

KINGS LAW REPORTS

(ALL SC/NOVEL CA)

(2004) KLR VOL 7 PART 183 pp. 1823 - 1922

JULY 2004

Dedicated to the King of kings

O. O. NOEL ESQ. Chief Editor

INDEX OF CASES REPORTED

1. Nwana v. Federal Capital Development Authority p. 1823
2. Union Bank Plc v. Umeoduagu p. 1839
3. Woherem v. Emeruwa p. 1857
4. State v. Onyeukwu p. 1875

COURT OF APPEAL

1. Ahamefule v. Imperial Medical Center p. 1913 CA

ii INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2004) 7 KLR

ACTIONS - Banking - Cause of action - Failure to remit respondent's funds overseas - Gives him right of action (H3) Union Bank Plc v. Umeoduagu p. 1839

ACTIONS - Banking - Cause of action - When it arose in this case - Was when respondent discovered where his money - Meant to be remitted abroad - Was wrongfully kept (H4) Union Bank Plc v. Umeoduagu p. 1839

ACTIONS - Cause of action - Definition of - It is a combination of facts - That give rise to right to file a claim in court (H1) Union Bank Plc v. Umeoduagu p. 1839

ACTIONS - Cause of action - Determining whether it exists - Is by restricted reference to the statement of claim - And writ of summons (H2) Union Bank Plc v. Umeoduagu p. 1839

ACTIONS - Cause of action - Maturity of - Duration of - Is limited by the Statute of Limitation (H1) Woherem v. Emeruwa p. 1857

ACTIONS - Limitation of - Affidavit - Date cause of action arose - As alleged by the defence - Need not be contradicted - By filing a counter affidavit (H4) Woherem v. Emeruwa p. 1857

ACTIONS - Limitation of - Computation of time - Is determined through the writ and claim in limine - But where issue is joined - The position is different (H2) Woherem v. Emeruwa p. 1857

ACTIONS - Limitation of - Courts - Facts to be relied on - Should not touch the merits of the suit - In a preliminary objection (H6) Woherem v. Emeruwa p. 1857

ACTIONS - Limitation of - Preliminary objection in limine - That action is statute-barred - Implies admission of averments in the claim (H5) Woherem v. Emeruwa p. 1857

ACTIONS - Limitation of - Statute-bar - Courts - Reliance on the defence - In holding that the action is statute-barred - Is not justified (H3) Woherem v. Emeruwa p. 1857

ACTIONS - Limitations of - Banking - Recovery of debt - Has 6 years limitation period - So that the present action - Is not statute barred (H5) Union Bank Plc v. Umeoduagu p. 1839

APPEALS - Courts - Issue - Suo motu raising of - Injustice must be shown - To ground a reversal (H6) Nwana v. FCDA p. 1823

APPEALS - Issue - Suo motu raising of by Court of Appeal - If based on the grounds of appeal - Is not fatal (H5) Nwana v. FCDA p. 1823

COURT MARTIAL - Power to convene - Can be delegated by the appropriate superior authority - To a senior officer - As was done in this case (H5) State v. Onyeukwu p. 1875

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Joint trial - Of separate indictments - Objection by accused - Ought to be raised at the trial time s. 168 CPA - Where no objection was raised - The proceedings is prima facie not a nullity - But an irregularity (H4) State v. Onyeukwu p. 1875

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Evidence of a co-accused - Relevance of - Is not a relevant fact against the accused - Without being corroborated (H6) State v. Onyeukwu p. 1875

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Joint trial - Procedural Policy of convenience - Makes it more convenient - To trial all accused persons jointly - In one indictment (H2) State v. Onyeukwu p. 1875

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Joint trial - S. 155 of the CPA - Permits joint trial - But there is ambiguity - As to whether it must be one charge sheet

iv INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2004) 7 KLR

- As Obi v. COP seemed to decide (H1) State v. Onyeukwu p. 1875

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Judicial precedents - Per incuriam decisions
- Joint trial - S.168 of the CPA - The observations in Arisah's and Obi's case - That declare joint trial on separate indictments a nullity - Are delivered per incuriam (H3) State v. Onyeukwu p. 1875

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Proof - Allegations and counts against respondent - Being not proved by evidence - His conviction is not justified (H7) State v. Onyeukwu p. 1875

JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS - Stare decisis - Obiter dictum - Meaning and relevance of - It is persuasive - And not binding as ratio (H2) Nwana v. FCDA p. 1823

JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS - Supreme Court - Stare decisis - Concurring judgment - Weight of - Is equal with the leading judgment - Where it compliments it - And is relevant to the issues (H1) Nwana v. FCDA p. 1823

LANDLORD & TENANT - Trespass - Licensee - Stare decisis - Dr. Chukwuma's case - Was rightly followed - In finding that a licensee - Cannot maintain an action in trespass against landlord (H4) Nwana v. FCDA p. 1823

LANDLORD & TENANT - Trespass - Licensee - Stare decisis - Obiter dictum - Karibi-Whyte's concurring judgment in Dr. Chukwuma's case - Is not an obiter (H3) Nwana v. FCDA p. 1823

COURT OF APPEAL

APPEALS - Leave to appeal - Consent judgment - Where a party consents to the order in question - Leave of the court should be obtained - Before he can appeal (H2) Ahamefule v. Imperial Medical Center p. 1913 CA

APPEALS - Leave to appeal - Where necessary - But was not obtained - The appeal will be struck out (H3) Ahamefule v. Imperial Medical Center p. 1913 CA

APPEALS - Right to appeal - Final decision - Constitutional law - Section 241(1) and 242(1) of the 1999 Constitution - Provide as to when appeal shall be as of right - And when leave of the court is required - The order made in this case - Is not a final decision (H1) Ahamefule v. Imperial Medical Center p. 1913 CA

PARTIES - Consent judgment - H.I.V. positiveness - Ascribed to a party - Where her counsel consents to court's order - To provide an expert witness on the H.I.V. issue - The party should not reprobate (H2) Ahamefule v. Imperial Medical Center p. 1913 CA

INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES

Actions Law (Cap. 3) Laws of Anambra State 1986 s. 20 Union Bank Plc v. Umeoduagu p. 1839

Armed Forces Decree 105 of 1993 (as amended) ss. 131, 114, 66 (a) & (b), 57 (1) State v. Onyeukwu p. 1875

Court of Appeal Rules O. 6 Nwana v. FCDA p. 1823

Criminal Code ss. 422, 98 (2) State v. Onyeukwu p. 1875

Criminal Procedure Act ss. 155, 168 State v. Onyeukwu p. 1875

Evidence Act ss. 27 (3), 11 State v. Onyeukwu p. 1875

Fire Arms Act 1958 s. 28 (1) (a) (i) State v. Onyeukwu p. 1875

High Court (Civil Procedure) Rules of Rivers State O. 24 rr. 2 & 3 Woherem v. Emeruwa p. 1857

Limitation Law of Rivers State No. 7 of 1988 s. 1 Woherem v. Emeruwa p. 1857

Rules of Procedure (Air Force), 1972 r. 16 (1) State v. Onyeukwu p. 1875

COURT OF APPEAL

Constitution of Nigeria 1999 ss. 241(1), 242(1) Ahamefule v. Imperial Medical Center p. 1913 CA