UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

Constitutional exclusion under section 35(5) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996

BY
DAVE ASHLEY VINCENT ALLY
STUDENT NO. 9704422

PREPARED UNDER THE SUPERVISION OF PROF FRANS VILJOEN
FACULTY OF LAW, UNIVERSITY OF THE PRETORIA, SOUTH AFRICA

15 JUNE 2009

Declaration

I, **Dave Ashley Vincent Ally**, declare that the work presented in this thesis is original. It has never been presented to any other University or Institution. Where other people's works have been used, references have been provided. It is in this regard that I declare this work as originally mine. It is hereby presented in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the LLD Degree.

Signed………………………………………….

Date…………………………………………….

Supervisor: Prof Frans Viljoen

Signature ……………………………………….

Date……………………………………………..

© University of Pretoria

SUMMARY/ OPSOMMING

This thesis examines the interpretation of section 35(5) of the Constitution of the Republic of South Africa, 1996, which empowers the courts to exclude unconstitutionally obtained evidence in criminal trials. A generous and purposive interpretation should be at the heart of the admissibility assessment.

This work explores the threshold requirements and the substantive phase of the interpretation of section 35(5). Given that this provision is manifestly modelled on the terms contained in section 24(2) of the Canadian Charter, the manner in which the courts of that country have grappled with the interpretation of section 24(2) has been accorded particular importance.

As a preliminary issue, the courts must consider whether the threshold requirements of section 35(5) have been satisfied. It is concluded that the courts of South Africa have interpreted the threshold requirements of section 35(5) in a broad manner, thereby making it less onerous to satisfy, compared to the threshold requirements contained in section 24(2).

The substantive phase of the admissibility assessment should consist of two legs that must be clearly separated from each other, for the reason that the assessment in each leg of the analysis serve to enhance different societal interests. The public interest in protecting the rights of the accused should be the central consideration during the first leg, while the societal interest in convicting the guilty should be contemplated during the second leg.

The **first leg** of the analysis is concerned with the effect that admission of the evidence would have on the fairness of the trial. It is suggested that the trial fairness requirement should be determined by means of a conscription analysis. The prosecution may rely on the 'discoverability' doctrine or on the 'independent source' exception. The admission of evidence based on these exceptions would not render the trial unfair. Such an infringement would, accordingly, not add to the seriousness of the violation. Conversely, although admission would tend to render the trial unfair, the evidence should **not** 'automatically' be excluded. However, such an infringement should be regarded as a serious violation, since section 35(5) was designed to prevent unfair trials.

The **second leg** is focused on the effect that either the admission or exclusion of the evidence would have on the integrity of the criminal justice system. It is concluded that the 'current mood' of society should not be determinative of the admissibility assessment.

The following overall admissibility framework is recommended: Despite the fact that admission would render the trial unfair, the courts should be allowed to consider police 'good faith' and other factors ordinarily considered during the second leg, in order to make an admissibility ruling. Differently put, a balancing exercise should be performed, in which the factors identified in the seminal case of *Collins* are considered and weighed at the end of the analysis. More importantly, the seriousness of the violation should be a significant factor in the overall admissibility assessment, since judicial condonation of serious infringements would generally impact negatively on the repute of the criminal justice system.

Hierdie tesis ondersoek die grondwetlik verskansde remedie wat Suid-Afrikaanse howe magtig om ongrondwetlik verkreë getuienis in strafsake uit te sluit. Dit word voorgestel dat 'n onbekrompte en doeldienende uitleg toegepas moet word ten einde betekenis aan artikel 35(5) te gee.

Die drempelvereistes en die substantiewe fase van artikel 35(5) word onder die soeklig geplaas. Aangesien artikel 35(5) onteenseglik geskoei is op die bepalings van artikel 24(2) van die Kanadese Handves van Regte, gee hierdie navorsing besonderse aandag aan verwikkelinge wat betrekking het op die uitleg van hierdie Kanadese bepaling.

Alvorens die meriete van 'n artikel 35(5) dispuut oorweeg mag word, moet daar bepaal word of die bepalings van die drempelvereistes nagekom is. In hierdie verband word konkludeer dat die Suid-Afrikaanse howe 'n onbekrompte uitleg volg, wat dit minder moeilik maak vir 'n beskuldigde om die vereistes van hierdie drempelvereistes na te kom, in teenstelling met iemand wat op artikel 24(2) sou steun.

Die substantiewe fase van die toelaatbaarheidsvraag bestaan uit twee bene, welke bene duidelik van mekaar onderskei moet word, omrede elke been die bevordering van 'n verskillende publieke belang onderskraag. Tydens die eerste been word die publieke belang in die beskerming van die regte van die beskuldigde oorweeg, terwyl die openbare belang in die bevordering van die publieke belang in die skuldigbevinding van skuldige partye gedurende die tweede been ondersoek word.

Die **eerste been** van die toelaatbaarheidsondersoek wentel om watter effek toelating van die getuienis op die billikheid van die verhoor het. Dit word voorgestel dat hierdie aspek bepaal moet word deur middel van 'n konskripsie-analise. Die staat mag steun op die feit dat die getuienis noodwendigerwys op 'n

grondwetlike wyse ('discoverability') of op grond van die 'independent source'-leerstuk verkry kon word. Toelating van getuienis wat op een van hierdie wyses verkry kon word, het nie 'n negatiewe effek op die verhoorbillikheidsvraag nie. Indien toelating van die gewraakte getuienis die verhoor onbillik sou maak, moet daardie getuienis **nie** 'outomaties' uitgesluit word nie. Inteendeel moet 'n skending wat 'n negatiewe impak op die verhoorbillikheidsondersoek het, as 'n ernstige inbreukmaking beskou word, aangesien artikel 35(5) ontwerp was om onbillike verhore te verhoed.

Die **tweede been** van die toelaatbaarheidsondersoek is gemoeid met die vraag of toelating of uitsluiting van die getuienis die regspleging nadelig sou tref. Daar word konkludeer dat daar nie besonderse gewig gehef moet word aan die 'huidige gemoedstemming' van die gemeenskap nie.

Die volgende algehele raamwerk waarbinne die artikel 35(5) analise behoort plaas te vind, word voorgestel: Ten spyte van 'n bevinding dat toelating van die getuienis 'n verhoor onbillik sou maak, behoort byvoorbeeld, die 'goeie trou' van die polisie oorweeg word, alvorens besluit word dat die getuienis toegelaat of uitgesluit word. Anders gestel, moet 'n balanseringsproses plaasvind aan die einde van die analise, waartydens die faktore wat in die Kanadese saak van *R v Collins* uitgelig is, evalueer word, ten einde vas te stel of die getuienis toegelaat of uitgesluit moet word. Die aard en erns van die betrokke inbreukmaking moet deurgaans 'n sentrale plek in die toelaatbaarheidsondersoek inneem.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I acknowledge the indispensable role played by the following persons and institutions in the completion of this thesis:

- The National Research Foundation of South Africa, for its financial assistance. However, the views expressed in this work are mine.
- Professor Frans Viljoen, for his never-ending patience, encouragement, meticulous guidance and mentorship.
- Professor Pieter de Kok, who edited major parts of this work. His contribution is especially appreciated, given that my home language is Afrikaans.
- My family members and colleagues, all of whom cannot be mentioned in the limited space available, who contributed in various ways towards the realisation of this thesis.
- The friendly assistance by the following members of staff at the Library of the Tshwane University of Technology ('TUT'), Eunice and Alice, is appreciated.
- The Department of Law and the Faculty Research Committee of the Faculty of Humanities at TUT is acknowledged for their financial assistance and for allowing me to take leave at a vital stage of my research.
- My sons, Omar and El-Dane, who, in their own subtle ways encouraged me to complete this thesis.

UNIVERSITEIT VAN PRETORIA
UNIVERSITY OF PRETORIA
YUNIBESITHI YA PRETORIA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY/ OPSOMMING .... **ii**

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .... **vi**

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS .... **xi**

TABLE OF CASES .... **xv**

Chapter 1: Introduction **1**

A. Background to research questions 2

B. Research questions 10

C. Terminology 20

D. Literature review 21

E. Methodology 25

F. Limitations 27

G. Structure and overview of chapters 28

Chapter 2: The rationales for exclusionary remedies; exclusion in England and Wales; and the birth of section 35(5) of the South African Constitution **32**

A. Introduction 33

B. The rationales for the exclusion of evidence 35

C. The common law inclusionary rule in England and Wales 45

D. The statutory law position in England and Wales 49

1 Introduction 49

2 The onus; the meaning of the concept 'fair trial' under section 78(1); and the nature of the discretion under section 78(1) 51

3 English case law: illustrations of the factors considered to determine trial fairness 56
4 The abuse of process doctrine........65
5 The Human Rights Act of 1998 and the case law of the European Court of Human Rights: its impact on the admissibility of evidence in England........71
E. Section 35(5) of the South African Constitution 84
1 Introduction........84
2 The Interim Constitution 85
3 The impact of international and foreign law on section 35(5) 91
F. Conclusion........100

Chapter 3: Threshold requirements under section 35(5) of the South African Constitution 107

A. Introduction 108
B. The beneficiaries of the exclusionary remedy 111
1 The concept 'suspect' during the pre-constitutional era........116
2 Brief comparative analysis of the concept 'suspect'........121
3 The concept 'suspect' during the post-constitutional era 138
C. The link between the violation and the discovery of the evidence: the 'connection' requirement........157
1 The 'connection' requirement in Canada 157
2 The 'connection' requirement in South Africa 162
D. Raising the section 35(5) issue and procedural matters 172
1 Raising the issue: the duties of the parties and the nature of the ruling...172
2 Trial-within-a-trial; establishing the basis for the issue by means of facts: the 'threshold onus'........175
E. Standing to rely on section 35(5)........189
F. Conclusion........199

Chapter 4: The first leg of the admissibility analysis: determining trial fairness under section 35(5) 209

A. Introduction 210

B. Determining trial unfairness under section 24(2) of the Canadian Charter214

1 The nature of the evidence obtained after a violation: 'conscriptive' evidence in Canada 218

2 Discoverability or causation analysis as a means to determine trial fairness... 238

3 The nature of the right violated as a factor determining trial fairness.......242

4 The post-*Collins* era: the *Stillman* and *Grant* fair trial directives in Canada 248

C. Determining trial unfairness under section 35(5) of the South African Constitution...284

1 The nature of the evidence obtained after a violation: 'conscriptive' evidence 287

2 Discoverability analysis as a means to determine trial fairness under section 35(5) 329

3 The nature of the right violated...332

4 Admission of conscriptive evidence despite trial unfairness; and the presumption in favour of exclusion...347

D. Conclusion 358

Chapter 5: The second leg of the admissibility analysis: Determining 'detriment to the administration of justice' in terms of section 35(5) 366

A. Introduction 367

B. Canada...373

1 Determining 'disrepute'; public opinion and the nature of the discretion...374

2 The seriousness of the violation: exclusion to prevent judicial condonation of unconstitutional conduct...379

3 Effect of exclusion on the administration of justice in Canada.................399
C. South Africa 417
1 Determining 'detriment'; public opinion and the nature of the discretion..419
2 The seriousness of the constitutional violation in South Africa 432
3 The effect of exclusion in South Africa 464
D. Conclusion..478

Chapter 6: Conclusions and recommendations 483
A. Conclusions...484
1 The appropriateness of Canadian section 24(2) jurisprudence as a guide for the interpretation of section 35(5)...484
2 Threshold requirements 487
3 The fairness of the trial requirement...497
4 Determining 'detriment' 521
B. Recommendations 541
1 Threshold requirements 541
2 The substantive phase 546
C. Concluding remarks 565

BIBLIOGRAPHY...573
ANNEXURES 601
ANNEXURE A 602
ANNEXURE B 606
ANNEXURE C 612
ANNEXURE D...615

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

A

A or AD	Appellate Division of South Africa (now SCA)
All ER	All England Reports
ALR	Australia Law Reports
A-G	Attorney-General
Alta CA	Alberta Court of Appeal
ASSAL	*Annual Survey of South African Law*
AU	African Union
Alta CA	Alberta Court of Appeal

B

BCLR	Butterworths Constitutional Law Reports
BC CA	British Columbia Court of Appeal
BC PC	British Columbia Provincial Court
BCLR	Butterworths Constitutional Law Reports

C

CBR or *Can BR*	*Canadian Bar Review*
CCLA	Canadian Civil Liberties Association
CC	Constititutional Court
Can Crim LR	*Canadian Criminal Law Review*
Cr App R	Criminal Appeal Reports

Cr Law Rev	*Criminal Law Review*
CLQ	*Criminal Law Quarterly*
CkH	Ciskei Division of the High Court of South Africa
Col L Rev	*Columbia Law Review*
CR	Criminal Reports (2nd, 3rd, 4th, 5th, or 6th series)
CRR	Canadian Rights Reporter
Cr App R	Criminal Appeal Report
CILSA	*Comparative International Law Journal of Southern Africa*

D

DLR	Dominion Law Reports
DCJ	Deputy Chief Justice
DP	Deputy President of the Constitutional Court
DPP	Director of Public Prosecutions

E

E & P	*International Journal of Evidence and Proof*
EHRR	European Human Rights Reports

H

HL	House of Lords

I

IC	Interim Constitution of South Africa
ICCS	International Criminal Court Statute

ICCT	International Criminal Court
ICTY	International Criminal Tribunal for Yugoslavia
ICTR	International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights
Israel LR	*Israel Law Review*

N

Nfld CA	Newfoundland Court of Appeal
NSCA	Nova Scotia Court of Appeal

O

Ont C (Gen Div)	Ontario Court General Division
Ont CA	Ontario Court of Appeal
Ont Prov Div	Ontario Provincial Division
Ont Prov Ct	Ontario Provincial Court

P

P	President of the Constitutional Court (South Africa)
PH	Prentice Hall Reports
PACE	Police and Criminal Evidence Act
Prov Ct J	Provincial Court Judge

Q

QB	Queen’s Bench Division

S

SA	South African Law Reports
SACC	*South African Journal of Criminology and Criminal Law*
SACJ	*South African Journal of Criminal Justice*
SALJ	*South African Law Journal*
SAJH	*South African Journal of Human Rights*
SCA	Supreme Court of Appeal
Stell LR	*Stellenbosch Law Review*
SACR	South African Criminal Law Reports
Sask CA	Saskatchewan Court of Appeal

U

UT Fac LR	*University of Toronto Faculty of Law Review*
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights

Z

ZASCA	South African Supreme Court of Appeal

TABLE OF CASES

A

A and Others v Secretary of State for Home Affairs
[2006] 2 AC 221 .... 50, 52, 71, 103, 183, 507
Alderman v US (1996) 394 US 165 ....110, 189
Allen v UK (2002) 35 EHRR CD 298 103
Attorney-General v Milne [1914] AC 765 51
August v Electoral Commission 1999 3 SA 1 (CC) 185

B

Bennett and Others v Minister of Safety and Security and Others
2006 1 SACR 532 (T) 535
Berkemer v McCarthy (1984) 468 US 420 124
Borowski v Canada 9Attorney-General) (1989) 47 CCC (3d) 1 110
Branon v Peek [1948] 1 KB 68 49

C

Coetzee v Attorney General, Kwazulu-Natal 1997 1 SACR 137 (D) 50
Connelly v DPP (1964) AC 1254 .... 65, 70

D

DPP v Marshall [1998] 3 All ER 683 50
Dpp, Natal v Magidela 2000 1 SACR 458 (SCA) 181
Du Plessis v De Klerk 1996 3 SA 850 (CC) 185

E

Ex Parte Minister of Justice, in re: R v Matemba
1914 AD 75 .... 2, 3, 13, 290, 291, 338

F

Ferreira v Levin NO; Vryenhoek v Powell NO
1996 BCLR 441, 1996 1 SA 984................... 26, 103, 126, 127, 195, 198, 200, 202, 240, 555, 572
Fose v Minister of Safety and Security
1997 7 BCLR 851 (CC) 42, 192, 301, 334
Funke v France (1993) 16 EHRR 297 .... 77, 78, 81, 499

G

Government of the RSA v Grootboom and Others 2001 1 SA 46 (CC) 526

H

Harris v Public Prosecutions Director [1952] 1 All ER 1048 47
Hunter v Chief Constable of Midlands [1981] 3 All ER 727 69
Hunter v Southam Inc (1985) 1 DLR (4th) 641 (SCC) 37

I

Imbrioscia v Switzerland 17 (1994) EHRR 441 .... 93, 135

Issacs v Minister van Wet en Orde 1996 1 SACR 314 (A) 152

J

Jeffrey v Black [1978] 1 QB 49 47

K

Katz v US (1967) 389 US 347 .... 37, 75, 189

Kaunda and Others v President of the RSA
2005 1 SACR 111 (CC) 111, 112, 488, 541

Key v Attorney-General, Cape Provincial Division
1996 4 SA 187, 6 BCLR 788 (CC) 304, 306, 433, 520, 555

Khan v S [1997] 4 All SA 435 (A) 286, 466

Khan v UK (2001) 31 EHRR 45 .... 73, 75, 101

Kuruma, Son of Kaniu v R
[1955] 1 All ER 236 (HL) 13, 47, 51, 61, 75, 221, 224, 289, 292, 450

L

Lam Chi-ming v R [1991] LRC (Crim) 416 3

Langa v Hlope (697/08) [2009] ZASCA 36 (31 March 2009) 568

Langemaat v Minister of Safety and Security 1998 3 SA 312 (T) 92

Lawless v Ireland, Series A, No 28 (1978) 73

Lawrie v Muir (1950) SC 19 (HCJ), 1950 SC (J) 16 .... 55, 304, 305, 306

Larbi-Odam v MEC for Education 1998 1 SA 745 (CC) 185

Louw v Minister of Safety and Security 2006 2 SACR 178 (T) 126, 536

M

Maghjane v Chairperson, North-West Gambling Board and Others
2006 2 SACR 447 (CC) 126, 536
Mahomed v National Director of Safety and Security and Others
2006 1 SACR 495 (W) 535
Manqalaza v MEC for Safety and Security and Security, Eastern Cape
2003 All SA 255 (Tk) 455
Mgcina v Magistrate, Lenasia and Another 1997 2 SACR 711 (W) 37
Mhaga v Minister of Safety and Security 2001 2 All SA 534 (Tk) 455
Minister of Safety and Security and Another v Xaba 2004 1 SACR 149 (D) 343
Miranda v Arizona (1966) 384 US 436 .... 124, 389
Mthembu v S (64/ 2007) [2008] ZASC 51 .... 12, 28, 168, 170, 196, 198, 200,
.... 201, 286, 294, 307, 324, 342, 352, 446, 492, 493,
.... 532, 544, 545, 551, 529, 530, 531

N

National Media Ltd and Others v Bogoshi 1998 4 SA 1196 (SCA) 116
Nelles v Ontario (1989) 60 DLR (4TH) 609 (SCC) 229
Nemetz v Germany (1992) 16 EHRR 97 .... 73, 79, 81
Ngqulunga v Minister of Law and Order 1983 2 SA 696 (N) 137
Nkosi v Barlow NO en Andere 1984 2 SA 148 (T) 288, 290
Noormohamed v R [1949] 1 All ER 370 47

O

Oregan v Elstad (1984) 470 US 298 388

Osman and Another v Attorney-General, Transvaal
1994 4 SA 1224, 4 SACR 493 (CC) 141, 147, 148, 205

P

Park-Ross v Director, Office of Serious Economic Offences
1995 2 SA 148 (C) 92, 337
Pillay and Others v S
2004 2 BCLR 158 (SCA) 5, 6, 15, 16, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 44, 68, 69, 92, 99, 100, 163, 167, 168, 182, 193, 213, 286, 215, 294, 295, 296, 301, 302, 303, 306, 308, 309, 310, 324, 327, 328, 329, 330, 331, 339, 351, 352, 354, 359, 361, 362, 367, 368, 369, 372, 417, 420, 422, 427, 428, 429, 433, 435, 436, 437, 438, 439, 442, 443, 445, 455, 453, 462, 465, 466, 467, 473, 474, 477, 478, 480, 481, 482, 486, 487, 500, 502, 505, 509, 510, 515, 517, 520, 523, 526, 528, 529, 530, 532, 533, 540, 547, 549, 551, 562, 564, 567

President of the RSA v Hugo 1997 4 SA 1 (CC) 185, 504
Prosecutor v Zejnil Delalić Case No IT-96-21-T 96

Q

Quozelini v Minister of Law and Order and Another 1994 3 SA 625 (EC) 185

R

R v Allardice [1998] 87 Cr App R 380 50

R v Allen [2001] 4 All ER 768 103

R v B 1993 OPD 768 2

R v B (L) (2007) 49 CR (4th) 245 (Ont CA) 376

R v Baltruisatis (1996) 37 CRR (2d) D-5 (Ont C Genl Div)........................... 376

R v Banghera [2001] 1 Cr App R 299 50

R v Bartle

(1994) 92 CCC (3d) 309 (SCC) 158, 163, 175, 184, 235, 277, 396, 398, 511, 514, 515, 518, 549

R v Beales [1991] Crim L Rev 118 .... 50, 57

R v Belnavis (1996) 107 CCC (3d) 195 (SCC) 110, 376, 386, 399, 414

R v Beveridge (1987) 85 Cr App R 255 78

R v Big M Drug Mart Ltd

(1985) 18 DLR (4th) 321 (SCC) 13, 140, 230, 264, 301, 423, 270, 542

R v Black

(1989) 50 CCC (3d) 20 (SCC) 15, 158, 175, 224, 229, 235, 239, 240, 243, 278, 331, 558

R v Bow Street Stipendiary Magistrate and Glogg (1993) Crim LR 221 65

R v Broyles

(1991) 68 CCC (3d) 308 (SCC) 229, 376, 396, 411, 511, 514, 518, 549

R v Brydges

(1991) CCC (3d) 330 (SCC) 158, 175, 244, 229, 376, 558

R v Buendia-Alas

(2004) 118 CRR 32 (BC PC) 175, 229, 261, 376, 403, 412, 415, 452, 450, 451, 530

R v Buhay

(2003) 174 CCC (3d) 97 (SCC) 175, 229, 257, 260, 261, 262, 376, 384, 386, 387, 390, 391, 397, 398, 400, 401, 402, 404, 407, 415, 427, 443, 447, 449, 450, 451, 452, 457, 458, 479, 462, 480, 528, 529, 530, 531, 533, 549

R v Burlingham
(1995) 97 CCC (3d) 385 (SCC) 224, 243, 256, 296, 298, 303, 326, 330, 376, 405, 407, 409, 410, 411, 412, 415, 460, 505, 508, 537
R v Camane 1925 AD 570 .... 288, 289, 290
R v Canale [1990] 2 All ER 187 .... 50, 63, 79, 127, 498, 499
R v Chalkey and Jeffries (1998) 2 Cr App R 79 .... 50, 127
R v Charley (1993) 16 CRR (2d) 388 (Ont CA) 376
R v Chesterfield Justices, Ex Parte Bradley
[2001] 1 All ER 441 .... 74, 76, 79, 499
R v Chetty 1943 AD 514 444
R v Clarkson (1984) 9 CCC (3d) 263 (SCC) 375
R v Cobham (1995) 92 CCC (3d) 333 (SCC) 235, 376
R v Collins
(1987) 33 CCC (3d) 1, 38 DLR (4th) 508, 1 SCR 265 (SCC) … 5, 15, 16, 29, 38, 39, 40, 41, 43, 82, 90, 106, 163, 184, 190, 194, 195, 212, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 207, 210, 211, 221, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 234, 237, 238, 242, 243, 248, 251, 254, 260, 261, 270, 271, 272, 273, 279, 294, 295, 305, 311, 322, 353, 367, 375, 377, 378, 380, 382, 388, 391, 401, 404, 412, 415, 420, 425, 427, 428, 429, 430, 436, 438, 460, 485, 493, 500, 507, 511, 514, 517, 522, 551, 561, 564
R v Cooke [1995] 1 Cr App R 328 .... 50, 54
R v Croydon Justices, Ex Parte Dean [1993] 3 All ER 129 68
R v Dalley [2002] NSWCCA 284 537
R v Debot (1989) 52 CCC (3d) 193 (SCC) 376
R v Dersch (1994) 85 CCC (3d) 1 (SCC) 224, 229, 279, 376
R v Duarte (1990) 53 CCC (3d) 1 (SCC) 376, 386, 392, 479

R v Dyment
(1988) 45 CCC (3d) 244 (SCC) 228, 236, 375, 385, 409, 389, 412, 415, 427, 439, 447
R v Delaney (1989) 88 Cr App R 338 .... 23, 50, 57, 62, 127, 499
R v Director of Serious Fraud Office, Ex Parte Smith [1993] AC 1 (HL) 148
R v Edwards (1996) 104 CCC (3d) 136 (SCC) 110, 189, 190, 192
R v Elshaw
(1991) 67 CCC (3d) 97 (SCC) 122, 124, 229, 243, 278, 376, 396, 398, 511, 514, 533
R v Espito (1985) 24 CCC (3d) 88 (SCC) 122
R v Evans (1996) 104 CCC (3d) 23 (SCC) 376, 407, 412, 415, 457, 462
R v Feeney
(1997) 115 CCC (3d) 129 (SCC) 83, 162, 175, 220, 222, 243, 244, 245, 250, 260, 261, 272, 273, 283, 309, 336, 368, 371, 376, 383, 387, 389, 391, 393, 397, 398, 400, 401, 412, 415, 427, 439, 443, 457, 460, 462, 479, 480, 508, 529, 530, 533, 566
R v Ferguson (1991) CRR (2d) 227 (SCC) 376

R v Fraser (1990) 55 CCC (3d) 551 (SCC) 189
R v Gama 1916 EDL 34 2
R v Gamble (1988) 44 DLR (4th) 502 (SCC) 230, 301
R v Genest (1989) 32 CCC (3d) 385 (SCC) 229, 375, 394, 408, 533
R v Goldhart
(1996) DLR (4th) 502 (SCC) 176, 159, 160, 162, 175, 376, 491, 446
R v Goopershad (1914) 35 NLR 87 2
R v Gordon (1996) 36 CRR (2d) D-8 (Ont Prov Div) 376
R v Grant (1994) CCC (3d) 173 (SCC) 158, 474, 552

R v Grant
(2006) 38 CR (6th) 58, 209 CCC (3d) 250, 143 CRR (2d) 223, CarswellOnt 3352, 213 OAC 127 (Ont CA) 15, 16, 17, 28, 123, 206, 212, 376, 379, 389, 391, 392, 394, 395, 396, 397, 398, 408, 412, 415, 416, 479, 490, 508, 510, 513, 517, 530, 533, 534, 543, 554, 559
R v Gray (1993) 81 CCC (3d) 174 (SCC) 394
R v Hamill (1985) CCC (3d) 338 (SCC) 375
R v Harper (1994) 92 CCC (3d) 423 (SCC) 376
R v Harris
(2007) 49 CR (6th) 376 (Ont CA) 376, 391, 399, 414, 416, 479, 534, 517,
R v Hebert
(1990) 57 CCC (3d) 1 (SCC) 229, 277, 351, 364, 376, 389, 395, 398, 511, 518, 519, 521, 530, 549, 554, 561
R v Hogan (1974) 18 CCC (3d) 65, (1975) 48 DLR (4th) 427 (SCC) 220
R v Holford [2001] 1 NZLR 385 (CA) 12
R v Horseferry Road Magistrates Court, Ex Parte Bennett
[1994] 1 AC 42 .... 44, 65
R v Hosie (1996) 107 CCC (3d) 385 (SCC) 376, 394, 387, 530
R v Hughes [1998] Crim LR 519 .... 50, 53, 82
R v Hughes [1994] 99 Cr App R 160 50
R v Honan (1912) 6 DLR 276 (SCC) 219
R v Ireland (1970) 126 CLR 321 (Aus HC) 305
R v Jacoy (1988) 38 CRR 290 (SCC) 228, 294, 295, 298, 299, 326, 353, 354, 386, 392, 399, 425, 427, 447, 454, 479
R v James; R v Dzagic (1988) 33 CRR 107 (SCC) 433
R v Janeiro (2003) CarswellOnt 5081 (Ont CA) 122, 154
R v Johnstone (1990) 15 CRR 308 (SCC) 110
R v Keenan [1990] 2 QB 54 .... 50, 61, 64, 79, 127, 499

R v Khan
[1997] 2 Cr LR 508, [1996] All ER 289, 2 Cr App R 440 .... 15, 50, 72, 290
R v Kitaichik (2002) 161 OAC 169, 166 CCC (3d) 14 (Ont CA) 401
R v Kirk [2002] 1 Cr App R 400 50
R v Kokesch
(1990) 61 CCC (3d) 207 (SCC) 158, 175, 229, 349, 376, 386, 389, 391, 393, 398, 399, 384, 392, 412, 415, 438, 447, 449, 450, 452, 457, 460, 462, 479, 530
R v Krall
(2003) CarswellAlta 1336, 30 Alta LR (4th) 350 (Alta CA) 386, 399, 452, 517
R v Kutynec (1990) 57 CCC (3d) 507 (Ont CA) 172
R v Kuzwayo 1949 3 SA 761 (A) 117
R v Ladouceur (1990) 56 CCC (3d) 22 (SCC) 276
R v Law (2002) 160 CCC (3d) 449, 1 SCR 227 (SCC) 229, 262, 376
R v Leany and Rawlinson (1987) 38 CCC (3d) 263 (SCC) 189
R v Leatham 1861 Cox CC 498 .... 35, 46, 47, 100, 485, 498
R v Legere (1988) 43 CCC (3d) 161 (Ont CA) 229, 246, 398, 393, 376, 458
R v Loosely [2001] 4 All ER 897 (HL) 74
R v Loveman (1992) 71 CCC (3d) 123 (Ont CA) 172
R v Loveridge [2001] 2 Cr App R 591 .... 50, 74
R v Lubovac (1989) 52 CCC (3d) 551 (CA) 189
R v Magoeti 1989 2 SA 322 (A) 155
R v Maleleke 1925 TPD 491 2
R v Manickavasagar (2004) 119 CRR (2d) 1 (Ont CA) 229, 262, 376
R v Mann
(2005) 2 SCR 303 (SCC) 123, 206, 377, 391, 399, 415
R v Manninen (1984) 8 CCC (3d) 193 (SCC) 228, 243, 245, 375
R v Marcoux (2) (1972) 13 CCC (2d) 213 (Sask CA) 222
R v Mason [1981] 1 WLR 144 .... 50, 53, 57, 62, 80, 127, 498, 499

R v Meddoui (1992) 5 CRR (2d) 294 (Alta CA) 376

R v Mellenthin

(1993) 76 CCC (3d) 481 (SCC) 224, 236, 278, 279, 322, 331, 390, 500, 508

R v Mills (1986) 29 DLR (4th) 161 (SCC) 230

R v Montoute (1991) 62 CCC (3d) 481 (Alta CA) 189, 192

R v Mooring (2003) 174 CCC (3d) 54 (SCC) 229, 261, 394, 376, 477

R v Moran (1987) 36 CCC (3d) 225 (SCC) 122

R v Mthlongo 1949 2 SA 552 (A) 118

R v Mullen (1990) 2 Cr App R 143 .... 65, 66

R v Nathaniel [1995] 2 Cr App R 565 .... 50, 79, 55, 82

R v Neilson (1985) 36 CRR (2d) D-3 (Ont Genl Div) 376

R v Orbanski; R v Elias

(2005) 2 SCR 3, 196 CCC (3d) 481 (SCC) 257, 353, 376, 400, 513, 549

R v O 'Leary [1998] 87 Cr App R 387 50

R v P [2001] 2 Cr App R 121 74

R v P (MB) (1994) 98 CCC (3d) 289 (SCC) 232

R v Paolitto (1994) 91 CCC (3d) 75 (SCC) 189

R v Pippin (1994) 20 CRR (2d) 62 (Sask CA) 376

R v Plant (1993) 84 CCC (3d) 203 (SCC) 158, 175

R v Pohoretsky

(1987) 33 CCC (3d) 330 (SCC) 228, 236, 375, 386, 389, 390, 480

R v Pozniak (1994) CCC (3d) 353 (SCC) 235, 376

R v Prosper (1994) 92 CCC (3d) 353 (SCC) 235, 243

R v Quinn [1995] 1 Cr App R 387 50

R v Racette (1988) CCC (3d) 250 (SCC) 228, 229, 236

R v Rahn (1985) 18 CCC (3d) 514 (SCC) 375

R v Raphaie [1996] Crim LR 812 50

R v Robb [1990] 91 Cr App R 161 .... 50, 53

R v Rodenbush (1985) 21 CCC (3d) 423 (BC CA) 152, 153

R v Rolls (2001) CarswellAlta 992, 86 CRR (2d) 151 (Alta CA) 452

R v Ross (1989) 46 CCC (3d) 129 (SCC) 278, 336, 353, 500, 508, 531

R v Rothman (1981) 121 DLR (3d) 578 (SCC) 222

R v Sam [1998] QB 615 .... 50, 51

R v Samuel

[1998] 87 Cr App R 232 .... 50, 56, 58, 60, 80, 87, 498, 499

R v Sanghera [2001] 1 Cr App R 299 74

R (Anderson) v Secretary for the Home Department

[2003] 2 WLR 1389 72

R v Sieben (1987) 32 CCC (3d) 574 SCC) 375, 457, 533

R v Silviera (1995) 97 CCC (3d) 574 (SCC) 229, 386

R v Smith (1991) 63 CCC (3d) 313 (SCC) 376

R v Stillman

(1997) 113 CCC (3d) 321, 5 CR (5th) 1, 1 SCR 607 (SCC) 16, 479, 480, 462, 479, 457, 458, 500, 501, 508, 512, 518, 528, 529, 530, 531, 548

R v Strachan

(1988) 46 CCC (3d) 479 (SCC) 157, 158, 159, 161, 163, 184, 228, 375, 388, 391, 398, 437, 440, 445, 454, 456, 533

R v Symbalisty (2004) 119 CRR (2d) 311 (Sask PC) 229, 261, 386, 449

R v Therens

[1985] 1 SCR 613, 18 CCC (3d) 481 .... 122, 164, 225, 227, 228

R v Togher [2001] 1 Cr App R 33 .... 50, 74

R v Trask (1984) 3 CCC (3d) 132 (SCC) 228, 244, 375

R v Traverse

(2003) CarswellNfld 119, 175 CCC (3d) 537 (Nfld CA) 376, 389

R v Tremblay (1985) 17 CCC (3d) 359 (SCC) 353

R v Trupedo 1920 AD 58 116

R v Turcotte (1988) 39 CCC (3d) 193 (Sask CA) 375, 394

R v Upston (1998) 42 CCC (3d) 564 (SCC) 157

R v Voisin [1918] 1 KB 531 118

R v Voss (1989) 50 CCC (3d) 58 (Ont CA) 122

R v Vu

(2004) 118 CRR (2d) 315 (BC CA)..... 229, 261, 376, 407, 411, 412, 415, 479

R v Walsh [1990] 91 Cr App R 163 .... 50, 53, 54

R v Wijesinha (1995) 100 CCC (3d) 410 (SCC) 189, 376

R v Wiley (1993) 84 CCC (3d) 161 (SCC) 158, 175

R v Williams (1992) 78 CCC (3d) 72 (SCC) 184

R v Williams (2008) 52 CR (6th) 210 (Ont SC) 391, 399, 415

R v Wise (1992) 70 CCC (3d) 193 (SCC) 224, 240, 375, 390

R v Wong (1990) 60 CCC (3d) 460 (SCC) 189, 376, 392, 376, 399

R v Wray (1970) 4 CCC (3d) 1 (SCC) 13, 220, 507

Rakas v Illinois (1978) 439 US 128 189

S

S v Agnew 1996 2 SACR 535 (C) 2, 86, 417, 435, 454

S v Aimes 1998 1 SACR 343 (C) 286

S v August and Others [2005] 2 All SA 605 (NC) 172, 176

S v Bhulwana 1996 1 SA 338 (CC) 186

S v Biko 1972 4 SA 492 (O) 118

S v Brown en 'n Ander 1996 2 SACR 49 (NC) 50

S v Cloete 1999 2 SACR 137 (C) 116, 359, 176

S v Desai 1997 1 All SA 298 (W) 291, 292, 293, 417, 424, 430

S v Du Preez 1991 2 SACR 372 (Ck) 137, 334

S v Dzukuda; S v Tshilo

2000 4 SA 1079 (CC) 119, 120, 309, 310, 345, 360, 541

S v Gabriel 1971 1 SA 646 (RA) 179

S v Gasa and Others 1998 1 SACR 446 (D) 176

S v Gumede 1998 5 BCLR 530 (D) 86, 286, 198

S v Hammer 1994 2 SACR (C) 86

S v Hena and Another

2006 2 SACR 33 (SE) 42, 176, 286, 444, 447, 462, 475, 478, 480, 529, 530, 531, 552, 555

S v Hoho 1999 2 SACR 159 (C) 176, 286

S v Huma 1995 2 SACR 411 (W) 315

S v Hlalikaya and Others 1997 1 SACR 613 (SE) 316

S v January; Prokureur-Generaal, Natal v Khumalo

1994 2 SACR 801 (A) 288, 471, 539

S v Khan 1997 2 SACR 611, 4 All SA 435 (SCA) 15

S v Khuzwayo 1990 1 SACR 365 (A) 471

S v Kidson 1999 SACR 338 (W) 86

S v Langa 1963 4 SA 941 (N) 288

S v Langa 1996 2 SACR 153 (N) 176

S v Langa 1998 1 SACR 21 (T) 140, 205, 336

S v Lebone 1965 2 SA 837 (A) 186, 471, 539

S v Lottering 1999 12 BCLR 1478 (N) 286, 348, 453, 472, 533

S v M 2000 2 SACR 474 (N) 216, 286, 297, 417, 427, 447, 448

S v M 2002 2 SACR 411 (SCA) 216, 222, 286, 294, 295, 297, 298, 300, 311, 322, 323, 417, 447, 509

S v Mabaso and Another 1990 3 SA 185 (A) 116, 117, 176, 178, 313

S v Madiba and Another

1998 1 BCLR 38 (D) 173, 176, 286, 306, 417, 435, 440, 530, 533, 534

S v Mahlakaza 1996 2 SACR 187 (C) 86, 347

S v Makwanyane

1995 2 SACR 1 (CC) 17, 44, 93, 98, 215, 372, 301, 421, 423, 425, 426, 430, 522, 542

S v Mansoor 2002 1 SACR 629 (W) 286, 294, 417

S v Mark and Another 2001 1 SACR 572 (C) 286

S v Marx 1996 2 SACR 140 (W) 86, 286, 336, 417, 457

S v Maseko 1996 2 SACR 91 (W) 86

S v Mashumpa and Another 2008 1 SACR 128 (E) 175, 176, 286

S v Mathebula

1997 1 SACR 19 (W) 86, 176, 183, 185, 286, 317, 319, 417, 457

S v Mayekiso 1996 2 SACR 298 (C) 4, 451, 530

S v Mbatha 1996 2 SA 464 (CC) 185

S v Melani and Others

1996 2 BCLR 174 (EC) 6, 475, 480, 481, 487, 500, 509, 523, 528, 530, 536, 539, 542, 547

S v Malefo en Andere

1998 1 SACR 127 (W) 173, 430, 433, 434, 468, 478, 530

S v Mfene and Another 1998 9 BCLR 115 .... 149, 286, 329, 417, 434, 530

S v Mhlungu and Others 1995 3 SA 867 (CC) 116, 355

S v Mkhize

1999 2 SACR 632 (W) 286, 434, 435, 438, 453, 460, 462, 467, 475 479, 481, 531, 532, 540

S v Mofokeng and Another 1969 4 SA 852 (W) 118

S v Mokoena en Andere 1998 2 SACR 642 (W) 286

S v Monyane 2001 1 SACR 115 (T) 286, 336, 339

S v Motloutsi

1996 1 SACR 78, 2 BCLR 220, 1 SA 584 (C) 4, 463, 530

S v Mphala 1998 1 SACR 388 (W) 41, 475, 478, 480, 530, 531, 555

S v Mufuya and Others (2) 1992 2 SACR 370 (W) 118

S v Naidoo and Others

1998 1 SACR 479, 1 BCLR 46 (D) 90, 452, 475, 480, 482, 515, 549, 551

S v Nel 1987 4 SA 950 (W) 288, 292

S v Ngcobo 1998 1O BCLR 1248 (W) 430, 466, 523, 527

S v Ngwenya and Others 1998 2 SACR 503 (W) 140, 286, 334, 335

S v Nomwebu 1996 2 SACR 396 (E) 44, 430, 431, 481, 523

S v Ntlantsi [2007] 4 All SA 941 (C) 5, 166, 207, 491, 549

S v Orrie and Another

2005 1 SACR 63 (C) 142, 150, 153, 155, 204, 286, 294, 489, 531, 542

S v Pitso 2002 2 SACR 586 (O) 286

S v R and Others 2000 1 SACR 33 (W) 533

S v Radebe 1968 4 SA 410 (A) 186

S v Radebe; S v Mbonani 1998 1 SA 191 (T) 335

S v Sebejan and Others 1999 8 BCLR 1086 (T) 86, 286, 319, 542

S v Seseane 2000 2 SACR 225 (O) 153, 435, 436, 454, 462, 480, 531

S v Shaba en Andere 1998 2 SACR 321 (T) 286, 318

S v Sheehama 1991 2 SACR 860 (A) 3, 454

S v Shongwe en Andere

1998 2 SACR 321, 9 BCLR 1170 (T) 35, 286, 294, 306, 318, 368, 417, 429, 434, 435, 453, 456, 462, 466, 470, 473, 474, 475, 479, 481, 487, 530, 532, 564, 570

S v Skweyiya 1984 4 SA 712 (A) 444

S v Soci 1998 2 SACR 275 (E) 44, 475, 480, 481, 523, 527, 530

S v T 2005 1 SACR 318 (E) 448

S v Tandwa

[2007] SCA 34 (RSA) 15, 213, 222, 286, 294, 298, 300, 301, 303, 304, 306, 307, 311, 326, 329, 342, 343, 349, 352, 500, 509, 510, 511, 517, 529, 530, 531, 542, 554 556, 559

S v Tsotsetsi and Others (1) 2003 2 SACR 623 (W) 286, 335, 471, 472

S v Van der Merwe 1997 19 BCLR 1470 (O) 118, 176

S v Vumase 2000 2 SACR 709 (W) 335, 337

S v Xaba 2004 1 SACR 149 (D) 343

S v Williams 1995 7 BCLR 861 (CC) 522, 523

S v Yawa 1994 2 SACR 709 (SE) 42, 86, 313

S v Zuma 1995 2 SA 642 (CC) 82, 468, 494, 495, 541

S v Zuma 2006 3 All SA 8 (W) 489

S v Zwayi 1997 2 SACR 772 (CkH) 173, 336

Sanderson v Attorney-General, Eastern Cape 1998 1 SACR 227 (CC) 199

Saunders v United Kingdom (1997) 23 EHRR 313 71

Schenk v Switzerland (1991) 13 EHRR 242 73

Soobramoney v Minister of Health 1998 1 SA 765 (CC) 526

T

Texeira de Castro v Portugal (1998) EHRR 101 34 72

Thebus and Another v S 2003 10 BCLR 110 (CC) 311, 327, 489, 510

The People (A-G) v O' Brien [1965] IR 142 .... 55, 90, 99, 433, 438, 479, 528

Thompson Newspapers Ltd v Canada

(1990) 54 CCC (3d) 417, 67 DLR (4th) 161 (SCC) 229, 238, 240, 266, 303, 326

Thint (Pty) Ltd v National Director of Public Prosecutions and Another; Zuma v National Director of Public Prosecutions and Others

[2008] ZACC 13 536

U

US v Cecolini (1978) 435 US 268 446

US v Fortna (1986) 479 US 950 189

US v Hawkins (1986) 479 US 850 189

US v Sugera (1984) 468 US 796 388

US v Wade (1967) 338 US 218 336

V

Van der Linde v Calitz 1967 2 SA 239 (A) 288

Van der Meer v The Queen (1988) 82 ALR 18 128

W

Whiteman v Attorney-General of Trinidad and Tobago
(1991) LRC (Cons) 563 (PC) 289

Williams v S [1997] 1 All SA 294 (NC) 286

Woolmington v Director of Public Prosecutions (1836) AC 462 (HL) 100

Z

Zantsi v Council of State, Ciskei 1995 4 SA 615 (CC) 116, 179, 181

Zuma and Another v National Director of Public Prosecutions
2006 1 SACR 468 (D) 535