



Case Number:	Criminal (Revision) Case 21 of 1979
Date Delivered:	26 Sep 1979
Case Class:	Criminal
Court:	High Court at Nairobi (Milimani Law Courts)
Case Action:	Judgment
Judge:	Edward Trevelyan, Surrender Kumar Sachdeva
Citation:	Republic v Mohamed Hassan [1979] eKLR
Advocates:	AR Rebelo senior State Counsel for the Republic. Kirumba Mwaura for the Accused.
Case Summary:	<p><b>Republic v Mohamed Hassan</b></p> <p><b>High Court, Nairobi</b></p> <p><b>26th September 1979</b></p> <p><b>Trevelyan &amp; Sachdeva JJ</b></p> <p><b>Criminal (Revision) Case No 21 of 1979</b></p> <p><i>Criminal law – sentence - mitigation – accused gaining no profit from crime – age of accused – delay between trial and sentence</i></p> <p><b>Appeal</b></p> <p>The Republic appealed to the High Court (Criminal (Revision) Case No 21 of 1979) against the sentence awarded against Mohamed Hassan on his conviction by FG Hiuhu Esq, Resident Magistrate, Nairobi (in Criminal Case No 2928 of 1978), on charges of forgery, uttering and obtaining a cover note.</p> <p><b>Cases referred to in judgment:</b></p> <p>1. <i>Mohamed Warsama HT Musa Aboker Bah</i></p>

	<p><i>Majelo v R</i> (1956) 23 EACA 576.</p> <p><b>Advocates</b></p> <p><i>AR Rebelo</i> senior State Counsel for the Republic.</p> <p><i>Kirumba Mwaura</i> for the Accused.</p>
Court Division:	Criminal
History Magistrates:	-
County:	Nairobi
Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	-
Case Outcome:	-
History County:	-
Representation By Advocates:	Both Parties Represented
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 AT NAIROBI**

**CRIMINAL (REVISION) CASE NO 21 OF 1979**

**REPUBLIC.....APPELLANT**

**VERSUS**

**MOHAMED HASSAN.....ACCUSED**

**JUDGMENT OF THE COURT**

The accused was charged with, and convicted upon, charges of forgery, uttering and obtaining a cover note. In the words of the magistrate “the accused is the one who engineered a fraud to cheat the insurance company after his lorry had an accident”, so he was satisfied that there had been deliberate fraud. But then, without calling on the prosecutor or defence counsel, he went on, “In this case nobody lost anything. The accused is an old *mzee*. Discharged for six months.” It is true that no money was got from the fraud; but that was not the charge, although we bear that in mind. We doubt that the accused who is fifty years old qualifies on sight for the description given him. But never mind. He is fifty years old. But beyond that, the award which the magistrate made, unaided, was, on the facts patently inadequate and in law quite wrong. On the facts, it did not recognise the gravity of the offence, even taking in all that Mr Mwaura has urged, and in law because you must have a separate sentence or award for each count on which a conviction is had; see *Mohamed Warsama H T Musa Aboker Bah Majelo v R* (1956) 23 EACA 576. Of course, no real gain resulted to the accused who has, as a result of all that happened indeed lost a fair amount of money; but the fact that one is burdened with years, while for taking into account, is no cushion, of itself for criminal activity. Of course, there has been a delay which was, on the face of it, overlong between the end of the hearing and the delivery of judgment; but it does not, as we believe, offend the Constitution; nor does it go further than to be taken fully into account. Having heard what Mr Rebelo urged before us, we set aside the award made, and having taken into account all that Mr Mwaura has urged before us we set concurrent sentences of nine months each on each count. This we believe, fully takes into account the matter of delay and also all that Mr Mwaura said in respect of it and generally.

*Order accordingly.*

**Dated and delivered at Nairobi this 26th day of September 1979.**

**E. TREVELYAN**

**JUDGE**

**S.K SACHDEVA**

**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](#)