



Case Number:	Civil Suit 70 of 2010
Date Delivered:	11 Nov 2011
Case Class:	Civil
Court:	High Court at Kisumu
Case Action:	Ruling
Judge:	Hilary Kiplagat Chemitei
Citation:	JOSEPH ABONGO v MOSES ODOYO NYAOKE & Another [2011] eKLR
Advocates:	-
Case Summary:	-
Court Division:	-
History Magistrates:	-
County:	-
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 KISUMU**

**CIVIL SUIT NO. 70 OF 2010**

**JOSEPH ABONGO ..... PLAINTIFF**

**VERSUS**

**MOSES ODOYO NYAOKE**

**..... DEFENDANT**

**AND**

**DICKENS AYUB ODHIAMBO**

**..... APPLICANT**

**RULING**

The plaintiff's application dated 4<sup>th</sup> November 2010 prays that the defendants statement of Defence dated 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2010 be struck out and judgment be entered for the plaintiff against the defendant as prayed in the plaint. He further prays for costs. The same is supported by the affidavit of the plaintiff sworn on 4<sup>th</sup> October 2010. The defendant did file a replying affidavit sworn on 25<sup>th</sup> January 2011. From the on set it has always been held and indeed it's a trite law now that striking out a pleading and in this case a defence should be done carefully and sparingly. In every circumstances an opportunity should be accorded to an individual to ventilate his case even when the same is frivolous but with an iota of merit

I have read carefully the rival affidavits together with the submissions filed by both counsels. I

would agree with the plaintiff counsel that his client is the current registered owner of the suit property. That alone entitles him to claim an overriding right over any other person including the defendant. Nevertheless I have read the defendant defence dated 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2010. In my opinion the same raise triable issues.

One of them include the fact that there seems to be a boundary dispute which has been existing between the parcels of land namely **KISUMU / KOGUTA / 170** and **KISUMU / KOGUTA / 165**. The same is unresolved. This is buttressed by the annexures of the defendant in his replying affidavit, namely the minutes of Upper Nyakach Land Control Board.

Further there is an issue regarding succession proceedings which led the plaintiff obtain title. There is an allegation of fraud allegedly purportedly by the plaintiff.

As stated earlier on this are issues which need adduction of evidence. They can't be done in a summary manner. The land Registrar in my opinion need to shade some light. Being a land issue I think its worthy that the same goes to full trial. The upshot of this is that I disallow the plaintiff's application and the cost shall be in the main suit.

Orders accordingly.

**Dated, signed and delivered at Kisumu this 11<sup>th</sup> day of November 2011.**

**H. K. CHEMITEI**

**JUDGE**

HKC/aao



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](#)