

**WILLEM SCHOON**

**Ninth Respondent**

---

**SUPPORTING AFFIDAVIT**

---


I, the undersigned


**VUSUMZI PATRICK PIKOLI**

state under oath as follows:

**INTRODUCTION**

1. I am an advocate of the High Court of South Africa and a former National Director of Public Prosecutions.
2. Save where appears from the context, the facts contained in this affidavit are within my own personal knowledge and are to the best of my knowledge and belief both true and correct.
3. I depose to this affidavit at the request of the applicant's legal representatives and in order to ensure that all the relevant facts are placed before this Court.

V.P. 

TP 

**PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE**

4. Prior to 1990 I was a member of Umkhonto weSizwe and I worked for the ANC's legal and constitutional affairs department in exile.
5. Between 1991 and 1994 I worked as a legal adviser with the Munich Reinsurance Company of Africa Limited Group. From 1994 until 1997 I was the Special Advisor to the then Minister of Justice, Mr. Abdullah Omar. My specific mandate was to help restructure the Department of Justice. At the time, there were eleven departments countrywide and I was tasked with amalgamating those departments into one central department.
6. From 1997 to 1999, I served as Deputy-Director General of the Department of Justice. In 1999, I was appointed Director General of the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development and worked in that role until 2005.
7. On 1 February 2005, I was appointed the National Director of Public Prosecutions ("NDPP") by the President in terms of Section 10 of the National Prosecuting Authority Act 32 of 1998 ("NPA Act") as read with Section 179 of the Constitution. My appointment was for a 10 year term as contemplated in Section 12(1) of the NPA Act.
8. As a result of my decision to authorize the prosecution of a former commissioner of police on corruption charges I was suspended from duty

TP (1)

v.f.

K



Commission, which investigated allegations of police inefficiency in Khayelitsha as well as allegations of a breakdown in relations between the community of Khayelitsha and the Police. In December 2014 I was appointed as the Western Cape's first police ombudsman.

12. I am a former trustee of the Constitutional Court Trust, a former member of the Magistrate's Commission and a founding member of the International Association of Anti-Corruption Authorities. I am currently an independent director on the board of Cricket South Africa, where I chair the social and ethics committee. Amongst my awards, I was conferred the International Association of Prosecutors Award in 2008.

#### CONFIRMATION

13. I confirm the contents of the founding affidavit of Thembisile Phumelele Nkadimeng ("the applicant") and the supporting affidavit of Anton Ackermann SC ("Ackermann"), insofar as they relate to me.
14. In particular, I confirm the contents of the applicant's affidavit under the heading "Political constraints". I confirm that there was political interference that effectively barred or delayed the investigation and possible prosecution of the cases recommended for prosecution by the TRC, including the kidnapping, assault and murder of Nokuthula Aurelia Simelane, ("Nokuthula") in the case: Priority Investigation: JV Plein: 1469/02/1996

TP (1)

v.p. h

("the TRC cases").

15. In this affidavit I set out evidence that reflects such political interference. I also set out the serious impact that such interference had on the pursuit of the TRC cases by the National Prosecuting Authority (NPA).

#### THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE NPA

16. The Office of the NDPP was created on 1 August 1998 in terms of section 179 (1) of the Constitution. The NDPP is the head of the NPA, and manages the directors of public prosecutions, investigating directors, special directors, and other members of the prosecuting authority either appointed or assigned. During my tenure I was duty bound to carry out the responsibilities set out in the NPA Act as well as the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa.
17. As NDPP I strongly believed in the independence of the NPA. I maintained that prosecutors were required to conduct themselves independently, objectively and professionally in making decisions whether to prosecute or not. This view is underscored by section 179(4) of the Constitution and section 32 of the National Prosecuting Authority Act 32 of 1998 ("the NPA Act") which both impose a duty on prosecutors to act "*without fear, favour or prejudice*". These provisions provide both a constitutional and statutory guarantee of independence to the NPA.

TP ①

V.R. h

**THE TRC CASES**

18. In April 2003 President Mbeki received the final TRC report. The President announced in Parliament that the prosecution of persons who did not take part in the TRC process was to be left in the hands of the NPA as part of the *"normal legal processes"*. He also said that those perpetrators who were prepared to unearth the truth would be welcome to enter into agreements that are standard in the normal execution of justice and the prosecuting mandate, and are accommodated in existing legislation. Former President Mbeki's statement to the national houses of Parliament dated 15 April 2003 is annexed hereto marked "VPP1". Regrettably what was to follow in relation to the TRC cases was anything but the *"normal legal processes."*
19. In my former capacity as Director General ("DG") of the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development ("DoJ") I had previously been involved in the formulation of a policy to deal with the TRC cases, which were regarded as politically sensitive. On 23 February 2004, I had chaired a Director-General's Forum which appointed a Task Team to report on a mechanism to give effect to the President's objectives.

TP (1)

v.p.

K

20. It is important to note that the recommendation of the Task Team of a two stage process which would have required a recommendation from an inter-departmental task team before the NDPP could institute any criminal proceedings in the political cases was rejected. This was because such a process would have been a violation of prosecutorial independence enshrined in Section 179 of the Constitution.
21. Some of these developments have been highlighted in the extracts from my affidavit filed before the Ginwala Commission in May 2008, which have been annexed to the founding affidavit. For the sake of completeness I highlight some of these facts in this affidavit.
22. In relation to the steps taken by the NPA with regard to the TRC cases prior to my appointment as NDPP on 1 February 2005 I refer to the affidavit of Anton Ackermann SC filed evenly herewith. On my appointment as NDPP, the Priority Crimes Litigation Unit (PCLU), a sub-unit within the NPA, had already been tasked with handling the TRC cases. The PCLU was headed by Special Director Advocate Anton Ackermann.
23. The decision to prosecute those implicated in the attempted murder, through poisoning, of former church leader and head of the South African Council of Churches, the Reverend Frank Chikane, on 23 April 1989 at the then Jan Smuts Airport, Kempton Park ("the Chikane matter), saw the

TP 1

v. d.

unravelling of the attempts by the NPA to hold apartheid-era perpetrators accountable for their crimes.

24. The initial decision to prosecute three Security Branch members, former Colonel C L Smith, and former Captains G J L H Otto and H J Van Staden, was taken prior to my appointment as NDPP. This decision was taken in November 2004 by Dr. Silas Ramalhe SC in his capacity as Acting National Director of Public Prosecutions. However, he instructed that this matter, and all other TRC cases, be held over pending the development of the guidelines to deal with the TRC cases that were to be incorporated into the Prosecution Policy.

Developments since 2005

25. Following the approval by the Minister of Justice, and after consultation with the Directors of Public Prosecutions as required by the NPA Act, the amendments to the Prosecution Policy were tabled in Parliament and became effective on 1 December 2005. The amendments to the Prosecution Policy were titled: **"PROSECUTING POLICY AND DIRECTIVES RELATING TO THE PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES EMANATING FROM CONFLICTS OF THE PAST AND WHICH WERE COMMITTED ON OR BEFORE 11 MAY 1994"** ("the Prosecution Policy Guidelines" or "the Guidelines"). A copy of the said amendments is annexed to the founding affidavit marked "TN30".

TP

v.r.

h

26. In terms of paragraph B6 of the amended Prosecution Policy it was stipulated that that the PCLU should be assisted in the execution of its duties by a senior designated official from the following State departments or other components of the NPA:

- 26.1. The National Intelligence Agency ("NIA");
- 26.2. The Detective Division of the South African Police Service ("SAPS");
- 26.3. The Department of Justice and Constitutional Development; and
- 26.4. The Directorate of Special Operations ("DSO").

27. When the Prosecution Policy became effective in December 2005 I reviewed the available evidence implicating the three suspects in the Chikane matter, which, in my opinion, was clearly sufficient to justify a prosecution. None had applied for amnesty for this offence. I therefore gave the initial instruction to proceed with the prosecution in February 2006.

28. In response to the said notification the three suspects made representations to me in terms of the Guidelines in support of their contention that they should not be subject to prosecution. These representations were reviewed by a team within the NPA under the

v.r.

TP ①

↑

leadership of Advocate T. Pretorius who reported to me that the representations did not comply with the requirements set out in the Guidelines, insofar as the suspects declined to disclose the full truth. After reviewing the report and the underlying documentation I wrote to the legal representative of the suspects in July 2006 informing him of my intention not to accede to the representations and to pursue the prosecution.

29. Meanwhile in early 2006 I had approached the then Commissioner of Police, the DG of Justice, and the heads of the NIA and the DSO (also known as 'the Scorpions') requesting them to nominate senior officials to assist the PCLU in accordance with the Prosecution Policy guidelines. Unfortunately the SAPS and the NIA never provided the PCLU with the necessary support to conduct its investigations adequately.
30. In early 2006, then Commissioner of Police, Mr. J Selebi, objected to Advocate Ackermann's participation claiming that Ackermann intended to prosecute the leadership of the ANC. This is notwithstanding the formal denial by the NPA that no such plans were in place. I advised Mr. Selebi that Ackermann was appointed as the head of the PCLU under Presidential proclamation and it was not for the SAPS to determine who should discharge the mandate given to the PCLU.
31. I then approached the Presidency in order to secure the necessary

TP ①

v.e

h

collaboration of the parties to apply the Prosecution Policy Guidelines. A meeting was arranged in mid-2006 by Reverend Frank Chikane, the then Director General in the Presidency. The meeting was attended by himself, the DGs of Justice and the NIA, Mr. Selebi, the Secretary of the Defence Secretariat, Mr. Jafta from the Presidency and I. Mr. Selebi again complained about Advocate Ackermann's involvement in the process.

32. Later in 2006 I was summoned to a meeting which was convened at the home of Minister Skweyiya, the then Minister of Social Development. The meeting was attended by the Ministers of Safety and Security and Defence, Minister Thoko Didiza (Acting Minister of Justice and Constitutional Development representing Minister Mabandla who was indisposed) and Mr. Jafta. The meeting was called by Acting Minister Didiza and I was advised that it related to the prosecution in the Chikane matter.
33. At this meeting it became clear that there was a fear that cases like the Chikane matter could open the door to prosecutions of ANC members. I quote hereunder from my affidavit filed before the Ginwala Commission as to what transpired at this meeting:

*"The Minister of Safety and Security was concerned about the decision to proceed with the prosecution and with Advocate Ackermann's involvement in the process and the issue of whether it was Advocate Ackermann or me who was behind the decision to*

TP 9

v.p.

h

*prosecute.*

*The Minister of Social Development was concerned about the impact of the decision to prosecute on the ranks of ANC cadres who were worried that a decision to prosecute in the Chikane matter would then give rise to a call for prosecution of the ANC cadres themselves arising out of their activities pre-1994.*

*The Minister of Defence had concerns about where the decision to prosecute rested – did it rest with me or did it rest with Advocate Ackermann.*

*I explained to the Ministers that the decision to proceed with the prosecution rested with me as did all other decisions in regard to post-TRC prosecutions being considered by the PCLU. I assured them that no prosecution would be undertaken without my specific direction and reiterated my concern about the delay in the process particularly in view of the requirement that I report to parliament on these matters.*

*...The Minister of Defence appeared satisfied with my explanation that I would exercise the decision as to whether there was a prosecution or not. The Minister of Safety and Security appeared to continue to be worried about the involvement of Advocate Ackermann. I have no recollection of a particular position adopted by the Acting Minister of Justice."*

34. Also in 2006 a further meeting took place at the office of the Presidency. My recollection of this meeting is that it was decided that the working committee or Task Team would not make recommendations on a decision

TP (1)

v.f.

h

as to whether to prosecute or not, but would be responsible for ensuring that I received all the necessary inputs and information from the various departments so as to assist me to make a well-considered decision.

35. At this meeting I proposed that Dr Silas Ramalte, the Deputy National Director of Prosecutions, should chair the Task Team. I suggested this in order to counter the complaints in regard to Advocate Ackermann and to get the Task Team working. The proposal was accepted.
36. Subsequent to this meeting there was a further meeting of Ministers in the security cluster at the office of the Minister of Safety and Security. This was attended by the Minister for Safety and Security, the Minister of Social Development, Acting Minister Didiza, Mr. Selebi, various DGs and Mr. Jafta. The proposal for the establishment of a working group was put to the Ministers and accepted.
37. After this meeting, in early October 2006 I again sent letters to the various Directors General, Mr. Selebi and the DSO inviting them each to nominate a senior official to perform the functions set out in paragraph B6 of the Guidelines.
38. The Task Team met for the first time on 12 October 2006. I attended the opening session of the first meeting together with Ms. Kalyani Pillay (my

TP 7

V.P.  
h

adviser), the Directors General of the NIA and Justice and Mr. Jafta from the Presidency. Aside from this meeting, I did not participate further in the activities of the Task Team. I received reports from time to time on their activities. These reports led me to believe that the committee was functioning and securing the requisite co-operation from the other agencies which had previously been missing.

39. Meanwhile I had received further representations from the suspects in the Chikane matter contending that they had received indemnity in respect of the threatened prosecution in terms of the original Indemnity Act of 1990. I sought an independent opinion from senior counsel concerning the validity of this claim of indemnity. The opinion was received in November 2006 and concluded that the claimed indemnities were no bar to prosecution and that the said law had been repealed in 1995.

40. Dr Silas Ramaite reported to me that at the Task Team meeting on 25 October 2006 had received an audit report from Advocate Ackermann on all cases in the possession of the PCLU. Dr. Ramaite reported to me further that the Chikane matter was discussed by Task Team for the first time at its meeting on 6 November 2006. Mr. J Lekalakala of the SAPS stated that the National Commissioner believed that Rev. Chikane was not interested in a prosecution. Advocate Ackermann however indicated that Rev. Chikane had left the matter in the hands of the NPA.

TP (S)

v.l.



41. In early December 2006 I was informed by Dr Ramalfe of the renewed contention by Mr. Selebi that Reverend Chikane had not been consulted. Reverend Chikane had in fact been extensively consulted in relation to the proposed prosecution. I personally held discussions with him during the course of interactions during 2006 and 2007. I also met with him separately. Reverend Chikane's advised me that while he may have forgiven his perpetrators, insofar as the application of the laws of the land was concerned, the matter must take its ordinary course. If a decision was made by the prosecuting authorities he would accept that.
42. Although I knew that Ackermann had discussed the matter with Rev. Chikane as far back as 2004, in December 2006 I instructed Advocate Ackermann to once again visit Rev Chikane to confirm his position.
43. However, towards the end of 2006 it became clear to me that powerful elements within government structures were determined to impose their will on my prosecutorial decisions. In this regard I quote from my affidavit filed before the Ginwala Commission:

*"In December 2006 Dr Ramalfe reported to me in regard to the contention raised by Mr. Selebi through Commissioner Jacobs that it was the function of the Task Team that it should make a final recommendation to a body identified as the "Committee of Directors*

TPH

v.p.

h

*General" which would in turn make recommendations to me. In essence the proposal made by Mr. Selebi and subsequently supported by the Directors General of Justice and NIA amounted to a reversion to a two stage process in which my decision on any prosecution would be dependent upon a prior recommendation by an Intervening committee of directors general which would be subject to the same constitutional challenge as had led to the rejection of this proposal in 2004.*

*It became clear to me that there was a material misunderstanding in regard to the role of the Task Team and that unless this was resolved, I would not be able to carry out my functions within the contemplation of the relevant legislation and as envisaged by the Government."*

#### Developments from 2007

44. In early 2007, as a result of the differences in approach that had developed between the NPA and the SAPS, NIA and DoJ I Informed Mr. Selebi and the Directors General that there was a serious misunderstanding. I resolved to approach the Minister of Justice and request her guidance. Pending such response the functioning of the Task Team was compromised by the uncertainty and it held no further meetings until 8 August 2007.
45. Towards the end of January 2007 Advocate Ackermann and Advocate Mthunzi Mhaga (also of the PCLU) reported to me that they had met with

TP

v.f.

~

Reverend Chikane on 22 January 2007 and that he had reaffirmed his attitude, namely that he was not against a prosecution and that the matter should take its ordinary course. In the light of this confirmation I wrote to the legal representatives of Messrs. Otto, Smith and van Staden on 25 January 2007 and informed them that the matter would now proceed and I instructed the PCLU to act accordingly.

46. Around this time, the former Minister of Police, Adriaan Vlok and the former Commissioner of Police, General Johann van der Merwe, had both made representations to me as contemplated in the Guidelines. They both admitted to authorising the murder of Reverend Chikane and requested me not to prosecute them in the light of this disclosure. However, they declined to make full disclosure in response to requests for information. I accordingly declined to accede to their request that they be given immunity from prosecution in terms of the Guidelines.

47. On 6 February 2007 I had a meeting with the Minister of Justice and Constitutional Development, Mrs. B S Mabandla. During this meeting it appears that she had gained the impression that I had agreed not to pursue the TRC cases. On 8 February 2007, she addressed a letter to me titled "TRC MATTERS", a copy of which is annexed hereto marked "VPP2" in which she stated the following:

*"I must advise you at the outset that the media articles alleging that*

TP (8)

v.p.



*the National Prosecuting Authority will go ahead with prosecutions have caught me by surprise. In our discussions you briefly mentioned to me that the NPA will not go ahead with prosecutions. As you had undertaken to advise me in writing, I will appreciate it if you could advise me urgently on the matter so that there can be certainty."*

48. An example of one of the articles in the press is from the Beeld newspaper titled "Cops up for apartheid crimes" which was published on 7 February 2007. A copy of this article is annexed hereto marked "VPP3".
49. I am at a loss to explain how the Minister reached such a conclusion. Her letter disclosed an assumption that the TRC matters will not be prosecuted. I found this to be a disturbing development as it appeared that at a political level there was an expectation that I would not prosecute the TRC cases. I regarded such an expectation as unwarranted interference in my constitutional duty to prosecute without fear, favour or prejudice.
50. It is most likely that I would have clarified my position with the Minister, either through a meeting or a telephone discussion. I would have confirmed to the Minister that it was not my intention to drop the TRC cases.
51. I decided to prepare a detailed memorandum for the Minister to set out the history behind the policy to the TRC cases and to inform the Minister of the

TP ①

v.t.



problems experienced in implementing this policy. This memorandum is titled 'PROSECUTION OF OFFENCES EMANATING FROM CONFLICTS OF THE PAST: INTERPRETATION OF PROSECUTION POLICY AND GUIDELINES' and was dated 15 February 2007. This memorandum was annexed to my affidavit before the Ginwala Commission marked as "TRC1".

52. In this memorandum I concluded that there had been improper interference in relation to the TRC cases and that I had been obstructed from taking them forward. I complained that such interference impinged upon my conscience and my oath of office. I indicated that I was unable to deal with these cases in terms of the normal legal processes and sought guidance on the way forward.
53. As I had marked this memorandum as an "*internal secret memorandum*" I have not attached it to this affidavit. I have attached it to an *in camera* affidavit which will be filed separately and which will not be made available to the public, unless this honorable Court authorizes such release. In this regard I make the following submissions:
- 53.1. The issues and complaints raised in the memorandum have already been discussed in the body of my affidavit filed before the Ginwala Commission, which has been part of the public record

TPD

v.e.

A

since 7 May 2008, and which was also part of the court record in the matter of *Nkadimeng & Others v The National Director of Public Prosecutions & Others* (TPD case no 32709/07).

- 53.2. In my view, there is nothing in the memorandum that implicates or impairs national security.
- 53.3. Since the memorandum points to unlawful and unconstitutional conduct it would in the public interest for this memorandum to be released
- 53.4. The public interest in the disclosure of the memorandum far outweighs any possible contemplated harm, inconvenience or embarrassment.
54. I never received any response from the Minister to this memorandum. Given the serious issues I was raising in the memorandum, and given that the NPA Act criminalizes obstruction of the work of the prosecuting authority, I would have expected an immediate response from the Minister. The failure or refusal of the Minister to respond to my memorandum suggested to me that she preferred for the deadlock between the NPA and the SAPS, NIA and DoJ to remain in place.

TP 9

V.P

h

55. During the course of the next few months the legal representative of Messrs. Otto, Smith and van Staden, Vlok and van der Merwe, held detailed negotiations with Advocate Ackermann and members of the PCLU in regard to a plea and sentencing agreement.
56. The negotiation of the plea and sentencing agreements with the five accused was an extended process and was only concluded in early July 2007. On 10 July 2007 I sent a memorandum to the Minister informing her of the fact that the prosecution had been set down for hearing on 17 August 2007 and that all accused had indicated their intention to plead guilty to a charge of attempting to murder Reverend Chikane by means of poisoning. The memorandum informed her of the fact that plea and sentencing agreements had been entered into. To the best of my recollection the Minister did not respond to this memorandum.
57. On or about 10 July 2007 I went off on compassionate leave because of the illness and subsequent death of my mother. In my absence, on 17 July 2007, Dr Ramalte and Advocate Ackermann were summoned to a meeting with the Minister and reported to her on these developments.
58. In August 2007, those implicated in the Chikane case pleaded guilty to the charges in exchange for suspended sentences as per Section 105A of the Criminal Procedure Act, 1977. Vlok and Van der Merwe were sentenced to

v.p.

TPD

~

ten years in prison suspended for five years, while the other three received five year prison sentences, suspended for five years.

59. I would have preferred a full prosecution in this case because Adriaan Vlok and Johan van der Merwe only made limited disclosure. They largely confined their disclosure to facts that were already in the public domain. They declined to disclose detailed information in relation to the compiling of the hit list and who was behind such compilation. They did not reveal the other names on the list; the *modus operandi* of the other hits or the identities of the other masterminds and perpetrators.
60. A full prosecution in the Chikane case would have produced greater truth and accountability. However there was strong political resistance to this prosecution and the pursuit of the other political cases. It was clear to me that the government, and in particular the then Minister of Justice, did not want the NPA to prosecute those implicated in the Chikane case. This was due to their fear of opening the door to prosecutions of ANC members, including government officials. Moreover I could not rely on the police to investigate this case, and the other political cases, thoroughly. Therefore, a plea and sentence bargain was in my view the most appropriate compromise in the circumstances.
61. Shortly after the plea and sentence agreement had been confirmed in court

v.p.

M

TP 17

a newspaper article appeared in the Rapport newspaper of 19 August 2007 in which it was claimed that the NPA was preparing to prosecute ANC leaders. The claim was made on the basis of a fabricated document. A copy of this newspaper article is annexed hereto marked "VPP4". The NPA responded to this article by way of a press statement dated 21 August 2007 in which the allegations made in the Rapport article were denied. A copy of this press statement is annexed hereto marked "VPP5".

62. After the newspaper article was published, I was summoned to a meeting of the of the subcommittee of the Justice, Crime Prevention and Security (JCPS) Cabinet Committee on Post TRC matters, which was held on 23 August 2007. This meeting was attended by several cabinet ministers, directors-general and Mr. Selebi. Cabinet Ministers included the Minister for National Intelligence Services, Mr. Ronnie Kasrils, Minister Mabandla, Minister Skweyiya amongst others.
63. During the meeting, Mr. Selebi said to me that the *'gloves are now off'* and that he was *'declaring war'* on me. In response I told him: *"for once in your life can you tell the truth and shame the devil"*.
64. Those at the meeting demanded answers from me about TRC prosecutions. They were also particularly concerned that I was instituting an investigation into certain members of the South African Police Service.

v.p.

a

TP (1)

This was in relation to my investigation into who was behind the fabrication of the letter purportedly written by Ackermann SC. Minister Mabandla told me to stop this investigation as we could not be seen to be taking each other to court. I advised the Minister that I would not stop the investigation.

65. I explained that:

65.1. the NPA was bound by law to continue with prosecutions of individuals who did not apply for or who were refused amnesty.

65.2. the NPA was actively preparing for those prosecutions and that we should not be stopped from doing our job.

65.3. It was my role as the NDPP to decide who would be charged.

66. On 28 August 2007 I received a faxed letter from the Minister of Justice, Ms. B S Mabandla. A copy of this letter is annexed hereto marked "VPP6". She referred to the meeting held on 23 August 2007. She noted that the National Commissioner of Police and I had different views on the Rapport article regarding the alleged forgery of certain NPA documents. She noted that I had initiated an investigation into the alleged forgery but she complained that she had not been advised of this decision or the basis thereof. Paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Minister's letter are particularly

N.F.



revealing:

**4. In the course of the discussion, it became clear that Mr. J Selebi was of the view that there is no truth in the Rapport article, and he produced documents to support his argument that indeed there is an investigation by the NPA on certain political office bearers.**

**5. It was suggested at the meeting then that it would be useful if you could respond to the allegation that there is an investigation as mentioned above. (Emphasis added).**

67. The Minister's letter was further indication of the view held at ministerial level that I should not enjoy actual discretion to make prosecutorial decisions in relation to the so-called political cases arising from the conflicts of the past.

68. I responded to the Minister's letter by way of a letter dated 29 August 2007, a copy of which is annexed hereto marked "VPP7". My copy of this letter is not on an NPA letterhead, but I confirm that the contents thereof were transmitted to the Minister.

69. In this letter I referred to the 23 August 2007 meeting:

*"....which I considered to be most unpleasant. Despite the information I put before the committee, I am both surprised and disappointed to see that I now stand accused of misleading alternatively having lied to the sub-committee members."*

TP

v.f.

N

70. I confirmed that there was no investigation by the NPA *"against the 37 ANC leaders including the President of this country, contrary to the assertions of the National Commissioner of Police"*.
71. In relation to paragraph 4 of the Minister's letter I noted that it is:
- "....clear that my account of the position as it relates to the NPA's handling of the post TRC matters has been completely ignored."*
72. I reminded the Minister that my predecessor had satisfied himself that there was no basis for the leadership of the ANC to be investigated and he had then briefed the then Minister of Justice, as well as the President. I also advised the Minister that all the dockets relating to the TRC cases, which had been stored at the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) in Pretoria, had been handed over to the SAPS in early and mid-2004. In my capacity as then DG of Justice I was actually present in the office of the DPP when representatives from the SAPS collected the said dockets.
73. I concluded my letter by requesting an urgent meeting with the Minister and myself and my Deputies. I also requested an opportunity to appear before the National Security Council *"to give a true account of this issue"*.
74. The Minister did not respond to my requests and these meetings never

TPM

v.p.

2

took place. On 23 September 2007 I was suspended from office by President Mbeki. Shortly after my suspension I learned that Advocate Ackermann had been relieved of his duties in relation to the TRC cases.

## CONCLUSION


75. I have little doubt that my approach to the TRC cases contributed significantly to the decision to suspend me. It is no coincidence that there has not been a single prosecution of any TRC matter since my suspension and the removal of the TRC cases from Advocate Ackermann.
76. The political interference or meddling that I have set out in this affidavit is deeply offensive to the rule of law and any notion of independent prosecutions under the Constitution. It explains why the TRC cases have not been pursued. It also explains why the disappearance and murder of Nokuthula Simelane was never investigated with any vigour and why the pleas of her family and her representatives were ignored.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
VUSUMZI PATRICK PIKOLI

TP 9

h

I hereby certify that the deponent has acknowledge that he knows and understands the contents of this affidavit, which was signed and sworn to before me, Commissioner of Oaths, at CAPE TOWN on this the 6<sup>th</sup> day of MAY 2011 the regulations contained in Government Notice No R1258 of 21 July 1972, as amended, and Government Notice No R1648 of 19 August 1977, as amended, having been complied with.



**COMMISSIONER OF OATHS**

**Andrew Lehloyo Dorcky Mohohlo**  
Commissioner of Oaths  
Practising Attorney  
2nd Floor, Leadership House, 40 Shortmarket Str  
Greenmarket Square, Cape Town, 8001

TP 11