COMPLAINTS AND COMPLIANCE COMMITTEE

DATE OF HEARING: 13/8/2025 **CASE NO: 492/2025**
10/7/2026

IN THE MATTER BETWEEN:

BROADCASTING COMPLIANCE UNIT **COMPLAINANT**

V

PRETORIA FM NPC **RESPONDENT**

CCC MEMBERS: Judge Thokozile Masipa – Chairperson
Councilor Catherine Mushi – Member
Mr Monde Mbanga - Member
Mr Thato Mahapa - Member
Mr Paris Mashile – Member
Ms Ngwako Molewa - Member

FROM THE OFFICE OF THE CCC:

Meera Lalla – CCC Manager
Thamsanqa Mtolo - CCC Assessor
Amukelani Masia – CCC Administrator

LEGAL REPRESENTATION FOR PARTIES

For the Complainant : Ms Busisiwe Mashigo
Mr Ashwin Fairbairn-Stewart

For the Respondent: Mr Willie Spies as attorney

DECISION

Judge Thokozile Masipa

INTRODUCTION

[1] On the 7 February 2025, Broadcasting Compliance Unit lodged a complaint with the CCC for investigation in terms of section 17B(a) of the ICASA Act.

THE PARTIES

[2] **The Complainant is the Broadcasting Compliance Unit, (BCU), a division of the Independent Communications Authority of South Africa (ICASA).**

[3] **The Respondent is Pretoria FM, a Community Sound Broadcasting Service Licensee, operating in Pretoria and the environs.**

[4] It is the holder of a Class Broadcasting Service Licence. Furthermore, it has additional Class Licences for each of the seven affiliated stations operating under different names in different locations. It shall be referred to as "Pretoria FM", "the Respondent" or "the Licensee".

THE COMPLAINT

[5] The Complainant alleged that the Respondent contravened two regulations namely:—

5.1 **Regulation 10A(3) of the Standard Terms and Conditions for Class Licences of 2016** which states that:

"A station must clearly identify itself at intervals of not more than thirty (30) minutes".

in that the Respondent's affiliate stations do not identify themselves using the prescribed station names (i.e. Radio Wolkberg, Radio Tafelkop, Radio Ysterberg,

Radio Naboom, Radio Kransberg, Radio Dagbreek, Radio Magaliesburg) as outlined in their licences. Instead, all the stations mentioned, identify themselves as Pretoria FM.

[6] **Regulation 10(1) of the Community Broadcasting Services Regulations of 2019** which states that:

"Majority of programmes, news bulletins and current affairs broadcast by a community broadcasting service must be local originating programmes."

in that, through its monitoring exercise, it further found that the programming between the Respondent and its affiliate stations is identical despite being required to provide services to different geographical areas.

RESPONDENT'S RESPONSE

[7] The Respondent denied the allegations against it. According to the Respondent, the allegations have no basis as they are firstly, based on a wrong interpretation of the law. Secondly, the Respondent's position was that the allegations in these proceedings were similar to those which were resolved by the CCC in 2021, where Pretoria FM had allegedly similarly failed to comply with Regulations. In that matter, the CCC had ruled in favour of the Respondent and dismissed the allegations against it.

[8] The Respondent argued, that since the relevant facts in that matter were essentially identical to those in the present matter, the present matter ought to be similarly dismissed.

[9] With regard to the interpretation of the law, the Respondent referred to the heading of Regulation 10A(3) of the Standard Terms and Conditions for Class licences, 2016. It was argued that because the heading referred to **"GENERAL OBLIGATIONS OF LICENSEES",** the provision regulates the conduct of Licensees. Accordingly, the obligations apply to Pretoria FM, as a Licensee, only, and not to individual stations.

[10] The Respondent submitted that Regulation 10A(3) should clearly be interpreted as meaning that the Licensee ought to identify itself by its licence names and not by

the names of the stations.

[11] In the same breath, the Respondent stated that, immediately it was made aware of the alleged noncompliance, it made amendments with immediate effect.

[12] The amended identification reads thus:

"*You are listening to Pretoria FM which broadcasts over the transmitters of Radio Wolkberg, Ysterberg, Kransberg, Naboom, Dagbreek, Tafelkop and Magaliesburg and nationwide on DSTV's audio bouquet channel 887 and worldwide via the internet or on your smartphone application. Visit us* at www.pretoriafm.co.za"

[13] Suffice to state that the Respondent's defence in this regard is inconsistent with its stated position that it has done no wrong, its defence shall be dealt with later in detail when all the facts are analysed.

THE PROCEEDINGS

[14] Soon after the complaint had been lodged, the Respondent requested a pre-hearing conference.

[15] On the day of the pre-hearing conference, it transpired that the Respondent was considering a settlement agreement between it and the Complainant while the CCC was expected to play the role of mediator.

[16] This is not the role of the CCC as envisaged or contemplated by the legislature. The parties were apprised of this fact and given an opportunity to discuss the issues with a view to independently arriving at a settlement and thereafter to return to the CCC with a proposal.

[17] This was duly done. When proceedings were resumed on 19 November 2025, the focus was on the validity of the proposed settlement agreement and on whether it should be adopted and made an order of the CCC.

THE SETTLEMENT PROPOSAL

[18] When the parties duly presented their proposed settlement agreement, the CCC was not satisfied that it met the requirements as envisaged by the legislature and advised the parties accordingly.

[19] Thereafter, the parties tried once more to reach an agreement but failed. As a result, the matter was set down for hearing for 10 July 2026.

PROCEEDINGS ON THE 10 JULY 2026

[20] On this occasion Counsel for the Respondent, raised a ***point in limine*** alleging that the complaint was filed out of time and that for that reason it had to be dismissed. There was no merit in this argument as a proper calculation of the days confirmed that the complaint was lodged timeously.

[21] The parties then proceeded to make submissions on the merits.

SUBMISSIONS DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

CHARGE 1

Regulation 10A(3)

[22] The Complainant alleged that the Respondent had failed to comply with **Regulation 10A(3) of the Standard Terms and Conditions for Class Licences of 2016**, in that it failed to ensure that each of the affiliate stations clearly identified itself at intervals of 30 minutes.

[23] The Respondent denied this allegation and specifically raised two defences. The first defence, as alluded to earlier, was that the Respondent interpreted the Regulation differently. According to the Respondent, the Regulation is clearly directed at Licensees and not at radio stations as alleged by the Complainant.

For this interpretation, the Respondent relied on the heading:
"GENERAL OBLIGATIONS OF LICENSEES"

According to the Respondent, the heading referred to all obligations of Licensees, which included identifying the stations by its name every 30 minutes.

[24] The Respondent, in addition, raised an alternative defence which was that it was in fact compliant with Regulation 10A (3). In support of this submission, the Respondent referred to the Radio Data System (RDS).

[25] According to the Respondent, the RDS served the role of identifying a radio station to its listeners. It was the Respondent's position that all the affiliate radio stations of Pretoria FM were identified this way. For that reason, therefore, the Respondent was in compliance with the regulations, it was argued.

[26] The first defence has no merit for the simple reason that it is trite that a heading cannot override a clear, unambiguous language of a specific text.

[27] The relevant provision reads:

"A station must clearly identify itself at intervals of not more than thirty (30) minutes".

[28] The language used in the section above is unambiguous. The wording of Regulation 10A (3) is simple and straightforward. The word used is *"station"* not *"licensee".* The plain language of the text tells us, without any doubt, that reference is made to radio stations and not to some other entity. Each station is required to identify "itself". "Itself" is a reflexive pronoun that shows that the subject and the object are exactly one and the same thing.

In my view, therefore, it is the station itself, not the Licensee, that should identify itself. If the Legislature had intended the provision to apply to any other entity, such as the Licensee, it would have said so.

[29] The Respondent, in its submission, also failed to appreciate the importance of a purposive interpretation.

[30] The purposive interpretation of a provision is a judicial method that looks beyond

the literal dictionary meaning of words to find the underlying goal, spirit or policy objectives that the Legislature intended to achieve.

[31] In the present case, instead of applying the text rigidly, it will assist to ask what problem or mischief the law was meant to address and interpret it to fulfil that purpose.

[32] Generally, regulations exist to govern the conduct of industry players and protect them from unnecessary conflicts. In the present case, Regulation 10A (3) helps to, ***inter alia***, resolve interference issues, and for branding purposes. This ensures accountability and allows for proper tracking of radio transmissions.

[33] Accurate station identification is crucial for identifying the source of radio frequency interference and taking steps to resolve it. Without proper identification, it can be difficult to determine which station is causing interference and how to mitigate it.

[34] Station identification also serves as a form of branding. This allows listeners to easily recognise the station and associate it with its programming. This is especially important in a community radio station where listeners, who are members of the community, actively play a role in programming.

[35] The purpose of a 30 minute station identification rule is to inform the public and the regulator, (in this case ICASA) exactly which transmitter they are tuned into.

[36] It is so, that Pretoria FM is permitted to operate multiple distinct affiliate stations on different frequencies or areas. However, identifying the stations purely as Pretoria FM, is misleading and might defeat the regulatory purpose of public identification.

[37] What seals the fate of the Respondent is that each radio station was granted a licence with specific terms and conditions. Among these is the requirement that the station must identify itself. Failure of the Respondent to ensure that each of the affiliate radio stations complies with this requirement is a breach of licence terms and conditions of the licence.

[38] I now proceed to deal with the alternative defence raised by the Respondent.

RDS - Alternative Defence

[39] An alternative defence by the Respondent was that it was, in any event, compliant with Regulation 10A(3) as it identified the individual stations by means of RDS.

[40] RDS was described as a Radio Data System, a communication protocol that allows FM radio stations to transmit small amounts of digital data — such as station names, song titles and time updates — hidden alongside the regular audio broadcasts.

[41] This defence is also devoid of merit for a number of reasons.

[42] The Respondent's submission loses sight of the fact that community radio stations are sound broadcasters meant to cater for grassroots interests. By their very nature, as sound broadcasters, community radio stations are expected to use sound to reach their listeners in the language they understand.

[43] A station identifying itself on-air every 30 minutes fulfills legal broadcasting rules and licensing requirements to prove ownership and operational compliance.
On the other hand, RDS is an automated digital data that could not have been contemplated in the Regulations because of its limited role in identifying a station and cannot be used for purposes of Regulation 10A (3).

CHARGE 2

Regulation 10(1)

[44] The second alleged contravention was that **the Respondent had failed to comply with Regulation 10(1) which reads**:

"Majority of programmes, news bulletins and current affairs broadcast by a community broadcasting service must be local originating programmes." (my emphasis).

[45] The Respondent denied this allegation. In the same breath, it submitted that the issue had been settled in 2021 by the CCC, when the CCC dismissed a case brought against it by Prime Media. The Respondent's submission was that since the facts in

the 2021 CCC ruling were identical to the facts in the present case, the matter ought to be dismissed.

[46] To place this defence in perspective, it is necessary to get into a little detail.

The Relevance, if any, of identical facts

[47] Urging the CCC to dismiss the present case on the basis of similar facts, counsel for the Respondent relied on a 2021 CCC ruling in the matter of **Prime Media v Pretoria FM 414/2021**, a case which the CCC dismissed.

[48] Counsel for the Respondent submitted that in that case *"the CCC investigated and dismissed a complaint by Prime Media against Pretoria FM on the same essential facts: one licensee (Pretoria FM), multiple transmitters serving the same Boere-Afrikaner community of interest, and programme sharing across those transmitters…"*

[49] A further submission was that the following key findings from that case were directly applicable in the present case namely:—

- Pretoria FM and its affiliates constitute one single licensee.
- Programme sharing/syndication regulations refer to "licensees" in the plural and therefore do not apply internally to one licensee.
- Pretoria FM is legally entitled to run seven other stations in seven different localities" for the Boere-Afrikaner community of interest.
- Listeners across geographic areas "are in fact one community which share a specific interest".
- The allegations that Pretoria FM had contravened its licence conditions "has no basis".

[50] Counsel for the Respondent then quoted a number of paragraphs from the **Prime Media** ruling in an attempt to demonstrate that the two cases had essentially identical facts.

[51] The interesting feature of the argument is that the so-called *"identical facts"* refer to the history of the Respondent as well as the manner in which it operated over

the years. This, in my view, has little to do with the core issues that led to the present complaint.

[52] In any event, a proper analysis of both cases shows that they are clearly distinguishable. In the **Prime Media** case the charges against Pretoria FM had to do with syndication of programmes. In the present case we are dealing with an alleged contravention of Regulation 10(1).

In the matter of **Prime Media v Pretoria FM**, the CCC had to determine completely different legal issues. There the Respondent was alleged to have contravened Regulation 10(2) of the Regulations which specifically deals with syndication.

[53] It is notable that in the present case, although reference is made to the origin of programmes, the allegations have nothing to do with syndication. Instead, it is alleged that that the Respondent contravened Regulation 10 (1) of the Standard Terms and Conditions for Class Licences of 2016.

[54] In terms of this Regulation, the majority of programmes, news bulletins and current affairs broadcast by a community radio station must be local originating.

[55] Once more, it is necessary to ask the question what was the rationale for such a regulation? Again, the answer is to be found by looking at what was the mischief sought to be remedied or prevented. An additional consideration may be what is in the interest of the community served by the station.

[56] Requiring the majority of programmes, news bulletins, and current affairs to originate from a community radio station's local area ensures, ***inter alia***, that there is meaningful participation of the community in the affairs of the station. This, in turn, ensures that broadcasts directly reflect everyday regional realities, give a voice to marginalized groups, and hold local leaders accountable rather than duplicating mainstream national media.

[57] The relevance of this is obvious: Residents would rather hear news that affects their daily lives—such as local water cuts, municipal service delivery, weather impacts, or community safety—rather than distant national headlines.

[58] There is also an added advantage for the specific community and it is this: Local current affairs and programming allow community members to do something about issues that affect them. They can, for example, take part in talk shows and debate and resolve issues or question municipal authorities and local power holders directly.

[59] Since one of the aims of a Community Radio station is to improve the lives of the poor and marginalised local people, it makes sense that the local people should be involved in the affairs of the station. And that ideal comes alive if the origin of programmes or news is local.

[60] The strength of a community radio station lies in its ability to educate and inform its listeners, especially the poor and marginalised, about critical issues such as health, education and sustainable development.

[61] This function is unlikely to be carried out successfully if most programmes, news bulletins and current affairs arise outside the local area, as in the case of Pretoria FM. In short, meaningful involvement of the community is unlikely if the origin of the programmes, news bulletins and current affairs comes from without the local area.

[62] Significantly, the requirement relating to the origin of programmes, news bulletins and current affairs applies to all sound broadcasting licensees without exception. This is irrespective of whether the licensee concerned caters for a geographic area or community interests. There is, therefore, no merit in the submission that because the 2021 CCC ruling dismissed the allegations against the Respondent, the present case should also be dismissed.

SUMMARY

[63] **Regulation 10A(3) of the Standard Terms and Conditions for Class Licences of 2016**
states:
"A station must clearly identify itself at intervals of not more than thirty (30) minutes".

[64] What was the intention of the Legislature? In my view, first, the intention was to ensure public accountability for the use of public airwaves. This also serves as branding for the station and allows listeners or viewers to distinguish between various stations.

[65] In addition, the identification of stations, in accordance with the Regulations, allows the audience to identify the source of the broadcast, distinguishing it from other stations. This is essential for tracking content.

[66] Compliance with the Regulation, therefore, entails much more than the station identifying itself. Rather, it means that the station has to communicate its identity by audio over the airwaves, in a manner that its listeners can have access to and in a language that they can understand.

[67] By failing to act in the manner described above, the Respondent failed to comply with Regulation 10A(3) of the Regulations.

[68] I proceed to summarise the Respondent's defence in charge 2.

[69] **Regulation 10(1) of the Community Broadcasting Services Regulations of 2019**
reads thus:

"Majority of programmes, news bulletins and current affairs broadcast by a community broadcasting service must be local originating programmes."

[70] A proper reading of the underlined portion shows that the provision is imperative and the broadcaster has no discretion in the matter. This is so, irrespective of whether the broadcaster caters for a community of interest community or a community in a geographical area. The reason for that is set out hereunder.

Addressing the Needs and Interests of the Community

[71] There is a good reason for the requirement that the origin of programmes must be local. It aligns with the overall purpose of a community sound broadcasting service, which is to serve a specific geographic community or community of interest.

[72] Both those serving a specific geographic community and those serving community of interests, provide a platform for local voices and perspectives.

[73] Whether we are dealing with a geographic community or community of interests, these stations focus on addressing the needs and interests of their listeners. They, ***inter alia,*** act as a conduit for community information, events, and discussions. More importantly, they play an important role in local development and social cohesion. This cannot happen where the origin of the majority of programs, news bulletins and current affairs broadcasts is elsewhere.

The Rationale For Local Originating Programmes

[74] The purpose of Regulation 10(1) is clearly to ensure that the needs and interests of the community are adequately met. That is why it's vital that the majority of programmes, news bulletins, and current affairs broadcast, be local originating programmes.

[75] It follows that the use of content, including news bulletins and current affairs, originating from outside the area where the radio station operates will be against this core element of community radio, and a noncompliance with the Regulation.

[76] In the present case, counsel for the Respondent, watered down the importance of the origin of the programmes, news bulletins etc., and sought to emphasize the bond enjoyed by those with community interests irrespective of where they resided. The answer to this is that every community is to be found in a particular geographical area or location. And this was recognized when each station was granted a licence.

[77] Since community radio stations are deeply rooted in their local areas and aim to reflect the unique character and concerns of the people they serve, it is essential that they adhere to specific befitting guidelines to achieve this purpose. Hence the promulgation of the Regulations.

[78] Pretoria FM's affiliates operate in different geographical locations. The fact that listeners in these locations share the same interests such as Boere music and braai vleis culture etc., is only one of considerations to be borne in mind by a community

radio station. The other is the geographic area.

[79] To ignore the geographical area of a community radio station is to ignore the community itself as the people and the environment in which they live are inextricably linked. One of the benefits to members of the community of having a community radio station is that members of the community can shape their own destinies, among others. In the present case, by failing to ensure that the majority of programmes, news bulletins and current affairs originate locally, Pretoria FM, has in fact, deprived the communities served by its affiliate stations, an opportunity to be actively involved in the affairs of the stations serving them. It has also denied those communities an opportunity to shape their own destinies through the assistance of their community radio stations.

[80] So, while a community radio station, such as Pretoria FM, enjoys the privilege of having a voice in different localities, it has an added responsibility to ensure that the programmes presented are not a one-size-fits-all affair. The programmes for each locality must be designed to cater for specific needs and aspirations of local people. This is because each community represented in the seven areas is different.

[81] An obvious example to demonstrate the above would be farming. Let us suppose that in all the seven geographical locations, where the affiliated stations operate, the communities are predominantly farming communities. That common interest cannot be the only consideration for a community radio station that wants to comply with the regulations.

[82] I say this because farmers in the different geographical areas may have to contend with different challenges and have different aspirations because of where they are located such as the weather, schooling for the children, transportation, security concerns and facilities for the aged etc. To adequately address these needs, programmes must originate from local sources who experience the impact of such issues at first hand.

[83] The last and interesting submission on behalf of the Respondent was that the CCC should consider the history of Pretoria FM and its affiliates and the manner in which they have operated for over 30 years.

The Principle of Equality Before the Law

[84] The difficulty with this submission is that it ignores the principle of equality before the law. All persons are subject to the same laws, regardless of their status or some other characteristics. Counsel for the Complainant, argued, correctly, in our view, that Pretoria FM was not unique in the sense that SABC and Prime Media had a number of stations in their respective stables but still comply with the Regulations.

[85] Counsel for the Respondent, on the other hand, insisted that the Respondent received a special dispensation and cited the decision of the CCC in the matter of Prime Media in support of his argument.

[86] If this argument was correct, it would mean that the principle of equality before the law did not apply to Pretoria FM, while other Licensees, such as the SABC and Prime Media, were expected to comply. That cannot be the correct legal position.

[87] Having regard to the facts of this matter, I am of the view that the Complainant has made out a case for the relief that it seeks.

[88] Before considering recommendations for a sanction, it is necessary to consider aggravating and mitigating circumstances.

AGGRAVATING AND MITIGATING FACTORS

[89] In considering a just and fair sanction for the above contraventions, the CCC took several factors into account. These included the nature and seriousness of the noncompliance, the circumstances under which the noncompliance's occurred, the consequences of the noncompliances, the steps taken by the Respondent to remedy the noncompliance and the steps taken by the Respondent to ensure that similar noncompliances did not occur in the future.
I shall proceed to deal with each in turn.

The Nature and Seriousness of the Noncompliances

[90] Both the contraventions that the Respondent has been charged with are very

serious.

[91] The Regulations are meant to ensure, ***inter alia***, that a community radio station is not one in name only. They are also meant to protect industry players' interests, including those which may be caused by interference etc. That is why noncompliance is viewed in a serious light.

Circumstances Under Which The Noncompliances Occurred

[92] From the history of the matter, it appears that the Respondent operated in this manner for more than 30 years.

[93] This long period, during which the Respondent operated without any complaint against it, may have fueled the mistaken belief that the Respondent was excused from complying with the provisions of the relevant laws.

[94] That belief was misplaced. It was also unfortunate in that for a number of years, it deprived communities served by the affiliated stations, of their rights and responsibilities accorded to them in terms of our Constitution. The right violated here is the right to equality. Every person is equal before the law.

[95] In addition, it served to put a spotlight on what can sadly be regarded as the Achilles heel in our regulatory system. It is unclear and worrisome that a Licensee can operate in noncompliance for so long without being detected and penalized. This shortcoming can be properly addressed below in the recommendations that operations of Pretoria FM be actively supervised by ICASA for a specific period.

Consequences of the Noncompliance

[96] Both charges faced by the Respondent have an impact on the communities served by the affiliated radio stations. Not complying with the regulations in the present case means ignoring the role played by the community in the affairs of the radio station.

Steps Taken By The Respondent to Remedy the Noncompliances

[97] The Respondent sought to remedy its noncompliance with Regulation 10A (3) by amending the manner in which it identified the affiliated radio stations. The result was the following announcement:

"You are listening to Pretoria FM which broadcasts over the transmitters of Radio Wolkberg, Ysterberg, Kransberg, Naboom, Dagbreek, Tafelkop and Magaliesburg and nationwide on DSTV's audio bouquet channel 887 and worldwide via the internet or on your smartphone application.
Visit us at www.pretoriafm@co.za

[98] Needless to say, this attempt did not yield the desired results, as the amended announcement proposed does not accord with objects of Regulation 10A (3).

Steps Taken By the Respondent to Ensure That Similar Noncompliances Did Not Occur In The Future

[99] The Respondent's position was that it had done nothing wrong. For that reason, it took no steps to prevent reoccurrences of the noncompliance in future. Even after ICASA indicated its noncompliance and afforded it the opportunity to correct the situation the Licensee remained noncompliant

FINDING

[100] Having considered all the facts, the CCC makes the finding that:

100.1 the Licensee failed to comply with Regulation 10A(3) of the Regulations, 2016

in that the stations affiliated to Pretoria FM failed to identify themselves by name at intervals of 30 minutes. Instead, Pretoria FM identified itself in respect of all its radio stations.

100.2 the Licensee failed to comply with Regulation 10(1) of the Regulations

in that the majority of its programmes, including news bulletins, current affairs and other programmes do not originate locally. Instead, the

programming for the Respondent and its various stations is identical.

RECOMMENDATIONS IN TERMS OF SECTION 17E(2) OF THE ICASA ACT NO 13 OF 2000

[101] In terms of section 17E(2) of the ICASA Act the CCC recommends to the Authority that the following order be issued to the Licensee:

101.1 that the Licensee desists from any further contravention of the Regulations as set out in the Charge Sheet.

101.2 that the Licensee takes the following remedial measures:

101.2.1 Within one (1) month of the issue of this Order, ensures that each affiliate stations namely: Radio Wolkberg, Radio Ysterberg, Radio Kransberg, Radio Naboom, Radio Dagbreek, Radio Tafelkop and Radio Magaliesberg, complies with Regulation 10A (3) in that each station is to clearly identify itself at intervals of 30 minutes.

101.2.2 Within one (1) month of the issue of this Order, the Licensee shall ensure that each affiliate station namely: Radio Wolkberg, Radio Ysterberg, Radio Kransberg, Radio Naboom, Radio Dagbreek, Radio Tafelkop and Radio Magaliesberg, complies with Regulation 10(1) which reads thus:

"Majority of programmes, news bulletins and current affairs broadcast by a community broadcasting service must be local originating programmes."

101.3 that within one (1) month of the issue of this Order, all seven (7) radio stations namely: Radio Wolkberg, Radio Ysterberg, Radio Kransberg, Radio Naboom, Radio Dagbreek, Radio Tafelkop and Radio Magaliesberg, shall operate as separate and independent radio stations within their respective licensed coverage areas to comply with Regulations 10A (3) and 10(1).

101.4 that for a period of 24 months, after the issue of this Order, the Licensee shall submit to ICASA, every three months, a report confirming its compliance with this Order.

[102] that the Licensee pay an amount of seven hundred thousand rands (R700 000.00) as a fine, amounting to one hundred thousand rands (R100 000.00) per station payable within six (6) months from date of this Order.

TM Masipa

Judge Thokozile Masipa
Chairperson of the CCC

23 September 2026

Date