

# **KINGS LAW REPORTS**

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

**(2014) KLR VOL 6 PART 349 pp. 2261 - 2476**

**JUNE 2014**

**Dedicated to the King of kings**

**O. O. NOEL ESQ. Founder/Publisher**

**C. L. Onwuegbuna Esq. Chief Editor**

### **INDEX OF CASES REPORTED**

1. Adeyemi v. State p. 2271
2. A-G of Adamawa State v. A-G of Federation p. 2303
3. Ajayi v. State p. 2343
4. Anachebe v. Ijeoma p. 2363
5. Azabada v. State p. 2385
6. Sheidu v. State p. 2407
7. Umar v. State p. 2439

**ACTIONS** - Cause of action - Definition of - It is the facts which give rise to right of action - Or the factual situation which gives a person - Right to judicial relief (H3) A-G Adamawa State v. A-G Federation p. 2303

**ACTIONS** - Institution of - Limitation - Although where there is right there is a remedy - But there are certain period of limitation for instituting certain actions - For there must be an end to litigation (H5) A-G Adamawa State v. A-G Federation p. 2303

**ACTIONS** - Statute barred - Determination - To consider an action caught by statute of limitation - It is vital to determine the cause of action - When the same arose - And when it became statute barred (H1) A-G Adamawa State v. A-G Federation p. 2303

**ACTIONS** - Statute barred - Effect on jurisdiction - As the cause of action in the matter expired after 6 years of its accrual - The action is statute barred - Hence jurisdiction of SC is ousted by Limitation Acts. 7(1)(e) (H6) A-G Adamawa State v. A-G Federation p. 2303

**ACTIONS** - Statute barred - Materials to consider - To determine such action - Court looks at writ of summons and statement of claim - And compares date of cause of action - With date on which writ was filed (H2) A-G Adamawa State v. A-G Federation p. 2303

**ACTIONS** - Statute barred - Meaning - It connotes that plaintiff who had a cause of action - Loses right to enforce same - As time laid down by limitation law for instituting such action has elapsed (H4) A-G Adamawa State v. A-G Federation p. 2303

**APPEALS** - Criminal procedure - Defence - Leave - Appellant requires no leave to raise on appeal - Any defence he is on the face of record entitled to (H4) Ajayi v. State p. 2343

**APPEALS** - Evidence - Wrongful admission - Judgment would not be reversed - On account of trial court accepting inadmissible evidence - When that evidence did not occasion miscarriage of justice

## **INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2014) 6 KLR 2263**

(H6) Adeyemi v. State p. 2271

APPEALS - Extension of time - Application - Determination of - Duty of appellate court is limited to ensuring that grounds are arguable - And not deciding the merit of the grounds (H5) Anachebe v. Ijeoma p. 2363

APPEALS - Extension of time - Application - Final judgment - The appeal being predicated on final judgment of the HC - Need for trinity prayers did not arise - As only an extension of time is required (H10) Anachebe v. Ijeoma p. 2363

APPEALS - Extension of time - Application - Jurisdiction - Where proposed grounds raise issues of jurisdiction - Same ought to be granted - Because jurisdiction is life wire of any adjudication (H4) Anachebe v. Ijeoma p. 2363

APPEALS - Extension of time - Application - Reasons for - For the application to succeed - Applicant must adduce good and substantial reasons for delay - And good cause why the appeal should be heard (H1) Anachebe v. Ijeoma p. 2363

APPEALS - Extension of time - Trinity prayers - Usage - The prayers must contain necessary reliefs - For the application to be competent - And it must relate to situations where leave is required - And time within which to appeal had also expired (H7) Anachebe v. Ijeoma p. 2363

APPEALS - Filing - Leave - Where leave is necessary before appeal is validly filed - It ought to be applied for and obtained - And notice of appeal filed within statutory period (H8) Anachebe v. Ijeoma p. 2363

APPEALS - Filing - Time limit - CA Act 1976 s. 25(2)(a) - For appeal in civil matter - 14 days is required for appeal against interlocutory decision - And 3 months where appeal is against final decision (H9) Anachebe v. Ijeoma p. 2363

APPEALS - Grounds - Objection - It is not enough for respondent to

state - That the grounds are on questions of facts and mixed law and facts - It must go further to show which of them is of facts - Or mixed law and facts (H1) Sheidu v. State p. 2407

APPEALS - Grounds - Validity - Objection on ground one is untenable - As the ground encapsulates CA's reasons for decision - And it is not an obiter but a decision which is appealable (H3) Sheidu v. State p. 2407

APPEALS - Hearing - Basis for - Supreme Court determines appeal solely on issues - Formulated from grounds of appeal - And does not hear arguments on a ground - From which no issue has been raised (H2) Umar v. State p. 2439

APPEALS - Issues - Argument on - Where appellant proffers argument on issue properly distilled - Whether or not the argument is correct - Is left for court to determine (H2) Sheidu v. State p. 2407

APPEALS - Issues - Formulation - Issues are distilled from grounds of appeal - And not from particulars of grounds - And if an issue is not related to any ground - It is liable to be struck out (H1) Umar v. State p. 2439

APPEALS - Issues - Proliferation of - Effect - Issues so formulated come to naught - Since in determination of appeal - Arguments are based on issues - And not on grounds (H1) Adeyemi v. State p. 2271

APPEALS - Judgment - Correctness of - Having failed to show that CA's decision is perverse - Appellant's appeal cannot be adjudged meritorious - And the same is dismissed (H7) Ajayi v. State p. 2343

APPEALS - Leave - Right of appeal - Exercise of - Is permissible within limit as provided by law - Otherwise it can only be exercisable by leave of court (H2) Anachebe v. Ijeoma p. 2363

APPEALS - Respondent's briefs - Failure to file - Does not tantamount to automatic allowing of appeal - Especially where the mistake of counsel is glaringly evident (H2) Adeyemi v. State p. 2271

CHARGES - Plea - Irregularity - Effect - Appellant having stated that he understood the charge - Failure of court to strictly follow requirements of CPC s. 242(2)(4) - Cannot vitiate the proceedings - As it is a mere irregularity (H4) Umar v. State p. 2439

COURTS - Discretion - Exercise of - Must be judicial and judicious - As it entails application of legal principles to relevant facts - To arrive at equitable decision (H3) Anachebe v. Ijeoma p. 2363

COURTS - Evidence - Evaluation - Correctness of - The learned trial Judge rightly believed testimony of prosecution witnesses - Which gave credence to the contents of appellant's confession in exhibit F (H6) Azabada v. State p. 2385

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Appeals - Concurrent findings - That appellant's statement was voluntarily made - Cannot be disturbed in spite of his allegation of denial of fair hearing - Which has been demolished (H9) Adeyemi v. State p. 2271

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Confession - Retraction - Weight such a confession attracts is enhanced by evidence outside it - Which corroborates it and establishes that accused had - Opportunity of committing the offence admitted (H6) Ajayi v. State p. 2343

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Confession - Retraction - Where accused retracts his statement - Court must look for evidence outside the confession - That makes the confession probable (H2) Azabada v. State p. 2385

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Conspiracy - Ingredients - Proof - Surrounding circumstances including evidence of PW2 & 3 - Establish that appellant and his co accused plotted the murder of deceased (H4) Azabada v. State p. 2385

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Conviction - Confession - A positive voluntary and unequivocal statement - Is an admission of guilt - And can solely sustain a finding of guilt - Without corroboration (H8)

Adeyemi v. State p. 2271

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Conviction - Confession - Although it is desirable that conviction be based on evidence outside confession - Court can convict solely on voluntary and unequivocal confession (H5) Ajayi v. State p. 2343

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Conviction - Confession - Where confessional statement is positive and unequivocal - As to the commission of crime charged - Conviction can be based solely on it (H1) Azabada v. State p. 2385

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Defence - Clarity of - Facts constituting defence must be apparent from evidence on record - To enable court consider them - As court does not speculate over defence (H3) Ajayi v. State p. 2343

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Guilty plea - Finding - Court makes finding of guilty for accused - Who has pleaded guilty in which no evidence is led - And in which there is no address by counsel (H3) Adeyemi v. State p. 2271

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Identification of accused - Failure to prove - That accused was the person who committed the offence - Disentitles trial court from convicting - And appellate court from affirming such erroneous conviction (H1) Ajayi v. State p. 2343

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Interpreter - Record of - CPC s. 242(2) - Where interpreter is used - It is mandatory to state his name - Language in which he interprets - And that he is bound by s. 242(1) (H3) Umar v. State p. 2439

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Provocation - Defence of - It was rightly held that it is only provocation that availed appellant - As no evidence was led to show that he was actually endangered - By the acts of deceased (H10) Sheidu v. State p. 2407

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Provocation - Ingredients - Accused must

show that there was sudden act of provocation by deceased - And that he lost self control as a result of the provocation (H8) Sheidu v. State p. 2407

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Provocation & self defence - Where provocation is set up in extra judicial statement - Subsequent raising of self defence - After prosecution has closed its case - Appears to be an afterthought (H4) Sheidu v. State p. 2407

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Self defence - Proof - Apart from accused leading evidence - To show he is entitled to the defence - Prosecution has onus to establish that the defence is not available (H6) Sheidu v. State p. 2407

EVIDENCE - Corroboration - Evidence on record and the testimony of PW3 - Corroborate the confessional statement of appellant in exhibit F - Which only a participant in the crime - Would have known and recounted (H3) Azabada v. State p. 2385

EVIDENCE - Testimony of a minor - Accused having been properly identified - Issue of admission of statement of the minor - Did not lead to miscarriage of justice (H7) Adeyemi v. State p. 2271

IDENTIFICATION PARADE - Necessity of - It is useful where witness claims to have seen unfamiliar person - Who escaped from crime scene - In circumstances that require testing the witnesses' power of recognition (H2) Ajayi v. State p. 2343

JUDGMENTS - Error in - Effect - It is not every mistake that results in appeal being allowed - As the slip must be substantial and occasion miscarriage of justice (H4) Adeyemi v. State p. 2271

JUDGMENTS - Mistake in - Effect - It is not every error in judgment - That results in the decision being set aside by appellate court - As such error must be substantial - And results in miscarriage of justice (H7) Azabada v. State p. 2385

JURISDICTION - Fundamentality of - Where trial court is bereft of jurisdiction - Appellate court would have no reason to entertain appeal - Since jurisdiction gives authority and competence (H6) *Anachebe v. Ijeoma* p. 2363

MURDER - Ingredients - Proof - To secure conviction - Prosecution must prove death of deceased - Caused by act of accused - With intention of causing death - And that accused knew that death was probable (H11) *Sheidu v. State* p. 2407

MURDER - Proof - Evidence - Having regard to evidence before trial court - There is no doubt that from the force used and position of the body stabbed - Appellant intended to kill deceased (H12) *Sheidu v. State* p. 2407

MURDER - Proof - Medical report - As the killing was by gun shot as admitted in exhibit F - There is no need for medical report - To further establish the cause of death (H5) *Azabada v. State* p. 2385

MURDER - Provocation - Weight - A plea of provocation if successful - Reduces the offence of murder to manslaughter (H7) *Sheidu v. State* p. 2407

MURDER - Self defence - Ingredients - Accused must prove that his life was threatened by acts of deceased - That he used force on deceased as the only option to save his own life (H9) *Sheidu v. State* p. 2407

MURDER - Self defence - Weight - Where the defence succeeds - Accused must be discharged and acquitted - Because he was at the time of killing - In reasonable apprehension of death (H5) *Sheidu v. State* p. 2407

WORDS & PHRASES - Miscarriage of justice - Meaning of - It is a departure from the rules - Which permeate all the judicial procedure - As to make it not a judicial procedure at all (H5) *Adeyemi v. State* p. 2271



## **INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES**

Commodity Boards Decree No. 29 of 1977 (now Cap. C17 LFN 2004) A-G Adamawa State v. A-G Federation p. 2303

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, s. 33(2)(a) Sheidu v. State p. 2407, s. 36(1) Adeyemi v. State p. 2271, ss. 241(1)(a), 243(b) Anachebe v. Ijeoma p. 2363

Court of Appeal Act 1976, s. 25 Anachebe v. Ijeoma p. 2363

Court of Appeal Rules 2002, O. 3 r. 4(1)(2)(3) Anachebe v. Ijeoma p. 2363

Criminal Procedure Code, s. 242(2)(4) Umar v. State p. 2439

Evidence Act 2011, ss. 28, 29 Azabada v. State p. 2385, ss. 67, 135(1)

Umar v. State p. 2439, ss. 138, 227 Adeyemi v. State p. 2271

Federal High Court Rules 2009, O. 29 r. 1 A-G Adamawa State v. A-G Federation p. 2303

Limitation Act Cap. 522 LFN 1990, ss. 7(1)(e), 37(1) A-G Adamawa State v. A-G Federation p. 2303

Penal Code, ss. 48, 221(b) Umar v. State p. 2439, ss. 65, 66, 221, 224 Sheidu v. State p. 2407, ss. 97(1), 298(c) Adeyemi v. State p. 2271, ss. 97(1), 79 Azabada v. State p. 2385

Public Officers' Protection Act, s. 2(a) A-G Adamawa State v. A-G Federation p. 2303

Robbery & Firearms (special provisions) Act Cap 398 LFN 1990, ss. 1(2)(a), 5(b) Ajayi v. State p. 2343

Supreme Court Rules (as amended) 1999, O. 3 r. 1 A-G Adamawa State v. A-G Federation p. 2303