



**REPUBLIC OF KENYA**

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KENYA AT NAIROBI**

**CRIMINAL APPEAL 1402 OF 1984**

**SEMPOLO OLE NAENI.....APPELLANT**

**VERSUS**

**REPUBLIC.....RESPONDENT**

**(Appeal from the Second Class District Magistrate’s Court at Kajiado, GK Mutai Esq)**

**JUDGMENT**

The appellant, Sempolo Ole Naeni, together with four others, who have not lodged any appeal were convicted on their own pleas of guilty, by the learned second class magistrate, Kajiado, of the offence of

“Moving Animals without a permit, contrary to rule 29(1) of the Animal and Disease Rules, cap 364, Laws of Kenya.”

The appellant, together with 4 others, were each sentenced to pay a fine of Kshs 2,000 in default, 3 months’ imprisonment. A further order was made forfeiting the 33 head of cattle to the Government. The appellant’s appeal before me was against both conviction and sentence, and the order of forfeiture. When the hearing of this appeal started before me, Mr Nyairo, State Counsel, conceded on the ground that the section under which appellant was charged, did not exist, as rule 29(1) of cap 364, was the rule dealing with “Notification of infected areas,” not a penalty section for “Moving animals without a permit.” Mr Nyairo relied on the case of *Uganda v Keneri Opidi* reported in [1965] EALR page 614. I have gone through the case and I would say, it provides a useful guide. I find that the appellant suffered a miscarriage of justice in having been convicted under rule 29 of cap 364, Laws of Kenya. The miscarriage of justice suffered cannot be cured under section 382 Criminal Procedure Code, because it goes to the root of the matter, in that the offence created under these Rules is, “Movement of Animals within restricted areas without a permit.” The intention of the legislature was to restrict movement of animals in restricted areas, not just movement of animals generally. This is why this defect cannot be cured by section 382 Criminal Produce Code. I also find that the proviso to section 382, Criminal Procedure Code cannot apply in this case either, because the appellant and the others who were unrepresented in the lower court, could not have been expected to know that they were charged under a non-existent section. Because of the foregoing, I am left with no alternative, but to allow the appeal, quash conviction and set aside the sentence imposed on the appellant. Because of the nature of the conviction imposed on the appellant, plus the other co-accused who have not appealed, these are Lekenye ole Noonkiyos, Kuya ole Loikitasae, Nkilasi ole Siaponi and Ntoyiau ole Moreru, I feel inclined to exercise my revisionary

powers under section 364(1) of the Criminal Procedure Code, and order that they all be acquitted and released forthwith, unless otherwise lawfully held. If any fine had been paid by the appellant, Sempolo ole Naeni, or any of the other accused persons charged together with him in the lower court, I order that such monies be refunded back to them.

Finally, I rescind the trial magistrate's order for the forfeiture of 33 head of cattle, and order that the head of cattle be restored to the owners. Orders accordingly.

**Dated and Delivered at Nairobi this 10th day of December 1984.**

**J.A.ALUOCH**

**JUDGE**



While the design, structure and metadata of the Case Search database are licensed by [Kenya Law](#) under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International](#), the texts of the judicial opinions contained in it are in the [public domain](#) and are free from any copyright restrictions. Read our [Privacy Policy](#) | [Disclaimer](#)