



Case Number:	Civil Appeal 62 of 1981
Date Delivered:	17 Nov 1982
Case Class:	Civil
Court:	Court of Appeal at Nairobi
Case Action:	Judgment
Judge:	Alan Robin Winston Hancox, Chunilal Bhagwandas Madan, Kenneth D Potter
Citation:	Gidraph Gichingiri Gachoka v Kariuki Gachoka [1982] eKLR
Advocates:	-
Case Summary:	-
Court Division:	Civil
History Magistrates:	-
County:	Nairobi
Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	130 of 1974
Case Outcome:	APPEAL DISMISSED WITH COSTS
History County:	Nyeri
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.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL

AT NAIROBI

(Coram: Madan & Potter, JJ,A. and Hancox, Aq, J.A)

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 62 OF 1981

BETWEEN

GIDRAPH GICHINGIRI GACHOKA.....APPELLANT

AND

KARIUKI GACHOKA RESPONDENT

(Appeal from a judgment of the High Court of Kenya at Nyeri (O'kubasu, J.) dated 20th November, 1981

in

Civil Case No. 130 of 1974)

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

MADAN, J.A.

The appellant and the respondent are brothers. On 19th August, 1959 they jointly agreed to buy parcel of land known as Title No. Ruguru/Gachika/ 624 for Shs. 1,100/- from Nderitu Githai in equal shares. The appellant paid Shs. 585/- and the respondent Shs. 515/-. The respondent produced in court the agreement of sale made with Nderitu Githai for the sale of the land to these parties. As the respondent was then engaged in the "Shifta Campaign" in the North Eastern Province of Kenya the land was registered in the appellant's name alone but in trust for the two of them, the appellant to transfer the respondent's half share to him on demand. The appellant having refused to do so the respondent sued him in the High Court and asked for a declaration accordingly which he was granted. The appellant had been living on his portion of the land for fourteen years when he filed his suit. He had also erected a semi-permanent house and planted coffee. The learned judge rejected the appellant's evidence that he had allowed the respondent to stay on the land until the respondent could buy his own land. The court also made an order that the suit land be subdivided into two equal portions so that the parties may be registered as owners of their respective portions.

This was not a transaction which fell under the Land Control Act. The trust was created personally between the parties. The evidence led to the only reasonable conclusion that the appellant held half portion of the land in trust for the respondent, The appeal is dismissed with costs.

Dated at Nairobi this 17th day of November, 1982.

C.B. MADAN

.....
JUDGE OF APPEAL

K.D. POTTER


.....
JUDGE OF APPEAL

A.R.W. HANCOX

.....
AG. 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](#)