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## ORDER

1. The conviction and sentence are confirmed.
2. The order of forfeiture of $\mathrm{N} \$ 97.00$ to the state is set aside and substituted with the forfeiture of $\mathrm{N} \$ 10.00$ to the state.

## REVIEW JUDGMENT

SHIVUTE J (UNENGU, A J concurring):
[1] The accused appeared in the magistrate's court Grootfontein on a charge of possession of dependence producing substance contravening s 2 (b) of Act 41 of 1971 as amended. He was convicted as charged after the state led evidence.
[2] I am satisfied with the conviction, however, an order was made that $\mathrm{N} \$ 97.00$ was forfeited to the state. According to the record the amount of $\mathrm{N} \$ 97.00$ was not featured anywhere.
[3] I directed a query to the magistrate as to how did the amount of N\$97.00 get involved in the matter?
[4] The learned magistrate responded to the query that, the accused was found with $N \$ 10.00$ in his pocket and not $N \$ 97.00$. Therefore the order should have read $\mathrm{N} \$ 10.00$ forfeited to the state.
[5] I fully agree with the magistrate's explanation that $\mathrm{N} \$ 10.00$ was supposed to be forfeited to the state and not $\mathrm{N} \$ 97.00$.
[6] In the result the following order is made:

1. The conviction and sentence are confirmed.
2. The order of forfeiture of $\mathrm{N} \$ 97.00$ to the state is set aside and substituted with the forfeiture of $\mathrm{N} \$ 10.00$ to the state.
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