



Case Number:	Civil Suit 464 of 1999
Date Delivered:	23 Jun 2005
Case Class:	Civil
Court:	High Court at Nairobi (Milimani Law Courts)
Case Action:	Ruling
Judge:	Philip John Ransley
Citation:	Loinge Printers & 29 others v City Council of Nairobi [2005] eKLR
Advocates:	-
Case Summary:	[RULING]Injunction - interlocutory injunction - to restrain local authority from implementing the terms of a gazette notice purporting to increase rent payable by the applicant - duty of the applicant to show that it has a prima facie case with a probability of success and that damages would not be an adequate remedy
Court Division:	Civil
History Magistrates:	-
County:	-
Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	-
Case Outcome:	-
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 OF KENYA**

**AT NAIROBI
CIVIL SUIT 464 OF 1999**

1. LOINGE PRINTERS1ST PLAINTIFF
2. CHARLEEN INSURANCE BROKERS2ND PLAINTIFF
3. ARSO3RD PLAINTIFF
4. MILLENIUM INSURANCE BROKERS4TH PLAINTIFF
5. MODERN SECRETARIAL SERVICES5TH PLAINTIFF
6. HESIMA INSURANCE BROKERS6TH PLAINTIFF
7. BUSINESS REGISTRARS7TH PLAINTIFF
8. KINYANJUI & ASSOCIATES8TH PLAINTIFF
9. SURVEY CONSULTANTS9TH PLAINTIFF
10. ATHARA & PARTNERS10TH PLAINTIFF
11. RUNJI & PARTNERS11TH PLAINTIFF
12. BARLANY CAR HIRE SERVICES12TH PLAINTIFF
13. RUMBA KINUTHIA & CO. ADVOCATES13TH PLAINTIFF
14. DR. SAMSON WANJALA14TH PLAINTIFF
15. GROSSBY AGENCIES15TH PLAINTIFF
16. KIMURA & ASSOCIATES16TH PLAINTIFF
17. WEST CONSULT17TH PLAINTIFF
18. PENTIUM TECHNOLOGIES18TH PLAINTIFF
19. WORLDWIDE CHURCH OF GOD.....19TH PLAINTIFF
20. DR. D.K. KIBUGA20TH PLAINTIFF
21. BONUS TRAVEL21ST PLAINTIFF
22. PLANO CONSULT22ND PLAINTIFF

23. HOTEL & ADVENTURES TRAVEL	23RD PLAINTIFF
24. COPOS LIMITED	24TH PLAINTIFF
25. INTEX S.S. ENTERPRISES SERVICE	25TH PLAINTIFF
26. ICHANGAI GICHUHI & ASSOCIATES	26TH PLAINTIFF
27. INBRED ARCHITECTS	27TH PLAINTIFF
28. MOHINDRA ENTERPRISES	28TH PLAINTIFF
29. NJERU NYAGA & ASSOCIATES	29TH PLAINTIFF
30. KENYA INSTITUTE OF PROFESSIONAL STUDIES.	30TH PLAINTIFF

VERSUS

THE CITY COUNCIL OF NAIROBIDEFENDANT

RULING

The Applicants seek an injunction in the following terms: -

“(2) **THAT** the Defendant be restrained either by itself, its agents and/or servants from implementing and/or enforcing terms and /or provisions of Gazette Notice dated 14th December, 2001 or in any manner whatsoever increasing the Plaintiffs/applicants rents and/or service charges until further orders of this court.”

The grounds on which it is sought are as follows:

- (a) **THAT** the Plaintiff have been tenants of the Respondents for over twenty years;
- (b) The Respondent purported to raise the rent payable by the Plaintiff by way of a Gazette Notice dated 14th December, 2001;
- (c) **THAT** in so doing the Applicants were not consulted at all, and the resultant proposed increments were translated to a massive and oppressive 283%;
- (d) **THAT** the Plaintiffs had challenged the said Gazette increments by way of Judicial Review in High Court Misc. application No.478 of 2002 and thereafter in Civil Appeal NO. 301 of 2002.
- (e) **THAT** the Court of Appeal found one of the main reason for challenging the increment being poor service by the Respondent, the same cannot be addressed through Judicial Review as they were matters of evidence and hence the present proceedings.
- (f) **THAT** the arrears based on the new rates are quite huge and unless the Respondents is retrained from recovering the same, the applicants business may be totally crippled.

The Applicants challenged the Gazette Notice, as stated on the grounds, by way of Judicial Review.

In a Judgment on Appeal from the decision of Mr. Justice Rimita the Learned Court of

Appeal held that: -.

1. The Gazette which was lawful and

2. The Landlord & Tenant (Shop, Hotel & Catering Establishment) Act does not apply to the City Council.

In order to succeed the Applicant must show that it has a prima facie case with a probability of success and that damages would not be an adequate remedy.

What the Applicant is trying to attain is an order restraining the Respondent from enforcing the Gazette Notice.

This can only be ordered where the Gazette Notice is unlawful or is null and void for some reason. However in the Appeal referred to above the Learned Court of Appeal found that the legal Notice was valid. Although in different proceedings that is a finding which even if not binding on this court is persuasive so that this court must take notice of it. In the result I cannot issue an injunction to restrain the Respondent exercising their lawful rights in respect of the Gazette Notice.

I therefore decline to grant the orders asked for and dismiss this application with costs to the Respondent.

Dated and delivered at Nairobi this 23rd day of June 2005

P.J. RANSLEY

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](#)