



Case Number:	Application 1 of 2014
Date Delivered:	17 Dec 2019
Case Class:	Civil
Court:	Supreme Court of Kenya
Case Action:	Ruling
Judge:	Smokin Charles Wanjala
Citation:	Charles Karathe Kiarie & 2 others v Administrators of the Estate of John Wallace Mathare (Deceased) & 2 others [2019] eKLR
Advocates:	-
Case Summary:	<p>Supreme Court declines to grant an extension of time where the delay was not explained to its satisfaction.</p> <p>Charles Karathe Kiarie & 2 others v Administrators of the Estate of John Wallace Mathare (Deceased) & 2 others [2019] eKLR</p> <p>Application 1 of 2014</p> <p>Supreme Court of Kenya</p> <p>SC Wanjala, SCJ</p> <p>December 17, 2019</p> <p>Reported by Mathenge Mukundi</p> <p><i>Civil Practice and Procedure - applications - application for extension of time to file and serve a reference out of time against the taxation ruling and orders of the Supreme Court – limitation period for filing the application – where it was alleged that the delay was occasioned by the Supreme Court Registry failure to furnish the applicants with a copy of the taxation ruling and</i></p>

typed proceedings – whether the applicants explained the delay in filing and serving a reference against the taxation ruling and orders of the Supreme Court to its satisfaction - Supreme Court Rules, 2012, rules 21, 49 and 53.

Brief facts

The applicants sought an extension of time to file a reference against the taxation ruling and orders of the Supreme Court, submitting that the delay was occasioned by the Supreme Court registry's delay in furnishing them with a copy of the typed proceedings.

The respondents contended that a copy of the ruling and typed proceedings were not required to file a reference on taxation under rule 49 (1) of the Supreme Court Rules. Even after being furnished with a copy of the ruling and typed proceedings, the applicants had not explained the 30-day delay in filing the taxation reference and that the application was an afterthought brought with an aim to delay the cause hence an abuse of court process.

Issue

Whether the applicants explained the delay in filing and serving a reference against the taxation ruling and orders of the Supreme Court to its satisfaction.

Held

A copy of the ruling and typed proceedings were availed to the applicants on May 17, 2018, and yet, it was not until June 12, 2018, that they filed the application for extension of time. The applicants contended that the 27-day delay was the time it took them, to prepare the application for extension of time. Such an explanation was neither reasonable nor credible.

Application dismissed with costs to the respondents.

Court Division:

Civil

History Magistrates:	-
County:	Nairobi
Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	-
Case Outcome:	Application dismissed
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 SUPREME COURT OF KENYA AT NAIROBI

(Coram: Wanjala, SCJ)

APPLICATION NO. 1 OF 2014

BETWEEN

CHARLES KARATHE KIARIE.....1ST APPLICANT

AND

THOMAS WANYOIKE WAINAINA.....2ND APPLICANT

KALANG ENTERPRISES.....3RD APPLICANT

AND

THE ADMINISTRATORS OF THE ESTATE OF

JOHN WALLACE MATHARE (DECEASED).....1ST RESPONDENT

THE ADMINISTRATORS OF THE ESTATE OF

DENNIS WAWERU RIMUI (DECEASED)..... 2ND RESPONDENT

THE ADMINISTRATORS OF THE ESTATE OF

JOYSE WANJA GITAU (DECEASED).....3RD RESPONDENT

(Being an application for extension of time to file and serve a reference out of time against the Taxation Ruling and Orders of the Supreme Court (D. Ole Keiuwa, Hon Deputy Registrar) delivered on 13th April, 2018).

RULING OF THE COURT

[1] **UPON** perusing the Notice of Motion Application by the Applicants dated 12th June 2018, brought under Rules 21, 49 and 53 of the Supreme Court Rules, 2012 and Article 163 of the Constitution, seeking an extension of time to file a Reference against the Taxation Ruling and Orders of the Supreme Court Deputy Registrar dated 13th April, 2018 in *Supreme Court, Civil Application No. 1 of 2014*; and

[2] **UPON** reading the Applicants' Supporting Affidavit sworn on 12th June 2018; and

[3] **UPON** considering the Applicants' written submissions dated 12th June 2018, and filed on 8th August 2018, wherein the Applicants submit that, the delay in filing the Reference under Rule 49 of the Supreme Court Rules 2012, was occasioned by the Supreme Court Registry's delay in furnishing them with a copy of the typed proceedings; that the typed proceedings were only availed to the Applicants on 17th May 2018; and

[4] **UPON** reading the 1st and 2nd Respondents' Replying Affidavit sworn on 10th July 2018, and filed on 11th July 2019, in which the Respondents oppose the Application, arguing that a copy of the Ruling and typed proceedings are not required to file a

Reference on Taxation under Rule 49(1) of the Supreme Court Rules; that even after being furnished with a copy of the Ruling and typed proceedings, the Applicants have not explained the 30 day delay in filing the Taxation Reference; that the Application is brought with an aim to delay this cause, hence an abuse of court process; and

[5] UPON considering the 1st and 2nd Respondents' written submissions dated 7th August 2018 and filed on even date in which, the Respondents have argued, that the Applicants filed their application for extension of time after an unjustified delay of 48 working days from the date of delivery of the Ruling; that the whole period of delay has not been explained satisfactorily to the Court; that the Respondents will suffer prejudice should the extension of time be granted; and, that the Application is an afterthought and an abuse of court process;

[6] I FIND as follows;

a) A copy of the Ruling and typed proceedings were availed to the Applicants on the 17th May 2018, and yet, it was not until the 12th of June 2018, that they filed the Application for extension of time. The Applicants contend that the 27-day delay is the time it took them, to prepare the application for extension of time. Such an explanation, in my view, is neither reasonable nor credible.

[7] HAVING considered the Application and the Affidavit filed in support thereof, the Replying Affidavit in opposition thereto, and the written submissions of the respective parties, I make the following Orders under Section 23(2)(b) of the Supreme Court Act, 2011 and Rules 21 and 23 of the Supreme Court Rules, 2012;

ORDERS

(i) *The Application dated 12th June, 2018 and filed on even date is hereby dismissed.*

(ii) *The Applicants shall bear costs of the Application.*

Orders accordingly.

DATED and DELIVERED at NAIROBI this 17th day of December, 2019

.....

S. C. WANJALA

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](#)