IN THE HIGH COURT OF SOUTH AFRICA (TRANSVAAL PROVINCIAL DIVISION)

NOT REPORTABLE

CASE NO. 35986/2006

In the matter between:

ROCHE PRODUCTS (PTY) LTD

DATE: 4/4/2008

APPLICANT and

THE COMMISSIONER FOR THE SOUTH AFRICAN REVENUE SERVICE RESPONDENT JUDGMENT GOODEY AJ: 1. INTRODUCTION: 1.1 This is an appeal in terms of Section 47(9)(e) of the Customs and Excise Act No 91 of 1964 ("the Act") against a tariff determination by the Commissioner that Zam-Buk

1.2 -2

is a preparation for the care of the skin as intended in Tariff Heading 33.04 in Part 1 of Schedule No 1 to the Act.

The Applicant contends that Zum-Buk is a medicament as intended in Tariff Heading 30.04. Respondent obviously deny same.

2.

GENERAL:

2.1

2.2 2.3

2.4

2.5

I heard full argument on behalf of both parties.

I am indebted to counsel for the comprehensive heads of argument.

Dr Butkow testified on behalf of the Applicant's case.

Dr Muntingh filed an affidavit on behalf of the Respondent.

Dr Duvenhage also filed an affidavit. It should be mentioned that Dr Duvenhage

inter alia says that Zam-Buk will *"keep the skin moist and in this way allow the skin to heal itself more rapidly."* - this should be further explained by experts or in any event, it calls for further explanation. This has obviously driven the Applicant to

2.6

2.7 2.8

-3

contend that Dr Duvenhage admits that Zam-Buk has therapeutic effect - is this an

admission that it is a medicament?

In passing it should be mentioned that the Applicant contends in its replying affidavit

that if the Tariff Heading of 3004.90 is not appropriate, then Tariff Heading 3004.99

will be appropriate.

Apart from the aforesaid, it should also be pointed out that it is the case of the

Respondent that the Applicant itself has never carried out any comprehensive tests

as far as Zam-Buk is concerned.

I was initially tempted to follow a robust approach, but came to the conclusion that justice will not be properly served if the matter is not referred to trial.

, 3.

Therefore I make the following order:

The application is referred to trial.

2.

The notice of motion shall stand as a simple summons.

3. The notice of intention to oppose shall stand as a notice of intention to

od OODEYAJ

-4 defend.

4. The Applicant shall deliver a declaration within twenty days of this order.

5. Thereafter the rules relating to actions shall apply.

<u>6</u>.

The costs to date shall be reserved for determination by the Trial Court. 2 April 2008