



Case Number:	Criminal Appeal 155 of 2004
Date Delivered:	11 Nov 2005
Case Class:	Criminal
Court:	High Court at Kakamega
Case Action:	-
Judge:	GBM Kariuki J
Citation:	Victor Odhiambo Nduso v Republic [2005] eKLR
Advocates:	-
Case Summary:	Criminal law - being in possession of Narcotic Drug contrary to section 3(1) as read with section 4(a) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Control Act, Act No. 4 of 1994 - accused person convicted and sentenced to a fine of Kshs. 60,000 in default imprisonment for five years - appeal - whether the trial court failed to consider the accused person's mitigation before passing sentence - whether the sentence meted out to him was excessive
Court Division:	-
History Magistrates:	-
County:	-
Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	-
Case Outcome:	Allowed
History County:	Baringo
Representation By Advocates:	Neither party 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 KAKAMEGA

Criminal Appeal 155 of 2004

{Appeal against both conviction and sentence of the Senior Resident Magistrate's court at Butere in Criminal Case No.979 of 2004 (B. O. OCHIENG ESQ., RM)}

VICTOR ODHIAMBO NDUSO APPELLANT
VERSUS
REPUBLIC RESPONDENT

JUDGEMENT

In his Petition of Appeal, the Appellant, Victor Odhiambo Nduso, proffered three grounds in which he submitted that the trial court failed to consider his mitigation before passing sentence and that the sentence meted out to him was excessive. He also submitted that his plea was unequivocal.

The appellant was convicted by the Resident Magistrate at Butere, in Cr.C. No.979/04, on his own plea of guilty. The offence was being in possession of Narcotic Drug contrary to section 3(1) as read with section 4(a) of Act 4 of 1994. He was fined Shs.60,000/= and in default to a term of five years in prison.

The record shows that the charge was read to the appellant in Kiswahili as were the facts and that the appellant admitted both as true following which he was convicted. He was given an opportunity to mitigate which he did. The trial court considered the mitigating factors before passing sentence. The court also considered why a severe sentence was called for. The sentence was in the discretion of the trial court.

The appellant did not show that the trial court exercised that discretion on the wrong principle or overlooked material factors nor did he show that the sentence was excessive in the circumstances. In the light of this, I find no merit in the appeal and I dismiss it.

Dated at Kakamega this 11th day of November, 2005.

G. B. M. KARIUKI
J U D G E



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](#)