ANNEXURE C: SAPS Factional Dynamics & Perception Risks

Implications of Allegations Involving Mr Junaid Johnson

---

1. Introduction

This annexure examines the persistent allegations linking Mr Junaid Johnson to internal SAPS factional disputes.

These allegations significantly heighten perception risks for Adv Johnson's independence and therefore directly impact her suitability for appointment as NDPP.

2. Nature of Allegations

Although unproven, public reporting and internal SAPS commentary suggest that Mr Johnson has been perceived as:

- aligned with a SAPS faction engaged in internal power struggles;
- participating in or influencing disputes involving senior officers;
- connected to efforts to undermine or sideline certain SAPS leadership figures.

These allegations have circulated widely in policing and security circles and cannot be dismissed as trivial.

3. Why These Allegations Matter for the NDPP

3.1 NDPP–SAPS Interdependency

The NDPP relies heavily on SAPS cooperation for:

- investigations,
- high-impact prosecutions,
- organised crime,
- corruption cases.

Any perception of proximity to SAPS factions undermines trust within this interdependent relationship.

3.2 Perception of Bias

Even if unproven, the allegations create:

- perception of partiality,
- risk of preferential treatment,
- potential for mistrust among SAPS leadership.

3.3 Magnified by Ethical Breach

Because Adv Johnson failed to recuse herself in spouse-related matters, these allegations assume far greater significance.

4. Operational and Governance Risks

4.1 Compromised Cooperation

Senior SAPS officers may distrust decisions coming from an NDPP perceived to be linked to internal SAPS factions.

4.2 Weaponisation Risk

There is risk that prosecutorial authority could be used — or be perceived as used — to influence internal SAPS battles.

4.3 Risk to High-Profile Prosecutions

SAPS factionalism has already compromised numerous investigations.

An NDPP associated with these dynamics amplifies the danger.