



THE SUPREME COURT OF APPEAL OF SOUTH AFRICA

MEDIA SUMMARY OF JUDGMENT DELIVERED IN THE SUPREME COURT OF APPEAL

From: The Registrar, Supreme Court of Appeal

Date: 21 October 2025

Status: Immediate

The following summary is for the benefit of the media in the reporting of this case and does not form part of the judgments of the Supreme Court of Appeal

Portapa (Pty) Limited t/a Supabets and Others v Casino Association of South Africa and Another, and The Gauteng Gambling Board v Casino Association of South Africa v Portapa (Pty) Ltd t/a Supabets and Others (182/2024 & 215/2024) [2025] ZASCA 158 (21 October 2025)

Today, the Supreme Court of Appeal (SCA) handed down a judgment in which it held that in the business of gambling within the Gauteng Province, bookmakers may not offer fixed-odds bets to punters on the outcomes of roulette games except where they are holders of casino licences. The matter arises from a dispute in which the Gauteng Gambling Board (the Board) allowed Portapa (Pty) Ltd t/a Supabets (Supabets) and Supaworld Gauteng (Pty) Ltd to offer bets on roulette games streamlined from Lithuania. Livestreamed feeds of roulette draws were offered at Supabets and Supaworld venues on the Aardvark software which the Gambling Board had approved.

When the Casino Association of South Africa (CASA) laid a complaint against such conduct on the basis that it was against the law, the Board ruled, after almost ten months of the complaint having been laid, that the conduct was not unlawful. An application instituted by CASA in the Gauteng High Court for a review and setting aside of the ruling was successful. The high court upheld the argument advanced by CASA that s 55 of the Gauteng Gambling Act which limited to sporting events, the contingency on which bookmakers could offer bets, was in conflict with s 4 the National Gambling Act 7 of 2004. The Supabets entities argued that s 4 of the National Gambling Act authorised bookmakers to offer bets on 'any contingency'. The high court rejected this argument holding that there was no conflict between the two statutes and that each played a different role within the national and provincial

gambling laws. The high court further rejected the argument by the Supabets entities that roulette is a sporting game on which bookmakers may offer fixed-odds bets under s 55 of the Gauteng Gambling Act. In addition, the high court held that roulette is a casino game. By offering bets on roulette games without a casino licence, the Supabets entities had contravened the provisions of sections 76(3) and 87 of the Gauteng Act which require that entities must be in possession of casino licences to be able to offer (roulette) casino games.

The SCA agreed with the findings of the high court. It emphasised that the National Gambling Act and the Gauteng Act play complementary roles. There was therefore no conflict between the two Acts. In any event the purpose of s 4 of the National Gambling Act is to explain how bets are placed with bookmakers rather than to define the scope of contingencies on which bookmakers may offer bets.

The SCA highlighted that the Gauteng Provincial Legislature has exclusive jurisdiction to determine and craft policy, and to regulate the issuing of licences in the province. The Court also agreed with the high court's interpretation of 'sporting event' in s 55 of the Gauteng Act and the relevant definitions in s 1 of that Act.

The SCA dismissed the appeal against the judgment of the high court.

~~~~ends~~~~