



Case Number:	Election Petition Appeal 45 of 2017
Date Delivered:	23 May 2017
Case Class:	Civil
Court:	High Court at Nairobi (Milimani Law Courts)
Case Action:	Judgment
Judge:	Stephen Nyangau Riechi
Citation:	Ronald Melkizedek Milare v Frankline Imbenzi & another [2017] eKLR
Advocates:	Mr. Wanyonyi Mr. Noor
Case Summary:	-
Court Division:	Constitutional and Human Rights
History Magistrates:	-
County:	Nairobi
Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	-
Case Outcome:	Appeal allowed
History County:	-
Representation By Advocates:	Both 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 NAIROBI**

**ELECTION PETITION APPEAL NUMBER 45 OF 2017**

**RONALD MELKIZEDEK MILARE. .... PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**MR. FRANKLINE IMBENZI. .... 1<sup>ST</sup> RESPONDENT**

**ORANGE DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT .....2<sup>ND</sup> RESPONDENT**

***(AN APPEAL FROM THE DECISION OF THE POLITICAL PARTIES DISPUTE TRIBUNAL IN CASE NO. 168 OF 2017 DELIVERED ON 11<sup>TH</sup> MAY, 2017 BY KYALO MBOBU, JAMES ATEMA AND HASSAN ABDI)***

***BETWEEN***

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA**

**IN THE POLITICAL PARTIES DISPUTE TRIBUNAL**

**CASE NUMBER 168 OF 2017**

**RONALD MELKIZEDEK MILARE. .... PETITIONER**

**VERSUS**

**MR. FRANKLINE IMBENZI. .... 1<sup>ST</sup> RESPONDENT**

**ORANGE DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENT .....2<sup>ND</sup> RESPONDENT**

**J U D G M E N T**

The Appellant, **Ronald Melkizedek Milare** and the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent, **Mr. Frankline Imbenzi** are members and were aspirants for the nomination of Member of Country Assembly Harambee Ward under the ODM ticket. That they participated in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent's nomination exercise for the candidate of Member of Country Assembly Harambee Ward conducted on 30<sup>th</sup> April, 2017. The Appellant states that the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent was irregularly declared the winner and issued with a provisional nomination certificate by the returning officer of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent after allegedly garnering 402 votes against the Appellant 469 which were announced on the 1<sup>st</sup> May, 2017.

The Appellant filed an appeal with the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent's Special Appeals Tribunal which delivered its judgment on the 6<sup>th</sup> May, 2017 revoking the provisional nomination certificate issued to the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent and directed NEB to nullify the nomination of the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent and issue the Nomination Certificate to the Appellant as the Member of Country Assembly Harambee Ward in Nairobi County.

The 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent appealed to the Political Parties Dispute Tribunal which set aside the decision of the

County Appeals Tribunal that nullified the Appellant's nomination Certificate. Dissatisfied with the judgment, the Appellant filed this appeal.

The appellant filed 3 grounds of appeal: -

- 1. The honourable Tribunal erred in fact and in law in failing to find that the Appellant was indeed the declared nominee of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent.**
- 2. The Honourable Tribunal erred in fact and in law in directing the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent to issue a nomination certificate to the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent without appreciating the overwhelming evidence tendered by the Appellant.**
- 3. The honourable tribunal erred in fact and in law in arriving at a decision that amounted to declaring the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent as the nominee of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent without appreciating the overwhelming evidence on record.**

The 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent thereafter filed a complaint with the Political Parties Dispute Tribunal in relation to the Appellant's nomination election for the candidate for member of Country Assembly Harambee Ward.

The Political Parties Dispute tribunal delivered its judgment on 11<sup>th</sup> of May, 2017 and quashed the decision of the National Appeals Tribunal for the sole reason that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent's National Appeals Tribunal did not accord the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent an opportunity to be heard and thus consequently without looking at all material evidence on record, the affidavit of the Returning officer admitting on oath that he occasioned an error at the tallying Centre which eventually made him declare the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent the elected nominee of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent as opposed to the actual winner the Appellant.

The Appellant contends that decision was bad in law and in fact since factually he had the highest votes tallied and it was an act of commission of the Returning officer when he erroneously added 100 votes to the results of the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent at Lumumba Social Hall Polling Centre.

The 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent Franklin Imbenzi filed a response by way of replying affidavit dated 22<sup>nd</sup> May, 2017 in which the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent contends that contrary to Memorandum of Appeal the allegations of the Appellant that he won was not supported by documentary evidence but mere statement sworn by the Appellant and his cronies. That the purported evidence alleged to be from the Returning officer one Wilson Nkurruna is a forgery. He further contends that he came to the conclusion of forgery on the basis that on the face of it, the signatures of the Provisional Certificate issued by the same Mr. Nkurruna and the affidavit in support of the complaint signed by the same person bear a similar signature whilst the Replying affidavit of the Appellant tendered at the Political Parties Dispute Tribunal bears a completely different signature purportedly signed by the said Returning Officer.

The 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent avers that it is incomprehensible and illogical that the Returning Officer who deposed an affidavit in support of the Complainant also deposed another Affidavit in opposition to the Complaint. Further he avers that from the advice by his Advocates on record, which he believes to be true that the Honourable Tribunal did not error in law for that it upheld the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent's rights to fair hearing and fair administrative action as guaranteed under article 47 and 50 and Section 4 of the Fair Administrative Act. That the Tribunal did not error in fact for reasons that the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent herein was never heard in the party's appeals tribunal a fact that was never controverted by the Appellant.

Mr. Wanyonyi for the Appellant filed written submissions which he highlighted. Counsel submitted that the Appellant along with others participated in the primaries. However, an error committed by the

Returning Officer Mr. William Nkurrana who tallied the results more specifically at Lumumba Social Hall Polling Station inflated the votes received by the Respondent by 100 votes which caused the Respondent to be declared a winner by the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent receiving 502 votes to the Appellants 469 votes. He submitted that the Returning Officer owned up to this mistake. To buttress his argument, counsel submitted that in the same polling station, Women representative whose case was 313, and for Member of Parliament 320 but for MCA position was 402 votes cast. He, therefore submits that due to this error the Appellant was robbed of his victory.

Mr. Noor for the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent submitted that the primaries were faulty conducted and the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent emerged the winner with 502 votes and was issued with a nomination certificate. The Appellant filed a complaint before the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent IDRIM but the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent did not participate as he was locked out and the special tribunal gave an ex-parte judgment which was challenged at the PPDT which found that he was not accorded a fair hearing. He on this appeal he submits that the Appellant has not rendered any documents to show that the tallying was changed. He submits that some of the documents purported to be signed by the Returning Officers are forgeries prepared for this appeal.

The main issue in this appeal as agreed by both parties is whether the results declared by the Returning Officer, Mr. William Nkurrana were the correct results or whether they were erroneous. Mr. William Nkurrana swore a further affidavit sworn on 10<sup>th</sup> May, 2017 in which he deponed

inter alia: -

**1. That the process went on smoothly and the results from each polling station were tallied as shown in the table below: -**

	Ronald Milare	Jack Olonde	Jackstone Mkabwa	John Oluoch	Frankline Imbenzi	Paul Ogola
Harambee Primary	130	20	15	8	12	7
Jericho Social Hall	42	28	23	4	214	4
Buruburu Girls & Rabai Road	116	135	41	29	60	10
Lumumba Social Hall	112	22	52	9	188	1
Bidii Primary & Baraka Primary School	69	29	42	108	28	10

**2. That based on these results, I announced the Complainant as the winner of the elections with 502 votes and presented him with a provisional certificate.**

**3. That the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent subsequently filed a complaint with the Party tribunal and I was contacted because an anomaly had been detected in the final tally figures.**

**4. That it emerged that the Complainant's votes at Lumumba Social Hall had been inflated by 100 votes as the Complainant had only garnered 88 votes. Therefore, the wrong candidate was declared the winner.**

In an earlier affidavit sworn on 8<sup>th</sup> May, 2017 the same William Nkurrana had deponed:

**1. That I was the Returning Officer in charge of the ODM Party Nomination exercise for Makadara**

**Constituency, conversant with the facts stated in the complaint and competent to swear this affidavit.**

**2. That, the nomination exercise was free and fair and devoid of any irregularities whatsoever.**

**3. That I supervised the nomination exercise on the 30<sup>th</sup> of April, 2017 where the complainant emerged the winner having garnered 502 votes in Harambee Ward.**

**4. That I declared him the winner and subsequently sued with the provisional certificate.**

**5. That there was no violence throughout the nomination exercise.**

These two affidavits sworn by the deponent cannot be accurate. Both parties by consent urged the court to call the Returning Officer to clarify the anomalies. He was asked to attend court through the Appellant's counsel but he failed to attend court and the parties urged the court to act on evidence on record.

The evidence on record is that there was glaring discrepancy in the votes cast at Lumumba Social Hall Polling Centre. This is more so when it is shown that the total votes cast at the Polling Centre for Women Representative 313 and Parliamentary seat 320 are significantly different from all the votes cast for MCA 423 votes. This discrepancy would mean that there were voters who voted for MCA but did not vote for Women Representative and Parliamentary candidates. This in my view is not possible and lends credence to Appellant submissions that the votes at Lumumba Social Hall Polling Station were inflated in favour of the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent.

I am therefore, satisfied that from the evidence the ODM nominations at the Member of County Assembly Harambee Ward were not conducted in a fair and transparent manner with the attendance result that it is not clear who won the nomination because even the Returning Officer in affidavit sworn on 10<sup>th</sup> May, 2017 disowned the results he announced.

I, therefore, allow the appeal and order that the 1<sup>st</sup> Respondent was not nominated as a MCA for Harambee Ward and the Nomination Certificate issued is hereby revoked. I order the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent, the ODM Party to conduct fresh nominations for Member of County Assembly Harambee Ward, Nairobi County within 48 hours of this order, in accordance with the Party Nomination Rules. I make no order as to costs

**Dated, signed and delivered at Nairobi this 23<sup>rd</sup> day of May, 2017.**

.....  
**S N RIECHI**

**JUDGE**

**23/5/2017**



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](#)