Watson Law Journal (2024), **2**, 1–3

WATSON LAW INCORPORATED

CASE SUMMARY

Caution with Domestic Violence Orders: Analysis of *K.J.G v J.T.G* (A85/2024) [2024] ZAGPPHC 913

H. Wesley Watson

Director, Watson Law Incorporated; Member: South African Legal Practice Council

Abstract

The case of *K.J.G v J.T.G* (A85/2024) [2024] ZAGPPHC 913 highlights the complexities of issuing domestic violence orders and the potential for their misuse. The appellant, a businessman, contested a final protection order granted under the Domestic Violence Act 116 of 1998, which had been based on allegations of abuse made by his wife, the respondent. Both parties accused each other of abusive behaviour, and the appellant presented recordings that revealed the respondent's aggressive conduct, contradicting her portrayal as a victim. The court expressed concerns about the misuse of domestic violence orders, emphasising the significant impact such orders can have on the accused, including the risk of arrest. The judgment stressed the need for careful consideration of both parties' credibility and the potential influence of mental health issues. Ultimately, the court found that a final protection order was not appropriate in this case, warning against the indiscriminate granting of such orders due to the severe consequences they carry. This case serves as a cautionary reminder that domestic violence orders must be applied fairly to prevent harm to innocent individuals.

Keywords: family law, judicial discretion, south africa, law, legal, south african courts, legal argument, domestic violence

The case of *K.J.G v J.T.G* (A85/2024) [2024] ZAGPPHC 913, recently decided by the High Court of South Africa, brings to the forefront the complex and delicate issues surrounding domestic violence orders. Domestic violence laws are designed to protect vulnerable individuals from abuse, but the misuse of such laws can have serious consequences for those falsely accused. This case highlights the importance of a fair, balanced approach when considering applications for domestic violence orders, particularly in cases where both parties allege abusive behaviour.

1. Background of the Case

The respondent, an accountant, and the appellant, a businessman, were married and shared a tumultuous relationship characterised by mutual accusations of abuse and manipulation. According to the respondent, the appellant had been controlling and abusive throughout most of their marriage. Conversely, the appellant accused the respondent of similar behaviour, describing the relationship as one filled with conflict and strife.

The incident that led to the court case occurred during the height of the Covid-19 pandemic in 2020. Following an argument one evening, tensions escalated the next morning, resulting in a physical confrontation over the appellant's laptop. In response to these events, the respondent obtained an interim protection order against the appellant, accusing him of continued intimidation, harassment, and stalking, even enlisting third parties to assist in the intimidation.

The appellant contested the protection order, claiming that the respondent had a long history of mental health issues, including a possible multiple personality disorder. He provided transcripts of recordings made on his doctor's recommendation, revealing the respondent verbally abusing him over extended periods, while he attempted to defuse the situation. These recordings presented a different narrative from the one the respondent had put forth in court.

2. Legal Context: Domestic Violence Act 116 of 1998

The appellant's appeal was against a final protection order issued under the Domestic Violence Act 116 of 1998. The Act is a key piece of legislation designed to provide victims of domestic violence with swift and effective protection. Under this Act, individuals can apply for protection orders to prevent further abuse from their partners or family members. Interim orders can be granted on an urgent basis, often without the accused party being present (the "Interim Order" stage), while final orders are issued after a more thorough judicial process.

It is at the Interim Order stage where the greatest potential of judicial abuse is being observed, as the court is wholly reliant on the applicant's presentation and full disclosure of all the material facts related to the matter. This obligation to disclose, the law dictates, includes material facts which may be contrary to the applicant's own personal matter. Often this criteria is either overlooked or simply not complied with, and without strict adherearance with this obligation, injustice can and will be the only potential result.

In this case, the appellant was interdicted from physically abusing, intimidating, stalking, or contacting the respondent. The final order in question was based on an earlier interim order granted in 2020.

3. Key Issues in the Case

Credibility of the Respondent: A crucial element of the case was the credibility of the respondent's testimony. The appellant argued that the respondent's allegations of being a submissive, quiet wife who endured constant abuse were contradicted by the evidence he provided. The transcripts of recorded conversations presented to the court revealed the respondent engaging in long periods of verbal abuse against the appellant, with the appellant making repeated attempts to calm her down. This contradicted the respondent's portrayal of herself as a victim.

Mental Health Concerns: The appellant's claim that the respondent suffered from long-standing mental health issues, including potential multiple personality disorder, was central to his defence. He contended that these issues were not adequately considered by the court when evaluating the respondent's claims of abuse. The court was urged to factor in the possibility that the respondent's mental health may have contributed to the conflict and the abusive behaviour recorded in the transcripts.

Misuse of Domestic Violence Orders: The court acknowledged the potential for abuse of domestic violence orders. While the Domestic Violence Act serves a vital purpose in protecting individuals from harm, the court noted that a malicious applicant can misuse the process by making false or exaggerated allegations. The power of a domestic violence order—especially the threat of arrest that accompanies it—can be devastating to the accused party. In this case, the court expressed concern that the final protection order might have been granted without sufficient consideration of the full context, particularly the respondent's own aggressive behaviour and the nature of the altercation.

4. Court's Findings and Conclusion

The court ultimately found that a final protection order was not appropriate in this case. It determined that the respondent's credibility was questionable, given the evidence of her abusive behaviour and the possibility that her mental health issues had played a role in the conflict. Moreover, the court expressed caution about granting final domestic violence orders too readily, emphasising the serious consequences such orders can have on the accused, including the risk of arrest at the applicant's discretion.

While the court affirmed the importance of the Domestic Violence Act and the protections it offers, it cautioned that these protections should not be granted lightly or without thorough consideration of all the facts. A domestic violence order is a powerful legal tool that, if misused,

can cause significant harm to an innocent party. The court highlighted that applicants who falsely or maliciously use the system can weaponise these orders to inflict harm, rather than seek genuine protection.

5. Implications of the Judgment

The ruling in *K.J.G v J.T.G* sends a clear message about the need for caution when issuing final domestic violence orders. While the court acknowledged the importance of protecting victims of abuse, it also recognised the potential for misuse of the legal system by malicious applicants. This case serves as a reminder that domestic violence orders should not be granted based solely on one party's allegations, particularly in situations where both parties have engaged in abusive behaviour.

The court's decision reinforces the idea that the credibility of both parties must be carefully considered, especially when there is evidence of mutual conflict and strife. Furthermore, mental health issues, if present, should be thoroughly examined as part of the process, as they may influence the behaviour and motivations of both parties.

6. Conclusion

The *K.J.G v J.T.G* case underscores the importance of a balanced approach when dealing with domestic violence orders. While the law rightly seeks to protect victims of abuse, it is crucial to ensure that these legal protections are not misused to harm others. The case illustrates the need for courts to carefully consider the credibility of all parties involved and to be mindful of the serious consequences that final domestic violence orders can have on those accused. As this case demonstrates, caution is essential in ensuring that justice is served, and that the domestic violence laws are applied fairly and equitably.

October 15, 2024