICANT	MANNER	DECISION	DATE
6210/97	ANDERSON, FB	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/09/15
8077/97	ANDERSON, GP	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/04/07
0101/96	BAM, ME	HEARING	GRANTED	97/04/14
2878/96	BATZOFIN, S	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/04/02
4118/96	BESTER, P	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/11/28
0105/96	BHEQEZI, S	HEARING	GRANTED	97/04/14
1190/96	BHILA, A	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/04/02
0041/96	BLEKI, SL	HEARING	GRANTED	98/05/11
0057/96	BOTHA, DP <i>(unlawful poss. of arms & ammu)</i>	HEARING	GRANTED	97/09/05
1703/96	BOTHA, JJC	CHAMBER	GRANTED	96/12/09
6422/97	BRAND, C	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/02
1298/96	BUSAKWE, E	HEARING	GRANTED	97/03/13
1548/96	CARD, DJ	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/04/02
0554/96	CHOLOTA, DB	HEARING	GRANTED	97/08/14
6610/97	CHRISTIE, MJS	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/02
0063/96	COETZEE, D <i>(Mxenge murder)</i>	HEARING	GRANTED	97/08/04
2478/96	CROWE, RJJ	CHAMBER	GRANTED	96/12/09
2337/96	DE BEER, JJ	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/08/21
3375/96	DE JONGH, NW	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/07/28
0081/96	DIALE, B	HEARING	GRANTED	96/08/22
4019/96	DLADLA, MA	HEARING	GRANTED	98/05/26
3905/96	DLAMINI, BP	HEARING	GRANTED	97/08/01
2466/96	DYANTI, WM	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/08/21
4133/96	ELS, WJ	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/11/28
0214/96	FAKU, NM	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/05/26
0483/96	FIETIES, C	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/09/15
0395/96	FRONEMAN, LH	HEARING	GRANTED	97/07/30
3514/96	GELDENHUYS, HC	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/08/17

3515/96	GELDENHUYS, HP	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/08/17
4139/96	GERBER, TH	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/11/28
4140/96	GEYSER, FH	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/11/28
0106/96	GOLA, AN	HEARING	GRANTED	97/04/14
4141/96	GOUS, AZ	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/06/01
0949/96	GQOMFA, H L <i>(Heidelberg Tavern)</i>	HEARING	GRANTED	98/07/15
1289/96	GSINISIZWE, D <i>(Att. murder-Mhlambiso)</i>	HEARING	GRANTED	97/01/23
0148/96	GXEKWA, N G	HEARING	GRANTED	98/07/21
3275/96	HARMSE, PJ	HEARING	GRANTED	97/07/13
1779/96	HLOPE, MJ	HEARING	GRANTED	97/08/07
4480/96	HLUBI, SS	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/07/02
5961/97	HOWELL, A	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/02
3613/96	HURTER, W	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/07/08
0919/96	JACK, TWO BOY	HEARING	GRANTED	97/05/20
0496/96	JAMESON, R	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/04/02
6178/97	JARDINE, HS	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/02
5240/97	JUDEEL, PJ	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/06/11
5619/97	KHOTLE, LA	HEARING	GRANTED	98/08/21
3443/96	KHOTLE, MI	HEARING	GRANTED	98/08/21
0632/96	KLAAS, MM	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/04/02
2893/96	KRIEL, AS	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/06/22
5180/97	KUBUKELI, P	HEARING	GRANTED	98/08/13
6440/97	KULA, MS	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/11/27
0312/96	LEBONA, P	HEARING	GRANTED	97/03/13
1297/96	LEKITLANE, TS	HEARING	GRANTED	97/03/13
4072/97	LETELE, MR	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/08/21
1004/96	LOTTERING, CJ <i>(Robbery & escape)</i>	HEARING	GRANTED	98/07/08
5931/97	MABALA, Z P <i>(Heidelberg Tavern)</i>	HEARING	GRANTED	98/07/15
5178/97	MABITSA, JT	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/22
6077/97	MADASI, V B <i>(Heidelberg Tavern)</i>	HEARING	GRANTED	98/07/15
0038/96	MADELA, M	HEARING	GRANTED	97/04/14
0865/96	MADODA, T	HEARING	GRANTED	97/07/17
6438/97	MAKAPELA, Z Z	HEARING	GRANTED	98/07/22
0080/96	MAKGALE, C	HEARING	GRANTED	96/08/22

0087/96	MAKOM, J	HEARING	GRANTED	97/04/14
0164/96	MAKOMA, G	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/11
0362/96	MAKROSI, T	HEARING	GRANTED	97/04/14
2567/96	MAKWENKWE, W	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/08/27
0293/97	MALEVU, BG	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/03
0998/96	MAMA, ST	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/08/18
0669/96	MANQINA, MC (<i>Amy Biehl</i>)	HEARING	GRANTED	98/07/28
0054/96	MARAI, E	HEARING	GRANTED	97/09/05
1880/96	MASEKO, AN	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/08/21
6439/97	MATI, L S	HEARING	GRANTED	98/07/22
2467/96	MATOMELA, WS	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/08/21
7016/97	MATSHAYA, MD	HEARING	GRANTED	98/08/13
1283/96	MAXAM, P (<i>Housebreaking</i>)	HEARING	GRANTED	97/07/17
0180/96	MAY, LJ	HEARING	GRANTED	97/10/27
0102/96	MBHEBE, DE	HEARING	GRANTED	97/04/14
4309/96	MDALANA, NJ	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/08/27
0103/96	MDYOGOLA, N	HEARING	GRANTED	97/04/14
0015/96	MENERA, NJ (<i>Murder-4 counts</i>)	HEARING	GRANTED	97/08/12
2586/96	MITCHELL, BV	HEARING	GRANTED	96/12/09
1290/96	MKHONTWANA, TP (<i>Att murder-Mhlambiso</i>)	HEARING	GRANTED	97/01/23
6140/97	MKHUMBUZI, BM	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/11
7596/97	MLAMBISI, T	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/11
4483/96	MNGUNI, MS	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/07/02
3998/96	MOALOSI, SP	HEARING	GRANTED	97/08/14
0116/97	MOHAPI, PT	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/22
0097/96	MOILWANYANE, D	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/04/02
4060/97	MONTOELI, TA	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/08/21
3902/96	MOTAUNG, SW	HEARING	GRANTED	97/08/01

AM	APPLICANT	MANNER	DECISION	DATE
2469/96	MOTSOPI, A	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/04/02
7110/97	MPANZA, B	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/09/15
0104/96	MPHAMBANI, SV	HEARING	GRANTED	97/04/14
6656/97	MPIYAKHE, LS	HEARING	GRANTED	98/08/13
0012/96	MPONDO, JP	HEARING	GRANTED	96/12/09
1249/96	MTJIKILO, TP	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/22
0638/96	MTSHALI, N G	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/08/11
0118/96	MXHOSANA, VW	HEARING	GRANTED	97/10/27
0435/96	MZIMELA, C	HEARING	GRANTED	97/07/14
0048/96	MZOMBA, FEP	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/04/02

0121/96	NCUBE, JT	HEARING	GRANTED	97/01/23
8080/97	NDABA, S	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/04/07
6692/97	NDABAPHI, M	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/12/15
3802/96	NDINISA, CS	HEARING	GRANTED	97/07/17
4058/96	NDLOVU, NW	HEARING	GRANTED	98/05/26
1702/96	NDLOVU, P	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/04/03
0184/96	NDLUMBINI, PM	HEARING	GRANTED	97/05/20
5051/97	NDZAMELA, IN	HEARING	GRANTED	98/08/13
0100/96	NGWENDU, MR	HEARING	GRANTED	97/04/14
0759/96	NGWENYA, DA	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/05/22
3813/96	NIEUWOUDT, JA	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/09/18
0826/96	NKUNA, C	HEARING	GRANTED	97/11/05
0812/96	NKUNA, H J	HEARING	GRANTED	97/11/05
5282/97	NOFEMELA, E M <i>(Amy Biehl)</i>	HEARING	GRANTED	98/07/28
0064/96	NOFOMELA, BA <i>(Murder-Mxenge)</i>	HEARING	GRANTED	97/08/04
6657/97	NOMASHIZOLO, ST	HEARING	GRANTED	98/08/13
0003/96	NONGONGO, OT	HEARING	GRANTED	98/05/11
4734/97	NTAMO, S N <i>(Amy Biehl)</i>	HEARING	GRANTED	98/07/28
6658/97	NTIKINCA, LL	HEARING	GRANTED	98/08/13
0677/96	NTSHOBANE, TR	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/05/20
1323/96	NTSITSI, SO	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/04/02
4481/96	NYAKANE, TJ	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/07/02
6624/97	NYEMBEZI, M	HEARING	GRANTED	98/08/13
3095/96	NZIMANDE, MA	HEARING	GRANTED	97/10/22

AM	APPLICANT	MANNER	DECISION	DATE
5177/97	OLIPHANT, ST	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/22
5188/07	PENI, N A <i>(Amy Biehl)</i>	HEARING	GRANTED	98/07/28
6612/97	PETE, AD	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/08/21
0027/96	PETRUS, RR	HEARING	GRANTED	96/12/06
0660/96	PHAKAMISA, M	HEARING	GRANTED	97/05/20
3641/96	PHOSWA, MT	HEARING	GRANTED	97/10/22
1288/96	POPANE, MM	HEARING	GRANTED	97/01/23
5179/97	PYPER, C R	HEARING	GRANTED	98/07/30
7168/97	RADEBE, TM	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/09/12
2758/96	ROBINSON, RK	CHAMBER	GRANTED	96/12/09
0094/96	ROUX, GPD	CHAMBER	GRANTED	96/12/09

7158/97	SALOOJEE, R	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/10/20
1567/96	SAMBO, J	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/08/18
3670/96	SCHUTTE, SM	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/03/25
1701/96	SEBILOANE, WMM	HEARING	GRANTED	97/06/12
4482/96	SEKERE, MD	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/07/02
0143/96	SEROALO, PT	HEARING	GRANTED	97/08/26
5939/97	SHICEKA, A (Crazy Beat Disco)	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/03
3903/96	SIBISI, NJ	HEARING	GRANTED	97/08/01
3904/96	SITHOLE, JM	HEARING	GRANTED	97/08/01
6139/97	SIYOLO, NM	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/07/16
3387/96	SKOSANA, DM	HEARING	GRANTED	97/11/05
1002/96	SLIPPERS, HJ (Att. murder)	HEARING	GRANTED	97/11/21
0056/96	SMUTS, A	HEARING	GRANTED	97/09/05
0193/96	SOLO, AS	CHAMBER	GRANTED	96/08/28
0069/96	STEYN, HJ	HEARING	GRANTED	97/05/28
4394/96	STOLS, D	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/11/28

AM	APPLICANT	MANNER	DECISION	DATE
5784/97	THANDA, WF (Crazy Beat Disco)	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/03
4245/96	THERON, PJ	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/09/25
3844/96	THOABALA, WO	HEARING	GRANTED	97/08/14
0077/96	THOBA, KE	HEARING	GRANTED	97/04/14
0078/96	THOMPSON, WR	HEARING	GRANTED	97/04/14
0030/96	THULO, MP	HEARING	GRANTED	96/12/09
0637/96	TOVELA, AA	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/08/18
1909/96	TRYSTMAN, KJ	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/04/02
7711/97	TSHABALALA, AC	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/09/15
0065/96	TSHIKALANGE, D (Murder-Mxenge)	HEARING	GRANTED	97/08/04
7983/97	TUTU, TAT	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/11/28
0079/96	VAN DER MERWE, AF	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/04/02
3718/96	VAN DER MERWE, CWA	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/02/05
1730/96	VAN DER WESTHUIZEN, J	CHAMBER	GRANTED	98/08/21
2759/96	VOLSCHENK, CG	CHAMBER	GRANTED	96/12/09
7253/97	VORSTER, O	CHAMBER	GRANTED	97/12/11
2997/96	WA-NTHOBA, JN	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/22
2084/96	WHEELER, J	HEARING	GRANTED	98/07/30

1215/96	XHIBA, JM	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/22
---------	-----------	---------	---------	----------

5864/97	ZULU, JM	HEARING	GRANTED	98/06/02
---------	----------	---------	---------	----------
