

KINGS LAW REPORTS

(ALL SC/NOVEL CA)

(2002) KLR VOL 5 PART 138 pp. 1099 - 1280

MAY 2002

Dedicated to the King of kings

O. O. NOEL ESQ. Founder/Publisher

C. L. Onwuegbuna Esq. Chief Editor

INDEX OF CASES REPORTED

1. Attorney-General of Anambra State v. Okeke p. 1099
2. Ani v. State p. 1131
3. Asafa Foods Factory Ltd v. Alraine Nig. Ltd. p. 1147
4. Caribbean Trading & Fidelity Corporation v. Nigerian National Petroleum Corporation p. 1169
5. Ezeokonkwo v. Okeke p. 1185
6. Fatoyinbo v. Osadeyi p. 1211
7. Fawehinmi v. Inspector General of Police p. 1123

COURT OF APPEAL

1. Alao v. Nigerian Industrial Development Bank p. 1267 CA

ii **INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2002) 5 KLR**

ACTIONS - Allegation of crime - Lack of evidence - Effect - In absence of evidence in regard to the alleged crime - Application for order of mandamus ceased to have any purpose - And court will have no business to discuss same (H11) *Fawehinmi v. IGP* p. 1123

AFFIDAVITS - Depositions - Counter-affidavit - Failure to file - Effect - Defendants are deemed to have admitted facts in affidavits - And court is to rely on same (H1) *A-G Anambra State v. Okeke* p. 1099

AGENCY - Agent of foreign principal - Personal liability - Where an agent contracts on behalf of a foreign principal - It is presumed that he is personally liable - Unless a contrary intention appears (H4) *Asafa Foods Factory Ltd v. Alraine Nig Ltd* p. 1147

APPEALS - Committal orders - Validity of - Since 2nd & 5th defendants have ceased to be parties at Court of Appeal - The orders were made in error and should be set aside (H8) *A-G Anambra State v. Okeke* p. 1099

APPEALS - Competence - Issues - Propriety of raising - The issue can be raised in Supreme Court - Because appellate court will not exercise jurisdiction - Over person who is not a party to the proceedings (H6) *A-G Anambra State v. Okeke* p. 1099

APPEALS - Court - Committal application - Jurisdiction - Court of Appeal Act s.16 - Power exercisable by the court - Does not include what trial court could not have done (H11) *A-G Anambra State v. Okeke* p. 1099

APPEALS - Court of Appeal - Exercise of discretion - Correctness of - The court exercised its discretion judicially and judiciously - In accordance with justice and relevant considerations (H6) *Fatoyinbo v. Osadeyi* p. 1211

APPEALS - Determination of - Court of Appeal cannot in all cases - Validly determine on merit - Matter it earlier struck out for improper filing (H9) *A-G Anambra State v. Okeke* p. 1099

APPEALS - Issues - Ruling - Supreme Court will not rule on a point - In which there is no live issue - As between parties before court (H1) Asafa Foods Factory Ltd v. Alraine Nig Ltd p. 1147

APPEALS - Notice of appeal - Service of - By O.7 r.5 Court of Appeal Rules - Notice shall be served on named parties - But parties not directly affected - Need not be served (H5) A-G Anambra State v. Okeke p. 1099

APPEALS - Parties - Right of appeal - 2nd & 5th defendants are parties for purpose of invoking jurisdiction of Supreme Court - To set aside order resulting from their improper inclusion (H7) A-G Anambra State v. Okeke p. 1099

APPEALS - Stay of execution - Grant - Since there are no substantial points of law - That necessitate maintaining the status quo until appeal is determined - Stay will not be granted (H5) Fatoyinbo v. Osadeyi p. 1211

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - Constitution - Interpretation - “Otherwise” - Meaning - 1999 Constitution s. 308(1)(b) - The word means any lawful process or command - Which has same effect as a process of any court (H10) Fawehinmi v. IGP p. 1123

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - Constitution - Interpretation - Principle - 1999 Constitution s. 308 - Where constitutional provisions are unambiguous - The same shall be given their ordinary meaning (H7) Fawehinmi v. IGP p. 1123

CONTRACTS - Bailment - Loss of goods - Burden of proof - In case of loss of goods - It is the bailees’ duty to prove that the loss was not caused by his breach of duty - It is not the bailors’ duty to show that it did (H3) Asafa Foods Factory Ltd v. Alraine Nig Ltd p. 1147

COURT PROCESSES - Originating summons - Service outside jurisdiction - Validity - The issue of the summons was valid - Though without obtaining leave - Since there is an address for service within Nigeria (H2) Caribbean Trading & Fidelity Corp v. NNPC p. 1169

COURT PROCESSES - Service - Outside jurisdiction - Leave to issue - Lagos High Court Rules O.2 r.4 - Judge should consider the purpose of the rules - In granting or refusing leave - So as to avoid indulging in technicalities (H1) *Caribbean Trading & Fidelity Corp v. NNPC* p. 1169

COURT PROCESSES - Service - Proof - Where service is in dispute - Bailiff can swear to an affidavit of service - Although a certificate of service is not an exclusive means of proof (H2) *A-G Anambra State v. Okeke* p. 1099

COURTS - Admission or default of defence - Declaration of right - Basis for grant - Court does not make declarations on admissions or in default of defence - Without hearing evidence and being satisfied with same (H11) *Ezeokonkwo v. Okeke* p. 1185

COURTS - Discretion - Exercise of - Stay of execution - Court will not normally at the instance of unsuccessful litigant - Deprive a successful litigant of fruits of judgment in his favour (H2) *Fatoyinbo v. Osadeyi* p. 1211

COURTS - Exercise of discretion - Correctness of - Service of process outside jurisdiction - Trial judge exercised discretion properly - By ordering the service - Though no leave was obtained before it was issued (H3) *Caribbean Trading & Fidelity Corp v. NNPC* p. 1169

COURTS - Exercise of discretion - Writ of mandamus - Grant - Court may not overrule discretion not to perform public duty - And may also refuse to order mandamus - On the ground that granting the order will serve no useful purpose (H5) *Fawehinmi v. IGP* p. 1123

COURTS - Land law - Finding of trial judge - Correctness of - Trial judge was right in his finding - That Evidence Act s. 46 operated more in favour of respondents than appellants (H5) *Ezeokonkwo v. Okeke* p. 1185

COURTS - Power - Stay of execution - Grant - Power to grant or

refuse stay of execution of a judgment is discretionary - And must be exercised judicially and judiciously (H1) Fatoyinbo v. Osadeyi p. 1211

COURTS - Processes - Affidavit of service - Proof - Affidavit of service is noncontentious document - Which is not required to be proved before court (H4) A-G Anambra State v. Okeke p. 1099

COURTS - Record of proceedings - Judicial notice - Record of proceedings - Court will take judicial notice of its own proceedings and records - As well as contents therein (H3) A-G Anambra State v. Okeke p. 1099

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Insanity - Determination of - Insanity is decided by trial judge - And not medical men - And it is dependent upon previous and contemporaneous acts of accused (H1) Ani v. State p. 1131

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Insanity - Ingredients - Proof - Accused must be suffering from mental disease - That rendered him incapable of understanding his acts or omissions (H4) Ani v. State p. 1131

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Insanity - Proof - Onus of - Where accused pleads insanity - Onus is on him to produce evidence of same (H2) Ani v. State p. 1131

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Murder - Insanity - Defence - Sustainability - The defence cannot be sustained - Since evidence abound that appellant was aware of her actions (H5) Ani v. State p. 1131

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Murder - Insanity - Proof - Mere absence of evidence of motive - Is not sufficient ground upon which to infer insanity (H3) Ani v. State p. 1131

CRIMINAL PROCEEDINGS - Commencement - The proceedings start when an accused person is arraigned before court - Or when charge has been filed against him in court (H9) Fawehinmi v. IGP p. 1123

ESTOPPEL - Res judicata - Plea - Condition precedent - Party relying on the plea must prove sameness of parties and subject matter - And a valid final decision - Delivered by court of competent jurisdiction (H8) Ezeokonkwo v. Okeke p. 1185

ESTOPPEL - Res judicata - Proof - Onus of - Party who sets up the defence - Has the onus to establish - Conditions necessary to sustain the plea (H9) Ezeokonkwo v. Okeke p. 1185

JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS - Actions - Application for committal - Authorities - Distinction - Okotie-Eboh v. Okotie-Eboh - Present action differs from the case law - Because the application was not determined on merit (H10) A-G Anambra State v. Okeke p. 1099

LAND LAW - Root of title - Proof - Party that relies on traditional history - Must plead founder and how land was founded - As well as particulars of intervening owners - Through whom he claims (H3) Ezeokonkwo v. Okeke p. 1185

LAND LAW - Title - Acts of long possession - Proof - Party relying on such acts as evidence of title - Must show that the same was extensive - And positively numerous to warrant - Inference of exclusive ownership (H4) Ezeokonkwo v. Okeke p. 1185

LAND LAW - Title - Proof - Onus is on plaintiff to prove his title - By relying on strength of his case - And not on weakness of defence - Save where his case is supported by defence (H1) Ezeokonkwo v. Okeke p. 1185

LAND LAW - Title - Proof - Traditional history - Relevance of - Where evidence of such history is not contradicted and is found to be cogent by court - The same can support a claim for declaration of title (H2) Ezeokonkwo v. Okeke p. 1185

LAND LAW - Title - Smaller land - Proof - Where plaintiff in a claim for title to land - Succeeds in proving boundaries and title to a smaller parcel of such land - He would be given title over the smaller land

(H10) Ezeokonkwo v. Okeke p. 1185

LAND LAW - Trespass - Right of action - Conflicting possession - Where two parties claim possession of a piece of land - Trespass will be at the suit of party - Who can show that title is in him (H7) Ezeokonkwo v. Okeke p. 1185

LAND LAW - Trespass - Right of action - It is only a person in possession of land - That can maintain an action for damages for trespass (H6) Ezeokonkwo v. Okeke p. 1185

ORDERS OF COURT - Mandamus - Grant - Conditions for - Applicant must inter alia show that he has specific legal right to enforce - Or an interest more substantial than general interests of others (H12) Fawehinmi v. IGP p. 1123

ORDERS OF COURT - Writ of mandamus - Intendment - The writ is used to secure performance of public duty - Of which applicant has interest - And if exercise of such involves discretion - Court is to examine whether discretion to refuse to act is properly exercised (H4) Fawehinmi v. IGP p. 1123

PLEADINGS - Admitted facts - Proof - Facts pleaded by one party and admitted by another - Will need no further proof (H2) Asafa Foods Factory Ltd v. Alraine Nig Ltd p. 1147

POLICE - Discretion - Exercise of - Criminal investigation - Police has discretion on whether or not to investigate allegation of crime - And such may be exercised depending on their capability - And overall interest of the society (H1) Fawehinmi v. IGP p. 1123

POLICE - Duty - Criminal investigation - Limitation - 1999 Constitution s. 308 - Police can investigate criminal allegation against a Governor - So long as they do not encounter him - In the course of investigation (H6) Fawehinmi v. IGP p. 1123

POLICE - Duty - Definition - Police Act s. 4 - Duty of the police cannot be defined as ministerial - Since it is not a simple one imposed

viii ***INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2002) 5 KLR***

by the law (H2) *Fawehinmi v. IGP* p. 1123

POLICE - Exercise of discretion - Investigation of crime - 1999 Constitution s. 188 - The section provides no reason for police - To refuse an investigation of alleged crime in appropriate circumstance (H3) *Fawehinmi v. IGP* p. 1123

POLICE - Investigation of crime - And criminal proceedings - Distinction - Criminal proceedings do not include police investigation - Though evidence acquired from the investigation - May be used in criminal proceedings (H8) *Fawehinmi v. IGP* p. 1123

STAY OF EXECUTION - Grant - Basis - Unsuccessful litigant must show special or exceptional circumstances - Clearly showing the balance of justice in his favour (H3) *Fatoyinbo v. Osadeyi* p. 1211

STAY OF EXECUTION - Special circumstances - Meaning - Special circumstance is situation that if not addressed - Will destroy subject matter of proceedings - And render nugatory any order of Court of Appeal (H4) *Fatoyinbo v. Osadeyi* p. 1211

COURT OF APPEAL

ACTIONS - Limitation - Computation - The period of limitation begins to run - From the date when cause of action accrued (H4) *Alao v. Nigerian Industrial Development Bank* p. 1267 CA

ACTIONS - Limitation - Statute bar - Proof - Defendant must prove that right to enforce cause of action has been lost - By not bringing it within time stipulated by law (H5) *Alao v. Nigerian Industrial Development Bank* p. 1267 CA

ACTIONS - Statutes - Limitation - Where statute prescribes period for instituting action - Proceedings cannot be initiated after the period (H3) *Alao v. Nigerian Industrial Development Bank* p. 1267 CA

JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS - Smith v. Selwyn - Application - The rule in that case law is no longer applicable in Nigeria - As it denies aggrieved person - The right to seek redress (H2) Alao v. Nigerian Industrial Development Bank p. 1267 CA

JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS - Stare decisis - Purport - It is to the effect that lower courts are bound - By decision of Supreme Court (H1) Alao v. Nigerian Industrial Development Bank p. 1267 CA

INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1979, s. 213(5) A-G Anambra State v. Okeke p. 1099

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, ss. 188, 214 (1), 308(1)(a) Fawehinmi v. IGP p. 1123

Court of Appeal Act 1976, s. 16 A-G Anambra State v. Okeke p. 1099

Criminal Code Law s. 28 Ani v. State p. 1131

Criminal Procedure Law of Lagos State, ss. 59 (1), 340, 343 Fawehinmi v. IGP p. 1123

English Rules of the Supreme Court, O. 2 r. 1, O. 6 r. 7, O. 7 r. 5 Caribbean Trading & Fidelity Corp v. NNPC p. 1169

Evidence Act s. 46 & s. 146 Ezeokonkwo v. Okeke p. 1185, s. 74(3) A-G Anambra State v. Okeke p. 1099

High Court of Lagos State Law, s. 12 Caribbean Trading & Fidelity Corp v. NNPC p. 1169, O. 1 r. 2, O. 2 r. 4 Caribbean Trading & Fidelity Corp v. NNPC p. 1169

x INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES IN (2005) 5 KLR

High Court Rules of Anambra State O. 7 r. 16 A-G Anambra State v. Okeke p. 1099

Judgment (Enforcement) Rules O. 1 r. 14, O. 9 r. 13(2) A-G Anambra State v. Okeke p. 1099

Police Act Cap 359, LFN 1990, s. 4 Fawehinmi v. IGP p. 1123

COURT OF APPEAL

Constitution of Federal Republic of Nigeria, s. 33(5) Alao v. Nigerian Industrial Development Bank p. 1267 CA

Criminal Code, s. 5 Alao v. Nigerian Industrial Development Bank p. 1267 CA

Interpretation Act 1964, s. 8 Alao v. Nigerian Industrial Development Bank p. 1267 CA

Torts Law 1987 of Anambra State, s. 5(1) Alao v. Nigerian Industrial Development Bank p. 1267 CA