# ANSWERING AFFIDAVIT - JACQUELINE FAUCITT (FINAL RECONSTRUCTED VERSION)

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA**  
**GAUTENG DIVISION, PRETORIA**

**CASE NO**: 2025-137857

**In the matter between:**

**PETER ANDREW FAUCITT** - Applicant

and

**JACQUELINE FAUCITT** - First Respondent  
**DANIEL JAMES FAUCITT** - Second Respondent

## ANSWERING AFFIDAVIT

I, the undersigned,

**JACQUELINE FAUCITT**

do hereby make oath and state that:

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND IDENTIFICATION

1.1 I am an adult female, South African citizen, and the First Respondent in this matter.

1.2 I am married to the Applicant, Peter Andrew Faucitt. We have been married for [X] years.

1.3 I am the mother of the Second Respondent, Daniel James Faucitt.

1.4 The facts contained herein are, save where the context indicates otherwise, within my personal knowledge and are both true and correct.

1.5 Where I make legal submissions, I do so on the advice of my legal representatives and believe such submissions to be correct.

## 2. PURPOSE OF THIS AFFIDAVIT

2.1 The purpose of this affidavit is to respond to the Applicant's founding affidavit and to place before this Honourable Court material facts that were not disclosed in the ex parte application that resulted in the interdict granted on 19 August 2025.

2.2 I will demonstrate that:

2.2.1 The Applicant failed to make full and frank disclosure of material facts in the ex parte application;

2.2.2 The interdict creates immediate and serious compliance risks for the RegimA businesses in 37 international jurisdictions due to my role as legally designated Responsible Person;

2.2.3 The Applicant's objections to business expenses and the R500,000 director's loan payment are inconsistent with his own conduct over many years and appear to be pretextual;

2.2.4 The timing of events - particularly the filing of the interdict 8 days after securing our signatures on a settlement agreement, and 9 months before a significant investment payout - demonstrates a suspicious pattern;

2.2.5 The systematic transfer of business control to Ms. Rynette Farrar, a non-director bookkeeper, represents a departure from the collaborative business model that operated successfully for [X] years.

## 3. MY ROLE AS LEGALLY DESIGNATED RESPONSIBLE PERSON

### 3.1 Legal Framework

3.1.1 I serve as the legally designated "Responsible Person" for RegimA International Skin Treatments across **37 international jurisdictions**.

3.1.2 This designation is not an administrative role but a **legal requirement** under:

* EU Cosmetics Regulation 1223/2009 (Article 4);
* UK Cosmetics Regulations (as retained EU law post-Brexit);
* Equivalent cosmetics regulations in 35 other jurisdictions.

3.1.3 **Documentary Evidence**: Attached as **Annexure JF-R** is comprehensive documentation of my designation, including:

* Regulatory appointment letters from authorities in 37 jurisdictions;
* CPNP (Cosmetic Products Notification Portal) registration confirmations;
* Correspondence with regulatory authorities in the EU, UK, and other jurisdictions;
* Product Information Files (PIFs) bearing my designation as Responsible Person.

### 3.2 Legal Responsibilities and Personal Liability

3.2.1 As Responsible Person, I bear **personal legal liability** under international law for:

**(a) Product Information Filing and CPNP Registration**:

* Ensuring all cosmetic products are registered on the EU Cosmetic Products Notification Portal;
* Maintaining equivalent registrations in 36 other jurisdictions;
* Updating product information when formulations or safety data change.

**(b) Cosmetic Product Safety Reports (CPSRs)**:

* Maintaining current safety assessments for all products;
* Ensuring ongoing toxicological evaluation;
* Updating safety reports based on new scientific data or adverse events.

**(c) Good Manufacturing Practice (GMP) Compliance**:

* Ensuring all manufacturing facilities comply with GMP standards;
* Monitoring supply chain compliance;
* Maintaining manufacturing records and batch documentation.

**(d) Regulatory Liaison**:

* Serving as the designated point of contact with regulatory authorities in 37 jurisdictions;
* Responding to regulatory inquiries;
* Submitting required reports and notifications.

**(e) Market Surveillance and Adverse Event Reporting**:

* Continuous monitoring of product safety in the market;
* Investigating and reporting adverse events;
* Implementing corrective actions when necessary.

**(f) Product Recalls and Corrective Actions**:

* Authority and obligation to initiate recalls if safety issues arise;
* Implementing corrective and preventive actions;
* Notifying regulatory authorities of serious incidents.

### 3.3 Non-Delegable Nature of This Role

3.3.1 The Responsible Person designation is **personal to me** and cannot be delegated or transferred without:

* Formal regulatory approval in each of the 37 jurisdictions;
* Re-registration of all products with the new Responsible Person;
* Notification to all relevant regulatory authorities;
* Processing time of several months per jurisdiction.

3.3.2 Under EU Regulation 1223/2009, Article 4(4), the Responsible Person must be established within the jurisdiction (EU/UK) or have a designated representative. I am the designated representative for RegimA products in these markets.

### 3.4 Direct and Immediate Consequence of the Interdict

3.4.1 The interdict granted on 19 August 2025 prevents me from:

* Accessing business premises where regulatory documentation is stored;
* Accessing computer systems containing CPNP login credentials;
* Accessing product formulation data and safety assessment documentation;
* Accessing manufacturing records and GMP compliance documentation;
* Accessing regulatory correspondence and submission records;
* Communicating with regulatory authorities on behalf of the businesses.

3.4.2 **This is Not Speculation - This is Direct Legal Consequence**:

Without access to these systems and documentation, I cannot legally perform my duties as Responsible Person. The regulatory framework does not provide for temporary suspension of these duties. The obligations are continuous and immediate.

3.4.3 **Compliance Crisis in 37 Jurisdictions**:

The RegimA businesses cannot legally sell cosmetic products in the following 37 jurisdictions without a Responsible Person who has access to necessary documentation and systems:

**European Union (27 jurisdictions)**:  
Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden

**Other Jurisdictions (10)**:  
United Kingdom, Norway, Switzerland, Iceland, [list remaining 6 jurisdictions]

3.4.4 **Potential Consequences** (Annexure JF-R1 - Regulatory Risk Analysis):

* Immediate suspension of sales in non-compliant jurisdictions;
* Regulatory penalties and fines (up to €[amount] per violation under EU law);
* Product recalls mandated by regulatory authorities;
* Loss of market access potentially affecting R[amount] in annual revenue;
* Reputational damage in international markets;
* Criminal liability for continued sales without proper Responsible Person designation.

3.4.5 **Timeline for Compliance Restoration**:

If the interdict remains in place and a new Responsible Person must be designated:

* Identification and appointment of qualified replacement: 1-2 months;
* Regulatory notification in 37 jurisdictions: 2-4 months;
* Re-registration of all products: 3-6 months per jurisdiction;
* Total estimated timeline: 6-12 months;
* Estimated cost: R[amount] (regulatory fees, consultant fees, lost sales).

### 3.5 This Argument is Evidence-Based, Not Speculative

3.5.1 This is not a claim about potential future harm. This is a statement of current legal non-compliance created by the interdict.

3.5.2 The regulatory framework cited above is established by international law (Annexure JF-R2 - Regulatory Framework Documentation).

3.5.3 My designation as Responsible Person is documented in Annexure JF-R.

3.5.4 The interdict's prevention of my access to necessary systems is documented in the court order (Annexure JF1).

3.5.5 Therefore, the compliance crisis is a **direct, documented, and immediate consequence** of the interdict, not speculation about future possibilities.

## 4. BACKGROUND: THE REGIMA BUSINESS STRUCTURE

### 4.1 Corporate Entities

4.1.1 The RegimA businesses comprise 18 registered entities operating in the cosmetics, skincare, and related industries (Annexure JF-S - Company Registration Documents).

4.1.2 Key entities include:

* RegimA Worldwide Distribution (Pty) Ltd (Reg. No. 2011/005722/07);
* Strategic Logistics CC (Reg. No. 2008/136496/23);
* RegimA Skin Treatments CC (Reg. No. 1992/005371/23);
* Villa Via Arcadia No. 2 CC (Reg. No. 1996/004451/23);
* [List remaining 14 entities with registration numbers].

### 4.2 Ownership and Directorship Structure

4.2.1 The Applicant and I, together with the Second Respondent, are co-directors and shareholders in several of these entities, specifically:

* Strategic Logistics CC: 33% each (Applicant, myself, Second Respondent);
* RegimA Worldwide Distribution: 33% each (Applicant, myself, Second Respondent).

4.2.2 Other entities have different ownership structures:

* RegimA Skin Treatments CC: 50% Applicant, 50% [other party];
* Villa Via Arcadia No. 2 CC: 50% Applicant, 50% [other party].

4.2.3 I am an employee of RegimA Skin Treatments CC but not a director or shareholder of that entity.

### 4.3 Historical Business Model: Collaborative and Informal

4.3.1 The RegimA businesses have operated for [X] years with an **informal but functional collaborative approach**:

**(a) Collaborative Decision-Making**:

* Directors consulted with each other on significant business decisions;
* Major transactions were discussed among directors before implementation;
* Disagreements were resolved through discussion and consensus;
* All directors had visibility into business operations.

**(b) Director Loan Accounts**:

* Each director maintains a loan account with credit balances of several million rand across different entities;
* The companies owe the directors substantial sums at all times;
* **Established Practice**: Director-company transactions are processed based on clear bank statement references; bank feeds allocate transfers to corresponding director loan accounts; reconciliation occurs during regular accounting processes;
* **No Formal Board Resolutions Required**: The businesses have never required formal board resolutions or written authorizations for routine director loan account transactions.

**(c) Financial Transparency**:

* Transactions were clearly marked on bank statements for proper allocation;
* Supporting documentation (invoices, contracts) was maintained;
* Directors had access to financial systems and records;
* Regular financial reporting and reconciliation occurred.

**(d) Trust-Based Relationships**:

* The business model relied on trust and collaboration among family members;
* Formal governance structures (written policies, board minutes, dual signature requirements) were not implemented;
* This informal approach operated successfully for [X] years without significant issues.

4.3.2 **Evidence of Historical Collaborative Model** (Annexure JF-T):

* Email correspondence from [date range] showing collaborative decision-making;
* Examples of directors consulting each other before significant transactions;
* Historical financial records showing transparent, clearly marked transactions;
* years of successful operation under this model.

4.3.3 **Applicant's Participation in This Model**:

The Applicant has been a full participant in this informal, collaborative model throughout the history of the businesses. He has:

* Made decisions without formal board resolutions;
* Received payments from director loan accounts without formal authorization;
* Operated on the basis of trust and collaboration;
* Never previously objected to this informal approach.

## 5. MS. RYNETTE FARRAR'S ROLE AND EXPANDING ACCESS

### 5.1 Initial Role as Bookkeeper

5.1.1 Ms. Rynette Farrar was initially engaged as a bookkeeper for the RegimA businesses in or around [date].

5.1.2 Her initial responsibilities were limited to:

* Recording transactions in accounting software;
* Preparing financial reports;
* Reconciling bank statements;
* Assisting with tax compliance.

5.1.3 She was not a director, shareholder, or officer of any RegimA entity.

### 5.2 Systematic Expansion of Access and Authority

5.2.1 Over time, and particularly since [date], the Applicant has systematically expanded Ms. Farrar's access and authority far beyond her role as bookkeeper.

5.2.2 **Documentary Evidence of Expanding Access** (Annexure JF-A):

**(a) System Access**:

* On [date], the Applicant granted Ms. Farrar access to all business financial software systems (Email, Annexure JF-A1);
* On [date], the Applicant provided her with all of his passwords and login credentials (Email, Annexure JF-A2);
* She now has access to: [list specific systems - accounting software, banking portals, email systems, etc.].

**(b) Banking Authority**:

* On [date], Ms. Farrar was granted signatory authority on [list specific bank accounts] (Bank authorization forms, Annexure JF-A3);
* She can initiate transactions without requiring co-director approval or dual signatures;
* She can transfer funds between accounts unilaterally.

**(c) Customer and Vendor Communications**:

* Ms. Farrar can email customers directly without director oversight;
* She can communicate with vendors and suppliers;
* She can make commitments on behalf of the businesses.

5.2.3 **Current Extent of Access** (as at the date of this affidavit):

Ms. Rynette Farrar now has:

* Access to every business bank account;
* All of the Applicant's passwords and login credentials;
* Signatory authority on multiple accounts;
* Ability to initiate transactions without director approval;
* Ability to email customers and transfer funds unilaterally;
* Unfettered access to all books of account, customer lists, and financial records.

5.2.4 **This Level of Access is Unprecedented**:

In the [X] years of RegimA business operations, no non-director employee has ever been granted this level of access and authority. This represents a fundamental departure from the historical business model.

### 5.3 Exclusion of Directors from Oversight

5.3.1 Concurrent with Ms. Farrar's expanding access, the Second Respondent and I have been systematically excluded from business oversight.

5.3.2 **Evidence of Exclusion** (Annexure JF-C):

**(a) Restriction of System Access**:

* On [date], my access to [specific system] was restricted (Access logs, Annexure JF-C1);
* The Second Respondent's access to [specific system] was restricted on [date] (Access logs, Annexure JF-C2);
* We no longer have the same level of visibility into business operations that we historically maintained.

**(b) Characterization of Oversight as "Interference"**:

* On [date], when the Second Respondent and I raised concerns about unclear transactions, the Applicant responded by characterizing our concerns as "interference" and defending Ms. Farrar's actions (Email dated [date], Annexure JF-C3);
* On [date], the Applicant stated that we should not "question Rynette" and that he "trusts her completely" (Email dated [date], Annexure JF-C4);
* Our attempts to maintain financial oversight have been rebuffed.

**(c) Exclusion from Decision-Making**:

* Decisions that were historically made collaboratively are now made unilaterally by Ms. Farrar with the Applicant's support;
* We are no longer consulted on significant transactions;
* We learn of major decisions after they have been implemented.

### 5.4 Breakdown of Collaborative Business Model

5.4.1 The systematic expansion of Ms. Farrar's authority, combined with the exclusion of directors from oversight, represents a **fundamental breakdown of the collaborative business model** that operated successfully for [X] years.

5.4.2 **What Has Changed**:

| Historical Model (Before) | Current Model (After Ms. Farrar's Expansion) |
| --- | --- |
| Collaborative decision-making among directors | Unilateral decision-making by non-director bookkeeper |
| Transparency and consultation | Exclusion and "interference" characterization |
| All directors have system access | Directors' access restricted, bookkeeper has full access |
| Trust-based family business | Control concentrated in non-family employee |
| Clearly marked, transparent transactions | Unclear transactions, missing documentation |

5.4.3 **This is Not About Formal Governance**:

The concern is not the absence of formal board resolutions or written policies, which have never been part of our business model. The concern is the **replacement of a collaborative, transparent, trust-based approach with unilateral control by a non-director**, combined with the **systematic exclusion of family member directors**.

5.4.4 **Pattern Analysis**:

The following pattern is established by documentary evidence:

* Ms. Farrar's access expands → Directors' access contracts;
* Directors raise concerns → Concerns characterized as "interference";
* Collaborative model → Unilateral control;
* Transparency → Opacity;
* Family business → Control by non-family employee.

This pattern demonstrates a systematic transfer of operational control from the directors to Ms. Rynette Farrar.

## 6. THE APPLICANT'S DECISION-MAKING AND RELATIONSHIP WITH MS. FARRAR

### 6.1 Observable Changes in Decision-Making

6.1.1 The Applicant's business decisions over the past [timeframe] have shown observable changes that raise concerns about his current capacity to manage complex corporate affairs independently.

6.1.2 The following documented instances demonstrate this pattern:

### 6.2 Documented Decision-Making Concerns

**(a) Granting Unprecedented Access to Non-Director** (Annexure JF-D):

* On [date], the Applicant provided all business passwords and login credentials to Ms. Farrar via email, stating "[quote from email]" (Email, Annexure JF-D1);
* He authorized her to initiate transactions unilaterally without board approval or consultation with co-directors (Authorization document, Annexure JF-D2);
* He eliminated the collaborative oversight that had characterized the business for [X] years;
* This decision was made without consulting the Second Respondent or myself, despite our status as co-directors and co-shareholders.

**(b) Defending Irregular or Unclear Transactions** (Annexure JF-E):

* On [date], the Second Respondent and I raised concerns about [number] transactions totaling R[amount] that were unclear or lacked proper documentation (Email dated [date], Annexure JF-E1);
* The Applicant's response was to defend Ms. Farrar's actions without addressing the substance of our concerns (Email dated [date], Annexure JF-E2);
* He refused to implement additional financial controls or oversight measures that we requested;
* He characterized our legitimate governance concerns as "interference" and stated we should "trust Rynette."

**(c) Exclusion of Co-Directors Without Justification** (Annexure JF-F):

* The Applicant filed an ex parte interdict against the Second Respondent and myself just **8 days** after securing our signatures on a settlement agreement (Court filing dated 19 August 2025, Annexure JF1; Settlement agreement signed 11 August 2025, Annexure JF5);
* He excluded directors who had managed day-to-day operations for [X years];
* He now relies entirely on Ms. Rynette Farrar for all business information and decisions;
* This represents a complete abandonment of the collaborative family business model.

**(d) Inconsistent Positions on Business Expenses** (Annexure JF-G):

* The Applicant previously approved approximately **R10,700,000** in business expenses for the 2023 tax year without question or objection (Tax records, Annexure JF-G1);
* He approved **R6,738,007.47** in business expenses for the 2024 tax year without question (Tax records, Annexure JF-G2);
* He suddenly claims that **R2,116,159.47** in expenses for the 2025 tax year are excessive and constitute grounds for an interdict (Founding affidavit, para [X]);
* This position is inconsistent: the 2025 expenses are **69% lower** than 2024, and **80% lower** than 2023;
* The 2024 expenses were **R4 million lower** than 2023, yet he raised no concerns;
* This inconsistency in financial oversight is unexplained and suggests the expense objection is pretextual.

### 6.3 The Applicant's Relationship with Ms. Farrar

6.3.1 The Applicant has developed an unusually close working relationship with Ms. Rynette Farrar, characterized by:

* Granting her unprecedented authority and access that far exceeds her role as bookkeeper;
* Defending her actions even when questioned by co-directors;
* Excluding family member directors in favor of relying solely on her;
* Characterizing oversight attempts as "interference";
* Filing an interdict to formalize her exclusive control.

6.3.2 This relationship has resulted in a systematic transfer of operational control from the directors to Ms. Farrar, creating significant corporate governance risks.

### 6.4 Pattern and Inference

6.4.1 These decisions, when viewed collectively, demonstrate a significant departure from the Applicant's historical business judgment.

6.4.2 The pattern is inconsistent with proper corporate governance and the collaborative family business model that operated successfully for [X] years.

6.4.3 The pattern demonstrates heavy reliance on a single advisor (Ms. Farrar) to the exclusion of other directors, co-shareholders, and established business practices.

## 7. THE R500,000 DIRECTOR'S LOAN PAYMENT

### 7.1 Established Practice: Director Loan Accounts

7.1.1 As stated in paragraph 4.3.1(b) above, the RegimA businesses operate with director loan accounts where:

* Each director maintains loan accounts with credit balances of several million rand across different entities;
* The companies owe the directors substantial sums at all times;
* Director-company transactions are processed based on clear bank statement references;
* Bank feeds allocate transfers to corresponding director loan accounts;
* Reconciliation occurs during regular accounting processes;
* **No formal board resolutions or written authorizations are required** for routine director loan account transactions.

7.1.2 This practice has operated successfully for [X] years and has been accepted by all directors, including the Applicant, throughout the history of the businesses.

### 7.2 Director Loan Account Balances

7.2.1 As of [date], the director loan account balances (amounts owed by the companies to the directors) were approximately:

* Jacqueline Faucitt: R[X,XXX,XXX] (Account statements, Annexure JF-X1);
* Daniel James Faucitt: R[X,XXX,XXX] (Account statements, Annexure JF-X2);
* Peter Andrew Faucitt: R[X,XXX,XXX] (Account statements, Annexure JF-X3).

7.2.2 These substantial credit balances demonstrate that the companies owe the directors significant sums, and payments from these accounts are routine repayments of amounts owed, not unauthorized withdrawals.

### 7.3 Historical Pattern of Similar Transactions

7.3.1 Over the past [X] years, there have been [number] similar director loan account transactions across the RegimA entities, none of which required formal board resolutions.

7.3.2 **Examples of Historical Transactions** (Annexure JF-X4):

* [Date]: R[amount] payment to [director] from [entity] (Bank statement, Annexure JF-X4a);
* [Date]: R[amount] payment to [director] from [entity] (Bank statement, Annexure JF-X4b);
* [Date]: R[amount] payment to [director] from [entity] (Bank statement, Annexure JF-X4c);
* [Continue with additional examples].

7.3.3 None of these historical transactions were accompanied by formal board resolutions, written authorizations, or dual signatures beyond what was required by the banks.

### 7.4 The Applicant's Own Use of This Practice

7.4.1 The Applicant himself has received numerous payments from director loan accounts without formal board resolutions, including:

| Date | Amount | Entity | Evidence |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Date] | R[amount] | [Entity name] | Bank statement, Annexure JF-X5 |
| [Date] | R[amount] | [Entity name] | Bank statement, Annexure JF-X6 |
| [Date] | R[amount] | [Entity name] | Bank statement, Annexure JF-X7 |
| [Date] | R[amount] | [Entity name] | Bank statement, Annexure JF-X8 |

7.4.2 The Applicant never objected to these payments to himself.

7.4.3 The Applicant never required formal board resolutions for his own director loan account transactions.

7.4.4 The Applicant accepted and participated in this informal practice for [X] years.

### 7.5 The R500,000 Payment on 16 July 2025

7.5.1 On or about **16 July 2025**, a payment of **R500,000** was processed from [company name] to [recipient/account].

7.5.2 **This Payment Was Consistent with Established Practice**:

**(a) Clearly Marked on Bank Statement**:

* The bank statement dated 16 July 2025 clearly marks this payment with reference to [director loan account reference] (Bank statement, Annexure JF-X9);
* The marking was consistent with the established practice for director loan account transactions.

**(b) Properly Allocated**:

* The accounting records show this payment was properly allocated to the corresponding director loan account (Accounting records, Annexure JF-X10);
* The allocation followed the same process used for hundreds of similar transactions over [X] years.

**(c) Within Credit Balance**:

* The director loan account had a credit balance of R[X,XXX,XXX] at the time of the payment;
* The R500,000 payment represented repayment of [X]% of the amount owed by the company to the director;
* This was not an unauthorized withdrawal but a partial repayment of a legitimate debt.

**(d) No Different from Historical Transactions**:

* The R500,000 payment was processed in exactly the same manner as the [number] similar transactions over the past [X] years;
* It was no different from the Applicant's own director loan account transactions listed in paragraph 7.4.1 above;
* It followed the established, accepted practice.

### 7.6 The Applicant's Inconsistent and Pretextual Objection

7.6.1 Despite accepting this practice for [X] years and using it himself on [number] occasions, the Applicant now objects to the R500,000 payment.

7.6.2 **Timeline of Events**:

* **16 July 2025**: R500,000 payment processed (consistent with established practice);
* **5 August 2025**: Applicant first consulted attorneys (**20 days later**);
* **11 August 2025**: Settlement agreement signed;
* **19 August 2025**: Ex parte interdict filed (**34 days after the payment**).

7.6.3 **Applicant's Inconsistency**:

The Applicant's position is internally inconsistent:

* He accepted this practice for [X] years → Now objects;
* He used this practice himself [number] times → Now claims it's unauthorized;
* He never required formal authorization for his own transactions → Now demands it for others;
* He approved R10.7M in expenses (2023) without question → Objects to R500K payment;
* He raised no concerns for decades → Suddenly objects 20 days before consulting attorneys.

7.6.4 **Inference: Payment Used as Pretext**:

The timing and inconsistency demonstrate that the R500,000 payment was used as a **pretext** for the ex parte interdict:

* The payment was entirely consistent with established practice;
* The Applicant's objection is inconsistent with his own conduct;
* The timing (20 days from payment to attorney consultation, 34 days to interdict) suggests the payment was seized upon as justification;
* The real motivation appears to be related to other factors, including the approaching May 2026 investment payout (see paragraph 9 below).

## 8. FINANCIAL IRREGULARITIES AND DEPARTURE FROM ESTABLISHED PRACTICE

### 8.1 Clarification: Not About Formal Authorization

8.1.1 As established above, the RegimA businesses have operated with an informal, collaborative model that did not require formal board resolutions or written authorizations for routine transactions.

8.1.2 The concern is therefore **not** the absence of formal authorizations (which have never been required), but rather:

* **Departure from established practice**: Transactions that differ from historical patterns;
* **Loss of transparency**: Transactions that are unclear or poorly documented;
* **Exclusion from consultation**: Decisions made unilaterally without the collaborative approach historically used;
* **Missing documentation**: Absence of supporting records (invoices, contracts) that would normally exist.

### 8.2 Transactions Requiring Investigation

8.2.1 The following transactions have been identified as departing from established practice and requiring forensic investigation:

**Schedule of Concerning Transactions** (Detailed in Annexure JF-H):

| Date | Amount | Description | Concern | Evidence |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| [Date] | R[amount] | Payment to [recipient] | Not clearly marked on bank statement; unclear allocation | Bank statement, JF-H1 |
| [Date] | R[amount] | Transfer to [account] | No corresponding director loan account entry; purpose unclear | Account statement, JF-H2 |
| [Date] | R[amount] | Expense claim by Ms. Farrar | No supporting invoice; not clearly business-related | Expense report, JF-H3 |
| [Date] | R[amount] | Payment to [recipient] | Outside normal business operations; no prior consultation | Bank record, JF-H4 |
| [Date] | R[amount] | Transfer between accounts | Unclear purpose; not discussed with co-directors | Transaction record, JF-H5 |

**Total Amount Requiring Investigation**: R[sum of amounts]  
**Period**: [Start date] to [End date]  
**Number of Transactions**: [count]

### 8.3 How These Differ from Established Practice

8.3.1 These transactions differ from the established practice in the following ways:

**(a) Lack of Clear Marking**:

* Historical practice: Transactions clearly marked on bank statements with references enabling proper allocation;
* These transactions: Unclear references, ambiguous purposes, difficult to allocate properly.

**(b) Missing Documentation**:

* Historical practice: Supporting documentation (invoices, contracts, purchase orders) maintained for business expenses;
* These transactions: Missing or incomplete documentation; no invoices for expense claims; no contracts for payments.

**(c) Outside Normal Operations**:

* Historical practice: Transactions related to established business operations (inventory, manufacturing, distribution);
* These transactions: Payments to recipients outside normal vendor relationships; purposes unclear.

**(d) No Consultation**:

* Historical practice: Significant transactions discussed among directors before implementation;
* These transactions: Initiated by Ms. Farrar without consultation; co-directors learned of them after the fact.

### 8.4 Pattern of Concern

8.4.1 All of the concerning transactions listed above:

* Were initiated by Ms. Rynette Farrar after she was granted expanded access;
* Occurred without consultation with the Second Respondent or myself;
* Lack the transparency and clear documentation that characterized historical transactions;
* Represent a departure from the established, accepted practice.

8.4.2 The pattern demonstrates a systematic breakdown of the collaborative, transparent approach that historically characterized the businesses.

### 8.5 Contrast with Historical Practice

8.5.1 **Historical Practice** (Before Ms. Farrar's Expanded Access):

* Directors consulted with each other on significant transactions;
* Transactions were clearly marked for proper allocation;
* Supporting documentation was maintained;
* All directors had visibility into business operations;
* Transparency and collaboration characterized decision-making.

8.5.2 **Current Practice** (After Ms. Farrar's Expanded Access):

* Unilateral decision-making by Ms. Farrar;
* Unclear or poorly marked transactions;
* Missing or incomplete documentation;
* Directors excluded from consultation and visibility;
* Opacity and unilateral control replace transparency and collaboration.

### 8.6 Required Forensic Investigation

8.6.1 A forensic investigation by an independent forensic accountant is necessary to:

* Determine whether the transactions listed in paragraph 8.2.1 were properly allocated to appropriate accounts;
* Identify additional transactions that fall outside established business practices;
* Trace unclear or poorly documented transactions to their ultimate recipients;
* Assess whether the departure from established practice has resulted in financial harm to the businesses;
* Restore transparency and accountability.

8.6.2 This investigation is necessary not to impose formal requirements that have never existed, but to restore the collaborative, transparent approach that successfully operated the businesses for [X] years.

## 9. TIMELINE ANALYSIS: PATTERN OF COORDINATED EVENTS

### 9.1 Timeline of Material Events

9.1.1 The following timeline is established by documentary evidence and demonstrates the temporal relationship between key events:

| Date | Event | Evidence |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **July 2024** | Danie Bantjies appointed Trustee of Faucitt Family Trust | Trust documents, Annexure JF-T |
| **[Date]** | Ms. Farrar granted initial expanded system access | Access authorization, Annexure JF-U1 |
| **[Date]** | Applicant provided Ms. Farrar with all passwords | Email, Annexure JF-U2 |
| **[Date]** | Ms. Farrar granted bank signatory authority | Bank authorization, Annexure JF-U3 |
| **[Date]** | First concerning transaction identified | Bank statement, Annexure JF-H1 |
| **July 1, 2025** | Settlement agreement (claimed effective date) | Agreement, Annexure JF5 |
| **July 16, 2025** | R500,000 director's loan payment | Bank records, Annexure JF-X9 |
| **August 5, 2025** | Applicant first consulted attorneys | Applicant's affidavit, para [X] |
| **August 11, 2025** | Settlement agreement actually signed | Agreement signatures, Annexure JF5 |
| **August 19, 2025** | Ex parte interdict granted | Court order, Annexure JF1 |
| **May 2026** | Investment payout window opens (R18,685,000) | Investment agreement, Annexure JF-W |

### 9.2 Temporal Analysis

9.2.1 **Settlement Signature to Interdict Filing**: **8 days**

* Settlement signed: 11 August 2025
* Interdict filed: 19 August 2025
* The Applicant secured our signatures on a settlement agreement and filed an ex parte interdict to exclude us just 8 days later.

9.2.2 **Interdict to Investment Payout**: **9 months**

* Interdict granted: 19 August 2025
* Investment payout window opens: May 2026
* The interdict was filed exactly 9 months before a significant investment payout of R18,685,000.

9.2.3 **Bantjies Appointment to Interdict**: **13 months**

* Bantjies appointed Trustee: July 2024
* Interdict granted: 19 August 2025
* Mr. Bantjies' appointment as Trustee occurred 13 months before the interdict, suggesting longer-term planning.

9.2.4 **R500K Payment to Interdict**: **34 days**

* R500K payment: 16 July 2025
* Interdict filed: 19 August 2025
* The Applicant used a routine director loan payment as pretext for the interdict just 34 days later.

### 9.3 The May 2026 Investment Payout

9.3.1 In or around [date], the Faucitt Family Trust (of which the Second Respondent and I are beneficiaries) entered into an investment agreement with Mr. Danie Bantjies (Investment agreement, Annexure JF-W).

9.3.2 Under this agreement, a **call option** becomes exercisable in **May 2026** for a total amount of **R18,685,000**.

9.3.3 Mr. Bantjies serves in multiple roles:

* Creditor under the investment agreement (owed R18,685,000);
* Trustee of the Faucitt Family Trust (appointed July 2024);
* Accountant to the Trust;
* Supporting deponent in the ex parte interdict application (Annexure JF1).

9.3.4 The Second Respondent and I, as beneficiaries of the Trust, have an interest in this investment payout.

### 9.4 Pattern Significance

9.4.1 The temporal proximity of these events creates a pattern that is inconsistent with coincidence:

**(a) Long-Term Planning**:

* July 2024: Bantjies appointed Trustee (13 months before interdict);
* [Date]: Ms. Farrar granted expanding access (months before interdict);
* This suggests planning over an extended period.

**(b) Rapid Escalation**:

* 11 August 2025: Settlement signed;
* 19 August 2025: Interdict filed (8 days later);
* This rapid escalation after securing our signatures suggests the settlement was used to facilitate the interdict.

**(c) Strategic Timing Relative to Payout**:

* 19 August 2025: Interdict granted;
* May 2026: R18,685,000 payout window (9 months later);
* The interdict establishes control 9 months before a significant financial event.

### 9.5 Reasonable Inference from Pattern

9.5.1 When the following documented facts are considered together:

* Bantjies' dual role as Trustee and creditor;
* Ms. Farrar's systematic expansion of control;
* The exclusion of family member directors;
* The rapid escalation from settlement to interdict (8 days);
* The timing relative to the May 2026 payout (9 months);
* The use of a routine payment as pretext;

9.5.2 The pattern is consistent with **coordinated action designed to establish control before the investment payout window opens**.

9.5.3 While direct evidence of explicit coordination may not be available, the temporal pattern and documented facts create a reasonable inference that the interdict serves purposes beyond the stated grounds, and is timed to establish control before the May 2026 financial event.

## 10. BUSINESS EXPENSES: APPLICANT'S INCONSISTENCY

### 10.1 Admitted Expense Amounts

10.1.1 I admit the following expense amounts as stated in the Applicant's founding affidavit:

* **2024 tax year**: R6,738,007.47 (legitimate business expenses);
* **2025 tax year**: R2,116,159.47 (correct amount).

### 10.2 Comparative Analysis

10.2.1 The following table shows business expenses in this category over three tax years:

| Tax Year | Expenses | Variance from Prior Year | Variance from 2023 |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **2023** | R10,700,000 (approx.) | Baseline | 0% |
| **2024** | R6,738,007.47 | -R3,961,992.53 (-37%) | -37% |
| **2025** | R2,116,159.47 | -R4,621,848.00 (-69%) | -80% |

(Source: Tax records and financial statements, Annexure JF-G)

### 10.3 Applicant's Inconsistent Position

10.3.1 The Applicant's position on business expenses is internally inconsistent:

**(a) 2023 Expenses (R10.7 Million)**:

* The Applicant raised **no concerns** about R10.7 million in expenses;
* He approved these expenses without question;
* He did not characterize them as excessive;
* He did not seek an interdict.

**(b) 2024 Expenses (R6.7 Million)**:

* These expenses were **R4 million lower** than 2023 (37% reduction);
* The Applicant raised **no concerns** at the time;
* He approved these expenses without question;
* He now, in hindsight, claims they were legitimate (Founding affidavit, para [X]).

**(c) 2025 Expenses (R2.1 Million)**:

* These expenses are **R4.6 million lower** than 2024 (69% reduction);
* These expenses are **R8.6 million lower** than 2023 (80% reduction);
* The Applicant suddenly claims these expenses are **excessive**;
* He uses these expenses as grounds for an **interdict**.

### 10.4 The Inconsistency is Unexplained

10.4.1 The Applicant has provided no explanation for why:

* R10.7 million in expenses (2023) was acceptable;
* R6.7 million in expenses (2024) was acceptable;
* R2.1 million in expenses (2025) is suddenly excessive and warrants an interdict.

10.4.2 The expenses have **decreased by 80%** over three years, yet the Applicant's concern has **increased** from none to seeking an interdict.

10.4.3 This inverse relationship (lower expenses → greater concern) is illogical and suggests the expense objection is **pretextual**.

### 10.5 Timing of Applicant's Concerns

10.5.1 The Applicant's sudden concern about expenses in 2025, after approving significantly higher expenses in prior years without question, raises questions about the true motivation for the ex parte interdict.

10.5.2 The timing of these concerns - arising in July-August 2025, just months before the May 2026 investment payout window - is consistent with the pattern of coordinated action documented in paragraph 9 above.

10.5.3 The expense objection appears to be a **pretext** used to justify the interdict, rather than a genuine concern about business spending.

## 11. MATERIAL NON-DISCLOSURE IN EX PARTE APPLICATION

### 11.1 Duty of Full and Frank Disclosure

11.1.1 An applicant in ex parte proceedings bears an absolute duty to make full and frank disclosure of all material facts to the court, including facts that may be adverse to the applicant's case.

11.1.2 This duty exists because the respondent is not present to present their side of the case, and the court must rely entirely on the applicant's disclosure.

### 11.2 Material Facts Not Disclosed

11.2.1 The Applicant failed to disclose the following material facts in the ex parte application:

**(a) Established Business Practice**:

* The Applicant did not disclose that the businesses have operated with an informal, collaborative model for [X] years;
* He did not disclose that formal board resolutions have never been required for routine director loan account transactions;
* He did not disclose that he himself has received numerous similar payments without formal authorization.

**(b) Director Loan Account System**:

* The Applicant did not disclose the existence of director loan accounts with credit balances of several million rand;
* He did not disclose that the R500,000 payment was a routine repayment from a director loan account with a credit balance of R[X,XXX,XXX];
* He characterized the payment as "unauthorized" without disclosing the established practice.

**(c) Expense History**:

* The Applicant did not disclose that 2023 expenses were R10.7 million (R4 million higher than 2024);
* He did not disclose that he approved these higher expenses without objection;
* He created the impression that 2024-2025 expenses were unusually high, when in fact they had decreased by 37-80%.

**(d) My Role as Responsible Person**:

* The Applicant did not adequately disclose my role as legally designated Responsible Person in 37 international jurisdictions;
* He did not disclose the immediate compliance crisis that would result from preventing my access to business systems and documentation;
* He characterized me as an "administrative assistant" when I bear personal legal liability under international law.

**(e) May 2026 Investment Payout**:

* The Applicant did not disclose the R18,685,000 investment payout window opening in May 2026;
* He did not disclose Mr. Bantjies' dual role as Trustee and creditor;
* He did not disclose the temporal relationship between the interdict and the approaching payout.

**(f) Timeline and Pattern**:

* The Applicant did not disclose that the interdict was filed just 8 days after securing our signatures on a settlement agreement;
* He did not disclose the pattern of expanding Ms. Farrar's control while excluding family member directors;
* He did not disclose his own inconsistent positions on expenses and director loan payments.

### 11.3 Materiality of Non-Disclosed Facts

11.3.1 Each of the facts listed above is material because:

* They provide context that would have affected the court's assessment of the urgency and necessity of the interdict;
* They demonstrate that the Applicant's characterizations were incomplete or misleading;
* They reveal a pattern suggesting purposes beyond the stated grounds;
* They show that the Applicant's objections are inconsistent with his own prior conduct.

11.3.2 Had these facts been disclosed, the court may have:

* Questioned the urgency of the application;
* Required the Applicant to proceed on notice rather than ex parte;
* Declined to grant the interdict;
* Imposed conditions to protect the businesses' regulatory compliance.

### 11.4 Consequence of Material Non-Disclosure

11.4.1 Material non-disclosure in ex parte proceedings is a serious matter that warrants setting aside the order obtained.

11.4.2 I respectfully submit that the interdict granted on 19 August 2025 should be set aside on the ground of material non-disclosure.

## 12. RESPONSES TO SPECIFIC PARAGRAPHS OF FOUNDING AFFIDAVIT

[This section would contain paragraph-by-paragraph responses to the Applicant's founding affidavit, following the format "AD PARAGRAPH X TO Y" as in the original document. Each response would apply the evidence-based approach established above.]

### 12.1 General Approach to Responses

12.1.1 In responding to specific paragraphs of the Applicant's founding affidavit below, I apply the following principles:

* Facts are admitted where they are accurate;
* Characterizations and conclusions are disputed where they are incomplete, misleading, or inconsistent with the full context;
* Additional context is provided where the Applicant's version is incomplete;
* Evidence is cited for all factual assertions.

[Continue with specific paragraph responses...]

## 13. RELIEF SOUGHT

### 13.1 Primary Relief

13.1.1 I respectfully request that this Honourable Court:

**(a) Set Aside the Interdict**:

* The interdict granted on 19 August 2025 should be set aside on the grounds of:
  + Material non-disclosure in the ex parte application;
  + Lack of genuine urgency (Applicant's inconsistent positions);
  + Immediate and serious harm to business operations (regulatory compliance crisis in 37 jurisdictions);
  + Pretextual grounds (R500K payment consistent with established practice; expense objections inconsistent with prior conduct).

**(b) Costs**:

* Costs of this application on an attorney-client scale, given the material non-disclosure in the ex parte application.

### 13.2 Alternative Relief

13.2.1 In the alternative, if the Court is not minded to set aside the interdict entirely, I request:

**(a) Modification to Permit Regulatory Compliance**:

* The interdict should be modified to permit me to access business systems and documentation necessary to fulfill my duties as Responsible Person in 37 jurisdictions;
* Specific access should include: CPNP portal credentials, product safety documentation, regulatory correspondence, manufacturing records;
* This access is necessary to prevent immediate regulatory non-compliance and potential penalties.

**(b) Forensic Investigation**:

* An independent forensic accountant should be appointed to investigate:
  + The transactions listed in paragraph 8.2.1 above;
  + The departure from established business practices since Ms. Farrar's expanded access;
  + The allocation and documentation of director loan account transactions;
  + The financial impact of the breakdown in collaborative oversight.

**(c) Interim Measures**:

* Pending final determination, Ms. Rynette Farrar's unilateral authority should be suspended;
* Significant transactions should require consultation with all directors;
* Financial transparency should be restored.

## 14. CONCLUSION

14.1 The evidence presented in this affidavit demonstrates:

14.1.1 **Material Non-Disclosure**: The Applicant failed to disclose material facts in the ex parte application, including the established business practices, his own use of those practices, the expense history, my regulatory role, and the approaching investment payout.

14.1.2 **Regulatory Compliance Crisis**: The interdict creates an immediate compliance crisis in 37 international jurisdictions by preventing me from fulfilling my legally mandated duties as Responsible Person. This is not speculation but a direct, documented consequence of the court order.

14.1.3 **Applicant's Inconsistency**: The Applicant's objections to the R500,000 director loan payment and the 2025 business expenses are inconsistent with his own conduct over [X] years. He accepted and used the same practices himself, and approved significantly higher expenses in prior years without objection.

14.1.4 **Pretextual Grounds**: The timing and inconsistency demonstrate that the stated grounds for the interdict (R500K payment, business expenses) are pretextual. The real motivation appears to be related to establishing control before the May 2026 investment payout.

14.1.5 **Pattern of Coordinated Action**: The timeline of events - Bantjies' appointment (July 2024), Ms. Farrar's expanding control, the rapid escalation from settlement to interdict (8 days), and the timing relative to the May 2026 payout (9 months) - creates a pattern consistent with coordinated action.

14.1.6 **Breakdown of Collaborative Model**: The systematic transfer of control from family member directors to Ms. Rynette Farrar, combined with the exclusion of directors from oversight, represents a fundamental departure from the collaborative business model that operated successfully for [X] years.

14.2 For these reasons, I respectfully submit that the interdict should be set aside, or alternatively modified to protect the businesses' regulatory compliance and restore collaborative oversight.

## 15. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS

15.1 I reserve all rights, including the right to:

* Supplement this affidavit upon receipt of further documentation;
* Lead additional evidence at the hearing;
* Amend or expand upon the relief sought;
* Pursue any other legal remedies available.

**WHEREFORE** I pray for an order in terms of the relief sought in paragraph 13 above.

**DEPONENT: JACQUELINE FAUCITT**

**DATE**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**PLACE**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

I certify that the deponent has acknowledged that she knows and understands the contents of this affidavit, which was signed and sworn to before me at \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ on this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ 2025, the regulations contained in Government Notice No. R.1258 of 21 July 1972, as amended, and Government Notice No. R.1648 of 19 August 1977, as amended, having been complied with.

**COMMISSIONER OF OATHS**

**Full Names**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Designation**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Address**: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_
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