

KINGS LAW REPORTS

(ALL SC/NOVEL CA)

(2013) KLR VOL 6 PART 331 pp. 2583 - 2840

JUNE 2013

Dedicated to the King of kings

O. O. NOEL ESQ. Founder/Publisher

C. L. Onwuegbuna Esq. Chief Editor

INDEX OF CASES REPORTED

1. Afosi v. State p. 2583
2. Ahmed v. Central Bank Nigeria p. 2611
3. Akpan v. Akwa-Ibom Property Invest. Co. Ltd. p. 2631
4. Aroh v. Peoples Democratic Party p. 2655
5. Banjo v. State p. 2683
6. Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall p. 2695
7. Odunlami v. Nigerian Navy p. 2721
8. Victor v. State p. 2763

COURT OF APPEAL

1. Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA
2. Yakubu v. Ida p. 2823 CA

ii **INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2013) 6 KLR**

ACTIONS - Company - Legal personality - Proof - Issue of appellant's legal personality cannot be treated on affidavit evidence - And except it is admitted - It must be proved that appellant has ceased to exist (H15) *Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall* p. 2695

AFFIDAVITS - Paragraphs - Validity - Evidence Act s. 115 - Paragraphs which lack evidential value or has infractions - Court does not waste time on such - But to strike out or attach no weight to them (H1) *Ahmed v. Central Bank Nigeria* p. 2611

APPEALS - Briefs - Reply - Purpose - Appellant's reply brief is liable to be discountenanced - As such brief is not to raise fresh points - Or repeat arguments in previously filed brief (H6) *Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall* p. 2695

APPEALS - Court - Discretion - Determination - Appellate court determines whether discretion was judicial and judicious - And not whether it would have exercised the discretion differently (H2) *Aroh v. Peoples Democratic Party* p. 2655

APPEALS - Court - Discretion - Exercise of - Correctness - CA rightly exercised its discretion - Having considered that appellant can still adduce evidence at the trial proper (H5) *Aroh v. Peoples Democratic Party* p. 2655

APPEALS - Court - Issue - Reformulation - Where appellant's issues are verbose - Court is entitled to reframe the issues - For the purpose of narrowing down same - In the interest of clarity (H4) *Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall* p. 2695

APPEALS - Fresh evidence - Admission - Power of CA - By CA Rules O. 4 r. 2 - The court can grant leave to adduce further evidence on appeal - And it must act judicially and judiciously in exercise of such discretion (H1) *Aroh v. Peoples Democratic Party* p. 2655

APPEALS - Fresh evidence - Admission - Principles - Under CA Rules O. 4 r. 2 - The evidence sought to be adduced must inter alia - Be of such that could not have been obtained with reasonable care for use

at the trial (H3) Aroh v. Peoples Democratic Party p. 2655

APPEALS - Fresh evidence - CA Rule O. 4 r. 2 - Applicability - The provision is only invoked in appeal - Against decision of a lower court on the merits of the case (H4) Aroh v. Peoples Democratic Party p. 2655

APPEALS - Grounds - Issue - Formulation - Where appellant failed to distil issue in respect of any ground - The ground is deemed abandoned - And court is to strike same out (H1) Victor v. State p. 2763

APPEALS - Issue - Clarity of - Parties are to avoid verbosity in formulating issues - But economy of words should not be made at the expense of clarity (H3) Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall p. 2695

APPEALS - Issue - Competence - Appellant's issue 2 is incompetent for not relating to decision of CA - As appeal to SC is against decision of CA - And not that of trial HC (H1) Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall p. 2695

APPEALS - Issue - Determination - Appeals are decided upon issues raised - And once issues are distilled from grounds of appeal - The latter become extinguished (H2) Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall p. 2695

APPEALS - Issue - Formulation by respondent - Respondent can formulate different issues - But such must be traceable to the grounds of appeal filed by appellant - And appellate court can rely on such issues - To determine the appeal (H5) Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall p. 2695

APPEALS - Judgment - Undefended suit - Decision transferring the matter to undefended list - Is correctly adjudged as defective - Even though CA wrongfully ruled that trial court is not bound - To consider documents for such transfer (H5) Akpan v. Akwa-Ibom Property Invest. Co. Ltd. p. 2631

ARMED ROBBERY - Alibi - Plea - Investigation - As appellant was duly identified and fixed at the crime scene by PW1 and 3 - There

iv **INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2013) 6 KLR**

was no burden to verify the plea (H2) Victor v. State p. 2763

CHARGES - Murder - Provocation - Defence of - Once the defence is sustained in the charge - Accused would be found guilty of manslaughter - And the Judge has discretion to impose sentence (H7) Odunlami v. Nigerian Navy p. 2721

COURT MARTIAL - Fair hearing - Sentence - Review of - By Armed Forces Act s. 149 - A convict has 3 months to appeal for a review - And is also allowed by s. 154(6) to appeal to CA - And thereafter to SC (H3) Odunlami v. Nigerian Navy p. 2721

COURTS - Competence - Principles - Court is competent to adjudicate over matter when inter alia - It is properly constituted - Subject matter is within its jurisdiction - And the case is initiated by due process of law (H10) Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall p. 2695

COURTS - Jurisdiction - Objection to - Option available - When court's jurisdiction is challenged - Court still has competence to enquire whether it has jurisdiction - To hear the case (H11) Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall p. 2695

CRIMINAL LAW - Provocation - Defence of - The defence can be considered if there was unlawful assault - That was not provoked by accused - And accused reaction must be proportionate with the provocation (H1) Odunlami v. Nigerian Navy p. 2721

CRIMINAL LAW & PROCEDURE - Provocation - Defence of - Ingredients - The defence can avail accused where his act in the heat of passion - Was caused by sudden provocation - With no time for passion to cool - And his resentment proportionate to the provocation (H5) Afosi v. State p. 2583

CRIMINAL LAW & PROCEDURE - Self defence - Sustainability - The defence is available to an accused - Who proved that he was victim of unprovoked assault - Which caused him reasonable apprehension of death or grievous harm (H3) Afosi v. State p. 2583

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Crime - Proof - Number of witness - Prosecution is not bound to call all witnesses - But only essential witness(s) to prove its case (H4) Victor v. State p. 2763

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Military law - Manslaughter - Sentence - Under Armed Forces Act s. 105 - Once accused is convicted of the offence - Trial Judge has no discretion - But to impose sentence of life imprisonment (H6) Odunlami v. Nigerian Navy p. 2721

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Military law - Service property - Loss of - To establish the offence under Armed Forces Act s. 68(1)(a) - Prosecution must inter alia prove that accused is subject to service law - And was in charge of the property (H2) Odunlami v. Nigerian Navy p. 2721

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Robbery - Evidence - Police - Failure to call policeman who recovered the items is of no moment - As PW2 stated that the item was recovered from appellant in his presence (H2) Banjo v. State p. 2683

EVIDENCE - Contradictions - Effect - Contradictions must be fundamental and substantial - Before they may affect prosecution's case - As discrepancies are minor differences in details - Which are allowed in proceedings (H4) Odunlami v. Nigerian Navy p. 2721

EVIDENCE - Conviction - Correctness of - Court can convict on evidence of one witness - If such evidence is credible - And it is believed and accepted by court (H3) Victor v. State p. 2763

EVIDENCE - Documentary evidence - Weight - Where the evidence supports oral testimony - The latter becomes more credible - As the former serves as hanger from which to assess the latter (H5) Odunlami v. Nigerian Navy p. 2721

JURISDICTION - Fundamentality of - It is important in adjudication process - As where there is no jurisdiction in court - Every step taken in the proceedings amounts to a nullity (H8) Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall p. 2695

JURISDICTION - Issue of - Objection to - Basis - Objection to competence of court is on the basis of statement of claim - Evidence received - Motion supported by affidavit setting out facts relied on - And on the face of writ of summons (H13) *Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall* p. 2695

JURISDICTION - Issue of - Objection to - Where there is challenge to jurisdiction of court - The court must first settle that issue - Before proceeding to hear the case on merit (H9) *Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall* p. 2695

JURISDICTION - Issue of - Time to raise - Jurisdiction can be raised at any stage of the proceedings - Either at trial court or on appeal - Even before the Supreme Court (H12) *Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall* p. 2695

JURISDICTION - Meaning - It is the authority which court has to decide matters - That are litigated before it - Or take cognizance of matters presented in a formal way for its decision (H7) *Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall* p. 2695

JURISDICTION - Objection - Validity - Nothing exists on the writ of summons and statement of claim - To show that trial court had no jurisdiction - Hence the objection is premature (H16) *Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall* p. 2695

MURDER - Definition of - The offence is defined as the taking of human life - By a person with malicious and willful intent to kill - Or is wickedly reckless as to the consequences of his act upon his victim (H1) *Afosi v. State* p. 2583

MURDER - Ingredients - Proof - To secure conviction for murder - Prosecution must prove that deceased died - As a result of act of accused - Which was intentional (H2) *Afosi v. State* p. 2583

MURDER - Self defence - Implication of - This presupposes that accused committed the offence in self defence - As the action he took

was unavoidable (H4) Afosi v. State p. 2583

PLEADINGS - Statement of claim - Averments in - For appellant to have successfully challenged the averments - It was required to join issue with respondent - And come up with its motion before the case proceeded to trial (H14) Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall p. 2695

ROBBERY - Stolen item - Recent possession - Where accused cannot explain how a robbed item got to his possession - It is presumed that he was one of the robbers - Or that he participated in the robbery (H1) Banjo v. State p. 2683

SUPREME COURT - Judgment - Date - Apart from the date at top of the judgment - There is nothing like signing with date by the Justice - Hence CTC of the contributing judgments - Whether signed or unsigned cannot affect validity of the judgment (H3) Ahmed v. Central Bank Nigeria p. 2611

SUPREME COURT - Judgment - Quorum - Validity - As the quorum of 5 Justices was complete at hearing and delivery of the judgment - The absence of the two concurring judgments - Does not vitiate the judgment (H2) Ahmed v. Central Bank Nigeria p. 2611

UNDEFENDED SUITS - Defence - Notice of - Failure to file - Judgment is not automatically given to plaintiff where defence is not filed - As trial court must scrutinize the claim - To ensure that it is one that could be heard under the procedure (H6) Akpan v. Akwa-Ibom Property Invest. Co. Ltd. p. 2631

UNDEFENDED SUITS - Interest - Proof - Plaintiff's affidavit must disclose - How his right to the interest being claimed accrues - And how the rate thereof was arrived at (H4) Akpan v. Akwa-Ibom Property Invest. Co. Ltd. p. 2631

UNDEFENDED SUITS - Liquidated demand - Contentious claims - As the dispute between the parties are contentious - The sum of N12,169, 847.71 and interest of 21% claimed by appellant - Were not liquidated money demand (H3) Akpan v. Akwa-Ibom Property

Invest. Co. Ltd. p. 2631

UNDEFENDED SUITS - Liquidated sum - Meaning - Maja's case - It is an ascertained claim or specific amount - That requires no further determination of extent of defendant's liability (H2) Akpan v. Akwa-Ibom Property Invest. Co. Ltd. p. 2631

UNDEFENDED SUITS - Listing - Condition for - To place a matter under this procedure - Plaintiff's claim must be liquidated - Or be based on ascertainable debt (H1) Akpan v. Akwa-Ibom Property Invest. Co. Ltd. p. 2631

COURT OF APPEAL

APPEALS - Court - Inadmissible evidence - Effect - Wrongful admission of evidence may not fatally affect decision of court - Unless use of the evidence has occasioned miscarriage of justice (H4) Yakubu v. Ida p. 2823 CA

APPEALS - Court - Inadmissible evidence - Where trial court admitted and acted upon such evidence - Appellate court should reject and after expunging the evidence - Consider if there is any legal evidence to sustain the claim (H3) Yakubu v. Ida p. 2823 CA

APPEALS - Elections - Qualification - As there is no evidence of conduct of the primary away from INEC - And as 1st respondent was not disqualified by FHC - He cannot be stopped from contesting the gubernatorial election (H16) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

APPEALS - Filing - Necessity of - Appeal arises where appellant who is dissatisfied with decision of lower court - Files notice of appeal stating inter alia the grounds of appeal (H1) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

APPEALS - Fresh issue - Raising of - Although such is not allowed on appeal - But where subject to demand of justice - And there is serious question of law - Court may by discretion entertain the issue (H9)

Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

APPEALS - Grounds - Error of law & misdirection - Jointly framed - SC stated in Aderounmu's case that such framing does not invalidate a ground - Provided the complaint in each particular is clearly shown (H6) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

APPEALS - Grounds - Incorporation of particulars - Where ground has furnished the particulars needed - There will be no need for separate paragraph - Stating particulars of error alleged (H7) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

APPEALS - Grounds - Issue - Competence - Appellant's complaint on the grounds 1 to 7 and issue 1 are not new - Because issue of discontinuance of suit no. FHC/ABJ/CS/3/2012 - Was borne out in record of the Tribunal (H8) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

APPEALS - Grounds - Particulars - Sustainability - Particular (i) is in harmony with ground 3 and capable of sustaining it - As it shows in what respect the Tribunal committed wrong (H4) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

APPEALS - Grounds - Purpose - Ground is the error of law or fact alleged by appellant - Which attacks basis of reasoning of the decision challenged (H2) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

APPEALS - Grounds - Vagueness - Ground notifies the other side of the case to meet on appeal - Hence no ground which is vague - Or incapable of conveying any specific complaint is permitted (H3) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

APPEALS - Grounds - Validity - Ground 4 did not challenge the Tribunal's rejection of Exhibits D & L - Thus objection that it relates to pre election matters is unsustainable (H5) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

APPEALS - Issues - Binding nature - The parties did not join issue on discontinuance of motion and suit no. FHC/ABJ/CS/3/2012 - Hence

they are forbidden to go outside issues joined between them (H10)
Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

COMPUTER EVIDENCE - Elections - Document - Admissibility - Party who seeks to tender such document - Must call evidence in relation to use of the computer - To establish the conditions under s. 84(2) EA (H12) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

COMPUTER EVIDENCE - Public documents - Certification under ss. 102(a)(ii) & 104(1) EA - Request must be made to the official body to produce - Failing which computer print out from their website - Can be used as secondary evidence in litigation (H14) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

ELECTION PETITIONS - Appeal - Abandoned ground - Effect - Exhibit D that was produced in support of abandoned ground 2 is irrelevant - As such the tribunal rightly struck them out (H13) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

ELECTION PETITIONS - Tribunal - Order - Exhibit N directed at 3rd respondent was an executory order - Having been executed it remains extant - As no appeal was filed by the respondent against it (H11) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

ELECTIONS - Candidates - Publication of names - Power - Is in the domestic domain of INEC - And no one should be punished if the names have been properly forwarded to INEC (H18) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

ELECTIONS - Qualification - Constitution - Supremacy of - Provision of Electoral Act that runs contrary to the Constitution - Is null and void to the extent of its inconsistency (H17) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

ELECTIONS - Qualification - Exhibit P1 - Weight - The mere fact that the exhibit was made by the Federal Government - Is not sufficient to regard it as authentic document - In determination of cross appellant's qualification to contest the election (H2) Yakubu v. Ida p.

2823 CA

EVIDENCE - Inadmissible evidence - Where court finds that certain documents were admitted in evidence in error - It has power to expunge such from its records (H15) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

EVIDENCE - Public document - Admissibility - By virtue of Evidence Act s. 97(2)(c) - Exhibit P1 being a public document - Must be certified to be admissible (H1) Yakubu v. Ida p. 2823 CA

INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES

African Charter on Human & Peoples' Rights (Ratification Enforcement Act) 1990, Art 3 & 7 Ahmed v. Central Bank Nigeria p. 2611

Akwa Ibom State High Court (Civil Procedure Rules) 1989, O. 23 r. 3(1) Akpan v. Akwa-Ibom Property Invest. Co. Ltd. p. 2631

Armed Forces Act Cap. A20 LFN 2004, ss. 68(1)(a), 103(i), 105, 106, 149, 154(6) Odunlami v. Nigerian Navy p. 2721

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, ss.1, 36(1), 17(1), (2)(a)(e) and 294(5) Ahmed v. Central Bank Nigeria p. 2611

Court of Appeal Act 2004, ss. 15, 16 Aroh v. Peoples Democratic Party p. 2655

Court of Appeal Rules 2011, O. 4 r. 2 Aroh v. Peoples Democratic Party p. 2655

Criminal Code Law Cap 29 Laws of Ogun State 1978, ss. 32(3), 286, 319(1) Afosi v. State p. 2583

Criminal Code, ss. 222, 224, 264, 317, 325, 518 Odunlami v. Nigerian Navy p. 2721

xii INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES IN (2013) 6 KLR

Evidence Act LFN 2004, s. 149(d) Afosi v. State p. 2583, s. 149(d)
Banjo v. State p. 2683, ss. 77(c), 149(d) Victor v. State p. 2763

Kogi State High Court (Civil Procedure) Rules Edict 1991, O. 10 rr.
3, 4(1) Musaconi Ltd. v. Aspinall p. 2695

Robbery & Firearms (Special Provisions) Act Cap 398 LFN 1990, ss.
1(1)(2)(C), 5(6) Banjo v. State p. 2683, s. 1(2)(a) Victor v. State p.
2763

Supreme Court Act 2004, s. 22 Ahmed v. Central Bank Nigeria p.
2611, s. 22 Aroh v. Peoples Democratic Party p. 2655

Supreme Court Rules 1999, O. 2 rr. 28(1) - 29(1) & (2), 2, O. 10 r.
1(1) Ahmed v. Central Bank Nigeria p. 2611

COURT OF APPEAL

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, ss. 177, 182
Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

Court of Appeal Act Cap 75 LFN 1990, s. 16 Yakubu v. Ida p. 2823
CA

Court of Appeal Rules 2011, O. 6 r. 2(2)(3) Kubor v. Dickson p.
2781 CA

Electoral Act 2005, s. 87(9) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

Electoral Act 2006, s. 145(1)(a) Yakubu v. Ida p. 2823, ss. 85(1),
87(9) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA

Electoral Act 2010 (as Amended), ss. 34, 87(10) Kubor v. Dickson p.
2781 CA

Evidence Act 2011, ss. 84(2), 97, 102, 104(1) Kubor v. Dickson p.
2781 CA

Evidence Act, ss. 97(2)(a)(c), 109, 111 - 113 Yakubu v. Ida p. 2823
CA

Federal High Court Civil Procedure Rules 2009, O. 26 rr. 7(3), 11,
12(1)(2) Kubor v. Dickson p. 2781 CA