



Case Number:	Succession Cause 168 of 2000
Date Delivered:	21 Dec 2015
Case Class:	Civil
Court:	High Court at Kericho
Case Action:	Directions
Judge:	Hedwig Imbosa Ong'udi
Citation:	Kimutai A Ngetich v Esther Chepkoskei Kotutu [2015] eKLR
Advocates:	Mr Motanya for the 1st Petitioner
Case Summary:	-
Court Division:	Family
History Magistrates:	-
County:	Kericho
Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	-
Case Outcome:	Orders of 4th June 2015 for the protest vacated
History County:	-
Representation By Advocates:	One party or some parties represented
Advocates For:	-
Advocates Against:	-
Sum Awarded:	-
<p>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.</p>	

REPUBLIC OF KENYA

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KENYA AT KERICHO

SUCCESSION CAUSE NO. 168 OF 2000

IN THE MATTER OF THE ESTATE OF THE LATE ZAKAYO KIMUTAI KOTUT (Deceased).

KIMUTAI A NGETICH.....1ST PETITIONER

VERSUS

ESTHER CHEPKOSKEI KOTUTU.....2ND PETITIONER

DIRECTIONS

1. This matter was coming for judgment on 30th October 2013 on the main issue of distribution of the estate of the deceased Zakayo Kimutai Kotutu.

2. Mr. Kimutai A. Ngetich filed an affidavit of protest on 24th September 2014 as directed by the Court on 1st July 2014.

3. No directions were taken on how the protest was to be heard. The two counsel appearing for the parties agreed by consent to dispose of the matter by way of written submissions.

- While highlighting the submissions it was indicated that the property falling for distribution was:

i. *Kericho/Nyamanga/325 (11) Acres*

ii. *Kericho/Roret/829 (14.2) Acres*

iii. *Kericho/Roret/599 (1.8) Ha.*

According to Mr. Motanya the two families have no problem with the distribution of No's (ii) & (iii).

Both petitioners have presented their different modes of distribution which are not in agreement.

- The 2nd petitioner says parcel no (i) was wholly sold to Samwel Kiplangat Kirui while the 1st

petitioner says only 6 out of the 11 acres were sold to the said Samuel Kiplangat Kirui.

- There is also an issue of the 1st Petitioner wanting compensation, over tea bushes. These are not matters which can be determined through written submissions.
- My view is that oral evidence must be led and witnesses cross-examined to assist the Court on how distribution should be done.
- I therefore vacate the Orders of 4th June 2015 for the protest to be determined by written submissions.
- The Order setting this matter for judgment on 30th October, 2015 is also set aside.
- The protest shall be determined by way of viva voce evidence.
- The parties to be heard on the earliest date available.

Dated, Signed and Delivered in open Court this 21st day of December, 2015.

H.I. ONG'UDI.

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](#)