

KINGS LAW REPORTS

(ALL SC/NOVEL CA)

(2016) KLR VOL 7 PART 389 pp. 3175 - 3482

JULY 2016

Dedicated to the King of kings

O. O. NOEL ESQ. Founder/Publisher

C. L. Onwuegbuna Esq. Chief Editor

INDEX OF CASES REPORTED

1. Adegbite v. Amosu p. 3185
2. Attorney-General of Kwara State v. Adeyemo p. 3209
3. Akinrinlola v. The State p. 3239
4. Friday (1) v. The State p. 3277
5. Friday (2) v. The State p. 3291
6. Ighalo v. The State p. 3311
7. Imoh v. The State p. 3337
8. Obasi v. Mikson Establishment Industries Ltd. p. 3361
9. Okiemute v. The State p. 3401
10. Osuagwu v. The State p. 3437
11. Umanah v. Nigeria Deposit Insurance Corporation p. 3465

ALIBI - Defence - Failure to investigate - As appellant's defence of alibi was not investigated - He is entitled to an acquittal and not the conviction handed on him by trial court (H6) *Osuagwu v. State* p. 3437

ALIBI - Defence - From evidence on circumstances of appellant's arrest - And his failure to raise the defence promptly - Appellant cannot be availed by the defence of alibi (H4) *Okiemute v. State* p. 3401

ALIBI - Investigation - Failure to conduct - It is not a must that once investigation is not conducted - It becomes fatal to prosecution's case - As Court can still consider credibility of prosecution's evidence (H4) *Ighalo v. State* p. 3311

ALIBI - Plea of - Particulars - Accused must state his whereabouts and those present with him at the time of the incident - And duty is then shifted to prosecution to investigate and disprove same (H3) *Ighalo v. State* p. *Ighalo v. State* p. 3311

APPEALS - Court - Jurisdiction - Basis - Jurisdiction of appellate court inures when trial court is imbued with jurisdiction - And jurisdiction is so fundamental that it can be raised any time (H4) *Adegbite v. Amosu* p. 3185

APPEALS - Grounds - Classification of - To classify ground of law or mixed law and facts - Court should examine the grounds and their particulars - And identify the substance of the appeal (H4) *Umanah v. N.D.I.C.* p. 3465

APPEALS - Grounds - Distinction - Grounds and their particulars are examined - As a ground is of law where issue of law based on proved facts is disclosed - But where disputed facts is disclosed - Then it is of mixed law and facts (H2) *Obasi v. Mikson Est. Ind. Ltd.* p. 3361

APPEALS - Grounds - Filing - Mixed law and facts - Leave must be obtained before such grounds are filed - As failure to do so renders the grounds and issues arising therefrom incompetent (H6) *Umanah v. N.D.I.C.* p. 3465

APPEALS - Grounds - Issues - Validity - Where ground is incompetent - Issues formulated from such ground - Are liable to be struck out (H5) Umanah v. N.D.I.C. p. 3465

APPEALS - Grounds of law - Validity - The grounds being complaint that rules of law were applied wrongly to established facts - Are grounds of law which can be raised without leave (H3) Obasi v. Mikson Est. Ind. Ltd. p. 3361

APPEALS - Preliminary objection - Failure to respond - Once Court is satisfied that appellant was given opportunity to react - But failed to do so - The objection should be heard and ruling rendered (H1) Umanah v. N.D.I.C. p. 3465

APPEALS - Preliminary objection - Filing - Purpose of - Isah v. INEC - It is filed against hearing of the appeal - To convince Court that the appeal is fundamentally defective (H3) Umanah v. N.D.I.C. p. 3465

APPEALS - Preliminary objection - Incorporated in brief - Respondent can argue his preliminary objection in his brief - And appellant is expected to respond by filing reply brief (H2) Umanah v. N.D.I.C. p. 3465

APPEALS - Preliminary objection - Purpose of - Preliminary objection is aimed at scuttling hearing of appeal - And as such must be determined as threshold matter (H1) Obasi v. Mikson Est. Ind. Ltd. p. 3361

APPEALS - Technicality - Weight - The appeal is based on mere technicality - As appellant lost nothing by the deletion of "Establishment" from respondent's name (H6) Obasi v. Mikson Est. Ind. Ltd. p. 3361

ARMED ROBBERY - Conspiracy - Proof - From evidence adduced - It can be inferred that appellant and others agreed to commit the crime - As their presence at the crime scene is not a coincidence (H2) Friday (2) v. State p. 3291

3178 INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2016) 7 KLR

ARMED ROBBERY - Identification - Of appellant by victims - That were not shaken under cross examination - Cannot be discredited - By counsel's speculation on absence of electricity (H7) Akinrinlola v. State p. 3239

ARMED ROBBERY - Proof - Identification - Failure to call the housemaid is not fatal - As PW1 positively identified appellant as one of the robbers (H1) Friday (2) v. State p. 3291

ARMED ROBBERY - Proof - Onus is on prosecution - To establish guilt of accused beyond reasonable doubt - By showing inter alia - That he was one of the armed robbers (H9) Akinrinlola v. State p. 3239

ARMED ROBBERY - Proof - Presumption of guilt - The toy gun used for the robbery having been found with appellant - It is presumed that he was part of the robbery gang (H1) Friday (1) v. State p. 3277

ARMED ROBBERY - Proof - The offence was proved against appellant beyond reasonable doubt - By evidence of identification given by PWs3 & 4 - Which disproved the defence of alibi (H5) Ighalo v. State p. 3311

ARMED ROBBERY - Proof - Where there are several evidence - Including appellant's confession to the crime - Prosecution has proved it's cased beyond reasonable doubt (H10) Akinrinlola v. State p. 3239

ARMED ROBBERY - Proof of - Ingredients - Prosecution must establish ingredients of the offence beyond reasonable doubt - Otherwise there will not be guilty verdict from court (H1) Osuagwu v. State p. 3437

ARMED ROBBERY - Toy gun - Possession of - The gun having been found in appellant's possession - He is bound to prove the ownership of same (H4) Friday (2) v. State p. 3291

CHARGES - Evidence - Discrepancy in - Failure to mention exhibit B in the charge is not fatal to prosecution's case - As appellant was prop-

INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2016) 7 KLR 3179

erly identified as one of the robbers (H3) Friday (1) v. State p. 3277

CHARGES - Validity - From evidence adduced and circumstances of the case - Charging of appellant with conspiracy along with the substantive charge - Does not render the charge bad in law (H5) Okiemute v. State p. 3401

CHIEFTAINCY MATTERS - Appointment - Challenge - Procedure - Aggrieved ruling house should seek redress from Governor - And if not yet satisfied - Action can be filed in Court to resolve the dispute (H5) A-G Kwara State v. Adeyemo p. 3209

CHIEFTAINCY MATTERS - Legislation - Fresh issue of jurisdiction - Raising the issue in Chiefs Law s. 3(3) for first time in SC is correct - As such issue may or may not be pleaded - And may be raised without leave (H6) A-G Kwara State v. Adeyemo p. 3209

CONVICTION - Confession - Corroboration - Though desirable and is available in this case - A satisfactory confessional statement alone is sufficient to ground conviction (H5) Akinrinlola v. State p. 3239

CONVICTION - Confession - Solola case on double interpretation - Does not apply - Where conviction is not solely based on the confessional statement (H3) Akinrinlola v. State p. 3239

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Confession - Corroboration - Veracity of a confession is tested inter alia - By whether it is possible - And consistent with other established facts (H4) Akinrinlola v. State p. 3239

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Confession - In which appellant stated his share of the armed robbery booty - Is not capable of two interpretations - As alleged by appellant's counsel (H2) Akinrinlola v. State p. 3239

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Conspiracy - Proof - Evidence of conspiracy is by inference from criminal acts or omissions of accused - Done in pursuance of criminal purpose common to them (H3) Okiemute v. State p. 3401

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Conspiracy - Proof - The coming together of accused persons - And their identification at the crime scene - Is a conclusive proof of offence of conspiracy (H2) Friday (1) v. State p. 3277

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Conviction - Confession - Where Court is satisfied that confession is direct and positive - It can convict on the confession alone (H1) Imoh v. State p. 3337

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Identification - Definition of - Can be circumstantial - Best form of is the prompt identification by the victim - Or those that witnessed the crime (H6) Akinrinlola v. State p. 3239

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Identification evidence - Must satisfy the courts - That accused committed the offence - As happened in this case (H8) Akinrinlola v. State p. 3239

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Miscarriage - Ingredient - Penal Code s. 233 - The offence is complete where intention to cause the woman's miscarriage is shown - As knowledge that death may likely occur is immaterial (H3) Imoh v. State p. 3337

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Proof - Burden of - Is on prosecution throughout and would not shift to an accused - Who makes and relies on his no case submission - Save circumstances such as where accused raises defence of insanity (H7) Osuagwu v. State p. 3437

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE - Proof - Number of witness - Prosecution need not call all the witnesses to prove its case - As the choice of witnesses is at its discretion (H4) Osuagwu v. State p. 3437

DOCUMENTS - Tendering of - Counsel's mistake - Documents not tendered at trial Court due to inadvertence of counsel - Can be tendered on appeal as fresh evidence in the interest of justice (H3) Adegbite v. Amosu p. 3185

EVIDENCE - Confession - Retraction of - Weight - Confession does

INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2016) 7 KLR 3181

not become inadmissible - Merely because appellant resiled from it - As it is an issue of evaluation within primary function of trial Court (H2) Imoh v. State p. 3337

EVIDENCE - Confession - Where voluntary, consistent and probable - Court will accept it as a satisfactory evidence to convict upon (H1) Akinrinlola v. State p. 3239

EVIDENCE - Contradiction - Weight - Contradiction is fatal where it goes to the substance of a case - As minor contradictions cannot vitiate prosecution's case (H3) Friday (2) v. State p. 3291

EVIDENCE - Conviction - Credibility of witness - Conviction of appellant based on evidence of PW3 was proper - As the witness positively identified him as perpetrator of the crime (H1) Okiemute v. State p. 3401

EVIDENCE - Cross examination - Failure to conduct - Where an adversary fails to cross examine a witness upon a particular matter - It is implied that he accepts the truth of that matter as led in evidence (H1) Ighalo v. State p. 3311

EVIDENCE - Inconsistency - Weight - PW3 having properly identified appellant - Minor contradictions in her evidence on oath and Exhibit C - Cannot render the evidence unreliable (H2) Okiemute v. State p. 3401

EVIDENCE - Single witness - Weight - Evidence of a single witness can justify conviction - If such evidence proves the case alleged - And is believed by Court which received it (H2) Ighalo v. State p. 3311

EVIDENCE - Withholding of - Effect - As prosecution failed to call the IPO to clear doubts in the matter - It is presumed that such evidence would have been favourable to accused (H5) Osuagwu v. State p. 3437

IDENTIFICATION PARADE - Conduct - Failure in - Effect - Where the exercise is poor - Trial court should return verdict of not guilty -

3182 INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2016) 7 KLR

Save there is another evidence showing correctness of the exercise (H3) *Osuagwu v. State* p. 3437

IDENTIFICATION PARADE - Conduct - Manner of - Police must assemble group of persons of common physical features - From whom witness is required to identify the suspect unaided (H2) *Osuagwu v. State* p. 3437

JUDGMENTS - Foreign judgment - Registration of - The registration shall be set aside where - Rights under the judgment are not vested in person - By whom application for registration was made (H4) *Obasi v. Mikson Est. Ind. Ltd.* p. 3361

JUDICIAL PRECEDENTS - Application of - Basis - Although decisions of superior Court are binding on all lower Courts - Yet a decision is authority for what it actually decided - Based on facts and law (H5) *Obasi v. Mikson Est. Ind. Ltd.* p. 3361

JURISDICTION - Federal High Court - Constitution 1999 s. 251(1)(p),(q),(r)(s) - Conferred exclusive jurisdiction on FHC - In a matter in which FG or any of its agency is involved (H2) *Adegbite v. Amosu* p. 3185

JURISDICTION - Fresh issue of - Leave - Due to fundamental nature of jurisdiction - Once it is raised as fresh issue - Leave is not required before it is raised in Supreme Court (H2) *A-G Kwara State v. Adeyemo* p. 3209

JURISDICTION - Fundamental nature of - Jurisdiction being a threshold matter must be resolved once it is raised - As a case heard without jurisdiction - Would be declared a nullity (H1) *A-G Kwara State v. Adeyemo* p. 3209

STATUTES - Interpretation - Literal rule - Provisions of statute that are clear and free from ambiguity - Should be construed as they are and given their ordinary meaning - Without any embellishment (H4) *A-G Kwara State v. Adeyemo* p. 3209

INDEX OF SUBJECT MATTER IN (2016) 7 KLR 3183

STATUTES - Interpretation - Where a party complains of non compliance with statutory provisions - Court must interpret and examine relevant evidence - To see if there was compliance or not (H3) A-G Kwara State v. Adeyemo p. 3209

SUPREME COURT - Fresh evidence - Tendering of - SC grants leave to adduce such evidence where inter alia - The evidence must be such as would not have been - With due diligence obtained for use at the trial (H1) Adegbite v. Amosu p. 3185

INDEX OF STATUTES & RULES

Chiefs (Appointment & Deposition) Law Cap C9 Laws of Kwara State 2006, s. 3(3) A-G Kwara State v. Adeyemo p. 3209

Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (as amended) s. 36 (5) Akinrinlola v. State p. 3239, s. 233(2)(a) Obasi v. Mikson Est. Ind. Ltd. p. 3361, ss. 233 (2)(a), (3) Umanah v. N.D.I.C. p. 3465

Criminal Code Act Cap. 77 LFN 1990, ss. 402(2)(a), 516 Osuagwu v. State p. 3437

Evidence Act 2011 s. 28 Akinrinlola v. State p. 3239, s. 131 Obasi v. Mikson Est. Ind. Ltd. p. 3361, s. 135 Ighalo v. State p. 3311, s. 135 Okiemute v. State p. 3401

Evidence Act Cap. E14 LFN 2004, s. 138(1) Imoh v. State p. 3337, s. 27 (2) Akinrinlola v. State p. 3239, s. 167(a) Friday (1) v. State p.

3277

Federal High Court (Civil Procedure) Rules 1996, O. 32 Obasi v. Mikson Est. Ind. Ltd. p. 3361

Foreign Judgments (Reciprocal Enforcement) Act Cap. 152 LFN 1990, ss. 6(1)(A)(VI), 10 Obasi v. Mikson Est. Ind. Ltd. p. 3361

High Court (Civil Procedure) Rules 2005 of Kwara State, O. 27 r. 4(i) A-G Kwara State v. Adeyemo p. 3209

Kano State High Court (Civil Procedure) Rules 1988, O. 11 r. 2, O. 26 r. 3 Obasi v. Mikson Est. Ind. Ltd. p. 3361

Penal Code, s. 233 Imoh v. State p. 3337

Robbery & Firearms (Special Provisions) Act Cap 398 LFN 1990, s. 1(2)(a) Ighalo v. State p. 3311, ss. 5(b) and 1(2)(a) Akinrinlola v. State p. 3239

Robbery & Firearms Act Cap R11 vol. 14 LFN 2004, ss. 1 (2)(a), 6(b) Friday (2) v. State p. 3291, ss. 1(2)(a), 6(b) Friday (1) v. State p. 3277, s. 1(2)(a) Okiemute v. State p. 3401

Sheriffs & Civil Process Law, s. 99 A-G Kwara State v. Adeyemo p. 3209

States Land Act Cap. 45 LFN 1958, s. 2(2) Adegbite v. Amosu p. 3185

Supreme Court Act, s. 33 Adegbite v. Amosu p. 3185

Supreme Court Rules, O. 2 r. 12 Adegbite v. Amosu p. 3185, O. 2 r. 9 Umanah v. N.D.I.C. p. 3465