

KINGS LAW REPORTS

(ALL SC/NOVEL CA)

(1999) KLR VOL 1 PART 76 pp. 129 - 264

JANUARY 1999

Dedicated to the King of kings

O. O. NOEL ESQ. Chief Editor

INDEX OF CASES REPORTED

JANUARY 1999 CONTD.

5. Fasikun II v. Oluronke II p. 129
6. Ohai v. Akpoemonye p. 165
7. Ecoconsult Ltd. v. Pancho Villa Ltd. p. 179
8. Nasiru v. The State p. 197

COURT OF APPEAL CASES

1. Lonestar Drilling Ltd v. Triveni Engineering & Industries p. 223
2. James Aladu v. The State p. 233

iv **INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (1999) 1 KLR**

APPEALS - Interlocutory appeal - From Court of Appeal to Supreme Court - Now prohibited by statute - Void decisions are not excluded. Ecoconsult Ltd. v. Pancho Villa Ltd. p. 179

APPEALS - Interlocutory decisions of Court of Appeal - Removal of right of appeal therefrom to Supreme Court- The orders now appealed against are interlocutory decisions. Ecoconsult Ltd. v. Pancho Villa Ltd. p. 179

APPEALS - Interlocutory Orders of the Court of Appeal - If made without jurisdiction - Appellant can move that court to set them aside - Refusal might then ground right of appeal to the Supreme Court. Ecoconsult Ltd. v. Pancho Villa Ltd. p. 179

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - Evidence - Right to opt not to testify under s. 33 (11) of the 1979 Constitution - It may not be desirable to exercise this right where in a trial - The prosecution had established a strong case against the accused. Nasiru v. The State p. 197

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - Jurisdiction - Conferred on the Court of Appeal under s. 224(1) of the 1979 Constitution - To receive appeals from the Customary Court of Appeal - The National Assembly has not prescribed matters with respect to which it is permissible to appeal. Ohai v. Akpoemonye p. 165

COURTS - Comment - About failure of accused to testify under the provisions of s. 33 (11) of the 1979 Constitution - Trial judge is at liberty to draw any unfavourable inference - Having regard to the evidence. Nasiru v. The State p. 197

CUSTOMARY LAW - Appeals - Decision of the Customary Court of Appeal - The only matter appealable from it - Is that which involves questions of customary law. Ohai v. Akpoemonye p. 165

CUSTOMARY LAW - Meaning - Question of Customary law - What

customary law means. Ohai v. Akpoemonye p. 165

EVIDENCE - Burden of proof - In a criminal case - Lies on the prosecution
- And the standard required is proof beyond reasonable doubt - But not
beyond any shadow of doubt. Nasiru v. The State p. 197

EVIDENCE - Circumstantial evidence - Proof of death by it - Is accepted
- Because in criminal cases the possibility of always proving the offence
charged by direct evidence is rare. Nasiru v. The State p. 197

EVIDENCE - Criminal trial - Burden of proof - Is upon the prosecution
- But the burden may shift to the accused. Nasiru v. The State p. 197

JUDGMENTS - Finding - Which is patently perverse - As it is not borne
out by the evidence - Must not be allowed to stand. Fasikun II v. Oluronke
II p. 129

JUDGMENTS - Misdirection - By the trial judge - In referring to the
doctrine of res ipsa loquitur - Has not occasioned any miscarriage of
justice. Nasiru v. The State p. 197

JUDGMENTS - Order - To be made where plaintiffs fail to prove their case
- Is to dismiss it - There is no jurisdiction to refer it to the Boundary
Settlement Commission. Fasikun II v. Oluronke II p. 129

JURISDICTION - Defect - Of jurisdiction - The rules of natural justice
- It is only after the court has assumed jurisdiction properly - That
observance of the rules would be looked into. Ohai v. Akpoemonye p. 165

LAND LAW - Survey Plans - Location of the land in dispute - The plans
cannot over ride the evidence of the witnesses. Fasikun II v. Oluronke II
p. 129

LAND LAW - Trespass and injunction - Where from the pleadings the

vi **INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (1999) 1 KLR**

issue of title to the land in dispute was involved - For plaintiff to succeed they had the burden to show a better title to the land. *Fasikun II v. Oluronke II* p. 129

MURDER - Conviction - Based on circumstantial evidence - The statement made by the accused to the Police - Does not constitute a co-existing circumstance which weakens the inference that the accused killed the deceased. *Nasiru v. The State* p. 197

COURT OF APPEAL

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - Fair trial of an accused - Is guaranteed by s. 33 (b) (a) of the Constitution and s. 215 of the CPL - For a proper trial - The provisions ought to be complied with. *James Aladu v. The State* p. 233 CA

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Arraignment - Plea of the accused - Was properly secured in this case - In full compliance with s. 33 (b) (a) of the Constitution and s. 215 CPL. *James Aladu v. The State* p. 233 CA

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Doubt - As to who killed the deceased - To be of any import ought to be a reasonable doubt. *James Aladu v. The State* p. 233 CA

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Identification parade - Is not necessary - Where the witness knew the accused previously. *James Aladu v. The State* p. 233 CA

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Proof beyond reasonable doubt - Is a basic necessity - The degree need not reach certainty - But must carry a high degree of probability. *James Aladu v. The State* p. 233 CA

INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (1999) 1 KLR CA vii

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Statement from the dock - Being unsworn
- Is not evidence that can be cross examined - But the jury can give to it
such weight as they think fit. James Aladu v. The State p. 233 CA

EVIDENCE - Affidavits - Need to comply with the provisions of the Oaths
Act - Failure to use exact word prescribed - Will not render affidavit
invalid. Lonestar Drilling Ltd v. Triveni Engineering & Industries p. 223
CA

EVIDENCE - Expert's opinion - Are admissible on a subject - Upon which
competence to form an opinion - Can only be acquire by a course of special
study or experience. James Aladu v. The State p. 233 CA

MURDER - Defences available to accused - Duty of court to consider
them - Is limited to such defences that fairly arose from the evidence.
James Aladu v. The State p. 233 CA

PRACTICE & PROCEDURE - Stay of proceedings - Principles
to be considered - Applicant's mere apprehension of incomplete
realization of its loss - Is not sufficient to warrant the grant. Lonestar
Drilling Ltd v. Triveni Engineering & Industries p. 223 CA

INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1979, s. 33 (5) and (11)
Nasiru v. The State p. 197; ss.33, 224(1) and 247 Ohai v. Akpoemonye
p. 165

Criminal Code, Cap. 29 Laws of Ogun State of Nigeria, 1978 ss 316 (3)
and 319 Nasiru v. The State p. 197

Customary Court Edict of Bendel State 1984. Ohai v. Akpoemonye p. 165

viii INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES IN (1999) 1 KLR

Evidence Act, Cap 112 of the Laws of the Federation of Nigeria, 1990, ss 19, 28, 136, 138, 139 141, 143 and 149 Nasiru v. The State p. 197

Laws of Oyo State, 1978, s.5 Fasikun II v. Oluronke II p. 129

Local Government and Community Boundaries Settlement Law, Cap. 67, Fasikun II v. Oluronke II p. 129

Sheriffs and Civil Process Act, Cap. 407 Laws of the Federation of Nigeria, 1990 Ohai v. Akpoemonye p. 165

Supreme Court Act, Cap. 424 s. 22 Fasikun II v. Oluronke II p. 129

COURT OF APPEAL

Constitution of Nigeria 1979 s. 31(1) Lonestar Drilling Ltd v. Triveni Engineering & Industries p. 223 CA; s. 33(b) (a) James Aladu v. The State p. 233 CA

Criminal Code Vol II Cap 30 Laws of Eastern Nigeria 1963 ss. 286, 319 James Aladu v. The State p. 233 CA

Criminal Procedure Law ss. 104, 215, 367 (2) James Aladu v. The State p. 233 CA

Evidence Act Cap 112 LFN 1990 s. 216 (3) James Aladu v. The State p. 233 CA

Oaths Act Cap. 333 LNF 1990 s. 13 and 1st schedule Lonestar Drilling Ltd v. Triveni Engineering & Industries p. 223 CA