

KINGS LAW REPORTS

(ALL SC/NOVEL CA)

(2009) KLR VOL 12 PART 272 pp. 2211 - 2382

DECEMBER 2009

Dedicated to the King of kings

O. O. NOEL ESQ. Chief Editor

Nnabuike S. Orji Esq. Managing Editor

INDEX OF CASES REPORTED

1. Bolanle v. State p. 2211
2. Diamond Bank Ltd v. Partnership Investment Co. Ltd p. 2221
3. Ogundele v. Agiri p. 2249
4. Oshoboja v. Amida p. 2275
5. Shasi v. Smith p. 2295

COURT OF APPEAL CASE

INEC v. Oshiomhole p. 2317 CA

ii **INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2009) 12 KLR**

APPEALS - Concurrent findings - Disturbance - Basis - They may only be disturbed where not supported by evidence - Or they were reached on application of wrong principles of law - Neither is the case herein (H1) Oshoboja v. Amida p. 2275

APPEALS - Grounds - Whether law or fact - Where a ground reveals a misapplication of the law - To facts already proved or admitted - It is a ground of law (H1) Ogundele v. Agiri p. 2249

APPEALS - Issues - Nature of - Whether of law or fact - Where facts are not in dispute - But the complaint is on application of the law to undisputed facts - The ground is one of law (H1) Diamond Bank v. Partnership Inv. Co. p. 2221

APPEALS - Issues - Raised and resolved suo motu - Effect - It amounts to a denial of fair hearing - Which occasioned miscarriage of justice to appellants - For Court of Appeal to have so raised and resolved the issue of admission (H1) Shasi v. Smith p. 2295

COURTS - Finding by trial court - False misrepresentation - Correctness - Respondents produced proceedings of 14/7/37 as final judgment - Instead of those of 5/10/38 - The finding was therefore correct (H2) Ogundele v. Agiri p. 2249

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Conviction of co-accused - And discharge of one - Propriety - Though where evidence is same against two accused persons - In all material respect - Discharge for one should be discharge for both - Evidence herein is not the same (H1) Bolanle v. State p. 2211

EVIDENCE - Burden of proof - Beyond reasonable doubt - Discharge - If trial court is left with no doubt - That the offence was committed by the accused person - The burden is discharged (H2) Bolanle v. State p. 2211

JUDGMENTS - Basis - Extraneous matters - Court of Appeal based its judgment on issues not raised by parties - Without affording them

opportunity to address it on them - As such it is based on extraneous matters (H3) Ogundele v. Agiri p. 2249

JUDGMENTS - Monetary judgments - Award of interest unclaimed - Propriety - The general rule is that monetary judgments attracts appropriate interest - Even where none is claimed (H5) Diamond Bank v. Partnership Inv. Co. p. 2221

JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS - Distinguishing - Bank draft - Made subject to confirmation - Propriety - As bank manager gave an implied undertaking - To comply to PW1's instruction - The facts of UBA Ltd V. Ibhafidon is not applicable to this case (H4) Diamond Bank v. Partnership Inv. Co. p. 2221

LAND LAW - Customary tenancy - Admission of existence - Issue of - The issue cannot now be raised by appellants - As it was neither raised nor canvassed - Before the lower courts (H2) Oshoboja v. Amida p. 2275

LAND LAW - Declaration of title - Proof - Effect of admission - Plaintiff has onus of proving title to satisfaction of the court - It is erroneous to grant a declaration of title - Based on admission in opponent's pleadings (H2) Shasi v. Smith p. 2295

TORTS - Negligence - Definition - It is failure to exercise the standard of care - That a reasonably prudent person would have exercised - In a similar situation (H2) Diamond Bank v. Partnership Inv. Co. p. 2221

TORTS - Negligence - Banking - Liability of appellant - Propriety of finding - In view of the evidence on record - Particularly the instructions from 1st respondent as per Exhibit C - The finding is proper as borne out from the records (H3) Diamond Bank v. Partnership Inv. Co. p. 2221

COURT OF APPEAL

ELECTION PETITIONS - Allegation of multiple voting - Whether pleaded - The allegation was clearly pleaded - Just as it was proved - Contrary to the contention of appellants (H8) INEC v. Oshiomhole p. 2317 CA

ELECTION PETITIONS - Election petitions - Nullification of election - Whether done by tribunal - Tribunal did not nullify any part of the election - It merely deducted invalid votes from valid votes cast - And gave judgment accordingly (H11) INEC v. Oshiomhole p. 2317 CA

ELECTION PETITIONS - Practice & procedure - Use of charts by tribunal - Propriety - It is proper for tribunals to use charts - In so far as the chart does not introduce extraneous evidence - But merely highlights evidence led at trial (H9) INEC v. Oshiomhole p. 2317 CA

EVIDENCE - Witnesses - Testimony - Partial acceptance - Propriety - It is not the law that a tribunal cannot accept part of the evidence of a witness - While rejecting part (H1) INEC v. Oshiomhole p. 2317 CA

EVIDENCE - Documents - Evaluation - Right and duty of tribunal - Once a document is received in evidence before a tribunal - It has a duty to evaluate the document's probative value - And the right to use the document as it sees fit (H3) INEC v. Oshiomhole p. 2317 CA

EVIDENCE - Evaluation - Documents viz-a-viz oral evidence - Relative weight - The best evidence is documentary evidence - It is more reliable than oral evidence - So tribunal was right to have given it greater weight (H5) INEC v. Oshiomhole p. 2317 CA

EVIDENCE - Onus of proof - Shifting of - Effect - In view of the differences in dates on the Exhibits - Onus shifted to appellants to explain the sequence of dates - Tribunal was therefore right to accept petitioners' evidence - When appellants failed to discharge the onus (H7) INEC v. Oshiomhole p. 2317 CA

EVIDENCE - Proof - Expunging of Exhibit 110 - Effect - Even if the exhibit and all other inadmissible exhibits are expunged - The case of petitioners is proved - As the standard of proof required of them - Is on a preponderance of accepted evidence (H6) INEC v. Oshiomhole p. 2317 CA

EVIDENCE - Subpoena to tender documents - Effect - It is expected that the person subpoenaed must produce entire document commanded once - Else any subsequent production of document will appear suspicious (H4) INEC v. Oshiomhole p. 2317 CA

EVIDENCE - Witnesses - Status of PW47 - Whether petitioners' witness for admission purposes - PW47 is the head of operation of INEC in Edo State - Who was delegated to tender documents in INEC's custody - He came to do just that (H2) INEC v. Oshiomhole p. 2317 CA

JUDGMENTS - Basis - Decision of tribunal - Rejecting unmarked ballot papers - Tribunal relied on s. 67 of Electoral Act - Which provides for rejection of such ballot papers - Though the chart was used as a guide - It was not the basis of the rejection (H10) INEC v. Oshiomhole p. 2317 CA

INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES

Court of Appeal Act, 1979, s. 16 Oshoboja v. Amida p. 2275

Evidence Act, Cap 112, L. F. N. 1990, s. 138 Bolanle v. State p. 2211

High Court Laws of Lagos State, s. 12 Diamond Bank v. Partnership Inv. Co. p. 2221

High Court of Lagos (Civil Procedure) Rules, 2004, 0.39 r. 7 Diamond Bank v. Partnership Inv. Co. p. 2221

Legal Practitioners Act, Cap 207 L.F.N. 1990, ss. 2 (i) and 24 Ogundele v. Agiri p. 2249

Robbery and Fire Arms (Special Provisions) Act, 1990, s. 1 (2) (a) Bolanle v. State p. 2211

COURT OF APPEAL

Electoral Act 2002, s. 144 INEC v. Oshiomhole p. 2317 CA

Electoral Act 2006, ss. 145 & 146 INEC v. Oshiomhole p. 2317 CA