



Jan Venter &lt;janventer902@gmail.com&gt;

---

**Subject: CAS 103/05/2020 – Outstanding Investigative Omissions and Confirmation of Polygraph Date**

1 message

**Jan Venter** <janventer902@gmail.com>  
To: tlala mokoena <tlalamokoena@gmail.com>

Wed, Nov 19, 2025 at 11:49 AM

Dear Warrant Officer Mokoena,

Thank you for your response.

I take careful note of your comment that service providers retain Section 205 metadata for 36 months. This directly confirms the concern I raised earlier:

When I reported this matter in 2020, the metadata for both the accused and the Crime Intelligence officer was still fully available.

The failure by the initial investigating officer and SAPS to issue the Section 205 subpoenas at that stage resulted in the permanent loss of critical evidence.

This omission must be expressly recorded in the docket narrative and in the submission to the DPP, as it forms part of the history of irregular investigation and constitutes a material failure that is relevant to both prosecutorial decision-making and oversight bodies.

I must be clear: this is not criticism of your current investigation. This is a factual procedural problem originating in 2020, and it must be disclosed transparently.

Regarding the polygraph, the appointment has now been rescheduled for **24 November 2025**. I am currently finalising the financial arrangements. Should funds clear earlier, I will take an earlier available slot. The report will be submitted to you immediately once received.

I also note your clarification regarding “high-level decision-making.” For purposes of the record, your earlier communication indicated that this required escalation beyond ordinary supervisory levels. It is important that all internal communication, memos, recommendations, and instructions from commanders be included in the docket for full transparency.

As previously stated, the docket must be referred directly to the DPP, and I appreciate your confirmation in this regard.

Finally, although you indicated that docket disclosure will be attended to once the investigation is finalised, administrative transparency documents (index, investigative-step summary, and commander recommendations) fall within the scope of the Victims’ Charter and Shabalala, and I will continue to request them so that I may prepare my own submission to the DPP.

I remain fully cooperative and committed to ensuring that this matter proceeds correctly, thoroughly, and without any room for irregularity.

Kind regards,  
**Jan Hendrik Stephanus Venter**  
ID No: 7607095034083

Email: [janventer902@gmail.com](mailto:janventer902@gmail.com)

Contact: +27 72 474 8546

**LEGAL DISCLAIMER:** This communication is not the advice of a registered attorney, tax practitioner, or financial advisor. It is analytical and research commentary provided under the constitutional rights to freedom of expression, inquiry, and public participation. All statements are made for lawful discussion, education, and public-interest oversight. No liability is accepted for actions or decisions taken based on this information.

---

**From:** tlala mokoena <[tlalamokoena@gmail.com](mailto:tlalamokoena@gmail.com)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, November 19, 2025 9:40 AM

**To:** Jan Venter <[janventer902@gmail.com](mailto:janventer902@gmail.com)>

**Subject:** Re: Subject: CAS 103/05/2020 – Completion of Outstanding Investigative Steps and Request for Full Transparency Before Referral

I acknowledge your concerns and requirements regarding the investigation.

I confirm that we are committed to conducting a thorough and transparent investigation.

Regarding the outstanding investigative steps, I confirm that:

Information we have currently from service providers regarding Section 205 subpoena process is that the data is kept for 36 months.

Seeing that the case was reported in 2020 and the date of incident is 2018, the retention period has lapsed.

Kindly provide me with date in which the polygraph report will be available so that it can be included in the docket before referral.

I also confirm that the docket will be referred directly to the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP) for a formal decision.

Regarding high-level decision-making i informed you about, I confirm that my immediate commander has been consulted and has provided guidance on this issue. That is what i meant when I spoke about "high-level decision-making".

I hereby emphasize the importance of maintaining the integrity of the investigation and ensuring that no external interference or influence has occurred.

Regarding full docket disclosure, this issue will be attended to once investigation is finalized.

Please note that the is no rush and i will work diligently to complete any outstanding investigation and will provide updates as soon as possible. We appreciate your cooperation and understanding in this matter.

Kind regards  
WO TJ Mokoena

On Wed, 19 Nov 2025, 08:46 Jan Venter, <[janventer902@gmail.com](mailto:janventer902@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Warrant Officer Mokoena,

I acknowledge receipt of your message requesting whether I have any new information to add before you take the docket for a decision.

Before any such step is taken, I must place the following on formal record.

**1. Prima facie evidence is already established**

As previously set out in detail, the sworn affidavits, witness intimidation, unlawful disclosure of confidential sexual-offence information, the admission by the accused of my presence on the date in question, and the involvement of a Crime Intelligence officer in irregular commissioning all cumulatively satisfy the standard of *prima facie* proof under *S v Boesak*, *S v Van Aswegen*, *S v Jackson*, and related authorities.

There is no dispute that this matter is prosecutable.

**2. The docket may NOT be taken to an ordinary court for a “court decision”**

With respect, I will not accept the docket being referred to a lower court for any preliminary ruling.

In terms of proper procedure for sexual-offence matters, and given the profile of the accused and the CI involvement, this docket must be referred **directly to the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP)** for a formal charging decision.

This is the correct legal route, and I will oppose any alternate referral.

**3. Your earlier emails raised immediate red flags**

You stated explicitly that this matter “requires high-level decision-making” and must be escalated to your seniors.

This is *not* the response typically given in a standard sexual-offence complaint.

That escalation, in itself, confirms that this matter is unusual, sensitive, and affected by the profile of the individuals involved.

It is precisely for this reason that the process must now be completely transparent before any referral is made.

**4. Outstanding investigative steps must be finalised before referral**

The investigation is not yet complete. I require confirmation of the following:

**4.1 Metadata of the accused**

Have Section 205 subpoenas been issued?

Has metadata for WhatsApp messages, calls, and tower logs before and after the incident been obtained? If not, this is a critical omission.

**4.2 Metadata of the Crime Intelligence officer**

A CI member commissioned my affidavit inside a private law office, despite two attorneys being present. This is on record and undisputed.

I require confirmation that his device metadata has been preserved and examined.

Given his role, failure to obtain his metadata would constitute an incomplete investigation.

**4.3 Polygraph report**

You are already aware that I postponed the polygraph solely because you requested compliance with specific chain-of-custody requirements.

That report will be filed shortly.

It must form part of the docket *before* any referral.

**5. Full docket disclosure is required**

In terms of the Constitution (section 195), *Shabalala v AG*, SAPS Client Service Charter, and the Victims’ Charter, I am entitled to full transparency.

I therefore formally request:

5.1 A complete copy of the docket index.

5.2 All affidavits relating to myself or referencing my name.

5.3 A list of all investigative steps taken and outstanding.

5.4 The **full written submission/memo** you have sent or will send to your commander.

**5.5 The commander's written recommendations, notes, or decision-making summary.**

5.6 Any communication or notes prepared for senior management relating to this matter.

These records form part of transparency obligations and are essential to ensure that no irregular influence, external pressure, or institutional interference has occurred.

**6. This must be a full investigation — not a rushed or superficial one**

I must emphasise this clearly:

I will not accept an incomplete referral.

This matter has already been mishandled once in 2020, which is why I had to seek a mandamus order.

The Portfolio Committee on Police, the Portfolio Committee on Justice, and other oversight bodies have already been informed of the sensitivity and historical interference associated with this case.

The President, the Minister of Police, and the National Commissioner have all stated publicly that complainants must receive full investigations — not partial processes designed merely to “show activity.” The investigation must be thorough, complete, and capable of withstanding scrutiny.

**7. Next steps**

Accordingly, before any referral:

- I require written confirmation that all outstanding items above will be completed.
- I require confirmation that the docket will be referred **only to the DPP**.
- I require the documents listed in paragraph 5 for my own submission to the DPP, as is my right under the Victims’ Charter.

I remain cooperative and respectful, but I must ensure that the process is correct, transparent, and beyond reproach.

Kind regards,  
Jan Hendrik Stephanus Venter  
ID No: 7607095034083  
Email: [janventer902@gmail.com](mailto:janventer902@gmail.com)  
Contact: +27 72 474 8546

**LEGAL DISCLAIMER:** This communication is not the advice of a registered attorney, tax practitioner, or financial advisor. It is analytical and research commentary provided under the constitutional rights to freedom of expression, inquiry, and public participation. All statements are made for lawful discussion, education, and public-interest oversight. No liability is accepted for actions or decisions taken based on this information.

---

**From:** tlala mokoena <[tlalamokoena@gmail.com](mailto:tlalamokoena@gmail.com)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 19, 2025 8:28 AM  
**To:** Jan Venter <[janventer902@gmail.com](mailto:janventer902@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** Additional Information Parkview Cas 103/05/2020

Good morning Mr Venter.

I would like to know if you have any new or additional information to add before I take the docket for court's decision on the matter.

Kind regards  
WO TJ Mokoena