



Case Number:	Criminal Revision 24 of 2014
Date Delivered:	19 Dec 2014
Case Class:	Criminal
Court:	High Court at Malindi
Case Action:	Revision
Judge:	Said Juma Chitembwe
Citation:	M D T v Republic [2014] eKLR
Advocates:	-
Case Summary:	-
Court Division:	Criminal
History Magistrates:	-
County:	Kilifi
Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	-
Case Outcome:	Accused discharged.
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.

REPUBLIC OF KENYA

IN THE HIGH COURT AT MALINDI

CRIMINAL DIVISION

CRIMINAL REVISION NUMBER 24 OF 2014

(From the original conviction and sentence in criminal Sexual Offences

Case Number 41 of 2011 of Malindi)

M D T**A**

APPLICANT

VERSUS

REPUBLIC

.....**RESPONDENT**

ORDERS ON REVISION

I have gone through the record of the trial court. The accused was charged with the offence of Defilement. The Complainant was aged 15 years old. The Complainant informed the court that she got married to the accused. They lived with the accused for one month until when the Children's Officer arrested them.

The accused has applied for revision of the sentence. His main ground is that he was 17 years old when the offence was committed. The record of the trial court shows that once the court passed judgment, an age assessment report was called for. The report dated 12th August, 2013 indicate that the Applicant was about 19 years old. The offence was committed in June, 2011. The accused testified before the court and produced his birth certificate which shows that he was born on 27th February, 1994.

Given the information herein, it is established that the accused was 17 years old when the offence was committed. Section 189 of the Children of the Children Act No. 8 of 2001 prohibits the use of the words "conviction and sentence" in relation to children. Section 191 of the same Act provides for methods of dealing with child offenders.

From the record herein, I do find that there is no need to send the accused to a Borstal Institution. The Complainant's position is that the two were married. Since both of them were minors, none could give consent to have sex as under the Sexual Offences Act, a child cannot give consent to have sex. The two parties were both children. I do find that punishing one of the children would be unfair. Further, the evidence of the Complainant is quite clear. The two used to communicate on phone and definitely the parents knew about it.

In the end, the sentence of twenty (20) years imprisonment is hereby reviewed as the same is unlawful. I will discharge the accused under Section 35 of the Penal Code. The discharge is absolute. The accused shall be set at liberty unless otherwise lawfully held.

Delivered and dated at Malindi this **19th** day of **December, 2014**.

Said J. Chitembwe

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](#)