



The MARC Tower 1  
129 Rivonia Road Sandton  
Johannesburg South Africa 2196  
P O Box 783347 Sandton South Africa 2146  
Docex 152 Randburg  
tel +2711 269 7600  
info@ENSafrica.com  
**ENSafrica.com**

Elliott Attorneys  
By email: [keegan@elliottattorneys.co.za](mailto:keegan@elliottattorneys.co.za)

0558631 | Ms Munga | Ms Makutu our ref  
29 August 2025 your ref  
date

Dear Sirs

**Peter Andrew Faucitt / Jacqueline Faucitt, Daniel James Faucitt and others – Case No.: 2025/137857**

1. We refer to the above matter and confirm that we act on behalf of Jacqueline Faucitt and Daniel James Faucitt (“**our clients**”).
2. We are instructed as follows:
  - 2.1. On Friday, 22 August 2025, and by way of sheriff, an *ex parte* application together with an order granted on 19 August 2025 was served on our clients at their respective homes.
  - 2.2. The court order interdicted and restrained our clients from, *inter alia*:
    - 2.2.1. dealing with the business of the four entities cited in the application as the third to sixth respondents (“**affected entities**”); and
    - 2.2.2. transacting on and dealing in any way with the banking accounts of the affected entities.
  - 2.3. Our clients are complying with the court order. There are two cards in possession of Jacqueline. Jacqueline has not used either of the cards and will not do so in accordance with the court order. To the extent that your offices require the cards to be handed over, please let us know and we will arrange a convenient date and time for collection of the cards. For good order, we further record that your client granted a company loan to Jacqueline in order for our clients to pay their legal fees. This agreement was reached on Tuesday, 26 August 2025.



- 2.4. The service of the application and court order came as a shock to our clients who were unaware that such drastic and far-reaching steps had been taken by your client. Jacqueline, in particular, was disappointed by the course of action taken by her husband given that she had specifically discussed with your client and requested that an audit be undertaken into the financials of the affected entities.
- 2.5. Following service of the application, Jacqueline sought to discuss the reasons why your client took such drastic action as he was present at the marital home at the time of the service of the application and order. Unfortunately, this conversation was fruitless and resulted in your client leaving the marital home.
- 2.6. On 27 August 2025, your client returned to the marital home where he continues to live with Jacqueline.
3. We have had an opportunity to consider the papers and consult with our clients. Whilst we hold instructions to oppose your client's application, we believe that it is imperative to highlight that the parties involved in the dispute are husband and wife, and father and son. At the core of the dispute is a familial relationship between the parties that is in jeopardy.
4. Moreover, the affected entities and the RegimA brand, which our respective clients have devoted significant time, effort and resources to, stand to be damaged by the ongoing court proceedings (which are a matter of public record).
5. Our clients' intention is to preserve the familial relationship and to ensure the continued success of the affected entities. There is a real risk that having our respective clients embroiled in protracted legal processes will further damage the familial relationships (which are already strained) and cause the affected entities harm. Whilst our clients remain of the view that approaching a court was a drastic step, our clients' main focus is to ensure the continued success of the RegimA brand.
6. In an effort to give effect to the above, our clients are prepared to mediate the dispute. For the avoidance of doubt, we are instructed to record that our clients have no difficulty with a forensic audit being conducted in relation to the affected entities and all related parties who play a role in the businesses.
7. Accordingly, we are instructed to propose, as we hereby do, that the dispute between the parties be referred to mediation before an independent and registered mediator.
8. Insofar as your client contends that a mediation process may result in him being prejudiced, we highlight that:
  - 8.1. If the version contained in your client's founding affidavit is true, he values the affected entities and will take all steps in the affected entities' best interests. This is a common intention of our

respective clients and there is a real possibility that the disputes can be amicably resolved;  
and

8.2. Even if each of the disputes forming the basis of the court papers are not resolved, a mediation may result in issues being curtailed to ensure that only the legitimate disputes between the parties are brought before the High Court.

9. If your client is amenable to mediating the disputes, we propose that:

9.1. The mediation be held as soon as practicably possible;

9.2. The application be held in abeyance pending the outcome of the mediation; and

9.3. In the interim, our clients will abide by the court order insofar as it relates to them.

10. Given the alleged urgency attached to your client's application, we will appreciate receiving your response by close of business on 1 September 2025.

11. All our client's rights remain reserved.

Yours faithfully

**Edward Nathan Sonnenbergs**

This is an electronic transmission and is therefore unsigned.