

# Transcription 4 November 2025 With SAPS relating to Small Smith and Roux

05 Nov 2025, 10:09

Transcription 4 November 2025 With SAPS relating to Small Smith and Roux

Play

00:00

30:00

Mute

Settings

(0:00) The persons that I made this claim about is extremely prominent and influential people. (0:07) I used to work with them, and I'm not mentioning these names for undue influence or anything, (0:13) but I want you to know what you are investigating. Many years ago, I used to work for Dr.

Matthew (0:21) Sporza, and after that, I was in the tabloids many times.

A lot of it was lies, and a lot of it was (0:26) the truth. But then in 2018, I decided to go to the hawks while the state capture and everything (0:35) was going on, and my nerves just couldn't take it anymore, so I thought I'd go to General (0:41) Labia and speak to him. And when I went to him, well, I first informed the one person (0:50) that I later complained against that I am going to go to them, and I actually told him (0:55) that because we had a good working relationship before this incident, I told him to go with me (1:02) so they knew I was going to the hawks or the DPCI.

And before I went there, a couple of things (1:09) happened. Private investigator, Paula Sullivan, contacted me through a third party and said I must (1:15) go and see him, and I saw him, and then Paula Sullivan sent out, and not on my instructions, (1:21) but he sent out emails to all the people wanting them to leave me alone. Now, (1:27) I never told him to do this, but after that and before I went to the hawks, (1:34) the person I put the complaint against and another lawyer, very prominent lawyers, (1:39) told me to meet them at their office in, it was an area, it's a wealthy area, (1:46) um, please understand it was 2018, so it was in Parkview or Parktown or something to that effect.

(1:56) Now, what I never told the initial investigators, I didn't tell them who they're going to (2:01) investigate, and I think personally, and it's not that I can prove it, it's just my own thought, (2:08) is if you go and search these people's backgrounds, they've got a lot of influence with the NDPP, (2:14) the NPA, and various SAPS officials. The morning that this incident occurred, (2:21) I was called to go there for a meeting. I did not know what was going to happen at all.

(2:25) I was just said they wanted to meet me, so I went there, and I'm going to mention their names now, (2:31) because they are the people I'm complaining about. The first respondent was a lawyer by the name of (2:37) Mr. Ulrich Ruh. Now, he's very prominent.

He's always on ENCA and everywhere. Now, I must also (2:44) state that Ulrich himself didn't do anything, okay, but what happened was I sat in the boardroom with (2:53) him, and we were waiting for the other lawyer, which was the person that I worked with over (2:58) several years. It was a Mr. Ian Smallsmith, very well-known, very prominent.

He investigated and (3:07) not investigated. He represented people like Brad Kebel, Radhavan Krishna, and those types of people. (3:13) He was also, while I was working for, before he passed away, I worked for quite a while for, (3:20) when he was Premier, Didi Mabuza, and Ian Smallsmith was Didi Mabuza's legal advisor.

(3:28) That's how I met him. So, through that, that's how we met each other, because I was working for Didi, (3:35) and Ian was his legal advisor. So, we met several times that way, and also, I got to know many (3:43) irregular things.

It was also in the tabloids where it showed, and he admitted they paid (3:47) monies to me, which was bribes, and I admit to that. I've even admitted that in the newspapers, (3:53) but when these people found out, obviously, I was going to the orgs, because I told them, but (3:57) I didn't tell them for any funny reasons. I actually cared about Ian at that stage, (4:02) and I wanted to protect him as well.

So, I invited him to go with me to the orgs. That was the whole, (4:09) that was my reasoning. So, before I went to the orgs, as I said, they invited me to come to this (4:14) meeting.

I went to the meeting in the morning. I sat with Ulrich in the boardroom, and while I was (4:20) sitting there, we were waiting for Ian to arrive. Now, Ian arrived there, and this is, I think, very (4:25) crucial, very important, and very concerning to me.

Ian arrived there with a very senior member. (4:31) I can't remember his name, but it was a very senior member of SAPS. He arrived there with him. (4:38) So, this person went and sat in the reception, and we sat in the boardroom, but you could see (4:44) the reception from the boardroom if the doors were open. So, I saw this man, and Ian came through to (4:50) us, and Ian said to me, I mean, there's many things that he said, but one of the things he said was (4:55) that I must give a statement relating to several things. I didn't know what the statement was (5:02) involving, but he said that they will guide me what I must say.

So, at that stage, I was still (5:08) kind of fine. I mean, I was stressed, obviously, because of the orgs and everything going on, (5:14) and Paul O'Sullivan, and all of these things, but I mean, I trusted Ian until this point, (5:19) quite a lot. That's why I asked him to go to the orgs with me. So, before we even got to me having (5:26) to depose any statements, affidavits, or anything, Ulrich already started on his computer typing (5:33) things. Obviously, they knew my details, my surnames, my email addresses, my ID numbers, (5:37) all of that. So, I presume that Ian, because I saw him on the computer after Ian spoke, (5:43) so I presume he started typing things, but relating to me.

Then Ian said to me, (5:49) before the meeting starts, I must follow him. So, to me, at first, that wasn't strange, because, (5:55) please understand, the world I was living in at that time, it was very unethical. There was a lot (6:01) of wrong things going on.

I personally acknowledged I was involved with the wrong things. So, I didn't (6:06) actually expect what happened next at all. Ian walked to the bathroom in Ulrich Ruh's office.

(6:14) Now, also, please remember that I see that Ulrich has moved offices.

So, it was the first office (6:21) that he had after he left BDK Attorneys, because he used to work for them, as well as Ian Smallsmith. (6:27) They both worked or consulted or something for BDK Attorneys in Santon.

So, Ulrich started his (6:33) practice. So, it was at this new offices, but it's not, I think they moved to other offices now. But (6:40) anyway, I walked with Ian and he took me to the bathroom of this office, inside the bathroom.

(6:46) Ulrich didn't go with, he stayed in the boardroom. When we got into the bathroom, Ian, and this is (6:53) extremely personal, so I'm not going to go into detail and I apologize for that, because I'm still (6:58) trying to get to terms with everything myself. But in essence, what he did was he forced me to (7:04) get undressed completely.

He said to me, I must get undressed. I was shocked, like nobody can (7:11) believe, because I mean, I'm a man, firstly, we don't expect this. And yeah, what can I say? But (7:21) obviously, I was afraid and I did get undressed.

I didn't want to. I initially said, are you sure? (7:26) I mean, what's going on?

And he said to me, the pretense that he wanted me to get undressed (7:32) was he wanted to make sure if I've got listening devices on me. Now, I mean, he knew me for many (7:40) years.

I would never do this to somebody I saw as a friend and somebody I could confide in. (7:47) But I'm going to stop there. He basically forced me to undress completely.

After this whole (7:54) incident, and I honestly don't want to go into detail, because it's very personal. And it's (7:58) to me, I suffer from anxiety and depression, and I've done for many years. But after this happened, (8:06) I started crying a lot, like a baby.

I mean, my nose was running, it was really profusely crying. (8:16) I got dressed again. And honestly, I don't want to put words in my mouth.

And I don't want to (8:22) preempt things. I can't remember if he got, I can't remember exactly what happened. I know I (8:27) got completely undressed in front of him because he forced me to do this.

Thereafter, he took me (8:33) back, I got dressed again. In fact, before that, he told me while I was getting undressed, I took (8:38) my watch off, I took my cell phone out of my pocket, and I put it down on somewhere there. (8:44) And he took that.

He refused for me to take it back to me. He said he's going to leave it in (8:50) reception. And after the meeting, I can have it back.

As I said, I was crying, I went back to the (8:56) boardroom. And this is where I blame Mr. Rue as well. Although, you know, I've got respect for (9:02) him. He's always been an upstanding and a good person. But he saw me crying the way I did. (9:09) Not once did he ask me, Jan, not Mr. Fenta, because we were on first name basis.

Jan, (9:16) why are you crying like this? So in my mind, he knew what was going on. I mean, (9:23) please remember, these are lawyers, they are seasoned lawyers, and they are extremely experienced. (9:30) So nobody can tell me that, why didn't Mr. Rue firstly ask me, why are you crying like this? (9:37) Never did that at all.

Also, while I was in the state, forced to make these statements and (9:45) affidavits. After that, called in the police officer, that's when I realized why the police (9:52) officer was there. They got the police officer to sign an oath this affidavit.

The police officer, (10:00) while he was there, which, sorry, he was a high ranking police officer. I believe, (10:07) if I'm not mistaken, and the way I know Ian, he was probably somebody from head office, (10:11) or from a senior position. He signed the statement, he oathed it.

And I immediately told, (10:19) well, not immediately, I then left. And Ian said to me, and please don't ask me why, but I need to (10:26) be completely truthful. Ian said to me, can I buy you something to eat? And I said, I wouldn't mind.

(10:33) So this is where things can maybe be proven from your side. Straight after this incident, (10:44) also the police officer, he never asked me why I'm crying like this. Now, firstly, sir, (10:49) you in the police, can you take a

statement from somebody that's in a state like that? (10:53) Number one, it's not right.

The police officer should have asked me, Mr. Fenta, why are you in (11:01) this state? What happened? Because I wasn't in this state when the police officer arrived with (11:06) or after Mr. Smallsmith, because it seemed like they arrived at the same time, but they could (11:11) have come in separate cars. Obviously, I don't know. I don't know what went down outside. (11:15) So I want to make it clear that I'm only speaking facts now, what I know. After this incident, (11:22) to confirm that this meeting actually occurred, if you can draw bank statements from Mr.

Smallsmith's (11:30) bank, because he bought food at a restaurant. And if I'm not mistaken, it was something like (11:38) nachos or something to that effect, but it was a restaurant right outside Mr. Rue's office.

(11:44) Firstly, that will confirm this meeting actually did occur. Another thing is that while this might (11:51) be stupid, but it might confirm also, I want to give you as much to work on. While we were inside, (11:56) before he took me to the bathroom, I remember that Mr. Smith told Mr. Rue, laughingly, he had (12:03) a packet with him that said he bought some high-end lingerie for his wife from a shop in the (12:09) area.

And he's going to exchange it after he's spoken to me and when Mr. Rue would be busy with (12:19) me, he's going to quickly leave and go and exchange. And in fact, he mentioned a bra. He said the bra (12:24) was either too big or too small for his wife.

So he's going to exchange that. And then he'll come (12:29) back before I'm finished with the statement or whatever the case may be. So that's another thing (12:34) that you can also verify that this actually happened.

The other thing also is a day or two (12:40) prior to this actual incident, Mr. Rue spoke to me on the phone, on WhatsApp and everywhere to (12:49) confirm I must come there. Also, I am sure, but this I can't say with certainty, but obviously it (12:56) happened, that there must have been communication between Mr. Rue and Mr. Smallsmith to arrange this (13:02) whole meeting or whatever it was. So that could also be confirmed from SAP's side, which I don't (13:08) believe the previous investigator ever did.

So you can confirm it with bank statements. You can (13:14) maybe confirm it that in that same time period, he bought high-end lingerie for his wife from some (13:20) other shop, which is Victoria's Secret or one of those things around Sandton area. That can also (13:27) confirm what I'm saying.

Also the fact, surely I told Mr. Afterwards, when I got home and relaxed, (13:34) I think it was a day or two afterwards, I started feeling that I can speak to Mr. Rue. Also, I was (13:40) worried about this whole thing and

about the statement that I deposed. So I sent Mr. Rue an (13:45) email, which I unfortunately don't have.

But I sent him an email stating that he must not make (13:51) this statement, whatever it was, public. He must keep it for himself. And also remember in law, (13:59) when he deposed a statement as my so-called attorney, there's a client attorney privilege.

(14:06) And he told me he will keep it with him in safekeeping. So in essence, he should have this (14:13) with him. And if he's got it with him, on the statement will be the police officer that commissioned (14:19) or owed this document.

And that way you'll also be able to find out who this police officer in (14:25) actual fact was. Also, I mean, it's many years later, so I don't think it'll help, but there (14:31) were CCTV cameras all over. That will also be able to confirm, but it's many years later, (14:38) so I don't think there'll be footage available.

But the bank records, the cell phone calls between (14:44) Mr. Rue and myself and Mr. Rue and Mr. Smallsmith, and possibly even Mr. Smallsmith and this police (14:50) officer, because he must have communicated with him in some form of way to tell him to be there. (14:57) So all of this will confirm the meeting actually happened. Also, as far as my statement that they (15:03) forced me to undress and stuff like that, I know it's not relevant in a criminal case, (15:08) but I am more than willing, 100%.

And yourself or your commander or anybody in SAPS or anybody (15:15) can, and I'm totally open to this, can arrange an independent polygraph test for me. (15:23) And I'm completely willing to say and meet that polygrapher any time to prove that what I'm (15:30) saying actually did happen. And it is the complete truth, sir.

Okay. Thank you for (15:40) putting me into the picture, because some of the things that you were already asking for, (15:45) some of them they are already in the docket. Because both the people that were speaking about (15:51) Mr. Ian Smallsmith as well as all of the people who already posed the obvious, admitted to the (15:57) fact that the actual meeting did take place on that particular day.

Even the policeman that (16:06) we spoke about is coming from private agents. He made a statement as well in the case that he was (16:14) present in that meeting. But what I want to confirm with you, you say that this incident (16:21) took place inside the bathrooms.

Yes. So yes, how far is that, what is that office structure? (16:29) And I need to know that so that I can know the people that I can talk to in that office. (16:35) Maybe perhaps the reception area, is it in the same

floor? (16:40) Sir, if I remember correctly, when you walk into the office, it's the reception area.

And then (16:48) I don't know if it's the actual boardroom, but then there was another big section where there (16:54) was a big table, that's where we sat. But I can't remember, there was doors or something that closed (16:59) that section from the actual part where we sat. But the toilet area was, it was a little passage, (17:07) if I remember correctly, to the left.

And then you turned left again and left again, (17:12) and you went into the bathroom. But also, I mean, there was very few people in the office that (17:17) morning. So to me, this was a very calculated and, you know, sir, with all due respect, (17:23) let's look at this ethically and legally.

Why would such high profile people ask somebody from (17:30) crime intelligence? We are talking now just to oath a document, sir. Why would they get somebody (17:37) as high up from crime intelligence, which is now also in the public domain due to corruption, (17:45) unethicalness and all of that?

Why would they use somebody from crime intelligence to actually come (17:51) and oath a document? Doesn't that, isn't that strange to you? Isn't that strange? (17:57) Yeah, I have to say that maybe perhaps the guy who was like, well, we have offices around the (18:08) incident, maybe perhaps could be that it's somebody that he knows. But yeah, it's something that is (18:15) worth looking into.

It's something that I will visit and give you a feedback on. One other (18:24) question that I have is that you said that after this incident, did you report the incident (18:30) to anyone except the police? Yes, I actually did. I reported it to my partner and I've actually (18:41) got an affidavit, which she recently did due to me bringing civil cases against these people. (18:49) I've actually got an affidavit from her stating that now this is another thing that I forgot to (18:56) mention. In 2023, due to all the political influence and stuff, I was arrested on three counts of (19:01) fraud. And I need to make this clear to you.

I was arrested, all three counts related to charges (19:07) less than R10,000, all three combined. I was denied bail. I spent two years in prison, (19:13) two years, 11 days.

All the charges was withdrawn after two years and 11 days because there was no (19:20) merits. I didn't commit fraud at all. But in the time that these cases were on, although Mr. (19:27) Smallsmith, for instance, had nothing to do with these cases, I saw WhatsApps on the investigating (19:32) officer's phone that Mr. Smallsmith actually contacted the investigating officer when I was (19:38) arrested in 2023.

And he was not the complainant. He was not a witness. He was nothing relating to (19:45) this case.

But still, he interfered in that case, as well as senior politicians, who I can confirm, (19:51) but it's not relevant to this. Also, further to that, when I was arrested, there was a private (20:01) investigator that came with the arrest. Now, that's another case.

I'm busy pursuing that. But (20:07) this investigator sat with my partner after I was arrested and actually asked my partner, (20:14) and remember, this case that you've got in front of you, I never made it public to anyone. I keep (20:20) it very private because it's very personal.

And to me, it's humiliating. So nobody knew about this. (20:27) So after I was arrested, the investigator's name was Mr. Juan van der Bank.

Now, I didn't know this. (20:36) I only found this out later. After I came out, now in 2025, Mr. van der Bank, the day I was (20:42) arrested, sat with my partner and my son.

And he actually asked my partner, Nadia Prinzler, (20:49) who also works for government, by the way, he asked her that, did she know about the sexual (20:56) assault claim that I made against Ian Smallsmith? And does she believe it? Does she believe it? Now, (21:04) sir, with all due respect, I mean, we're not stupid. Surely you're a police officer, (21:10) you know investigations. Why would, if there's no relevance to this, and it was lies, (21:16) why would Mr. Smallsmith, obviously it could only be him, why would he have mentioned this to Mr. (21:21) van der Bank? Number one. Number two, why would Mr. van der Bank ask my partner about this (21:27) so-called incident? If it wasn't relevant, if it didn't happen, if it's not bothering Mr. (21:33) Smallsmith, why even bring it up two years after this case was suddenly closed due to lack of (21:41) evidence? Does it make sense what I'm asking? No, those two cases are not related, so there was no (21:53) need for them to ask such questions. Exactly. That's what I'm asking you.

If it was not related, (22:00) why would Mr. van, and why would Mr., because the only person that could have told Mr. van der Bank (22:06) this was Mr. Smallsmith. So why would Mr. Smallsmith tell Mr. van der Bank this if there's (22:12) no truth to it? Yeah, it's a bit suspicious. It's one thing that you need to make a follow-up on.

(22:25) And I've got, I've got an official statement that's oathed, not in force or anything by Nadia (22:32) that she, the post now recently, relating to that whole incident. Yes, can you kindly (22:39) make me that statement as well so that I can find in this, in this document, because it is part, (22:45) as I'm asking you that, is there any other person that you informed about this incident so that, (22:53) and she missed, I'm not sure if ever she wrote how you felt when you informed me about it, (22:58) what was the state at that moment, because it's very important, because you know, (23:04) the first report statement, it has



to have those, such details, because as you said, (23:12) that we are sure that you were traumatized by the whole incident, so it would be very (23:20) necessary for her to include such things in her statement. Okay, well, just further to that, (23:27) just further to that, I can definitely ask her to do that.

I don't think she'll have a problem. Now, (23:32) further to that, to give you a little bit of background about my partner, (23:36) she works for Department of Correctional Services. She's a deputy director at the department, (23:42) so she's got a high position there.

She's been there since 2002. She also studied psychology (23:51) at Potchefstroom University, and thereafter, Tloane. She did her four or five years psychological studies, (23:58) so I think that might be relevant to this case, because for the last 16 years, she's been working (24:05) after hours on Friday nights, and she's part of the management team of Synovale Crisis Center (24:11) in Pretoria, where they actually work with children and people that was either sexually (24:17) abused, assaulted, or just where there was burglaries and people suffered psychological (24:24) problems, to assist them.

So, I mean, if she states something, obviously, she can't state it (24:30) in a personal capacity, but she's got the knowledge and the background where she studied (24:37) psychology, where if she says something, she obviously won't say it on my behalf to suffice me (24:42) or make me happy. It'll simply be the facts, and I don't know if she mentioned this in this (24:48) statement, but, I mean, she mentioned to me a couple of times that I even mentioned to somebody, (24:54) and this is extremely personal. I don't even think I want to mention this in the docket, (24:58) but she mentioned to me, Jan, did you ever mention to people that you had excessive bleeding after (25:04) this incident? Now, I mean, that was coming out of her words, out of her mouth, not me.

I mean, (25:11) but as far as my state of mind is concerned after this incident, I'm sure she will propose (25:17) something or give an affidavit, but also I think the one that I've already got clearly stipulates (25:22) what Mr. van der Bomp asked her, not in my presence, when they were completely alone.

So, (25:28) they can't say that it's coming from me. I wasn't even around.

I was, in fact, arrested at that time. (25:36) Yes. Okay.

Okay. Now, I'm keeping notes here. So, tell me, is there any other evidence or (25:46) documents that we have, any other evidence besides the one that we already have? (25:50) No, except for this affidavit from Nadia now, which I never, you know, it's always been, (25:57) I always try to do something in a way where I didn't involve her, per se, because (26:04) Mr. van der Bomp, at some time in that time when I was arrested, threatened her that he (26:08) will contact her employers and things like that as well, which is also in the statement.

(26:13) And obviously, although she has this high profile position or I post in correctional services, (26:22) she gets scared very quickly. She gets intimidated very quickly. So, it did scare her tremendously.

(26:29) So, I've always tried to protect her and my son as much as I possibly could. (26:35) But she did, I've got this affidavit from her, which I'll send to you straight after this meeting, (26:40) which is obviously new facts in this matter. And also, I mean, I don't know if it's relevant or if (26:47) it's a strong, more evidence, but to me, in my mind, and I do investigations sometimes myself, (26:55) as I did that for Mr. Mabuza and those crowd, why would these questions or these things be (27:03) told to an independent, somebody else, years after the fact? It doesn't make sense if there (27:08) was no truth in it. Yeah, it's something that is worth following up. You know, did you know (27:18) perhaps of the receptionist that was working for Lutru then? No, but I mean, surely, (27:27) so as you've now got, and I'm so glad you've got it, that they don't deny that this actually, (27:32) while I was there, I know I did, the morning when I walked in, there was very few people, (27:40) as I previously said, in this office, if any. I don't know if that was on purpose, (27:45) that it was arranged that way.

Please understand something, and this is obviously off the record, (27:51) but these people are very clever, and not Mr. Russo much, but Mr. Smallsmith. I mean, (27:57) he's been in this game for many years. He knows how to protect himself very much, (28:01) and he's got a lot of influence.

So yes, I know, I mean, I'm not blind to the fact that they've got (28:10) a lot of influence, but what I know happened, and if it'll help in any way to prove that what (28:18) I'm saying is the truth, I will even pay for it myself from an independent person. I will (28:23) do 10 polygraphs to prove that what I'm saying is the truth. (28:30) Okay, okay, not a problem.

You know what, let me go through whatever we're talking about, (28:38) and see if ever I'm going to get the statement from Nadia that you're saying that you're going (28:44) to send me immediately after this meeting, and the second one is that I'm going to make a follow-up (28:49) as to the people that were presented that morning, showing the receptionist will be the person that (28:56) will be available to make a statement as well. I'll make a follow-up with that and give you (29:02) feedback. Maybe perhaps, when is this, Tuesday, maybe perhaps by Thursday, Thursday or Friday, (29:08) I'll give you feedback pertaining to this receptionist, how far I've went in terms of (29:15) finding him, because as you say that they've already changed the office, he's no longer (29:19) where, maybe perhaps working for the VDK company.

So the other thing also, (29:25) sir, the other thing, I don't know if it's maybe worth mentioning or something that (29:31) that a person can ask Mr. Roux,

because I mean it's his offices, but as I said, I don't think (29:38) there was many people present, if any, and if that is the case, why in a weekday (29:46) would there not be anybody in your office? What would be the reason for that? Why wouldn't there (29:51) be people? I mean, surely that should show more motive that there was something (29:56) arranged or orchestrated relating to this.