# Affidavit Analysis - Part 3: Circumstantial and Inferred Points

## Speculative and Circumstantial Points - Inferred or Likely but Not Provable

**Case Number:** 2025-137857  
**Court:** High Court of South Africa, Gauteng Division, Pretoria  
**Classification:** CIRCUMSTANTIAL/INFERRED - Logical but not directly provable  
**Date:** October 12, 2025  
**Prepared by:** Manus AI

## Document Purpose

This document contains **points that are inferred, likely, or circumstantial but cannot be directly proven** with current evidence. These points are based on:

* Logical inferences from proven facts
* Circumstantial patterns
* Reasonable assumptions
* Expert opinions without direct proof
* Probable scenarios without documentation
* Contextual interpretations

These points **should be used cautiously** in the affidavit, if at all. They may be useful for:

* Internal case strategy
* Understanding the full picture
* Identifying areas for further investigation
* Anticipating opposing arguments
* Contextualizing proven facts

**Recommendation:** Use these points only with heavy qualification (e.g., "it appears," "it is likely," "circumstances suggest") or omit from affidavit entirely and reserve for oral argument or further investigation.

## CATEGORY 1: Subjective Intent and Mental State

### 1.1 Peter's Actual Cognitive State

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Affidavit claims early-onset dementia, confusion, deterioration
* Actions show sophisticated planning (ex parte interdict, fraud in inducement)
* Contradiction between claims and demonstrated capability

**What We Infer:**

* Peter may have selective cognitive impairment (some areas affected, others retained)
* OR cognitive impairment claims may be exaggerated for litigation purposes
* OR Peter may have genuine decline but retained strategic capability
* OR Peter plans strategy while Rynette executes details

**Why Not Provable:**

* Cannot access Peter's medical records without court order
* Cognitive state is subjective and requires expert evaluation
* Contradiction documented, but actual mental state unknown
* Multiple explanations possible, cannot prove which is correct

**Strength:** Weak - Multiple possible explanations, no direct evidence

**Affidavit Use:** Avoid specific claims about Peter's actual mental state; note contradiction only

### 1.2 Peter's Knowledge of Rynette's Actions

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Rynette signed "pp Peter" (acting on his behalf)
* Rynette controlled [pete@regima.com](mailto:pete@regima.com)
* Peter benefited from fraud (Villa Via extraction)
* Peter obtained ex parte interdict

**What We Infer:**

* Peter likely knew of Rynette's actions (agency relationship)
* Peter likely directed or approved Rynette's conduct
* Peter's "computer illiteracy" doesn't equal ignorance of Rynette's actions
* Peter and Rynette likely coordinated throughout

**Why Not Provable:**

* No direct evidence of Peter's knowledge (no emails from Peter, no recordings)
* Agency relationship proven, but specific knowledge inferred
* Benefit suggests knowledge, but doesn't prove it
* Peter could theoretically claim ignorance (though implausible)

**Strength:** Medium-Weak - Agency proven, specific knowledge inferred

**Affidavit Use:** State agency relationship and benefit, avoid claiming specific knowledge without proof

### 1.3 Rynette's Motive and Intent

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Rynette controlled financial systems
* Rynette acted as Peter's agent
* Rynette coordinated fraud scheme
* Affidavit suggests extra-marital affair with Peter

**What We Infer:**

* Rynette's motive may be financial benefit
* OR relationship with Peter (if affair exists)
* OR professional advancement
* OR combination of factors

**Why Not Provable:**

* Motive is subjective psychological state
* No direct evidence of Rynette's intentions
* Affair alleged but not proven
* Actions documented, motive inferred

**Strength:** Weak - Actions proven, motive speculative

**Affidavit Use:** Avoid speculation about Rynette's motive; focus on documented actions

### 1.4 Bantjies' Actual Knowledge When Becoming Trustee

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Bantjies was accountant for entities (designed schemes)
* Bantjies became trustee July 2024
* Bantjies received fraud evidence June 2025
* Bantjies supported Peter's interdict August 2025

**What We Infer:**

* Bantjies likely knew of fraud schemes when becoming trustee (he designed them)
* Bantjies likely knew accepting trustee position created conflict
* Bantjies likely understood fiduciary duties he was undertaking
* Bantjies likely knew supporting Peter would breach duty to Jax/Dan

**Why Not Provable:**

* No direct evidence of Bantjies' knowledge in July 2024
* Professional knowledge inferred from accountant role
* Fiduciary duty knowledge expected (professional should know)
* Actual subjective knowledge cannot be proven

**Strength:** Medium-Weak - Professional role suggests knowledge, but not proven

**Affidavit Use:** State Bantjies' professional role and fiduciary duties, avoid claiming specific knowledge without proof

## CATEGORY 2: Specific Fraud Mechanisms

### 2.1 Exact Villa Via Profit Extraction Amount

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Villa Via 86% profit margin (proven)
* Villa Via charged rent to operating entities
* Extraction occurred over multiple years

**What We Infer:**

* Conservative estimate: ZAR 4M+
* Possible actual amount: ZAR 10M-15M
* Depends on actual rent amounts over time
* Depends on years of operation at 86% margin

**Why Not Provable:**

* Don't have complete rent payment records for all years
* Don't have Villa Via financial statements for all years
* 86% margin proven for documented period
* Exact total requires complete records

**Strength:** Weak for exact amount - Range can be estimated, exact figure unknown

**Affidavit Use:** Use conservative estimate (ZAR 4M+) based on proven margin, avoid claiming exact amount

### 2.2 Strategic Logistics Inventory Adjustment Purpose

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* R5.2M inventory adjustment (proven)
* Adjustment is 10x prior year
* Negative R4.2M finished goods inventory (impossible)
* SLG sells to RST at 38% COS (below cost)

**What We Infer:**

* Adjustment likely represents cumulative transfer pricing difference
* OR year-end manipulation for tax purposes
* OR inventory given away without proper invoicing
* Purpose likely profit shifting from SLG to RST

**Why Not Provable:**

* Don't have detailed inventory records
* Don't have transfer pricing documentation
* Don't have accountant's working papers
* Adjustment proven, purpose inferred from pattern

**Strength:** Medium-Weak - Pattern suggests purpose, but not directly proven

**Affidavit Use:** State the adjustment and red flags, note commercial impossibility, avoid claiming specific purpose without proof

### 2.3 Specific Expenses Dumped on RWW

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* RWW has 0 employees, all expenses
* RST has all employees, minimal expenses (ZAR 16K IT)
* Specific examples: Shopify costs, AppDirect (ZAR 678K)

**What We Infer:**

* Many other expenses likely dumped on RWW
* Full extent of dumping likely larger than documented
* Systematic pattern across all expense categories
* Deliberate allocation to create RWW losses

**Why Not Provable:**

* Don't have complete expense allocation documentation
* Don't have inter-company agreements (if any exist)
* Examples proven, full extent inferred
* Pattern clear, but complete picture requires all records

**Strength:** Medium-Weak - Examples proven, full extent inferred

**Affidavit Use:** State documented examples (Shopify, AppDirect, IT), note pattern, avoid claiming complete extent without proof

### 2.4 Tax Evasion Amount

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Operating entities show losses (SLG: R5.4M)
* Profit entities show profits (Villa Via: 86% margin)
* Tax losses reduce liability
* Profits hidden in different entities

**What We Infer:**

* Substantial tax liability avoided
* Possibly millions in unpaid taxes
* SARS may have claims against entities and individuals
* Tax fraud likely occurred

**Why Not Provable:**

* Would require complete tax analysis by expert
* Would require access to all tax returns
* Would require SARS investigation
* Pattern suggests tax evasion, amount unknown

**Strength:** Weak for amount - Pattern proven, tax evasion probable, amount unknown

**Affidavit Use:** Note pattern suggesting tax manipulation, avoid claiming specific amounts or definitive tax evasion without expert analysis

## CATEGORY 3: Relationship Dynamics

### 3.1 Peter and Rynette Extra-Marital Affair

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Affidavit alleges extra-marital affair (¶27)
* Rynette acted as Peter's agent
* Close working relationship evident
* Rynette controlled Peter's email

**What We Infer:**

* Affair may exist (alleged in affidavit)
* OR close professional relationship misinterpreted
* Relationship nature unknown without direct evidence
* Not relevant to fraud analysis (actions matter, not relationship)

**Why Not Provable:**

* No direct evidence of affair
* Allegation only, no proof
* Relationship nature is private matter
* Not material to fraud claims

**Strength:** Very Weak - Alleged but not proven, not material

**Affidavit Use:** Avoid speculation about personal relationship; focus on professional agency relationship and documented actions

### 3.2 Rynette Manipulating Peter vs. Coordinating with Peter

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Affidavit suggests Rynette manipulated Peter
* Evidence shows Rynette acted "pp Peter" (as agent)
* Peter is primary beneficiary (Villa Via extraction)
* Actions benefited Peter primarily

**What We Infer:**

* More likely coordination than manipulation (Peter benefits most)
* "Manipulation" narrative may be defensive strategy
* Relationship may have elements of both (influence and coordination)
* Cannot definitively prove manipulation vs. coordination

**Why Not Provable:**

* Relationship dynamics are subjective
* Both manipulation and coordination possible
* Peter's cognitive state affects interpretation
* Cannot prove subjective relationship nature

**Strength:** Weak - Evidence suggests coordination, but relationship dynamics unprovable

**Affidavit Use:** State agency relationship and Peter's benefit, avoid characterizing relationship as manipulation or coordination without proof

### 3.3 Bantjies' Relationship with Peter

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Bantjies was accountant for entities
* Bantjies designed profit extraction schemes
* Bantjies became trustee July 2024
* Bantjies supported Peter's interdict

**What We Infer:**

* Long-standing professional relationship
* Financial dependence on Peter (fee income)
* Loyalty to Peter over fiduciary duty
* Possible personal relationship beyond professional

**Why Not Provable:**

* Relationship nature is subjective
* Professional relationship proven, personal unknown
* Financial benefit inferred, dependence unknown
* Loyalty demonstrated by actions, but motivation unknown

**Strength:** Weak - Professional relationship proven, nature and motivation inferred

**Affidavit Use:** State professional relationship and breach of duty, avoid speculation about relationship nature or personal loyalty

## CATEGORY 4: Timeline Speculation

### 4.1 When Peter Decided to Attack Jax

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* May 15: Jax confronts fraud
* May 15-29: Evidence destruction
* August 11: Jax signs "Main Trustee" appointment
* August 14/19: Interdict filed

**What We Infer:**

* Peter likely decided to attack Jax after May 15 confrontation
* OR Peter planned attack earlier and May 15 accelerated it
* Evidence destruction suggests decision made by May 22 (7 days)
* "Main Trustee" signature suggests decision made by August 11

**Why Not Provable:**

* Cannot access Peter's subjective decision-making process
* Timeline shows actions, not decisions
* Decision point inferred from actions
* Multiple possible timelines

**Strength:** Weak - Actions documented, decision timing speculative

**Affidavit Use:** State action timeline only, avoid claiming when Peter decided

### 4.2 When Bantjies Joined Conspiracy

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Bantjies designed schemes (as accountant, before July 2024)
* Bantjies became trustee July 2024
* Bantjies received evidence June 2025
* Bantjies supported interdict August 2025

**What We Infer:**

* Bantjies may have been involved from beginning (scheme design)
* OR joined conspiracy when becoming trustee (July 2024)
* OR joined when receiving evidence (June 2025)
* OR joined when supporting interdict (August 2025)

**Why Not Provable:**

* "Conspiracy" requires proof of agreement
* Timing of agreement unknown
* Actions documented, agreement timing speculative
* Multiple possible entry points

**Strength:** Very Weak - Actions documented, conspiracy timing unknown

**Affidavit Use:** State Bantjies' actions at each stage, avoid claiming specific conspiracy timeline

### 4.3 When Evidence Destruction Was Planned

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* May 15: Jax confronts
* May 22: Shopify destroyed (7 days later)
* Targeted destruction of specific evidence

**What We Infer:**

* Planning likely occurred between May 15-22
* OR destruction was pre-planned response to exposure
* 7-day gap suggests deliberation, not panic
* Targeted nature suggests careful planning

**Why Not Provable:**

* Cannot access planning discussions
* Timeline shows execution, not planning
* Planning inferred from targeted nature
* Could have been planned earlier or decided quickly

**Strength:** Weak - Execution documented, planning timing speculative

**Affidavit Use:** State destruction timeline and targeted nature, avoid claiming when planning occurred

## CATEGORY 5: Kayla's Death and Fraud Escalation

### 5.1 Kayla's Death as Opportunity for Fraud Escalation

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Kayla died 2023
* Kayla was legitimate operator (July 26, 2017 email)
* Phone number 011 615 29869 transferred from Kayla to Rynette
* Fraud escalated after Kayla's death

**What We Infer:**

* Kayla's death removed obstacle to fraud
* Kayla may have prevented or detected fraud while alive
* Fraud escalated because Kayla was no longer present
* Rynette appropriated Kayla's role and assets

**Why Not Provable:**

* Cannot prove Kayla would have prevented fraud
* Cannot prove fraud was planned around her death
* Timing correlation doesn't prove causation
* Kayla's death and fraud escalation may be coincidental

**Strength:** Very Weak - Timing correlation, causation unprovable

**Affidavit Use:** State Kayla's role as legitimate operator and timing of death, avoid claiming death enabled fraud

### 5.2 R1.8M Stolen After Kayla's Death

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Repository mentions "Kayla murdered, R1.8M stolen"
* Kayla died 2023
* Timing correlation with fraud escalation

**What We Infer:**

* R1.8M may have been stolen in connection with Kayla's death
* May be separate theft or part of broader fraud scheme
* May be related to insurance, estate, or business assets

**Why Not Provable:**

* No direct evidence of R1.8M theft in provided documents
* Repository reference not substantiated with documents
* Cannot verify amount or circumstances
* May be separate matter requiring investigation

**Strength:** Very Weak - Repository mention only, no supporting documents

**Affidavit Use:** AVOID - No supporting documentation provided, requires investigation before inclusion

### 5.3 Kayla's Death as "Murder" vs. Natural/Accidental

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Repository references "Kayla murdered"
* No supporting documentation provided
* Death occurred 2023

**What We Infer:**

* Repository may have information not provided
* OR "murdered" may be emotional characterization
* OR actual evidence of foul play exists elsewhere
* Cannot verify without investigation

**Why Not Provable:**

* No death certificate provided
* No police report provided
* No investigation documentation provided
* Repository reference only

**Strength:** Very Weak - Repository mention only, no evidence

**Affidavit Use:** AVOID ENTIRELY - Serious allegation requiring substantial proof, none provided

## CATEGORY 6: Broader Conspiracy Theories

### 6.1 Pre-Planned Scheme from Trust Creation (2013)

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Trust created 2013
* Assets transferred 2014
* Fraud schemes operated for years
* Betrayal occurred 2025

**What We Infer:**

* Scheme may have been planned from beginning
* OR scheme evolved over time
* OR opportunistic fraud rather than pre-planned
* Cannot determine when fraud scheme originated

**Why Not Provable:**

* No evidence of planning in 2013-2014
* Fraud schemes evident, but origin timing unknown
* Could have been planned or evolved
* Cannot prove Peter's intent in 2013

**Strength:** Very Weak - Schemes documented, origin timing unknown

**Affidavit Use:** AVOID - State when schemes became evident, avoid claiming pre-planning without proof

### 6.2 Bantjies Designed Schemes Specifically for Fraud

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Bantjies was accountant
* Schemes have fraudulent characteristics (86% margin, transfer pricing, expense dumping)
* Bantjies benefited from professional fees

**What We Infer:**

* Bantjies may have designed schemes knowing they were fraudulent
* OR Bantjies designed "aggressive" structures that became fraudulent
* OR Bantjies designed legitimate structures that were misused
* Cannot prove Bantjies' intent when designing

**Why Not Provable:**

* No evidence of Bantjies' intent when designing schemes
* Schemes may have been presented as legitimate tax planning
* Fraudulent use doesn't prove fraudulent design
* Intent at design stage unknown

**Strength:** Weak - Schemes are fraudulent, designer's intent unknown

**Affidavit Use:** State Bantjies designed schemes and their fraudulent characteristics, avoid claiming Bantjies intended fraud without proof

### 6.3 Coordinated Plan to Exclude Dan from Businesses

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Dan's entities (RWW) subjected to expense dumping
* Dan blamed for "excessive spending"
* Ex parte interdict excluded Dan
* Pattern harms Dan specifically

**What We Infer:**

* May be coordinated plan to exclude Dan
* OR Dan harmed as collateral damage of excluding Jax
* OR Dan harmed by schemes designed to benefit Peter
* Cannot prove coordinated plan to target Dan specifically

**Why Not Provable:**

* No direct evidence of plan to exclude Dan
* Dan's harm documented, but intent to harm unknown
* May be consequence rather than goal
* Cannot prove conspiracy to target Dan specifically

**Strength:** Weak - Dan's harm documented, coordinated plan to harm him unprovable

**Affidavit Use:** State Dan's harm and exclusion, avoid claiming coordinated plan without proof

## CATEGORY 7: Legal Characterizations Requiring Proof

### 7.1 Criminal Conspiracy (vs. Civil Coordination)

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Coordination documented (emails, timeline, actions)
* Multiple parties involved (Peter, Rynette, Bantjies)
* Pattern of coordinated actions
* Mutual benefit evident

**What We Infer:**

* Likely criminal conspiracy (agreement to commit crimes)
* Coordination proven, criminal agreement inferred
* Pattern strongly suggests conspiracy
* Criminal prosecution would be warranted

**Why Not Provable:**

* Criminal conspiracy requires proof of agreement
* Coordination shown, but specific agreement not documented
* Criminal standard higher than civil standard
* Prosecution would need to prove agreement beyond reasonable doubt

**Strength:** Medium-Weak for criminal - Civil coordination proven, criminal conspiracy requires prosecution

**Affidavit Use:** State coordination and pattern, note circumstances suggest conspiracy, avoid definitive criminal characterization without prosecution

### 7.2 Money Laundering

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Funds extracted through Villa Via (ZAR 4M+)
* Funds moved through multiple entities
* Corporate structure obscures fund flows
* Profits hidden in trust structure

**What We Infer:**

* May constitute money laundering (concealing proceeds of crime)
* Corporate structure may be laundering mechanism
* Trust may be used to hide proceeds
* FICA violations likely

**Why Not Provable:**

* Money laundering requires proof of predicate crime
* Requires proof of intent to conceal
* Requires tracing of specific funds
* Complex analysis requiring expert and investigation

**Strength:** Weak - Pattern suggests laundering, proof requires extensive investigation

**Affidavit Use:** AVOID - Serious criminal allegation requiring substantial proof and expert analysis

### 7.3 RICO/Racketeering (Criminal Enterprise)

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Multiple entities involved
* Systematic fraud over years
* Multiple parties coordinating
* Pattern of criminal activity

**What We Infer:**

* May constitute racketeering (criminal enterprise)
* Entities used as criminal enterprise
* Pattern of racketeering activity
* RICO-type charges may be appropriate

**Why Not Provable:**

* Racketeering requires proof of enterprise and pattern
* Requires multiple predicate crimes proven
* Complex legal analysis required
* South African law may not have exact RICO equivalent

**Strength:** Very Weak - Pattern evident, racketeering characterization requires extensive legal analysis

**Affidavit Use:** AVOID - Complex legal characterization requiring expert analysis and prosecution

## CATEGORY 8: Damages and Remedies

### 8.1 Total Damages Amount

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Villa Via extraction: ZAR 4M+ (conservative)
* Strategic Logistics loss: R5.4M
* RWW expense dumping: Amount unknown
* UK funding: $77,000+ (ZAR 1.4M+)
* Other damages: Unknown

**What We Infer:**

* Total damages likely ZAR 10M-20M+
* Possibly much higher with complete analysis
* Multiple damage categories
* Full accounting required

**Why Not Provable:**

* Don't have complete financial records
* Don't have forensic accounting analysis
* Some damages documented, total unknown
* Requires comprehensive investigation

**Strength:** Weak for total - Components documented, total requires forensic analysis

**Affidavit Use:** State documented damage categories, avoid claiming total without forensic analysis

### 8.2 Punitive Damages Warranted

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Trustee fraud (highest duty violated)
* Founder's betrayal (Peter corrupted own trust)
* Fraud in inducement (deception to obtain signature)
* 11-year partnership destroyed

**What We Infer:**

* Conduct warrants punitive damages
* Highest level of betrayal and breach
* Deterrent effect needed
* Exemplary damages appropriate

**Why Not Provable:**

* Punitive damages are discretionary
* Court must decide if warranted
* Conduct documented, punitive award uncertain
* Depends on court's assessment

**Strength:** Medium - Conduct warrants consideration, award uncertain

**Affidavit Use:** State conduct and breaches, request punitive damages, but award is discretionary

### 8.3 Trust Dissolution Warranted

**CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE:**

**What We Know:**

* Trust operated for criminal purposes (fraud schemes)
* Founder corrupted own trust (Peter)
* Trustees breached duties (Peter and Bantjies)
* Trust purpose (family protection) completely violated

**What We Infer:**

* Trust dissolution appropriate remedy
* Trust cannot fulfill original purpose
* Corruption too extensive for reform
* Dissolution and distribution to beneficiaries warranted

**Why Not Provable:**

* Dissolution is discretionary remedy
* Court must decide if warranted
* Conduct supports dissolution, but not guaranteed
* Alternative remedies possible (new trustees, etc.)

**Strength:** Medium-High - Conduct supports dissolution, but remedy is discretionary

**Affidavit Use:** State conduct and violations, request dissolution as appropriate remedy, but outcome uncertain

## Summary of Circumstantial/Inferred Points

### Subjective Intent (4 Points)

1. Peter's actual cognitive state - Multiple explanations, unprovable
2. Peter's knowledge of Rynette's actions - Agency proven, knowledge inferred
3. Rynette's motive - Actions proven, motive speculative
4. Bantjies' knowledge when becoming trustee - Role proven, knowledge inferred

### Fraud Mechanisms (4 Points)

1. Exact Villa Via extraction amount - Margin proven, exact total unknown
2. SLG inventory adjustment purpose - Adjustment proven, purpose inferred
3. Specific expenses dumped on RWW - Examples proven, full extent unknown
4. Tax evasion amount - Pattern proven, amount unknown

### Relationships (3 Points)

1. Peter/Rynette affair - Alleged, not proven, not material
2. Manipulation vs. coordination - Evidence suggests coordination, dynamics unprovable
3. Bantjies/Peter relationship - Professional proven, nature unknown

### Timeline Speculation (3 Points)

1. When Peter decided to attack - Actions documented, decision timing unknown
2. When Bantjies joined conspiracy - Actions documented, timing unknown
3. When destruction was planned - Execution documented, planning timing unknown

### Kayla's Death (3 Points)

1. Death as fraud opportunity - Timing correlation, causation unprovable
2. R1.8M stolen - Repository mention, no documentation
3. "Murder" characterization - Repository mention, no evidence

### Conspiracy Theories (3 Points)

1. Pre-planned from 2013 - Schemes documented, origin unknown
2. Bantjies designed for fraud - Schemes fraudulent, intent unknown
3. Plan to exclude Dan - Harm documented, coordinated plan unprovable

### Legal Characterizations (3 Points)

1. Criminal conspiracy - Coordination proven, criminal agreement requires prosecution
2. Money laundering - Pattern suggests, proof requires investigation
3. Racketeering - Pattern evident, characterization requires extensive analysis

### Damages (3 Points)

1. Total damages amount - Components documented, total requires forensic analysis
2. Punitive damages - Conduct warrants, award discretionary
3. Trust dissolution - Conduct supports, remedy discretionary

## Total: 26 Circumstantial/Inferred Points

**These points are based on:**

* Logical inferences from proven facts
* Circumstantial patterns
* Reasonable assumptions
* Probable scenarios without documentation

**These points should be used cautiously or avoided in the affidavit.**

## Recommended Approach for Affidavit

### AVOID ENTIRELY

* Kayla's death as "murder" (Point 17)
* R1.8M stolen (Point 16)
* Money laundering (Point 22)
* Racketeering (Point 23)
* Peter/Rynette affair (Point 9)
* Pre-planned scheme from 2013 (Point 18)
* Total damages amount (Point 24)

**Reason:** Serious allegations or claims requiring substantial proof not currently available

### USE WITH HEAVY QUALIFICATION

* Peter's cognitive state (Point 1) - Note contradiction only
* Coordination vs. manipulation (Point 10) - State agency and benefit
* Fraud mechanisms purposes (Points 6, 7, 8) - State patterns, note implications
* Timeline speculation (Points 12, 13, 14) - State actions only
* Criminal characterizations (Point 21) - Note pattern, suggest investigation

**Language:** "It appears," "circumstances suggest," "the pattern indicates," "further investigation may reveal"

### RESERVE FOR STRATEGY/ARGUMENT

* Punitive damages (Point 25) - Request but acknowledge discretion
* Trust dissolution (Point 26) - Request as appropriate remedy
* Conspiracy theories (Points 19, 20) - Use to understand full picture
* Relationship dynamics (Point 11) - Context for understanding actions

### USE FOR INVESTIGATION

* Exact amounts (Points 5, 8, 24) - Identify areas for forensic analysis
* Kayla's death circumstances (Points 15, 16, 17) - Investigate separately
* Bantjies' knowledge and intent (Points 4, 19) - Discovery target
* Timeline details (Points 12, 13, 14) - Discovery and witness testimony

## Key Principle for Affidavit Drafting

**For each point in this document, ask:**

1. **Is it necessary?** Can the case be made without it?
2. **Is it provable?** Do we have documents or will witnesses testify?
3. **Is it defensible?** Can we defend it under cross-examination?
4. **Is it strategic?** Does it help or hurt our case?

**If the answer to any question is "no," consider omitting the point from the affidavit.**

**Better to have a strong affidavit with fewer, proven points than a weak affidavit with many speculative claims.**

## Strength Assessment Summary

### Very Weak (Avoid)

* Points 9, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23

### Weak (Use with extreme caution)

* Points 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 19, 20, 24

### Medium-Weak (Qualify heavily)

* Points 2, 6, 7, 10, 21

### Medium (Defensible with qualification)

* Points 25, 26

**Document Classification:** CIRCUMSTANTIAL/INFERRED  
**Evidentiary Standard:** Logical inferences and probable scenarios without direct proof  
**Affidavit Use:** Use cautiously with heavy qualification or avoid entirely  
**Total Points:** 26

**Analysis Prepared by:** Manus AI  
**Date:** October 12, 2025  
**Case:** 2025-137857 (High Court of South Africa, Gauteng Division, Pretoria)

## Final Recommendation

**Focus the affidavit on Part 1 (Irrefutable Proof) and Part 2 (Strong Evidence).**

**Use Part 3 (Circumstantial/Inferred) primarily for:**

* Internal case strategy
* Understanding the full picture
* Identifying investigation targets
* Anticipating opposing arguments
* Oral argument (not written affidavit)

**The strongest affidavit is built on irrefutable facts and strong evidence, not speculation.**