

**Jan Hendrik Stephanus Venter**  
Identity Number: 7607095034083  
Email: janventer902@gmail.com  
Contact Number: 072 474 8546

Date: 29 December 2025

To:  
The Acting National Head  
Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation (DPCI – Hawks)  
Republic of South Africa

**RE: FORMAL DEMAND FOR THE RE-OPENING AND CONSOLIDATION OF INVESTIGATIONS ARISING FROM WITNESS PROTECTION, MISUSE OF INTELLIGENCE FUNDS, POLITICAL INTERFERENCE, DEFAMATION, AND THE SYSTEMATIC MISREPRESENTATION OF FACTS RELATING TO MY CASE**

**14/5/2018**

I address this letter to you in your capacity as Acting National Head of the Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation. I do so deliberately and exclusively at this level, because the matters set out below concern failures, omissions, and misrepresentations that occurred at the highest levels of law enforcement, intelligence oversight, and prosecution. This correspondence is not intended for circulation at operational or junior levels, nor for discretionary deflection.

This letter constitutes a **formal demand** for the reopening and consolidation of investigations that were previously fragmented, prematurely closed, improperly narrowed, or consciously avoided. I do not make this demand lightly. I do so because the factual record—much of which has since been corroborated by independent investigative reporting, subsequent arrests, court proceedings, sworn correspondence from your own office, and binding High Court orders—now makes it impossible to maintain the position that there was no danger to my life, no misuse of intelligence-linked funds, and no improper interference in matters in which I was a witness.

For more than seven years, I have effectively lived indoors, in isolation, as a direct consequence of the risks created by my involvement in politically sensitive litigation, my cooperation with the Hawks, and my subsequent placement in the Witness Protection Programme. This is not a narrative constructed after the fact. It is consistent with contemporaneous emails, formal complaints, and recorded communications that exist on the record and that pre-date later tabloid narratives portraying me as opportunistic, unstable, dishonest, or motivated by money or attention.

At the outset, it is necessary to correct and restate the factual background accurately, because sustained mischaracterisation of that background lies at the heart of the injustice that followed.

I previously worked for Mr Mathews Phosa, a former Premier of Mpumalanga, senior ANC leader, and Umkhonto we Sizwe regional commander in exile. That relationship placed me within an environment historically associated with intelligence structures, covert operations, and

internal political conflict. I later worked directly for Mr David Mabuza, then Premier of Mpumalanga and subsequently Deputy President of the Republic of South Africa. Mr Mabuza was the principal individual about whom I ultimately provided evidence to the Hawks. My role was not peripheral, informal, or speculative. I was directly involved in matters that became the subject of civil litigation, political confrontation, and intelligence attention.

A defamation action instituted by Mr David Mabuza against Mr Mathews Phosa did not simply disappear or resolve quietly. It proceeded to court. I testified in that matter for Mr Mabuza and against Mr Phosa. This is a matter of public record, reported at the time and later examined by the High Court. Contemporary reporting confirms both the litigation and my involvement, including the political context in which it unfolded. One such report is the TimesLive article titled *“Phosa and Mpumalanga premier in court challenge over spy saga”* dated 9 December 2015, available at:

<https://www.timeslive.co.za/politics/2015-12-09-phosa-and-mpumalanga-premier-in-court-challenge-over-spy-saga/>

Following my testimony in that litigation, I received substantial payments. These payments were not made to me directly by Mr David Mabuza. They were routed through attorney Mr Ian Small-Smith. The existence of these payments, their timing, and their routing through Mr Small-Smith’s accounts were reported contemporaneously and are not a later invention. City Press, via News24, reported on 19 October 2015 that a top lawyer had paid Mathews Phosa’s former butler, identifying me by name and confirming deposits made into my bank account by Mr Small-Smith. That article is available at:

<https://www.news24.com/citypress/news/top-lawyer-did-pay-mathews-phosas-ex-butler-20151019>

At the time, explanations were advanced in the media suggesting that these payments were charitable, personal, or related to legal assistance. What was not publicly known then—but later became a matter of national reporting—is that SARS investigators traced funds flowing through Mr Small-Smith’s accounts to Police Crime Intelligence and the State Security Agency. This was reported by the Sunday Times in November 2017 in an article titled *“Exposed: top lawyers unmasked for taking dodgy cash ‘gifts’ from kingpin Mazzotti”*, available at:

<https://www.sundaytimes.timeslive.co.za/sunday-times/news/2017-11-04-exposed-top-lawyers-unmasked-for-taking-dodgy-cash-gifts-from-kingpin-mazzotti/>

That reporting fundamentally alters the understanding of the earlier payments. It establishes that money routed to me through Mr Small-Smith after my testimony in politically charged litigation flowed through the same channels that SARS later linked to covert intelligence funds. I am not asking the Hawks to accept conjecture or speculation. I am placing a verifiable sequence of events on record: testimony in a political defamation case; payments thereafter via a specific legal intermediary; and subsequent independent confirmation by SARS-linked investigations that intelligence-connected funds flowed through that intermediary’s accounts.

It was against this background that I approached the Hawks, sought protection, and disclosed what I knew. I did so because I understood—correctly—that my position placed me at risk. That assessment was not mine alone. I was placed in the Witness Protection Programme. I raised

repeated concerns about leaks, interference, and danger while inside that programme. Those concerns were recorded in emails and correspondence addressed to senior officials, including the National Head of the Hawks at the time.

One such letter, dated November 2018 and signed by then National Head Lieutenant-General Godfrey Lebeya, formally acknowledged my situation and forms part of the official record. That letter directly contradicts later tabloid narratives asserting that my life was never in danger or that Witness Protection was unnecessary or indulgent. I will attach that correspondence again, not as a courtesy, but as evidence that senior leadership within the Hawks was aware of the risks at the time.

Despite this, a false narrative was later allowed to take hold in the public domain and, more troublingly, within institutional decision-making. Tabloid articles portrayed me as someone seeking money, attention, or protection for improper reasons. It was suggested that I exaggerated threats, that I was removed from Witness Protection for misconduct, and that there was no objective danger to my life. Those claims are demonstrably false when measured against the written record, the contemporaneous reporting cited above, the Hawks' own correspondence, and later developments within Crime Intelligence itself.

Since my removal from Witness Protection, South Africa has witnessed a cascade of events that place my earlier disclosures in stark relief. Senior Crime Intelligence officials have been arrested on allegations relating to fraud, corruption, and the abuse of intelligence funds. The BBC reported on 27 June 2025 that South Africa's Crime Intelligence chief, Lt-Gen Dumisani Khumalo, was arrested over fraud and corruption allegations linked to the misuse of intelligence funds, available at:

<https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c78nj7np6d80>

Business Day has reported on allegations of unlawful surveillance and covert fund misuse within SAPS, confirming that these abuses are not hypothetical or historical, but ongoing:  
<https://www.businessday.co.za/bd/national/2025-10-08-mkhwanazi-alleges-active-surveillance-of-mps-and-covert-funds-misuse-in-saps/>

At the same time, whistleblowers and witnesses continue to be murdered in South Africa at an alarming rate. The killings of Babita Deokaran, Jimmy Mohlala, and others are no longer isolated tragedies. They demonstrate a systemic failure to protect those who expose corruption. The murder of Marius van der Merwe ("Witness D") after testifying before the Madlanga Commission further underscores the lethal consequences of institutional failure in witness protection.

In this context, the earlier assertion that my life was never in danger is unsustainable. Eight days ago, I again spoke to Mr Freddy Bannink in a recorded conversation that forms part of my archive. That discussion confirms that the Hawks were aware of the risks while I was in Witness Protection and that my fear was not imagined. I have now lived under the consequences of that acknowledged risk for more than seven years.

It must be stated unequivocally that **risk does not terminate when Witness Protection ends**. A person identified by the State as being at risk of serious harm does not become safe because an administrative programme concludes or a file is closed. The duty to protect does not expire when it becomes inconvenient.

I have remained silent for a long time because I believed institutions would eventually correct the record. Recent events, including renewed public scrutiny of the National Prosecuting Authority and the imminent departure of the current National Director of Public Prosecutions, Advocate Shamila Batohi, make it imperative that this matter is addressed now rather than buried under institutional transition. Public analysis of the state of the NPA and Advocate Batohi's tenure is available, including reporting by Daily Maverick:

<https://www.dailymaverick.co.za/article/2025-12-28-shamila-batohi-drifts-into-2026-retirement-and-choppy-waters-following-nkabinde/>

I further place on record that my website, <https://expose.org.za>, was created **solely as a defensive security measure**. It was not created for notoriety or personal gain. I know as a fact that individuals implicated in these matters have viewed it. The site functions as a deterrent and a form of dead-man's switch: trusted third parties in Europe and elsewhere hold custodial access to the complete evidentiary archive. The purpose was to protect my life by ensuring that harm to me would render full exposure inevitable. A person can only protect himself so far. That point has now been reached.

I must now place on record a material change in circumstances that has substantially escalated the danger to my life. The death of Mr David Mabuza has removed a central political shield around Mr Ian Small-Smith. While Mr Mabuza was alive and politically powerful, implicit protection insulated certain individuals from scrutiny. That protection no longer exists. In the absence of that cover, those who relied on it are now exposed to criminal consequence. In that context, the incentive to permanently silence a witness who can connect intelligence-linked funds, political litigation, and personal misconduct has increased, not diminished.

Compounding this danger is the existence of an active criminal case against Mr Ian Small-Smith arising from a sexual assault committed against me in 2018, prior to my entry into Witness Protection. I was forced to undress under coercive and humiliating circumstances in the presence of individuals who held power over my safety, finances, and legal position. That conduct formed part of a broader pattern of abuse and control intersecting directly with the misuse of power I later disclosed.

This complaint was improperly buried in 2020. I was compelled to approach the High Court of South Africa. On 5 September 2025, the High Court, Gauteng Division, Pretoria, under case number 2025-147892, granted a mandamus directing that the complaint be investigated. SAPS has since confirmed in writing that the investigation under Parkview CAS 103/05/2020 has been reopened and is active. These are judicially compelled facts.

When viewed together with the removal of political protection following Mr Mabuza's death, the risk calculus changes fundamentally. A person who is both financially and criminally exposed, and now under renewed investigation, has a clear motive to silence a complainant whose

testimony spans sexual violence, intelligence-fund misuse, and politically sensitive litigation. Any continued minimisation of risk is indefensible.

I therefore formally and unequivocally demand the reopening and consolidation of investigations relating to DPCI ENQUIRY CAS 14/5/2018, my placement and treatment in Witness Protection, the misuse of Crime Intelligence and State Security Agency funds routed through legal intermediaries, the payments made to me following my testimony, the interference and leaks I repeatedly reported, the defamatory misrepresentation of these facts to the public, and the continuing threat to my life.

This letter is not a request for sympathy, negotiation, or discretion. It is a demand that the Directorate for Priority Crime Investigation discharge its constitutional mandate without fear, favour, or regard for past embarrassment. The evidence exists. The danger is real. The consequences of further inaction are foreseeable.

I expect a substantive response addressed to me directly, confirming how and under whose authority these investigations will be reopened. Silence, deflection, or procedural delay will be understood for what they are.

Yours faithfully,

**Jan Hendrik Stephanus Venter**

**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-interest oversight. All statements are made for lawful discussion, education, and accountability. No liability is accepted for actions or decisions taken based on this information. Recipients should seek appropriate professional advice before acting.