

KINGS LAW REPORTS

(ALL SC/NOVEL CA)

(2003) KLR VOL 6 PART 164 pp. 1837 - 2064

JUNE 2003

Dedicated to the King of kings

O. O. NOEL ESQ. Founder/Publisher

C. L. Onwuegbuna Esq. Chief Editor

INDEX OF CASES REPORTED

JUNE CONTD.

4. Abalogu v. Shell Petroleum Development Co. Nig. Ltd. p. 1837
5. Akanbi v. Salawu p. 1865
6. Ayman Enterprises Ltd v. Akuma Industries Ltd p. 1881
7. Buhari v. Yusuf p. 1903
8. M.V. Lupex v. Nig. Overseas Chartering & Shipping Ltd. p. 1967
9. Nangibo v. Okafor p. 1983
10. Osolu v. Osolu p. 2017
11. Umoru v. Zibiri p. 2045

ii **INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2003) 6 KLR**

APPEALS - Courts - Evidence - Evaluation - Ascription of probative value is the duty of trial court - And when issue involves credibility of witnesses - Opinion of trial court must be respected (H3) *Osolu v. Osolu* p. 2017

APPEALS - Courts - Evidence - Evaluation - Trial court assesses demeanor of witnesses - And it is not for appeal court to interfere - More so when credibility of the witnesses is involved (H4) *Umoru v. Zibiri* p. 2045

APPEALS - Courts - Judgments - Issues - Binding nature of - In determination of disputes between parties - Decision must be confined to issues properly raised by them (H1) *Osolu v. Osolu* p. 2017

APPEALS - Courts - Jurisdiction - Absence of - Effect - Since the Federal High Court lacked jurisdiction ab initio - Its decision and that of the Court of Appeal thereon - Are a nullity (H6) *Ayman Enterprises Ltd v. Akuma Industries Ltd* p. 1881

APPEALS - Evidence - Evaluation - Appellate Court does not interfere with findings of trial court - Save when such findings are perverse - Or wrong because of violation of some principles of law (H2) *Osolu v. Osolu* p. 2017

APPEALS - Grounds - Framing of - Implications - Framing a ground as a misdirection in law - Does not make the ground incompetent - Rather it raises a ground of mixed law and fact (H1) *Akanbi v. Salawu* p. 1865

APPEALS - Grounds - Omnibus ground - Implication of - The ground implies that judgment of trial court - Cannot be supported by weight of evidence (H7) *Osolu v. Osolu* p. 2017

APPEALS - Grounds - Supreme Court Rules - Compliance to - Ground 3 did not comply with the rules - As it merely alleged error of facts - Based on evidence in Exhibits F, G & J (H1) *Umoru v. Zibiri* p. 2045

APPEALS - Retrial Order - Basis - Retrial is ordered where trial court failed to consider material pieces of evidence - Which Court of Appeal is not in a position to evaluate (H8) Osolu v. Osolu p. 2017

APPEALS - Retrial order - Principle - Where appellate court decides to order retrial - It should desist from making statements - That may tend to prejudice the new trial (H5) Osolu v. Osolu p. 2017

ARBITRATION - Agreement - Binding effect - Where parties have chosen to refer any of their disputes to arbitration instead of regular courts - Courts must act upon such agreement (H3) M.V. Lupev v. Nig. Overseas Chartering & Shipping Ltd. p. 1967

ARBITRATION - Stay of proceedings - Grant - Grounds - Where parties agree that all dispute shall be referred to arbitration - It is a strong ground for granting stay (H2) M.V. Lupev v. Nig. Overseas Chartering & Shipping Ltd. p. 1967

ARBITRATION - Submission to - Implication - By submitting to arbitration - Respondent had compromised its right to resort to litigation in court (H1) M.V. Lupev v. Nig. Overseas Chartering & Shipping Ltd. p. 1967

CHIEFTAINCY MATTERS - Custom - Evidence - Eldest quarter - Findings - Where appellants did not challenge the special privileges given to Ebese - Court of Appeal rightly accepted the inference of trial court (H2) Umoru v. Zibiri p. 2045

CONTRACTS - Determination - Procedure - Where stipulated - The determination must be done in accordance with the procedure - stipulated in the contract (H3) Abalogu v. Shell Petroleum p. 1837

CONTRACTS - Terms - Collective agreements - Incorporation - They were not incorporated - Nor intended to be binding on the parties - Else they would have been expressly incorporated (H5) Abalogu v. Shell Petroleum p. 1837

CONTRACTS - Terms - Collective agreements - Relevancy - Even if

iv **INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2003) 6 KLR**

the agreements had been incorporated - They would still be irrelevant to the issue of whether appellant's employment was lawfully terminated (H6) *Abalogu v. Shell Petroleum* p. 1837

COURTS - Jurisdiction - Edict - Status - Determination - Court can pronounce any edict which conflicts with a decree - As void to the extent of its inconsistency (H3) *Nangibo v. Okafor* p. 1983

COURTS - Written agreement - Binding nature - Duty of court - Court must confine itself to the plain words and meaning - Which are derivable from the right and obligation - Of parties thereunder (H2) *Abalogu v. Shell Petroleum* p. 1837

CUSTOMARY LAW - Evidence - Pleadings - Ancestral home (Obi) Extent of - Appellant was not bound to prove what the home consisted of - As same have been pleaded - And were not specifically denied by respondents (H4) *Osolu v. Osolu* p. 2017

ELECTION PETITIONS - Filing - Multiple respondents - Propriety - Such respondents must each have been returned in the particular election - Since it is only the return of a candidate that can be questioned under Electoral Act s.131 (H6) *Buhari v. Yusuf* p. 1903

ELECTION PETITIONS - Filing - Right of - Electoral Act s.133(1) - Filing of the petition can only be by election candidate(s) - Or by political party that participated in the election (H5) *Buhari v. Yusuf* p. 1903

ELECTION PETITIONS - Joinder of parties - Loser in election - Such person need not be joined as respondent - Merely because petitioner has allegation against him (H1) *Buhari v. Yusuf* p. 1903

ELECTION PETITIONS - Nature of - Election petition proceedings are sui generis - Hence special provisions made in the Constitution for such petitions - Must be complied with (H4) *Buhari v. Yusuf* p. 1903

ELECTIONS - Statutes - Ejusdem generis rule - Application - Elec-

toral Act s.133(2) - The rule is inapplicable to the section - As its application will be unduly restricting the scope of the section (H3) Buhari v. Yusuf p. 1903

ESTOPPEL - Estoppel by conduct - Application of - Propriety - Estoppel by conduct cannot apply - Since there is no where in Exhibit N - That respondent promised appellant - Employment till retirement age (H4) Abalogu v. Shell Petroleum p. 1837

ESTOPPEL - Estoppel by conduct - Plea - Exhibit N cannot be construed as an assurance - Nor can it be interpreted to override the express contractual stipulation - As to determination of Exhibit D (H1) Abalogu v. Shell Petroleum p. 1837

EVIDENCE - Admissibility - Where the testimony given by DW3 & 1st respondent was not challenged - In cross examination by appellants - The same shall be deemed as more credible (H3) Umoru v. Zibiri p. 2045

JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS - Authority - Patkum's case - Ratio decidendi - Tort of passing-off goods exists generally - But not in respect of infringement of unregistered trade marks (H4) Ayman Enterprises Ltd v. Akuma Industries Ltd p. 1881

JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS - Judgments - Overruling - Supreme Court decision in Oyeniran v. Egbetola - That High Court lacks jurisdiction over land in non-urban area - Was overruled in Adisa v. Oyinwola (H2) Akanbi v. Salawu p. 1865

JURISDICTION - Federal High Court - Passing off - Basis - For the court to entertain passing-off claims - Arising from infringement of trade mark - The trade mark infringed must have been registered (H3) Ayman Enterprises Ltd v. Akuma Industries Ltd p. 1881

JURISDICTION - Federal High Court - Passing off - In respect of the general jurisdiction in passing off - Jurisdiction of the court is as set out in s.230 (1) (f) of 1979 constitution - In respect of actions arising from federal enactments (H2) Ayman Enterprises Ltd v. Akuma In-

dustries Ltd p. 1881

JURISDICTION - Federal High Court - Passing off - Patkun's case - Effect - The effect is that the court will only have jurisdiction - Where the action arises from infringement of registered trade mark - In relation to a Federal Enactment (H5) Ayman Enterprises Ltd v. Akuma Industries Ltd p. 1881

JURISDICTION - Fundamental nature of - Issue of jurisdiction must be looked into first when raised - Because any proceedings of court in absence of jurisdiction - Is futile (H1) Ayman Enterprises Ltd v. Akuma Industries Ltd p. 1881

JURISDICTION - Ouster clause - Scope - S.6(6)(d) of 1979 Constitution did not prohibit any court from questioning the validity of any law - It only prohibits questioning the competence of the lawmaker (H1) Nangibo v. Okafor p. 1983

LAND LAW - Acquisition - Compulsory acquisition - Right of action - Decree No.1 of 1966 gave right of action - And payment of compensation - To person whose interest in land was compulsorily acquired (H2) Nangibo v. Okafor p. 1983

LAND LAW - Customary tenancy - Payment of Ishakole - A party who asserts payment of Ishakole - Must specifically plead the nature of same - As Ishakole could be in kind or in cash (H4) Akanbi v. Salawu p. 1865

LAND LAW - Deed of Assignment - Cancellation of - Governor cannot cancel deed of assignment - As it is only parties thereto - That can go to court for such cancellation (H4) Nangibo v. Okafor p. 1983

LAND LAW - Evidence - Contradiction - Effect - Plaintiff and his witnesses gave inconsistent testimonies - Which are fatal to plaintiff's claim (H5) Akanbi v. Salawu p. 1865

LAND LAW - Leases - Property - Disposition of - Having failed to effectively cancel the subsisting lease of respondent - The Govern-

ment could not have validly disposed the property to appellant (H6) Nangibo v. Okafor p. 1983

LAND LAW - Sale - Validity - State Lands Edict 1972 - Since the Edict has been declared unconstitutional - Sale of the property to appellant is invalid (H7) Nangibo v. Okafor p. 1983

LAND LAW - Title - Root of - Proof - Party who relies on traditional history for his root of title - Must plead that history - And lead evidence on it (H3) Akanbi v. Salawu p. 1865

PLEADINGS - Fact in issue - Meaning - It is a matter of fact affirmed on one side and denied on the other - As may be ascertained from the pleadings of parties (H6) Osolu v. Osolu p. 2017

STATUTES - Interpretation - Ejusdem generis - The rule is used to confine the scope of general words which follow special words - Within the genus of those special words (H2) Buhari v. Yusuf p. 1903

STATUTES - Ouster clauses - Interpretation of - Principle - Statutes purporting to deprive citizens of their acquired rights - Are always interpreted strictly (H5) Nangibo v. Okafor p. 1983

INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES

Abandoned Property (Management and Custody) Edict 1969,
Nangibo v. Okafor p. 1983

Arbitration & Conciliation Act Cap. 19 LFN 1990, ss. 4, 5 & 57 M.V.
Lupex v. Nig. Overseas Chartering & Shipping Ltd. p. 1967

Constitution of Federal Republic of Nigeria 1979, s. 230 & 251 Ayman
Enterprises Ltd v. Akuma Industries Ltd p. 1881, s. 6(6)(d) Nangibo
v. Okafor p. 1983

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1963 Nangibo v.
Okafor p. 1983

Evidence Act Cap 112 LFN 1990, Abalogu v. Shell Petroleum p.
1837, ss. 133, 134 and paragraph 49 of 1st Schedule Buhari v. Yusuf
p. 1903

Federal High Court (Civil Procedure) Rules, O. 12 r. 1 Buhari v. Yusuf
p. 1903

Federal High Court Act 1973, s. 7 Ayman Enterprises Ltd v. Akuma
Industries Ltd p. 1881

State Lands (Cancellation of Leases) Edict No. 15 1972, s. 3 Nangibo
v. Okafor p. 1983

Supreme Court Rules, O. 2 r. 1, & O. 8 r. 2 Buhari v. Yusuf p. 1903,
O. 8 r. 2(2) Umoru v. Zibiri p. 2045

Trade Marks Act Cap 436 LFN 1990, s.3 Ayman Enterprises Ltd v.
Akuma Industries Ltd p. 1881

Traditional Rulers and Chiefs Edict, 1979 of Bendel State, s. 27 Umoru
v. Zibiri p. 2045