

---

**Civil Magistrates Court, District of George, Held At George**  
**Case 5048-14: Lara Johnstone v Clive Johnstone**

---

**Reply Affidavit of Lara Johnstone**

**Annexure: C: L Johnson v SAPS Nat Comm Selebi & Others**

Excerpts of documents filed with: Tinus Le Roux: Braam Swart and Partners; appointed by the High Court Registrar as In Forma Pauperis Counsel in L Johnson v National Commissioner J.S. Selebi & Others. Re: Illegal and Irregular Malicious Arrest, Detention and Admittance to State Psychiatric Hospital on 23 July 2002 and 22 August 2002.

---

- C.01** 06 March 2006: Letter to Tinus Le Roux: RE: In Forma Pauperis: L Johnson v National Commissioner J.S. Selebi & Others.
- C.02** Notice of Intention: LARA JOHNSON, vs. NATIONAL COMMISSIONER J.S. SELEBI (1ST), SAPS INSPECTOR MALCOLM POTJE (2ND), DR. ME TSHABALALA-MSIMANG (3RD), DR TOMCHECK (4TH), DR. GISELLE RAUSCH (5TH), DR. DLAMINI (6TH), MS. M. ERASMUS (7TH).



Lara Johnstone

---

7 Rigelou Court, 84 Meade St. George, 6529  
Tel: (044) 874 5121 || Cell: (072) 785 0080

06 March 2006

MR. TINUS LE ROUX  
BRAAM SWART AND PARTNERS  
SUITE 12, FIRST FLOOR  
VAN KERWEL HOUSE  
117 YORK STREET  
GEORGE, 6529  
TEL: (044) 874 3940  
FAX: (044) 874 3945

Dear Mr. Le Roux,

**RE: *In Forma Pauperis: L Johnson v National Commissioner J.S. Selebi & Others.***

The meeting scheduled by your secretary for Monday, 13<sup>th</sup> March at 14:00 hrs, to enquire into my means and the merits of my cause, in terms of S. 40 (l)(b), refers.

Attached please find the following documentation for your pre-perusal, should you feel so inclined:--

- a. Notice of Intention in terms of S. 57(2) and (3) of SA Police Service Act, Act 68 of 1995, which has already been served on all Defendants.
- b. Affidavit (of Lara Johnson) in support of *In Forma Pauperis* Application to Registrar, which covers my financial statement of affairs.

Please feel free to let me know prior to the meeting, should you wish me to bring any further specific related documentation to the meeting. My intentions in proceeding with this matter, subject to your approval of the merits of my cause, was to file an application for condonation. I also include my initial draft thereto (I am currently finalizing the affidavit, which would be attached to it).

I look forward to meeting you.

Yours faithfully,

Lara Johnson

1 **IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA**  
2 **CAPE OF GOOD HOPE PROVINCIAL DIVISION**

3  
4 LARA JOHNSON, ) Case No.: To be Assigned  
5 Plaintiff, )  
6 vs. )  
7 NATIONAL COMMISSIONER J.S. SELEBI (1<sup>ST</sup>), )  
8 SAPS INSPECTOR MALCOLM POTJE (2<sup>ND</sup>), DR. )  
9 ME TSHABALALA-MSIMANG (3<sup>RD</sup>), DR )  
10 TOMCHECK (4<sup>TH</sup>), DR. GISELLE RAUSCH (5<sup>TH</sup>), )  
11 DR. DLAMINI (6<sup>TH</sup>), MS. M. ERASMUS (7<sup>TH</sup>). )  
12 Defendant )

---

**NOTICE OF INTENTION**

IN TERMS OF S. 57(2) & (3) OF SA POLICE  
SERVICE ACT, ACT 68 OF 1995.

13  
14 TO: (1) **SAPS NATIONAL COMMISSIONER J.S SELEBI**  
15 (2) **SAPS INSPECTOR MALCOLM POTJE**  
16 C/O NATIONAL COMMISSIONER  
17 SOUTH AFRICAN POLICE SERVICES  
18 WACHTHUIS 7<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR  
235 PRETORIUS STREET, PRETORIA, 0001  
Tel: (012) 339 1000 || Fax: (012) 339 1530

19  
20 AND TO: (3) **MINISTER OF HEALTH DR M.E. TSHABALALA-MSIMANG**  
21 C/O STATE ATTORNEY  
22 LIBERTY LIFE CENTER  
23 22 LONG STREET  
24 CAPETOWN, 8000  
Tel: (021) 441 9200

25 AND TO: (4) **DR. TOMCHECK** (5) **DR. GISELLE RAUSCH**  
26 (6) **DR. DLAMINI** (7) **MS. M. ERASMUS**  
27 C/O SENIOR MEDICAL SUPERINTENDENT  
28 LENTEGEUR HOSPITAL  
29 P.O. MITCHELLS PLAIN OR HIGHLANDS DRIVE ROAD  
7785 LENTEGEUR, MITCHELLS PLAIN, 7785  
Tel: (021) 370 1111 || Fax: (021) 371 7359

KINDLY TAKE NOTICE THAT THE applicant intends to initiate Application for Condonation proceedings in terms of S 57(1) & (5), of the SA Police Service Act, Act 68 of 1995, in the above Honourable Court, one month after service of this notice, in accordance with the following particulars of claim (plus costs):--

<b>Nature of Claim*</b>	<b>Defendant Claimed From</b>	<b>Amount Claimed**</b>
<b>1. MALICIOUS ARREST</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> &amp; 2<sup>nd</sup> Defendants</b>	<b>R 75,000.00</b>
<b>2. MALICIOUS DETENTION</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> &amp; 2<sup>nd</sup> Defendants</b>	<b>R 5,000.00</b>
<b>3. MALICIOUS ADMITTANCE TO STATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, &amp; 5<sup>th</sup> Defendants</b>	<b>R24,000.00</b>
<b>4. MALICIOUS DETENTION IN STATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> &amp; 5<sup>th</sup> Defendants</b>	<b>R 100,000.00</b>
<b>5. MALICIOUS ADMITTANCE TO MAXIMUM SECURITY WARD IN STATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> &amp; 6<sup>th</sup> Defendants</b>	<b>R24,000.00</b>
<b>6. MALICIOUS DETENTION IN MAXIMUM SECURITY WARD IN STATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> &amp; 7<sup>th</sup> Defendant</b>	<b>R 2,920,000.00</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>R 3,148,000.00</b>

\* Further Particulars to the Nature of the Claim, are provided in Attached "Provisional Draft of Plaintiff's Particulars of Claim" (Pages: 5). The plaintiff reserves the right to amend the wording therein in summons to be issued, to reflect brevity or legal accuracy if so required, the general meaning however shall not be altered. Furthermore, further particulars facts to the claims shall be provided in the Statement of Material Facts.

\*\* Amounts claimed are based on the similarity of the merits of the case to the cases of *Ingram v Minister of Justice* 1962 (3) SA 225; & *Whittaker v Roose & Bateman: Morant v Roose & Bateman* 1912 AD 92; with a conversion of the damages awarded in the aforementioned cases to their value in 2002, at 10% interest rate. Accordingly the plaintiff reserves the right to amend the amounts claimed, to reflect more accurate current norms in the form of higher interest/conversion rates, or as appropriate or required. [Ingram Calc: 1962 @ R 500 : In 2002, at 10% = R 24,892.00]  
[Morant Calc: 1912 @ £ 100: In 2002, at 10% = £ 584,432.00 / R 2,922,160.00 (£1=R5)]

TAKE NOTICE FURTHER that the applicant appoints the address of Millers Attorneys as set out below as the place where service of all documents in these proceedings will be accepted.

1 TAKE NOTICE FURTHER THAT the aforementioned address for service of documents does not imply or  
2 express that Millers attorneys are representing the plaintiff in this matter, nor the effective date of receipt of  
3 documents by the plaintiff personally. Millers Attorneys are only acting as an administrative address for  
4 purposes of service of process of documents within eight kilometres of the High Court in terms of Uniform  
5 Rules 6 (5) (b).

6  
7 TAKE NOTICE FURTHER THAT until otherwise informed: For purposes of accurate calculation of service  
8 of documents upon the plaintiff personally: Millers Attorneys shall after acceptance of service of any  
9 documents served upon the plaintiff, to their offices:--

- 10 1. if the documents served are two (2) or less pages, forward them to the plaintiff by facsimile; within  
11 1 court day, of service of the documents upon Millers Attorney's offices.
- 12 2. if the documents served are three (3) or more pages, forward them to the plaintiff by registered  
13 mail, within 1 court day, of service of the documents upon Millers Attorney's offices.

14  
15 Dated this 10<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2006

16  
17 \_\_\_\_\_  
18 LARA JOHNSON

19 PER: C/O Eben Potgieter, Attorney at Law  
20 Millers Attorneys  
21 Business Partners Center, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
22 60 Sir Lowry Road  
23 Capetown, 8000  
24 Tel: (021) 462 3815  
25 Fax: (021) 462 3818

26 Encl:

- 27 A. Plaintiff's Particulars of Claim (Pages: 5)
- 28 B. J138A Transfer Warrant, dated 22 July 2002 (Pages: 2)
- 29 C. J138A Transfer Warrant, dated 21 August 2002 (Pages: 2)

30 PLEASE NOTE Access to Attachments (B) & (C) were denied to plaintiff by appropriate Defendant's responsible for providing them to the plaintiff, upon her request, at all material times referred to in this cause of action. They were only finally provided to Plaintiff, by Mr. A Searle, Directorate: Policy and Planning, Dept. of Health, on 26 November 2004, after the Plaintiff had filed an official Request for Access to Record of Public Body, in terms of Section 18(1) of the Promotion of Access to Information Act, 2000 (Act No 20 of 2000).

**Parties to Cause of Action: PLAINTIFF**

- 1 The Plaintiff is LARA JOHNSON, an adult female, employed as a waitress at Panarotti's Pizza Pasta, 112A York Street, George, who resides at 7 Rigelou Court, 84 Meade Street, George, 6529. Tel: (044) 874 5121; married in community of property, to Demian Emile Johnson, a prisoner at Salinas Valley State Prison, California, USA.

**Parties to Cause of Action: DEFENDANTS**

- 1 The FIRST defendant is J.S. SELEBI, who is sued in his capacity as the National Commissioner, for the South African Police Services (SAPS), at Wachthuis, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor, 235 Pretorius Street, Pretoria, who is liable for the acts of his servants, and where therefore a wrongful act is committed by a member of the force in the course of his duty, the State is prima facie liable; further particulars to the plaintiff unknown.
- 2 The SECOND defendant is MALCOLM POTJE, who is sued in his capacity as the arresting officer who committed the unlawful and malicious act, without reasonable and probable cause, in his capacity as an Inspector for the South African Police Services (SAPS), at SAPS George, 37 Courtenay Street, George, 6529, and whose address for purpose of service of process of this document is that of the National Commissioner, at 235 Pretorius Street, Pretoria; further particulars to the plaintiff unknown.
- 3 The THIRD defendant is DR. ME TSHABALALA-MSIMANG, who is sued in her capacity as the Minister of Health, at at 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, Room 411, 120 Plein Street, Capetown, whose address for the purpose of service of process in these proceedings is that of the State Attorney (Western Cape), Liberty Life Center, 22 Long Street, Capetown, 8000; who is liable for the acts of her servants, and where therefore a wrongful act is committed by a member in the course of her duty, the State is prima facie liable; further particulars to the plaintiff unknown.
- 4 The FOURTH defendant is DR. TOMCHECK, who is sued in her capacity as the Dept of Health Psychiatrist in charge of Lentegeur Hospital Admissions on the night of 23 July 2002, and whose current address for the purpose of service of process in these proceedings is that of the Senior Medical Superintendent, Lentegeur Hospital, PO Mitchells Plain, 7785 or Highlands Drive Rd, Lentegeur, Mitchells Plain, 7785 ("Lentegeur Hospital"); further particulars to the plaintiff unknown.
- 5 The FIFTH defendant is DR. GISELLE RAUSCH, who is sued in her capacity as the Dept. of Health Psychiatrist at all material times, in charge of the Department of Forensic Psychiatry, at Lentegeur Hospital, and whose current address for the purpose of service of process in these proceedings is that of the Senior Medical Superintendent, Lentegeur Hospital, Highlands Drive Rd, Lentegeur, Mitchells Plain, 7785; further particulars to the plaintiff unknown.
- 6 The SIXTH defendant is DR. DLAMINI, who is sued in her capacity as the Dept. of Health Psychiatrist in charge of Lentegeur Hospital Admissions on the day of 22 August 2002, and whose current address for the purpose of service of process in these proceedings is that of the Senior Medical Superintendent, Lentegeur Hospital, Highlands Drive Rd, Lentegeur, Mitchells Plain, 7785; further particulars to the plaintiff unknown.
- 7 The SEVENTH defendant is MS. M. ERASMUS, who is sued in her capacity as the Dept of Health's Senior Medical Superintendent at all material times at Lentegeur Hospital; and whose current address for the purpose of service of process in these proceedings is that of the Senior Medical Superintendent, Lentegeur Hospital, Highlands Drive Rd, Lentegeur, Mitchells Plain, 7785; further particulars to the plaintiff unknown.

Particulars of Claim	Defendant Claimed From	Amount Claimed
<b>1. MALICIOUS ARREST</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> &amp; 2<sup>nd</sup> Defendants</b>	<b>R 75,000.00</b>
<p>6. At approximately 16:10 hours on 23 July 2002, the 2<sup>nd</sup> defendant restrained the liberty of the plaintiff without lawful justification ("arrest") in the Geronimo Spur, York Street, George.</p> <p>7. The 2<sup>nd</sup> defendants arrest of the plaintiff was (a) without lawful justification, in that the essential elements of the sections of the statutes giving the right of arrest of a free citizen, are absent (An arrest without warrant is <i>prima facie</i> wrongful); (b) without reasonable or probable cause, and (c) was intentionally done with indirect or improper motive (malicious).</p> <p>8. The 2<sup>nd</sup> defendant caused such treatment in contempt of the plaintiff and as a contumelious injury to her, in that where the plaintiff provided the 2<sup>nd</sup> defendant with the opportunity to allay or confirm the suspicion raised that the arrest was unlawful and malicious, by contacting Magistrate Essel, whom had refused the prosecution's attempt to refer the applicant for observation during court proceedings on 22 July 2002; that opportunity should have been taken, and the failure of the 2<sup>nd</sup> defendant to have taken it, was a failure to act as a reasonable and honest man, with good faith intentions.</p> <p>9. As a consequence of the malicious arrest, the plaintiff suffered psychological assault and physical confinement in an illegal manner and has been held up to ridicule and contempt; she suffered great pain of mind, psyche and body, and injury to her employability and reputation. The arrest infringed her constitutional rights to freedom, due process, psychological integrity, equal protection, and freedom of expression. The nature of the injuria and patrimonial damages claimed being:--</p> <p>.1.1.1.1. Malicious Arrest [Freedom, Due Process, equal protection, freedom of expression] R 24,000.00</p> <p>.1.1.1.2. Public Arrest at Work [Freedom, Psychological Integrity] R 24,000.00</p> <p>.1.1.1.3. Loss of employment for 27 weeks R 27,000.00</p>		

Particulars of Claim	Defendant Claimed From	Amount Claimed
<b>2. MALICIOUS DETENTION</b>	<b>1<sup>st</sup> &amp; 2<sup>nd</sup> Defendants</b>	<b>R 5,000.00</b>
<p>A. The detention lasted to approximately 23:30 hours on the same day.</p> <p>B. The detention was without lawful justification in that detention after arrest can only be justifiable if the arrest itself was legal</p> <p>C. If the arrest was without reasonable or probable cause, the consequent detention if, for the same reasons as the arrest, is consequently without reasonable or probable cause.</p> <p>D. If the arrest was malicious, the consequent detention if, for the same reasons as the arrest, is consequently malicious. The injuria nature of the damages claimed being:--</p> <p>a) Malicious Detention &amp; transfer by male policemen [Freedom, Reason for Detention, court within 48 hours] R 5,000.00</p>		

<b>3. MALICIOUS ADMITTANCE TO STATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup>, 4<sup>th</sup>, &amp; 5<sup>th</sup> Defendants</b>	<b>R 24,000.00</b>
<p>A. At approximately 23:30 hours on 23 July 2002, the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant unlawfully telephonically authorized the 4<sup>th</sup> defendant to admit the plaintiff to 30 days detention for observation purposes in Lentegeur Psychiatric State Hospital, as a consequence of the malicious arrest, and unlawful and fraudulent Warrant to Transfer the Plaintiff ("J138A Referral").</p> <p>B. The admittance was (a) without lawful justification in that it occurred as a result of an unlawful and malicious arrest, detention and transfer of the plaintiff with the unlawful and fraudulent J138A Referral, (b) without reasonable or probable cause, and (c) was intentionally done with indirect or improper motive (malicious) in that the intention was calculated to impair and restrain the person, dignity and reputation of the plaintiff.</p> <p>C. The 5<sup>th</sup> defendant caused such treatment in contempt of the plaintiff and as a contumelious injury to her, in that where the plaintiff provided the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant with the opportunity to allay or confirm the suspicion raised that the arrest, detention, transfer and admittance was unlawful and malicious, by contacting Magistrate Essel, whom had refused the prosecution's attempt to refer the applicant for observation on 22 July 2002; that opportunity should have been taken, and the failure of the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant to have taken it, was a failure to act as a reasonable and honest woman with good faith intentions.</p> <p>D. As a consequence of the malicious admittance, by the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant, the plaintiff suffered psychological assault and physical confinement in an illegal manner, &amp; injury to her intellect, psyche, body, employability and reputation. The injuria nature of the damages claimed being:--</p> <p>a) Malicious Admittance [Freedom, Psychological Integrity, Prompt Reason for Detention, Freedom of Expression] <span style="float: right;">R 24,000.00</span></p>		

<b>4. MALICIOUS DETENTION IN STATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup> &amp; 5<sup>th</sup> Defendants</b>	<b>R 100,000.00</b>
<p>A. From 23:30 hours on 23 July 2002 to 23:30 hours on 02 August 2002, for a period of 10 days, the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant authorized the restraint of liberty without lawful justification ("detention") of the plaintiff.</p> <p>B. The detention was <u>without lawful justification</u> in that detention in a State Psychiatric Hospital after arrest, detention and transfer by the SAPD can only be justifiable if the original arrest itself was legal, which it was not. The detention was <u>without reasonable or probable cause</u> in that, if the arrest was without reasonable or probable cause, the consequent detention if, for the same reasons as the arrest, is without reasonable or probable cause. The detention was <u>malicious</u> in that, if the arrest and/or admittance was malicious, the consequent detention if, for the same reasons as the arrest, and/or admittance, is consequently malicious.</p> <p>C. As a consequence of the malicious detention, by the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant, the plaintiff suffered psychological assault and physical confinement in an illegal manner and has been held up to ridicule and contempt; she suffered great pain of mind, psyche and body, and injury to her employability and reputation. The injuria nature of the damages claimed being:--</p> <p>a) Malicious detention for 10 days [Freedom] <span style="float: right;">R50,000.00</span></p>		



b) Compelled to divulge information during interviews [Privacy, remain silent]	R10,000.00
c) Requirement to adjust to severe standard of 'normality/sanity' (Freedom of Expression, opinion, thought and belief]	R10,000.00
d) Requirement as a Buddhist to adhere to Christian practices at meal times, etc. [Freedom of Religion, Religious Observances]	R10,000.00
e) Refusal to provide valid documentation authorising detention [Reason for detention, challenge lawfulness of detention, released from detention, access to information]	R10,000.00
f) Refusal to consider information and appeal against detention [Just administrative action, Due process]	R10,000.00

<b>5. MALICIOUS ADMITTANCE TO MAXIMUM SECURITY WARD IN STATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> &amp; 6<sup>th</sup> Defendants</b>	<b>R24,000.00</b>
<p>A. On 22 August 2002, the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant unlawfully authorized and ordered the 6<sup>th</sup> defendant to admit the plaintiff to isolation/solitary confinement detention for observation purposes in Lentegeur Psychiatric State Hospitals, Maximum Security Ward.</p> <p>B. The admittance, and consequent detention of the plaintiff in isolation in the Maximum Security Ward, on the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant's instructions was (a) <u>without lawful justification</u> in that it did not fall under the rule of law, since:-- (i) The Magistrate's J138A referral dated 21 August 2002, clearly stated that the plaintiff was released on bail on 21 August 2002 by the Magistrate, and that consequently the plaintiff's arrival at Lentegeur was not coerced but of her own free will, and (ii) Any differential treatment of patients who voluntary arrive to be detained for observation purposes, and where such plaintiff patient was subjected to harsher or more severe treatment than others without reasonable or probable cause, such treatment savours of punishment, and is <i>prima facie</i> illegal, (b) without reasonable or probable cause, and (c) was intentionally done with indirect or improper motive (malicious).</p> <p>C. Consequently, the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant caused such treatment in contempt of the plaintiff and as a contumelious injury to her, in that where the plaintiff provided the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant with the opportunity to allay or confirm the suspicion raised that the admittance and detention of the plaintiff in the Maximum Security Ward was unlawful and malicious, and repeatedly requested that she be released to general population, that opportunity should have been taken, and the failure of the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant to have taken it, was a failure to act as a reasonable and honest woman with good faith intentions.</p> <p>D. The injuria nature of the damages claimed being:--</p> <p>a) Malicious Admittance [Freedom, Equality, Human Dignity, Access to Information, Presumption of Innocence]</p>		
		R 24,000.00

<b>6. MALICIOUS DETENTION IN MAXIMUM SECURITY WARD IN STATE PSYCHIATRIC HOSPITAL</b>	<b>3<sup>rd</sup>, 5<sup>th</sup> &amp; 7<sup>th</sup> Defendant</b>	<b>R 2,920,000.00</b>
<p>A. From 22 August 2002, to 05 September 2002, for a period of 14 days, the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant unlawfully and maliciously detained the plaintiff in solitary confinement in the Maximum Security Ward of the State Psychiatric Hospital at Lentegeur.</p>		
<p>B. The detention was (a) <u>without lawful justification</u> in that detention in solitary confinement in a the Maximum Security Ward of a State Psychiatric Hospital is without lawful justification if the original admittance thereto was without lawful justification, (b) <u>without reasonable or probable cause</u> in that, if the admittances was without reasonable or probable cause, the consequent detention if, for the same reasons as the admittance, is without reasonable or probable cause, and (c) <u>malicious</u> in that, if the admittance was malicious, the consequent detention if, for the same reasons as the admittance, is consequently malicious.</p>		
<p>C. As a consequence of the malicious detention in the State Psychiatric Hospital's Maximum Security Ward, by the 5<sup>th</sup>, 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> respondents, the plaintiff suffered as follows &amp; aforementioned. The injuria nature of the damages claimed arise from (I) the plaintiff being:--</p>		
<p>a) Detained in a 1.5m by 1.5m cell, with no window, a camera in the ceiling, a potty for a toilet, and a urine infested mattress to sleep on, for 20 odd hours a day, for 14 days. [Freedom, Human Dignity]</p>	<p>R1,700,000.00</p>	
<p>b) Forced to wear Lentegeur old uncomfortable clothing [Dignity]</p>	<p>R 10,000.00</p>	
<p>c) Denied the right to reading or writing material in her cell. [Conditions of Detention ("C.D."): Reading Material]</p>	<p>R 200,000.00</p>	
<p>d) Required to bath in public before other patients and nurses [CD: Human Dignity]</p>	<p>R 200,000.00</p>	
<p>e) Only allowed to smoke a maximum of 4 cigarettes a day.</p>	<p>R 10,000.00</p>	
<p>f) Refused access to telephone family, or attorney [CD: Visits]</p>	<p>R 25,000.00</p>	
<p>g) Refused visits by family, friends or her attorney, except for one brief 5 minute 'emergency' family visit.[CD: Visits]</p>	<p>R 25,000.00</p>	
<p>h) Subjected to the endless screams, cries of anger and pain from the other detainees who would throw their potty's against the door, bang on their doors senselessly and endlessly, while the night staff ignored their screams. [CD: Human Dignity]</p>	<p>R 200,000.00</p>	
<p>And (II) the following conduct by the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant:</p>		
<p>i) Any criticism of the conditions by the plaintiff were used by 5<sup>th</sup> defendant to punish the plaintiff by alleging that the plaintiff had an inflexible, maladaptive, hostile and argumentative, self entitled personality, in her final report to the court. [Reason for Detention, CD: Challenge Lawfulness]</p>	<p>R 250,000.00</p>	
<p>j) Denial to family and attorney of reasons or procedure to question her isolation. [Prompt Reasons, Challenge Lawfulness]</p>	<p>R 25,000.00</p>	
<p>k) The plaintiff's family were denied the opportunity of a meeting with the 5<sup>th</sup> defendant to be informed of lawful reasons for solitary confinement/isolation. [Reasons, Challenge Lawfulness]</p>	<p>R 25,000.00</p>	
<p>l) Consequence of malicious personality report on plaintiff's (i) defence &amp; (ii) criminal trial [Equality, Expression, Access to court]</p>	<p>R250,000.00</p>	

