

# **KINGS LAW REPORTS**

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

**(2005) KLR VOL 7 PART 203 pp. 2387 - 2592**

**JULY 2005**

**Dedicated to the King of kings**

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

## **INDEX OF CASES REPORTED**

### **JULY CONTD.**

15. G. Chitex Ind. Ltd. v. Oceanic Bank Ltd p. 2387
16. Elegushi v. Oseni p. 2411
17. Jombo v. P.E.F. (MGT. Board) p. 2441
18. Ndoma-Egba v. A.C.B. p. 2467
19. Ogbu v. Wokoma p. 2503
20. Okike v. L.P.D.C. (No.2) p. 2525

**ii INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2005) 7 KLR**

APPEALS - Concurrent findings - Where appeal is against concurrent findings of facts - Such findings should not be disturbed - Save for cogent reasons (H4) Ogbu v. Wokoma p. 2503

APPEALS - Issues - It is not the number of issues for determination that is formulated - That guarantees the success of an appeal - But the contents and quality (H1) G. Chitex Ind. Ltd. v. Oceanic Bank Ltd p. 2387

APPEALS - Reversal - Evidence - Where there are two versions of evidence - And the trial Court whose duty it is accepts plaintiff's version of evidence - Court below cannot reverse such findings of fact (H5) Ndoma-Egba v. A.C.B. p. 2467

BANKING - Forged cheque - Negligence - By Bank in paying cheque with forged signature - Bank's liability is not absolute - Save reasonable care is not exercised - In processing the cheque (H8) Ndoma-Egba v. A.C.B. p. 2467

CONTRACTS - Agreements - Banking - Transfer of money - Court is right - Where it held that the liability of the respondent - Was only to pay the differences in the exchange rate - When the respondent failed to transfer the money (H6) G. Chitex Ind. Ltd. v. Oceanic Bank Ltd p. 2387

CONTRACTS - Breach of contract - Damages - The terms 'special' and 'general' damages - Are not appropriate in an action for breach of contract - But where parties bind themselves knowingly under special circumstances - It would attract damages - Which parties agreed at the time of the contract (H3) G. Chitex Ind. Ltd. v. Oceanic Bank Ltd p. 2387

CONTRACTS - Damages - Award of - Amount of damages for breach of contract - Is the amount it will entail to put that person - In the position he would have been - If there had been no breach of contract (H2) G. Chitex Ind. Ltd. v. Oceanic Bank Ltd p. 2387

COURTS - Evidence - Inquiry - Examination of documents - It is not the duty of court to make inquiry into the case outside court (H4) Ndoma-Egba v. A.C.B. p. 2467

COURTS - Jurisdiction - Competence of court - Where statute ousts the jurisdiction of court - Court should examine all the circumstances of the case - With a view of discovering whether it fits into the orbit of the intendment of the statute (H3) Jombo v. P.E.F. (MGT. Board) p. 2441

COURTS - Jurisdiction - Competence of court to adjudicate on a matter - Where jurisdiction of court is being thrown away - Court should not readily lend its hand to forces - That seek to take away its jurisdiction (H4) Jombo v. P.E.F. (MGT. Board) p. 2441

COURTS - Jurisdiction - Interpretation of Statutes - Where a law has the feature of being punitive - Court should launch out into its jurisprudential knowledge - To ensure that its jurisdiction is not taken away (H2) Jombo v. P.E.F. (MGT. Board) p. 2441

DAMAGES - Special claim - Proof of - Where plaintiff fails to prove the special claim - The plaintiff will not be entitled to such damages (H4) G. Chitex Ind. Ltd. v. Oceanic Bank Ltd p. 2387

ESTOPPEL - Banking - Negligence - In honouring Cheque - Where defendant was negligent - In honouring plaintiff's unauthorized cheque - It ought not rely on estoppel (H9) Ndoma-Egba v. A.C.B. p. 2467

EVIDENCE - Admissibility - Previous proceedings - Can never be accepted as evidence in a present case - But could be used for cross examination - And the ones tendered in this case are inadmissible (H10) Elegushi v. Oseni p. 2411

EVIDENCE - Admissibility - Relevance - Before any evidence or docu-

**iv INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2005) 7 KLR**

ment - Can be considered admissible - It must be shown to be relevant in law (H11) Elegushi v. Oseni p. 2411

EVIDENCE - Documents - Authenticity of - Where a document is challenged as not authentic - The maker of the document should be called to support the document - Otherwise no weight should be attached to it (H5) G. Chitex Ind. Ltd. v. Oceanic Bank Ltd p. 2387

EVIDENCE - Negligence - Proof of - Where defendant did not call evidence - To show plaintiff's negligence - It will be difficult to hold that the defendant - Exercised due amount of care (H7) Ndoma-Egba v. A.C.B. p. 2467

EVIDENCE - Proof - Signature - Cheques - Burden of proof - Is on the defendant - Where it could not escape liability for plaintiff's claim - Or establish that it was the plaintiff who signed the cheques (H1) Ndoma-Egba v. A.C.B. p. 2467

EVIDENCE - Proof - Pleadings - Burden of proof - May shift to defendant as case progresses - Where it becomes the duty of defendant to call evidence - In proof of some particular points - Which may arise in the case (H1) Ogbu v. Wokoma p. 2503

EVIDENCE - Signature - Forgery of - Proof - Where plaintiff was not saying that a particular person - Forged his signature - He did not bear the burden - Of establishing the case - On a standard beyond reasonable doubt (H2) Ndoma-Egba v. A.C.B. p. 2467

EVIDENCE - Witnesses - Veracity - Cross examination - Admissions by PW2 under cross examination - Makes it impossible to regard him as truthful (H9) Elegushi v. Oseni p. 2411

FAIR HEARING - Breach of - Cannot be raised - Where appellant

deliberately decided to opt out of trial - When he had adequate information about hearing date (H4) Okike v. L.P.D.C. (No.2) p. 2525

JURISDICTION - Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Committee - Has jurisdiction - To try matters - Where appellant is charged - For infamous conduct - Pertaining to the legal profession (H5) Okike v. L.P.D.C. (No.2) p. 2525

LAND LAW - Acquisition by government - Notice of - Plaintiffs that fail to prove their title - Are not the rightful persons to be served - And they have no locus standi - To seek nullification of the acquisition (H12) Elegushi v. Oseni p. 2411

LAND LAW - Customary tenancy - Forfeiture - Challenge by defendants to plaintiffs' claim of title - Will not amount to a misconduct - Or lead to forfeiture - If plaintiffs do not succeed in proving title (H3) Elegushi v. Oseni p. 2411

LAND LAW - Evidence - Identity of land in dispute - Where parties are ad idem as to identity of the land - The fact that defendant gave it another name - Cannot change the identity (H2) Ogbu v. Wokoma p. 2503

LAND LAW - Title - Evidence - Traditional ownership - Where traditional evidence is in conflict - Court should not go by the credibility of witnesses - But should examine the acts of ownership (H1) Elegushi v. Oseni p. 2411

LAND LAW - Title - Pleadings - Root of title and ownership - Is not established by mere plea of customary tenancy - But by showing inter alia when and how - The land was founded by their ancestor (H4) Elegushi v. Oseni p. 2411

LAND LAW - Title - Possession - Claim of - Where two competing parties claim the possession of land in dispute - Law ascribes possession to the one with better title (H3) Ogbu v. Wokoma p. 2503

LAND LAW - Title - Prima facie case - Pleadings - Where parties' pleadings - Raise the issue of who the original owners of land are - Plaintiffs have a heavy burden to discharge - Based on the strength of their own case (H5) Elegushi v. Oseni p. 2411

LAND LAW - Title - Proof - Possession - Defendants presented sufficient proof of ownership - And right to remain in possession - By showing acts of ownership (H6) Elegushi v. Oseni p. 2411

LAND LAW - Title - Proof of - Where Plaintiffs' claim to land - Is predicated on ownership - The onus is on them to prove and establish their ownership (H2) Elegushi v. Oseni p. 2411

LAND LAW - Title - Traditional history - Party that relies on it - May not rely on documents of title - But should prove ownership and source of his title (H7) Elegushi v. Oseni p. 2411

LAND LAW - Title - Traditional History - Where evidence of parties are conflicting - Reference should be made to facts in recent years - As established by evidence - And see which of the histories is more probable (H8) Elegushi v. Oseni p. 2411

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS - Complaint against - How pursued under the law - Misconduct - Will lead to disbarment - Which is designed to protect the public - And be a punishment to the legal practitioner (H1) Okike v. L.P.D.C. (No.2) p. 2525

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS - Disciplinary Tribunal - Complaint - On procedural process - Where appellant had the opportunity to complain in the proceedings before the respondent - But refused to do so - Complaint before the NBA Committee is late (H2) Okike v. L.P.D.C. (No.2) p. 2525

MASTER & SERVANT - Appointment - Termination of - Where letter of termination is issued to a person - The employer has no other intention - Than to put an end to the job (H1) Jombo v. P.E.F. (MGT. Board) p. 2441

PARTNERSHIP - Account - Bank - Duty of - The bank owes each partner the duty not to allow - Either of them to draw funds from the account - Without the concurrence of the other (H6) Ndoma-Egba v. A.C.B. p. 2467

PLEADINGS - Averments - Value - Where an averment does not in a juridical sense - Add any value to the plaintiff's case - Such averment is unnecessary (H3) Ndoma-Egba v. A.C.B. p. 2467

PRACTICE & PROCEDURE - Disciplinary Tribunal - Legal Practitioners - Charges - Nature of - Where the allegation in the petition - Contains all the essential elements - It is not necessary - To make reference to particular breaches of the Rules (H3) Okike v. L.P.D.C. (No.2) p. 2525

## **INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES**

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999 s. 36(2) & (3) Okike v. L.P.D.C. (No.2) p. 2525

Contract Law of Anambra State ss. 412(1) & 423(4) G. Chitex Ind. Ltd. v. Oceanic Bank Ltd p. 2387

Criminal Code s. 465 Ndoma-Egba v. A.C.B. p. 2467

**viii INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES IN (2005) 7 KLR**

Evidence Act ss. 108, 137(1) *Ndoma-Egba v. A.C.B.* p. 2467; ss. 118 & 188 *Okike v. L.P.D.C. (No.2)* p. 2525; ss. 6(b), 34(1), 46, 93, 111, 112, 146 & 209 *Elegushi v. Oseni* p. 2411

Legal Practitioners Act (as amended in 1994) ss. 10, 11, 12(7), 13(2), 112 *Okike v. L.P.D.C. (No.2)* p. 2525

Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Committee Rules, 1965 rr. 2A (2) & (3), 3, 6(3)7 *Okike v. L.P.D.C. (No.2)* p. 2525

Partnership Act, 1890 ss. 5, 10 & 15 *Ndoma-Egba v. A.C.B.* p. 2467

Public Officers (Special Provisions) Decree No. 17 of 1984 ss. 1(1), 3(3) & 4(2) *Jombo v. P.E.F. (MGT. Board)* p. 2441