

23 November 2026

MADLANGA COMMISSION REJECTS SCANDALOUS STATEMENTS BY SULIMAN CARRIM'S LAWYER

STATEMENT BY JEREMY MICHAELS, SPOKESPERSON OF THE COMMISSION

This statement is issued in response to what was said by Mr Ulrich Roux, Mr Suliman Carrim's attorney, in the Pretoria Magistrate's Court on Friday 20 November 2026. Details of what Mr Roux said are given later in this statement.

On Wednesday 28 October 2026, Mr Carrim was granted bail subject to several conditions. One of those conditions obliged Mr Carrim's legal representative to report in person within 48 hours to the Commission, in order to make the necessary arrangements for Mr Carrim's next appearance before the Commission.

By early afternoon on Friday 30 October 2026, the 48-hour period contemplated by the bail condition had passed and the Commission received several queries from the media as to whether Mr Carrim's legal representatives had complied with the relevant bail condition.

In response to those queries, the Commission issued the following media release on the afternoon of Friday 30 October 2026:

> "S*ULIMAN CARRIM FAILS TO COMPLY WITH BAIL CONDITION*
>
> *STATEMENT BY JEREMY MICHAELS, SPOKESPERSON OF THE COMMISSION**
>
> *The Madlanga Commission can confirm that the attorneys representing Mr Suliman Carrim have written to the Commission merely bringing to its attention the judgment on bail delivered by the Pretoria Magistrate's Court on Wednesday, 28 October 2026, and the relevant bail condition contained in that judgment.*
>
> *The bail condition requires Mr Carrim's attorneys to take the initiative and 'report in person, within 48 hours, to [the Commission] ... in order to make the necessary arrangements for [Mr Carrim's] next appearance before the Inquiry'.*
>
> *Thus the attorneys have not taken the initiative envisaged in the relevant bail condition. As a result, Mr Carrim has failed to comply with the bail condition."*

All of the facts set out in this media statement were correct. Moreover, these facts were known by Mr Carrim's attorney, Mr Roux, to be correct.

Mr Roux was aware of the terms of Mr Carrim's bail conditions. He was also aware of the fact that no member of his firm had presented themselves at the Commission within the stipulated 48-hour period to make the necessary arrangements for Mr Carrim's next appearance at the Commission.

Instead of presenting themselves at the Commission within 48 hours as required by the bail condition, what Mr Carrim's legal representatives did was to address an email to the Commission authored by Mr Roux on 29 October 2026. All that the email did was merely to bring the bail judgment and bail condition to the attention of the Commission. The email made no attempt whatsoever to schedule an in-person meeting to arrange Mr Carrim's next appearance before the Commission as required by the bail condition.

In a letter written on 31 October 2026 pursuant to the Commission's media statement of 30 October 2026 Mr Roux argued that, because the bail condition required action by Mr Carrim's legal representatives, Mr Carrim, of whom no action was required, could not breach the bail condition. This argument is disingenuous. The point is that, as at the deadline on 30 October 2026, the bail condition stood. The legal representatives had not done what the bail condition required of them within the stipulated period. Therein lies the breach. It had nothing to do with what was required of Mr Carrim personally.

Despite his disingenuous argument, in the letter of 31 October 2026, Mr Roux expressly acknowledged the Commission's interpretation of the bail condition as requiring physical attendance rather than communication by email.

On Friday 20 November 2026, in a televised address to the Pretoria Magistrate's Court, Mr Roux stated that the Commission had issued the press statement of 30 October 2026 "maliciously" with the sole intent of causing harm to Mr Carrim and causing confusion.

In the light of what had taken place, which is explained fully above, Mr Roux's utterance not only boggles the mind, but amounts to a gratuitous insult to the Commission. The Commission rejects the utterance with the contempt it deserves. In fact, the utterance is so scandalous that no responsible legal representative could have made it. It was calculated to discredit the Commission.

To the extent that, based on his reference to his "instructions", Mr Roux may seek to hide behind acting on instructions from Mr Carrim in making the reckless, insulting utterance, that will be unavailing because he was aware of all the true facts detailed above. On those facts, the utterance was simply unjustified.

The Commission is considering referring the matter to the Legal Practice Council to investigate a charge of misconduct against Mr Roux for contravention of clauses 57.1 and 57.9 of the Code of Conduct for legal practitioners which prevent a legal practitioner from knowingly relying on allegations which are false in his or her submissions to a Court.

On Friday 20 November 2026 the Pretoria Magistrate's Court instructed Mr Carrim to make arrangements for his appearance, and the Commission awaits his approach in this regard.

//ENDS