



Case Number:	Environment and Land Judicial Review 27 of 2008
Date Delivered:	10 Dec 2019
Case Class:	Civil
Court:	Environment and Land Court at Meru
Case Action:	Ruling
Judge:	Lucy Ngima Mbugua
Citation:	Republic v Lands Demarcation Officer Amwathi/Maua Adjudication Unit & another; M'birithia Kithongo & 8 others (Interested Parties) Ex parte M' Lingera M'tuaruchiu [2019] eKLR
Advocates:	-
Case Summary:	-
Court Division:	Environment and Land
History Magistrates:	-
County:	Meru
Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	-
Case Outcome:	-
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>	

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA**

**IN THE ENVIRONMENT AND LAND COURT AT MERU**

**ELC JR NO. 27 OF 2008**

**IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION OF JUDICIAL REVIEW ORDERS OF PROHIBITION AND CERTIORARI  
AGAINST THE DECISION OF THE LANDS ADJUDICATION OFFICER IGEMBE DISTRICT**

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF SECTIONS 8 AND 9 OF THE LAW REFORM ACT**

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF OBJECTION NO. 668/97 AMWATHI/MAUA ADJUDICATION UNIT**

**REPUBLIC.....APPLICANT**

***VERSUS***

**THE LANDS DEMARCATION OFFICER AMWATHI/MAUA**

**ADJUDICATION UNIT.....1<sup>ST</sup> RESPONDENT**

**THE DISTRICT LANDS ADJUDICATION AND SETTLEMENT**

**OFFICER IGEMBE DISTRICT.....2<sup>ND</sup> RESPONDENT**

**M'BIRITHIA KITHONGO.....1<sup>ST</sup> INTERESTED PARTY**

**ISABELLA KARWIRA.....2<sup>ND</sup> INTERESTED PARTY**

**JULIUS BAARIU NTOITOBIL.....3<sup>RD</sup> INTERESTED PARTY**

**MUTUMA M' KIRIMA.....4<sup>TH</sup> INTERESTED PARTY**

**ISUMAEL MITHIKA AYUBU.....5<sup>TH</sup> INTERESTED PARTY**

**ALICE GACHOGA SAMWEL.....6<sup>TH</sup> INTERESTED PARTY**

**FRANCIS MUTHEE.....7<sup>TH</sup> INTERESTED PARTY**

**EUNICE KINANU MBOROKI.....8<sup>TH</sup> INTERESTED PARTY**

**JULIUS KINYUA.....9<sup>TH</sup> INTERESTED PARTY**

**M' LINGERA M'TUARUCHIU.....EX-PARTE APPLICANT**

## RULING

1. **M' Lingeria M'Tuaruchiu** (*the ex-parte applicant herein*) instituted these Proceedings vide a Notice of Motion dated 7<sup>th</sup> May 2008 praying for leave to challenge the Decision made by the 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondent dated 8<sup>th</sup> November 2007 in objection case no. 668 of 97 and the leave was granted on 8.5.2008. The ex-parte applicant filed his substantive application on 29<sup>th</sup> May 2008 praying for the following Orders;

**(a) That this Honourable Court be pleased to issue an Order of Certiorari to quash the decision of the land Adjudication Officer dated 8<sup>th</sup> November 2007 made in objection No. 668/97 Amwathi/Maua Adjudication Unit Igembe District.**

**(b) That an Order of Prohibition be issued against the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondents prohibiting each of them or anybody else from implementing the decision dated 8<sup>th</sup> November 2007 in Objection No.668/1997 Amwathi/Maua Adjudication Unit, Igembe District.**

**(c) That this Honourable Court do grant costs of this application to the ex-parte applicant.**

**(d) That the leave so granted do operate as stay of implementation/execution of the decision dated 8<sup>th</sup> November 2007 in Objection No. 668/1997 Amwathi/Maua adjudication unit.**

**(e) That the costs of the application be provided for.**

2. Between the years 2008 to 2017 the proceedings have been marred with calls for settlement of the issues in dispute and numerous adjournments.

3. The amended Notice of Motion application of 23.2.2018 was filed pursuant to leave granted on 2/11/2017 which introduced the 1<sup>st</sup> to 9<sup>th</sup> interested parties.

4. The 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Interested parties filed a preliminary Objection dated 8<sup>th</sup> October 2018 seeking this honourable Court to dismiss the notice of motion on the following grounds;

**a) That the application is bad in law in that it has not complied with Order 53 Rule 7 of the Civil Procedure Rules.**

**b) That the prayers sought by the applicant are bad in law as no verifying affidavit has been filed as required by the law.**

5. The preliminary objection was canvassed by way of written submissions where by both parties, the Ex-parte Applicant and the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> interested parties have duly filed their submissions.

### **Analysis and Determination**

6. I have looked at the proceedings, the Notice of motion, the Preliminary Objection and the submissions of the parties. I discern that the Main issue for determination is whether the Notice of Motion application was filed contrary to the provisions of order 53 rule 7 of the Civil Procedure Rules.

7. The decision which the applicant herein seeks to challenge was made on 8<sup>th</sup> November 2007. The Ex-parte Applicant made the application seeking leave to file for Judicial Review on 7<sup>th</sup> May 2008. This was a day before the lapse of the six months period enshrined in **Order 53 Rule 2 of the Civil Procedure Rules**, where it is stipulated that;

*“An Application for such leave as aforesaid shall be made ex-parte to a judge in chambers, and shall be accompanied by a statement setting out the name and description of the applicant, the relief sought and the grounds on which it is sought, and by affidavits verifying the facts relied on.”*

8. The application for leave was supported by the sworn affidavit of the ex-parte applicant and a statement of facts. I therefore find that to this end the application was well placed and within the provisions of the Civil Procedure Rules. The substantive motion was there after filed on 29.5.2008 which is well within the 21 one days.

9. The 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> interested party also took issue with the fact that the decision sought to be quashed was not verified by an affidavit as enshrined in Order 53 Rule 7 of the Civil Procedure Rules. The said section provides;

*“In the case of an application for an order of certiorari to remove any proceedings for the purpose of their being quashed, the applicant shall not question the validity of any order, warrant, commitment, conviction, inquisition or record unless before the hearing of the motion he has lodged a copy thereof verified by affidavit with the registrar, or accounts for his failure to do so to the satisfaction of the court.”*

10. The record shows that the applicant has attached a copy of the decision he is seeking to challenge and the same was marked as exhibit **MMI** in his affidavit. The decision has also been certified as a true copy of the Original by the Land Adjudication and settlement Officer. I find that by attaching the aforesaid copy of the decision, the applicant satisfied the threshold required under Order 53 Rule 7 of the Civil Procedure Rules.

11. The last point of contention by the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> interested party is that they have not been served with the relevant pleadings. The court takes special cognizance of the fact that the interested parties have since come on record and the fact that it was a challenge to effect service on all the interested parties. It is however debatable whether or not they have been served with the pleadings here in since how then would they have known of the inconsistencies perceived through their preliminary Objection.

12. The last ambit of their preliminary objection is that the interested parties were not party to the decision. The interested parties have been referred to as persons who were given portions of the suit premises. I find them to be necessary parties to the suit since they are bound to be affected by the decision of this Court.

13. I therefore find that the Preliminary objection by the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> interested parties dated 8<sup>th</sup> October 2018 lacks merit and the same is therefore dismissed with costs to Exparte Applicant. I note that this suit has been marking time in court corridors since year 2008. I therefore direct that the same be heard on priority basis.

**DATED, SIGNED AND DELIVERED IN OPEN COURT AT MERU THIS 10<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF DECEMBER, 2019 IN THE PRESENCE OF:-**

C/A: Kananu

Gikunda Anampiu holding brief for H. Gitonga for Exparte Applicant

Gikonyo holding brief for Rimita for 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> interested parties

**HON. LUCY. N. MBUGUA**

**ELC 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](#)