

# **KINGS LAW REPORTS**

## **(ALL SC/NOVEL CA)**

**(1998) KLR VOL 7 PART 69 pp. 1835 - 1984**

**JULY 1998**

**Dedicated to the King of kings**

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

### **INDEX OF CASES REPORTED**

#### **JULY CONTD.**

8. Ahmed v. The State p. 1835
9. Babayeju v. Ashamu p. 1861
10. Kada v. Yawa p. 1877
11. U.A.C of Nigeria Ltd. v. Fasheyitan p. 1889
12. Nabisco Inc. v. Allied Biscuits Company Ltd. p. 1901
13. Ovenseri v. Osagiede p. 1917
14. Osakwe v. Nigerian Paper Mill Ltd. p. 1937
15. Umaru v. Abdul-Mudallabi p. 1955

#### **COURT OF APPEAL**

- Ajebon v. The State p. 1979

iv **INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (1998) 7 KLR**

**ACTIONS** - Parties - Necessary party to an action - Is one whose presence is necessary - And should be bound by the result of the action. Babayeju v. Ashamu p. 1861

**APPEALS** - Concurrent findings of fact - Based on admissible evidence - And that were not perverse - The Supreme Court will not interfere. U.A.C of Nigeria Ltd. v. Fasheyitan p. 1889

**APPEALS** - Concurrent findings of fact - The Supreme Court has no duty in interfering with concurrent findings of fact - Unless they are shown to be perverse. Ahmed v. The State p. 1835

**APPEALS** - Evidence - Admission of an exhibit which was prominently made an issue throughout the lower courts proceedings by the Court of Appeal - Is in order - Even if it does not arise from any of the grounds of appeal. Umaru v. Abdul-Mudallabi p. 1955

**APPEALS** - Findings of fact - Where there was nothing on the record to show that such findings were erroneous - The Appeal Court would dismiss the appeal. Ahmed v. The State p. 1835

**APPEALS** - Islamic Law - Prescription - Raising of the issue suo motu by the Court of Appeal is wrong - And whatever it decided on the point goes to no issue. Umaru v. Abdul-Mudallabi p. 1955

**APPEALS** - Issues for determination - Must be related to the grounds of appeal - Issues are to be argued in the brief and not the grounds of appeal. U.A.C of Nigeria Ltd. v. Fasheyitan p. 1889

**APPEALS** - Issues - Should not ordinarily be raised suo motu by an appellate court - But where raised no decision should be based on it - Unless the parties are afforded the opportunity of being heard. Umaru v. Abdul-Mudallabi p. 1955

**APPEALS** - Locus standi - Where the defendants did not cross-appeal in the Court of Appeal - It is late to raise the issue in the Supreme Court. Ovenseri v. Osagiede p. 1917

**APPEALS** - Respondent's notice - It's effect - Is only to vary and retain the judgment - But not its reversal. Nabisco Inc. v. Allied Biscuits Company Ltd. p. 1901

**APPEALS** - Respondent's notice - That did not comply with the requirements - Of Order 3 rule 14 of the Court of Appeal Rules - Is incompetent - And should be struck out. Nabisco Inc. v. Allied Biscuits Company Ltd. p. 1901

**ISLAMIC LAW** - Evidence - Preference - The applicable law is that the evidence of two male credible witnesses is to be preferred - To that of one male credible witness with a complimentary oath. Umaru v. Abdul-Mudallabi p. 1955

**ISLAMIC LAW** - Oath of judgment - Claim affecting a deceased person's estate - Where the respondent acquired title over the land through prescription (hauzi) - He must be made to take the oath. Kada v. Yawa p. 1877

**ISLAMIC LAW** - Oath of rebuttal - Claim of property in the possession of another - The claimant is required to prove his claim by calling witnesses - If he fails the defendant will be called upon to take the oath of rebuttal - Unless the defendant has been in undisturbed possession for up to the period of hauzi (Prescription). Kada v. Yawa p. 1877

**ISLAMIC LAW** - Title by prescription - Where the appellant saw the respondent farming the land in dispute - And did not raise any objection - There is ample evidence to hold that the respondent acquired title by prescription. Kada v. Yawa p. 1877

vi **INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (1998) 7 KLR**

**JUDGMENTS** - Appeal - Against an order of dismissal - The Court of Appeal was right to make the order which the trial court ought to have made - By applying s. 16 Court of Appeal Act. *Ovenseri v. Osagiede* p. 1917

**JUDGMENTS** - Dismissal order - What could be dismissed - Is only an action legally and procedurally before the court. *Ovenseri v. Osagiede* p. 1917

**JUDGMENTS** - Order of a new trial - In view of the findings of the registrar which were not appealed against - And that no miscarriage of justice was occasioned - Nothing can be gained from an order of a new trial. *Nabisco Inc. v. Allied Biscuits Company Ltd.* p. 1901

**JUDGMENTS** - Verdicts - That the trial court can give - In a case properly before the court. *Ovenseri v. Osagiede* p. 1917

**LAND LAW** - Family land - Conveyance - By one Principal member out of three - And without the head of the family joining - Is void ab initio. *Babayaju v. Ashamu* p. 1861

**MASTER & SERVANT** - Dismissal - Misappropriation of company's funds - Is not a criminal offence. *Osakwe v. Nigerian Paper Mill Ltd.* p. 1937

**MASTER & SERVANT** - Dismissal - Right to fair hearing - Allegation of breach - The Board was not obliged to act quasi-judicially - But rather purely administratively. *Osakwe v. Nigerian Paper Mill Ltd.* p. 1937

**MASTER & SERVANT** - Order for reinstatement - In a contract of personal service - Will rarely be made - The remedy against party in breach lies in damages. *Osakwe v. Nigerian Paper Mill Ltd.* p. 1937

**MASTER & SERVANT** - Summary dismissal - For gross misconduct -

Is justified. *Osakwe v. Nigerian Paper Mill Ltd.* p. 1937

**MURDER** - Common Intention - There is plethora of evidence that both the appellant and the 1st accused had the common intention - Of terminating the life of the deceased. *Ahmed v. The State* p. 1835

**MURDER** - Premeditated Killing - From the circumstances of the case the two courts below were right in coming to the conclusion - That the deceased died as a result of the concerted criminal act of the 1st accused and the appellant. *Ahmed v. The State* p. 1835

**RES JUDICATA** - Decision - In a Previous Proceeding that is inconclusive - Cannot be used as a res judicata. *Umaru v. Abdul-Mudallabi* p. 1955

**TRADEMARKS** - Application for registration - Opposition proceedings - The general sequence of procedure. *Nabisco Inc. v. Allied Biscuits Company Ltd.* p. 1901

**TRADEMARKS** - Opposition proceedings - Failure by the opponent to file statutory declaration - He is deemed to have abandoned his opposition - But the registrar has a discretion under Regulation 52 of the Trademarks Regulation 1967. *Nabisco Inc. v. Allied Biscuits Company Ltd.* p. 1901

**TRADEMARKS** - Opposition Proceedings - Objection - Contending that there was no evidence - The Registrar is not functus officio after upholding the objection. *Nabisco Inc. v. Allied Biscuits Company Ltd.* p. 1901

**WORDS & PHRASES** - "Brief" - What it connotes. *U.A.C of Nigeria Ltd. v. Fasheyitan* p. 1889

**WORDS AND PHRASES** - Hauzi (Prescription) - Under Islamic law - What it means. *Kada v. Yawa* p. 1877

**WORDS AND PHRASES** - Yaminul Qada'i (oath of judgment) - Under Islamic Law - How defined. Kada v. Yawa p. 1877

**COURT OF APPEAL**

**BAIL** - Sentence - Where applicants are sentenced to a long term of imprisonment - It is not usual to grant bail. Ajebon v. The State p. 1979 CA

**BAIL** - After conviction - Special circumstances that will justify bail - Will depend on particular facts of each application - And may include the nature of the offence. Ajebon v. The State p. 1979 CA

**BAIL** - Grounds for allowing the applications - For bail after conviction - Are not sufficient - Seeing that some of the suspects are still at large. Ajebon v. The State p. 1979 CA

**CRIMINAL PROCEDURE** - Bail - Presumption of innocence - Bail could be granted pending trial - But after conviction bail is granted only on special circumstance. Ajebon v. The State p. 1979 CA

# **INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES**

ix

Area Court (Civil Procedure) (Amendment) Rules, 1980 Rules 7, 16 (3)  
Kada v. Yawa p. 1877

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1979. Section 33. Osakwe  
v. Nigerian Paper Mill Ltd. p. 1937

Court of Appeal Act, 1976, s. 16 Ahmed v. The State p. 1835

Court of Appeal Rules, Order 3 rule 14 Nabisco Inc. v. Allied Biscuits  
Company Ltd. p. 1901

Penal Code, ss. 79 and 221 (a) Ahmed v. The State p. 1835

Supreme Court Rules, 1985 Nabisco Inc. v. Allied Biscuits Company  
Ltd. p. 1901

Trade Marks Act, 1965 (now cap. 436, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria,  
(1990) S 21(1) Nabisco Inc. v. Allied Biscuits Company Ltd. p.  
1901

Trade Marks Regulation, 1967, Regulations 51,52,56, and 106 Nabisco  
Inc. v. Allied Biscuits Company Ltd. p. 1901