

HIGHVELD SYNDICATION NO 15 LIMITED: REGISTRATION NUMBER (2003/031064/06)
HIGHVELD SYNDICATION NO. 16 LIMITED REGISTRATION NUMBER: (2003/031129/06)
HIGHVELD SYNDICATION NO. 17 LIMITED, REGISTRATION NUMBER: (2003/025913/06)
HIGHVELD SYNDICATION NO. 18 LIMITED, REGISTRATION NUMBER: (2003/030778/06)
HIGHVELD SYNDICATION NO. 19 LIMITED, REGISTRATION NUMBER: (2003/030144/06)
HIGHVELD SYNDICATION NO. 20 LIMITED, REGISTRATION NUMBER: (2005/029425/06)
HIGHVELD SYNDICATION NO. 21 LIMITED, REGISTRATION NUMBER: (2005/027601/06)
HIGHVELD SYNDICATION NO. 22 LIMITED, REGISTRATION NUMBER: (2005/027390/06)

(“the companies”)

BUSINESS RESCUE STATUS REPORT IN TERMS OF SECTIONS 132 OF THE COMPANIES ACT, 71 OF 2008 (“THE ACT”) READ WITH REGULATION 125 OF THE ACT FILED BY THE BUSINESS RESCUE PRACTITIONER JF KLOPPER AND A NOTICE IN TERMS OF SECTIONS 145 AND 146 OF THE ACT.

1. The companies were placed under business rescue in September 2011 and Johannes Frederick Klopper was appointed as Business Rescue Practitioner (“BRP”) of the companies at the time.
2. A Business Rescue Plan (“the Plan”) in respect of the companies was published on 30 November 2011 and adopted by affected persons (“HS Investors”) on 14 December 2011.
3. The BRP’s March 2022 status report contained a summary of events in this matter.
4. Reference was made in the BRP’s previous status report of 31 May that that the applicants in the Smith application/the DECA Case, launched an application for Orthotouch and the HS Companies to “fund” their litigation despite the fact that they have over the years boasted that they had thousands of contributing members.
5. The applicants in the Smith application/ The DECA case filed their replying affidavit in the “funding application” on 4 August 2022.
6. On 15 August 2022 the applicants’ attorney addressed a letter to the case manager in this case without informing any of the other parties requesting that the setting aside application be transferred from the Johannesburg High Court to Pretoria.
7. During September the applicants filed proposed amendments to the notice of motion to their funding application and an application for condonation of their late filing of their replying and confirmatory affidavits. Various objections have been filed by certain of the respondents against the notice to amend the notice of motion to the funding application.

8. What is however clear is the applicants are doing their utmost to delay the hearing of the Smith Application/DECA case and their attempt to seek funding by virtue of the funding application indicates that they are out of funds and unable to fund the hearing of the matter.



JF KLOPPER

BUSINESS RESCUE PRACTITIONER

Date: 30 September 2022