

Dear Mr. van Niekerk.

I hereby attach to the following for your attention, which speaks for itself

1. My report to Mr Tony Berlowitz;
2. My inspection summary in the Mashiloane matter.

I take strong exception that Mr Norman Berger refers to me as a candidate attorney employed by Attorney Ronald Bobroff. At the time of the inspection I was employed as a cost consultant. Rule 70 grants me the power to inspect any file before taxation and the warden has no time-limit on the amount of time it takes to inspect the file.

Mr Berger's assertion that at the time of the inspection I was a candidate attorney and attempted to draw me into the whole media debut, is considered by the contempt that it deserves. You can find out when my contract is registered and hopefully see to it that Mr. Berger is being subjective. Mr Berger's account was **riddled with fictional items**. Unfortunately, I did not have the chance to appeal the case to the court because I did not get notification of the taxation beforehand.

I have discussed my findings, namely the many fictitious items in the party and party accounts with the RAF, and my recommendations to bring this matter to the attention of Forensics have been conveyed to Mr Berlowitz.

I will not allow people to implicate me in this matter if it is surrounded by lies and untruths. The average expectation of the man on the street is that you as editor should have some control over the contextual correctness of the publication? Or do you throw away the untruths of the constitutional right of freedom of speech. Well, weigh it up against my constitutional rights and I think the scale will tip to my side.

Sincerely

-

CORA VAN DER MERWE

TEL: 071 712 9453

FAX: 086 692 7895

<20140430153807839.pdf>

Annexure 42