

# **KINGS LAW REPORTS**

**(ALL SC PLUS MORE)**

**(1998) KLR VOL 4 PART 62 pp. 815-964**

**APRIL 1998**

**Dedicated to the King of kings**

**O. O. NOEL ESQ. Chief Editor**

## **INDEX OF CASES REPORTED**

### **APRIL CONTD.**

5. Onuchukwu v. The State p. 815
6. Knight Frank & Rutley Nigeria v. Attorney-General of Kano State p. 847
7. Shuaibu v. Nigeria-Arab Bank Limited. p. 891

### **COURT OF APPEAL CASES**

1. Government of Kwara State v. Gafar p. 929
2. Akegbejo v. Ataga p. 949

**ALIBI** - Onus - Is on the accused to prove where he was at the time of the incident - And once the defence is put up it is for the Police to investigate it properly - As failure to do so could lead to the conviction being quashed. *Onuchukwu v. The State* p. 815

**ALIBI** - Plea of alibi - Is demolished if the Prosecution adduces sufficient evidence - To fix the person at the scene of crime at the material time - But in the present case there was no such evidence. *Onuchukwu v. The State* p. 815

**APPEALS** - Evaluation of evidence - Where there are clear contradictions in the evidence adduced by the prosecution witnesses - And the trial judge erroneously formed the impression that they are witnesses of truth - The appellate Court is entitled to re evaluate the evidence and make its own assessment. *Onuchukwu v. The State* p. 815

**APPEALS** - Findings of court - Arguments that findings were not based on evidence - Is misconceived - As the court thoroughly considered the evidence - And came to an unimpeachable conclusion. *Shuaibu v. Nigeria-Arab Bank Limited.* p. 891

**APPEALS** - Judgments - Where by an accidental slip a justice who did not partake in the appeal - Appeared in the record as delivering a concurring judgment - The judgment is not incompetent in view of the provisions of s. 258(3) of the 1979 constitution. *Shuaibu v. Nigeria-Arab Bank Limited.* p. 891

**APPEALS** - Remark by a Justice - Which did not amount to a decision within s. 277 (1) of the 1979 Constitution - Cannot be made the subject of appeal. *Shuaibu v. Nigeria-Arab Bank Limited.* p. 891

**CRIMINAL PROCEDURE** - Contradictions in evidence - Such that it

cast reasonable doubt upon the guilt of the accused person - The accused person should not be convicted on the basis of such unreliable evidence. *Onuchukwu v. The State* p. 815

**CRIMINAL PROCEDURE** - Conviction - Could only follow where the charge against an accused has been proved beyond reasonable doubt - And it is the duty of the prosecution to prove the prisoner's guilt - Once there is reasonable doubt created by the available evidence the prisoner is entitled to an acquittal. *Onuchukwu v. The State* p. 815

**CONSTITUTIONAL LAW** - Infringement of the provisions of the Constitution - When unconstitutional contract - Will be declared null and void. *Knight Frank & Rutley Nigeria v. Attorney-General of Kano State* p. 847

**CONSTITUTIONAL LAW** - Ultra vires act - Where the respondent entered into a contract with the appellant - Without constitutional backing - The lower courts rightly held that the respondent acted ultra vires. *Knight Frank & Rutley Nigeria v. Attorney-General of Kano State* p. 847

**DAMAGES** - Quantum meruit - Award of damages on the basis of quantum meruit - Where there was no counter claim to that effect - Such damages cannot be awarded. *Knight Frank & Rutley Nigeria v. Attorney-General of Kano State* p. 847

**MASTER AND SERVANT** - Summary dismissal - Where the servant is guilty of misconduct - Summary dismissal is justified. *Shuaibu v. Nigeria-Arab Bank Limited.* p. 891

### **COURT OF APPEAL CASES**

**APPEALS** - Grounds of Appeal - Classification - Where the grounds qualify to pass as grounds of law - As in the instant case - No leave is required to file them - And they are as such competent grounds. Govern-

ment of Kwara State v. Gafar p. 929 CA

**COURTS** - Jurisdiction of the Courts - May be extended by the Legislature but not by the Courts - For part of the interpretation functions of the Courts is to expound but not to expand it. Government of Kwara State v. Gafar p. 929 CA

**FAIR HEARING** - Jurisdiction - Allegation that the method adopted in raising the issue removed right to fair hearing - Is untenable - As the law requires that the issue can be raised at any stage of the proceedings. Akegbejo v. Ataga p. 949 CA

**JURISDICTION** - Federal High Court - Claim for the enforcement of fundamental rights - Which arose from the activities of a commission of inquiry established by a State Government under its law - The Federal High Court has no jurisdiction to entertain the claim. Government of Kwara State v. Gafar p. 929 CA

**JURISDICTION** - Federal High Court - Agency relationship of the Federal Government with State Governments - Relied on by the trial judge to expand his jurisdiction under s. 230 (1) (9) (r) & (s) of the 1979 constitution as amended - Is misconceived. Government of Kwara State v. Gafar p. 929 CA

**JURISDICTION** - Federal High Court - Where claim involves a federal Government Agency - Exclusive jurisdiction belongs to Federal High court vide s. 230 (1) (q) and (s) of the constitution. Akegbejo v. Ataga p. 949 CA

**JURISDICTION** - Raising the issue of the court's jurisdiction - In the course of a reply to a motion is not wrong - And is not against demurrer proceedings. Akegbejo v. Ataga p. 949 CA

# **INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES**

vii

Arbitration Law Cap. 7 Laws of Northern Nigeria, 1963, s.15 Knight Frank & Rutley Nigeria v. Attorney-General of Kano State p. 847

Assessment Law, Cap. 8 Laws of Northern Nigeria, 1963 Knight Frank & Rutley Nigeria v. Attorney-General of Kano State p. 847

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1979 ss. 4 (1), 7 (1) (5) 274 (1) and (4) (b) Knight Frank & Rutley Nigeria v. Attorney-General of Kano State p. 847; ss. 213 (2) and (3); 258 (1) (2) and (3); 258 (1) (2) and (3); 277 (1), 226 Shuaibu v. Nigeria-Arab Bank Limited. p. 891

Constitution (Suspension and Modification) Decree No. 1 of 1984 Knight Frank & Rutley Nigeria v. Attorney-General of Kano State p. 847

Court of Appeal Act, s. 9 Shuaibu v. Nigeria-Arab Bank Limited. p. 891

Criminal Code, s. 319(1) Onuchukwu v. The State p. 815

Interpretation Law, Cap. 51 Laws of Northern Nigeria, 1963. s. 32 Knight Frank & Rutley Nigeria v. Attorney-General of Kano State p. 847

Interpretation Act, 1964, s 10 (2) Knight Frank & Rutley Nigeria v. Attorney-General of Kano State p. 847

Kano State Local Government Edict No. 5 of 1977 ss. 3. 4. 38 76, 80, 81, 83, 84, 85, 88, 89 Knight Frank & Rutley Nigeria v. Attorney-General of Kano State p. 847

Supreme Court Rules, 1985, O 6 r 8 (7) Knight Frank & Rutley Nigeria v. Attorney-General of Kano State p. 847; O. 8 r. 2(3) & (4) Shuaibu v. Nigeria-Arab Bank Limited. p. 891

Supreme Court Act, s.22 Shuaibu v. Nigeria-Arab Bank Limited. p. 891

**COURT OF APPEAL**

African charter of Human and People Rights (Ratification and Enforcement) Act 10 Laws of the Federation of Nigeria 1990 Government of Kwara State v. Gafar p. 929 CA

Bendel State High Court (Civil Procedure Rules) 1988 Order 214 rule 1, order 8 rule 1. Akegbejo v. Ataga p. 949 CA

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1979 s.33. Akegbejo v. Ataga p. 949 CA; s. 42 Government of Kwara State v. Gafar p. 929 CA

Constitution Suspension and Modification Decree (No 107 of 1993) s. 230 (1) (q) &(s). Akegbejo v. Ataga p. 949 CA; s. 230 (1), (9) (r) and (s) Government of Kwara State v. Gafar p. 929 CA

Decree No. 12 of 1994 Government of Kwara State v. Gafar p. 929 CA

Decree No. 1 of 1984 Government of Kwara State v. Gafar p. 929 CA

Edict No 4 of 1994 Laws of Kwara State Government of Kwara State v. Gafar p. 929 CA

Federal High Court (Amended) Decree No. 60 of 1991. Government of Kwara State v. Gafar p. 929 CA

Federal High Court Act 1990, s. 22(3) Akegbejo v. Ataga p. 949 CA

Fundamental Right (Enforcement Procedure) Rules 1979, O 1 r 2(6) Government of Kwara State v. Gafar p. 929 CA

Public Officers Protection Act Cap 379 Laws of the Federation 1990. Government of Kwara State v. Gafar p. 929 CA

## CORRIGENDUM

ix

In the Court of Appeal case of Fawehinmi v. Abacha published in (1998) 2 KLR (Pt 58) 351 at p. 353 C, instead of "... has now appealed to the Supreme Court" the correct text is ... has now appealed to the Court of Appeal. We are sorry about the error.

It was an editorial error that arose at the early days of our beginning to add novel Court of Appeal decisions within the KLR. We trust that such error will never arise again, but if it mistakenly does, we request you take a clue from the present correction and then read on.

**Caprawino Law Publications Ltd**