

JEEBHAI AND OTHERS v MINISTER OF HOME AFFAIRS AND ANOTHER 2009 (5) SA 54 (SCA)

2009 (5) SA p54

Citation 2009 (5) SA 54 (SCA)

Case No 139/2008

Court Supreme Court Of Appeal

Judge Mpati P, Streicher JA, Ponnann JA, Cachalia JA and Hurt AJA

Heard February 16, 2009

Judgment March 31, 2009

Counsel Z Omar (attorney) for the appellants.
PM Mtshaulana SC (with him G Bofilatos) for the respondents.
A Katz (with him M du Plessis) for the amicus curiae.

B

Flynote : Sleutelwoorde

Immigration - Illegal foreigners - Arrest, detention and deportation - Arrest - Who may be arrested - Whether compliance with ministerial review and appeal procedures prerequisite for valid arrest of illegal foreigner - 'Illegal c foreigner' by definition person present in Republic in contravention of Immigration Act, and not person confirmed to be illegal foreigner by Minister on review - Review and appeal procedures not prerequisite for valid arrest and detention of illegal foreigner - Immigration Act 13 of 2002, s 1 sv 'illegal foreigner', s 8 and s 34.

Immigration - Illegal foreigners - Arrest, detention and deportation - Arrest - D Who may be arrested - Foreigner by own admission 'illegal foreigner' as defined in Immigration Act - Perpetrating fraud to facilitate entry into and sojourn in Republic - Arrest authorised - Immigration Act 13 of 2002, s 1 sv 'illegal foreigner', s 34.

Immigration - Illegal foreigners - Arrest, detention and deportation - Justification E - Since deprivation of liberty prima facie unlawful, onus on Minister to justify such deprivation - Must comply with applicable immigration regulations - If Minister fails to show compliance, arrest and deportation unlawful - Immigration Regulations ito s 7 of Immigration Act 13 of 2002 (promulgated in GN R616 of 2005), reg 28.

F **Contempt of court** - What constitutes - Failure to comply with court order - Court order prohibiting publication of documents in Department of Home Affairs file - Judge stating in court that order not preventing appellants' attorney from using file in other court proceedings - Court subsequently amending court order to include such exception - Use of document from file in later proceedings not constituting contempt of court.

Headnote : Kopnota

G If a person is an illegal foreigner he may be arrested in terms of s 34 of the Immigration Act 13 of 2002. Under s 1 of the Act an illegal foreigner is by definition a foreigner who is in the Republic in contravention of the Act and not a person who is confirmed to be an illegal foreigner by the Minister upon review in terms of s 8(2). Therefore the cases, in which it was decided H that the procedure outlined in s 8(1) and (2) must be followed before a person may be arrested in terms of s 34, were wrongly decided. (Paragraph [59] at 76F - H.)

The decisions in *Arisukwu and Others v Minister of Home Affairs and Another* 2003 (6) SA 599 (T); *Muhammed v Minister of Home Affairs and Others* [2007] JOL 18935 (T); and *Khan v Minister of Home Affairs* [2007] JOL 18958 (T) I overruled.

A senior immigration officer, D, had arrested one R as an illegal foreigner, as he had been unable to produce any identification papers or a permit authorising him to stay in South Africa. D accompanied R to the C police station in Pretoria where R was detained. Two days later R was interviewed by S, a chief immigration officer. In the interview R admitted to being an illegal foreigner and that he had fraudulently obtained documents purporting to

2009 (5) SA p55

authorise his presence in South Africa. S thereupon handed R a notice of A deportation as contemplated in reg 28(2) of the Immigration Regulations promulgated in Government Notice R616 of 2005. S informed R of his right to appeal against the decision to deport him and to have his detention confirmed by a warrant of the court. R read the notice and indicated his wish to be deported at the first reasonable opportunity, whilst remaining in custody. He also signified that he did not wish to appeal the decision or have B his detention confirmed by a warrant of the court. S averred that R signed the document in the space provided for the detainee's signature and said that he consented to being sent back to Pakistan immediately. Four days later R was handed over to five Pakistani law-enforcement officials at the Waterkloof Military Air Base in Pretoria from where he was flown to C Islamabad Airport in Pakistan and held in custody. His removal from the country was apparently effected secretly, without his relatives or friends having been informed of what had happened to him. Eventually the appellants launched an application in a High Court seeking, inter alia, a declaration that the arrest, detention and 'removal' of R from South Africa were unlawful, inconsistent with the Constitution and constituted an D 'enforced disappearance' as envisaged in art 7(2)(i) of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. In opposing the application, the respondents counter-applied for an order declaring the appellants to have been in contempt of court for using the first page of a document (MV9) emanating from the respondents' file and for which the High Court in earlier proceedings had made an order prohibiting publication of the contents of E the file. The matter was heard by a full court of the High Court. The appellants' application was dismissed and the counter-application was granted, and the appellants declared to have been in contempt of court. In an appeal,

Held (per Ponnann JA; Streicher JA and Hurt AJA concurring), that R, by his own admission, fell within the definition of illegal foreigner in s 1 of the Act. F Moreover, also on his own version, he had perpetrated a fraud in order to facilitate his entry into and sojourn in the Republic. In those circumstances, his arrest was authorised by the Act. (Paragraph [59] at 76I - 77A.)

Held , further, as to R's detention at the C police station, that, since the deprivation of his liberty was prima facie unlawful, it was for the respondents to justify such deprivation. The respondents had, however, failed to G show compliance with reg 28 of the Immigration Regulations: the reg 28 safeguards existed, not just for the benefit of the illegal foreigner, but also to protect the respondents against unjustified and unwarranted claims flowing from detention or deportation, or both. Accordingly, from the time that R was handed over by D to the officials at the C police cells, until he came to leave the Republic, the conduct of the State officials in whose H charge he found himself was unlawful. It followed that R's detention and subsequent deportation were unlawful. (Paragraph [63] at 78I - 79B.)

Held , further, as to the contention that the arrest, detention and 'removal' of R from South Africa constituted an 'enforced disappearance' as envisaged in art 7(2)(i) of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, that I the appellants had relied on the document MV9, but that for various reasons no evidential weight could be attached to the document: it was only the first page of the document; it was unsworn and unsigned; ex facie the statement the information in it was inadmissible hearsay evidence; even if it

had been made by an official in another arm of the State, it could not be binding on the first respondent in the absence of an admission by the first

2009 (5) SA p56

A respondent of the truth of its contents. Accordingly, such evidence as there was did not support the inference sought to be advanced by the first appellant. (Paragraph [66] at 80D - F.)

Held, further, as to the conviction of contempt of court, that it had to be accepted that when publication of the respondents' file had been prohibited, the judge had stated in court that the prohibition on publication did not prevent B the appellants' attorney from using the contents of the file in any other proceedings. Furthermore, the court had subsequently amended the order prohibiting publication of the file by including therein a paragraph that the order 'shall not prohibit use of the file of the Department of Home Affairs in the advancement of any other court proceedings'. The appellants' use of the document before the full court had, therefore, not violated the court's C order. It followed that the appellants had been incorrectly convicted of contempt of court. (Paragraph [67], read with paras [47] - [49] at 80G - H, 72H - 73D.) Appeal upheld.

The decision in the Transvaal Provincial Division in *Jeebhai v Minister of Home Affairs and Another* 2007 (4) SA 294 (T) reversed.

Cases Considered

D Annotations

Reported cases

Arisukwu and Others v Minister of Home Affairs and Another 2003 (6) SA 599 (T): overruled

Jeebhai v Minister of Home Affairs and Another 2007 (4) SA 294 (T): reversed on appeal

E *Jeebhai and Others v Minister of Home Affairs and Another* 2009 (4) SA 662 (SCA) : referred to

Kazee v Principal Immigration Officer and Another 1954 (3) SA 759 (W): considered

Lawyers for Human Rights and Another v Minister of Home Affairs and Another 2003 (8) BCLR 891 (T): considered

F *Lawyers for Human Rights and Another v Minister of Home Affairs and Another* 2004 (4) SA 125 (CC) (2004 (7) BCLR 775): considered

Minister of Justice and Constitutional Development and Another v Zealand 2007 (2) SA 401 (SCA): applied

Minister of Law and Order and Others v Hurley and Another 1986 (3) SA 568 (A) : dictum at 589E - F applied

G *Minister van Wet en Orde v Matshoba* 1990 (1) SA 280 (A) : considered

Ulde v Minister of Home Affairs and Another 2008 (6) SA 483 (W): considered and not followed

Zealand v Minister of Justice and Constitutional Development and Another 2008 (4) SA 458 (CC) (2008 (2) SACR 1): applied.

Unreported cases

Abid Ali and Others v Minister of Home Affairs and Others (TPD case No 36405/2006, Mabuse AJ): approved

Khan v Minister of Home Affairs [2007] JOL 18958 (T): overruled

Muhammed v Minister of Home Affairs and Others [2007] JOL 18935 (T): overruled.

Statutes Considered

Statutes

The Immigration Act 13 of 2002, ss 1 sv 'illegal foreigner', 8(1), 8(2) and 34: see *Juta's Statutes of South Africa 2008/9* vol 7 at 4-38 and 4-46.

Case Information

Appeal from a decision in the Transvaal Provincial Division (Ngoepe JP, Pretorius J and Snijman AJ), reported at 2007 (4) SA 294 (T). The facts appear from the judgments of Cachalia JA and Ponnann JA.

2009 (5) SA p57

CACHALIA JA

Z Omar (attorney) for the appellants. ^A

PM Mtshaulana SC (with him *G Bofilatos*) for the respondents.

A Katz (with him *M du Plessis*) for the amicus curiae.

Cur adv vult .

Postea (March 31). ^B

Judgment

Cachalia JA:

[1] This is an appeal from the full court, Pretoria (Ngoepe JP, Pretorius J and Snijman AJ sitting as a court of first instance), in which it dismissed with costs an application to declare unlawful the arrest, detention and ^C subsequent removal from the country of one Khalid Mahmood Rashid (including certain ancillary relief) and granted a counter-application by the respondents declaring the appellants to have been in contempt of court.

Jeebhai v Minister of Home Affairs and Another ¹ The full court refused the appellants leave to appeal against its judgment but this court granted the necessary leave to them. ^D

[2] The first appellant is Mr Ismail Ebrahim Jeebhai who is a businessman from Lenasia. Rashid was arrested in Estcourt at the home of Jeebhai's brother, Mr Mohamed Ali, in circumstances that are described in greater detail below. As Rashid was unable to instruct attorneys or depose to an affidavit, Jeebhai, the first appellant, instituted proceedings ^E on his behalf. Mr Zehir Omar, who is the attorney of record in these proceedings, and his professional assistant, Ms Yasmin Naidoo, were found guilty of

having been in contempt of court by the full court, along with Jeebhai. Jeebhai was cautioned and discharged but Omar and Naidoo were each sentenced to a fine of R2000 or six months' imprisonment suspended for a period of three years on condition that they are not convicted of contempt of court committed during the period of suspension - hence their interest in the present proceedings (as the third and second appellants, respectively). The first respondent is the Minister of Home Affairs and the second respondent a senior immigration officer in the Department of Home Affairs. They are cited in their official capacities.

[3] The events surrounding this appeal span more than three years. I set them out in some detail so that the issues that arose from them are understood in their proper context.

[4] On the evening of 31 October 2005, at about 22:00, a senior immigration officer, Mr Anthony de Freitas, and several members of the South African Police Service, descended on Mohamed Ali Jeebhai's home in Forderville, Estcourt, in the province of KwaZulu-Natal. The police were armed and clad in protective bulletproof vests. The police first gained entry to the house and, having established that it was safe to enter, De Freitas also entered. They found Mohamed Ali and Rashid, a Pakistani national, on the premises. De Freitas asked them for their

2009 (5) SA p58

CACHALIA JA

identification papers. Rashid was not able to produce any permit authorising his stay in the country. De Freitas arrested both as illegal foreigners and accompanied them with the police to the Cullinan Police Station in Pretoria where they were detained. De Freitas played no further role in the events that unfolded.

[5] On 2 November 2005 Mr Joseph Swartland, a chief immigration officer, interviewed Rashid. Rashid, Swartland says, admitted to being an illegal foreigner and also that he had fraudulently obtained documents purporting to authorise his presence in the country. Swartland handed him a 'Notice of Deportation' as contemplated in reg 28(2) of the Immigration Regulations.

The notice states that as the person is an illegal foreigner he is notified that he is to be deported to his country of origin - in this case Pakistan. The cryptic reason given for the deportation was that he is 'illegal'. The notice then states:

'In terms of section 34(1) (a) and (b) of the Act, you have the right to -

- (a) appeal the decision to the Director-General in terms of section 8(4) of the Act within 10 working days from the date of receipt of this notice; and
- (b) at any time request any officer attending to you to have your detention for the purpose of deportation confirmed by a warrant of the court.

NB: Should you choose not to exercise the rights mentioned above, you shall be detained pending your deportation. Should you however choose to exercise the rights mentioned above, you shall remain in custody and may not be deported pending the outcome of the appeal or the confirmation of the warrant of detention by the court.

F

ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF RECEIPT OF NOTIFICATION OF DEPORTATION

I hereby acknowledge receipt of the original notification of deportation in which my rights in terms of section 34(1) (a) and (b) of the Act were explained to me.

After due consideration, I have decided to -

Await my deportation at the first reasonable opportunity, whilst remaining in custody.	Yes	No
Appeal the decision to deport me.	Yes	No

Have my detention confirmed by a warrant of the court.	Yes	No
--	-----	----

I
Signature of Detainee Date

2009 (5) SA p59

CACHALIA JA

Swartland states that after handing this form to Rashid he informed him ^A of his right to appeal against the decision to deport him and to have his detention confirmed by a warrant of the court. Rashid, he says, read the form and placed a tick in the 'yes' column, indicating his wish to be deported at the first reasonable opportunity, whilst remaining in custody. He also signified that he did not wish to appeal the decision or have his ^B detention confirmed by a warrant of the court by placing a cross in the relevant 'no' column. Swartland avers that Rashid signed the document in the space provided for the detainee's signature and said that he consented to being sent back to Pakistan immediately so that he could receive treatment for a skin problem.

[6] On 6 November 2005 Rashid was handed over to five Pakistani ^C law-enforcement officials at Waterkloof Military Air Base in Pretoria from where he was flown to Islamabad Airport in Pakistan and held in custody.

³ His removal from the country was apparently effected secretly - without his relatives or friends having been apprised of what had happened to him. In the meantime Mohamed Ali was transferred to ^D Lindela Repatriation Centre - a facility that the Department of Home Affairs uses to detain illegal immigrants pending their deportation. It appears that he contacted his family from Lindela. The first appellant then instructed his attorneys to commence legal proceedings in the Pretoria High Court both for his and Rashid's release. (They were at this ^E stage unaware of Rashid's removal.) The application was set down for hearing on 15 November 2005.

[7] On that day the application was postponed after the respondents consented to an order for Mohamed Ali's immediate release and to disclose where Rashid was 'upon such information being available' by ^F 6 December 2005. Mohamed Ali was released but the respondents failed to provide any information concerning Rashid. On 25 January 2006 the respondents delivered a notice to the first appellant's attorneys that reads as follows:

'Mr Mahmood Rashid Khalid was deported to Pakistan, in terms of ^G s 34 of the Immigration Act 13 of 2002, on 6 November 2005. As Mr Khalid is outside the Republic, the first and (second) respondents are unable to say what his present whereabouts are.'

[8] On 14 February 2006 the matter again came before Legodi J. The appellants contested whether Rashid had indeed been deported because ^H his family in Pakistan had not heard of his arrival in that country. They also persisted in their claim that the respondents were in contempt of court for not having disclosed his 'whereabouts'. The judge postponed the application indefinitely to allow the respondents to file a further affidavit within ten days dealing with both issues.

[9] The further affidavit filed by Swartland provided no additional ^I information about Rashid's location. It did, however, provide confirmation from the Pakistani Ministry of the Interior that he had indeed

2009 (5) SA p60

CACHALIA JA

^A arrived in that country. So, on 15 March 2006, the appellants filed papers to amend the original notice of motion directing the respondents to disclose details of the Pakistani

officials who dealt with Rashid during his deportation both in South Africa and in Pakistan, the flight information of the aeroplane that transported him to Pakistan and the airport where he was deported from. The amended notice also included a prayer that all South African officials who had dealt with Rashid appear in person to answer questions from the court concerning his disappearance.

[10] The matter was enrolled for hearing before Poswa J on the urgent roll on 10 May 2006. On 15 May 2006, having heard argument on the amended application, Poswa J granted an order in the following terms:

'The respondents must within 10 days of this order:

1. Identify the persons/people with whom arrangements were made at the Pakistani Embassy to have Mr Rashid deported.
2. Identify the person in Pakistan who received Mr Rashid, by making appropriate enquiries.
3. Name the airport where the aeroplane, in which Mr Rashid was transported, landed in this country.
4. Furnish the flight number of the aeroplane in which Mr Rashid was transported at the time of his being flown from this country.'

[11] On 6 June 2006 the respondents furnished the following information:

'No arrangements were made with the Pakistani High Commission in South Africa. Mr Khalid was handed to a Pakistani official by the name of Habib Ullah, by Joseph Swartland, an official of the Department of Home Affairs, at Waterkloof Air Base. Mr Ullah was accompanied by four Pakistani officials whose names appear on Annexure A2. Mr Ullah signed as receiver as is apparent from Annexure A1. The aircraft departed from Waterkloof Air Base on 6 November 2006. The respondent has no knowledge of the airport at which the aircraft landed in Pakistan. The respondent is not in possession of the flight number. However, the registration number of the aircraft appears on Annexure A2. The respondent has no knowledge of the time of landing.'

[12] By 12 June 2006, more than seven months after his arrest, the first appellant had still not been able to establish what had happened to Rashid. So he launched another urgent application in which he sought, among other orders, a declaration that the arrest, detention and 'removal' of Rashid from South Africa were unlawful, inconsistent with the Constitution and constituted an 'enforced disappearance' as envisaged in art 7(2)(i) of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. In their answering affidavit filed in response to the application the respondents applied for the appellants to be committed for contempt of court. (I deal more fully with this issue later in paras [46] - [49].) On 19 June 2006 Legodi J struck the matter from the roll for want of urgency and ordered that the matter be heard by a full court. (This is the application with which we are concerned in this appeal - the 12 June 2006 application.)

[13] A few days afterwards, on 22 June, yet another application was launched - this time in the name of the 'Society for the Protection of Our

2009 (5) SA p61

CACHALIA JA

Constitution'. The notice of motion sought relief similar to that claimed in the application that Legodi J struck from the roll. The matter came before Southwood J who also struck the matter from the roll.

[14] The matter was duly enrolled before the full court, which directed that the various applications be consolidated so as to be heard together. The appellants filed a consolidated record comprising 12 volumes in compliance with the court's directions. The court heard argument on 25 August 2006 and delivered its judgment on 16 February 2007.

[15] It is apparent that, in considering the relief sought by the first appellant, the court below had regard only to the evidence that appeared from the papers in the 12 June

2006 application - not any other evidence that was contained in the various applications that were part of the consolidated record. In this court the appellant filed a consolidated record of all the applications that were consolidated before the full court. On 4 November 2008 the matter was struck from the roll mainly for the reason that the appellants had failed to comply with the rules of this court relating to the record on appeal. During the hearing it emerged that only three of the 12 volumes were relevant for the adjudication of the appeal.

Jeebhai and Others v Minister of Home Affairs and Another [4](#)

[16] The matter was re-enrolled for hearing in this court on 16 February 2009. The application for the appeal to be reinstated, this time with a shortened record, was granted. However, as part of the reinstatement application the first appellant applied for leave to place further documentary evidence, which had been part of the consolidated record but not of the 12 June 2006 application, before this court. (It was contained in the application brought by the Society for the Protection of Our Constitution.) The evidence was required to support the contention that Rashid had been removed from the country because he was being sought for his alleged connection with international terrorism. There were two pieces of evidence that they sought to have admitted for this purpose: first, the statement of the Pakistan High Commission issued on 14 June 2006 which reads:

Mr Khalid Mahmood, a Pakistani national, was arrested by South African Authorities on 31 October 2005. Mr Khalid Mahmood was wanted in Pakistan for his suspected links with terrorism and other anti-State elements. The suspect was handed over to Government of Pakistan officials on 6 November 2005. Presently he is in custody of (the) Government of Pakistan.'

The second item of evidence was a letter apparently written by an Advocate Malik of the Pakistan High Court. (The letter is addressed to Dr Mary Rayner outlining their efforts to secure Rashid's release in the Lahore High Court, Rawalpindi.)

2009 (5) SA p62

CACHALIA JA

[17] The difficulty for the first appellant was that his attorneys did not bring a proper application, supported by a reasonably sufficient explanation for not having included the evidence in its founding affidavit, or outline any special reason for the court to grant this relief.

Erasmus Superior Court Practice [5](#) In the circumstances the evidence could not be admitted and will be disregarded for the purposes of deciding this appeal.

[18] The full court was asked to decide whether:

- The respondents ought first to have invoked the procedure provided for in s 8 of the Act before arresting Rashid;
- the respondents' failure to obtain a warrant for Rashid's deportation rendered the deportation unlawful;
- the respondents purportedly used a deportation procedure to achieve an ulterior and unlawful purpose - the extradition of Rashid as an 'international terrorist' under the guise that they were deporting an illegal foreigner (in other words, the court was asked to decide whether the deportation constituted a 'disguised extradition');
- Rashid's disappearance after his arrest constituted an 'enforced disappearance of persons' as contemplated in art 7(1)(i) of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court - and thus a 'crime against humanity';
- by annexing a document to the first appellant's founding affidavit, apparently in violation of a court order, the appellants were in contempt of court.

[19] The court decided these issues against the appellants, but did not deal with the argument advanced by the amicus concerning the respondents' alleged failure to obtain a deportation warrant.

F [20] Before I deal with each issue I outline what the law requires when disputes regarding deportations arise. Deportation is a unilateral act of the deporting State to remove a foreigner, who has no right or entitlement to be in its territory. Its purpose is achieved when the foreigner leaves the deporting State's territory. The authority of and constraints on G the State to deport people is to be found in the Immigration Act 13 of 2002

6 and the Immigration Regulations made by the Minister under s 7 of the Act.

GG 7 For a deportation to be carried out lawfully, the 'action or procedure' used to facilitate an illegal foreigner's removal from the country must be done in 'terms of the Act'.

8

H [21] A decision to deport someone often carries far-reaching consequences - it concerns that person's livelihood, security, freedom and, sometimes, his or her very survival. This is why immigration laws, often harsh and severe in their operation, contain safeguards to ensure that

2009 (5) SA p63

CACHALIA JA

people who are alleged to fall within their reach are dealt with properly A and in a manner that protects their human rights. Our courts have thus stressed 'the duty which lies on officials entrusted with the administration of the immigration laws of observing strictly and punctiliously the safeguards created by the Act'.

Kazee v Principal Immigration Officer and Another 9

[22] An act of deportation does not necessarily involve the loss of a B deportee's liberty, but it usually does - as in this case, where it is preceded by arrest and detention. And because every deprivation of liberty is presumptively unlawful the respondents bear the onus to adduce sufficient facts to justify their actions.

Minister of Law and Order and Others v Hurley and Another Zealand v Minister of Justice and Constitutional Development and Another 10. This is so also in motion proceedings - as an exception to the general requirement that the applicant must disclose its entire case in the founding affidavit.

Minister van Wet en Orde v Matshoba 11. There C is good reason for this approach, especially in the present case where a person on whose behalf the application was launched is alleged to have disappeared and is himself unable to depose to an affidavit. Moreover, the respondents alone know the true facts concerning the detention and deportation. The appellants have, in their founding affidavit, squarely D placed the lawfulness of Rashid's arrest, detention and deportation in issue - the respondents must therefore prove that they acted lawfully.

Matshoba . 12

[23] It is convenient, at this stage, to outline the scheme of the relevant provisions of the Act (and regulations) that bear on this appeal. The provisions of the Act are ss 1, 8, 32, 34 and 41 and they are interrelated. E Section 1 defines an 'illegal foreigner' as '(a) foreigner who is in the Republic in contravention of this Act'.

Unless an illegal foreigner has the written authorisation of the Director-General to be in the country pending his application for a status he must be deported. (Section 32.) F

[24] Section 41(1) is concerned with the verification of the identity and status of persons suspected of being illegal foreigners.

13 To this end an immigration officer or police officer who reasonably suspects a person to

2009 (5) SA p64

CACHALIA JA

^A be an illegal foreigner may interview that person about his identity and status and hold him in custody briefly for this purpose. If necessary, the person may be detained in terms of s 34(2) for a period not exceeding 48 hours during the verification exercise.

14 In performing this function the officer must gain access to relevant documents; or contact persons ^B who may be of assistance; and access departmental records.

15 The detention contemplated in s 34(2) must be by warrant addressed to the station commissioner or head of a detention facility.

16 Thereafter the suspected illegal foreigner may either be released or, if he is in fact an illegal foreigner, detained further under s 34(1) for the purpose of facilitating the person's deportation.

(a) (b) (c) 17

^C [25] However, the s 41 process may only be used in cases involving persons who are suspected of being illegal foreigners. Where an immigration officer has decided, as a fact, that the person concerned is an illegal foreigner the officer must consider what to do next. He may either arrest the illegal foreigner without a warrant and then detain him in ^D terms of s 34(1) for deportation or, in terms of s 8(1), inform the foreigner concerned in the prescribed manner that he is entitled to make

2009 (5) SA p65

CACHALIA JA

representations to the Minister within three days to review his determination ^A as an illegal foreigner.

^(b) 18 The illegal foreigner may not be deported before the Minister's decision is made.

^(b) 19 It must be emphasised that s 34(1) confers on an officer a discretion whether or not to effect an arrest or detention of an illegal foreigner. There is no obligation to do so. If the officer exercises his discretion to arrest and detain a foreigner and it then ^B transpires that the foreigner concerned is in fact not illegally in the country, the arrest and detention would have been unlawful - as it would have been if the officer had failed to exercise his discretion properly or at all.

Lawyers for Human Rights and Another v Minister of Home Affairs and Another 20

[26] Once an illegal foreigner is arrested and detained in terms of s 34(1) ^C the Act and regulations contain safeguards to protect that person's rights. He must upon arrest or immediately thereafter be notified in writing of the decision to deport him; of his right to appeal the decision and also of his right to request that his detention be confirmed by warrant issued by a court within 48 hours. If the warrant is not issued he ^D must be released immediately.

^{(a) (b) (c) (a)} 21 In addition, and although not mentioned in the Act or regulations, detained illegal foreigners are beneficiaries of rights under s 12(1) and s 35(2) of the Constitution.

Lawyers for Human Rights and Another v Minister of Home Affairs and Another 22 The arrested person's detention must be by means of a warrant issued by an immigration officer authorising the station commissioner or head of the detention facility to detain him.

23 Where the authorities intend to detain ^E an illegal foreigner for longer than 30 days, they must obtain, from a court, a warrant which may on good and reasonable grounds be extended for a period not exceeding 90 days.

(d) 24 The person must be held in compliance with minimum standards protecting his dignity and human rights.

(e) 25 Once detained an illegal foreigner's release may be effected only by written authority of an immigration officer as contemplated in s 34(7) of the Act or if a court so orders.

26

2009 (5) SA p66

CACHALIA JA

^A [27] Section 8 of the Act provides for review and appeal procedures and deals with people who are refused entry into the country and those who are found to be illegal foreigners.

'Review and appeal procedures' (a) (b) (a) (a) (a) (b) (b) 27 In this appeal we are concerned only with the latter category. I have mentioned earlier that the effect of s 8(1)

2009 (5) SA p67

CACHALIA JA

is that once an immigration officer finds that a person is an illegal ^A foreigner, he must inform the foreigner concerned of his right to make representations to the Minister. In terms of s 8(3) any decision other than one contemplated in s 8(1) (a finding by an immigration officer that a person is an illegal foreigner), which adversely and materially affects the rights of any person, must be communicated in writing to the person ^B concerned. In my view, a decision to deport a person falls within the purview of this subsection. A decision of this nature, and the reasons for it, must be communicated in writing to the affected person promptly. The notification must also inform the person that he may, within 10 working days, make representations to the Director-General for a review or appeal of the decision.

28 An aggrieved applicant who has made ^C written representations to the Director-General in terms of s 8(4), may, if still unhappy with the outcome, make further representations to the Minister.

29

[28] It is apparent that s 8 is concerned only with appeals and reviews and s 34(1) with the arrest, detention and deportation of illegal foreigners. ^D The review procedure contemplated in s 8(1) applies only when an illegal foreigner has not been arrested for deportation purposes. A right of review or appeal of any other decision contemplated in s 8(3), including the decision to deport an illegal foreigner, which adversely affects the rights of any person, is clearly applicable to all people, whether or not they are in custody. ^E

[29] I revert to the first issue. The appellants and amicus curiae submitted that the provisions of s 8 of the Act ought to have been invoked before Rashid was arrested.

[30] The source of the contention that s 8 procedures providing for ^F appeal and review must be applied before an arrest is effected under s 34(1) is a trilogy of decisions of the Pretoria High Court. The first was *Arisukwu and Others v Minister of Home Affairs and Another*

30 where De Villiers J held that s 9 of the Aliens Control Act 96 of 1991 must be complied with before an illegal alien may be detained in terms of s 44(1) (a) of that Act. (These provisions are the predecessors of s 8 and ^G s 34 in the current Act.) This was followed by judgments of Southwood J in *Muhammed v Minister of Home Affairs and Others* ;

31 and Bertelsmann J in *Khan v Minister of Home Affairs*.

32 In the latter case the learned judge held that: ^H

'(O)nce an official ha(s) decided that a foreigner was illegally in the country and the foreigner ha(s) been informed of that fact, the foreigner must be informed of his rights in terms of the relevant section. The foreigner is entitled, as a matter of law, not to be detained immediately

2009 (5) SA p68

CACHALIA JA

A after his having been informed of the decision to deport him, but to exercise his rights either to appeal to the Minister or to apply to the Director-General to review or appeal the decision to deport him either in terms of s 8(1) and s 8(2) or s 8(4) without and before being incarcerated.'
[At 18 in fine to 19.]

B [31] A contrary view was adopted by Mabuse AJ in *Abid Ali and Others v Minister of Home Affairs and Others*

33 who held that an illegal foreigner has no right not to be detained in terms of s 34(1) while he is being dealt with under s 8. The full court approved of Mabuse AJ's approach and disagreed with the judgments that preceded it. In *Ulde v Minister of Home Affairs and Another*

34 Sutherland AJ considered himself bound by the full court. His view captures the essence of the difference between the approach in these cases and that of the earlier trilogy:

'Section 8 does not address an arrest. Section 34 does. It is a decision that a person is an illegal immigrant and in turn the decision to deport D that triggers s 8. The notion that a s 8 notice must be given for an arrest to be valid is not warranted.'

Ulde 35

[32] The first appellant's contention that a person may not be arrested or detained in terms of s 34(1) until he has been permitted to exhaust his right of appeal and review is, in my view, not only contrary to the scheme E of the Act but would, if upheld, effectively render s 34(1) nugatory. This may be illustrated by a simple example, which, regrettably, is common- place in this country. A person enters the country illegally and fraudulently obtains documents which appear to authorise his presence here. An immigration officer examines the documents, realises that they are forgeries, and having failed to obtain a satisfactory explanation for them F decides that the person is an illegal foreigner who is liable for deportation. The officer proceeds to arrest and detain him. The submission that s 8 must be invoked before such a person may be arrested and detained for the purposes of deportation, effectively means that the fraudster is entitled not to be arrested and detained until he has exhausted his right G of appeal and review in terms of s 8. If on the other hand a person has been found to be an illegal foreigner and an officer decides not to arrest him, it would rarely be necessary to arrest him after the appeal or review process is finalised. In the event that his appeal or review fails, the foreigner concerned is likely to depart voluntarily, without the need for an arrest and detention.

H [33] But there is a more telling reason why this submission is unsustainable. Section 41(1), as I have mentioned, read with s 34(2), permits the detention of a suspected illegal foreigner for a period not exceeding

2009 (5) SA p69

CACHALIA JA

48 hours while his status is being verified. And s 34(1) permits the arrest A and detention of an illegal foreigner for deportation purposes. The consequence of the submission is that a suspected illegal foreigner can be taken into custody - but not a person who is found in fact to be an illegal foreigner because, as it is submitted, he may not be arrested until he has exhausted his right of appeal or review under s 8. This is an absurdity B that the legislature could not have contemplated.

[34] To recapitulate, a decision that a person is an illegal foreigner triggers his right to

appeal or review that decision. It may also cause an arrest and detention for the purposes of deportation, but need not.

Lawyers for Human Rights and Another v Minister of Home Affairs and Another 36. The decision to arrest and detain an illegal foreigner for the purposes of c deportation is a discretionary one. It does not detract from any of the alleged foreigner's rights under s 8 and is not contingent upon his decision whether or not to exercise them. I conclude that the judgment of the full court on this aspect is, with respect, correct and the trilogy of cases which are relied upon in support of the contrary view, not. D

[35] I turn to the next issue. The first appellant and amicus curiae contended that Rashid's arrest, detention and deportation were unlawful because of the failure of the respondents to comply with the peremptory requirements of the Act. Concerning the arrest, detention and deportation E the respondents were, at the very minimum, required to prove that:

- (i) The arresting officer arrested a person who is an illegal foreigner as defined in s 1;
- (ii) the detention was, as reg 28(1) prescribes, by means of a warrant corresponding to form 28; F
- (iii) the detainee was informed promptly, in writing, at the time or soon thereafter in terms of s 34(1) read with reg 28(2), and on a form corresponding to form 29, what the reason(s) for his intended deportation were; that he may in terms of s 34(1) (a) appeal against the decision to deport him and also, in terms of s 34(1) (b) , request his detention to be confirmed by a warrant of a court (if the warrant G is not issued within 48 hours of such request, he must be released); and
- (iv) the detained illegal foreigner's removal from custody for deportation was effected in terms of s 34(7) read with reg 28(9) through the issue of a warrant, corresponding to form 35, by an immigration H officer addressed to the person in charge of the detention facility. (As proof that the person removed from detention and deported through a port of entry is in fact the person whose name appears in the warrant, the form makes provision for a left and right thumb- print of the deportee to be taken and also the identification of the I port of entry from which the deportation will be carried out. This is to ensure that there is a proper record of the identity of the illegal

2009 (5) SA p70

CACHALIA JA

A foreigner and the place from where he was deported. Its purpose is also to protect the Department from unwarranted allegations.)

37

[36] De Freitas arrested Rashid on 31 October 2005 to, in his words, 'facilitate his deportation under s 34 (and) it was decided to detain him at the Cullinan Police cells, pending further investigation and compliance B with the formalities prescribed in the Act'.

[37] At the time of his arrest Rashid was an illegal foreigner and on that basis, absent any attack on the exercise of the arresting officer's discretion, his arrest was authorised by the section. In respect of the other formalities prescribed by the Act the facts show a lamentable C disregard for them. On the respondents' own showing:

- Rashid was detained without a warrant;
- form 29 was given to him almost two days after his arrest - not promptly as s 34(1) requires; and the respondents provide no explanation for the delay. (It was suggested in argument by counsel for the D respondents that there was in fact no delay as Rashid was being dealt with under s 41(1). De Freitas's affidavit, however, makes clear that Rashid was arrested immediately in terms of s 34(1). He makes no reference to s 41(1));

- no warrant was obtained for his removal from the Cullinan Police Station for the purposes of his deportation; and
- he was not deported from a port of entry that the Minister had designated for this purpose in terms of s 1 of the Act. I should point out that the full court accepted the respondents' denial that Waterkloof Air Base was not a designated port of entry. But it erred in this regard. The respondents were required to prove that the air base was a designated port of entry as contemplated in s 1 of the Act. They failed to do so.

38

[38] In the view I take it is not necessary to deal with what legal consequences, if any, flow from the failure of the respondents to warn Rashid of his rights under s 34(1) (a) and s 34(1) (b) promptly after his arrest or their failure to prove that he was deported through a designated port of entry. For present purposes, the fact that Rashid was detained at the Cullinan Police Station without a warrant and then removed from this facility, also without a warrant, means that both his detention there and his deportation were unlawful.

[39] It is true, as counsel for the respondents contended, that the failure of the respondents to comply with the regulations, at least in respect of Rashid's deportation, was not raised pertinently on the papers. But, it

2009 (5) SA p71

CACHALIA JA

does not follow, as counsel for the respondents sought to contend, that this failure precludes the point being raised before this court as a point of law. As I have mentioned, the respondents bore the onus to prove that the detention and deportation were lawful. And once the first appellant had placed the lawfulness of the detention and deportation in issue, the respondents were required, at the very minimum, to adduce sufficient facts to prove that every procedural requirement, including the issue of the necessary warrants, was complied with.

[40] The first appellant and amicus raised another important challenge to Rashid's deportation. They contended that his deportation to Pakistan was the result of a request to the South African government from the government of Pakistan or some other State, because of his alleged links with international terrorism. His deportation, so it is contended, therefore constituted an unlawful disguised extradition.

International Law - A South African Perspective 39. A variation of this argument is that the deportation was constitutionally offensive because the South African government failed to secure an assurance from Pakistan that Rashid would not be tortured or sentenced to death if put on trial. The challenge failed before the full court on the ground that the respondents were not shown, on the admissible evidence, to have been aware that Rashid was being sought because of his alleged connection with international terrorism at the time of his deportation.

40

[41] Although the circumstances of Rashid's deportation from the country are troubling, the first appellant did not make out a case for a disguised extradition in his founding papers. His case is that Rashid is not an illegal foreigner (I have already found that he was) and that -

(t)he real reason for the unlawful arrest, detention and deportation of Mr Rashid, which was never frankly disclosed . . . was the request by the British Authority/Intelligence following upon their suspicion that Mr Rashid was suspected of having links to International Terrorist Networks'.

[42] Be that as it may, the only evidence to support this allegation directly is the first page of a document emanating from a file of the respondents. The document became a

hotly contested issue after the appellants had annexed it to the founding papers before the full court, apparently in violation of a court order of Poswa J issued on 14 May 2006. The circumstances under which the file containing the document was placed before Poswa J are not explained in the papers before us. The document linked Rashid to international terrorism and appears to be a part of a report on Rashid's arrest which, according to the respondents, formed 'a part of the notes by an employee of the first respondent for the purposes of briefing counsel'.

[43] In summary the document reveals that a member of the South African Police Service Crime Intelligence Unit, Captain Moses, ¹ contacted De Freitas to assist in arresting a suspected illegal foreigner. De

2009 (5) SA p72

CACHALIA JA

^A Freitas referred him to his supervisor, Mr Chembayan. Moses then contacted Chembayan and told him that he required De Freitas's help to track down the Pakistani national 'who was suspected of having links with International Terrorist Networks abroad'. He also told Chembayan that due to the 'sensitive nature of the case' it was being 'handled at ^B Ministerial level'. Chembayan authorised De Freitas's participation in the operation. The following day, on 31 October, Moses collected De Freitas at the Durban Central Police Station from where they proceeded to Estcourt in search of the suspected illegal foreigner. On route Moses indicated that the suspect was 'wanted by the British Authorities for having links with international terrorist networks', but made no mention ^C of the suspect's nationality.

[44] The full court struck out the contents of the founding affidavit upon which this report was based on the grounds that the appellants had published it in violation of Poswa J's court order of 14 May 2006.

^D [45] The document is incomplete, unsigned and its author unknown. *Ex facie* the statement the information it contains constitutes inadmissible hearsay evidence. Moreover, it does not suggest that Rashid was wanted for questioning in Pakistan. In those circumstances there was no basis for the suggestion, in argument, that the deportation was actually a disguised extradition. In my view, the contents of the document are not ^E only unreliable but do not advance the first appellant's case that he now seeks to make.

[46] I turn to deal with the next issue - whether the appellants were properly convicted of contempt of court arising from their use of the controversial document in support of their application. On 15 May 2006 ^F Poswa J prohibited publication of the file's contents (mentioned earlier in connection with the disguised extradition argument) and ordered its return to the Department. The order read:

- '1. That there shall be no publication of the contents of the affidavit for the intended application for intervention as *amicus curiae* and ^G annexures whatsoever.
2. That there shall be no publication of the contents of the file of the Department of Home Affairs.
3. That the file shall be restored to the representative of the respondent.'

[47] The order, which was issued by the registrar, is clear in its terms. ^H Nevertheless, in the present proceedings the appellants annexed the document to the founding affidavit to support the allegation that Rashid was deported because of his alleged involvement with international terrorism. The respondents, in addition to filing an answering affidavit on the merits in the 12 June 2006 application, lodged a counter-application ^I for the appellants to be committed for contempt of court because of their use of the document in apparent disregard of the court order. However, in their answering affidavit filed in

response to the respondents' counter-application, Mr Omar avers that Poswa J stated in court that the prohibition on publication did not prevent him from using the contents of the file in any other proceedings. The respondents do not deny this averment and for present purposes it must be accepted.

2009 (5) SA p73

CACHALIA JA

[48] Mr Omar, however, took a further precaution by instituting ^A proceedings before Poswa J, before the full court heard the matter, for his order to be corrected so as to confirm the appellants' understanding of it. Having heard the party's submissions the judge upheld the appellants' contentions and amended the order on 8 August 2006. The relevant amendment was contained in para 4 of the amended order. It reads as ^B follows:

'4. Orders 1 and 2 above shall not prohibit use of the file of the Department of Home Affairs in the advancement of any other court proceedings. The orders in 1 and 2 above shall endure until judgment by this court in these proceedings.'

[49] The full court took the view that the amended order had no bearing ^C on the original prohibition against the usage of the contents of the file before any other court.

⁴¹ But it seems that this is precisely what Poswa J intended. The appellants' use of the document before the full court, therefore, did not violate his order. It follows that the appellants were incorrectly convicted of contempt of court. ^D

[50] The last issue to be decided is whether the manner of Rashid's removal from South Africa constituted a 'crime against humanity' under art 7(1)(i) of Part 2 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court because it was an 'enforced disappearance'. The Rome Statute sets a threshold for a crime to be elevated to the level of a 'crime against ^E humanity'. The criminal act must be committed with specific intent and be 'part of a widespread or systematic attack directed at a civilian population'.

International Law - A South African Perspective ⁴² Article (2)(i) defines 'enforced disappearance of persons' as -

'the arrest, detention, abduction, of persons by, or with the authorisation, ^F support, or acquiescence of, a State or political organization, followed by a refusal to acknowledge that deprivation of freedom or to give information on the fate or whereabouts of those persons, with the intention of removing them from the protection of the law for a prolonged period of time'.

For present purposes, even if I were to accept that the circumstances of ^G Rashid's removal from South Africa do fall within this definition (which I do not because the definition refers to 'persons', not a person), there can be no suggestion that removing a single person from a country meets the threshold level for a 'crime against humanity'. This contention must fail.

[51] I turn to the question of costs. In the reinstatement application, ^H Mr Omar contended that the order of this court on 27 November 2008, that he pay the wasted costs *de bonis propriis* relating to the record on appeal which had been struck from the roll, be reconsidered because it was interlocutory in nature. The submission is without merit. An order striking a matter from the roll with costs is final in effect and cannot be ^I reconsidered.

2009 (5) SA p74

CACHALIA JA

^A [52] The amicus contended that the respondents ought to pay their costs for having unreasonably opposed their application to be admitted as amicus curiae in this court. In this matter the submissions of the amicus were of considerable assistance to the court. There were no proper grounds for opposing its application and I agree that it is appropriate that ^B the respondents pay such costs.

[53] To conclude, Rashid's arrest was lawful but his detention and deportation were not because they were carried out without compliance with the peremptory procedures prescribed by the Act. We were informed from the bar that Rashid was released from the custody of the c Pakistani authorities in December 2007. The appellants have accordingly abandoned the relief sought for an order declaring that the government conduct an investigation while Rashid's fate was not clarified. The appellants have, in the main, been successful in this appeal and it follows that they are entitled to their costs.

[54] I must express our gratitude to the amicus curiae for its assistance d to us.

[55] The following order is made:

1. The appeal is upheld with costs.
2. The convictions and sentences of the appellants for contempt of e court are set aside.
3. The respondents are to pay the costs occasioned by their opposition to the application for the admission of the amicus curiae.
4. The order of the court below is set aside and in its place the following is substituted:
 - (a) The detention of Khalid Mahmood Rashid at Cullinan f Police Station and his subsequent removal and deportation are declared to have been unlawful.
 - (b) The respondents are to pay the costs of the application.
 - (c) The counter-application is dismissed with costs.

Mpati P concurred in the judgment of Cachalia JA.

Judgment

g Ponnann JA:

[56] I have read the judgment of my colleague Cachalia. I take a far narrower approach to the matter. Although there had been a proliferation of applications and counter-applications involving essentially the h same issues, the matter ultimately came to be decided, at the direction of the learned Judge President, by a specially constituted court consisting of three judges (Ngoepe JP, Pretorius J and Snijmann AJ), on the basis of just one of the many applications that served before them. It is noteworthy that the founding and answering affidavits in the matter comprise a single volume of less than 120 pages. That matter serves i before us on appeal on the basis of leave having been granted by this court. We are thus constrained by that record, which I may add, does not contain a replying affidavit.

[57] A useful starting point is the allegations made in the affidavits filed of record in the matter. To my mind, the crux of the first appellant's case j is to be found in para 24 of the founding affidavit, which reads:

2009 (5) SA p75

CACHALIA JA

'Noteworthy is that Mr De Freitas, who at all material times worked in A the course and scope of his employment with the first respondent immediately arrested, detained and later deported Mr Rashid following upon the said Mr De Freitas having declared Mr Rashid an illegal foreigner. Mr Rashid was not afforded the rights contemplated in s 8(1) and (2) of Act 13 of 2002, more specifically to appeal/make representations challenging the decision to *declare* him (Mr Rashid) an B illegal foreigner. The adverse consequence of being declared an illegal foreigner is that an illegal foreigner may be arrested, detained and deported. I respectfully say that the legislature intended that the procedure in s 8(1) and (2) of Act 13 of 2002 *must* be followed *before* arrest and detention in terms of s 34 of Act 13 of 2002. The arrest and detention of Mr Rashid on 31 October 2005 is/was therefore unlawful. ' c

.....
The response it elicited was:

'In the light of the facts before court, the affidavits of De Freitas and Swartland I do not understand on what basis the deponent makes the allegations in this paragraph. He has no personal knowledge of what D happened to Khalid after his arrest. The rest of the contents of this paragraph are argumentative, speculative and incapable of traverse. Questions of interpretation of the Act will be dealt with at the hearing of this matter.'

[58] Earlier in the answering affidavit filed on behalf of the respondents, the following appears: E

'Khalid's arrest and detention were effected pursuant to information that the Department had received that he was an illegal foreigner, residing in Estcourt. On 31 October 2005, Anthony de Freitas, who is employed by the Department as a Senior Immigration Officer at its offices in Durban, arrested Khalid in the following circumstances. He F went to Khalid's place of residence, namely 12 Canna Avenue, Fordville, Estcourt. As is often the practice when Department officials effect arrests under their statutory powers, De Freitas was accompanied by a number [of] policemen. On this occasion the policemen were under the command of Inspector Arumugan Munsamy. They were armed and clad in bullet proof vests, which is the practice employed in G such operations. After they had pronounced the premises safe to enter, De Freitas went in. There he found Khalid and Mohamed Ali Ebrahim Moosa Jeebhai (Jeebhai), the deponent to the founding affidavit.

.....
When De Freitas entered the premises in which Jeebhai and Khalid H were to be found, he asked for their identification and travel documents. Khalid said he did not have any identification papers. He said his passport was in Johannesburg. But he produced a copy of the passport. However, no permit of any nature appeared on the page where his personal particulars were reflected. It was clear to De Freitas that Khalid was an illegal foreigner, as contemplated in the Act. As I such, he was subject to arrest and deportation.

De Freitas informed Khalid that he was being placed under arrest. The purpose of his arrest was to facilitate his deportation under s 34 of the Act. In order to facilitate his deportation, it was decided to detain him at the Cullinan Police cells, pending further investigations and compliance with the formalities prescribed in the Act. Khalid was then J

2009 (5) SA p76

CACHALIA JA

A transported to the Cullinan Police cells. De Freitas accompanied the police who were responsible for such transportation. After Khalid was placed in the police cells at Cullinan, De Freitas returned to Durban. While at the Cullinan Police cells, Khalid was in the custody of the police members there. I annex hereto as JS1 a confirmatory affidavit of De Freitas.

B Swartland, an employee of first respondent, conducted an investigation into the residence status in South Africa of Khalid. In his capacity as the Department's Tshwane Chief Immigration Officer, he has access to all [the] Department's records on foreign nationals in South Africa.

He interviewed Khalid at the Cullinan Police Station on 2 November c 2005. Khalid admitted to Swartland that he had entered the country illegally. He then advised him that, because he was in the country illegally, he was liable to be deported. As he is required to do under the Act, he gave Khalid written notification of his decision to deport him to his country of origin, namely Pakistan. He further informed Khalid of his right to appeal against that decision and to have his detention confirmed by a warrant of the court. These averments are D confirmed by the written notification that he then handed to Khalid, on 2 November 2005. A copy of that notification is annexed hereto marked JS2.

.....
I may mention that Khalid's decision in respect of the three matters

1E are entirely consistent with the following. In response to Swartland's enquiries as to how he had entered the Republic and secured a work permit, Khalid told Swartland the following: That he had entered the country without a visa, and had paid an agent \$600 "to get me through the immigration". He had thereafter paid R7000 to the agent for "a fake work permit". Khalid later confirmed the foregoing in an F affidavit. A copy of the affidavit is annexed hereto, marked JS3.'

[59] Significantly, those allegations are not disputed by or on behalf of the appellants. Nor, given the nature of the allegations, could they be. Absent a referral to oral evidence, and there was none here, it follows that the matter falls to be determined on the version of the respondent. G On that version they were dealing with a self-confessed illegal foreigner in Mr Khalid Rashid, who had by virtue of that fact rendered himself liable to arrest in terms of s 34(1) of the Act for the purposes of deportation. I pause to record that, in my view as well, the cases, in which it was held that the procedure outlined in s 8(1) and (2) must H be followed before a person may be arrested in terms of s 34, were wrongly decided. If a person is an illegal foreigner he may be arrested in terms of s 34. An illegal foreigner is, in terms of s 1, by definition a foreigner who is in the Republic in contravention of the Act and not a person who is confirmed to be an

illegal foreigner by the Minister upon review in terms of s 8(2). Mr Khalid Rashid by his own admission fell within this definition of 'illegal foreigner'. Moreover, and also on his own version, he

2009 (5) SA p77

CACHALIA JA

had perpetrated a fraud in order to facilitate his entry into and sojourn in the Republic. In those circumstances, like Cachalia JA, I too am of the view that his arrest was authorised by the Act.

[60] The same does not hold true for Mr Rashid's detention at the Cullinan Police Station and his subsequent deportation. The receipt and subsequent retention of an individual in custody is an exercise of public power. Any such exercise is constrained by the principle of legality.

Minister of Justice and Constitutional Development and Another v Zealand Zealand v Minister of Justice and Constitutional Development and Another 2 It may thus only occur in terms of lawful authority.

[61] Regulation 28(1) of the Immigration Regulations provides:

'The detention and deportation of an illegal foreigner contemplated in section 34(1) of the Act shall be by means of a warrant issued by an immigration officer, which warrant shall substantially correspond to form 28 contained in Annexure A.'

Form 28 is headed 'Warrant of Detention of Illegal Foreigner', and must be addressed to the relevant 'Station Commissioner/Head of Prison or Detention Facility'. It reads:

'As . . . (first name(s) and surname of illegal foreigner) has made *himself/herself liable to *deportation/removal from the Republic and for detention pending such *deportation/removal in terms of section *34(1)/34(5)/34(8) of the Act, you are hereby ordered to detain him or her until such time as *he/she is *deported/removed from the Republic.'

There then follows designated spaces on the form for the 'Signature of [the relevant] immigration officer', 'Date' and 'Official stamp'.

[62] Regulation 28(9) (a) provides that the warrants contemplated in s 34(7) of the Act shall 'in respect of the removal of an illegal foreigner, be in a form substantially corresponding to form 35'. Form 35 reads:

'Department of Home Affairs

Republic of South Africa

Warrant for removal of detained illegal foreigner

[Section 7(1)(g) read with section 34(7); Regulation 28(9)(a)]

To: **Person in charge of prison or detention facility**

As . . . (first name(s) and surname), whose fingerprints appear on the reverse side of this form, has made *himself/herself liable to removal from the Republic, you are hereby requested to deliver *him/her into my custody.

Removal from the Republic shall be affected via . . . (port of entry) and the responsible immigration officer or police officer at that port of entry shall, before the removal of the detainee, impress the left and right

2009 (5) SA p78

PONNAN JA

A thumb prints of the detainee in the space provided hereunder and certify that the prints were taken by him or her.

.....
Signature of immigration officer Date

B Appointment No.:
Place:
Reference No.:

Certificate by Immigration Officer

I hereby confirm that the abovementioned person was removed from c the republic on (date) to (country) via (port of entry).

I also confirm that *his/her left and right thumb prints were taken by me.

D



E

Left thumb print Right thumb print

Immigration officer:

F Appointment number:

Date:

Port of entry:

Departure Stamp

G



H

[63] Given that the deprivation of Mr Rashid's liberty was prima facie unlawful, it was for the respondents to justify such deprivation.

Zealand 4. In this instance one would have thought that as a bare minimum the respondents I would have sought to show compliance with reg 28. It would to my mind have been a relatively simple matter to have adduced duly completed forms 28 and 35 as proof of compliance with reg 28. That the respondents failed to do. After all, it seems to me that the reg 28

2009 (5) SA p79

PONNAN JA

safeguards exist, not just for the benefit of the illegal foreigner, but A also to protect the respondents against unjustified and unwarranted claims flowing from detention or deportation, or both. Accordingly, on the view that I take of the matter, from the time that Mr Rashid was handed over by De Freitas to the officials at the Cullinan Police cells until he came to leave the Republic, the conduct of the State officials in whose charge he found himself, was unlawful. It follows that Mr Rashid's B detention and subsequent deportation were unlawful.

[64] That, ordinarily at any rate, ought to be the end of the matter certainly insofar as the main issue is concerned. There remains the contention - which was not pressed with any vigour before us - that Mr Rashid's deportation constituted a disguised extradition. Although C I am by no means persuaded that this is still a live issue in the current appeal, it may nonetheless be prudent for me to deal with it, albeit briefly. Once again the starting point has to be the founding affidavit. In this regard, the closest that the founding affidavit comes to advancing that rather speculative hypothesis is as follows: D

'The real reason for the unlawful arrest, detention and deportation of Mr Rashid, which was never frankly disclosed to this Honourable Court was the *request* by the British Authority/Intelligence following upon their *suspicion* that Mr Rashid was suspected of having *links* to International Terrorist Networks. Ironically, the former British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher labelled our former president Madiba (Nelson Mandela) a terrorist. Madiba was conferred the status of 'Icon' approximately three years ago. British Authority and particularly the British Prime Minister were clearly wrong in labelling Madiba a terrorist, particularly because not too long ago the same Madiba was awarded an International Nobel Peace Prize. Mr Rashid was not linked to any International Terrorist Network nor was Mr Rashid suspected of having committed a crime anywhere in the world including South Africa.'

The response, unsurprisingly, was:

'I deny that the real reason for the arrest of Khalid was not disclosed. G Khalid was an illegal foreigner who had entered the country through illegal means including fraud and corruption in that he paid money to buy both a visa and a permit. The Act referred to above empowers first respondent to arrest, detain and deport an illegal foreigner. That is the basis on which Khalid was deported from South Africa. The rest of the contents of this paragraph are polemic, vague, irrelevant and incapable of traverse.' H

[65] Without more and given the nature of the factual dispute, had those juxtaposed paragraphs stood in isolation, the issue of the alleged disguised extradition would have been resolved against the first appellant. But, in the paragraph of the founding affidavit immediately preceding that under consideration, the following appears: I

"MV9"

5 hereto is the first page of a report supplied to the first respondent about the "arrest" of Mr Rashid by the SAPS Crime

2009 (5) SA p80

PONNAN JA

A Intelligence Unit Durban. Noteworthy is the concluding paragraph on "MV9" more specifically:

"That the suspected illegal foreigner to be arrested in Estcourt (referring to Mr Rashid) was wanted by the British Authority for having links to International Terrorist Networks abroad. . . .'

B The response it elicited was:

'The report referred to in this paragraph is also part of the notes by an employee of first respondent drawn for the purposes of briefing counsel. The notes are privileged and inadmissible and should have never been used or annexed to this application. The use of all these C documents in contempt of a court order shows how desperate deponent is to buy publicity.'

It is thus necessary to subject MV9 to greater scrutiny to ascertain whether it materially advances the first appellant's case in this regard.

[66] For the reasons that follow, I am of the view that no evidential D weight can be attached to MV9. First, on the first appellant's own showing, it is only the first page of a report. Second, the statement is unsworn and unsigned and there is, moreover, no evidence as to the identity of its author. Third, *ex facie* the statement, the information it contains constitutes inadmissible hearsay evidence. Fourth, even if it be E shown to have been made by an official in another arm of State, MV9 could hardly be binding on the first respondent, absent an admission by her of the truth of its contents. Fifth, if agents of the South African State were acting at the behest of the British authorities in securing Mr Rashid's arrest - as the document asserts - it is incomprehensible, and indeed F would appear to be inconceivable, that they would have simply handed him over to the Pakistani authorities. I thus remain unpersuaded that such evidence as there is (namely the reliance on MV9) - which to my mind is neither reliable nor credible and stands to be disregarded in its entirety - supports the inference sought to be advanced by the first appellant.

G [67] I agree with Cachalia JA that the contempt of court conviction cannot stand and that the respondents' counter-application in that regard should accordingly have been dismissed with costs by the court below. I likewise agree with his approach to costs. In the result, I agree with the order proposed by my learned colleague.

h Streicher JA and Hurt AJA concurred in the judgment of Ponnar JA.

Appellants' Attorneys: *Zehir Omar* , Springs; *Goodrick & Franklin* , Bloemfontein.

Respondents' Attorneys: *State Attorney* , Pretoria and Bloemfontein.

ı Attorneys for the Amicus Curiae: *Wits Law Clinic* , Johannesburg; *Matsepes Inc* , Bloemfontein

© 2005 Juta and Company, Ltd.