



Case Number:	Petition 9 of 2014
Date Delivered:	23 Jun 2014
Case Class:	Civil
Court:	High Court at Meru
Case Action:	Directions
Judge:	Peter Muchoki Njoroge
Citation:	Law & Social Deelopment Trust (LASODET) & 2 others v Attorney General & 10 others [2014] eKLR
Advocates:	-
Case Summary:	-
Court Division:	Judicial Review
History Magistrates:	-
County:	-
Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	-
Case Outcome:	Allowed partly
History County:	-
Representation By Advocates:	-
Advocates For:	-
Advocates Against:	-
Sum Awarded:	-

The information contained in the above segment is not part of the judicial opinion delivered by the Court. The metadata has been prepared by Kenya Law as a guide in understanding the subject of the judicial opinion. Kenya Law makes no warranties as to the comprehensiveness or accuracy of the information.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KENYA T MERU

PETITION NO. 9 OF 2014

IN THE MATTER OF ARTICLES 22, 70 AND 258 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF KENYA 1020

IN THE MATTER OF THE CONTRAVENTION OF FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS AND FREEDOMS UNDER
ARTICLES 19, 20, 27, 32, 35, 42, 44 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF KENYA 2010

AND IN THE MATTER OF THE CONTRAVENTION OF ARTICLES 2(5) & (6), 10, 60, 62, 63, 67, 69,
70, 71, 73 AND 174 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF KENYA 2010

BETWEEN

LAW & SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT TRUST (LASODET).....1ST PETITIONER

ATIRIRI BURURI MA CHUKA TRUST.....2ND
PETITIONER

WENDY W. MUTEGI AND OTHERS 3000 PETITIONERS

as named in the schedule attached in the schedule annexed.....3RD PETITIONER

AND

THE HONOURABLE ATTORNEY GENERAL.....1ST
RESPONDENT

THE CABINET SECRETARY

MINISTRY FOR ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.....2ND
RESPONDENT

THE CABINET SECRETARY MINISTRY OF LANDS.....3RD
RESPONDENT

THE NATIONAL LAND COMMISSION.....4TH
RESPONDENT

THE KENYA
FOREST.....5TH
RESPONDENT

KENYA WILDLIFE
SERVICE.....6TH
RESPONDENT

THE CABINET SECRETARY

MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION.....7TH
RESPONDENT

THARAKA NITHI COUNTY GOVERNMENT.....8TH
RESPONDENT

RHINO ARK.....
.....9TH RESPONDENT

THE NYAYO TEA ZONES DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION.....10TH
RESPONDENT

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT

AUTHORITY
("NEMA").....11TH
RESPONDENT

DIRECTIONS

This is an environment case. What was slated for today was the hearing of 2 applications. The first one is by Wendy Mutegi on behalf of other petitioners dated 22.4.2014. The second one is by the 1st petitioner dated 13.6.2014.

Gleaning from the expressions of the parties in Court, the two applications spawn weighty and convoluted issues. There have even been allegations that the petitioners and even one of their advocates feel insecure. Some of the respondents do not oppose one of the applications. The issue of who represents who has also been raised. The rationale for bringing some of the respondents on board has been questioned.

The Constitution of Kenya requires that the principle of sound conservation and protection of ecologically sensitive areas be embraced when the Court deals with environmental matters. The Court should also consider the principle that resources should be managed in a sustainable and productive manner.

There have been claims that the saw millers have paid millions of shillings to be allowed to harvest trees in the disputed forest. It has also been claimed that the oversight agency, NEMA, and the lead agency, Kenya Forestry Service, have approved the harvest of the trees being challenged. There has even been a claim that the petitioners are not altruistic in their applications but are only piqued as they have not been allowed to partake in the financial benefits arising out of the millers harvesting of the trees.

To demystify these issues, I give the following directions/orders:

1. ***This application be heard very urgently.***
2. ***The application should be heard by way of written submissions with all petitioners filing and exchanging their submissions within 14 days.***
3. ***Respondents to file their submissions within 14 days after service by the petitioners.***
4. ***All respondents allowed to file their responses within 10 days and all parties are allowed***

liberal leave to respond, if and as necessary.

5. In their submissions, parties should raise all pertinent issues including representation and clear any grey areas.

6. In accordance with the precautionary principle, I grant prayer c of the application dated 22.4.2014. Prayer e of the application is granted STRICTLY pending interpartes hearing of this application.

7. Regarding the application dated 13th June, 2014, prayer e is granted STRICTLY pending interpartes hearing of this application. Prayer c is granted.

8. Regarding apprehension by the Petitioners and one of the advocates regarding threats to their security, I direct that they present themselves before the County Commander of Police, Tharaka, Nithi so that concerned OCPD'(s) and OCS'(s) can investigate this matter

9. All parties to properly serve all parties they have not served.

10. Directions on 30.7.2014 regarding a date for ruling.

11. The directions herein be typed immediately and be availed to parties at their own costs.

Dated and delivered at Meru this 23rd day of June, 2014.

P. M. NJOROGE

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](#)