



Case Number:	Civil Appeal 103 of 1996
Date Delivered:	16 Oct 1996
Case Class:	Civil
Court:	Court of Appeal at Nyeri
Case Action:	Judgment
Judge:	Johnson Evan Gicheru, Abdulrasul Ahmed Lakha, Richard Otieno Kwach
Citation:	EUNICE KARIMI KIBUNJA v MWIRIGI M'RINGERA KIBUNJA [1996] eKLR
Advocates:	-
Case Summary:	-
Court Division:	Civil
History Magistrates:	-
County:	Nyeri
Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	-
Case Outcome:	Allowed with costs
History County:	-
Representation By Advocates:	Both Parties 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 COURT OF APPEAL OF KENYA
AT NYERI**

Civil Appeal 103 of 1996

EUNICE KARIMI KIBUNJA.....APPELLANT

AND

MWIRIGI M'RINGERA KIBUNJA.....RESPONDENT

(Appeal from Ruling and decree of the High Court of Kenya at Meru (Kuloba J) dated 4th March, 1993

IN

H. C. C. C. NO. 126 OF 1992)

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

This is an appeal by the unsuccessful plaintiff whose suit by way of an originating summons was dismissed by the superior court (Kuloba, J.) by his ruling delivered on March 4, 1993 on a so called preliminary point of law that the suit was time barred.

By her originating summons the plaintiff claimed a declaration that she had become entitled by adverse possession to 5 acres out of a parcel of land ABOTHUGUCHA/GITHONGO/494. Without any evidence or finding as to when the possession by the plaintiff became adverse to that of the defendant or when the suit became barred by limitation, the judge dismissed the plaintiff suit.

We have carefully considered the appellant,' complaint and find that the complaint is fully justified. The issue before court clearly required a full hearing and we reiterate that the practice of raising point, which should be argued in the normal manner, by way of preliminary objection does nothing but unnecessarily increase cost and, on occasion, confuse the issues. A preliminary point cannot be raised if any fact has to be ascertained.

Accordingly and, for the reasons above stated, the appeal is allowed with costs here and in the court below and the case is remitted to the superior court for hearing on its merits.

Dated and delivered at Nyeri this 16th day of October, 1996.

J. E. GICHERU

.....

JUDGE OF APPEAL

R.O. KWACH

.....

JUDGE OF APPEAL

A.A.LAKHA

.....

JUDGE OF APPEAL

I certify that this is a true copy of the original.

DEPUTY REGISTRAR



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](#)