

# Katekani Mashamba

Senior Associate



Katekani Mashamba is a Senior Associate in our Dispute Resolution practice.

## About Katekani

Katekani is an accomplished commercial litigation attorney with a proven track record litigating cases in various courts, including the High Court, Supreme Court of Appeal, and the Constitutional Court. She specialises in commercial litigation, and her focus is on areas such as the Companies Act, insolvency, business rescue, as well as general civil litigation, public, and administrative law. In addition, Katekani is well-versed in alternative dispute resolution methods, offering clients effective solutions outside the traditional courtroom setting.

She joined CDH as an Associate in 2022 and was promoted to Senior Associate in 2024.

## Credentials

### Education

- Bachelor of Laws – UNISA
- Year of admission as an attorney: 2019
- Registered with the Legal Practice Council

### Membership

- Member of the South African Restructuring & Insolvency Practitioners Association (SARIPA)

## News

[Unilateral decisions by business rescue practitioners: A make or break in the termination of business rescue proceedings](#)

Monyela N.O and Others v Tayob N.O and Others (2023/117272) ZAGPPHC 86 (2 February 2024 ) involved an application for leave to appeal a judgment granted in the urgent court.

## Contact Katekani

+27 (0)11 562 1392

[katekani.mashamba@cdhlegal.com](mailto:katekani.mashamba@cdhlegal.com)

[Katekani on LinkedIn](#)

## Expertise

[Dispute Resolution](#)

## Location

Johannesburg

## Language

English

isiZulu

Sesotho

Xitsonga

### Non-compliance with court orders: When is late too late?

In *Economic Freedom Fighters and Others v The Chairperson of The Powers and Privileges Committee N.O and Others* (23230/2023) ZAWCHC 16 (30 January 2024) the court had to determine whether to condone non-compliance with a court order that would lead to a delay in finalising a matter of national importance.

### Trusts and suretyship: Is consent from a majority of trustees enough for a trust to conclude an agreement?

In the decision of *Shepstone & Wylie Attorneys v Abraham Johannes de Witt N O and Others* (1270/2021) ZASCA, the Supreme Court of Appeal (SCA) had to determine whether the court a quo was correct in finding that a resolution taken by the majority of a trust's trustees was sufficient to authorise the conclusion of a deed of suretyship in favour of a third party.

### Orthogonal tactics to try save a sinking ship

People rarely abandon a ship unless they have absolutely no alternative. The same can be said of some affected parties even when it is clear that the business rescue process has failed. This was again demonstrated in the recent Supreme Court of Appeal (SCA) judgment of *Louis N O and Others v Fenwick N O and Others* (598/2021) ZASCA 59, where certain affected parties pursued an orthogonal interpretation of the legislation to try rescue (every pun intended) the business rescue of Louis Group SA (Pty) Limited (Company).

[All news by Katekani Mashamba →](#)

## Recognition

- Pro-Bono Award

Won Pro-Bono Award 2020 – Refugee Law