



Case Number:	Civil Application 301 of 2009
Date Delivered:	24 Jun 2010
Case Class:	Civil
Court:	Court of Appeal at Nyeri
Case Action:	Ruling
Judge:	Joseph Gregory Nyamu
Citation:	Boniface Njuguna Gakuru v Paul Njoroge Gakuru [2010] eKLR
Advocates:	Mr. Nganga, learned counsel for the applicant
Case Summary:	Civil practice and procedure-leave to appeal-application for leave to file and serve notice of appeal and record of appeal out of time-discretionary power of the court to extend time-principles applied by the court in exercise of its discretion-whether the intended appeal was arguable-whether the respondent would suffer prejudice if the application was allowed-validity of application-Court of Appeal Rules rule 4
Court Division:	Civil
History Magistrates:	-
County:	-
Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	HCCC 92 OF 2007
Case Outcome:	Application allowed
History County:	-
Representation By Advocates:	One party or some 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.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF KENYA**  
**AT NYERI**

**CIVIL APPLICATION 301 OF 2009**

BETWEEN

BONIFACE NJUGUNA GAKURU ..... APPLICANT

AND

PAUL NJOROGE GAKURU ..... RESPONDENT

(An application for leave to file and serve notice and record of appeal out of time against the judgment of the High Court of Kenya (Mbatia J.) dated 27<sup>th</sup> July 2009)

is

H.C.C. NO. 301 OF 2009

.....

**SULLING.**

The applicant has invoked rule 4 of this Court's Rules in seeking an extension of time to file and serve a notice of appeal and record of appeal out of time against the judgment of Mbatia J. delivered on the 27<sup>th</sup> July 2009 in High Court Civil Appeal No. 301 of 2009. In support of the application the applicant has relied on grounds in the body of the application namely, that the applicant is not guilty of inordinate delay, the respondent is not likely to suffer any prejudice and that the applicant has a good appeal with high chances of success. In addition the applicant has more extensively explained the above grounds in an affidavit in support of the application sworn on 10<sup>th</sup> September 2009.

The principal grounds relied on by Mr. Njuguna, learned counsel for the applicant is that the applicant's advocate at the time the judgment was delivered on 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2009 had advised that there was nothing more which could be done and that by the time the applicant sought advice from the second advocate Mr. Njuguna, the time for filing the notice of appeal had expired. Mr. Njuguna further submitted that the applicant was outside the prescribed time for the filing of the notice of appeal by 27 days which was largely due to the change of legal representation and that this delay was not in the circumstances foreseeable and could be excused. As regards the chances of success of the appeal Mr. Njuguna explained that as the subject matter of the dispute is both the District Land Charges Tribunal and the Provincial Land Charges Tribunal and by extension, the decision of the Resident Magistrate's Court involved a registered title, he sought to argue on appeal that the District Land Charges had no jurisdiction to deal with registered land and that the tribunal's award was a nullity and therefore of the other bodies which handled the matter thereafter perpetrated a nullity and consequently the superior court had seriously misdirected itself on the matter.

He concluded the submissions by stating that since the matter involved land and it is not likely to be interfered with in terms of ownership between now and the determination of the intended appeal, the respondent would not experience any hardship or suffer prejudice.

On her part Miss Masi contended that the application was misconceived and therefore an abuse of the court process, that no reasons for the delay of 27 days was given; that no leave had been sought and allowed by the superior court and therefore there is currently no right of appeal to this Court; that the court has no jurisdiction to entertain the application and finally that as the application in the superior court was based on merit it was properly dismissed instead of being struck out.

I have considered the factors which guide the exercise of this Court's discretion under rule 47 - see [Law of Civil Procedure in Kenya, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Chapter 10, Civil Appeal No. 255 of 1997 \(unreported\)](#). I have also considered the factors which assist in giving effect to the overriding objective as set out in the Appellate Jurisdiction Act. I have deliberately brought it to the respondent's attention, because the O<sub>1</sub> principle is the whole objective of the Appellate Jurisdiction Act and therefore the O<sub>2</sub> principle is both substantive and procedural. The factual basis is that the total delay occasioned over 27 days which period elapsed as the applicant made arrangements to change representation and I have also taken into account the respondent's responsibility of what prima facie appears to be a substantive jurisdictional issue touching on the vital title and the subsequent decision-making bodies and for all these reasons my inclination is to grant a reasonable extension of time.

Since the purpose of the overriding objective is to enable this Court to do justice in the special circumstances of each appeal, I consider that in the special circumstances before me preventing the applicant from having an appeal which touches on jurisdiction based on merit because of a delay of 27 days and which in my view has been satisfactorily explained would be unjust.

All in all, I allow the application and order that the applicant files and serve a notice of appeal together within 14 days from the date hereof and a record of appeal within 14 days of the service of the notice of appeal. I further order that the costs abide the outcome of the appeal. It is so ordered.

Dated and delivered at Nairobi this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of June, 2010.

J. G. WYAMU

JUDGE OF APPEAL

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

\*\*\*\*\*



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](#)