

KINGS LAW REPORTS

(ALL SC/NOVEL CA)

(2014) KLR VOL 5 PART 347 pp. 1823 - 2042

MAY 2014

Dedicated to the King of kings

O. O. NOEL ESQ. Founder/Publisher

C. L. Onwuegbuna Esq. Chief Editor

INDEX OF CASES REPORTED

MAY CONTD.

6. Akintokun v. Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Committee p. 1831
7. Akoma v. Osenwokwu p. 1915
8. Olonade v. Sowemimo p. 1963

COURT OF APPEAL

1. Beloxxi & Co. Ltd. v. South Trust Bank p. 1997 CA
2. Benson v. Mobil Producing Nig. Unltd. p. 2013 CA
3. Zenith Bank Plc. v. John p. 2025 CA

1824 INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2014) 5 KLR

ACTIONS - Judgment per incuriam - Meaning of - When a case is decided per incuriam - It denotes that it is reached through inadvertence - And or in ignorance of the relevant law (H4) Akintokun v. LPDC p. 1831

APPEALS - Concurrent findings - Interference - Where appellant fails to show that - Findings of facts he contests do not flow from evidence - His entreaties that the findings be reversed must fail (H6) Olonade v. Sowemimo p. 1963

APPEALS - Court - Finding - Decision of CA in this case - Is that facts which led to the judgment appealed against - Constitute issue estoppel as distinct from res judicata - Which robs court of jurisdiction (H4) Akoma v. Osenwokwu p. 1915

APPEALS - Court - Issues - Estoppel - Appellants' contention here - Is based on mere technicality - As estoppel was a live issue presented before the courts for determination (H11) Akoma v. Osenwokwu p. 1915

APPEALS - Evidence - Evaluation - Judgment - Delay in delivery - 1999 Constitution s. 294 applies more to judgments of trial courts - And not to appellate courts - Which can rarely be said to have lost touch of printed records - Placed before them (H3) Akoma v. Osenwokwu p. 1915

APPEALS - Filing - Grounds - Basis - Party should not appeal merely on ground of delay in delivery of judgment - But should fight appeal on grounds - Which can render judgment unsustainable (H2) Akoma v. Osenwokwu p. 1915

APPEALS - Grounds - Basis - Grounds must relate to judgment of court appealed from - And any complaint that does not flow from the decision - Cannot be legitimately entertained (H1) Olonade v. Sowemimo p. 1963

APPEALS - Issues - Pleadings - CA did not suo motu make a case of issue estoppel - And proceeded to pronounce on same unilaterally -

INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2014) 5 KLR 1825

But issues on that fact has been joined in pleadings of parties (H9)
Akoma v. Osenwokwu p. 1915

APPEALS - Judgment - Error in - Effect - It is not every error of law committed by trial or appellate court - That justifies reversal of the particular court's judgment on appeal (H2) Olonade v. Sowemimo p. 1963

APPEALS - Land law - Issue estoppel - Appellants cannot raise same issue - Already determined in a previous suit - As to ownership of the land in issue (H10) Akoma v. Osenwokwu p. 1915

CONFLICT OF LAWS - Legislations - Amendment - Where later enactment does not expressly amend an earlier one - But provisions of the later are inconsistent with the earlier - The later by implication amends the earlier (H5) Akintokun v. LPDC p. 1831

COURTS - Action - Standard of proof - Court decides civil matters on balance of probabilities - By placing evidence of both sides on the imaginary scale - And deciding which side's evidence is heavier (H5) Olonade v. Sowemimo p. 1963

COURTS - Legislations - Interpretation - Courts interpret and apply the law as it is - They do not make law - As that is the function of the legislature (H1) Akintokun v. LPDC p. 1831

ESTOPPEL - Plea of - Form - Estoppel need not be pleaded in any form - Provided that facts which can be interpreted as constituting estoppel - Are stated in a way to raise estoppel (H8) Akoma v. Osenwokwu p. 1915

EVIDENCE - Evaluation - Ascription of probative value to evidence - Are primary functions of trial court - Which saw and assessed the witnesses as they testified (H3) Olonade v. Sowemimo p. 1963

EVIDENCE - Evaluation - Interference - Where trial court unquestionably evaluates evidence - And justifiably appraises facts - Appellate court should not substitute its views for that of trial court (H4)

Olonade v. Sowemimo p. 1963

JUDGMENTS - Delivery - Delay in - Effect - Judgment will not be invalidated for non compliance with 1999 Constitution s. 294(1) - Unless appellate court is satisfied that the delay - Occasioned miscarriage of justice (H1) Akoma v. Osenwokwu p. 1915

JUDGMENTS - Delivery - Delay in - Notice of - Failure to inform NJC cannot form a ground of appeal against the judgment - Since the report is not meant to form part of the judgment (H5) Akoma v. Osenwokwu p. 1915

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS - Appeals - Jurisdiction - Provisions relating to discipline in LP Act LFN 2004 - Regulate appeals from directions of LPDC - SC therefore lacks jurisdiction to entertain appeals direct from LPDC (H6) Akintokun v. LPDC p. 1831

LEGISLATIONS - Validity of - LFN 2004 - Where National Assembly approves a law - The same must take the form of a law passed by the legislature - Save where the contrary is shown (H2) Akintokun v. LPDC p. 1831

LEGISLATIONS - Validity of - LFN 2004 edition - All laws in the edition are authentic laws of the federation - Hence they must be respected and applied - And SC is bound to give effect to any of such laws (H3) Akintokun v. LPDC p. 1831

RES JUDICATA - Applicability - Land matters - A plea that does not meet all the conditions to constitute res judicata - May constitute Issue estoppel (H10) Akoma v. Osenwokwu p. 1915

RES JUDICATA - Meaning of - It arises where court of competent jurisdiction had earlier adjudicated upon an issue - And same comes up again - Between same parties or their privies (H6) Akoma v. Osenwokwu p. 1915

RES JUDICATA - Plea of - Is not available to plaintiff as basis of his claim - Except by way of reply to defence raised by defendant - As

plaintiff cannot raise plea that ousts jurisdiction of court (H7) Akoma v. Osenwokwu p. 1915

COURT OF APPEAL

ACTIONS - Counter claim - Meaning of - It is claim by defendant against plaintiff - Which is typically concerning and resolved within the same action (H4) Beloxxi & Co. Ltd. v. South Trust Bank p. 1997 CA

ACTIONS - Counter claim - Status of - Even though a claim and counter claim may exist in the same action - They are two separate and distinct causes of actions (H5) Beloxxi & Co. Ltd. v. South Trust Bank p. 1997 CA

ACTIONS - Statutes - Limitation Act 1623 - Application of - Oil exploration rights - The Act is not applicable to this case - As the rights are new rights - That could not have been within the purview of the Act (H2) Benson v. Mobil Producing Nig. Unltd. p. 2013 CA

APPEALS - Competence of - Objection - The clarification made by trial Judge is not an appealable decision - Hence the appeal of 17th June 2009 is incompetent and liable to be struck out (H3) Beloxxi & Co. Ltd. v. South Trust Bank p. 1997 CA

APPEALS - Fresh evidence - Admission of - Conditions - For leave to adduce such evidence - Court must ensure that the evidence must be inter alia - Such as could not have been with reasonable diligence - Obtained for use at the trial (H2) Zenith Bank Plc. v. John p. 2025 CA

APPEALS - Fresh issue - Raising of - Anatogu v. Iweka II - Once an issue is fundamental in nature - Appellate court will for that reason - Be disposed to give leave for it to be raised and heard (H4) Zenith Bank Plc. v. John p. 2025 CA

APPEALS - Interlocutory stage - Determination of substance of the

1828 INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2014) 5 KLR CA

ruling sought to be relied on - Should be at hearing of the substantive appeal - As such issue is not determined at interlocutory stage (H3) Zenith Bank Plc. v. John p. 2025 CA

APPEALS - Right of appeal - Final judgment - Once final decision is given by HC sitting at first instance - Anybody aggrieved can appeal to CA - Notwithstanding whether grounds are of fact or mixed law and fact (H1) Beloxxi & Co. Ltd. v. South Trust Bank p. 1997 CA

APPEALS - Right of appeal - Ground of law - Right against matter that was originally heard by a lower court but went on appeal to HC - Is circumscribed by 1999 Constitution s. 242(1) - Unless ground is of law alone (H2) Beloxxi & Co. Ltd. v. South Trust Bank p. 1997 CA

COURTS - Actions - Functus officio - A learned trial Judge becomes functus officio - Only after he has disposed of the main claim - As well as the counter claim (H6) Beloxxi & Co. Ltd. v. South Trust Bank p. 1997 CA

JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS - Authorities - Distinction - Eboigbe's case - The State Limitation Law is not applicable - As the case law was not in respect of item on exclusive legislative list of 1999 Constitution (H4) Benson v. Mobil Producing Nig. Unltd. p. 2013 CA

JURISDICTION - Fundamentality of - Question of jurisdiction is a fundamental one - Which is capable of being raised even verbally - And for the first time at the apex court (H5) Zenith Bank Plc. v. John p. 2025 CA

STATUTES - Conflict of laws - Bayelsa State Limitation Law that seeks - To curtail right of action created by Oil Pipeline Act - Is unconstitutional (H1) Benson v. Mobil Producing Nig. Unltd. p. 2013 CA

STATUTES - Interpretation of - As the words which make up the provisions are unambiguous - The same must be given their ordinary literal meaning (H1) Zenith Bank Plc. v. John p. 2025 CA

STATUTES - Limitation Act - Effect of - Limitation Act removes the right of action of a plaintiff - Hence it should be strictly interpreted (H3) Benson v. Mobil Producing Nig. Unltd. p. 2013 CA

INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES

Constitution of Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, s. 294(1)(5)(6) Akoma v. Osenwokwu p. 1915, s. 233, 315[1], [4][b] Akintokun v. LPDC p. 1831

Evidence Act, s. 127(1)(b) Olonade v. Sowemimo p. 1963

Legal Practitioners (Amendment) Decree No. 21 of 1994 Akintokun v. LPDC p. 1831

Legal Practitioners Act 1962 (No. 33), ss. 6[3], 7[1][6] Akintokun v. LPDC p. 1831

Legal Practitioners Act Cap 207 LFN 1990, ss. 11[7], 12[5][6][7] Akintokun v. LPDC p. 1831

Legal Practitioners Act Cap. 101 LFN & Lagos 1958, ss. 20, 31-37 Akintokun v. LPDC p. 1831

Legal Practitioners Act Cap. L11 LFN 2004 Akintokun v. LPDC p. 1831

COURT OF APPEAL

Bayelsa State Limitation Law Cap. 18, s. 16 Benson v. Mobil Producing Nig. Unltd. p. 2013 CA

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, s. 248 Zenith Bank Plc. v. John p. 2025 CA, ss. 241(1)(a), 242 Beloxxi & Co. Ltd.

1830 INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES IN (2014) 5 KLR

v. South Trust Bank p. 1997 CA, ss. 4(3)(5), 251(i)(n), 315 Benson
v. Mobil Producing Nig. Unltd. p. 2013 CA

Court of Appeal Rules 2007, O. 4 r. 2 Zenith Bank Plc. v. John p.
2025 CA

Limitation Act 1623 Benson v. Mobil Producing Nig. Unltd. p. 2013
CA

Limitation Decree No. 88 of 1966, s. 70 Benson v. Mobil Producing
Nig. Unltd. p. 2013 CA

Oil Pipelines Act 1990, s. 19 Benson v. Mobil Producing Nig. Unltd.
p. 2013 CA