



Case Number:	Misc Civ Appli 30 of 2004
Date Delivered:	13 May 2005
Case Class:	Civil
Court:	High Court at Bungoma
Case Action:	Ruling
Judge:	Joseph Kiplagat Sergon
Citation:	Republic v Chairman,Kamukuywa Lands Disputes Tribunal Court ex-parte Thamson Namunyu Njibwakale & another [2005] eKLR
Advocates:	-
Case Summary:	[RULING] Judicial review - application for orders of certiorari and prohibition - Order LIII rule 3 (1) of the Civil Procedure Rules - preliminary objection that the motion became fatally defective when it failed to cite the provisions of sections 8 and 9 of the Law Reform Act - the failure to cite the provisions of Sections 8 and 9 of the Law Reform Act is not fatal so long as a party has cited the provisions of Order LIII of the Civil Procedure rules. In any case no prejudice suffered by either side in these proceedings - preliminary objection dismissed.
Court Division:	Civil
History Magistrates:	-
County:	Bungoma
Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	-
Case Outcome:	Dismissed with costs
History County:	-
Representation By Advocates:	Both Parties Represented
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 OF KENYA AT BUNGOMA**

**Misc Civil Appli 30 of 2004**

**IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPLY FOR  
JUDICIAL REVIEW ORDERS NAMELY CERTIORARI, PROHIBITION AND  
MANDAMUS**

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION BY THAMSON NAMUNYU  
NJIBWAKALE AND SAMUEL KUCHIKHI FOR LEAVE APPLY TO APPLY  
FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW ORDERS OF CERTIORARI, PROHIBITION AND  
MANDAMUS**

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF THE LAND TRIBUNAL ACT NO. 18 OF 1990**

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF KAMUKUYWA LAND DISPUTES TRIBUNAL CASE NO.**

**5**

**OF 2003**

**BETWEEN**

**REPUBLIC.....APPLICANT**

**VS**

**CHAIRMAN, KAMUKUYWA LAND DISPUTES**

**TRIBUNAL COURT ..... RESPONDENT**

**EX-PARTE**

**VS**

**THAMSON NAMUNYU NJIBWAKALE.....1ST APPLICANT**

**SAMWEL WAMALWA KUCHIKHI.....2ND APPLICANT**

**AND**

**WYCLIFFE WANYONYI KASAKA.....INTERESTED PARTY/RES**

**R U L I N G**

In a motion taken out pursuant to the provisions of Order LIII rule 3 (1) of the Civil Procedure Rules, the applicants Thamsion Namunyu Njibwakale and Samuel Wamalwa Kuchikhi applied for judicial Review orders in the nature of certiorari and prohibition. However when the motion came up for interpartes hearing, Wycliffe Wanyonyi Kisaka, the interested party herein, raised a preliminary objection in a notice dated 21st July 2004. It therefore became imperative that the preliminary objection had to be disposed of first before the substantive motion.

The interested party was of the view that the motion became fatally defective when it failed to cite the provisions of sections 8 and 9 of the Law Reform Act Chapter 26 Laws of Kenya. Mr. Kaosa who appeared for the interested party urged this court to strike out the motion for that reason. He referred to the decision of Mr. Justice Etyang in Kitale H.C. MISC. APPLICATION NO. 150 OF 2001, in which the honourable Judge struck out a similar motion on the ground that the applicant had not cited the substantive law under sections 8 and 9 of the Law Reforms Act.

In his response, Mr. Makokha for the ex parte applicants opposed the preliminary objection. He was of the view that failure to cite the provisions of the sections 8 and 9 of the Law Reform is not fatal at all. He argued that the failure was merely technical which did not go to the jurisdiction of the case.

I have anxiously considered this preliminary objection and the arguments for and against it. To begin with it should be noted that the provisions of Order LIII of the Civil Procedure rules was promulgated pursuant to the provisions of sections 8 and 9 of the Law Reform Act Chapter 26 Laws of Kenya. In my view, the failure to cite the provisions of Sections 8 and 9 of the Law Reform Act is not fatal so long as a party has cited the provisions of Order LIII of the Civil Procedure rules. In any case no prejudice suffered by either side in these proceedings. Consequently I respectively disagree with the decision of my learned brother, Alex Etyang in Kitale H.C. Misc Application No. 150 of 2001.

The second preliminary point raised by the interested party is that the ex parte applicants failed when they did not issue and serve the Deputy Registrar of this court with the notice under Order LIII rule 1 (3) of the Civil Procedure rules at the time of obtaining leave. The applicants' advocate pointed out that the notice was duly served hence opined that this objection lacked merit.

I am satisfied that the notice issued pursuant to order LIII rule 1 (3) of the Civil Procedure Rules was served upon the Deputy Registrar of this court as evidenced in the affidavit of Martin Shikuku Okinda. This objection therefore must fail.

The upshot therefore is that the preliminary objection is dismissed with costs to the ex parte applicants.

**DATED AND DELIVERED THIS 13th DAY OF May 2005**

**J.K. SERGON**

**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](#)