

SF8: Linda Employment Records (Bookkeeper)

Annexure Reference: SF8

Subject: Linda Employment Records as Bookkeeper (Rynette's Sister)

Relevance: Demonstrates control structure and raises questions about two years of unallocated expenses

Executive Summary

This annexure documents the employment of Linda (Rynette Farrar's sister) as bookkeeper for RegimA companies. Linda's employment is significant because, despite being employed specifically to do the books, expenses remained unallocated for two years. This raises critical questions about the competence and actual role of Linda, and whether the unallocated expenses were deliberate rather than accidental. The employment of Rynette's sister in a key financial control position is part of the broader pattern of family members being placed in positions to extract value from trust and company assets.

Key Evidence Required

Employment Documentation

Employment Contract: Complete employment contract for Linda, including:

- Start date of employment
- Job title and description
- Reporting relationships
- Compensation and benefits
- Duties and responsibilities
- Performance expectations

Job Description: Detailed job description for bookkeeper position, specifying:

- Bookkeeping duties (expense allocation, reconciliation, etc.)
- Accounting software responsibilities (Sage system)
- Financial reporting requirements
- Quality control and accuracy expectations

Hiring Documentation: Documentation of hiring process, including:

- Job posting or recruitment method
- Application materials
- Interview notes
- Reference checks
- Hiring decision and authorization
- Disclosure of family relationship with Rynette

Family Relationship Documentation

Proof of Relationship: Documentation establishing Linda as Rynette's sister, including:

- Birth certificates or family records
- Witness statements
- Public records
- Acknowledgment by Rynette or Linda

Conflict of Interest: Analysis of whether family relationship was disclosed and whether it created conflict of interest in hiring and supervision.

Performance and Work Product

Work Product: Examples of Linda's bookkeeping work, including:

- Expense allocations (or lack thereof)
- Journal entries
- Reconciliations

- Financial reports prepared
- Quality and accuracy of work

Performance Reviews: Any performance reviews, evaluations, or feedback regarding Linda's work:

- Competence assessments
- Accuracy and timeliness evaluations
- Issues or concerns raised
- Corrective actions taken (or not taken)

Supervision: Documentation of who supervised Linda and how her work was reviewed:

- Reporting structure
- Quality control processes
- Review and approval procedures
- Oversight by Bantjies (as accountant)

Two Years of Unallocated Expenses Analysis

The Central Question

Linda was employed specifically to do the books, yet expenses remained unallocated for two years. This raises the question: **Why were expenses unallocated for two years if accountant (Bantjies) and bookkeeper (Linda) were performing their duties?**

Possible Explanations

Incompetence: Linda lacked competence to perform bookkeeping duties, and Bantjies (as accountant) failed to supervise or correct the deficiencies.

Deliberate Non-Allocation: Expenses were deliberately left unallocated to conceal their nature, create confusion, or facilitate fraud.

Bantjies' s Instructions: Linda followed Bantjies' s instructions not to allocate expenses, as part of systematic concealment scheme.

System Manipulation: Rynette (controlling Sage system using pete@regima.com) prevented proper expense allocation despite Linda' s efforts.

Evidence Pointing to Deliberate Scheme

Several factors suggest the unallocated expenses were deliberate rather than accidental:

Bantjies as Accountant: Bantjies, as professional accountant for all RegimA companies, should have immediately identified and corrected unallocated expenses. The fact that they remained unallocated for two years suggests Bantjies permitted or orchestrated it.

Rynette' s Control: Rynette controlled the Sage accounting system using pete@regima.com. She had ability to allocate expenses but chose not to.

Timing of Dumping: The two years of unallocated expenses were dumped into RegimA Worldwide on March 30, 2025, with a 12-hour deadline. This timing suggests deliberate information dump to create confusion and prevent analysis.

SARS Audit Context: The unallocated expenses were subject to SARS audit, and Rynette claimed Bantjies instructed her to make payments. This suggests Bantjies was directing financial operations and would have known about unallocated expenses.

Concealment of Fraud: The R5.4M Strategic Logistics stock adjustment and other fraudulent transactions may have been concealed within the unallocated expenses.

Control Structure Analysis

Family Network in Financial Control

Linda' s employment as Rynette' s sister creates a family network in key financial control positions:

Rynette Farrar:

- Controlled accounting system (Sage) using pete@regima.com

- Controlled all bank accounts
- Controlled email systems
- Made all banking transactions daily

Linda (Rynette's Sister):

- Employed as bookkeeper
- Responsible for expense allocation
- Worked under Rynette's direction

Adderoy (Rynette's Son):

- Registered competing domain regimaskin.co.za
- Supplied stock (same type that disappeared from Strategic Logistics)
- Received diverted customers and revenue

Pattern: Rynette placed family members in positions to control financial systems and extract value from trust and company assets.

Bantjies' Oversight

Bantjies, as accountant and undisclosed trustee, had responsibility to oversee bookkeeping and ensure proper expense allocation:

Professional Duty: As professional accountant, Bantjies had duty to ensure accurate and timely bookkeeping.

Trustee Duty: As trustee (even if undisclosed), Bantjies had fiduciary duty to ensure proper financial management.

Failure to Act: Bantjies' failure to correct two years of unallocated expenses demonstrates either gross incompetence or deliberate facilitation of concealment scheme.

Conflict of Interest: Bantjies' R18.685M debt to the trust created incentive to conceal financial information and prevent discovery of fraud.

Timeline of Unallocated Expenses

Two-Year Period (Approximately 2023-2025)

Expenses remained unallocated for two years while:

- Linda was employed as bookkeeper
- Bantjies was accountant
- Rynette controlled Sage accounting system
- SARS audit was pending or ongoing

March 30, 2025: Expense Dumping

Two years of unallocated expenses dumped into RegimA Worldwide with 12-hour deadline:

- Daniel given insufficient time to analyze
- Deliberate information dump to create confusion
- Prevented proper investigation of expense nature

June 6, 2025: Daniel Exposes Fraud

Daniel used the time between March 30 and June 6 to analyze expenses and expose Villa Via fraud to Bantjies:

- Analysis revealed 86% profit margin rent extraction
- Exposure triggered immediate retaliation
- Bantjies dismissed audit request 4 days later

June 10, 2025: Audit Dismissed

Bantjies dismissed Daniel's audit request:

- Audit would have fully analyzed unallocated expenses
- Would have discovered concealed fraud
- Bantjies protected concealment scheme by blocking audit

Connection to SARS Audit (SF4)

The unallocated expenses were subject to SARS audit, and in the SARS audit email (SF4), Rynette claimed Bantjies instructed her to make substantial payments. This connection raises questions:

Were Unallocated Expenses the Payments? Were the two years of unallocated expenses the same “substantial payments” that Rynette claimed Bantjies instructed?

Why Unallocated? If Bantjies instructed the payments, why were they left unallocated for two years? This suggests the payments lacked legitimate business purpose or proper documentation.

Linda’s Role: What was Linda’s role in processing these payments? Did she follow Bantjies’ or Rynette’s instructions not to allocate them?

SARS Investigation: What did SARS conclude about the unallocated expenses? Were they accepted as legitimate business expenses or challenged?

Legal Implications

Breach of Fiduciary Duty

Bantjies, as accountant and trustee, breached fiduciary duty by:

- Failing to ensure proper bookkeeping
- Permitting two years of unallocated expenses
- Failing to supervise Linda’s work
- Using unallocated expenses to conceal fraud

Professional Negligence

Bantjies, as professional accountant, may be liable for professional negligence in:

- Failing to maintain proper accounting records
- Failing to allocate expenses in timely manner

- Failing to supervise bookkeeper
- Permitting financial records to be manipulated

Nepotism and Conflict of Interest

Employment of Rynette's sister in key financial control position creates conflict of interest and raises questions about:

- Proper hiring procedures
- Qualifications for position
- Supervision and accountability
- Use of position to benefit family members

Fraud Facilitation

If unallocated expenses were deliberately maintained to conceal fraud, Linda's role in the scheme (whether knowing or unknowing) facilitated the fraud.

Cross-References

Related Annexures:

- SF2: Sage screenshots - Rynette's control of accounting system
- SF4: SARS audit email - Rynette claimed Bantjes instructed payments
- SF1: Bantjes debt documentation - Motive to conceal financial information
- SF3: Strategic Logistics stock adjustment - Possibly concealed in unallocated expenses

Related Narrative Sections:

- Part II: The Network of Control - Rynette Farrar: The Administrator
- Part III: Section 5 - Two Years of Unallocated Expenses (AD 8.5)
- Part VII: Chapter 5 - The Fraud Exposure

Related Timeline Events:

- March 30, 2025: Expense dumping with 12-hour deadline
- June 6, 2025: Daniel exposes fraud to Bantjies
- June 10, 2025: Bantjies dismisses audit request

Notes for Legal Team

This annexure demonstrates:

1. **Family network** in financial control positions (Rynette + Linda + Adderory)
2. **Deliberate concealment** suggested by two years of unallocated expenses
3. **Bantjies' s facilitation** through failure to supervise or correct
4. **Connection to SARS audit** and Bantjies' s payment instructions
5. **Pattern of control** enabling fraud and value extraction

Linda's employment is significant not because of her individual culpability (which may be limited if she was following instructions), but because it demonstrates the family network that Rynette established in key financial control positions. The two years of unallocated expenses, despite Linda being employed as bookkeeper and Bantjies serving as accountant, suggests systematic concealment rather than mere incompetence.

Action Items:

1. Obtain complete employment documentation for Linda
2. Obtain proof of family relationship between Linda and Rynette
3. Obtain job description and performance expectations for bookkeeper
4. Obtain examples of Linda's work product (or lack thereof)
5. Obtain evidence of Bantjies' s supervision (or lack thereof)
6. Obtain timeline of when expenses should have been allocated vs. when they were
7. Obtain SARS audit documentation regarding unallocated expenses
8. Obtain witness statements from Linda about instructions received
9. Obtain evidence of disclosure (or non-disclosure) of family relationship
10. Prepare analysis of competence vs. deliberate concealment question

Email: Fw: The RegimA Group results and Computer Expense analysis

Email Headers

From: Daniel Faucitt d@rzo.io
To: "smunga@ensafrica.com" smunga@ensafrica.com, j faucitt jfaucitt@proton.me
Date: Fri, 29 Aug 2025 09:40:05 +0000
Cc: "Dan@regima Com (dan@regima.com)" dan@regima.com
Subject: Fw: The RegimA Group results and Computer Expense analysis

Email Body

From: Danie Bantjes https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_danie.bantjes-40gmail.com&d=DwIFAg&c=euGZstcaTDllvimEN8b7jXrwqOf-v5A_CdpgnVfiiMM&r=7ZULBZmD5L4dM8U3nU-5WA&m=YnvLWUs9geF68R3Ne5IW-zDwbgefsnFQ8ESgvzlhlo83PFAB8pv5Lq9YoUr-qnSy&s=xg7LNDiMhuyU74CCzq85G8Val7_qz05uMLpxwpC27q0&e= Sent: 10 June 2025 3:33 PM To: Daniel Faucitt d@rzo.io Cc: Peter Andrew Faucitt pete@regima.com; Jacqui Faucitt jax@regima.zone; Daniel Faucitt [dan@regima.zone](mailto:(dan@regima.zone) dan@regima.zone) Subject: Re: The RegimA Group results and Computer Expense analysis

Dear Dan

Thank you for the speedy response.

Your comments and assertions will be taken under consideration in due course.

I am unfortunately away for 2 weeks, with little or no access to my communications.

In the meantime I implore everyone to try and work out a solution to the position we find ourselves in.

Kind regards,

Danie Bantjes

On Tue, 10 Jun 2025 at 11:45, Daniel Faucitt > wrote: Hi Danie

Fundamentally the issue is that Worldwide has found itself absorbing all costs of all companies when the cards all expired in Aug 2023 2 weeks after Kayla's murder. As an emergency measure the expenses were put on the Worldwide cards which had a different expiry date. This is why RegimA Skin Treatments and Strategic have no record of their actual computer expenses. Everything was dumped in Worldwide. The majority of these transactions belong in Rezonance, a technology and IT company Kayla and I spent nearly a decade building. As an IT company and service provider, the operating expenses are essentially different from a skincare distribution company, so an operating expense for the former would often be considered capital expenditure in the latter etc. As you can see from the ProfitandLoss.pdf Rezonance made its first annual profit in Feb 2023 which Kayla and I celebrated as all the hard work finally paying off. Rezonance currently owes me ZAR 1.8 million as a director from my investments over the years, you can understand why I firmly rejected Pete's insistence that I just close the company. In addition there was an ongoing murder investigation where the authorities reminded me of the familiar firearms rule that life comes

before property and instructed me to freeze all activity immediately while they conducted their investigations and resolve the financial issues later. Which is exactly what I have done.

Further to the question of necessity to the business, as can be seen from the ProfitandLossReport (RWD).pdf RegimA Worldwide Distribution absorbed the operational overhead of 4 large distribution partners between 2020 and 2023. It did so with no additional staff as I single-handedly rebuilt the entire demand side of the distribution function into the marketplace and ecommerce platforms to allow continuity of business in the wake of cascading failure of our distribution partners. The margins are structured so that each hub uses its margin to cover the costs. The recent moves to take all of the payments directly into an account which only Rynette has access to and deny me any visibility while leaving all the expenses with me are not only bizarre but will ultimately prevent us from ever being able to resolve anything while placing someone who is neither a director or employee of Worldwide Distribution in complete control without any liability. This is concerning as it makes me as a director liable for their actions without my knowledge or consent. This cannot continue.

As can be seen in the Worldwide Distribution P&L, the year-on-year turnover increase from 2M to 12M to 19M reflects the additional distribution activity it took on over the period. The significant drop of 1M to 18M the following year was after Pete signed an affidavit to make himself the administrator on the Worldwide accounts and all my automations were unhooked. I informed Pete and Rynette prior to this not to touch it or it would break the automations but they did so anyway. I informed them after that I could no longer see the things i needed to complete the accounts and that they need to ensure they know what they are doing. Over the past year the bank contacted me on several occasions to ask for my approval where Pete and Rynette had attempted to draft mandates to change the ownership structure, have my accounts closed and cancel my cards, all without my knowledge or consent. I informed the bank these must be errors and informed both Pete and Rynette to cease this activity immediately.

As you can see in AccountTransactionsReport.pdf the correct format up to Aug 2023 shows invoices from Rezonance which group the services with itemized billing. This involves a 10% mark-up for Rezonance managed services which I use to also cover the account processing where I have a system that remunerates R50 for whoever is managing the 3rd party service for each invoice, ensuring its line items, forex rates etc are correctly filled in on quickbooks for comprehensive records. After Aug 2023 you can see all items are allocated to FNB which is the auto bank feed i have on Worldwide accounts.

The actual companies RegimA Zone and RegimA SA that operate the Shopify systems were configured to operate the distribution functions using trust accounts and RegimA SA with Pete and I as directors was doing this with Dermal (Barend) and RegimA Zone (Only me as director) was an aggregation of 3 smaller distributions. I had specifically structured it this way to prevent Pete from doing to me what he did to Kachan, simply taking the revenue for himself by instructing people to pay into another account (which is basically what has happened). The problem is that since the ownership of the companies is not the same (i.e. I am not a member of RegimA Skin Treatments and the other companies are not subsidiaries), therefore there is no fixed “group” or intercompany and moving assets from a company where I am a director to a company where I am not is essentially theft or at the very least fraudulent for tax purposes. I urge you to keep this in mind as these issues should not be dismissed as “family disputes” when there is a distinct material and legal difference between ownership of companies which should be treated as such.

I have been telling both Pete and Rynette for 4 years now that the outstanding amounts owed to Rezonance need to be paid before I am able to purchase the services and continue as normal, attached is the Rezonance Febr 2023.PDF showing over 1M outstanding owed by RegimA Skin Treatments to Rezonance. I have been telling Pete for over a year that I cannot file the accounts for Rezonance until the errors of 2024 are corrected in RegimA Skin Treatments. RST has had an account with GoDaddy since 2014 which is also an international payments account with some forex etc. For reasons I can only speculate, in 2024 Rynette made the debt to Rezonance “disappear” by misallocating international GoDaddy payments as though they were local payments made to Rezonance, yet Rezonance received no such payments (the amounts are still outstanding). I was explaining to Pete that these need to be corrected before I submit Rezonance accounts as there will immediately be a mismatch showing Rezonance never received the payments and they will flag as fraudulent on RegimA Skin Treatments with SARS. This was just ignored and they opted instead to try and close my accounts and dissolve my company. This cannot continue.

To the best of my understanding the course we need to follow for correct accounts is:

1. Inform SARS about my freezing activity on the accounts in cooperation with law enforcement for the murder inquiry
2. Explain that we are now in the process of updating the affected records to reconcile the past 2 years so it reflects an accurate account
3. Make the payments from RegimA Skin Treatments to Rezonance and correctly allocate the 2014 GoDaddy expenses to GoDaddy
4. Process the Invoices in the same way I had been doing up until Aug 2023 so there is a single invoice from Rezonance each month.
5. Configure the Paystack systems on Shopify to split the payments directly into Distribution and Manufacturer accounts.

Other than that I can't see any other way to properly remedy the situation. We cannot just try to shoehorn an entire architecture for multiple distribution operations into one account. The transactions on RegimA Skin Treatments must not be signed off as they will later show up as fraudulent. Bear in mind that Pete does not use the computer and has never seen the actual accounts for the company, nor has Jacqui and nor have I. They exist solely on Rynette's computer and nobody else is able to see them. The amounts I can see going through Strategic and RegimA Skin Treatments seem off the charts so we need an internal audit with extreme urgency to see what is going on there.

Warm Regards, Dan

From: Danie Bantjes https://urldfense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_danie.ba&d=DwIFAg&c=euGZstcaTDllvimEN8b7jXrwqOf-v5A_CdpgnVfiiMM&r=7ZULBZmD5L4dM8U3nU-5WA&m=YnvLWUs9geF68R3Ne5IW-zDwbgefsnFQ8ESgvzhlo83PFAB8pv5Lq9YoUr-qnSy&s=UfJdIRw9HqAVQ5CXE7hrY_jfQRuWd48lbVHjp6bYIAI&e=ntjes@gmail.com<mailto:danie.bantjes@gmail.com>

Sent: 10 June 2025 09:58 To: Peter Andrew Faucitt >; Jacqui Faucitt jax@regima.zone; Daniel Faucitt > Subject: The RegimA Group results and Computer Expense analysis

Good morning Pete, Jacqui and Danny

It saddens me to write this email this morning, as in my 30-odd year involvement with the Faucitt family business I have never had to encounter or get involved with an internal dispute of this serious nature.

Although perhaps difficult for you as family members, I suggest we try and keep the emotions at bay and resolve this dispute regarding the spend on Computer related expenses by applying basic business principles in deciding what needs to be done to restore the profitability and ultimate survival of the business going forward. What do you think?

Just a friendly request please, not to send me any relevant information and comments privately. We all need to be working as a team to be able to ascertain the potential problem/s and focus on finding the most viable solution/s.

Danny has responded to my email of 26th May, his email attached. Danny, many thanks for the very professional and detailed analyses you have provided.

I would still like for the Excel printouts I've attached to be answered line by line please.

Your email contains a lot of information. It is a lot to digest. By doing a category analysis helps tremendously to understand the nature and purpose of all the various IT related services and platforms that are used throughout the RegimA Group.

I am neither an IT expert, nor am I an e-Commerce expert so I would not be able to comment on the necessity, use and value each expense adds to the company.

What is clear though, is that the RegimA group has over the past few years invested heavily in IT and e-commerce platforms and continues to do so. For any business to spend in excess of 20% of revenue generated on these services, the spend needs to be justified, transparent, relevant and needs to add the desired value to the business, i.e. it has to benefit the "bottom line".

Insofar as these computer expenses are concerned, I suggest we need to ask ourselves these questions to start off with:

1. Do we have the necessary invoices for each expense to be able to satisfy a SARS investigation?
2. Verify what each expense is used for on a daily basis?
3. Confirm the sales volume and value generated by each and every e-commerce platform the company is paying for.
4. Consider the relevance and necessity of all collaboration, communication, marketing, development , AI services as well as Analytics & Monitoring tools and do a cost-benefit analysis.on each and every service paid for.

The other concerning aspect is that from my high-level analysis of the state of the finances of the RegimA Group as at 28 February 2025, it is concerning to notice that the Group has, for the first time in its history, made a substantial trading loss in the past financial year.

This reflects in the bank balances as well, which saw a decline of R10m year-on-year for the Group, including Villa Via.

So, besides considering Computer Expenses, other aspects of the business like product margins, selling and distribution costs etc. needs to be looked at in depth again.

This will hopefully be the start of an in-depth discussion regarding the profitability and ultimate future viability of the business.

Kind regards,

Danie Bantjes