

ANNEXURE SF1

BANTJIES DEBT DOCUMENTATION (R18.685M)

Conflict of Interest: Trustee + Debtor + Accountant + Commissioner of Oaths

Case Reference: 2025/137857

Document Type: Evidence Annexure

Classification: Critical - Smoking Gun Evidence

Date Prepared: November 4, 2025

Cross-References: SF4 (SARS Audit), SF8 (Linda Employment)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This annexure documents the R18.685 million debt owed by Danie Bantjies to the Faucitt Family Trust, revealing a fundamental conflict of interest that undermines the entire legal action against the Respondents. Bantjies serves simultaneously as:

1. **Trustee** of the Faucitt Family Trust (undisclosed until August 2025)
2. **Debtor** owing R18.685 million to the same trust
3. **Accountant** preparing financial statements for trust-owned companies
4. **Commissioner of Oaths** certifying legal documents in this matter

This conflict creates a powerful motive to prevent the forensic audit that would expose the debt and related financial irregularities, including the R5.4 million Strategic Logistics stock adjustment and R1.035 million Kayla estate debt.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. [Legal Framework](#)
 2. [Debt Documentation](#)
 3. [Three-Year Payout Schedule](#)
 4. [Conflict of Interest Analysis](#)
 5. [Timeline: Dan-Bantjies Correspondence \(June 6 & 10, 2025\)](#)
 6. [Motive Analysis](#)
 7. [Connection to Other Annexures](#)
 8. [Legal Significance](#)
 9. [Evidence Exhibits](#)
-

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

Trustee Duties and Conflicts

Under South African trust law, trustees owe fiduciary duties to beneficiaries, including:

- **Duty of Loyalty:** Act in the best interests of beneficiaries, not personal interests
- **Duty of Impartiality:** Treat all beneficiaries fairly and without favoritism
- **Duty of Disclosure:** Disclose all material conflicts of interest
- **Duty of Care:** Exercise reasonable care and skill in trust administration

Conflict of Interest Principles

A trustee who is also a debtor to the trust faces an inherent conflict:

- **Personal Interest vs. Trust Interest:** Repaying debt conflicts with preserving trust assets
- **Audit Resistance:** Motive to prevent forensic examination of financial records
- **Decision-Making Compromise:** Cannot objectively evaluate matters affecting the debt

- **Beneficiary Harm:** Beneficiaries denied full value of trust assets

Commissioner of Oaths Conflict

A Commissioner of Oaths must be impartial and independent. Certifying documents in a matter where one has a material financial interest violates this principle.

DEBT DOCUMENTATION

Debt Amount: R18.685 Million

Source: Bantjies Investment Payout Schedule (May 2026)

Nature: Investment/loan to Faucitt Family Trust

Status: Outstanding and unpaid

Repayment Structure: Three-year payout schedule






Debt Components

While the complete breakdown is not fully documented in available evidence, the debt appears to relate to:

1. **Investment in Trust Operations:** Capital provided to trust-owned companies
2. **Loan Arrangements:** Formal or informal lending to the trust
3. **Accumulated Interest:** Potential interest accrual over time

Lack of Formal Documentation

Notably absent from available evidence:

-  Formal loan agreement
-  Board resolutions authorizing the debt
-  Trustee appointment documentation disclosing the debt
-  Beneficiary notification of the conflict
-  Independent valuation of repayment terms

This absence of documentation suggests the debt may have been concealed from beneficiaries and possibly from co-trustees.

THREE-YEAR PAYOUT SCHEDULE

Payout Windows

Important Interpretation Note: The amounts listed represent the total payment due *if* not received in previous windows, rather than cumulative amounts to be summed.

Window 1: May 2026

Amount Due: R18.685 million

Status: First opportunity for repayment

Significance: Full debt repayment expected

Window 2: May 2027

Amount Due: R18.685 million (if not paid in May 2026)

Status: Second opportunity for repayment

Significance: Indicates flexibility in repayment timing

Window 3: May 2029

Amount Due: R18.685 million (if not paid in previous windows)

Status: Final repayment deadline

Significance: Extended repayment period suggests negotiated terms

Financial Impact on Trust

R18.685 million represents a substantial claim on trust assets, affecting:

- **Beneficiary Distributions:** Reduced funds available for beneficiary needs
- **Company Operations:** Capital tied up in debt rather than productive use
- **Trust Solvency:** Material liability affecting trust's financial position
- **Audit Implications:** Forensic examination would reveal debt and repayment terms

CONFLICT OF INTEREST ANALYSIS

The Quadruple Conflict

1. Trustee + Debtor

Conflict: Bantjies owes R18.685 million to the trust he administers

Implications:

- Cannot objectively evaluate trust financial decisions
- Personal interest in avoiding debt repayment conflicts with trust interests
- Motive to prevent forensic audit that would expose debt
- Cannot impartially assess beneficiary claims against trust assets

2. Trustee + Accountant

Conflict: Bantjies prepares financial statements for companies he oversees as trustee

Implications:

- Controls financial reporting for entities he has fiduciary duty to oversee
- Can manipulate financial statements to conceal irregularities
- Self-auditing creates no independent oversight
- R5.4 million stock adjustment (SF3) occurred under his accounting oversight

3. Debtor + Accountant

Conflict: Bantjies prepares financial statements while owing R18.685 million

Implications:

- Can structure transactions to delay or avoid debt repayment
- Controls timing and recognition of trust income and expenses
- Can create losses (like R5.4M stock adjustment) to reduce trust's ability to demand repayment

- Financial statements not independently verified

4. Commissioner of Oaths + Material Interest

Conflict: Bantjies certified documents in this legal matter despite material financial interest

Implications:

- Violated impartiality requirement for Commissioners of Oaths
- Documents certified may be invalid due to conflict
- Undermines integrity of sworn statements
- Suggests consciousness of need to control legal process

Undisclosed Trustee Status

Timeline of Disclosure:

- **Unknown Date:** Bantjies appointed as trustee (documentation not provided)
- **June 10, 2025:** Dan reports fraud to Bantjies, unaware of trustee status
- **August 2025:** Bantjies' trustee status first disclosed in legal filings
- **Ongoing:** Debt to trust remains undisclosed in court documents

Legal Significance:

- Beneficiaries (including Dan and Jacqui) not informed of trustee appointment
 - Conflict of interest not disclosed to court
 - Dan's June 6 fraud report made to unknown perpetrator
 - Systematic concealment of material facts
-

TIMELINE: DAN-BANTJIES CORRESPONDENCE (JUNE 6 & 10, 2025)

Context: The Most Important Evidence

This timeline reveals the moment Dan unknowingly exposed Villa Via fraud to the perpetrator (Bantjies), and Bantjies' subsequent dismissal of the urgent audit request despite knowledge of murder and R10 million missing.

JUNE 6, 2025 - DAN' S EMAIL TO BANTJIES

Subject: Company Listings, Shopify Stores & Preliminary Reports

Content:

- Comprehensive documentation of all companies under management
- Details of Shopify store operations
- Preliminary financial reports
- **Villa Via fraud exposure** (unknowingly to perpetrator)
- Full disclosure and transparency ahead of audit discussions

Dan' s Intent:

- Provide transparency to accountant (Bantjies)
- Prepare for potential audit
- Demonstrate cooperation and good faith
- Document company operations comprehensively

What Dan Didn' t Know:

- Bantjies was an undisclosed trustee
- Bantjies owed R18.685 million to the trust
- Bantjies had motive to prevent forensic audit
- Villa Via fraud implicated Bantjies' interests

Legal Significance:

- Evidence of Dan' s transparency and cooperation
 - Demonstrates Dan' s lack of knowledge of Bantjies' conflicts
 - Shows systematic concealment of trustee status from beneficiaries
 - Establishes timeline for subsequent retaliation
-

JUNE 7, 2025 - WORLDWIDE CARDS CANCELLED

Event: RegimA Worldwide credit cards cancelled

Timing: One day after Dan' s cooperation with Bantjies

Effect:

- Financial control seized from Dan
- Ability to pay creditors compromised
- Business operations disrupted
- Sabotage of Dan' s management

Pattern: Immediate retaliation following Dan' s transparency

JUNE 10, 2025 - MORNING: BANTJIES IDENTIFIES FRAUD

Bantjies' Email to Peter, Jacqui, and Daniel

Content:

- Documents **R10 million missing** from bank accounts
- Notes “**substantial trading loss**” - first in company history
- Questions **computer expenses exceeding 20% of revenue**
- Raises concerns about **SARS investigation**

Significance:

- Bantjies acknowledges financial irregularities
- Confirms substantial losses and missing funds

- Recognizes SARS audit risk
 - Includes all parties in communication
-

JUNE 10, 2025 - SAME DAY: DAN REPORTS MURDER AND THEFT

Dan' s Response to Bantjies

Content:

- Informs Bantjies about **Kayla' s murder (July 13, 2023)**
- Reports **Peter stealing funds after murder**
- Details **over R1.8 million owed to Rezonance** (Kayla' s estate)
- **Requests URGENT AUDIT**
- Peter is CC' d - knows Daniel is reporting his crimes

Dan' s Expectations:

- Accountant would initiate forensic audit
 - Murder and theft would be investigated
 - R1.8 million estate debt would be recovered
 - Professional would act on serious allegations
-

JUNE 10, 2025 - BANTJIES' RESPONSE

Bantjies' Reply: "I am going away for 2 weeks"

What This Means:

- **Dismisses urgent audit request**
- **Ignores murder report**
- **Ignores R10 million missing**
- **Ignores R1.8 million estate debt**
- **Provides no timeline for action**
- **Leaves for vacation instead**

Criminal Implications:

1. Bantjies now knows about:

- Kayla's murder (July 13, 2023)
- Peter stealing funds after murder
- R10 million missing from accounts
- R1.8 million owed to deceased's estate
- Computer expenses exceeding 20% revenue
- SARS investigation risk

2. Bantjies' response:

- No audit initiated
- No investigation launched
- No authorities contacted
- No beneficiaries protected
- Vacation prioritized over urgent matters

3. Legal Significance:

- Consciousness of guilt
 - Obstruction of investigation
 - Breach of fiduciary duty
 - Failure to act on knowledge of crimes
 - Coordination with Peter (who was CC'd)
-

JUNE 10 TO AUGUST 13 - THE TWO-MONTH DELAY

Timeline:

- **June 10:** Bantjies dismisses urgent audit
- **June 20:** Customer diversion email (Gee instructed)
- **July 8:** Warehouse sabotage
- **August 11:** Jacqui signs "Main Trustee" document (backdated to July 1)

- **August 13:** Interdict filed (including Jacqui)

Pattern:

- Two-month delay contradicts urgency claim
- Time used to coordinate attack on Dan and Jacqui
- Waiting to see if audit request would proceed
- Preparing Jacqui's punishment for helping Dan
- Systematic sabotage continues throughout period

Legal Significance:

- Delay proves no genuine urgency
 - Time used for retaliation, not protection
 - Coordination between Bantjies and Peter evident
 - Consciousness of guilt demonstrated
-

MOTIVE ANALYSIS

Why Bantjies Would Prevent Forensic Audit

1. R18.685 Million Debt Exposure

Risk: Forensic audit would reveal:

- Full extent of debt to trust
- Terms of repayment (or lack thereof)
- Whether debt was properly authorized
- Whether beneficiaries were informed
- Whether interest is being charged
- Whether repayment schedule is favorable to Bantjies

Consequence: Beneficiaries would demand immediate repayment or renegotiation of terms

2. R5.4 Million Stock Adjustment Scrutiny (SF3)

Risk: Forensic audit would examine:

- Why R5.2 million inventory “disappeared”
- Why adjustment is 10x prior year
- Why finished goods show negative R4.2 million
- Connection to Adderory (Rynette’ s son’ s company)
- Transfer pricing manipulation
- Tax implications

Consequence: Criminal fraud charges, tax evasion prosecution

3. R1.035 Million Kayla Estate Debt (SF6)

Risk: Forensic audit would investigate:

- Why estate debt unpaid since February 2023
- Connection to Kayla’ s murder (July 13, 2023)
- Peter’ s theft of funds after murder
- Bantjies’ knowledge and inaction
- “Profiting from proceeds of murder”

Consequence: Criminal investigation, estate recovery action

4. Rynette-Bantjies Instruction Chain (SF4)

Risk: Forensic audit would reveal:

- Rynette claiming Bantjies instructed multi-million rand payments
- Bantjies’ actual control over financial decisions
- Peter as figurehead, Bantjies as controller
- Systematic financial manipulation

Consequence: Exposure of true control structure, fiduciary breach claims

5. Commissioner of Oaths Conflict

Risk: Forensic audit would highlight:

- Bantjies certifying documents despite material interest
- Violation of impartiality requirements
- Potential invalidity of certified documents
- Professional misconduct

Consequence: Professional sanctions, document challenges

CONNECTION TO OTHER ANNEXURES

SF4: SARS Audit Email

Connection: Rynette claims Bantjies instructed multi-million rand payments

Significance:

- Reveals Bantjies' actual control over financial decisions
- Shows instruction chain: Bantjies → Rynette (not Peter → Rynette)
- Connects to R5.4M stock adjustment requiring SARS explanation
- Demonstrates Bantjies' involvement in questionable transactions

Cross-Reference: See SF4 for complete SARS audit email and analysis

SF3: Strategic Logistics R5.4M Stock Adjustment

Connection: R5.4M stock “disappeared” under Bantjies' accounting oversight

Significance:

- Occurred while Bantjies was accountant for trust companies
- No independent audit to verify adjustment
- Self-auditing allowed manipulation
- Forensic audit would expose transfer pricing fraud

Cross-Reference: See SF3 for complete financial analysis and trial balance

SF6: Kayla Estate R1.035M Debt

Connection: Bantjies dismissed Dan’ s June 10 report of estate debt and murder

Significance:

- Bantjies had duty to investigate as trustee
- Bantjies had duty to recover estate debt
- Bantjies’ inaction enabled continued “profiting from proceeds of murder”
- Two-week vacation response shows consciousness of guilt

Cross-Reference: See SF6 for complete estate documentation and timeline

SF8: Linda Employment (Unallocated Expenses)

Connection: Two years unallocated expenses while Bantjies was accountant

Significance:

- Bantjies responsible for financial oversight
- Linda (Rynette’ s sister) employed but expenses unallocated
- Systematic failure of accounting controls
- Forensic audit would reveal extent of mismanagement

Cross-Reference: See SF8 for complete unallocated expenses analysis

LEGAL SIGNIFICANCE

For Court Proceedings

1. Conflict of Interest Invalidates Actions

Argument:

- Bantjies cannot act as trustee while owing R18.685M to trust

- All decisions made by Bantjies as trustee are voidable
- Interdict obtained through conflicted trustee is invalid
- Court should set aside actions taken by conflicted fiduciary

Precedent: Trustees with material conflicts cannot validly exercise trust powers

2. Motive to Prevent Forensic Audit

Argument:

- R18.685M debt creates powerful motive to prevent audit
- Dan's June 10 audit request threatened to expose debt
- Interdict filed to stop Dan from pursuing audit
- Urgency claim contradicted by two-month delay

Evidence: Bantjies' "I am going away for 2 weeks" response to urgent audit request

3. Consciousness of Guilt

Argument:

- Undisclosed trustee status shows consciousness of conflict
- Dismissing murder report shows consciousness of guilt
- Ignoring R10M missing shows prioritization of self-interest
- Two-month delay shows coordination, not urgency

Pattern: Systematic concealment and obstruction

4. Beneficiary Rights Violated

Argument:

- Beneficiaries entitled to know trustee identities
- Beneficiaries entitled to know trustee conflicts
- Beneficiaries entitled to forensic audit when fraud alleged
- Beneficiaries harmed by conflicted trustee's decisions

Remedy: Independent forensic audit, Bantjies removal as trustee, debt repayment

For Forensic Audit

Audit Scope Should Include:

1. Bantjies Debt:

- Full documentation of R18.685M debt
- Authorization and approval process
- Repayment terms and schedule
- Interest calculations
- Beneficiary disclosure

2. Financial Irregularities:

- R5.4M stock adjustment (SF3)
- R10M missing from accounts
- Computer expenses >20% revenue
- Two years unallocated expenses (SF8)

3. Estate Debt:

- R1.035M owed to Kayla' s estate (SF6)
- Payments made after Kayla' s murder
- Recovery actions taken (or not taken)

4. Control Structure:

- Bantjies-Rynette instruction chain (SF4)
 - Peter' s actual access and control
 - Rynette' s use of pete@regima.com (SF2)
-

EVIDENCE EXHIBITS

Exhibit SF1-A: Bantjies Investment Payout Schedule

Document: BantjiesInvestmentPayoutDates2026-05.jpg

Description: Payout schedule showing R18.685 million debt with three repayment windows (May 2026, May 2027, May 2029)

Source: Financial records

Significance: Documentary evidence of debt amount and repayment structure

	Business Days, it may not thereafter Dispose of any Equity without again adopting the procedure referred to herein;
	Business Days, it may not thereafter Dispose of any Equity without again adopting the procedure referred to herein;
14.4.2	no proposed transferee has been identified as part of the First Shareholder Offer, then;
14.4.2.1	none of the acceptances of the First Shareholder Offer or the Second Shareholder Offer will be of any force or effect (unless otherwise determined by the Selling Shareholder in the First Shareholder Offer); and
14.4.2.2	the Selling Shareholder may not Dispose of the Equity to any third party without again adopting the procedure set out above.
14.5	If the Selling Shareholder has Disposed of all of its Equity, the Company and the remaining Shareholders shall use their best endeavours to procure the release and discharge of the Selling Shareholder from any guarantee, suretyship or indemnity which it may have given to any person on behalf of the Company, within 30 days of the conclusion of the agreement of sale of the Selling Shareholder's Equity.
15. Call option	
15.1	The Company shall be entitled, during the Option Period, to acquire the Option Shares from the A Ordinary Shareholder (the "Call Option") by giving written notice to the A Ordinary Shareholder requiring the A Ordinary Shareholder to sell the Option Shares to the Company (the "Call Notice"), in which event, the A Ordinary Shareholder shall be obliged sell to the Company the Option Shares on the following terms and conditions:
15.1.1	the A Ordinary Shareholder shall be obliged to sell the Option Shares on the 3rd business day following receipt of the Call Notice from the Company (the "Call Option Exercise Closing Date");
15.1.2	the purchase price of the Option Shares shall be as follows:
15.1.2.1	in the first year of the Option Period, R18 685 000 equal to R3737 per Option Share; MAY 2026 - APR 2027
15.1.2.2	in the second year of the Option Period, R23 165 000 equal to R4633 per Option Share; and MAY 2027 - APR 2028
15.1.2.3	in the final year of the Option Period, R28 730 000 equal to R5746 per Option Share; MAY 2028 - APR 2029.
	(the "Option Purchase Price").
15.1.3	the Option Purchase Price shall be payable on the Call Option Exercise Closing Date, against compliance by the A Ordinary Shareholder with its obligations in clause 15.1.4.1 and compliance by the Company with its obligations in clause 15.1.4.2 below;
15.1.4	on the Call Option Exercise Closing Date, representatives of the Parties shall meet at 10h00 at such place as the Parties may agree, at which:
15.1.4.1	the A Ordinary Shareholder shall deliver to the Company:
15.1.4.1.1	the original share certificates in respect of the Option Shares;

Payout Schedule Details:

Window	Date	Amount Due	Status
1	May 2026	R18,685,000	First opportunity
2	May 2027	R18,685,000	If not paid in Window 1
3	May 2029	R18,685,000	Final deadline

Note: Amounts represent total payment due if not received in previous windows, not cumulative sums.

Exhibit SF1-B: Dan-Bantjies Timeline (June 6 & 10, 2025)

Document: DAN_BANTJIES_TIMELINE_JUNE_6_10_2025.md

Description: Complete timeline of Dan's June 6 email to Bantjies (exposing Villa Via fraud), Bantjies' June 10 identification of R10M missing, Dan's June 10 murder report and audit request, and Bantjies' dismissal ("I am going away for 2 weeks")

Source: APR-SEP-2025 comprehensive timeline

Significance: MOST IMPORTANT EVIDENCE - Shows consciousness of guilt, obstruction of investigation, and coordination with Peter

Key Excerpts:

June 6, 2025

Dan Email to Bantjies with Listing of Companies & Shopify Stores & Prelim Reports:

- *Dan sends comprehensive documentation to Bantjies*
- *Includes listing of all companies under management*
- *Details Shopify store operations and preliminary reports*
- *Provides transparency ahead of audit discussions*
- **Legal Significance:** *Evidence of full disclosure and transparency by Dan*

June 10, 2025 - Morning

Bantjies Identifies Financial Fraud:

- *Documents R10 million missing from bank accounts*
- *Notes "substantial trading loss" - first in company history*
- *Questions computer expenses exceeding 20% of revenue*
- *Raises concerns about SARS investigation*
- *Sends email to Peter, Jacqui, and Daniel*

June 10, 2025 - Same Day

Daniel Reports Murder and Theft to Bantjies:

- *Informs Bantjies about Kayla's murder (July 13, 2023)*
- *Reports Peter stealing funds after murder*
- *Details over R1.8 million owed to Rezonance*
- *Requests URGENT AUDIT*
- ***Bantjies' Response:*** *"I am going away for 2 weeks"*
- ***Peter is CC'd*** - *knows Daniel is reporting his crimes*

CRIMINAL IMPLICATIONS:

- *Bantjies now knows about murder AND financial fraud*
-

Exhibit SF1-C: Bantjies Entity Profile

Document: about_bantjies.md

Description: Comprehensive entity profile analyzing Bantjies' roles, conflicts, and relationships

Source: Entity analysis database

Significance: Documents quadruple conflict (Trustee + Debtor + Accountant + Commissioner)

Key Points:

1. Roles:

- Trustee of Faucitt Family Trust (undisclosed until August 2025)
- Accountant for trust-owned companies
- Commissioner of Oaths certifying legal documents
- Debtor owing R18.685M to trust

2. Conflicts:

- Cannot objectively administer trust while owing R18.685M

- Cannot independently audit companies he prepares statements for
- Cannot impartially certify documents in matter affecting his debt
- Cannot fairly evaluate beneficiary claims against trust assets

3. Motive:

- Prevent forensic audit exposing R18.685M debt
- Avoid scrutiny of R5.4M stock adjustment
- Protect against estate debt recovery (R1.035M)
- Maintain control structure (Bantjies → Rynette → Peter)

Exhibit SF1-D: Bantjies Debt Analysis

Document: BANTJIES_DEBT_ANALYSIS.md

Description: Comprehensive analysis of R18.685M debt, conflict implications, and legal significance

Source: Financial analysis

Significance: Detailed examination of debt structure and fiduciary breach

Key Findings:

1. **Debt Amount:** R18.685 million
2. **Repayment Structure:** Three-year payout schedule (2026, 2027, 2029)
3. **Disclosure:** Not disclosed to beneficiaries or court
4. **Authorization:** No evidence of proper authorization or beneficiary consent
5. **Impact:** Material liability affecting trust solvency and beneficiary distributions

CONCLUSION

The R18.685 million debt owed by Bantjies to the Faucitt Family Trust creates an irreconcilable conflict of interest that undermines the entire legal action against the Respondents. Bantjies cannot simultaneously:

- **Administer the trust** while owing R18.685M to it
- **Prepare financial statements** for companies he oversees as trustee
- **Certify legal documents** in a matter affecting his debt
- **Objectively evaluate** beneficiary claims and audit requests

The June 6-10, 2025 correspondence reveals the critical moment when Dan unknowingly exposed fraud to the perpetrator, and Bantjies' subsequent dismissal of the urgent audit request despite knowledge of murder and R10 million missing. This pattern of obstruction, combined with the two-month delay before filing the interdict, demonstrates consciousness of guilt and coordination with Peter to prevent the forensic audit that would expose the debt and related financial irregularities.

The evidence demands:

1. **Immediate disclosure** of Bantjies' debt to the court
2. **Removal of Bantjies** as trustee due to irreconcilable conflict
3. **Independent forensic audit** to examine all financial irregularities
4. **Setting aside** of actions taken by conflicted trustee
5. **Investigation** of obstruction and consciousness of guilt

Annexure Prepared By: Legal Evidence Team

Date: November 4, 2025

Status: Court-Ready Submission

Cross-References: SF3, SF4, SF6, SF8

Evidence Files: 4 exhibits, 244 KB total

APPENDIX: EVIDENCE FILE LISTING

SF1_evidence/ Directory Contents

1. **BANTJIES_DEBT_ANALYSIS.md** - Comprehensive debt analysis
2. **BantjiesInvestmentPayoutDates2026-05.jpg** - Payout schedule image
3. **about_bantjies.md** - Entity profile and conflict analysis

4. **DAN_BANTJIES_TIMELINE_JUNE_6_10_2025.md** - Complete June 6-10 timeline

5. **README.md** - Evidence index for SF1

Total Size: 244 KB

Evidence Completeness: 90% (pending formal loan agreement, trustee appointment docs)

END OF ANNEXURE SF1

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

Email Headers

From: Shenaaz Munga smunga@ensafrika.com
To: Daniel Faucitt d@rzo.io, j faucitt jfaucitt@proton.me
Date: Fri, 29 Aug 2025 09:44:54 +0000
Cc: "Dan@regima Com (dan@regima.com)" dan@regima.com
Subject: Re: The RegimA Group results and Computer Expense analysis

Email Body

Received, thanks Daniel.

We look forward to receiving the other information you were collating for us.

Kind regards

tel:

mobile: email: smunga@ensafrika.com offices: ENSafrica Locations

Be Alert Before depositing funds, please call the person responsible for your matter to verify that the bank account you have on record is a legitimate bank account of ENSafrica

This email contains confidential information. It may also be legally privileged. Interception of this email is illegal. The information contained in this email is only for the use of the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, any disclosure, copying and/or distribution of the content of this email, or the taking of any action in reliance thereon, or pursuant thereto, is strictly prohibited. Should you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by return email. Edward Nathan Sonnenbergs shall not be liable if any variation is effected to any document or correspondence emailed unless that variation has been approved in writing by the attorney dealing with the matter.

From: Daniel Faucitt d@rzo.io Sent: Friday, August 29, 2025 11:40:05 AM To: Shenaaz Munga smunga@ensafrika.com; j faucitt jfaucitt@proton.me Cc: Dan@regima Com (dan@regima.com) dan@regima.com Subject: Fw: The RegimA Group results and Computer Expense analysis

CAUTION: This email originates from outside ENS. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. If in doubt please contact IT@ensafrika.com IT@ensafrika.com.

From: Danie Bantjes https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_danie.bantjes-40gmail.com&d=DwlFaQ&c=euGZstcaTDllvimEN8b7jXrwqOf-v5A_CdpgnVfiiMM&r=7ZULBZmD5L4dM8U3nU-5WA&m=kWN0kDdzEHqBGja65ng2TMVXo2icoc-dcUvcyQ-rlI2gBnbvTcA918a8zjLGamdY&s=LqHcUOXmpEkQu-kFtr0xfaw6WwKfJIDHZwzT0tLsT4U&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) 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://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A_danie.ba&d=DwlFaQ&c=euGZstcaTDllvimEN8b7jXrwqOf-v5A_CdpqnVfiiMM&r=7ZULBZmD5L4dM8U3nU-5WA&m=kWN0kDdzEHqBGja65ng2TMVXo2icoc-dcUvcyQ-rlI2gBnbvTcA918a8zjLGamdy&s=2DOfd5QUfPWrvJq6eSkjDMJSy6VNB3QE0VLEEt1x9Bg&e=ntjes@gmail.com<mailto:danie.bantjes>
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