COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO STATE CAPTURE

HELD AT

CITY OF JOHANNESBURG OLD COUNCIL CHAMBER

158 CIVIC BOULEVARD, BRAAMFONTEIN

14 MAY 2021

<u>DAY 395</u>



22 Woodlands Drive Irene Woods, Centurion TEL: 012 941 0587 FAX: 086 742 7088 MOBILE: 066 513 1757 info@gautengtranscribers.co.za

CERTIFICATE OF VERACITY

I, the undersigned, hereby certify that, *in as far as it is audible*, the aforegoing is a *VERBATIM* transcription from the soundtrack of proceedings, as was ordered to be transcribed by Gauteng Transcribers and which had been recorded by the client

COMMISSION OF INQUIRY INTO STATE CAPTURE

<u>HELD AT</u>

CITY OF JOHANNESBURG OLD COUNCIL CHAMBER

158 CIVIC BOULEVARD, BRAAMFONTEIN

DATE OF HEARING:

TRANSCRIBERS:

14 MAY 2021

B KLINE; Y KLIEM; V FAASEN; D STANIFORTH



Gauteng Transcribers Recording & Transcriptions

Page 2 of 133

PROCEEDINGS RESUME ON 14 MAY 2021

DOROTHY: Chair the first witness to testify this morning is Dorothy. She has taken the oath before you in chambers and an application has been granted by yourself in chambers under Application Number SEQ27/2021. The order should be on your desk before you.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Well just for the benefit of the public we are starting late because the witnesses who are going to give evidence today are witnesses whose identity needs to
10 be protected and the delay is connected with the logistics that needed to be attended to in order to make sure that they have taken the oath and are able to testify.

I have considered an application for an order aimed at protecting the identity of the witnesses concerned in regard to each witness and I have been satisfied that in each case a proper case has been made out for an order protecting their identity.

I am going to read out one order and not all three because they are basically the same except for the names. 20 That is correct Mr Pretorius.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: That is correct Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And if I may just place on record the orders that you have granted in chambers and will announce now are in respect of Dorothy, Frank and Steven.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes. Yes I see that one is under the number that you gave earlier plus 01. Another one – are they all under 01 – that gave their applications.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: The other one is SEQ26 and the third one is SEQ04/2021 just for the record.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay alright. I am going to deal with the one for Frank.

The order I grant in respect of Frank is the following.

 The application – this application may be heard in camera and without notice to affected parties.

10

20

- 2. The witness the witness referred to in this application and who is scheduled to testify today is to be referred to as Frank during his testimony before the commission and thereafter insofar as matters relating to the commission are concerned.
- 3. The witness identity all not be disclosed or published in any manner.
- 4. The names and initials of the witness shall be redacted from all affidavits and documentation presented in evidence – presented in evidence.
- 5. When the witness testifies before the commission
 - 5.1 No photograph or video or other image of the witness may be taken or published or broadcast.
 - 5.2 No person may photograph or publish any photograph or other image of any person

Page 4 of 133

engaged in and or responsible for the protection of the witness when he gives evidence.

- 5.3 The witness need not be present at the commission's hearing venue that is the hearing venue and give evidence but he may instead give his evidence from a separate and undisclosed location the protected witness location.
- 5.4 No camera will be permitted in the protected witness location.
- 10 5.5 No person other than the Chairperson, members of the commission's legal team, the commission's safety and security advisor those necessary to assist or protect the witness when he give evidence or another person specifically designated by the Chairperson will be permitted to enter the protected witness location without the prior written permission of the Chairperson.
 - 5.6 The oath or affirmation 5.6 is to be deleted. So5.7 becomes 5.6.
- 20 5.6 An audio link from the protected witness location will be provided so that the witness evidence can be heard in the commission's hearing venue when such evidence is given.
 - 5.7 Subject to the usual rules applicable to the conduct of the commission's proceedings.

5.8.1 Members of the public including the media may be present in the hearing venue in such numbers as may be directed by the Chairperson. 5.8.2 Sound reaching the hearing venue via the audio link from the protected witness location may be broadcast and proceedings in the hearing venue may be filmed and 00:07:30.

I think the old 6 does not seem to be necessary Mr Pretorius.

10 ADV PRETORIUS SC: Not necessary Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja. Ja. Okay. And then to the old 7 becomes 6.

6. This order may be amended or supplemented by the Chairperson at any time if in his opinion that is necessary to protect the witness or any person in connection with the witness evidence or to ensure then as to any implicated person.

That is the order and that order is also granted in relation to witness referred to as Dorothy and where in this order it says Frank it will say Dorothy in the case of the order relating to Dorothy.

And the same order is granted in regard to – in relation to a witness to be referred to as

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Stephen.

20

CHAIRPERSON: Stephen and where reference is made to

Frank the reference in the case of the order relating to Stephen will be a reference to Stephen.

So all those orders have been granted.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you Chair. Chair as you are aware Dorothy is now available.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: To begin her testimony. She is legally represented.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

10 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: And may her representative place himself on record?

CHAIRPERSON: Yes please.

ADV RENDANI: Chair Advocate Vumbe Rendani. Chair I must just note that previously I have been appearing under instruction of P G Maseko. I must just note the Chair that there have been some change. I am formally now on instruction from the State Attorney.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

ADV RENDANI: However I must note that Ms Palesa 20 Maseko is here. She will also note appearance on behalf of Dorothy and with that regard she will further address the Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Well are you appearing for Dorothy?

ADV RENDANI: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Because if you are appearing you are the

one who must address me on behalf of the whole team.

ADV RENDANI: Okay.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

ADV RENDANI: Chair Ms Palesa Maseko will continue to receive correspondence on behalf of Dorothy and she will also be communicating with Chair. Also with the employer of Dorothy.

CHAIRPERSON: With the secretary of the commission.

ADV RENDANI: With the secretary of the commission 10 correct.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

ADV RENDANI: Myself I will be on brief from the State Attorney officially from today. The issue has been on the pipeline but it has been resolved and I can confirm that I have got instruction formally from the State Attorney.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay no that is fine. I do not know what the issue is but I probably do not need to know as long as you confirm you are appearing for Dorothy you have – you have been instructed by attorneys that is – that is fine.

20 ADV RENDANI: Thank you Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay alright.

ADV ADONIS: Chair I know my colleague I am 00:11:13. Good morning again.

CHAIRPERSON: Good morning.

ADV ADONIS: Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

<u>ADV ADONIS</u>: Chair I am – should I just take this opportunity to place myself on record?

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

ADV ADONIS: I will be representing Dave – obviously – my name is Lehlohonolo Peter Adonis.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

ADV ADONIS: As I appeared previously.

CHAIRPERSON: You have appeared before.

10 ADV ADONIS: I am still on record for the former Minister David Mahlobo

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

ADV ADONIS: And now I also act on the instruction of the witness pseudo name Frank.

CHAIRPERSON: Frank.

ADV ADONIS: That is correct.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay no that is fine.

ADV ADONIS: So I am appearing for both.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay no thank you.

20 ADV ADONIS: Chair thank you.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay alright. I – I take it there is no conflict there Mr Pretorius – I do not know.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Chair they will emerge there are conflicts.

CHAIRPERSON: There are conflicts.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes. I do not know - are you aware - are you aware or what is the position.

ADV ADONIS: Chair I – obviously with my ethical rules have enquired insofar as the client is concerned and the documentary evidence that was presented to me.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

ADV ADONIS: From where I am sitting Chair but obviously I would not engage with the legal team.

10 **CHAIRPERSON:** Yes.

ADV ADONIS: We have not in actual fact I have confirmed this with my initial client being the former Minister.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

ADV ADONIS: And at looking at the documents as I was briefed.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

ADV ADONIS: There is no conflict from where I am sitting at. But obviously with caution we will thread Chair moving forward.

20 **CHAIRPERSON:** Okay alright.

ADV ADONIS: Thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Well we will see how matters turn out.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja how it goes ja.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Chair. I am glad to hear there is no conflict.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: According to my learned friend but when we get to the detail it may turn out differently.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Hopefully not.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja. Okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Chair the documentation relevant to

10 Dorothy's evidence appears in Exhibit YY12 in Bundle SSA02(a).

ADV RENDANI: Chair I am sorry to interfere.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

ADV RENDANI: Chair if I am correct I think Mr Pretorius did mention the fact that the oath has already been taken.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes it has been.

ADV RENDANI: Yes and my client just asked me to humbly request that she would like to address the Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Oh.

20 ADV RENDANI: Before anything else.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

ADV RENDANI: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay – no, okay that is fine. Yes Mr Pretorius.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Dorothy are you there?

MS DOROTHY: Yes I am here.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Do you wish to say anything to the Chair before you commence your evidence?

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Her picture does not appear we just see her name.

MS DOROTHY: Yes I would.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: We just see her – oh no her picture is not supposed to appear. No, no that is alright I forgot that she – her picture is not supposed to appear. Dorothy are you

10 ready? I understand that you would like to address me before you start giving your evidence.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes please.

MS DOROTHY: Yes I am ready Chair thank you.

CHAIRPERSON: Oh please go ahead.

MS DOROTHY: Okay. Thank you for allowing me – okay thank you for allowing me to put my version forward and speak out against the old allegations that have in the course of the commission been said against me.

I have over the years served my country with great pride and joy. Never at once with any malicious or personal saving intent. Taking into account the nature of the work that I did I have further had to compromise on my personal life because the code of conduct that all served by was that the safety of the state and those under our care was always above our own personal lives.

This led to me suffering a great deal and compromising much of what being human encompasses.

As I sit here today I can confirm that I carried out all my duties to the best of my ability. Following all the rules, procedures and observed protocols that were set in place and never serving my own personal interests.

Given the nature of the sector that I worked for I would like to point out that in keeping in line with the one 10 principle that governs our behaviour that being confidentiality.

I carried out every single one of my duties on a need to know basis careful to never cross lines or go beyond my scope of which – of work which was a doctrine that I understood from day 1.

Any questions asked were always only in line with gaining and understanding of what I was being tasked to do and thus subsequently coming out – carrying out that task. It is safe to say that I was always careful not to ask for 20 more.

It is my intention in sitting here today and participating in this commission to testify to the best of my ability and work through with the commission to ensure that all questions are answered and endeavours of today are met. I thank you.

- **CHAIRPERSON**: Thank you very much Dorothy. I have already expressed the commission's appreciation when you were taking the oath privately for your making yourself available to the commission to assist it. We understand from what I read in the affidavits that it is not easy but I appreciate that nevertheless you – you and others are making yourselves available to assist this commission. So I just want you to repeat that publicly that we appreciate that you have availed yourself to assist the commission.
- 10 MS DOROTHY: Thank you Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Thank you. Mr Pretorius.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: You may proceed.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you. Chair the exhibit which contains all the documents relevant to Dorothy's evidence is Exhibit YY12.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: There are a number of documents including more than one affidavit attested to by Dorothy.

20 CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Over a period of time.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: I – with your leave may I ask the witness to identify each relevant document when we get to it?

CHAIRPERSON: Yes that is fine.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you Chair. But for the moment may the documentation contained in Exhibit YY12 be put before you?

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Do – there are – there are two or more affidavits by Dorothy.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: Is that right?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes Chair they are all - referred to

10 in the index.

CHAIRPERSON: ja.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Which is at page 419.2.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. 419.2

ADV PRETORIUS SC: SSA04.

CHAIRPERSON: Hang on one second. Now to the extent that any document or affidavit is an annexure to the main affidavit they would fall under the main affidavit as an exhibit. But to the extent that there are affidavits that are standalone then they would need to be separate exhibits we

20 can admit them as and when we get to them.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Is that fine?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: That is fine Chair. The affidavit that we will commence with is the affidavit that appears at page 12 to 26.

CHAIRPERSON: 12 to

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Of the exhibit but of the bundle black number 431 to 445.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay ja I think – I think if you use the bundle number or the pagination of the bundle that will make life – my life easier.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: We use the black numbers.

CHAIRPERSON: 431.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes.

10 **CHAIRPERSON:** Ja 431 that is where it starts.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay you want her to identify that affidavit and...

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes perhaps we should start there Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja let us do that so that I can admit it.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Dorothy...

CHAIRPERSON: Properly.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Would you please go to page 431 of

20 the bundle – SSA02.

MS DOROTHY: Okay I am there.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Is that the first page of your affidavit in that bundle?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And if you could go please to page

445 whose signature...

MS DOROTHY: Yes I confirm that is me.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Is that your signature?

MS DOROTHY: That is mine.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right and you attested to this before a Commissioner of Oaths on the 2nd of March 2021 is that correct?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right. And as far as you are 10 concerned are the contents of this affidavit to the best of knowledge true and correct?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Chair may this affidavit then be admitted?

CHAIRPERSON: It will be Exhibit YY

ADV PRETORIUS SC: 12.

CHAIRPERSON: 12.1

ADV PRETORIUS SC: 12.1 yes Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja okay. The affidavit of Dorothy that

20 starts at page 431 will be admitted as an Exhibit and will be marked as Exhibit YY12.1.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Dorothy if you could go to page 420 please and we at all times referring to the numbers in the top left hand corner of each page.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Is it correct that on the 20th January 2021 the commission addressed to yourself a request for an affidavit to deal with various matters and that is the document that appears – appears at page 420 and following?

MS DOROTHY: Yes I agree.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And the affidavit that has just been admitted by the Chair is the affidavit that you provided to the commission in response to that request for an affidavit,

10 is that correct?

MS DOROTHY: Yes it is correct.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: So – so what we are going to do is to go through your affidavit and at times refer back to the questions that were asked giving rise to your answer in the affidavit. If we could just do it that way please. The questions are set out in Annexure A to the request for affidavit at page 422 to 424 can you just confirm that please?

MS DOROTHY: I confirm true.

20 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: Alright so if we go now to page 431 which is your affidavit I am not going to refer to your previous positions at the request of your legal representatives to avoid ease of identity of yourself. So if we can go – your background is however set out there. You have a long experience of employment within the SSA, is that correct?

MS DOROTHY: Correct Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright we will leave the detail in the written affidavit. But if we could go briefly to describe the system of dealing with cash because it becomes relevant later in your testimony and in the testimony of other witnesses. There is a process that you set out in paragraph 4 that applies when cash is withdrawn from the SSA for special operations through the use of temporary advances.

10 You set that out in paragraph 4. You see that?

MS DOROTHY: Is that at para 4?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: No it at para 3.

MS DOROTHY: Or 3?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Paragraph number 4 on page 432.

MS DOROTHY: Okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: AT para 3.

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Okay at para 3 okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: If you could just briefly describe step by step please the various steps you set out in 20 paragraph 4.

MS DOROTHY: Okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: You can ...

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Cash was withdrawn from the SSA for CDSO through the temporary advance system. A TA required that the member taking the advance to compile a memorandum known as a submission requesting the advance and motivating the use of the funds for the specified operation of project.

Once a submission has been approved by the person with the delegation of authority to do so which was dependent on the amount requested the member would then make an application on a green TA form and hand this to the finance chief directorate with the authorised submission to process the payment.

10 The chief directorate finance would then issue a TA number to enable the member to withdraw the agreed amount of funds in the form of cash and or electronic funds transfer.

After the funds had been withdrawn and used the member was then required to settle that advance which required that he or she provide the finance directorate with a signed receipt of funds and or invoice when services were rendered.

Establishing that the funds been utilised as 20 contemplated in the submission settlement advance...

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Sorry just before you go on.

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Also required that part A – okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Dorothy before you go on I would like to just ask you one question. When you say in line 3 of the second part of the paragraph which required that he/she provide the finance chief directorate with a signed receipt of the funds or an invoice when services were rendered the receipt of the funds would be signed – would that be by the for example a source who received the funds? Who would sign the receipt of the funds?

MS DOROTHY: It would be the service – it would vary. It would either be the service provider, it could be anybody because when you signed receipt it varies whatever service that that member was going to provide – whatever project

10 that - so it would vary. It cannot - I cannot specifically say it is a source or it is - it could be anyone.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright it could be a source?

MS DOROTHY: It could be a service provider to a company.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes or it could be a source I presume. In other words the final recipient of the funds.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Would sign the receipt is that correct?

20 <u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Excuse me Chair I did not hear that part. <u>ADV PRETORIUS SC</u>: Alright presumably when cash is withdrawn and goes out.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Of the SSA to its final destination. **MS DOROTHY:** Yes. **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: It is the final destination whether that be a service provider or a source or any other destination that would sign the receipt, is that correct?

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: It looks like there is a delay in whenever anybody speaks then she takes long to respond. Dorothy can you hear me?

MS DOROTHY: Chair. Hello.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes I can hear you. Do you hear us quickly when we speak

10 MS DOROTHY: Oh okay.

CHAIRPERSON: Or does it take time before you hear what we are saying?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: No there was a slight – there was a slight **CHAIRPERSON:** Delay.

MS DOROTHY: Interference just little bit but I heard what he said. I think you said that the signed receipt would be signed by the – by the source. I did not – can you please just repeat it one more time for me.

CHAIRPERSON: Oh. That was the evidence leader speaking to you. It is the Chairperson speaking to you now. So I am just checking whether there is a delay in you hearing what we are saying. I see you do take a little bit of time before responding so I do not know whether it is the delay or what.

MS DOROTHY: I heard you now Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MS DOROTHY: Clearly.

CHAIRPERSON: Do you feel like there is a delay or you do not think there is a delay?

MS DOROTHY: So I do know if Mr Pretorius will start - I hear him but 00:30:40.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Do you feel like there is a delay or you do not feel that there is any delay before you can hear us? **<u>MS DOROTHY</u>**: There is a delay.

10 <u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes. It is not long but if it – if the technicians can attend to it that would help. I will assume that they can attend to it while we are – we continue. So let us continue. Yes Mr Pretorius had asked you to confirm whether the source or the service provider or the final destination of the cash would be required to sign the receipt. That was his last question.

MS DOROTHY: Definitely they would be expected to sign the receipt.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright.

20 **CHAIRPERSON**: Okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you Dorothy if you would then go. That receipt then would establish that the funds had been utilised as contemplated in the submission. You say then at the end of that sentence. If you could just continue then settling an advance. **<u>MS DOROTHY</u>**: Okay. Settling an advance also requires that part B of the TA form be completed by the member for approval by way of the line manager. Once part B of the TA form had been signed the claim would be settled by the chief finance directorate and the TA was then removed from the member's name.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Is it by way of the signature of the line manager – the approval.

10 MS DOROTHY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Now if you could just explain I understand that when the temporary advance is removed from the member's name the member would no longer be responsible for that amount and will therefore not be required to repay it if called upon to do so. Do I understand that correctly?

20 MS DOROTHY: Correct.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. If you could on then to paragraph 5. You continue with the process that is required.

MS DOROTHY: Here it is in relation to cash withdrawals. All cash TA's requested had to be any withdrawal thereof. On any TA requested and approved if the amounts and fell short of the amount taken no cash was returned the amount of the unpaid funds would be loaded on the system and deducted from the member's salary.

Should there be monies outstanding or not settled by the member they would not be allowed to take out any further money until the advance taken by them is fully settled.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right if you could just read the first 10 sentence again please of paragraph 5. There was an interruption in the transmission.

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Okay. All cash temporary advance requested had to be authorised by the CFO before any withdrawal thereof.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Okay if we could...

MS DOROTHY: On any TA requested and approved if the amount of money spent fell short of the amount taken and no cash was returned the amount of the unpaid funds would be loaded on the system and deducted from the member's

20 salary. Should there be monies outstanding or not settled by the member they would not be allowed to take out any further money until the advance taken by them is fully settled.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. Now Dorothy there has been substantial evidence in regard to the required procedures

within SSA for the use of cash and in respect of the use of temporary advances. I am not going to take you to all that evidence I just want to highlight one issue and that is where a member has not settled a temporary advance in accordance with this procedure or at all that member is not allowed to withdraw further monies. That is what you say here, is that correct?

MS DOROTHY: Yes correct.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: But that system can be circumvented avoided if that member says look I do not have authority now to withdraw money or cash but I can ask someone else to do it for me. There is evidence that that happened. Do you know of that?

MS DOROTHY: Yes it has happened.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right. If we could then go on please to...

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: I am sorry Mr Pretorius just before you go - or let me just get clarification. Dorothy so the process of obtaining cash which you have described it starts with the

20 member who feels that he needs or she needs cash, is that correct?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: And that member must prepare what is referred to or must prepare a memorandum that you say is referred to as a submission, is that correct?

MS DOROTHY: Yes Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: And in that memorandum or submission he or she will state how much they need and for what purpose and they will motivate for the grant of that cash, is that correct?

MS DOROTHY: Yes Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: And who does he or she submit that memorandum to? Is it their line manager or is it somebody who may not be their line manager but who has certain

10 responsibilities?

MS DOROTHY: It is the line manager and line management from the chief directorate finance.

CHAIRPERSON: Do they submit it to two places?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: They do – to the line manager of the ...

CHAIRPERSON: Of the member.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: And the chief directorate of finance.

MS DOROTHY: Yes. It would be the line manager of the chief directorate.

20 **CHAIRPERSON**: Okay please just repeat that

MS DOROTHY: Hello.

CHAIRPERSON: Just repeat your answer.

MS DOROTHY: Okay. It would be line manager of the member requesting the funds.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

MS DOROTHY: And to a certain extent the line manager of 00:37:54 depending on the amount.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Oh will he – will he or she submit the memorandum to two people?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: It is quite a number of people Chair it is not only two people it is quite a number of recommenders and finally to the approval.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay but in terms of the person to whom the member submits the memorandum is it to one person

10 who must then escalate it if to various people must all recommend or the member must go from one office to another to submit it?

MS DOROTHY: Yes in our case it is the member that takes it from office to another.

CHAIRPERSON: Oh okay.

MS DOROTHY: Because we did not have systems at 00:38:47.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes. And – but ultimately did say the – the final person is – is a finance person who must give approval?

MS DOROTHY: The approval.

20

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: And is it the CFO or is it somebody else? <u>MS DOROTHY</u>: No, no it is – okay the CFO only comes in if the member is requesting cash. It is the CFO that can authorise. Right you can receive cash or not. <u>**CHAIRPERSON</u>**: Yes okay the – we only talking about a member who – who wants cash. So are you saying that in all cases where a member requires cash the CFO must approve before cash can be withdrawn?</u>

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay. Alright. And is the CFO the final authority to approve?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Yes on the green form there is a portion. **<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>**: Yes. There is a portion for the CFO.

10 **MS DOROTHY**: On the green form there is a portion that allocates 00:40:06. Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay alright. Okay Mr Pretorius.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right. Thank you. If we could go over the page please to paragraph 6. There was in the SSA a directorate responsible for ensuring the protection of the then President Mr Jacob Zuma and the then Deputy President Mr Ramaphosa. Is that correct?

MS DOROTHY: Correct.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right and you set out the duties of the directorate within the SSA in that regard in paragraph 6 but I would like to go onto paragraph 7 please on page 435. You refer there to two groups of individuals referred to as co-workers.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Who were recruited and trained to

be utilised by the SSA. Would you tell the Chair about those two groups please?

MS DOROTHY: Two groups of individuals whom we refer to as co-workers were recruited and trained and utilised by SSA. The first group was recruited by Mr Dlomo when he was then General Manager at Special Operations.

The second group was recruited by him after his appointment as the DDG upon his request for Curricula Vitae of potential recruits.

These with my knowledge they were contracted between them and SSA.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright so you have left out some words there if I can just fill them in.

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: (Inaudible.)

10

ADV PRETORIUS SC: The first group was recruited by Mr T Dlomo when he was General Manager at SO. The second group was recruited by Mr T Dlomo after his appointment as the DGG upon his request for Curricula Vitae of the potential recruits. These were not SSA members however

20 to my knowledge there were contracts between them and SSA. Have I read you affidavit correctly?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes if you could go onto the next paragraph please or the next sub-paragraph.

MS DOROTHY: Okay. On the – on the instruction of Mr T

Dlomo we at SO utilise individuals from these groups including the PSS. To my knowledge the co-workers employed in Special Operations were paid monthly salaries through one of our companies by our HR consultant at CDSO.

May I continue?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Ja I think leave out the next paragraph because it refers to your office but read the paragraph begging with the words "About fourteen members" please.

MS DOROTHY: Okay.

10

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Or tell the Chair about that.

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Okay. About fourteen members from the second group who were sitting at home after their training were then assigned to assist us at PSF.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright now the point that you are making here I think and this evidence must be regarded or had regard to in connection with other evidence that has been given but co-workers recruited and trained to be

20 utilised by the SSA in various tasks were not members of the SSA but were paid by the SSA salaries to do their work. Is that correct?

MS DOROTHY: Correct.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right. If we could go then to paragraph 10 over the page please on page 436.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: I just announce Mr Pretorius that we will not be taking the tea break because of the time we lost earlier.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Sure thank you Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: So ja.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Would you go please to paragraph 10 on page 436.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. Now you will see there a 10 spreadsheet format of references to the questions in the request for affidavit that we referred to earlier and your comments in relation to those question in the box on the right hand side.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Now if we can deal with the first box. It says in the left hand column ad para 9a. That is a reference to the request for an affidavit sent to you on the 20th of January and if we could go to annexure A and look at paragraph 9 on page 422 please.

20 Paragraph 9 says and I am going to read it.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And you can confirm to me if I have read it correctly.

"It is pointed out that the electronic TA record provided to the commission by SSA reflects that you were involved in the withdrawal of R38.5 million in cash over the period March 2014 to September 2016. You are required to provide a full account of the aforementioned withdrawals including the amount of – and then we get to

a. R1 million allegedly used to pay MK veterans at the rally held by the ANC on 8 January 2016 in Rustenburg."

And in answer to a request for an explanation in relation to that expenditure you make a comment. What is that comment and we are back at page 436?

MS DOROTHY: Okay. By instruction of Mr Dlomo this was in relation to the rally held by the ANC on the 8 January 2016 in Rustenburg. We used MK veterans who were deployed to the Royal Bafokeng Stadium to assist with identifying and reporting on potential disruptive behaviour of attendees at the events. The funds were utilised to cover their expenses such as 00:37:22 student deployment transport fees, accommodation and meals. Requested supporting documents for person settling the account internally whilst duly submitted.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright.

10

20

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: So I think that – so are you confirming that you used – or R1 million was used to pay MK veterans at the rally held by the ANC on 8 January 2016 and that this was done on the instruction of Mr Dlomo. Are you confirming that Dorothy?

MS DOROTHY: Correct Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Correct. Okay and Mr Dlomo referred to here is...

MS DOROTHY: Yes correct.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: And Mr Dlomo that you referred to here is Mr Thulani Dlomo or not?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Yes Thulani Dlomo.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay alright.

20

10 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: If I may just ask Dorothy you can answer the following questions as a general rule one would assume that the ANC would be responsible for its own security or that would be the responsibility of the South African Police. Why was it decided to use MK veterans to deal with the issues here to identify and report on potential disruptive behaviour?

Firstly they would not be trained. Secondly one would assume that the duty should rest upon trained persons if anyone at all as members of the SSA – why was this outsourced to MK veterans?

MS DOROTHY: Chair Mr Thulani Dlomo would be the better person to answer this question.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. You – you have no explanation for why MK veterans were used rather than the ANC's own security, the police or members of the SSA.

MS DOROTHY: Yes Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And what we do know however that is that funds from the SSA were used to transport MK veterans to the Royal Bafokeng Stadium for the rally and their transport fees, accommodation and meals were paid for by the SSA. Is that correct?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right. If we could go then please...

CHAIRPERSON: I am sorry Mr Pretorius. Subject 10 obviously to ensuring that her identity is not indirectly disclosed I am not sure that the – her evidence or her answer indicates how she gets to know about this. Whether she was involved.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: In this.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: She withdrew the money so that is apparent from the introductory part of the question.

CHAIRPERSON: Oh okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: At paragraph 9.

20 **CHAIRPERSON**: Okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: In other words you were involved in the withdrawal of that R1million is that correct?

MS DOROTHY: Yes Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And you would have known what it was for?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Yes as stated in my comment.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay do you have an idea more or less how much this stipend was that was given to them per individual is that something you do not know?

MS DOROTHY: I do not remember Chair because I do not have copies of that – the settlement – the document in relation to that.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes okay.

10 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: Alright. Let us go then back to page 422 if you will and look at page – well paragraph rather 9b which refers to another question put to you by the investigators. It reads:

> "R1.85 million was withdrawn in September 2016 allegedly used to pay MK veterans used for #occupy Luthuli House."

If we can go back to page 436 the second block your comment appears on the right hand side. What is your comment in relation to that withdrawal in which you were

20 involved? Well perhaps before we go there what is occupy Luthili House? What was that event?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Occupy Luthili House was – it was a # that was created by certain individuals who wanted to come and occupy the offices of Luthili House on the day when the President and Deputy President were to be – for the weekly meetings.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes that was the former President.

MS DOROTHY: That take place on the specific day.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes and you referring to the former President and the former Deputy President, is that correct? **MS DOROTHY**: The former and the current.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes so the current in his capacity as Deputy President at the time, is that correct?

MS DOROTHY: No current (inaudible) in his capacity as 10 President.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: In other words Mr Zuma and Mr Ramaphosa.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay Dorothy are you referring to a time when Mr Zuma was the President and Mr Ramaphosa was the Deputy President?

MS DOROTHY: Yes Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay alright.

20 ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right. So there was a plan I suppose you could put it that way that certain individuals wanted to occupy Luthili House at that time or on that occasion and what were the funds referred to that is the amount of R1 850 000.00 – what were those funds used for? <u>MS DOROTHY</u>: The funds were utilised to cover expenses such as stipends, transport fees, accommodation and meals of the MK veterans who were deployed then. I worked with the head of the ANC security which I will not mention his name Mr T Dlomo instructed me to make requisition and pay for all the expenses related to the operation above.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: And you confirm that you were involved in the withdrawal of that amount of R1 850 000.00?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

10 ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right. Now what...

MS DOROTHY: I confirmed.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Now what – why were the MK veterans deployed as you say at Luthili House on funds paid for or funds provided by SSA. Was that to defend Luthuli House?

MS DOROTHY: I think Chair – I think my answer is going to be the same as the one for the Rustenburg rally wherein I think Mr Dlomo being the person that had requested that we utilised these people he is the best person to explain what

20 was the rationale behind having the MK members come to Luthuli.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right. But the MK members whose transport fees, accommodation, meals and a stipend were paid for by the SSA they were not the persons going to occupy Luthuli House I presume?

MS DOROTHY: Yes they were not the person to occupy.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. Let us then go to paragraph 9c if I can take you back please to page 423.

MS DOROTHY: Okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: R1.5 million withdrawn in February 2017 allegedly used for the State of Nation Address related expenses and which was transported to Cape Town by a SSA member and handed to you – that is Dorothy which you allegedly handed to Minister Mahlobo at his official

10 residence in Cape Town. That is the question. It is referred to at the top of page 437 in the table. What is your comment?

MS DOROTHY: Chair I did not hear what it -

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: The question was whether you were in involved in the withdrawal of R1.5 million in February 2017 allegedly used for SONA related expenses and which was transported to Cape Town by a SAA member and handed to you which you allegedly handed to Minister Mahlobo at his official residence in Cape Town. It may be that you were

20 not involved in the withdrawal but it was handed over to you, you can clarify what you know about this.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And you deal with it Dorothy at the top of page 437 in the right hand column – the top of the page under the head comment.

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Okay. Can I just correct something here

Chair?

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MS DOROTHY: These expenses were not related to SONA in terms of my work. I – what I said there was that I was deployed in Cape Town for SONA and then I was called in relation to this amount. Because I hear Pretorius talking about it is SONA expenses.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MS DOROTHY: I do not know what the money was meant for but nonetheless during my deployment – I was deployed to Cape Town from- for the SONA event. During my deployment I was instructed by Mr Fraser to receive a bag of money from one security employee of SSA and to take the same to Mr – Minister Mahlobo.

I met the SSA member and collected the bag of money as was instructed from him. I then handed the money to the Minister Mahlobo personally as his – at his official residence. I cannot recall if he signed for it or not nor how the TA was settled.

20 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: Right. Where was this residence? Was it in Cape Town or Pretoria?

MS DOROTHY: In Cape Town in Cape Town the official residence in Cape Town.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Okay. Alright but you say you have no knowledge of what this money was intended for and you

cannot say that is was a SONA related expense.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Is that correct.

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: I am saying I am not sure if it was SONA related. I was deployed there for SONA but I am not sure if the funds were for SONA related expenses.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes. And you say that you were instructed by Mr Fraser to receive a bag of money from one security of employ of SSA and to take the same to Minister

10 Mahlobo. What that instruction given verbally, in writing, how was it given?

MS DOROTHY: Verbally.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right an you then met the SSA member. Was this a SSA member referred to by Mr Fraser in his instruction to you?

MS DOROTHY: Mr Fraser would not have known who specifically the member would be.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right.

MS DOROTHY: That is bringing the money.

20 <u>ADV PRETORIUS SC</u>: So money – when you say bag of money how do you know there – it was a bag of money? <u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Because I was told he is bringing money. <u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Right. <u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Well, you give ...[intervenes] MS DOROTHY: ...amount <u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Do you remember? Were you given a bag by the member?

MS DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Did you get a chance to see whether there was money in the bag?

MS DOROTHY: I do not remember Chair the part that I opened the bag or not.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay but you were told that it was money that was in the bag?

10 MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: When you handed ...[intervenes] MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: ...it to minister – when you handed the bag to Minister Mahlobo, you actually say here in your comment: I then handed the money. Was any mention there made of money?

MS DOROTHY: [Speaker unclear]

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Sorry, I did not hear the answer.

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: I said, did he mention anything? [Speaker

20 unclear]

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. From all the circumstances ...[intervenes]

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Sorry, I did not hear that part?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Sorry. When you handed, as you say here the money to the Minister Mahlobo personally at

his official residence, did you hand it to Minister Mahlobo himself?

MS DOROTHY: Yes, I did.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And from all that you were told then, the instructions that you were given and the circumstances of the receipt and transfer of the money to Minister Mahlobo, are you satisfied that you handed R 1.5 million, as mentioned, to Minister Mahlobo?

MS DOROTHY: I cannot be – I cannot say that I am one hundred percent satisfied that I handed one point five. I have relied on the instruction that I was given that there is an amount of one point five that is coming and then I need to take it Minister Mahlobo.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. Are you satisfied from all the circumstances that you were handing money ...[intervenes]

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: ...if not the exact amount. Is that - can we assume that from your evidence?

20 MS DOROTHY: Yes, you can.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: When you handed the ...[intervenes] <u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Yes, Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: When you handed the money or bag to Minister Mahlobo, did he open the bag in your presence? <u>MS DOROTHY</u>: I cannot recall. I cannot recall Chair if we opened the bag.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: And you cannot recall whether you ever saw that there was indeed money in the bag?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

<u>**CHAIRPERSON</u>**: Just try and remember as far as you can what Mr Fraser said to you and just try and repeat the gist of what he said to you in regard to this issue.</u>

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Mr Fraser informed me that there will be an amount of one point five coming and that I should take

10 it then to Mr Mahlobo himself.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes, was he speaking to you over the phone or were you with him when he gave the instruction? **MS DOROTHY**: We met personally.

<u>MS DOROTHT</u>. We met personally.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja. And where was this?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: We met personally.

CHAIRPERSON: Where was this?

MS DOROTHY: In Cape Town.

CHAIRPERSON: Uhm ...[intervenes]

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: In Cape Town.

20 <u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Oh, at an office or not in an office? <u>MS DOROTHY</u>: It was not in an office but I do not recall the exact – I am not very familiar with Cape Town.

CHAIRPERSON: Oh.

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Ja, I am not very familiar with Cape Town but it was in Cape Town, not in an office, it was at - in a parking somewhere. I do not remember where. I drove there and he – I waited for him and he came there with his car.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

MS DOROTHY: [Speaker unclear]

CHAIRPERSON: Was it just the two of you?

MS DOROTHY: Obviously, he came with his protectors.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Oh, okay. So he said a certain member, and I assume he mentioned the name, would come – would

10 bring money to you about R 1.5 million that he said you should take ...[intervenes]

MS DOROTHY: No.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: ...to the Minister. I just want you to tell me how your conversation with him went. I just want you to try as far as you can remember, to say this is how our conversation went.

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Okay. The conversation was that there will be money coming. He did not indicate who the person is who was going to bring the money. I was to receive a

20 call. So he would not have known who is bringing the money because he issues an instruction and then somebody delegates a member to bring the money. So he would not have known who brought the money. But I am going to receive a call and there is money that is going to be coming. I must take it to Minister Mahlobo. <u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Oh, so he did not tell you who the member is who was going to bring the money to you? **MS DOROTHY**: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: He just said you were going to receive a call and he did not say from whom and that after that call you would then be given money which you should take to Minister Mahlobo.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: Did he specifically say you would be given money or did he say you would – somebody would bring you a bag and you must take that bag to Minister Mahlobo and you assumed that in the bag there was cash? <u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Chair, I knew it was money because he informed me.

CHAIRPERSON: He told you it was money?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: Did he tell you the amount?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

CHAIRPERSON: What amount did he tell you?

20 MS DOROTHY: One point five million.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Alright. And when you – had you been to Minister Mahlobo's official residence in Cape Town at the time before that or was this your first time?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Yes, I had.

CHAIRPERSON: You had been?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: No, it was to my first time.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay. And ...[intervenes]

MS DOROTHY: Yes, I had been.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Tell me how the conversation between you and Minister Mahlobo went when you came to his residence.

MS DOROTHY: I would not recall that, Chair. It has been a while back. I would not recall ...[intervenes]

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Do you remember ...[intervenes]

10 **MS DOROTHY**: ...what conversation we then had.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Do you remember whether you just gave him the bag and he took the bag or whether you told him that you had been asked by Mr Fraser to bring this money and it was supposed to be R 1.5 million or whether you did not mention that? Can you recall whether you mentioned that?

MS DOROTHY: I do not remember but – I do not recall but sensible it would – I would have that conversation to say: Minister, I have been requested by – instructed by the DG to bring this to you. I would not just walk in and leave the bag and leave. Definitely a conversation would ensure where I would be informing him that I was tasked to bring this to him but we would not discuss figures with him because that was not my place to ask. For me it was just

20

to do the drop-off.

<u>**CHAIRPERSON</u>**: Okay. So in the conversation between you and Minister Mahlobo there was not any mention of cash or money or was there?</u>

MS DOROTHY: No.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay. Mr Pretorius.

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: There was not any conversation. I just informed him that I was tasked to bring this bag to him. I knew what was in there.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja. Okay. Mr Pretorius.

10 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: Thank you. If we can move on to the next issue.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Or maybe before you do so, Mr \ Pretorius. With regard to the earlier amount that you testified about of one million rand. So that one you know quite well because you withdrew that amount. Is that right?

MS DOROTHY: Yes ...[intervenes]

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: The one relating to the MK Veterans in Rustenburg.

20 MS DOROTHY: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: But after you had withdrawn it, how do you know that it ultimately was paid to the MK Veterans? Obviously, I do not want you to say anything that might directly or indirectly disclose your identity but obviously somebody listening to this. Yes, you saw you withdrew it. Yes, you say it was used for the MK Veterans. But were you involved in the actual handing over of cash to the MK Veterans or did you give the money to somebody else who you understood would be giving it to the MK Veterans?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: No, I personally was involved.

CHAIRPERSON: You were involved?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: In actually giving the money to the MK Veterans?

10 MS DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay alright. And was the handing – was the actual giving of the money to the veterans, did it take place in Rustenburg?

MS DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: On the day of the event or after or before?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: It would – the stuff(?) is usually paid after the event and obviously the food is on a daily basis.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

20 <u>MS DOROTHY</u>: And the accommodation is once-off. Ja, so it varies. It depends on the days because the food they eat on a daily basis. So.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes. For how long were they there, the MK Veterans in Rustenburg in connection with the event of the 8th of January?

MS DOROTHY: Chair, I do not recall. As I said that the documents would actually guide me in the sense of when did they come and when did they leave.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay alright. Mr Pretorius.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you.

MS DOROTHY: ...from different venues. So I would not remember.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay alright.

20

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: ...when they came and when they left.
10 Whether it was the day before or two days before. I do not recall.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay alright. Mr Pretorius.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Then in paragraph (small) "d" on page 423, another topic is drawn to your attention and you were requested to provide an explanation of certain transactions. Sub-paragraph (d) on page 423 reads:

> "R 500 000,00 which was paid into your bank account in December 2014, allegedly for a safe house situated at [blank] Western Cape, providing full details for the purpose for which the house is or was used and details of the occupants thereof..."

And your explanation appears in the second box on page 437. Would you place that before the Chair, please? **MS DOROTHY**: Do I read from: "I met..."?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes.

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Okay.

10

"I met Mr Alan Nickson on the 19th of November 2020, where he asked me about the R 500 000,00 that was transferred into my bank account.

I said to him that I am not sure about this but we will go and get a printout of my bank statement to verify this transaction.

I received my statement and called Mr Nickson on the very same day of the 19th of November 2020 to inform him that I can confirm receipt of this money.

I further informed him that it was for furniture and other expenses which were related to the rental of the safe house at Bloubergstrand.

Mr Nickson asked for the physical address of the safe house which I had forgotten.

20 I then called Lilly who also could not remember the exact address ...[intervenes]

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Do not give the address.

MS DOROTHY: "...but it was in [redacted] Excuse me? **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: No, I am sorry. I came too late to say you should not mention the address but be that as it

```
may.
```

MS DOROTHY: Oh.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: The last paragraph.

MS DOROTHY: "Mr T Dlomo instructed me

to make a requisition and pay for all expenses related to the above..."

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Was that claim settled and the expenditure of that amount settled by way of receipts ...[intervenes]

10 MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: ...as you set out in your affidavit? <u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: The name Lilly, of course, that you used there is a pseudonym name. You say:

"Mr T Dlomo instructed you to make requisition and pay all the expenses related to the above..."

What is the above? The expenses related to what?

20 **MS DOROTHY**: The house.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: The safe house.

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: The expenses related to... Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: This was in 2020 - November 2020, is that right?

MS DOROTHY: No, Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Well, I thought that is what ...[intervenes]

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: In November 2020 is when I had the discussion ...[intervenes]

CHAIRPERSON: I was saying I see that you say:

"I met Mr Alan Nickson on 19th of November 2020 where he asked me about the amount of R 500 000,00 that was transferred into ...[intervenes]

10 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: He is the investigator concerned, Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes. The R 500 000,00 had been deposited into your account. Is that right?

MS DOROTHY: Correct, Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Before the – who had deposited that amount into your account if you are able to say?

MS DOROTHY: [No audible reply]

CHAIRPERSON: Where was that money coming from?

MS DOROTHY: It is an EFT from SSA.

20 **CHAIRPERSON**: From SSA?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: And what were you supposed to do with that amount?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: It is to pay the expenses related to the acquisition of the rental of the house which is inclusive of

furniture and other ...[intervenes]

CHAIRPERSON: Oh.

MS DOROTHY: ...and other things related to the house.

<u>**CHAIRPERSON</u>**: Was there a safe house that was to be obtained or rented and you were to pay the rent and to pay for furniture for that safe house?</u>

MS DOROTHY: Yes, Chair. Rented safe house.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes. Well, Mr Pretorius, I can understand the previous transactions but I am not sure – it

10 is not apparent to me whether there would be something irregular about this one?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: No, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: No. She was asked to explain and an explanation was given.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And her evidence says that it was done in accordance with proper procedure.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay alright.

20 <u>ADV PRETORIUS SC</u>: No point will be made ...[intervenes]

CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: ...by the Legal Team on that issue.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: If we could go on, please, to

paragraph 10 which appears on page 423 of Bundle SSA-02. If you could go back to page 423, please, Dorothy. You were asked certain questions about Project Construção. That project has been detailed in evidence that has been given before the Chair before but essentially you say that you were not aware of co-workers who performed protection services and were part of Project Construção. That is apart from what you have already told the Chair in relation to the two groups of co-workers that you referred to earlier. Is that correct?

MS DOROTHY: Correct.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: 10.3 says – asks for your explanation, rather, in relation to the withdrawal of cash for Project Construção referred to in the documentation attached, marked Annexure C10 including details of to whom and for such purpose the cash was provided. Chair, if I may just say? The annexures that are referred to here are all collated in Bundle 1 which is before you and they will be referred to only when necessary. Your explanation

20 ...[intervenes]

10

CHAIRPERSON: That is fine.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: ...for comment, Dorothy, appear on page 438 at the bottom of the page. Did you sign an omission in respect of funds to be utilised for Project Construção and do you have any comment in that regard? **MS DOROTHY**: Chair, you will bear with me. I have hivefever. So my voice would – if you do not ...[intervenes]

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

MS DOROTHY: ...have a glitch. I signed this submission in my capacity as the acting General Manager.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. And ...[intervenes]

MS DOROTHY: So when this submission was developed(?), I was acting General Manager.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. And you say in the second 10 paragraph:

> "My signature and recommendation was guide by the fact that Lilly would have vetted and verified content of the submission before same was presented for my recommendation thereof..."

Is that correct?

MS DOROTHY: Correct, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. Let us go on to paragraph 11, please. You are asked to comment on the following 20 statement which appears at page 423 at paragraph 11:

> "With regard to Project Mayibuye, please indicate your knowledge or and/or role and/or involvement in:

> 11.1 Operation Justice, Operation Commitment and Operation Lock.

11.2 The withdrawal of cash for Project Mayibuye reflected in Annexures M5, M6, M17, M18 and M19, indicating in each instance for what purpose the funds were withdrawn and to whom payment was made..."

Your answer appears at page 439. You say in paragraph 11.1:

"I was not involved in the conceptualisation of Project Mayibuye nor played any role in the operations of Justice, Commitment and Lock..."

Is that a correct statement?

MS DOROTHY: Correct.

10

ADV PRETORIUS SC: It is of course to what is said below.

MS DOROTHY: Chair, I did not get that.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Dorothy. Okay, maybe Mr Pretorius, you can put the question. Let her answer.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right.

20 **CHAIRPERSON**: Put the question and let her answer.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Paragraph 11.1 asks for – or let us go – start again so that it is clear. On page 423 in paragraph 11, you are asked of your knowledge of certain operations and your answer is at page 439, paragraph 11.1. What is that answer? So go to paragraph ...[intervenes]

MS DOROTHY: I was not involved in the... 11.1?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Ja.

MS DOROTHY: Okay.

"I was not involved in the conceptualisation of Project Mayibuye nor played any role in the operations of Justice, Commitment and Lock..."

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Dorothy, where you are sitting, 10 have they provided you with water or tea or something to help you?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Yes, I am drinking. As I said I do have a bout of flu which is hay fever. So.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. Well, if you need anything ...[intervenes]

CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: That is my voice is... [Speaker unclear]

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Well, Mr Pretorius, I had said we would not take the tea break but maybe we should have five

20 minutes or ten minutes break.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, perhaps Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Perhaps – I... Okay, we will take a ten minutes break. We adjourn.

INQUIRY ADJOURNS

INQUIRY RESUMES

CHAIRPERSON: Okay let us continue.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you, Chair. Dorothy, can you hear us?

MS DOROTHY: Yes, I can hear you.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you. Let us then move to the question which appears on page 423 in paragraph 11.2. You were asked in that question to give detail or explanation in relation to the withdrawal of cash for Project Mayibuye reflected in Annexures M5, M16, M17, M18 and

10 M19, indicating in each instance for what purpose the funds were withdrawn and to whom payment was made.

Now those annexures appear in a bundle which should be before you, Bundle 1, and I am going to ask you to turn now to page 439 where your comments in relation to those documents are contained, okay?

MS DOROTHY: [No audible reply]

ADV PRETORIUS SC: So do you have Bundle 1 in front of you?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

20 ADV PRETORIUS SC: If you could go to page 384 of Bundle 1, please?

MS DOROTHY: Yes, I do.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: [No audible reply]

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: That is Annexure M5 which is one

of the documents referred to in the question put to you.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: and if you could go, please, just briefly through, from page 385 to 386. The signature at the bottom of page 385 above the date 15 November 2015, whose signature is that?

MS DOROTHY: That is my signature.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And if you go to page 386, there is another signature next to the date 15 September 2015,

10 whose signature is that?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: That is my signature.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. The approval by line management appears to be a S T Dlomo. Do you confirm that?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes ...[intervenes]

CHAIRPERSON: Sorry.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: ...a page.

CHAIRPERSON: I am sorry, Mr Pretorius. Is S T Dlomo

20 the same person as Thulani Dlomo or is it somebody else?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: It is Thulani Dlomo.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And then if you go over the page, there is an acknowledgment of receipt. It reads:

"It is hereby certified that I..."

And it loos like Moses. Do you know that person?

MS DOROTHY: No, I do not who Moses is.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: "...received R 5 million, an

amount(?) [background noise interference]

R 5 million only for the purpose of..."

And it reads:

"...for the Project Mayibuye.

2.5..."

10 I presume that means million rand and the word appears to be commitment.

"...OPS Justice, R 1.8 million. Save return, R 700 000,00..."

Do you see that and those words? Do you confirm that?

MS DOROTHY: [Speaker unclear – interruption in transmission]

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

20 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: Want do you know about these transactions?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Okay. As I have indicated on the comment section:

"I accept copies of the application documents would be necessary to enable me to verify this transaction.

Lilly would have to give an account to this transaction as in all instances where there is any transaction outside of my scope of work, would be a request to assist in taking money in my name..."

And then I eluded to the fact of the receipt at the back, saying that:

"The receipt is in Lilly's handwriting.

10 However, this is not her signature on the document.

I am not aware as to whose signature this is.

I cannot explain on Lilly's behalf as I have no clue where or to whom this money was taken to..."

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. let us take a few questions step by step, please. The receipt in Lilly's handwriting, on what page does that appear in Bundle 1? Is that ...[intervenes]

20 **MS DOROTHY**: 387.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: 387? You say that is Lilly's handwriting?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Correct.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And you say that that transaction was outside your scope of work but your name could have been assist in taking money. Is that correct?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Why would your signature appear on those documents?

MS DOROTHY: Okay. My signature would appear in the sense that I am taking the money in my name. So I have to be the one that signs for it on the green form.

10 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: But you are taking it for someone else who is actually dealing with the project, is that right? **MS DOROTHY**: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Would that be necessitated, for example, if Lilly had outstanding TA's which had not been settled? Would that be a circumstance which would require this?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Is that right?

MS DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

20 <u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Was that the case in regard to this transaction? Why did you on this occasion ...[intervenes] <u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Chair, it would ...[intervenes] <u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: So, let me repeat. <u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Chair, with this transaction...

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay let us start again. Let me put the

question. Why did you on this occasion sign for the amount and allowed the amount to be taken out in your name?

MS DOROTHY: The only time, Chair, that I would take money out in my name which is outside of my scope of work is when I am assisting them to take money if somebody within – the project managers or Lilly herself have outstanding TA's that need to be settled at headquarters.

10 **<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>**: And in that situation, why would it be right to take – to allow somebody else to take money in your name? Should they not settle their TA's timeously if they have taken cash out of SSA for legitimate projects for operations?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: That is true, Chair, but in some instances the explanation would be that maybe a service provider had not supplied them with the invoice as yet and the work needs to continue.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: And why would the person who must authorise, if the money is taken out in that member's name in those circumstances, not understand that? In other words, if I have unsettled TA's in my name and I need cash for legitimate purposes. Why should I not follow the normal process with a view to taking money out in my name even if I have TA's that have not been settled but on the basis that the explanation that I will provide will be acceptable to the person who must approve?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Ja, unfortunately, Chair, it will be finance that needs to responds to that because that rule came with finance that a person cannot have two TA's under their name. One needs to be settled before they can take further advances in their name.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: So does that mean that the relevant authorities would not accept any explanation and give an

10 approved withdrawal of cash in favour of a member who has got a TA that has not been settled?

MS DOROTHY: Chair, I do not know. I cannot answer on their behalf but I am assuming, if the person a way to explain something would have come out of it but in this instance I am not aware what was the situation.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: You see, I am asking because I am hearing evidence of a lot of irregularities that were happening at the agency, SSA, and some of it seems to be criminal and so on. So if, as I understand the position, the policy of the organisation is: We will not give you – we will not approve cash withdrawals in your favour as a member if you have a TA that has not been settled.

If that is the official position and there are – one would expect that there would be exceptions if you provide and acceptable explanation why you have a TA that has not been settled. And then if your explanation is acceptable then you would have cash allowed to be withdrawn in your name but if they do not allow any exception, then it must be that they regard it as a good reason to say settle first the TA before we can give you – can approve cash.

So why should you go to another colleague and say: Get it out in your name for me? Because it is for work. If your superiors do not think you have a good reason to have that unsettled TA, then you will not do that 10 work. Then they know it is because of their rule. So why should you circumvent that process and go to a colleague and say: Take it out in your name but it is for me. That is my concern.

MS DOROTHY: I understand your concern, Chair. Mr Dlomo signed this green form, the TA, knowing the fact – fully know that I do not deal with projects and this money was not for my work that I was doing. So I would not be able to really answer in terms of the question that you asked but they went to finance to settle(?) the second TA or not.

20

But the fact that Mr Dlomo signed the green form, for me it says he was aware that I am taking the money and the person that was supposed to take money why they did not take the money. Hence, I think I said that I would not be able to account but I think Lilly would be the best person, really, to talk to this transaction specifically. But I understand your concern.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Ja, you see, what comes to my mind is that if you have a valid reason as to why you have a TA that has not been settled that is in your name. If you put that advance to the authorities, one, they should accept and then should approve that you get cash for a legitimate purpose. Or, if they do not approve, then they should accept that you cannot work with the cash until that TA has been settled.

Once you have a situation where a member who is in that situation goes to another member and ask that that member should take the money out in their name, that seems to be me to be irregular. That seems to me as if that member seeks to get that money for an illegitimate purpose because if it is for a legitimate purpose, there is no reason why it should not – the authority should not approve that the cash be given to him or her even if he has got a TA in his name because they are satisfied that there

20 is a good reason for the fact that the TA has not been settled and they are satisfied that it is for a legitimate purpose. You understand that/

MS DOROTHY: I understand, Chair.

10

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. Okay. Mr Pretorius.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you, Chair. Just in

summary, Dorothy. It seems that two issues arise out of the evidence you have given and what you are about to tell the Chair. The first is that a member of the SSA may have not settled a temporary advance. That person then, in terms of the rules, would not be authorised to withdraw further cash but that system or that rule was avoided by asking someone else who was authorised to do it for the person who was not authorised. Is that correct?

<u>MS DOROTHY</u>: Correct, Chair. But Chair, it is like...
10 [Speaker unclear – break in transmission] ...something.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Ja, your line seems to be breaking but just try again.

MS DOROTHY: As I said now. When you said illegally. When you have taken the money illegally. I beg to differ with him because in the submission – hence I have said here:

"Copies of the application documents would be necessary..."

In the submission – the submission does not talk 20 to a person, it talks to a pretence(?) [Speaker unclear]. They could use that submission to request anybody to withdraw the funds.

<u>**CHAIRPERSON</u>**: Well, are you saying there is nothing wrong in a person – in a member who is, as I understand the position, disqualified from receiving cash,</u> circumventing that rule by going to a colleague and saying: Obtain cash, not for yourself but for me.

MS DOROTHY: No, Chair, I am not saying that. I am saying the statement that Advocate Pretorius eluded to earlier to say that I took the money under my name illegally. So I just wanted just to justify that by saying. In the submission it does not talk to a name. So the person could go and ask anybody in assist in taking the money. I am not talking about the process itself of me taking the money. I am talking about the submission.

10

20

The sense that the submission does not have a name attached to it. I did had some as illegal, in the sense, that I cannot take money when that submission has got somebody else's name written. But I understand the fact that he says: How do a person take a money on behalf on another who has not settled?

Hence, I am saying. It is Mr Dlomo's signature on the green form. He would have known by then. I would have asked Lilly why are you making [redacted] take the money. Sorry...

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Of course. Yes, I am taking a general point to you, Dorothy. And that general point is that, at times, the rule that a person who has not settled a temporary advance may be evaded or avoided by asking someone else to do it for them. That is all I am putting to

you. That has happened and you confirmed that.

MS DOROTHY: [Speaker unclear – break in transmission] **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: Correct?

MS DOROTHY: Noted. Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: You agree that that has happened as opposed to just noting what I am saying?

MS DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. And the second issue that arises is that it seems that the documents authorising

10 withdrawals of cash and documents confirming that cash has been expended by way of a receipt or other documents are often signed by people who do not know what was done with the money. Is that correct, generally, not to a specific case here?

MS DOROTHY: Can you repeat the question?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: You have said that there is a trail of documentation ...[intervenes]

MS DOROTHY: Yes?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: ...which authorises the withdrawal of cash, the expenditure of cash and the accounting for the expenditure of cash. You described that earlier in your evidence. Do you recall that?

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Now that process requires various persons at various stages to sign authorisation or receipt,

correct?

MS DOROTHY: Authorisation of receipt?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: No, authorisation for the expenditure of money on the one hand. Well, the withdrawal and expenditure of money on the one hand and its receipt at the end of the process, different people signing at different stages.

MS DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right?

10 MS DOROTHY: Yes.

<u>ADV PRETORIUS SC</u>: But on occasion, and it seems ...[intervenes]

MS DOROTHY: Yes, yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: ...on more than isolated occasions, persons would sign without knowing what the money was for or how the money was spent.

MS DOROTHY: True, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. Let us then go to the next box which is M16. I am not sure if it is necessary for us to

20 go to the document, but M16 is a submission dated 5 September 2016, requesting authorisation to pay the related expenses for Project Mayibuye for the months April to August 2016. It was recommended by Dorothy.

Part B of the temporary advance that R 13.15 million was taken by Darryl and the claim settlement was approved by Dorothy and certain invoices are attached and they – it goes over the page and a company called Nay-washer-ways(?) [phonetically] is mentioned. Now, perhaps it is better that you go to SSA Bundle 1 at page 468, please.

MS DOROTHY: Yes, I am there.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: What was the page, Mr Pretorius, page number?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: 468 of Bundle 1 but you can start 10 at page 469. And if you could just go, please, to page 472. You see there:

> "The request for authorisation payment to related expenses as per the approved Project Mayibuye recommended..."

And then there is a signature. Whose signature is that?

DOROTHY: That is my signature.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. And if you go to page 476. **DOROTHY**: 476?

20 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: Yes, in the middle of that page, this is one of the green forms, Section 1, Approval of Incurred Expenses by Line Management. Whose signature is that there?

DOROTHY: It looks like my signature. It is my signature, Chair. <u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Mr Pretorius, is that the one under Section 1 that you were asking about?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Then there are further documents which refer to a company whose pseudonym is Napa, N-ap-a, they are appear on page 478, 479 and 480. Do you see that? These are documents in relation to these expenditures provided by the SSA about which you were

10 asked questions, but I just want to draw your attention to the fact that on page 478 it is indicated the professional fees as per the approved contract were paid in relation to project Mayibuye, do you see that? R5 300 000.

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And then over the page. 479, R5 million, again professional fees for Mayibuye. Do you see that?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And on page 480, professional fees

20 as per the approved contract project Mayibuye, R2.850 million. Do you see all those documents?

DOROTHY: Yes. Yes, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right. What do you know about this documentation? You will see that your signature appears in respect of that documentation on some pages.

DOROTHY: Chair, when this submission was done I was acting general manager then and Darryl was acting – I think Darryl was Acting DDG, if I am not mistaken. Yes. And it would seem that he took the money and then came to me to sign off his settlement.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right.

DOROTHY: Which I did.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Did you know anything about the services to be provided or provided that appear in this documentation?

DOROTHY: No, Chair.

10

ADV PRETORIUS SC: But you signed as part of the authorised ...[intervenes]

DOROTHY: Darryl would be better suited than me.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, Darryl would know, Darryl brought it to you but he did not tell you what the money was for, as I understand your answer.

DOROTHY: Yes, it was only for project Mayibuye, but what specifically, no.

20 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: Right. But was it normal practice for someone in a senior position to sign without knowing what the money was for?

DOROTHY: It was not normal practice but I assume because I was acting general manager then that he would have come to me, not looking that he is a senior person than me, I would rather my acting capacity at that point.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Okay, it would seem unusual, to put it at its lowest, for someone to authorise expenditure in these amounts of several million rands without knowing what the money was to be used for or what the money was used for. Do you agree with that? In fact it would be irregular.

DOROTHY: Chair the money ...[intervenes]

10

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And I am talking about what happened in practice. I am sorry, I interrupted you.

DOROTHY: You got cut, I did not hear that. I am sorry, you got cut, I did not hear the last part.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes I stopped myself because I was interrupting you. Please answer.

DOROTHY: No, I am saying the environment that I worked in, we worked on a need to know basis. So as long as there is a submission that is approved for the project I would not question as to what the money is for because it was not in my place to know that. So the need to know

20 principle was always applied within my environment.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright, so someone may authorise the expenditure of funds but because of the application of the need to know principle in these circumstances that person would not know whether the money was going to be spent in accordance with the submission, whether it was going to be spent properly, whether it was going to be spent at all. Is that how the need to know principle works in these circumstances?

DOROTHY: True, Chair.

10

20

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. Let us then go to – well, there are further examples in relation to reference document M17 and M18. The circumstances are similar but let us go to M18, if we could. Well, perhaps for the sake of completeness we should just mention M17. That document appears in SSA bundle 1, page 481. The documentation is summarised as follows:

> "Submission dated 3 October 2016 requesting authorisation to pay the related expenses for project Mayibuye for the month of the September 2016. Part B of the temporary advance reflects that R4.51 million was taken by Darryl and the claims settlement was approved by Dorothy."

And then attached were certain invoices. What is your knowledge of that as stated in the comments column to the right?

DOROTHY: It would be the same as the M16.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right.

DOROTHY: Where I say that I signed the settlement for Darryl at the time because I was acting GM but have no knowledge as to where or who or what the money was meant for.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. Can you confirm, though, that R4.51 million was withdrawn or taken by Darryl in cash for the purposes at least as appeared on the documentation of the execution of project Mayibuye?

DOROTHY: I am relying on the documentation and that is what it says, Chair, so...

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright.

DOROTHY: I am assuming that that is the amount.

10 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: Yes. Well, it is the documentation you signed, correct? Or you signed the settlement at least. Correct?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: M18.

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Is a similar circumstance, the document appears in SSA bundle 1, page 494 but I am just going to read the summary:

"Submission dated 26 October 2016 requesting authorisation to pay the related expenses for project Mayibuye for the month of October 2016. Part B of the temporary advance reflects that R4.51 million was taken by Darryl and the claim settlement was approved by Dorothy."

So it seems that on a monthly basis, at least in this period,

R4.51 million was withdrawn in cash for the purposes of the execution of project Mayibuye, is that correct? According to the documentation at least.

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right. And your explanation in the right hand column, what is that?

DOROTHY: Is that - that is M18, am I correct?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Correct.

DOROTHY: I signed the settlement as Mr Fraser had 10 approved the withdrawal of the cash. Darryl was my senior at the time as I as acting GM at that point.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright, let us go to M19 because you do know about that. M19 appears at page 504 of B1. If we could go there please?

DOROTHY: Okay, I am there.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: On page 505 is a request for authorisation payment of related expenses as per the approved project Mayibuye and at the bottom of page 506 is a signature. Do you know whose signature that is? Can

20 you recognise it? It is cut off slightly. Do you recognise that signature?

DOROTHY: 506?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Page 506.

DOROTHY: Under compiler?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes.

DOROTHY: That is Lilly.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Is that Lilly's signature. Okay. You will see that under the head, paragraph 3, Financial Implications, that same amount, covert action expenses, R4,510 million. Do you see that? Same amount as the previous two months. Do you see that?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And on page 4 of that document, which is at page 508, there is a signature against the date

10 1 December 2016. Whose signature is that?

DOROTHY: That is my signature.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. And on page 509 at the bottom of the page under cost implications. It is very unclear but one can make it out:

"The amount required, R4,510 000, that is four million, five hundred and ten thousand rand, under the head Section 3, Cost Implications on page 509. Do you see that?

DOROTHY: Yes.

20 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: And at the bottom of that section is a signature above the date 5 December 2016. Whose signature is that?

DOROTHY: That is my signature.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: The amount appears clearly in the right hand column, R4 510 000. Do you see that?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And then, over the page, page 510, there is another signature. Whose signature is that in the middle of the page?

DOROTHY: That is my signature.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: That is first of the two signatures, hey? It looks like there are two signatures or is it one, Mr Pretorius?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: There is one signature next to the date 5 December 2016.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja, okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: That Dorothy confirms, as I understand it, as her signature. Underneath that, there is the name A J, and you cannot read the initial, Fraser and the date 2/12/2016. Do you recognise that signature?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Whose signature is it? Are you able to identify ...[intervenes]

DOROTHY: Mr Fraser's signature.

20 ADV PRETORIUS SC: Mr Fraser's signature. And then there is receipt - and we will explain this in a moment, R470 000. Do you see that?

DOROTHY: No, I do not see that.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. Do you see at the bottom of page 510?

DOROTHY: There is a receipt?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Receipt, yes. The words four hundred and seventy thousand rand appear. Do you see that?

DOROTHY: 510?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, bottom of page 510.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: It is written in where it is ...[intervenes] DOROTHY: Oh yes, I see that.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

10 ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright.

DOROTHY: Yes, I see that.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And then on page 512 at the top of the page in handwriting above the green print is a word settlement, do you see that?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And in the middle of the page, Signature by Claimant. Whose signature is that?

DOROTHY: That is my signature.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And then on page 513 is an 20 invoice:

"Professional fees as per the approved contract,

project Mayibuye."

And the amount of R4 510 000. Do you see that? I am not going to mention the name of the company.

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right. That document then is described in the left hand column at page 440 of your affidavit and your comment is on the right hand side. What is your comment?

CHAIRPERSON: That is page ...[intervenes]

<u>ADV PRETORIUS SC</u>: And please do not mention the ...[intervenes]

DOROTHY: In my comments, this is one of the ...[intervenes]

10 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: Sorry, can I stop you there for a moment?

DOROTHY: I must not mention?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: The name of the company.

DOROTHY: Okay.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Just one second, Mr Pretorius, for the transcript, it is page 440 of the bundle, bundle 2.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, I apologise, did I not mention it?

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Is that 440 of the affidavit? Okay, 20 alright.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Are you there, Dorothy?

DOROTHY: Yes, I am there.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: The bottom of page 440, you provide an explanation for the contents of the documentation that you have just been shown, M19. What

is your explanation? But please do not mention the name of the company in the last line.

DOROTHY: Okay. Okay:

"This is one of the instances where I took the 4,51 million in cash to Minister Mahlobo at his residence. I do not know how the invoice from this company was generated for the settlement or how it was provided to by Lilly."

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right. And then there is an explanation for why the amount of R470 000 appears that we have just referred to. What is the explanation for that? DOROTHY: Yes, okay. It appears that I initially took 470 000 and then the balance later as sometimes there was insufficient cash available.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right. Now did you withdraw R4.51 million in cash or R470 000 in cash?

DOROTHY: I do not remember very well the specific transaction how – whether I took the 470, waited and then there must have been a delivery on that same day and then

20 I took the balance.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: But did you have money in your possession on that day? Leave aside the amount for the moment.

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Cash?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Was it in a bag? Did you put it in a bag?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right, did you push the cash in the bag?

DOROTHY: Are you saying did I specifically put the cash in the bag?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes.

10 DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright and what did you do, where did you go?

DOROTHY: I took the money to Minister Mahlobo's official residence.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right and to whom did you give the money?

DOROTHY: I gave it to him personally.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right, in which room in the residence, can you remember?

20 **DOROTHY**: In the study.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. And what happened in the study, if you would just tell the Chair please what you recollect of what happened when you walked into the study?

DOROTHY: When I walked into the study I then informed

that I brought the money, would take it out, I would count it so that he is satisfied that it is the specific amount and then I put it back in the bag and leave.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright. So is it correct that in his presence you counted out the cash in the amounts, whatever amount was specified and supposed to have been handed to him? Is that correct?

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Did you take this money to him on 10 somebody's instruction?

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: On whose instruction?

DOROTHY: Darryl.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay and when was this? Was it November 2016? I am looking at your document here. When was this?

DOROTHY: I do not remember the specific date when he informed me that I am going to having to do that. He informed me – when he was Acting DDG he informed me

20 that I would have to take over the role of taking the money because he has been doing it prior to me. So it could not have been that specific day when I took the money. The specific day would have been that this is the day when I (sic) said you need to take the money, go and take it but he had informed me beforehand. <u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Oh but are you tell which year it was when you took the money to Minister Mahlobo on this occasion?

DOROTHY: Chair, the date of withdrawal of the money would be the same date that the money is delivered.

CHAIRPERSON: Oh.

DOROTHY: Immediately I withdraw the money I would immediately take it to him.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes but are you able to say whether that
10 was 2016 or 2017 or when it was?

DOROTHY: 2016.

CHAIRPERSON: 2016. Towards the end of the year?

DOROTHY: Yes, according to the documents.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes. You withdrew the money and you put it into a bag and then on the same day you delivered it to Minister Mahlobo's residence, is that right?

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: This particular residence to which you delivered it, was it in Pretoria, was it in Cape Town or where was it?

DOROTHY: In Pretoria.

20

<u>**CHAIRPERSON</u>**: Yes. And when you arrived at his residence was he the only person that you interacted with or did you first have to speak to somebody else who then told you where he – in which room he was an you went</u>

there?

DOROTHY: Chair, since he – when I arrive at this house, the protectors would obviously be outside.

```
CHAIRPERSON: Yes.
```

DOROTHY: So that was my first point of contact.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

DOROTHY: And they would then inform that I am there.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes. And would they have then told you to go into the study?

10 **DOROTHY**: They would not have told me to go into his study, they would have said he says that I must come in. They would not come into the house with me because obviously when I enter the door he would be there waiting for me.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Oh, he was waiting for you when you entered the door?

DOROTHY: Yes, the protectors would have informed him that I am here to see him.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

20 **DOROTHY**: Then I would wait for them to come back to me to tell me that I could go in an see him.

<u>**CHAIRPERSON</u></u>: Was there a conversation that took place between you and Minister Mahlobo other than you saying I have brought you money, this money or something to that effect? Did he say anything himself?</u>** DOROTHY: No, Chair, I do not recall.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: He did not say anything or you cannot recall whether he said anything?

DOROTHY: I do not recall – yes, ja, I do not recall our conversation.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes but you counted the money in his presence and when you were done you then left?

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay, alright. Mr Pretorius? I see we 10 are at five past one.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: It is a convenient time, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes, okay.

ADV RENDANI: No, Chair, maybe I will take the opportunity to, during the break to discuss with the legal team.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay. No, that is fine.

ADV RENDANI: It is around the evidence in particular the annexures.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Ja, okay, alright.

20 ADV RENDANI: I will address it with the evidence leader.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay. No, that is alright.

ADV RENDANI: Thank you, Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: We will take the lunch adjournment then and we will resume at five past two. We adjourn.

INQUIRY ADJOURNS

INQUIRY RESUMES

CHAIRPERSON: Let us continue.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you, Chair. Dorothy, are you there? Can you hear us?

DOROTHY: Yes, I am here, yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you. I would like to go back to margin number M18 on page 440 please?

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Mr Pretorius, I am sorry, I notice that these two bundles that we are using or we were using just

10 before lunch, they both have numbers that are more or less the same, so it is important to say which bundle each time we refer to a page otherwise somebody reading the transcript might go to a wrong bundle for a particular reference.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, Chair, you are correct because bundle 2 is bundle 2(a) and bundle 2(b). so if you could go to bundle 2(a) the bundle we have been referring to, Dorothy, at page 440.

DOROTHY: Yes.

20 ADV PRETORIUS SC: Against the exhibit number in the margin M18.

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: If I could just take you to SSA bundle 1. The documents that form part of M18 on contained there and I just want to take you to specific

pages please. If you go to page 494.

DOROTHY: Okay. Yes?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Oh, that is the cover page, so 495 is the request for authorisation. It is for project Mayibuye, do you see that?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And it is dated the 28 October 2016. Sorry, the 26 October 2016 and on page 496, the signature that you have identified or a similar one which

10 you have identified is that of Lilly. Do you see that?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And it is a request for authorisation of that amount which we have seen before of R4.51 million. You see that at paragraph 3 of the letter on page 496.

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Now we know from other evidence and you have referred to a written entry on a document earlier this morning that project Mayibuye involves

20 Operation Justice, Operation Lock and Operation Commitment. Do you recall that?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Now if you go please to page 498 of bundle 1.

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: There is a series of signatures related to the request for authorisation, all recommended. At the bottom of page 497, do you recognise that signature, right at the bottom?

DOROTHY: The green form?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: No, page 497, it is not a green form, page 497, before the green form.

DOROTHY: Yes, I do.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Whose signature is that?

10 **DOROTHY**: Mr Arthur Fraser.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right. And then on page 498 at the bottom, it reads – there is a handwritten note reading:

"Funding of the project was approved by the Minister, see attached approval. Operational reports must be submitted to..."

And then I cannot read those words.

"...DBO1 and DG01 to justify continued expenditure on the project."

Do you see that?

20 DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Did you know that to be correct that the Minister had approved the project or the funding for the project?

DOROTHY: Chair, I do not recall but no funds can be withdrawn from a particular project without having the

project being approved in the first instance because this submission is to withdraw funds but there would have been a submission to establish the project. So I am assuming this is what Dwayne was talking about.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right, that is Dwayne's signature? **DOROTHY**: It is the bigger submission, the principal submission.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, but he is saying funding of the project was approved by the Minister ...[intervenes]

10 **DOROTHY**: Excuse me?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Do you know whether that is correct or not?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: It is correct?

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Dorothy, the question is whether ...[intervenes]

DOROTHY: I am not sure. I am not sure, Chair, I cannot hundred percent confirm that it is correct, I do not know.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: If you will go to page 500 please?

20 There is a signature below the words – on the green form now.

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Approval by line management. Whose signature is that? You have identified it before. **DOROTHY**: Yes. Mr Fraser. Mr Fraser. ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you. And on page 502 under:

"Approval of incurred expenses by line management"

Whose signature is that?

DOROTHY: It is my signature.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And then there is an invoice on the next page 503.

"Professional fees per approved contract, R4 510 000."

Do you see that?

10

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right, if we could go back please to page 441 of bundle 2A.

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: You will recall that there was documentation reflecting the approval for withdrawal of R4.51 million and you said a first delivery of cash would have been in the amount of R470 000 and you said you

20 would have made up the difference via delivery at a later time. Do you recall that evidence?

DOROTHY: No, I did not say that.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: What did you say?

DOROTHY: Can I clarify?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, please.

DOROTHY: I said I would have taken that 470 and waited for the difference which would have been the same particular day and then took the whole amount.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright, so you did not take the amount in two batches, you say you would have taken the amount drawn ...[intervenes]

DOROTHY: No.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: You said you would have taken the full amount of R4.51 million.

10 **DOROTHY**: Fully.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Is that correct?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Okay. Sorry, I misunderstood you, but I just do, in any event, want to take you to a document provided to the investigators by the SSA. It appears at the back of bundle SSA02, page number is 522.137. If you could go there please? It is a schedule of expenses or it is a schedule ...[intervenes]

DOROTHY: Which bundle is that?

20 ADV PRETORIUS SC: Bundle 2, the same bundle in which your affidavit appears but at the end of the file, back of the file. Do you see there is a schedule ...[intervenes] DOROTHY: Which one is that?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: It is page 522.137 but it is not the large document, it is a single spreadsheet, it is the first

document with that number on it. Do you see it?

DOROTHY: 522.13..?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: 7.

CHAIRPERSON: Is it the last document on bundle 2.

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: This is a schedule prepared by the investigators or by the SSA, I am not sure which, but it is a summary of the temporary advance records of the SSA and if you look at the dates in the left hand column and you go

10 down to 8 December 2016.

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: You will see two entries on 8 December 2016.

DOROTHY: Yes.

20

ADV PRETORIUS SC: For – and you look at the right hand column, for project Mayibuye. Do you see that? **DOROTHY**: Yes, I see that, yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And the two amounts of R470 000 and R4 040 000 which would total the amount that we have spoken about.

DOROTHY: Yes, will go to 4.1.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: 4.1, 510, yes. So that seems to ...[intervenes]

DOROTHY: Yes, it is, exactly.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: ... coincide with your evidence that

there would have been two withdrawals on the same day. Correct?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Okay. Now if we can go onto paragraph 13 of your statement on page 441 please? You say in paragraph – well, what do you say in paragraph 13.1 regarding deliveries to any person, deliveries of cash?

DOROTHY:

"I can confirm that I have on three occasions withdrew 4.5 million by instruction of Mr Darryl to hand the money over to Minister Mahlobo."

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Now you gave a description of the first occasion next to the entry M19 on page 440 that you delivered cash to Minister Mahlobo. On the other occasions, what did you do, did you deliver the money personally?

DOROTHY: Yes, I delivered the money personally and I was accompanied by Lilly.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right and ...[intervenes]

20 <u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Maybe let us just for clarification get this right, Dorothy. You are not including in the three occasions the occasion you talked about earlier where you delivered a bag to Minister Mahlobo but you had not checked whether there was money inside. You are not including that one, is that correct, or are you including it? **DOROTHY**: As excluding it, the 1.5, it is excluding that.

<u>**CHAIRPERSON</u>**: You are excluding that one. Okay, alright. So you have told us about another one where you withdrew the cash yourself and you delivered it to Minister Mahlobo.</u>

DOROTHY: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: And you said you found him in his study. So that is the one. So you will tell us about the other two. Mr Pretorius?

10 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: Yes. Please describe what happened on the other two occasions?

DOROTHY: Yes. The same would happen, we would get to the residence, inform the protectors that we are there and then we will wait until we get the green light to go into the house. We went in and we went his study, with Lilly ...[intervenes]

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Hang on, hang on, Dorothy.

<u>DOROTHY</u>: He came, we counted the money and ...[intervenes]

20 <u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Hang on, Dorothy, hang on, Dorothy, take one at a time. Tell us about one of the two occasions.
<u>DOROTHY</u>: Okay.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: And then you will tell about another one. Tell us about one at a time.

DOROTHY: Okay. Okay, I spoke about the first occasion.

The second occasion, it is the same scenario, where I would get to the gate, inform the protectors to inform the Minister that I have arrived.

CHAIRPERSON: No, hang on.

DOROTHY: I would wait in my car and then ...[intervenes] **CHAIRPERSON**: Sorry, Dorothy, sorry, sorry. You see, the earlier one you told me somebody instructed you to go and withdraw the cash, how much you – you told us you withdrew the cash.

10 DOROTHY: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: How much it was and that you then proceeded on the same day to Minister Mahlobo's residence. Start at the beginning. Whose decision was it, were you carrying out somebody's instruction, was it your own decision and did you withdraw it yourself, how did you carry it, was it in a bag and so on. Okay, start.

DOROTHY: I understand, Chair. The instruction to withdraw the second amount of 4.5 was given by Darryl. I withdrew the money in my name, went to the cashiers with

20 Lilly, the money was counted there by the cashier, packed into the bags and we would call – I would call Minister Mahlobo to say I will be coming. When I get to the house I would then inform the protectors to inform him that we have arrived. We would wait in the care and then we would then get the green light to say we can come in. We would come in and he would usher us to the study where the money is counted, put back into the bags and we leave.

The second time I was with Lilly. The first time when I went I was alone.

And the third time the same applies, Darryl gave me the instruction to take the money to Minister Mahlobo. I would call him to say that I am coming, then get to the gate, speak to the protectors who then in turn inform him. They would come back to me, if I would wait – I would wait if he has got meetings. They would then come back and

10 if he has got meetings. They would then come back and say I could come in and then Minister Mahlobo would usher me into his study. The same applies, we would count the money and I would put it back into the bags and leave.

On both occasions - on the last two occasions I was with Lilly.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay, on the first occasion you were alone.

DOROTHY: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: On the two occasions you were with 20 Lilly, is that right?

DOROTHY: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: And was the amount the same on each of these occasions?

DOROTHY: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: And on each occasion you had been

instructed by Darryl. Is that right?

DOROTHY: Yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay on each ...[intervenes]

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

<u>**CHAIRPERSON</u>**: And on each of the three occasions when you delivered – when you say delivered money to Minister Mahlobo you did see the money?</u>

DOROTHY: Chair, the money was in my name, I withdrew in my name. So from the cashiers it is counted and put 10 into bags. I am there, I sign for it. From there we get to the house, I then take the money out, count it again to make sure that it is the money that he is expecting, then I leave.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes. And on each occasion – well, you told us about the first occasion, that there was not much conversation between yourself and Minister Mahlobo. On the other two occasions was there a conversation of any kind or it was just greeting and saying you brought the money or whatever? How did the conversation go?

20 **DOROTHY**: It was - no, it is just greeting and that we brought the money and then we would count and then say thank you and we would leave.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay, alright. Mr Pretorius?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you, Chair. Dorothy, two questions. In paragraph 13.1 your mention an amount of

R4.5 million and on page 440 against the exhibit number M19 you mentioned 4.51 million. Is the amount of R4.5 million in paragraph 13.1 correct?

DOROTHY: I am sorry, that must have been a – yes, I am sorry, Chair, it must have been a typing error, it is 4.51.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And secondly, on any of these three occasions was any receipt given to you for having received the money?

DOROTHY: When I dropped the money off I did not make 10 Minister Mahlobo sign anything.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: I am sorry, just to make sure I understand the clarification ...[intervenes]

DOROTHY: So I would drop the money off and leave.

<u>**CHAIRPERSON</u>**: Just to make sure I understand the clarification in relation to paragraph 13.2, Dorothy, did you say that where it says R7 million in paragraph 13.2 at bundle 2, page 441, it should be R4,5 million or how should it read?</u>

ADV PRETORIUS SC: If I may just explain the question,

20 Chair? The amount of R4.51 million appears on page 440.

CHAIRPERSON: Oh, okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And in the documentation.

CHAIRPERSON: Oh, okay, not ...[intervenes]

ADV PRETORIUS SC: But in 13.1 it is R4.5 million.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: That is the correction.

CHAIRPERSON: Oh, okay, okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: So if you could confirm that, Dorothy, please?

DOROTHY: Yes, I am confirming that it is 4.51 million.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay, no, that is [inaudible – speaking simultaneously]

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And that is the amount that should appear in paragraph 13.1. Do we understand you correctly?

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

10

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right and then 13.2 you refer to another occasion. What is that occasion?

DOROTHY: Which one?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Well, before we go there, I would need to ask you just one more question. You say that Mr Mahlobo did not give you a receipt for the money or you did not request a receipt for the money on any of the three occasions that you have now referred to. Did anybody else

20 give you a receipt, a protector or anyone in Mr Mahlobo's house or anyone else?

DOROTHY: Okay. Chair, when I deliver the money Mr Mahlobo does not sign for it. I would deliver it and leave. A week or two an envelope would come which I would give to Lilly but I cannot confirm that it is receipt based on the money that he received or receipts in terms of whatever activities that money was intended for.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: So do I understand you correctly, you have not ...[intervenes]

DOROTHY: But it was in an envelope, (indistinct – recording distorted)

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Do I understand your correctly that you have not seen a receipt for those three amounts of R4.51 million that you delivered?

10 DOROTHY: No.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Then 13.2 you mention another incident. What was that?

ADV RENDANI: Chair, sorry to disrupt. Chair, can I ask – my learned colleague had asked, even though we will have record, there was a question and answer and the answer was almost not completed or at least my understanding, if I may seek clarity. She testified that a week or two an envelope will come from Lilly.

CHAIRPERSON: Oh.

20 <u>ADV RENDANI</u>: That statement was incomplete when my learned colleague interrupted. I did not get that. If we may...

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes, okay, we can clarify. I understood her to say ja – I think, I do not know whether a week or two, but an envelope would come from, as I understood it, from Minister Mahlobo to Darryl but she would not have seen whether it contained receipts or not for the money that she would have delivered. Dorothy, is that what you were saying?

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair, that is what I was saying.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

ADV RENDANI: Thank you, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right, if we could get 13.2. What 10 is the incident there described, if you could tell the Chair please?

DOROTHY: Okay.

"Lilly together with Frank requested me to take out cash in the amount of 7 million under my name but nevertheless utilising the name of this project. The reason for the request was that Frank could not take the money as he had an amount that he needed to clear at finance before he could take further monies."

20 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: Alright, what – do you know what the project was that was the name of the project justifying the amount of the withdrawal of the amount of R7 million?

DOROTHY: Chair, I do not recall but I am assuming it would have been under Mayibuye. Without the documents I cannot really ascertain exactly but the documents would have reflected my signature in terms of the green and the attachment would have been related to Frank's activities.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, the question at least – and that appears at page 423 and 424, seems to indicate at least form the investigator's point of view – and this we could clarify later, reflects the amount of R7 million as being related to project Mayibuye. Do you see that on page 423 and 424?

DOROTHY: 423 and 424? Which bundle?

10 <u>ADV PRETORIUS SC</u>: Yes, if you look at the top of page 424.

DOROTHY: 423.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: The bottom of the page, you see there is question 12?

DOROTHY: Okay, yes, I see, yes, yes, yes. Yes, yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And at the top of page 424.

DOROTHY: Yes, yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: You do not – you have no reason to think that is incorrect, do you, as I understand from your answer?

DOROTHY: No.

20

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright.

DOROTHY: No.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Now before you delivered the R4.51 million on three occasions to Minister Mahlobo, do

you know whether such deliveries were made and if so, who would have made them?

DOROTHY: Darryl.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: So what did Darryl do?

DOROTHY: When Darryl asked me to assist in taking the money when he was acting as a DDG he said to me he was the one that was taking the money before, since I am acting in his position I should now be the one taking it but I do not know how many times he took it.

10 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: And after your three occasions that you delivered money, as you have said? Do you know whether the deliveries continued and if so, by whom?

DOROTHY: Chair, I do not have proof that the monies were indeed delivered after my three occasions so I cannot honestly and with confidence say that it indeed is true that he was receiving the monies after my three deliveries to him.

<u>ADV PRETORIUS SC</u>: Okay, we may come back ...[intervenes]

20 **DOROTHY**: I would have to have proof to show that he was receiving still.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes. We may return to that issue later in relation to another document but let us go then to page 424. Once again the questions that were put to you. Paragraph 13:

"With regard to any cash withdrawn..."

And I am reading the question put to you.

"...and taken to the office or residence of Minister Mahlobo, please indicate for what purpose the money was taken to the Minister, by whom the cash was withdrawn, to whom the money was provided, the Minister's involvement in operations and the person to whom the money was disbursed, if any, by the Minister or any other person."

10 Now some of those questions have been answered already but really the essence of the question that remains is do you know what the money was intended for and to whom the money was disbursed, if at all by the Minister, or anyone else?

DOROTHY: I bear no knowledge what the money was intended for or to whom he was giving the money to.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And does the same apply to the amount of R7million, the two amounts of R6million and R1million respectively.

20 DOROTHY: Yes Chair. Yes, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: That amount of R7million Dorothy referred to in paragraph 13.2.

DOROTHY: Yes Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Did you deliver that money deliver that

money, anywhere?

DOROTHY: No, I did not deliver the money anyway, at the cashiers once it was signed off by my name, it was taken there.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: It was taken by who or too where, do you know?

DOROTHY: Chair, I – Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes, yes.

DOROTHY: Lily and Frank were there.

10 **CHAIRPERSON**: Oh.

DOROTHY: Lilly and Frank, were there.

CHAIRPERSON: Oh, so okay, I was under the impression that they sent you there. So they were there when the money was withdrawn, it was just withdrawn in your name, but they were the ones who were going to need it, is that right?

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

20

CHAIRPERSON: Okay, alright.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And the reason for this arrangement...[intervene]

DOROTHY: That is correct, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: I am sorry, I interrupted you.

DOROTHY: I was agreeing to what the Chair was saying that it is correct to what he said.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Okay, and the reason for that

arrangement Dorothy, as I understand your statement, was that Frank could not draw money because he still had to account or clear money at finance before he could take further monies. Is that correct?

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright, in paragraphs 16, 17 and 18 of your affidavit, you refer to amounts relating to Project Hollywood, Project Accurate/Construcao and Project Tin Roof, right. You say in respect of Project

10 Hollywood, that you cannot recall this advance and you cannot respond meaningfully in the absence of receipts. Is that – do I understand it correctly? Even though you approved it according to the documentation.

DOROTHY: Chair you got cut, Chair you got cut I did not hear a word. Just the last part, I did not hear anything.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: I am so sorry, alright. If you go to page 442 of Bundle SSA 2A, paragraph 16.

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: There is documentation referred to 20 there in relation to Project Hollywood and it appears that you approved a settlement of R 107,766, 96. Do you see that?

DOROTHY: I do.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Approved by yourself.

DOROTHY: 107 thousand?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, 766 96. Do you see that, the figure that appears in the box?

DOROTHY: You said 107 million?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, I know but I was wrong. So I have corrected myself maybe that had got cut out. It is R107,766,00.

DOROTHY: Okay, yes.

<u>ADV PRETORIUS SC</u>: Alright. Now according to the documentation, you approved the settlement but you say
 you cannot recall that advance and in the absence of receipts, you cannot respond meaningfully. Is that correct?
 <u>DOROTHY</u>: Yes, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And then in paragraph 17 there is an amount referred to in the documentation of R16,370,000 recommended by Dorothy - we can go to the documents if you like, but you say that you cannot recall what Project Accurate was about that is the project for which the amount was approved or Project Construcao, correct you say you were neither project manager nor a participant of

20 Project Construcao?

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright, so you cannot really assist in respect of that amount and that project, it is safe to say that you really did not know much about the use of the monies or for what the use for which the money were intended, is that correct?

DOROTHY: No, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright.

DOROTHY: Except for Construcao and the toxicology salaries, that is all.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Okay, so you were involved in the chain of authorisation for the withdrawal of the money in relation to Project Hollywood and Project Accurate and Construcao but you have, as I understand it, very limited

10 knowledge of how that money was used. Is that correct? DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And does the same apply to the statements made in regard to Project Tin Roof on page 443, where you say in relation to the amount of R3,677,200,00 that amount you have limited knowledge of its use, except that it was for Project Tin Roof. Am I correct?

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair, as I have indicated, I said my role was limited to recommending the submission.

20 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: Right, then in paragraph 19 I would like to ask you to exercise some caution here in the first five lines of paragraph 19. What do you what do you wish to say to the Chair?

DOROTHY: When you say I must exercise caution in terms of names?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: You need not mention any names, but just deal with the first five lines, please, in paragraph 19.

DOROTHY: Okay, in December 2017, I was asked by a gentleman...[intervene]

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Well, it does not matter you can mention his name. I am sorry, I am interrupting you, you can mention that name.

DOROTHY: Can I mention the name?

10 ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, you can.

DOROTHY: Or just the title?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Both.

DOROTHY: Okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: That person is not – sorry before you go on Dorothy sorry perhaps I had better check. The person whose name is mentioned in the first line of paragraph 19. He is not an operative or a member of the SSA, is he?

DOROTHY: No, Chair.

20 ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright, so you can mention his name.

DOROTHY: Yes, okay. In December 2017 I was asked by Paula the head of the ANC security to assist him at NASREC. I then advised him to seek permission from my seniors to utilise me. Mr Langer informed me that he had obtained consent from Mr Fraser to utilise my services at NASREC. To protect myself I wrote a submission to SSA management who gave me permission to assist the ANC.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Now without going any further in your document, and I will explain to the Chair why in a moment. Did you withdraw any money for these purposes? **DOROTHY**: Money was for SNT and accommodation for myself.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And was there any other money 10 withdrawn by yourself for the purposes of assisting the ANC at the conference?

DOROTHY: No, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And what did you do, can you say that or is that something you should not say?

DOROTHY: No, I was assisting the ANC in monitoring the movement of buses that were coming from the provinces, coordinating that movement and checking if there are any glitches along the way and reporting back to them.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright, the remainder of the 20 paragraph deals with an allegation which I have asked our investigators about. It is an allegation Chair, which is hearsay upon hearsay, and we have absolutely no confirmation that this was contemplated or done, I do not feel it appropriate to put it before you.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Ja, know that is fine, can I ask you this

question Dorothy, you say that you were asked by the head of the ANC security, Mr Paul Langer to assist him at NASREC and you asked him to seek permission from your seniors to utilise you and you subsequently wrote a submission to SSA management who gave you permission to assist the ANC. Was this about assisting the ANC or doing some work for the ANC or the benefit of the ANC as opposed to doing your normal work as part of SSA?

DOROTHY: Okay, Chair by then when the conference started, I was not doing anything else, I was sitting at home since the activities of SO were stopped by the former Director General, so I was not doing anything at home. Hence, Mr Langer then called me to request me to come and assist them because they had a shortage, but because I am an employee of SSA, I felt it necessary that I should have authorisation to be there.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: What I am trying to establish is whether the work you were doing whatever it is, you were doing that you regarded as assisting the ANC was not SSA work.

20 You were not performing – were you performing SSA duties?

DOROTHY: No, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: You were performing none SSA duties to assist the ANC?

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: What actually were you were you doing? **DOROTHY**: I was coordinating, assisting in the coordinating of the movement of buses should there be any glitches along the way, the busses that are coming from the different provinces. So I was asked to monitor that there is no glitches along the way, until they reach Johannesburg.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes, you were not...[intervene] **<u>DOROTHY</u>**: So we were providing alerts.

10 **CHAIRPERSON**: Was it some kind of intelligence kind of duty?

DOROTHY: No, Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: No, was it like what traffic cops would do? **<u>DOROTHY</u>**: No, traffic cops with lead the buses, but with us to check if bus number 50 has left in Mpumalanga for an example.

CHAIRPERSON: So it is the position...[intervene]

DOROTHY: Is everybody on board and so forth.

CHAIRPERSON: So you were doing what a member of the 20 ANC would have done to make sure that the buses departed on time and that all that had departed where they were supposed to depart from that kind of thing.

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair so I worked with the transport unit.

CHAIRPERSON: Transport unit of the ANC?

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay, alright Mr Pretorius. Were you going to be paid by the ANC for that or what was the position?

DOROTHY: No.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: You were not going to be paid by the ANC?

DOROTHY: No, I was not going to be paid by the ANC Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay, alright Mr Pretorius.

10 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: If you go please to page 460 of Bundle SSA 2A, please, Dorothy.

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: This is another affidavit which appears to have been attested by you. Is it correct that you attested to more than one affidavit for the purposes of the Commission?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And if you go to page 468, is that your signature?

20 DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: As far as you are concerned are the ...[intervene]

DOROTHY: No, 467 is my signature not 68?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, you are quite correct, my apologies, 467 is your signature and the signature of the

Commissioner of oaths appears on page 468, is that correct? **DOROTHY:** Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Good, as far as you are concerned, are the contents of this affidavit true and correct?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: This will be Exhibit YY 12.2, Chair. **CHAIRPERSON**: Okay, she confirmed the correctness of the contents?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes and she's drawn my attention 10 to the precise - is on page 467, where her signature appears.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay, alright. The affidavit of Dorothy that starts at page 460 will be admitted as an exhibit and will be marked as Exhibit YY 12.2.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Now, as I understand it Dorothy this affidavit was prepared in response to a Rule 33 notice that you received in respect of the statement to affidavit of Lloyd Mhlanga, is that correct?

DOROTHY: Yes.

20 **ADV PRETORIUS SC:** Now, we are not going to deal in detail with its content save that I would like you please to refer to paragraph 2.2. What do you say there?

DOROTHY: "I have never told Mr Lloyd Mhlanga that I had

given the alleged cash withdrawals to Mr Mahlobo."

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alight, and if you could then just read on to the record, please or just - yes, I think it is important that you read the detail from paragraph 2.3 to paragraph 2.21.

DOROTHY: So I must start from 2.3?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, please.

<u>DOROTHY</u>: "In the absence of schedules of the cash withdrawals of R4.51million, I am only able to recall

10 having done so on three occasions."

<u>ADV PRETORIUS SC</u>: Sorry, before you go on...[intervene]

DOROTHY: "For all material times I made the" - okay.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: I am sorry, Dorothy, for interrupting you. That R4.5million, do I understand that should read R4.51million?

DOROTHY: Yes, yes.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: That does that also apply to the amount in paragraph 2 at page 460?

20 DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Okay.

<u>ADV PRETORIUS SC</u>: And while we are about it, paragraph 2.21? <u>DOROTHY</u>: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright, apologies for interrupting,

Page 118 of 133

if you could continue, please.

10

20

DOROTHY: "At all material times, I have made the

advancements Temporary in my name. The documents for settlement and preparation for settlement of each temporary an advancement was done by my colleague known as Lily in the State Capture Commission. I would sign off the request with the temporary advance in my name, though prepared by Lily and also sign off the settlement documents in my name, though prepared by Lily too. I would then go to finance section with Lily and the cashier would count the money in front of me and Lily, Lily always brought the bag where the money would be packed by myself and Lili. The money would then be taken to the official resident in Waterkloof of former Minister Mahlobo. On the first occasion, I delivered it alone. On the second and third occasion I was accompanied by Lily. I got involved in the cash withdrawal, because I was told by Mr Darrell that I should do so because I am acting in his position and he used to do the same and take the money to former Minister Mahlobo. I was acting in the position of Mr Darryl because he was acting in another senior position."

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Please continue.

Page 119 of 133

DOROTHY: "I was made to inherit all that he used to do and continue to do it. I was specifically instructed by Darryl to agree that my name be used and also to collect and deliver to Minister Mahlobo. At no stage did Darryl or Minister Mahlobo inform me of the purpose and objective of the withdrawal and delivery of the cash. At no stage did Mr Mahlobo temporary asked make the me to advance At no stage did Darryl or Minister withdrawal. inform me of the objective and ultimate destination of the cash I had to deliver and as an intelligence officer, one of the cornerstone values of intelligence is always working on a need to know basis, only on the need to know principle. The environment in which I was working in is covert operations and offices were unknown to many SSA members. On the delivery of the money I would be ushered by them to his home office where I would remove the money and count it, having countered it in front of him and having satisfied himself that it is R4.51million I would leave the money and the suitcase with him."

10

20

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Alright, you go on in the statement, Dorothy to talk of an occasion when you were asked to collect arms, firearms from the Musanda Armoury that is the SSA Armoury, is that correct?

DOROTHY: Yes, yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Who gave you that instruction?

DOROTHY: Okay, I received a call from a colleague, which I cannot name for obviously operational reasons, on the 28th of January 2015, that I need to come and collect arms and ammunition. I was not aware because nobody had for warned me that I am going to be collecting arms. I then called a late colleague of mine, which also I cannot divulge his name for security reasons, asking him if it indeed it is true that I have to collect arms at Musanda.

He then confirmed that yes, I am the one that needs to collect, my instruction of Mr Thulani Dlomo. The letter that I have also states, a letter that came from Mr Thulani Dlomo to the security chief director at requesting for these for these guns. I then drove to Musanda for collection of those arms and ammunition.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Did you collect the arms and ammunition?

20 DOROTHY: Yes, yes.

10

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And where did you take them? **DOROTHY**: I was informed by the late colleague that the VIP protector of Mr Dlomo would come to my house to collect the arms. So I drove home, parked the car in the garage and waited until he came, I sent him a code to access the place where I stay. He came, opened the boot, assisted him to carry the steel suitcase and he left.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right. Is this normal practice for an operative such as yourself to be told to go and collect arms for someone else?

DOROTHY: It's definitely not normal Chair. Hence, I wrote here that driving from Musanda to my home was the longest trip ever because I had never been involved in carrying any firearms. So it was the longest trip that I had to take to ensure that the safety of the States guns are secured at all times until I reach my destination.

10

So it was a bit weird, hence I called my late colleague to say, I received a call saying I must fetch guns but nobody forewarned me about this and then he responded back to say no Mr Thulani Dlomo is the one that instructed that I need to fetch those firearms.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Were the arms collected from you, the arms and ammunition?

DOROTHY: Yes, Mr Thulani Dlomo's protector came that 20 same – within - I do not remember the time but I know because I sent him a code to access where I stayed to come in and collect.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Did - after this, well, did you have any idea of what the firearms were to be used for? **DOROTHY:** No, Chair, I had no idea. **ADV PRETORIUS SC:** Did you later raise this event or the facts related to this event to anybody at SSA, anyone in authority at SSA?

DOROTHY: I raised the issue of the firearms with the former DG Mr Fraser and why I did that was word was circulating that Mr Dlomo is leaving and I was worried that there were firearms that were taken out of Musanda in my name. So I then informed him that there are firearms that are out in my name, and I am very worried about it and he

10 instructed that all SO firearms are to be returned.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Right and were all or some returned?

DOROTHY: All they were returned except for I discovered I think, early this year or late that there are three still outstanding from the batch that I took.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Is that in paragraph 3.19 on page 465?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: So you say there:

20 "I compared the inventory delivered with the inventory of collection."

That means the arms you took out and the arms that were returned:

"From armoury control and found that three pistols and two R4 rifles were outstanding." Is that correct?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: So, what happened in relation to these missing rifles and pistols?

DOROTHY: I do not know but in February this year, I went to a specific police station to do a statement. So there is a case opened in relation to this missing firearms.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: You say in your affidavit that you saw a document indicating that two more pistols had been

10 recovered and that outstanding was one pistol and two R4 rifles, you say that in paragraph 3.26. Is that correct?

DOROTHY: Yes, I learned that from the police station.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: And then you refer to evidence of Ms K but you need not go there we can get the evidence directly from her. Do you have any training or competency qualification in relation to the handling of firearms?

DOROTHY: No, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Do you know why you were asked to do this collection and delivery?

20 **<u>DOROTHY</u>**: I have no idea, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Chair, if you would just bear with me one moment please to check that I have dealt with everything.

CHAIRPERSON: That is fine.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: You have spoken Dorothy of three

occasions on which you delivered R4.51million relation to Project Mayibuye to Minister Mahlobo. Do you know why you stopped taking the money, whether money was taken after you did it?

DOROTHY: It's I think it's when SO's activities or SO was closed when we were told that Mr Fraser's SO.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: If I could ask you please to go to page 522.

CHAIRPERSON: Is that in Bundle 2?

10 **ADV PRETORIUS SC:** Bundle SSA 02A, Chair. This appears to be...[intervene]

DOROTHY: 522?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, point 2, SSA 02A 522.2. This is a transcript obtained from the SSA of an interview you had with investigators in an internal investigation at the SSA on the 3rd of July 2019. Do you recognise this just have a look at the names and the first page?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Did you conduct an interview in the 20 internal investigation at SSA?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: I do not want to go into too much detail about that but if you could go to 522.68, please.

DOROTHY: Yes, Chair.

CHAIRPERSON: Mr Pretorius?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Chair, I am just checking I am not sure that I need to go to this, is there any detail here about the Luthuli House incident that would help you recollect the expenditure of monies in relation to the Luthuli House hash tag occupy Luthuli House incident? Have a look at those pages, I do not think there is.

In fact, if you go to page 522.70, we see that you were questioned about the Luthuli House matter and you appear to have said, yes, they signed for this money. We settled and gave finance, and finance takes all our things. So the reason for that operation was because the President was there or the Deputy President was there, yes. Or was it for the ANC question, and say no, no, no, it was for the principal, who was the principal?

DOROTHY: I am talking about the President and the Deputy President, those are the principals, that is what we call them.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: So it was for his protection was it, that you got MK people there, is that right?

20 **DOROTHY:** Chair, the Deputy President and the President attend meetings at Luthuli at a specific day on that specific day. On that specific day the hash tag Luthuli, people who were going to occupy the building as an inside, and that posed a danger for the two principals, hence, we call them principals there. So I am talking about both President and Deputy.

20

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, but the question, I suppose really is not whether those two persons did not deserve protection. The question is, whether it was appropriate to pay MK veterans to do so, what do you say about that? **DOROTHY:** Chair, as previously said, Mr Dlomo as I have previously stated that Mr Dlomo would be the best person to answer this question since he is the person that instructed that these people be activated.

10 **ADV PRETORIUS SC**: Yes, and you do confirm that on page 71. Right, if you just bear with me a further moment, Chair. In the same document, would you go to page 522.62 please?

CHAIRPERSON: 522.62, Mr Pretorius?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, 522.62. Right, at the top of page 522.62 on the fourth line, in the same interview, internal investigation at SSA next to the name, Dorothy agreed, that is the part I forgot to ask.

"But I can get December, January, she said March remember, I do not remember how long hence I called her and I asked, are you sure about February? She said no. She said no, February looks like I did not. Then it was March I think last, but then after that, I think it was this girl taking it. What's her name?" And the name Helen is typed in there, that is not her real name, it is a pseudonym.

"I met the Minister one time and he was like, I do not see you anymore. I said, Minister, I am busy. He said, I see they sent Helen to come, I do not see you anymore. I said everything is now with Mr Fraser."

What was being said there, can you explain to the Chair?
<u>DOROTHY</u>: If you can recall earlier you asked me this
question and I said to you, I cannot 100% confirm that somebody else was taking the 4.5 to Minister Mahlobo. If you can see the conversation there he does not say, what was brought to him. He just said to me, I do not see you anymore. I see they sent Helen to come, so I do not know, what was Helen doing there.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Okay, good thank you and then I must just point out something to you on page 522.63 where the question of receipts is discussed and the envelope that you said in your evidence came after the delivery, if you could just refer please to a third down the page of 522.63. it reads:

> "So later on, then an envelope with acknowledgement receipt forms and then it would be submitted sent to Lily to do the settlement or would you be settling?"

That is a question put to you. The answer that Dorothy gives here:

"I would be settling but she does the green form and all."

And then Demi says to you, that is the interviewer:

"Okay, so you would settle and Ozzy would clear." Ozzy is a pseudonym. Dorothy:

> "Yes, remember, I was assisting so she knew I would not take my time and sit on a computer and draft a green form. So she would do it."

Demi:

10

"Okay, have you ever seen the receipts yourself that would come back from the Minister?"

Dorothy:

"Yes, I have seen them because when I sign I must go through, I cannot just sign a blank."

Demi:

"Was it his signature that was there, would he write his full name as the recipient?"

20 Dorothy:

"I do not remember seeing his name."

Demi:

"So how would those be signed when you say you have seen it?"

Dorothy:

"I think the receipts that we get it is not his signature, it is the people getting those funds."

Dorothy:

"Yes, the money receipts of the people that are getting the funds."

So can you comment on that please and whether it is accurate or not?

DOROTHY: Chair, earlier on we were talking about sorry, receipts that the Minister would have signed and I said to

10 you I have not seen those, sorry for that.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Yes, you said that.

DOROTHY: We were talking about receipts that the Minister would have signed, and I said to you I have not seen any receipts that bear the Minister's signature and when I talk about Lily submitting and me going through it is the invoices or receipts that are related to this company that I would not be able to name.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: I see, and do you remember that I showed you those receipts?

20 **DOROTHY**: So from my understanding and so on - excuse me Chair?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Kay, let me not interrupt.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Okay, Mr Pretorius was saying to you, do you remember that he showed you those receipts? **DOROTHY:** Mr Mahlobo has never showed me any receipts.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yeah, you say you did not see any receipt signed by Mr Mahlobo but you may have been referring and I think you are now referring to a documents such as the one on page SSA 01503. Can you confirm that?

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: So is it that you were telling them about on page 522.63?

10 **DOROTHY:** Yes, yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you that clarifies that.

DOROTHY: Yes.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Thank you very much, Dorothy we have come to the end of your evidence. Once again, we appreciate you availing yourself to try and assist the Commission. Thank you very much, you are now excused.

DOROTHY: Thank you so much, Chair.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you, Dorothy.

20 **DOROTHY:** Thank you, Mr Pretorius.

CHAIRPERSON: Yes, Mr Pretorius?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Chair, it is decision making time I am not sure that any purpose would be served by calling a witness for the 20 minutes that we had planned would remain but may I consult with the investigator.

CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: They may say that it is worthwhile to spend, say, 15 minutes from half past or quarter to...[intervene]

CHAIRPERSON: Ja.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: ... on the next witness.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Do you want me to adjourn or you want to talk?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Well, would you adjourn, please
10 Chair because the witness would be a witness who would need to take the oath, they did not take the oath.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: Oh, okay act alright, we will adjourn for five minutes, we adjourned.

INQUIRY ADJOURNS

INQUIRY RESUMES

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: You have taken instructions Mr Pretorius?

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Yes, Chair because the witness whom we intended to call next would be required to give

20 some detail in his evidence it would not be advisable to break it up. So if we may Chair, adjourn and reschedule the other witness.

<u>**CHAIRPERSON</u>**: Okay, we will adjourn for the day then today and I cannot remember which work stream is on Monday but the public will be notified in due course or over</u> the weekend.

ADV PRETORIUS SC: Thank you, Chair.

<u>CHAIRPERSON</u>: We adjourn.

INQUIRY ADJOURNS TO 17 MAY 2021