

# **KINGS LAW REPORTS**

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

**(2002) KLR VOL 6 PART 141 pp. 1675 - 1828**

**JUNE 2002**

**Dedicated to the King of kings**

**O. O. NOEL ESQ. Founder/Publisher**

**C. L. Onwuegbuna Esq. Chief Editor**

## **INDEX OF CASES REPORTED**

### ***JUNE CONTD.***

2. Abdulsalami v. Salawu p. 1675
3. Adaka v. Anekwe p. 1691
4. Adeleke v. Raji p. 1703
5. Ajukwara v. Izuoji p. 1715
6. Akalaonu v. State p. 1729
7. Anyanwu v. State p. 1741
8. M.V Caroline Maersk v. Nokoy Investment Ltd p. 1767

### ***COURT OF APPEAL***

**Ita v. Ekpenyong p. 1795 CA**

**ii INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2002) 6 KLR**

**ACTIONS** - Orders of court - Enforcement of - Applicable laws - Uhunmwangbo v. Okojie - The relevant laws are Sheriff and Civil Process law s.71 & Judgment Enforcement Rules O.9 r.13 - Hence trial court and Court of Appeal were wrong to have relied on English rules of procedure (H2) Adaka v. Anekwe p. 1691

**ADMIRALTY** - Courts - Findings of facts - Effect - Reliance on rule 8 of Article III Hague Rules did not affect - The courts' approach to determination of the carrier's liability - And same is of no consequence to the result of the case (H1) M.V Caroline Maersk v. Nokoy Investment Ltd p. 1767

**ADMIRALTY** - Evidence - Misdirection in - Effect - Misdirection in regard to date when the vessel arrived - When the material issue is date when same was discharged - Is inconsequential (H2) M.V Caroline Maersk v. Nokoy Investment Ltd p. 1767

**ADMIRALTY** - Ship agent - Liability of - Proof - To have a cause of action against the agent - The act or default complained of must be in respect of anything done in Nigeria by the ship - And same must be alleged and proved (H4) M.V Caroline Maersk v. Nokoy Investment Ltd p. 1767

**ADMIRALTY** - Ship agent - Liability of - Though agent is not vicariously liable for default of his principal - But by s. 16(3) Admiralty Jurisdiction Act - Agent may be personally liable - In respect of anything done in Nigeria (H3) M.V Caroline Maersk v. Nokoy Investment Ltd p. 1767

**APPEALS** - Courts - Issues - Suo motu raising - Propriety - Ojusanya v. Olusanya - Where points are taken suo motu by appellate court - Parties must be given the opportunity to address the court - Before decision is taken on such points (H1) Adeleke v. Raji p. 1703

**APPEALS** - Ground of law - Objection - Propriety - The objection is misconceived - Since ground one was ground of law - As it dealt with the consequences of failure to traverse an allegation in pleadings (H1) Abdulsalami v. Salawu p. 1675

APPEALS - Land law - Courts - Findings of facts - Court of Appeal erred by dismissing the cross-appeal - And proper finding of trial court should be - That Owerre deforested the land in dispute (H7) Ajukwara v. Izuoji p. 1715

APPEALS - Land law - Evidence - Rejection of - Propriety - Court of Appeal was wrong to reject plaintiffs' traditional history - Without considering whether or not they were physically on the land (H6) Ajukwara v. Izuoji p. 1715

APPEALS - Rehearing - As issue one did not satisfactorily determine the appeal - Course of justice is better served - If the appeal is sent to Court of Appeal - For hearing on merit (H2) Adeleke v. Raji p. 1703

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Confession - Language used - Exhibits C&D were rightly made in English language - Since appellant proffered no evidence to controvert same (H1) Anyanwu v. State p. 1741

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Fair hearing - Interpreter - 1979 Constitution s. 33(6)(a)(e) - Failure to provide interpreter where needed - Is breach of the section which is fatal to a criminal trial (H4) Anyanwu v. State p. 1741

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Interpreter - Failure to record - Though it is desirable for trial judge to record use of interpreter - But failure to so record does not vitiate trial (H3) Anyanwu v. State p. 1741

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Interpreter - Necessity of - Use of interpreter becomes mandatory - Where a person charged with criminal offence - Does not understand the language used at trial (H2) Anyanwu v. State p. 1741

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Proof - Number of witnesses - Prosecution can call any number of witnesses to prove its case - As it is not necessary to call a multitude of witnesses - Where only a few can do (H2) Akalaonu v. State p. 1729

iv **INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2002) 6 KLR**

DAMAGES - Award - Error - Effect - Erroneous assumption of additional award is inconsequential - Since Court of Appeal did not make an award of its own (H5) *M.V Caroline Maersk v. Nokoy Investment Ltd* p. 1767

EVIDENCE - Tainted witnesses - Credibility - Blood relationship of such witnesses with deceased - Does not make the witnesses tainted - Or persons with personal purposes to serve - In respect of offence charged (H1) *Akalaonu v. State* p. 1729

JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS - Authorities - *Uhunmwangbo v. Okojie & Hart v. Hart* - Decisions in - Supreme Court did not change the law - As to the enforcement of mandatory and restrictive injunctions - But gave proper interpretation of relevant law and rule on the subject (H1) *Adaka v. Anekwe* p. 1691

JURISDICTION - Fundamental nature of - Matter of jurisdiction if raised in good time - Must be determined first by court - To avert possibility of nullity of trial (H2) *Abdulsalami v. Salawu* p. 1675

JURISDICTION - Issue of - When to raise - Jurisdiction can be raised any time during trial - But where it is new issue in an appellate court - Proper application must be made to raise it as a ground of appeal (H3) *Abdulsalami v. Salawu* p. 1675

JURISDICTION - State High Court - 1999 Constitution s.251 - Where the Constitution confers jurisdiction - Power of court cannot be vitiated - Merely because the matter concerns parties who are Moslems - Provided the matter is not of Islamic personal law (H4) *Abdulsalami v. Salawu* p. 1675

LAND LAW - Courts - Judicial precedents - *Kojo v. Bonsie* - Application of - Trial court properly applied the principle - And Court of Appeal erred in its criticism of same (H1) *Ajukwara v. Izuoji* p. 1715

LAND LAW - Injunction - Claim for - Sustainability of - Claim for injunction does not necessarily fail - After claim for title fails - Unless the land is not clearly defined (H5) *Ajukwara v. Izuoji* p. 1715

LAND LAW - Title - Conflicting evidence - Resolution - Since there were competing versions of traditional evidence - The principle in *Kojo v. Bonsie* is applicable (H3) *Ajukwara v. Izuoji* p. 1715

LAND LAW - Title - Proof - Claimant can establish his title solely on traditional evidence - Which is among five ways of proving ownership of land (H2) *Ajukwara v. Izuoji* p. 1715

LAND LAW - Trespass - Determination - Claim for trespass is not dependent on claim for title - As relevant issue in trespass is whether plaintiff established possession - And whether defendant trespassed (H4) *Ajukwara v. Izuoji* p. 1715

### ***COURT OF APPEAL***

LAND LAW - Title - Proof - Burden is on plaintiff to prove his case on preponderance of evidence - Or balance of probabilities (H1) *Ita v. Ekpenyong* p. 1795 CA

EVIDENCE - Evaluation - Matters relating to assessment of evidence - And consideration of veracity of testimony of witness - Are to be determined by trial court (H2) *Ita v. Ekpenyong* p. 1795 CA

EVIDENCE - Evaluation - Interference - Where trial court properly made findings of fact - Appellate court does not interfere - Save where such findings are perverse (H3) *Ita v. Ekpenyong* p. 1795 CA

DOCUMENTS - Improper admission - Fate - Where document has been improperly received in evidence - Trial and appellate court have powers - To expunge it from the record (H4) *Ita v. Ekpenyong* p. 1795 CA

DOCUMENTS - Rejection - Effect - Document which is rejected in evidence - Cannot subsequently be admitted - As it has no value (H10) *Ita v. Ekpenyong* p. 1795 CA

vi **INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2002) 6 KLR CA**

FAIR HEARING - Actions - Procedure - Irregularity - Party cannot take advantage of irregularity - Which he acquiesced in and thereafter be heard - To complain on appeal (H5) Ita v. Ekpenyong p. 1795 CA

EVIDENCE - Cross examination - Purpose - Cross examination seeks to discredit a witness - And to water down the case of an adversary (H6) Ita v. Ekpenyong p. 1795 CA

EVIDENCE - Cross examination - Party - Document extracted from a party by his adversary during cross examination - Cannot be used against the party - If facts therein were not pleaded (H7) Ita v. Ekpenyong p. 1795 CA

PLEADINGS - Rules of - An essential rule of pleadings is that - Only material facts must be pleaded by parties - But not evidence (H8) Ita v. Ekpenyong p. 1795 CA

PLEADINGS - Binding nature of - Parties are bound by their pleadings - And any evidence which is at variance with pleadings - Ought to be expunged by court (H9) Ita v. Ekpenyong p. 1795 CA

JUDGMENTS - Court - Signature - Every judgment of court shall be dated and signed by judge or magistrate - At the time of pronouncing the judgment (H11) Ita v. Ekpenyong p. 1795 CA

PLEADINGS - Amendment - Pleadings can be amended at any stage of proceedings - Save where inter alia - Such amendment is made mala fide - Or will cause unnecessary delay (H12) Ita v. Ekpenyong p. 1795 CA

PLEADINGS - Amendment - Fresh issue - After evidence has been concluded by parties - An amendment that introduces new defence - Will not be entertained by court (H13) Ita v. Ekpenyong p. 1795 CA

## **INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES**

- Admiralty Jurisdiction Act, s. 16(3) *M.V Caroline Maersk v. Nokoy Investment Ltd* p. 1767
- Carriage of Goods by Sea Act Cap. 44, s. 4 *M.V Caroline Maersk v. Nokoy Investment Ltd* p. 1767
- Constitution of Federal Republic of Nigeria 1979, ss. 213(3), 236 and 242 *Abdulsalami v. Salawu* p. 1675, s. 33(6)(e)(7) *Anyanwu v. State* p. 1741
- Constitution of Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, ss.251 and 262 *Abdulsalami v. Salawu* p. 1675, s. 36(6)(e)(7) *Anyanwu v. State* p. 1741
- Criminal Code Cap 30 Vol. 2 Laws of Eastern Nigeria 1963, s. 319(1) *Anyanwu v. State* p. 1741
- Criminal Code, s. 34 *M.V Caroline Maersk v. Nokoy Investment Ltd* p. 1767
- English Rules of the Supreme Court 1956 O. 42 r. 7 *Adaka v. Anekwe* p. 1691
- Federal High Court (Civil Procedure) Rules 1976 O. XXXI r. 7 *M.V Caroline Maersk v. Nokoy Investment Ltd* p. 1767
- High Court Law of Eastern Nigeria, s.16 *Adaka v. Anekwe* p. 1691
- Judgment Enforcement Rules O. 9 r. 13(1) *Adaka v. Anekwe* p. 1691
- Sheriff and Civil Process Law Cap.118 Laws of Eastern Nigeria 1963, s. 71 *Adaka v. Anekwe* p. 1691
- Sheriff and Civil Process Law Cap.151 Laws of Bendel State 1976, s.63 *Adaka v. Anekwe* p. 1691
- Supreme Court Rule 1985 O. 6 r. 5(1) *M.V Caroline Maersk v. Nokoy Investment Ltd* p. 1767, O. 8 r. 9(1) and (5) *Abdulsalami v. Salawu* p. 1675