

KINGS LAW REPORTS

(ALL SC/NOVEL CA)

(2014) KLR VOL 3 PART 343 pp. 1027 - 1320

MARCH 2014

Dedicated to the King of kings

O. O. NOEL ESQ. Founder/Publisher

C. L. Onwuegbuna Esq. Chief Editor

INDEX OF CASES REPORTED

1. Amaremor v. State p. 1037
2. Federal Republic of Nigeria v. Mohammed p. 1079
3. Gbemisola v. Bolarinwa p. 1129
4. Jimoh v. State p. 1165
5. Obidike v. State p. 1211
6. Okoh v. State p. 1251
7. The People of Lagos State v. Umaru p. 1279

1028 INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2014) 3 KLR

ACTIONS - Judgment - Estoppel - Plea of - Party may be precluded from contending the contrary of any precise point - That had been distinctively put in issue - And determined with certainty against him (H1) *Gbemisola v. Bolarinwa* p. 1129

ACTIONS - Pleadings - Estoppel - Defence of - Where pleadings are necessary - Estoppel should be set up with sufficient particulars - To show plaintiff the basis on which he is estopped from re-litigating (H2) *Gbemisola v. Bolarinwa* p. 1129

APPEALS - Concurrent findings - Charge - Proof - Trial court and CA having by overwhelming evidence - Found the charge proved beyond reasonable doubt - Supreme Court will not interfere (H5) *Amaremor v. State* p. 1037

APPEALS - Concurrent findings - Supreme Court is slow in setting aside such findings - As it allows appeals on the findings on the basis that the same are perverse (H4) *Gbemisola v. Bolarinwa* p. 1129

APPEALS - Grounds - Basis - Must arise from decision appealed against - As complaint must be against ratio of the decision - And issues must arise from and be limited to the grounds (H8) *Federal Republic of Nigeria v. Mohammed* p. 1079

APPEALS - Issues - Binding nature - Court is bound to confine itself to case and issues presented by parties - And it has no business considering issue not properly brought before it (H9) *Federal Republic of Nigeria v. Mohammed* p. 1079

APPEALS - Parties - Issues - Binding nature - Parties are bound by case they made out in their pleadings - Or on the grounds of appeal (H10) *Federal Republic of Nigeria v. Mohammed* p. 1079

ARMED ROBBERY - Conspiracy - Proof - Prosecution must prove that there was agreement to commit offence - That accused took part in the robbery in furtherance of the agreement - And that the robbery was armed robbery (H5) *Okoh v. State* p. 1251

INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2014) 3 KLR 1029

ARMED ROBBERY - Ingredients - Proof - Means of - Proof can be done through documentary or oral evidence - Or even through circumstantial evidence (H3) People of Lagos State v. Umaru p. 1279

ARMED ROBBERY - Ingredients - Proof - Prosecution must prove that there was robbery - Which was an armed robbery - And that accused took part in the armed robbery (H3) Okoh v. State p. 1251

ARMED ROBBERY - Ingredients - Proof - Prosecution must prove that there was robbery - Which was armed robbery - And that accused took part in the armed robbery (H2) People of Lagos State v. Umaru p. 1279

ARMED ROBBERY - Proof - Identity of stolen sandal - Where unreliable - It is unsafe to base any conviction on such evidence (H6) People of Lagos State v. Umaru p. 1279

ARMED ROBBERY - Proof - Recent possession - Prosecution must establish identity of stolen goods - Which must be in possession of accused - And possession must be recent (H5) People of Lagos State v. Umaru p. 1279

CHARGES - Guilty plea - Interpreter - Record of - Where accused pleads guilty his plea shall be recorded - As nearly as possible in words used by him - But where there is interpreter - Court records what is interpreted (H1) Federal Republic of Nigeria v. Mohammed p. 1079

CHARGES - Interpreter - Absence of record - Does not amount to proof that there was none - Or denial of accused right to fair hearing - As there is presumption of regularity under EA s. 150(1) (H3) Federal Republic of Nigeria v. Mohammed p. 1079

CHARGES - Plea - Proceedings - Validity - From responses given by respondent - It was evident that he understood the charge against him - And was able to follow the proceedings (H4) Federal Republic of Nigeria v. Mohammed p. 1079

CHARGES - Plea - Record of - CPA s. 218 specifically provides that

plea shall be recorded as nearly as possible - Hence there is no legal requirement that exact words used by accused must be recorded (H2) Federal Republic of Nigeria v. Mohammed p. 1079

CRIMINAL LAW - Accident - Defence - Inconsistencies in - Appellant's 3 separate statements reveal inconsistencies which ruled out event of accident - Hence they were rightly rejected by trial court and CA (H1) Amaremor v. State p. 1037

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Capital offence - Guilty plea - Where accused pleads guilty to charge in capital offence - Court would enter plea of not guilty - Whereupon full trial would be conducted (H6) Federal Republic of Nigeria v. Mohammed p. 1079

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Charges - Conspiracy & substantive - Determination - Proper approach is to first deal with the latter - And then proceed to see how far conspiracy charge has been made out (H3) Jimoh v. State p. 1165

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Co accused - Discharge & acquittal of - Nkebisi v. State - Freedom given to 7th accused upon his alibi cannot avail appellant - As both had no common base for their defence (H7) Obidike v. State p. 1211

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Confession - Co accused - Where more persons are jointly charged - Court shall not consider statement made by one in the presence of another - As affecting that other person - Unless the other adopts the statement by words or conduct (H7) Jimoh v. State p. 1165

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Confession - Meaning - It is admission made at anytime by person charged with a crime - Stating or suggesting the inference that he committed the crime (H6) Jimoh v. State p. 1165

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Confession - Retraction - Where accused objects to statement - Because it was not made by him and signature thereto is not his own - There will be no need for trial within trial (H2)

Jimoh v. State p. 1165

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Confession - Retraction - Where there is retraction in court - Corroboration however slight must be brought - But mere retraction does not render statement inadmissible - As it only affects weight to be attached (H6) Okoh v. State p. 1251

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Conspiracy - Ingredients - It lies in agreement to do unlawful thing - Whether or not it is criminal - Or whether accused know of its unlawfulness (H4) Okoh v. State p. 1251

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Conspiracy - Proof - Once conspiracy is proved to exist - Evidence admissible against one conspirator is admissible against the others (H11) Jimoh v. State p. 1165

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Conviction - Confession - Before confession is used to convict accused - The same must be voluntary and consistent with other facts as proved (H9) Jimoh v. State p. 1165

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Conviction - Confession - Tendering accused statement is fundamental in grounding conviction - Otherwise the conviction is defective and can be quashed - (H4) People of Lagos State v. Umaru p. 1279

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Conviction - Confession - Validity - Free and voluntary confession alone is sufficient to sustain conviction - Provided court is satisfied that it is unequivocal and positively proved (H2) Okoh v. State p. 1251

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Conviction - Guilty plea - CPA s. 285(2) - Once accused understands charge and intends to admit offence - In the absence of any cause to the contrary - Court can convict and sentence him (H5) Federal Republic of Nigeria v. Mohammed p. 1079

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Narcotic drug - Possession - The offence lies in unlawful possession of the substance - And not ownership thereof (H7) Federal Republic of Nigeria v. Mohammed p. 1079

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Proof - Burden of - Is on prosecution to prove guilt of accused beyond reasonable doubt - Failure to do so leads to discharge of accused - As the burden does not shift (H1) *People of Lagos State v. Umaru* p. 1279

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Proof - Burden of - Prosecution has burden to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt - Accused has no burden to prove his innocence - Except where for instance he raises defence of insanity (H1) *Okoh v. State* p. 1251

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Proof - Number of witnesses - Prosecution has no duty to call all known material witnesses - Provided it calls those necessary to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt (H3) *Amaremor v. State* p. 1037

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Proof - Prosecution witness - Appellant's complaint that prosecution failed to call witness from his side has no basis - Since he cannot dictate witnesses to be called by prosecution (H3) *Obidike v. State* p. 1211

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Trial within trial - Conduct of - Such trial is conducted to ascertain voluntariness of confession - When accused denies making the statement voluntarily (H1) *Jimoh v. State* p. 1165

EVIDENCE - Confession - Weight - Once accused makes statement under caution - Admitting the charge or creating impression that he committed the offence - The statement becomes confessional (H10) *Jimoh v. State* p. 1165

EVIDENCE - Evaluation - Ascription of probative value to evidence is duty of trial court - Which watched demeanor of witnesses - Appellate court should not interfere - Except where finding was perverse (H1) *Obidike v. State* p. 1211

EVIDENCE - Murder - Testimony of deceased' relation - Weight - Such evidence can be accepted if cogent enough to rule out bias - As what court considers is truthfulness of the witness (H5) *Obidike v. State* p. 1211

EVIDENCE - Proof - Oath practice - As there was no denial by appellant in his evidence of Iyi Ani customary oath practice - It is not relevant whether witnesses should be called to establish it (H4) *Obidike v. State* p. 1211

EVIDENCE - Withholding of - It is presumed under EA s. 149(d) - That evidence of PW1, respondent and other corroborating evidence - Are unfavourable to prosecution who withheld them (H7) *People of Lagos State v. Umaru* p. 1279

LAND LAW - Title - Proof - Respondents are entitled to the declaration they seek from trial court - Since they have beside the traditional history - Pleaded two other modes to prove title to land (H3) *Gbemisola v. Bolarinwa* p. 1129

LAND LAW - Title - Traditional history - Test - *Kojo II v. Bonsie* - Best way to test such history is by reference to facts in recent years - As established by evidence in relation to land in dispute (H5) *Gbemisola v. Bolarinwa* p. 1129

LAND LAW - Trespass - Damages - Plaintiff is entitled to nominal damages for trespass - Even if no loss is caused - And if loss is caused - Same is recovered according to general principle (H6) *Gbemisola v. Bolarinwa* p. 1129

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS - Address - Nature of - It should be in line with evidence on record - As no amount of brilliance therein - Can make up for lack of evidence in prove of an issue (H2) *Obidike v. State* p. 1211

MURDER - Composition - Murder is committed when a person unlawfully terminates another's life if he intends to cause death - To do some grievous harm - And if death occurs by act done in prosecution of unlawful purpose (H4) *Jimoh v. State* p. 1165

MURDER - Evidence - Testimony of relation - Weight - Blood rela-

tion of deceased is not precluded from testifying for prosecution - As court considers the truthfulness of the witnesses - Touching on his credibility (H4) *Amaremor v. State* p. 1037

MURDER - Ingredients - Proof - Prosecution must establish that deceased died - As a result of act of accused - Which act was intentional - With knowledge that death or grievous bodily harm was probable (H2) *Amaremor v. State* p. 1037

MURDER - Proof - Circumstantial evidence - It is not imperative that there must be eye witness before murder is proved - As prosecution can establish same by circumstantial evidence - That creates no room for doubt (H8) *Jimoh v. State* p. 1165

MURDER - Proof - Prosecution must establish that deceased died - That the death was caused by accused - And that he intended to either kill deceased or cause grievous harm on him (H5) *Jimoh v. State* p. 1165

MURDER - Proof - Witness - Evidence of single witness if believed by court - Can sustain a charge even in murder case (H6) *Obidike v. State* p. 1211

SUPREME COURT - Alibi - Fresh issue of - No ground covers the issue of alibi - And being raised for first time in the court without leave - It is incompetent and should be discountenanced (H8) *Obidike v. State* p. 1211

INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 (as amended), s. 36(5) *Okoh v. State* p. 1251, s. 36(1) *Jimoh v. State* p. 1165, s. 36(6)(e) *Federal Republic of Nigeria v. Mohammed* p. 1079

Criminal Code Cap 29 Laws of Ogun State of Nigeria 1978, ss. 319(1), 324 *Jimoh v. State* p. 1165

Criminal Code Cap 36 Vol. 1 Laws of Anambra State of Nigeria 1996, s. 274(1) *Obidike v. State* p. 1211

Criminal Code Law Cap 17 vol. 12 Laws of Lagos State 2003, s. 402[2][a] *People of Lagos State v. Umaru* p. 1279

Criminal Code, ss. 24, 319 *Amaremor v. State* p. 1037

Criminal Procedure Act, ss. 218, 285(1)(2) *Federal Republic of Nigeria v. Mohammed* p. 1079

Evidence Act 2004, ss. 34, 46, 109, 111, 112 *Gbemisola v. Bolarinwa* p. 1129, s. 149(a)(d) *People of Lagos State v. Umaru* p. 1279, s. 138(1) *Amaremor v. State* p. 1037

Evidence Act 2011 (as amended), s. 168 (1) *Federal Republic of Nigeria v. Mohammed* p. 1079, ss. 27, 28, 29(2)(a)(b),(3) *Jimoh v. State* p. 1165, ss. 131, 132, 135, 136, 140 *Obidike v. State* p. 1211

National Drug Law Enforcement Agency Act Cap. N30 LFN 2004, s. 19 *Federal Republic of Nigeria v. Mohammed* p. 1079

Penal Code, s. 97(1), 221(b) *Okoh v. State* p. 1251

Robbery & Firearms (Special Provisions) Decree 1984, s. 1(2), 2 (a), 5(b) *Okoh v. State* p. 1251