

KINGS LAW REPORTS

(ALL SC/NOVEL CA)

(1998) KLR VOL 12 PART 74 pp. 2649-2874

DECEMBER 1998

Dedicated to the King of kings

O. O. NOEL ESQ. Chief Editor

INDEX OF CASES REPORTED

- 5. Mohammed v. Hussein p. 2649
 - 6. Omoborinola II v. Military Governor of Ondo State p. 2713
 - 7. Kalu v. The State p. 2739
 - 8. Okoro v. The State p. 2837
- [ALL ARE SC CASES. NO NOVEL CA IS ADDED IN THIS VOL.]

*ALL SC 1998 DECISIONS TALLING 87 CASES AND 29 NOVEL
CA CASES ARE PUBLISHED IN THIS 1998 SET OF THE KLR.*

iv **INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (1998) 12 KLR**

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW - Commission of Inquiry - Complaint that the findings and recommendations of the commission are contradictory - Is unfounded - And nothing stops the State Government from acting on its white paper. *Omoborinola II v. Military Governor of Ondo State* p. 2713

APPEALS - Concurrent findings - Of both the trial and appellate court - Have not been shown to be wrong or perverse - To warrant interference by the Supreme Court. *Mohammed v. Hussein* p. 2649

APPEALS - Judgments - Comments by the Court of Appeal - Which in no way affected what the learned trial judge had done - Is not a confirmation of the judgment on grounds other than those relied upon by the trial court. *Omoborinola II v. Military Governor of Ondo State* p. 2713

APPEALS - Notice of appeal - When the trial court granted the application to set aside its default judgment - The notice of appeal pending became impliedly abandoned. *Mohammed v. Hussein* p. 2649

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - Constitutional issue - Like the question of jurisdiction is fundamental - And must be disposed of as soon as it is raised - To ensure that the proceedings is not rendered nugatory. *Kalu v. The State* p. 2739

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - Constitutional rights - Enforcement procedure - By s. 42 of the Constitution original jurisdiction to entertain the matter is conferred on the High Court - And not the Supreme Court. *Kalu v. The State* p. 2739

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - Death penalty - S. 30 (1) of the 1979 Constitution - The provision thereof - Has not proscribed the death penalty. *Kalu v. The State* p. 2739

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - Fundamental rights - The question whether or not the appellant is or has been subjected to torture - Contrary to S. 31(1)

(a) of the Constitution - Cannot be decided in the present appeal as it is not intrinsic to it. Okoro v. The State p. 2837

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - Inconsistency - Provisions of ss. 30 (1), 213 (2) (d) and 220 (1) (e) - By their combined effect on the death sentence - Are not inconsistent with any provision of the Constitution. Kalu v. The State p. 2739

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - Interpretation - Ambiguity - The provisions of s. 30 (1) of the 1979 constitution - Is free from ambiguity - It protects the right to life - And permits life to be taken in execution of the sentence of a court. Kalu v. The State p. 2739

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - Interpretation - Of the constitution - The fundamental principles that govern it. Kalu v. The State p. 2739

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - Interpretation - Right recognized under s. 30 (1) of the Constitution - If the legislature had intended to take away the right by s. 31 (1) (a) of the same document - It would have done this by clear terms. Kalu v. The State p. 2739

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - Right to life - Under S. 30 (1) of the 1979 Constitution - The death penalty is not inconsistent with the section. Okoro v. The State p. 2837

COURTS - Legislation - Revocation of the law providing for death penalty - Is not a matter for the Law Courts - But is within the exclusive jurisdiction of the legislature. Kalu v. The State p. 2739

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Arraignment - Requirements of proper arraignment - Laid down in KAJUBO'S CASE - The arraignment of the appellant accorded with the requirements. Okoro v. The State p. 2837

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Arraignment - Provisions of s. 215 Criminal

vi INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (1998) 12 KLR

Procedure Law - Must be strictly complied with - For there to be a valid arraignment. *Kalu v. The State* p. 2739

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Arraignment - Validity - The necessary procedure was complied with in the present case. *Kalu v. The State* p. 2739

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Evidence - Proof beyond reasonable doubt - In the circumstances of the present case - The case against the Appellant was not proved beyond reasonable doubt. *Okoro v. The State* p. 2837

EVIDENCE - Admissibility - Extra-judicial statement made by the Appellant's wife - Who was not called as a witness - Cannot be inadmissible under s.161 of the Evidence Act. *Okoro v. The State* p. 2837

EVIDENCE - Admissibility - Inadmissible evidence which was not objected to - This will not affect its inadmissibility - As parties cannot by consent admit in evidence that which by law is inadmissible. *Okoro v. The State* p. 2837

EVIDENCE - Hearsay Evidence - Admissibility - The extra - judicial statement of the Appellant's wife who is not called as a witness - Is hearsay evidence - And is inadmissible. *Okoro v. The State* p. 2837

EVIDENCE - Proof - Where the plaintiff raised an issue but led no evidence in proof thereof - The issue is deemed to have been abandoned - And whatever the Court of Appeal said thereon went to no issue. *Omoborinola II v. Military Governor of Ondo State* p. 2713

EVIDENCE - Wrongful admission of evidence - It's effect - In the present case it could not be said that the mind of the learned trial judge - Was not affected by the evidence. *Okoro v. The State* p. 2837

JUDGMENTS - Default judgment - Application to set aside - Is prima facie not an abuse of process - Where neither the appeal filed by the applicant was entered nor was the order on the default judgment drawn up. Mohammed v. Hussein p. 2649

JUDGMENTS - Default judgment - Judgment delivered in the absence of filing a statement of defence - And nonappearance of defence counsel - Is a default judgment. Mohammed v. Hussein p. 2649 Mohammed v. Hussein p. 2649

JUDGMENTS - Evidence - The Rule in KOJO II v. BONSIE - Where the plaintiff failed to prove his case - The learned trial judge had no alternative but to have dismissed the claims - Without recourse to the rule. Omoborinola II v. Military Governor of Ondo State p. 2713

JUDGMENTS - Findings - Of the trial High Court - Which were all unfavourable to the plaintiff - And knocked the bottom out of his case - The case should have been dismissed outright. Omoborinola II v. Military Governor of Ondo State p. 2713

JUDGMENTS - Setting aside - Power of court - Until the court pronounced a judgment on merit or by consent - It retains the power to set it aside - And the power is discretionary. Mohammed v. Hussein p. 2649

MAXIMS - *Omnia praesumuntur rite esse acta* - Arraignment - Carried out in a manner which was substantially regular - The maxim applies in the matter of the validity. Kalu v. The State p. 2739

PRACTICE & PROCEDURE - Default judgment - Oral application to proceed with the hearing of the case made and granted on the same date - The proper thing was to adjourn the case to another date for proof - And to put the other counsel on notice. Mohammed v. Hussein p. 2649

INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1979, ss. 219 and 220
 Mohammed v. Hussein p. 2649; ss 30(1), 31(1) (a), 33(6) (a) and 42(1)
 Okoro v. The State p. 2837; ss. 30 (c), 31 (4) (a) 32, 33 (6) (a), 34, 35,
 36, 37, 38, 41, 42, 213 (2) and 220 (1) (e) Kalu v. The State p. 2739

Constitution of the Republic of Hungary, s. 54 Kalu v. The State p. 2739
 Court of Appeal Act, 1976 section 16
 Court of Appeal Rules, 1981, Orders 1 (22) and; 3(18) (1), (2) and (4)
 Mohammed v. Hussein p. 2649

Criminal Code, cap. 31, Laws of Lagos State of Nigeria, 1973, ss. 319 (1)
 Kalu v. The State p. 2739; ss. 319(1) Okoro v. The State p. 2837
 Criminal Procedure Law, Cap. 32, Laws of Lagos State of Nigeria, 1973,
 ss. 215, 367 (1) Kalu v. The State p. 2739; ss. 215 Okoro v. The State
 p. 2837

Evidence Act, Cap. 112 Laws of the Federation of Nigeria, 1990, s.150
 (1). Kalu v. The State p. 2739; ss. 135, 136 and 137. Omoborinola II v.
 Military Governor of Ondo State p. 2713; ss. 8,161, and 227 Okoro v.
 The State p. 2837

Indian Constitution, Article 21 Kalu v. The State p. 2739
 Jamaican Constitution ss. 14 (1) and 17 Kalu v. The State p. 2739

Kwara State High Court (Civil Procedure) Rules, 1981 Orders 5 (7); 6; 27
 (2) (8) (1) and (10); 32 (15); and 37 (9) Mohammed v. Hussein p. 2649
 South African Constitution, ss. (11) (2), and 9 Kalu v. The State p. 2739

Supreme Court Rules 1985 (as amended) Order 6 (5) (1) and (2)
 Mohammed v. Hussein p. 2649
 Tanzanian Constitution, Article 30 (2) Kalu v. The State p. 2739
 Zimbabwean Constitution, s. 15 (1) Kalu v. The State p. 2739