



Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>

Subject: Parkview CAS 103/05/2020 – Follow-up on Investigation and Clarification of Next Steps

1 message

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

Wed, Nov 12, 2025 at 11:20 AM

Dear Warrant Officer Mokoena,

Thank you for your detailed reply of today regarding the proposed polygraph examination and for the professionalism you continue to show. I appreciate that you took time to consult with counsel before advising me on the chain-of-custody requirements.

Please note, however, that I have **postponed today's polygraph** after receiving your message, as I could not risk conducting it in a manner that might later be ruled non-compliant. This cancellation has caused a financial loss to me personally, but I have done so in good faith to ensure that every step of this investigation remains procedurally sound and above reproach.

I also wish to record that, while I fully respect internal SAPS structures, it remains unusual for a sexual-offence docket to be escalated to "high-level decision-making." Ordinarily, an investigating officer proceeds under the guidance of the supervising prosecutor. The continued withholding of the commander's identity and direct contact details leaves me uncertain who now carries ultimate responsibility for the investigative direction. In terms of **section 195(1)** of the Constitution (transparency and accountability in public administration) and **Standing Order (G) 117**, I again request disclosure of the **name, rank and station** of the commander who has taken carriage of this matter, together with confirmation of the next procedural steps.

Furthermore, the circumstances already on record—including the presence of a **Crime Intelligence** member at a private law office on the date of the incident, the intimidation of a witness, the public SARS findings reported by the **Sunday Times (5 November 2017)** linking deposits from Crime Intelligence to Mr Ian Small-Smith, and the absence of any denial that I was present that day—collectively amount to **prima facie evidence sufficient for prosecution**. I therefore respectfully submit that the matter should now move to the **prosecutorial phase** for a formal charging decision by the DPP. Any further delay risks the appearance of interference or preferential treatment.

For transparency, I have informed the **Portfolio Committee on Police**, the **Portfolio Committee on Justice**, and the relevant **Parliamentary Oversight structures** that I am pursuing this case strictly through lawful channels. This is **not a threat**, nor an attempt to influence your work. It is simply to ensure that the process remains visible, accountable, and beyond external pressure, given the profile of the accused persons.

Finally, I again thank you for your professionalism and courtesy. I remain available to supply any additional documentation or sworn statement that may assist. Please confirm receipt of this email and indicate the anticipated timeline for the commander's feedback and the docket's submission to the DPP.

Kind regards,
Jan Hendrik Stephanus Venter

ID No: 760709 5034 083

Email: 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>

Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2025 10:09 AM

To: Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: REQUEST FOR URGENT INTERVENTION – PARKVIEW CAS 103/05/2020 AND THE REOPENED FCS CASE – DELAYED ACTION DESPITE PRIMA FACIE EVIDENCE AND RISK OF INTERFERENCE

Good Morning Mr Venter.

In response to your email regarding the Polygraphy test that you will be undertaking today out of your own accord and expense, I had to consult with an advocate so that I provide you with a proper answer.

Here is what is required pertaining to the chain of custody.

The person conducting the test (examiner) to provide his affidavit under oath authenticating the test, method, instrument, and chain of custody.

Should you have the Audio/video recording of the pre-test, in-test, and post-test phases that will be greatly appreciated. The CAS number Parkview Cas 103/05/2020 to be mentioned on the report cover page.

When the test is done and the report is available you or the examining officer can hand it over to me so that I can file inside the docket.

Pertaining to the chain of command within our within our department, I appreciate your inquiry and concern. I would like to clarify that our internal chain of command is strictly confined within the organization and does not involve any external parties. This ensures that our decision-making processes and communication channels remain transparent and secure hence I informed you that I would consulting my commander for him to make a decision on the matter.

Rest assured, all matters are handled internally, and we are committed to maintaining the highest level of confidentiality and professionalism.

Kind Regards
WO TJ Mokoena

On Tue, 11 Nov 2025, 22:52 Jan Venter, <janventer902@gmail.com> wrote:

Date: 12 November 2025

To:

The Honourable Minister of Police

General Fannie Masemola – National Commissioner, SAPS

Major General Mmantsheke Lekhele – Head: FCS, SAPS

Dear Minister, General Masemola and Major General Lekhhele,

My name is **Jan Hendrik Stephanus Venter (ID 7607095034083)**. I am the complainant in the above-mentioned matter, originally registered as **Parkview CAS 103/05/2020**, which is now reopened and under the FCS Directorate.

Before addressing the core issue, I want to state clearly and on record that the **investigating officer(s) who have recently contacted me have been professional, respectful and willing to engage**. My concern does *not* relate to their work ethic. I believe they are attempting to do their jobs under difficult circumstances.

However, in reviewing the full communication trail, it has become **evident that there is hesitation and fear** around acting — specifically because the individuals implicated in the matter are **high-profile and previously associated with state-linked networks**.

This concern is supported by the fact that the case was expressly stated to be "**escalated to senior command**," yet, **despite multiple submissions of clear prima facie evidence**, no arrests have been effected.

This is deeply troubling, particularly given:

1. The **serious and violent nature of the offences** originally reported;
2. The **existence of corroborated witness statements**;
3. The **availability of documentary, digital and forensic supporting material** which has already been furnished;
4. And the fact that the original case was **improperly frustrated in 2020**, which is precisely what the **High Court Mandamus Order** was sought to prevent.

I am **not** alleging corruption by the officers presently handling the matter. What I am concerned about — especially in light of what has been revealed publicly by **General Nhlanhla "Nkwamazi" Zulu during the current Parliamentary Committee proceedings** concerning **systemic intimidation within SAPS Criminal Intelligence** — is that **the same pattern of pressure and obstruction is repeating here**.

No individual, irrespective of status, past office, political affiliation, or associations, is **above the law**. Delays in processing arrests **in matters where prima facie evidence is already established** places the integrity of the investigation, the safety of myself as complainant, and the safety of witnesses at risk.

Accordingly, I respectfully request the following:

1. **A written assurance** that no interference — internal or external — will be permitted in the handling of this case.
2. **A written directive** to the FCS unit authorising immediate procedural continuation of the matter including effecting arrests based on the evidence already on record.
3. **Confirmation that the officers assigned will be afforded institutional support and protection**, should they experience pressure or intimidation from influential parties.

I again place on record that I respect the work of the officers currently dealing with the matter. This letter is intended to **protect them** as much as it is intended to protect the integrity of the investigation.

I am available at any time should you require further submissions or clarification.

Kind Regards,

Jan Hendrik Stephanus Venter

ID No: 7607095034083

Email: 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: Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, November 11, 2025 12:20 PM

To: tlala mokoena <tlalamokoena@gmail.com>

Subject: Subject: Follow-Up: CAS 103/05/2020 – Polygraph Report Format Confirmation Required

Dear Warrant Officer Mokoena,

I hope you are well. I am following up on my email sent yesterday regarding CAS 103/05/2020 and the independent polygraph examination scheduled for tomorrow.

To ensure that the report aligns with SAPS and prosecutorial requirements, kindly confirm the preferred format and submission method, specifically:

1. Whether the report must include an examiner's affidavit under oath (instrument, method, chain of custody),
2. Whether physiological data charts and examiner notes must accompany the report,
3. Whether an audio/video record is required to be preserved or submitted, and
4. Whether the report should be filed with you for OB entry, or delivered directly to Lt Col Bester as the current decision-maker.

If there is any SAPS covering memo or form to include, please advise so I can ensure it is attached before submission.

The purpose of this step is simply to keep the docket complete, compliant, and clean for referral.

Kindly confirm at your earliest convenience today, as the polygraph session is scheduled for tomorrow.

Thank you for your assistance.

Kind regards,
Jan Hendrik Stephanus Venter
ID: 7607095034083
Email: janventer902@gmail.com
Contact: **+27 72 474 8546**
Pretoria, Gauteng

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: Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, November 10, 2025 1:20 AM
To: tlala mokoena <tlalamokoena@gmail.com>
Subject: Subject: SENSITIVE & PRIVATE — Parkview CAS 103/05/2020: Polygraph examination arranged — please confirm preferred submission format

Sensitivity: SENSITIVE & PRIVATE (Criminal case material; do not distribute)

Dear Warrant Officer Mokoena,

Further to our recent correspondence and your updates on CAS 103/05/2020, please note that I have already arranged an **independent polygraph examination** with an **APA/SAPFED-accredited examiner** for **this coming week**. This is a good-faith, supplementary step on my part to support the docket.

Kindly confirm, **in advance of the appointment**, the **exact format** you would prefer for SAPS use and referral to the prosecutor, for example:

A full written report (with physiological charts/data prints),

An **examiner's affidavit under oath** authenticating the test, method, instrument, and chain of custody,

Audio/video recording of the pre-test, in-test, and post-test phases,

Identification documentation and **case reference (CAS 103/05/2020)** on the report cover page, and

Delivery method (sealed hard-copy for OB entry vs. secured digital submission), and whether the report should be sent to you or directly to **Lt Col Bester** as current decision-maker.

Please also let me know if there is any **SAPS form or covering memo** (e.g., an internal reference or OB notation requirement) that you want attached when I submit the report to you.

As always, my aim is to keep the record complete and procedurally neat. Thank you for your continued professionalism.

Kind regards,
Jan Hendrik Stephanus Venter
ID: 7607095034083
Email: 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>
Sent: Saturday, November 8, 2025 8:10 PM
To: Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: SUBJECT: Parkview CAS 103/05/2020 – Follow-Up: Commander Communication & Documentation Request

Good Evening Mr Venter.

Sorry for the late reply. On Thursday I had an appointment with Leandre who was the Receptionist at Ulrich Roux's office in May 2018.
She told me that she felt uncomfortable with her making a statement to the police as she had no recollection of it and did not remember you either.
My Commander I, Lt Col Bester is still looking into the matter and will provide me with feedback as soon as possible. As soon as I get my instructions, I will provide you with feedback on what direction we would be taking.

Talk to you soon. Have a great weekend

Regards
WO TJ Mokoena

On Fri, 07 Nov 2025, 07:42 Jan Venter, <janventer902@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Warrant Officer Mokoena,

I trust you are well.

I write to follow up on my email dated [insert date you sent the previous email], in which I requested:

1. The **name and direct contact details** of the commander now exercising decision-making authority in this matter; and
2. Copies of the **affidavits and commissioning documentation** as listed in my previous correspondence.

As noted, the escalation to “high-level decision making” requires transparency in accordance with **section 195(1)** of the Constitution, and it is important that I am able to communicate directly with the commander who is now responsible for determining the investigative direction of CAS 103/05/2020.

I respectfully request written confirmation of:

- The **commander’s full name**;
- **Rank and station**; and
- The **expected timeframe** for the provision of the documentation and records requested.

To ensure clarity and to avoid administrative misunderstanding, I would appreciate acknowledgment of this email and the requested details **by close of business tomorrow**.

Please note that this request remains **non-accusatory** and is made in good faith, solely to ensure transparency, procedural integrity, and the protection of both myself and Ms Prinsloo.

Thank you for your continued attention.

Kind regards,

Jan Hendrik Stephanus Venter

ID: **7607095034083**

Email: janventer902@gmail.com

Contact: **+27 72 474 8546**

From: Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>

Sent: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 10:49 AM

To: tlala mokoena <tlalamokoena@gmail.com>

Subject: Parkview CAS 103/05/2020 – Immediate Record Clarification & Commander-Level Engagement

Dear Warrant Officer Mokoena,

Thank you for confirming during our 4 November meeting that the SAPS member who commissioned the affidavit at the attorneys’ office was a **Crime Intelligence** officer. That is now an established and undisputed fact on record.

You further indicated that this matter has been escalated to your commander as it “requires high-level decision making.” I acknowledge the chain of command; however, the **nature of the escalation itself requires transparency**. It is **not standard** for a sexual-offence complainant to be advised that routine investigative steps must be referred upward unless there are **external or institutional sensitivities** affecting the docket.

For that reason, and in full accordance with **section 195(1)** of the Constitution (transparency, accountability, responsiveness in public administration), I request that **your commander communicate directly with me**, or that I be included in the follow-up engagement where the investigative direction is determined. This protects the integrity of the process, protects you, and protects the record. I am making this request respectfully, formally and **without accusation**.

It is necessary to repeat what was placed on record:

- It is **operationally irregular** for a **Crime Intelligence** officer to be deployed to commission an affidavit **inside a private law office**, particularly where **two attorneys on the premises were commissioners of oaths**, and where commissioning could have occurred at any SAPS station.
- The **public record** already reflects proximity between **Crime Intelligence structures** and **Mr Ian Small-Smith**, as reported by the **Sunday Times (5 November 2017)** and in SARS findings, in which SARS traced **undisclosed deposits** into Mr Small-Smith's account which SARS concluded originated from **Crime Intelligence/SSA**. Mr Small-Smith denied bribery but apologised for creating a perception of influence. I reference this **not as allegation**, but because it is directly relevant to the present need for procedural safeguards and transparency.

Given the above, I now **formally request** the following **without delay**:

1. **A copy of the affidavit deposed by the Crime Intelligence officer** regarding his presence at the attorneys' office.
2. **A copy of the commissioning page** of my affidavit, showing rank, force number, station, and attestation wording.
3. **The duty/OB entry or CI tasking reference** authorising his attendance there.
4. **Copies of the affidavits deposed by Mr Small-Smith and Mr Roux** in this docket.

To avoid misunderstandings, I also formally record that:

- All my interactions are documented and archived, including our Teams meeting.
- I am acting in **good faith** and in lawful protection of myself and Ms Prinsloo, given prior intimidation which is recorded in her affidavit.

Please **confirm receipt** and **provide a timeline** by which the above documents and confirmations will be supplied. If your commander is now the decision-maker regarding further investigative steps, kindly provide **his/her full name and direct contact details**, as required for institutional transparency under **section 195** and the SAPS Client Service Charter.

I appreciate your professionalism to date, and I trust we now proceed in a manner that ensures the **dignity, equality and fairness** guaranteed to all complainants under South African law.

Kind regards,
Jan Hendrik Stephanus Venter
ID No: 7607095034083
Email: 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>
Sent: Wednesday, November 5, 2025 9:58 AM
To: Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Parkview CAS 103/05/2020 – Follow-Up Regarding Derivative Offences and Addition of Further Accused

Noted, and will escalate the matter to my commander as it requires high level decision making.

Thank you

On Wed, 05 Nov 2025, 08:08 Jan Venter, <janventer902@gmail.com> wrote:

Dear Warrant Officer Mokoena,

I trust you are well.

Thank you again for the professional manner in which you have continued to handle this matter. I write further to my previous correspondence to request that you kindly consider the position of **Mr Johan van der Bank** in relation to CAS 103/05/2020.

As you will recall, in Ms Nadia Prinsloo's sworn affidavit dated 7 October 2025, she states that **Mr Van der Bank approached her and raised the sexual-assault allegation directly**, asking her whether she believed that "Ian Small-Smith sexually assaulted Jan." The significance of this is that such information was **confidential** and could only have been obtained from within the accused's circle or someone with access to the case. Sexual-assault complainant information is protected under:

- **Criminal Procedure Act 51 of 1977, section 154(2)**
- **Protection of Personal Information Act 4 of 2013, section 11(1)(a)**
- **SAPS Standing Order 324** (confidentiality of sexual-offence dockets)

Therefore, the fact that Mr Van der Bank possessed this information demonstrates **unlawful access and disclosure** of protected material.

Furthermore, the manner in which the conversation took place, as described by Ms Prinsloo, amounted to **intimidation of a witness**. This conduct falls under the:

- **Intimidation Act 72 of 1982, section 1(1)(a)**

Additionally, by approaching a key witness in an active sexual-offence matter, discussing the allegation, and creating fear or pressure, **he interfered with the proper administration of justice**, which constitutes the common-law offence of:

- **Defeating or obstructing the ends of justice (S v Heyne 1956 (3) SA 604 (A))**

Given that these actions relate **directly to this case** and occurred *because* the sexual-assault complaint was opened, they should form part of the **same docket**, rather than being handled separately. In South African criminal procedure, where intimidation, interference, or information-leaks arise from and relate to the original offence, the conduct is treated as **derivative criminality linked to the main case**.

For this reason, it is respectfully submitted that **Mr Van der Bank should be considered for addition as an accused person in CAS 103/05/2020** on the following charges:

- 1. Intimidation** – Intimidation Act 72 of 1982, s 1(1)(a)
- 2. Unlawful possession and disclosure of confidential criminal-case information** – CPA s 154(2), POPIA s 11(1)(a)
- 3. Defeating or obstructing the ends of justice** – common-law offence

This request is made **not in aggression**, but simply in the interest of ensuring that **the case is complete**, and that all persons whose conduct directly affects the integrity of the investigation are properly accounted for under law.

I appreciate the diligence with which you are handling this matter and trust that this submission will assist you in your continued evaluation of the docket.

Kind regards,
Jan Hendrik Stephanus Venter
ID No: 7607095034083
Email: 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: Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 9:05 PM
To: tlala mokoena <tlalamokoena@gmail.com>
Subject: Subject: Parkview CAS 103/05/2020 – Confirmation that Prima Facie Evidence Exists and Clarification Regarding Further Statements

To: Warrant Officer Tlala Mokoena
South African Police Service – Parkview Detectives

From:
Jan Hendrik Stephanus Venter
ID No: 760709 5034 083
Email: janventer902@gmail.com
Contact: +27 72 474 8546

Dear Warrant Officer Mokoena,

Thank you for your time, your courtesy, and for the ongoing attention you have given to this very sensitive matter.

I want to place on record that it is **not because we are unwilling to cooperate** that Ms Nadia Prinsloo has not provided an additional affidavit — it is because she remains genuinely **afraid** following the

intimidation and threats she experienced from Mr Johan van der Bank, which she already set out in her sworn affidavit dated 7 October 2025. Her safety and mental well-being are at risk, and in law and conscience it would be wrong to expose her further to those who have already attempted to silence or frighten her.

At the same time, I must respectfully submit that **her existing affidavit, together with the other evidence already before you, is more than sufficient to meet the legal threshold for *prima facie* proof** in a sexual-assault prosecution. I will outline why this is so, citing the law and relevant precedents so there is no uncertainty as to the legal position.

When I first opened this case (Parkview CAS 103/05/2020), both accused persons — Mr Ian Small-Smith and Mr Roux — were invited to provide sworn affidavits. As you confirmed, they **did not deny that I was present** at the relevant place and time; they merely denied that a sexual assault took place. This partial admission in itself establishes *opportunity* — a recognised element of corroboration under *S v Jackson 1998 (1) SACR 470 (SCA)* and *S v Trainor 2003 (1) SACR 35 (SCA)*. Once the presence of the complainant with the accused is accepted and the complainant's version remains consistent, the evidential burden shifts to the accused to provide an innocent explanation.

Years after those affidavits were obtained, **Mr Small-Smith discussed the sexual-assault allegation with Mr Johan van der Bank**, who later confronted Ms Prinsloo and asked her directly whether she believed that "Ian Small-Smith sexually assaulted Jan." This conversation occurred two to three years after the complaint had been laid. That fact alone is highly significant. Under *S v De Villiers 1944 AD 493* and *S v L 2000 (2) SACR 434 (W)*, post-event conduct by an accused that shows continued anxiety, management of information, or efforts to influence perceptions is admissible as **evidence of a consciousness of guilt**. If the allegation were false, there would be no reason for Mr Small-Smith to raise it again years later with a third party. His actions demonstrate that the matter still troubled him or that he sought to manage its potential consequences — both consistent with guilt, not innocence.

Equally important is that **Mr Van der Bank's knowledge of the allegation could only have come from within the accused's circle**, since such information was confidential and contained in a protected sexual-offence docket. The *Criminal Procedure Act 51 of 1977* (section 154(2)), the *Protection of Personal Information Act 4 of 2013* (section 11(1)(a)), and *SAPS Standing Order 324* all prohibit the disclosure of such material. The fact that he possessed it confirms that the sexual-assault allegation was real and not fabricated, and that it was discussed and circulated internally long after it was made. That is independent circumstantial corroboration that the event occurred.

Ms Prinsloo's affidavit also records direct intimidation by Mr Van der Bank, which constitutes a contravention of the *Intimidation Act 72 of 1982* section 1(1)(a) and provides further corroboration that the accused and their associates have sought to suppress or influence evidence.

Taken together — the accused's admission of my presence, the later discussion of the incident with Mr Van der Bank, the unlawful disclosure of confidential information, and the intimidation of a witness — all these facts, considered cumulatively, satisfy every element of *prima facie* proof as defined by the Constitutional Court in *S v Boesak 2001 (1) SACR 1 (CC)* and reaffirmed in *S v Van Aswegen 2001 (2) SACR 97 (SCA)*. The evidence, viewed in totality, is consistent with guilt and inconsistent with innocence. That is the precise threshold required for prosecution — nothing more.

It is therefore my respectful submission that this matter now falls squarely within the ambit of section 205(3) of the *Constitution* and section 13(1)(a) of the *SAPS Act 68 of 1995*, which require SAPS to investigate and ensure that offences are prosecuted without fear or favour, and without discrimination. Section 9(1) of the *Constitution* guarantees equality before the law. Male victims of sexual assault are entitled to exactly the same protection, urgency, and dignity as any female

complainant, and the same weight must be attached to the evidence when the *prima facie* standard is met.

I again wish to emphasise that I am not refusing to cooperate, nor am I withholding anything. I am simply acting in good faith to protect a key witness who has already been intimidated, and to ensure that the process now follows the correct legal course: namely, that the matter proceeds to **prosecution of the accused persons**, as the existing sworn evidence is already sufficient in law.

Thank you again for your time, professionalism, and the manner in which you have engaged with me throughout this investigation. I trust this clarification will assist you in finalising the docket and preparing the matter for referral to the Director of Public Prosecutions for formal charging.

Kind regards,

Jan Hendrik Stephanus Venter

ID 760709 5034 083

Email: 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>

Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 2:41 PM

To: Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Parkview CAS 103/05/2020

Will appreciate that... thank you

On Tue, 04 Nov 2025, 14:32 Jan Venter, <janventer902@gmail.com> wrote:

I will speak to her tonight Sir

Thank You

From: tlala mokoena <tlalamokoena@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 2:29 PM

To: Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Parkview CAS 103/05/2020

I went through the statement of Ms Nadia Prinsloo that you sent to me. I need a statement from the person you first told about the incident of the 18 May 2018. If it is still Ms Nadia Prinsloo you first reported to, ask her to depose to an affidavit regarding that.

The affidavit should contain the date you told her about the incident and time, your condition when you were telling her about it (what she observed) and what did you tell her.

In rape cases prosecutors look for these first report statement.

Thank you

On Tue, 04 Nov 2025, 13:02 Jan Venter, <janventer902@gmail.com> wrote:

Thank you

From: tlala mokoena <tlalamokoena@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 1:01 PM
To: Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Parkview CAS 103/05/2020

Email with statement received. Will go through and revert back to you should there be any thing that needs to be addressed.

Thank you

On Tue, 04 Nov 2025, 12:54 Jan Venter, <janventer902@gmail.com> wrote:

Good day Sir

Kindly find attached

Regards

And thank you again

From: Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 12:05 PM
To: tlala mokoena <tlalamokoena@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Parkview CAS 103/05/2020

Invite send Sir

Please let me know if you have difficulty

From: Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 11:57 AM
To: tlala mokoena <tlalamokoena@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: Parkview CAS 103/05/2020

Jan Venter invited you to a Microsoft Teams Meeting:

Venter And SAPS

Tuesday, November 4, 2025

12:00 PM - 12:30 PM (SAST)

Meeting link: [Venter And SAPS | Microsoft Teams | Meetup-Join](https://venterandsaps.com/meetup)

From: tlala mokoena <tlalamokoena@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 11:54 AM

To: Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Parkview CAS 103/05/2020

Today.

Sorry for not providing a a day

On Tue, 04 Nov 2025, 11:50 Jan Venter, <janventer902@gmail.com> wrote:

Today sir , Tommorow , ehen ever I will be ready

From: tlala mokoena <tlalamokoena@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 11:49 AM

To: Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Parkview CAS 103/05/2020

12:00pm suits me fine, if it's okay with you.

On Tue, 04 Nov 2025, 11:47 Jan Venter, <janventer902@gmail.com> wrote:

No problem Sir

I rely just appreciate contacting me and do put trust in you

Simply let me know then I will invite you to a teams meeting asap

Regards

From: tlala mokoena <tlalamokoena@gmail.com>

Sent: Tuesday, November 4, 2025 11:41 AM

To: Jan Venter <janventer902@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: Parkview CAS 103/05/2020

Good day Mr Venter

I appreciate your diligence in verifying the authenticity of the communication. My official laptop has crushed and I use my private Gmail account for MicrosoTeams to ensure that service delivery is not hampered, hence Gmail account is used for this specific purposes, but all official correspondence can be done via my commanders SAPS Email address @SmithB3@saps.gov.za to adhere to standard SAPS protocols.

On Tue, 04 Nov 2025, 11:27 Jan Venter, <janventer902@gmail.com> wrote:

Good day Warrant Officer Mokoena,

I acknowledge receipt of your SMS this morning regarding the above matter. Thank you for reaching out and for taking the time to attend to this case.

I just wanted to confirm whether the use of a Gmail address is standard procedure, as I noticed it's not the usual SAPS domain. Please understand this is merely for verification and record purposes on my side.

I will make myself available for a Teams meeting as requested — kindly just confirm the time that suits you best, as the matter is quite urgent.

Kind regards,

Jan Hendrik Stephanus Venter

ID No: 7607095034083

Email: 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. Recipients should seek appropriate professional advice before acting.