## 26 JULY 2023 **Real Estate Law** ALERT

## **IN THIS ISSUE**

Acquisitive prescription of property: Is it still applicable in cases where there has been illegality?

Dhanwanthie Gianchandi (the possessor), along with her late husband, purchased a house three houses away from the property in April 1990. The property was undeveloped and deserted and the possessor and her family made improvements to the property, transforming it into a functional nursery and community park. The possessor had been running the nursery and park at her own cost since 1990. At the time the possessor's application was brought, the improvements made to the property amounted to approximately R950,000 and the possessor also absorbed the park's running costs of R16,000 per month.





INCORPORATING KIETI LAW LLP, KENYA



## Acquisitive prescription of property: Is it still applicable in cases where there has been illegality?

Dhanwanthie Gianchandi (the possessor), along with her late husband, purchased a house three houses away from the property in April 1990. The property was undeveloped and deserted and the possessor and her family made improvements to the property, transforming it into a functional nursery and community park. The possessor had been running the nursery and park at her own cost since 1990. At the time the possessor's application was brought, the improvements made to the property amounted to approximately R950,000 and the possessor also absorbed the park's running costs of R16,000 per month. The possessor alleged that at the time that her application was brought, she had been in occupation of the property for a period of 31 years. She further asserted that she had exercised her possession openly and that she had possessed the property with the intention of possessing it and controlling it as if she was the owner.

Various neighbours of the possessor confirmed, by way of confirmatory affidavits, that she had been using and occupying the property openly. One of the neighbours confirmed that he had been residing in the area for longer than 31 years and that the possessor had been using the property as a nursery and a park for 31 years.

The respondents argued that the possessor had not been on the property for 30 years as she had failed to provide proof in her affidavit that evidenced the possession. The possessor's ownership was further disputed due to her illegal connection of electricity and water and the lack of applications for legal water and lights connection. The respondents also argued that the property was used illegally as it was zoned for public open space and that the possessor did not make an application to the municipality to use the property as a nursery.

# Legal requirements for acquisitive prescription

In reaching its decision, the court considered the legal requirements to be met for a claim of acquisitive prescription to be granted.

Section 1 of the Prescription Act 68 of 1969 (Act) provides that:

"Subject to the provisions of this Chapter and of Chapter IV, a person shall by prescription become the owner of a thing which he has possessed openly and as if he were the owner thereof for an uninterrupted period of 30 years or for a period which, together with any periods for which such thing was so possessed by his predecessors in title, constitutes an uninterrupted period of 30 years."



Recommended Lawyers: Simóne Franks | Fatima Gattoo Muhammad Gattoo | Samantha Kelly



# Acquisitive prescription of property: Is it still applicable in cases where there has been illegality?

CONTINUED

A party claiming acquisitive prescription of an object must prove:

- civil possession (meaning that they possess the object with the intention to possess and control it as an owner);
- possession for an uninterrupted period of 30 years;
- that possession was exercised openly; and
- that they were the adverse user.

Section 4(1) of the Act further provides that the running of acquisitive prescription is interrupted by the service on the possessor of any process whereby any person claims ownership of the property in question.

Importantly, the court had to consider whether the requirement that the property be "possessed openly and as if he were the owner thereof" was met, as required by section 1 of the Act.

## Findings

The court held that the illegality of the water and electricity usage, the failure to apply for the requisite zoning, as well as the use of the nursery without the requisite authority could be separated from the issue of possession. The court reasoned that this was appropriate in relation to prescription matters.

Lastly, the court considered the extent of the possession due to the fact that the possessor only utilised certain parts of the property. The court applied the test of whether "there was such use of a part or parts of the ground as amounts, for practical purposes, to possession of the whole".

The court applied the reasoning from Markets Transport, in Morgenster 1711 (Pty) Ltd v De Kock NO and Others [2012] JOL 28477 (WCC) in which the court observed that "the acts of use constituting the open possession need not have been exercised in relation to every part of the disputed area or with absolute continuity". In the current circumstances, the court was satisfied that even though the possessor used certain portions of the property infrequently, that fact did not detract from her open possession.

The court ultimately held that the possessor was the rightful owner of the property through acquisitive prescription, and it was ordered that the property be transferred into her name.

It should be noted that the courts were not condoning the illegal acts of the possessor, nor will they do so future.

**Mike Collins** 

## **OUR TEAM**

For more information about our Real Estate Law practice and services in South Africa and Kenya, please contact:



## **Muhammad Gattoo**

Practice Head & Director: Real Estate Law T +27 (0)11 562 1174 E muhammad.gattoo@cdhlegal.com



## Sammy Ndolo

Managing Partner | Kenya T +254 731 086 649 +254 204 409 918 +254 710 560 114 E sammy.ndolo@cdhlegal.com



#### **Bronwyn Brown** Director:

Real Estate Law T +27 (0)11 562 1235 E bronwyn.brown@cdhlegal.com

## Mike Collins

Director: Real Estate Law T +27 (0)21 481 6401 E mike.collins@cdhlegal.com



#### Simone Franks Director:

Real Estate Law T +27 (0)21 670 7462 E simone.franks@cdhlegal.com





Director: Real Estate Law T +27 (0)11 562 1236 E fatima.gattoo@cdhlegal.com

## Simone Immelman Director: Real Estate Law

T +27 (0)21 405 6078 E simone.immelman@cdhlegal.com



Real Estate Law T +27 (0)11 562 1237 E muriel.serfontein@cdhlegal.com

## John Webber

Director: Real Estate Law T +27 (0)11 562 1444 E john.webber@cdhlegal.com



## Alex de Wet

Director: Real Estate Law T +27 (0)11 562 1771 E alex.dewet@cdhlegal.com



Natasha Fletcher Counsel: Real Estate Law T +27 (0)11 562 1263 E natasha.fletcher@cdhlegal.com



Samantha Kelly



## E samantha.kelly@cdhlegal.com

## Kirsty de Sousa



Professional Support Lawyer Real Estate Law T +27 (0)11 562 1747 E kirsty.desousa@cdhlegal.com

## **OUR TEAM**

For more information about our Real Estate Law practice and services in South Africa and Kenya, please contact:



## **Robert Kaniu Gitonga**

Senior Associate | Kenya T +254 731 086 649 +254 204 409 918 +254 710 560 114 E robert.gitonga@cdhlegal.com



## Bridget Witts-Hewinson

Senior Associate: Real Estate Law T +27 (0)21 481 6447 E bridget.witts-hewinson@cdhlegal.com



### Lutfiyya Kara Senior Associate: Real Estate Law

T +27 (0)11 562 1859 E lutfiyya.kara@cdhlegal.com

## Sune Kruger

Senior Associate: Real Estate Law T +27 (0)11 562 1540 E sune.kruger@cdhlegal.com



Senior Associate: Real Estate Law T +27 (0)21 481 6443 E lulama.lobola@cdhlegal.com



## Ceciley Oates Senior Associate: Real Estate Law T +27 (0)11 562 1239 E ceciley.oates@cdhlegal.com



Associate: Real Estate Law T +27 (0)11 562 1754

## Zahra Karolia



E fatima.essa@cdhlegal.com



#### Ebun Taigbenu Associate:

Real Estate Law T +27 (0)11 562 1049 E ebun.taigbenu@cdhlegal.com



Muneerah Hercules Associate Designate: Real Estate Law T +27 (0)11 562 1579

E muneerah.hercules@chdlegal.com

### **BBBEE STATUS:** LEVEL ONE CONTRIBUTOR

Our BBBEE verification is one of several components of our transformation strategy and we continue to seek ways of improving it in a meaningful manner.

## PLEASE NOTE

This information is published for general information purposes and is not intended to constitute legal advice. Specialist legal advice should always be sought in relation to any particular situation. Cliffe Dekker Hofmeyr will accept no responsibility for any actions taken or not taken on the basis of this publication.

## **JOHANNESBURG**

1 Protea Place, Sandton, Johannesburg, 2196. Private Bag X40, Benmore, 2010, South Africa. Dx 154 Randburg and Dx 42 Johannesburg. T +27 (0)11 562 1000 F +27 (0)11 562 1111 E jhb@cdhlegal.com

## **CAPE TOWN**

11 Buitengracht Street, Cape Town, 8001. PO Box 695, Cape Town, 8000, South Africa. Dx 5 Cape Town. T +27 (0)21 481 6300 F +27 (0)21 481 6388 E ctn@cdhlegal.com

## NAIROBI

Merchant Square, 3<sup>rd</sup> floor, Block D, Riverside Drive, Nairobi, Kenya. P.O. Box 22602-00505, Nairobi, Kenya. T +254 731 086 649 | +254 204 409 918 | +254 710 560 114 E cdhkenya@cdhlegal.com

### STELLENBOSCH

14 Louw Street, Stellenbosch Central, Stellenbosch, 7600. T +27 (0)21 481 6400 E cdhstellenbosch@cdhlegal.com

©2023 12515/JUL



INCORPORATING KIETI LAW LLP, KENYA