

KINGS LAW REPORTS

(ALL SC/NOVEL CA)

(2015) KLR VOL 12 PART 375 pp. 3593-3758

DECEMBER 2015

Dedicated to the King of kings

O. O. NOEL ESQ. Founder/Publisher

C. L. Onwuegbuna Esq. Chief Editor

INDEX OF CASES REPORTED

1. Akinlolu v. State p. 3601
2. Assams v. Ararume p. 3629
3. Jitte v. Okpulator p. 3649
4. Sale v. State p. 3679
5. S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara p. 3707

ACTIONS - Striking out - Effect - Once a matter is struck out by a court - The court lacks jurisdiction to make any subsequent order on it (H13) S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara p. 3707

ALIBI - Defence - Conditions - For the defence to be entertained - It must be raised at earliest time - With sufficient particulars given of accused whereabouts - So as to enable police verify the claim (H10) Sale v. State p. 3679

ALIBI - Defence - Failure to investigate - Failure of police to investigate the truth or otherwise of appellant's alibi - Has cast doubt on prosecution's case (H12) Sale v. State p. 3679

ALIBI - Defence - Investigation - Prosecution must not investigate every alibi - But where accused story is capable of providing a defence - There is duty on prosecution to carry out investigation (H11) Sale v. State p. 3679

APPEALS - Civil appeals - Filing fees - The fees are generally set out by Rules of Court - And paid to registrar of the court from which appeal emanates (H5) S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara p. 3707

APPEALS - Commencement - It is initiated by filing a Notice of Appeal - Which is the foundation of a proper and valid appeal (H3) S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara p. 3707

APPEALS - Court - Discretion - Exercise of - Must always be judicial and judicious - Hence discretion based on principle that inadequate filing fees is fatal to appeal - Is a wrong exercise of discretion (H9) S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara p. 3707

APPEALS - Filing fees - Inadequacy of - Remedy - Where there is insufficient filing fee on document placed before the registry - Court should direct that such shortfall be remedied (H11) S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara p. 3707

APPEALS - Interested party - Leave - Failure to obtain - Appellants

being interested parties ought to seek leave to appeal - And having failed to do so - CA rightly struck out the appeal as incompetent (H4) *Assams v. Ararume* p. 3629

APPEALS - Leave - Application - Time frame - No period of time is prescribed within which interested party may apply for leave - But when leave is obtained - Appeal must be within time prescribed by CA Act s. 25 (H3) *Assams v. Ararume* p. 3629

APPEALS - Notice of - Filing - Proper venue - Party aggrieved by decision of any HC - Shall file his notice in registry of the trial court not that of CA - Save after compilation and transmission of record (H4) *S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara* p. 3707

APPEALS - Notice of - Filing fees - Miscalculation of - Mistake made by the court registry officials in assessing the fees - Cannot be visited on appellant (H8) *S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara* p. 3707

APPEALS - Notice of - Inadequate filing fees - Payment of inadequate filing fees can only make a process irregular - And not capable of affecting jurisdiction of the court (H7) *S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara* p. 3707

APPEALS - Notice of - Multiple filing - Appellant may file several notices but must rely on one - Hence appellants' amended notice filed within time was properly filed (H6) *S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara* p. 3707

APPEALS - Reply brief - Failure to file - Although filing of reply is not mandatory - But where appellant failed to reply to issue raised by respondent - It may amount to a concession of the point raised (H2) *S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara* p. 3707

APPEALS - Reply brief - Purpose - Where respondent's brief raises issue on points of law not covered in appellant's brief - Appellant should file a reply to deal with such new points (H1) *S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara* p. 3707

3596 INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2015) 12 KLR

APPEALS - Right of - Or with leave - Distinction - 1999 Constitution s. 243(1)(a) - A party can exercise right of appeal - While person having an interest can only exercise his right of appeal with leave (H2) Assams v. Ararume p. 3629

ARMED ROBBERY - Identification parade - Failure to conduct - Absence of conducting the parade - As well as failure to report the incident to Police timeously - Cast doubts on prosecution's case (H3) Sale v. State p. 3679

ARMED ROBBERY - Ingredients - Conspiracy - Where ingredients of armed robbery have been established - Criminal conspiracy can properly be inferred (H2) Sale v. State p. 3679

ARMED ROBBERY - Proof - Identification parade - Appellant cannot be said to have been identified by evidence of PW2 - As the trial court did not weigh the evidence - To prevent mistaken identity (H9) Sale v. State p. 3679

ARMED ROBBERY - Proof - Ingredients - Prosecution must prove that there was robbery - That the same was armed robbery - And that appellant was one of those who took part in the armed robbery (H1) Sale v. State p. 3679

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW - Constitution - Interpretation - Where words used are clear and free from ambiguity - They should be given their natural meaning - Without any embellishment (H1) Assams v. Ararume p. 3629

COURTS - Applications - Joint hearing - The procedure adopted by trial judge in hearing all applications jointly - Amounts to procedural expediency - Clearly within His Lordship's powers (H6) Assams v. Ararume p. 3629

COURTS - Customary courts - Parties - To ascertain capacity in which a party initiates action in the court - The whole proceedings must be looked into - And broad interpretation placed on the judgment (H2) Jitte v. Okpolor p. 3649

COURTS - Legislation - Interpretation - Justice - Court does not read provisions of enactment in a way to deny litigant access to justice - As court is guided by its rule in conduct of its business (H10) S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara p. 3707

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Proof - Doubt - Any doubt cast on the case of prosecution - Should be resolved in accused favour (H8) Sale v. State p. 3679

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Proof - Material witness - Prosecution must call all vital witnesses - Failure to so do will be fatal to its case - Which cannot be proved beyond reasonable doubt (H6) Sale v. State p. 3679

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Proof - Standard of - Required is not proof beyond any shadow of doubt - But proof beyond reasonable doubt - Which connotes sufficiency of evidence against accused person (H2) Akinlolu v. State p. 3601

EVIDENCE - Inconsistency rule - Application - Udo v. Queen - Inconsistency rule does not apply - To the previous confessions of an accused and his evidence in court (H3) Akinlolu v. State p. 3601

EVIDENCE - Tainted witness - As no attempt was made to show the falsity of trial court's findings - CA affirmation that PW2 is not to be classified as tainted witness cannot be faulted (H3) Akinlolu v. State p. 3601

EVIDENCE - Withholding of - Presumption - EA 2011 s. 167(d) - Evidence which could be and is not produced - Is presumed to be unfavourable to the person who withholds it (H7) Sale v. State p. 3679

FAIR HEARING - Breach - Allegation of - A party must be heard before case against him is determined - And once he can satisfy court that his right to fair hearing was infringed - He is entitled to remedy (H5) Assams v. Ararume p. 3629

IDENTIFICATION PARADE - Evidence - Weight - To guard against cases of mistaken identity - Court must consider circumstances in which eye witness saw suspect - Length of time witness saw suspect (H5) Sale v. State p. 3679

IDENTIFICATION PARADE - Necessity of - It is a must for conviction where victim did not know accused before the offence - Where victim was confronted by accused for a very short time (H4) Sale v. State p. 3679

LAND LAW - Appeals - Court - Findings - As the trial court was constituted by men better placed to appreciate the matter - Its findings that respondent rightly proved his claim cannot be faulted (H3) Jitte v. Okpolor p. 3649

LAND LAW - Appeals - Variation order - CA rightly varied the decision of the trial customary court - Rather than reversing same - For this was done in the general interest of the family (H5) Jitte v. Okpolor p. 3649

LAND LAW - Reliefs - Extent of - Respondent did not only require the court to grant him declaration to title - He also claimed for disturbance of his possessory right (H4) Jitte v. Okpolor p. 3649

LAND LAW - Trespass - Locus standi - Having established interest in the matter - Respondent has locus to defend a case of trespass into his family land (H1) Jitte v. Okpolor p. 3649

LEGAL PRACTITIONERS - Mistake - Court does not punish litigant because of error committed by his counsel - Save it can be shown that the litigant was party to the commission of the error (H12) S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara p. 3707

MURDER - Proof - Ingredients - Prosecution must prove that the deceased had died - That act of the accused caused the death - And that the act was done with intention to cause death (H1) Akinlolu v. State p. 3601

INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999, ss. 236, 243(1), 248 S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara p. 3707, ss. 241, 243 Assams v. Ararume p. 3629

Court of Appeal Act 1976, s. 25 Assams v. Ararume p. 3629

Court of Appeal Rules 2007, O. 12 r. 1 S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara p. 3707

Criminal Code Vol. 2 Laws of Cross River State (as applicable in Akwa Ibom State), s. 319(1) Akinlolu v. State p. 3601

Customary Court Edict No. 7 of 1984, s. 21 Jitte v. Okpular p. 3649

Customary Rules of Imo State 1989, O. 5 r. 2 Jitte v. Okpular p. 3649

Evidence Act 2004, s. 138(1) Sale v. State p. 3679

Evidence Act 2011, s. 135(1) Akinlolu v. State p. 3601, s. 135(1) Sale v. State p. 3679

Penal Code s. 97 Sale v. State p. 3679

Robbery & Firearms (Special Provisions) Act Cap R11 LFN 2004, s. 1(2) Sale v. State p. 3679

Supreme Court Rules, O. 2 r. 4 S.P.D.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Agbara p. 3707