



Case Number:	Election Petition 4 of 2017
Date Delivered:	14 Nov 2017
Case Class:	Civil
Court:	Supreme Court of Kenya
Case Action:	Ruling
Judge:	David Kenani Maraga, Jackton Boma Ojwang, Isaac Lenaola, Philomena Mbete Mwilu, Smokin C Wanjala, Susanna Njoki Ndungu
Citation:	Njonjo Mue & another v Chairperson of Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission & 4 others [2017] eKLR
Advocates:	-
Case Summary:	<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Legal requirements to be enjoined as an interested party in Supreme Court Proceedings</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Njonjo Mue & Another v Chairperson of Independent Electoral and Boundaries Commission & 4 Others [2017] eKLR</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Presidential Election Petition 4 of 2017 <i>(Application for Joinder as an Interested Party)</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Supreme Court of Kenya</p> <p style="text-align: center;">D. Maraga, CJ, P. Mwilu, DCJ, J. B. Ojwang, S. Wanjala, N. Ndung'u and I. Lenaola, SCJJ</p>

November 14, 2017

Reported by Chelimo Eunice

Civil Practice & Procedure – parties – parties to a suit – joinder as an interested party - where Applicant applied to be admitted as an interested party in proceedings before the Supreme Court – circumstances in which a party can be admitted as an interested party in a matter – where the Applicant was a presidential candidate in the fresh Presidential Election - whether the Applicant could be admitted as an interested party in the circumstances –Supreme Court Rules, 2012, rule 25; Supreme Court (Presidential Election Petition) Rules, 2017, rule 4 (2).

Brief facts:

Ekuru Aukot, the Party Leader of the Thirdway Alliance Kenya, made an application for joinder as an interested party in the Presidential Election Petition No. 4 of 2017. He contended that he had direct and legitimate interest in the petition; that he was a presidential candidate for both the general election held on August 8, 2017 and the fresh presidential election held on October 26, 2017; that being a presidential candidate in the election which was the subject of the instant petition, he would suffer prejudice if he was not enjoined as a party in the proceedings; that he would advance submissions that were relevant and useful to the petition and which would be different from those of the other parties since he had been an active player in the elections and had gathered crucial information, facts and analysis that had a direct bearing on the instant proceedings and the ultimate outcome; and, that he would be directly affected by the outcome of the instant petition.

The Applicant further contended that he had made a similar application within Presidential Election Petition No. 1 of 2017 and the Court had found that he would have been prejudiced if not enjoined

and that he had an identifiable stake in the matter in line with the criteria laid down in ***Trusted Society of Human Rights Alliance v Mumo Matemu & 5 Others***, Supreme Court Petition No. 12 of 2013, [2015] eKLR and ***Francis Kariuki Muruatetu & another v Republic & 5 others***, Supreme Court Petition No. 15 & 16 of 2015 (consolidated) [2016] eKLR.

Issues:

1. What were the legal requirements governing applications for parties to be enjoined as interested parties in Supreme Court Proceedings?
2. Whether the Applicant satisfied the legal requirements governing applications for parties to be enjoined as interested parties in Supreme Court Proceedings.

Relevant Provisions of the Law

The Supreme Court Rules, 2012;

Rule 25; Interventions;

(1) A person may at any time in any proceedings before the Court apply for leave to be joined as an interested party.

(2) an application under this rule shall include :-

(a) a description of the interested party;

(b) any prejudice that the interested party would suffer if the intervention was denied; and

(c) the grounds or submissions to be advanced by the person interested in the proceeding, their relevance to the proceedings and the reasons for believing that the submissions will be useful to the Court and different from those of the other parties.

(4) An application under this rule shall be determined on the basis of written submissions. Provided that the Court may, where the applicant is unrepresented, direct that submissions may not be made orally.

	<p><i>The Supreme Court (Presidential Election Petition) Rules, 2017;</i></p> <p><i>Rule 4 (2);</i></p> <p><i>4(2); Where there is no applicable provision in the Act or in these Rules, the procedures set out in the Supreme Court Rules, 2017 in so far as they are not inconsistent with the Act or these Rules, shall apply to an election petition.</i></p> <p>Held:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Applicant qualified to be joined as an interested party and allowed the application under Rule 25 of the Supreme Court Rules as read with Rule 4(2) of the Supreme Court (Presidential Election Petition) Rules, 2017. 2. The application met the principles laid out in <i>Trusted Society of Human Rights Alliance v Mumo Matemu & 5 Others</i>, Supreme Court Petition No. 12 of 2013[2015]eKLR and <i>Francis Kariuki Muruatetu & another v Republic & 5 others</i>, Supreme Court Petition No. 15 & 16 of 2015 (consolidated)[2016]eKLR in that the Applicant having been a presidential candidate in the fresh presidential election would have been directly affected by the outcome of the petition in the event of invalidation of the declared results. <p><i>Application allowed.</i></p>
Court Division:	Civil
History Magistrates:	-
County:	-
Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	-
Case Outcome:	Petition allowed
History County:	-
Representation By Advocates:	-

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>	

THE REPUBLIC OF KENYA

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF KENYA

(Coram: Maraga: CJ & President, Mwilu; DCJ & V-P, Ojwang, Wanjala, Njoki & Lenaola, SCJJ)

PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION PETITION NO. 4 OF 2017

(APPLICATION FOR JOINDER AS INTERESTED PARTY)

BETWEEN

**NJONJO MUE.....1st
PETITIONER**

**KHELEF KHALIFA.....2nd
PETITIONER**

AND

THE CHAIRPERSON OF INDEPENDENT

ELECTORAL AND BOUNDARIES COMMISSION.....1ST RESPONDENT

INDEPENDENT ELECTORAL AND

BOUNDARIES COMMISSION.....2ND RESPONDENT

H.E UHURU MUIGAI KENYATTA.....3RD RESPONDENT

NATIONAL SUPER ALLIANCE (NASA).....4TH RESPONDENT

AND

EKURU AUKOTAPPLICANT/ INTERESTED PARTY

RULING

(An application for joinder as an interested party under Rule 25 of the Supreme Court Rules, 2012 as read with Rule 4 (2) of the Supreme Court (Presidential Election Petition) Rules, 2017)

- 1. UPON** perusing the application dated 10th November, 2017 and filed on 11th November, 2017 by **Ekuru Aukot** for joinder as an interested party in **the Presidential Election Petition No. 4 of 2017** and;
- 2. UPON** reading: **the affidavit of Mr. Ekuru Aukot**, the Party Leader of the Thirdway Alliance Kenya, sworn on the 10th November, 2017; and;
- 3. UPON** considering the arguments made for the applicant in which **it is contended that the applicant**

has direct and legitimate interest in the present petition; he was a presidential candidate for both the General Election held on the 8th of August 2017 and the fresh Presidential election held on 26th October, 2017; being a presidential candidate in the election which is the subject of the present petition, he will suffer prejudice if he is not enjoined as a party in the proceedings; he shall advance submissions that are relevant and useful to the petition and which will be different from those of the other parties since he has been an active player in the elections and has gathered crucial information, facts and analysis that have a direct bearing on the current proceedings and the ultimate outcome; and, that he will be directly affected by the outcome of this petition.

4. The applicant had made a similar application within Presidential Election Petition No. 1 Of 20017 in the month of August and the Court found he would have been prejudiced if not enjoined and that had an identifiable stake in the matter in line with the criteria laid down in **Trusted Society of Human Rights Alliance v Mumo Matemu & 5 Others**, Supreme Court Petition No. 12 of 2013, [2015] eKLR and **Francis Kariuki Muruatetu & another v Republic & 5 others**, Supreme Court Petition No. 15 & 16 of 2015 (consolidated); [2016] eKLR

5. Having considered the application, by a unanimous decision of the Court, we find that the applicant qualifies to be joined as an interested party and make the following orders under Rule 25 of the Supreme Court Rules as read with Rule 4(2) of the Supreme Court (Presidential Election Petition) Rules 2017.

6. ORDERS

REASONS

The application is allowed.

The application meets the principles laid out in **Trusted Society of Human Rights Alliance v Mumo Matemu & 5 Others**, Supreme Court Petition No. 12 of 2013, [2015] eKLR and **Francis Kariuki Muruatetu & another v Republic & 5 others**, Supreme Court Petition No. 15 & 16 of 2015 (consolidated); [2016] eKLR in that the applicant having been a presidential candidate in the fresh Presidential Election will be directly affected by the outcome of the petition in the event of invalidation of the declared results.

DATED and DELIVERED at NAIROBI this 14th Day of November, 2017.

.....

D. K. MARAGA

CHIEF JUSTICE & PRESIDENT

OF THE SUPREME COURT

.....

J.B. OJWANG

JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

.....

P. M. MWILU

DEPUTY CHIEF JUSTICE &

VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE SUPREME COURT

.....

S. C. WANJALA

JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

.....
S. N. NDUNGU

.....
I. LENAOLA

JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT

I certify that this is a true copy of the original

REGISTRAR

SUPREME COURT OF KENYA



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](#)