



Case Number:	Succession Cause 798 of 2013
Date Delivered:	17 Sep 2021
Case Class:	Civil
Court:	High Court at Kakamega
Case Action:	Ruling
Judge:	William Musya Musyoka
Citation:	In re Estate of Jeremiah Kamau Muchiri (Deceased) [2021] eKLR
Advocates:	-
Case Summary:	-
Court Division:	Civil
History Magistrates:	-
County:	Kakamega
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 HIGH COURT OF KENYA AT KAKAMEGA

SUCCESSION CAUSE NO. 798 OF 2013

IN THE MATTER OF THE ESTATE OF JEREMIAH KAMAU MUCHIRI (DECEASED)

RULING

1. The application for determination is the summons dated 18th December 2015, which seeks confirmation of the grant herein. It is brought at the instance of Joseph Muchiri Kamau and Elizabeth Waithera Njoroge, who I shall refer to hereafter as the applicants. It carries proposals on distribution of the assets of the estate. There is an attached consent n Form 37, duly executed by Joseph Muchiri Kamau, Elizabeth Waithera Njoroge, Francis Ndung'u Kamau, Gladys Muthoni and Milka Mugure Kamau.

2. There is only one objection to the distribution, by Peter Wainaina Kamau, through a protest affidavit, sworn on 8th September 2016. I shall refer to him as the protestor. He raises only two principal objections: that motor vehicle KDY *** did not belong to the estate, for he had bought it; and that the deceased had died testate having left a will. The protest affidavit on record does not have any annexures. There is, therefore, no evidence that KDY *** had ceased to be estate property, and equally there is no evidence that the deceased had made any will, leave alone a valid one.

3. The applicants filed separate affidavits, in response, which are perfect replicas of each other, essentially making a variety of accusations against the protestor.

4. I have not found anything substantive in the protest. The protestor has not presented any material to show that he owned the vehicle he claims he bought from the deceased. He has equally not attached copy of the will that he says the deceased made. He who alleges must prove. He has said nothing about the distribution proposed by the applicants, and I shall take it that he has no concrete objection to it.

5. In the end, I find no merit at all in the protest. Since there is no serious opposition to the proposals made in the summons for confirmation of grant, dated 18th December 2015, I shall allow the same. The estate shall be distributed as proposed. A certificate of confirmation of grant shall issue accordingly. Any party unhappy with these orders has leave of 28 days to move the Court of Appeal appropriately.

DELIVERED, DATED AND SIGNED IN OPEN COURT AT KAKAMEGA THIS 17TH DAY OF SEPTEMBER 2021

W MUSYOKA

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](#)