

# **KINGS LAW REPORTS**

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

**(2001) KLR VOL 2 PART 115 pp. 387 - 542**

**FEBRUARY 2001**

**Dedicated to the King of kings**

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

### **INDEX OF CASES REPORTED**

1. Unilife Development Co. Ltd. v. Adeshigbin p. 387
2. Hambe v. Hueze p. 437
3. Kode v. Yussuf p. 457
4. Adah v. Adah p. 491
5. Nweke v. State p. 501
6. Global Transport Oceanico S.A. v. Free Enterprises Nig. Ltd. p. 521

ii **INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2001) 2 KLR**

**ACTIONS** - Locus standi - Respondent had a right to sue - For non delivery of the pallets of paper to it - As the pallets belonged to him at all material times. Global Transport Oceanico S.A. v. Free Enter. Ltd. p. 521

**APPEALS** - Briefs - Argument in a brief - On issues not backed by the grounds of appeal - Will be discountenanced and struck out. Adah v. Adah p. 491

**APPEALS** - Fresh point - Will not ordinarily be entertained - If lower court had not expressed its view - Or is better placed to deal with it. Global Transport Oceanico S.A. v. Free Enter. Ltd. p. 521

**APPEALS** - Ground of appeal - Competence - Since the ground complained against is clear - It is therefore competent and should not have been struck out. Hambe v. Hueze p. 437

**APPEALS** - Ground of appeal - Which has been struck out - Cannot be used as basis for a decision or judgment. Global Transport Oceanico S.A. v. Free Enter. Ltd. p. 521

**APPEALS** - Grounds of appeal - Alleging error in law and misdirection in fact - Is not ipso facto incompetent - If it otherwise complies with the rules of court. Hambe v. Hueze p. 437

**APPEALS** - Grounds of appeal - Alleging error or misdirection - But fails to provide particulars of such error or misdirection - Is incompetent and liable to be struck out. Global Transport Oceanico S.A. v. Free Enter. Ltd. p. 521

**APPEALS** - Grounds of appeal - If framed to contain particulars of error or misdirection complained of - Without setting them out in different headings - Is competent and is rightly entertained. Global Transport Oceanico S.A. v. Free Enter. Ltd. p. 521

**APPEALS** - Issues - Amounting to academic exercise - Will not be entertained by the court as in this case. *Global Transport Oceanico S.A. v. Free Enter. Ltd.* p. 521

**APPEALS** - Issues - Must be based on the grounds of appeal - Filed by the parties. *Adah v. Adah* p. 491

**APPEALS** - Leave - Supreme Court - Fresh issues - If raised without the leave of the court - Will not be considered. *Global Transport Oceanico S.A. v. Free Enter. Ltd.* p. 521

**APPEALS** - Notice - Defective notice of appeal - Without any competent or valid ground of appeal - Cannot be cured by filing amended grounds out of time - And the appeal should be struck out. *Global Transport Oceanico S.A. v. Free Enter. Ltd.* p. 521

**APPEALS** - *Suo motu* issues - May be raised by the court - But court must not base its decision thereon - Without inviting the parties to address it on such issues. *Hambe v. Hueze* p. 437

**COURTS** - Documents - Interpretation - The responsibility of the court - Is simply to give effect to the intention of the parties - And not to rewrite the lease Agreement for the parties. *Unilife Dev. Co. Ltd. v. Adeshigbin* p. 387

**COURTS** - Duty - Speculation - The duty of the court is not to embark on speculation - But to act upon facts tested before it - According to the rules and law. *Kode v. Yussuf* p. 457

**CRIMINAL PROCEDURE** - Circumstantial Evidence - On the facts of the case - No coexisting circumstances exist - To whittle down the cogency - Of the circumstantial evidence led in the case *Nweke v. State* p. 501

**CRIMINAL PROCEDURE** - Murder - Identification of corpse - Will be sustained despite error in witness's testimony - If sufficient identification is established - And there is no miscarriage of justice. *Nweke v. State* p. 501

**DOCUMENTS** - Interpretation - Fragmentary interpretation of the various clauses of the agreement - Made ascertainment of parties intention distorted, erroneous and unacceptable. *Unilife Dev. Co. Ltd. v. Adeshigbin* p. 387

**DOCUMENTS** - Interpretation - Harmonious interpretation - Is a fundamental rule of interpretation - And lower court was clearly in error in failing to use it. *Unilife Dev. Co. Ltd. v. Adeshigbin* p. 387

**DOCUMENTS** - Interpretation - The use of the phrase 'similar land' - As opposed to 'similar premises' - Used in the Deed of lease - Has the effect of referring strictly to bare land. *Unilife Dev. Co. Ltd. v. Adeshigbin* p. 387

**EVIDENCE** - Expert Evidence - Opinion evidence - Is rightly rejected if it is inconsistent with the evidence at trial. *Nweke v. State* p. 501

**EVIDENCE** - Murder - Circumstantial evidence - The facts proved are cogent, unequivocal and conclusive - With unbroken chain of circumstances - Suggesting guilt of the appellant. *Nweke v. State* p. 501

**JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS** - Distinguishing - The dictum on definition of the word 'premises' - In *Turner v York Motors Property Co. Ltd* is sound - But not applicable to peculiar circumstances of this case. *Unilife Dev. Co. Ltd. v. Adeshigbin* p. 387

**JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS** - Distinguishing - The facts of the case of *Cuff v J & F Stone Property Ltd* - Are distinguishable from the present case. *Unilife Dev. Co. Ltd. v. Adeshigbin* p. 387

**JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS** - Distinguishing - The facts of the present case can be distinguished from Ponsford's case. *Unilife Dev. Co. Ltd. v. Adeshigbin* p. 387

**JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS** - Stare decisis - Meaning of - The principle does not apply to decisions given per incuriam - And a court can depart from its earlier decision - If it was wrong. *Global Transport Oceanico S.A. v. Free Enter. Ltd.* p. 521

**LAND LAW** - Title - As there is a distinction - Between grant of land and settlement - Proof of a grant in this case - Does not amount to proof of title. *Kode v. Yussuf* p. 457

**LAND LAW** - Title - Evidence - Pleadings - Having led evidence - In line with pleading - As to grant of land in dispute to him - Appellant cannot later ask to plead settlement instead of grant. *Kode v. Yussuf* p. 457

**PLEADINGS** - Amendment - Appellate court should not use its discretion - To give approval for an amendment - Prompted by the findings of trial court - In favour of one party. *Kode v. Yussuf* p. 457

**PLEADINGS** - Amendment - Could be allowed at any time - Except in certain circumstances. *Kode v. Yussuf* p. 457

**PLEADINGS** - Amendment sought on appeal - Is incompetent - As it will require defendant - To amend his statement of defence - And lead new evidence thereon - Giving the case a completely different complexion. *Kode v. Yussuf* p. 457

**PLEADINGS** - Amendment - The case of *Laguro v Honsu* - Is distinguishable from present case - As it was merely an amendment - To bring record - In line with evidence adduced. *Kode v. Yussuf* p. 457

**PLEADINGS** - Amendment - Which is designed to overreach - By making a ground of appeal useless - Constitutes an abuse of process of court - And ought to be dismissed. Kode v. Yussuf p. 457

**WORDS & PHRASES** - 'Land' - Where the structures and objects on the land - Are to be excluded in its meaning - It must be shown that this is clearly discernible from the executed or written document. Unilife Dev. Co. Ltd. v. Adeshigbin p. 387

**WORDS & PHRASES** - 'Premises' - Its meaning or definition is elastic - And depends on the facts of each case. Unilife Dev. Co. Ltd. v. Adeshigbin p. 387

## **INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES**

Court of Appeal Rules - Order 3 rule 2 (1) Hambe v. Hueze p. 437; O. 3 r. 2 (2), O. 6 r. 10, O. 3 r. 2 (7) Global Transport Oceanico S.A. v. Free Enter. Ltd. p. 521

Federal High Court (Civil Procedure) Rules 1976 Order 27 & 33 Global Transport Oceanico S.A. v. Free Enter. Ltd. p. 521

Interpretation Act, Cap 192, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria S.3 Unilife Dev. Co. Ltd. v. Adeshigbin p. 387

Supreme Court Rules, 1985 - Order 8, r.2(3) Adah v. Adah p. 491; Order 6 rule 5 (1)(b) Global Transport Oceanico S.A. v. Free Enter. Ltd. p. 521