



Case Number:	Criminal Appeal 108 of 2000
Date Delivered:	13 Dec 2002
Case Class:	Criminal
Court:	Court of Appeal at Nyeri
Case Action:	Judgment
Judge:	Amrittal Bhagwanji Shah, Samuel Elikana Ondari Bosire, Effie Owuor
Citation:	Andrew Ndambuki Muthike v Republic [2002] eKLR
Advocates:	Mr Kigotho for the Appellant.
Case Summary:	<p>Andrew Ndambuki Muthike v Republic</p> <p>Court of Appeal, at Nyeri</p> <p>December 13, 2002</p> <p>Shah, Bosire & Owuor JJ A</p> <p>Criminal Appeal No 108 of 2000</p> <p><i>(Appeal from a judgment of the High Court at Nyeri, Juma & Mulwa JJ dated June 6, 2000 in High Court Criminal Appeal No 250 of 1998)</i></p> <p><i>Criminal Law – robbery with violence – ingredients of the offence – Penal Code (cap 63) section 296— facts disclosing that accused person robbed a shop owner of property while in the company of other persons – trial court urged that there was no violence used and no proof of injury - trial court reducing charge to simple robbery and sentencing accused— whether facts disclosing offence of robbery with violence – whether sentence legal.</i></p> <p><i>Sentencing— legality of sentence – charge of</i></p>

robbery with violence under the Penal Code (cap 63) section 296(2) reduced to simple robbery under section 296(1)— facts disclosing that accused robbed his victim while in the company of other robbers – whether robbery with violence proved – whether sentence for simple robbery legal – whether sentence of death the proper sentence.

The appellant was convicted in a magistrate's court on a charge that he, jointly with other persons, robbed one Jamlick of cash and that before or immediately after the time of such robbery, he used actual violence to the said Jamlick.

The evidence which the court accepted was that on the material night, Jamlick was in his shop with his wife when the door was broken by about nine intruders who beat him up with clubs and took money and property from him. Jamlick and his wife testified that the appellant was known to them and he was among the intruders. Jamlick stated that he had later identified the appellant in an identification parade.

The trial magistrate reduced the charge from robbery with violence to simple robbery under section 296(1) of the Penal Code (cap 63) and proceeded to convict and sentence the appellant on that lesser charge. The appellant nevertheless appealed against the decision to the High Court.

The High Court found that the facts disclosed the offence of robbery with violence contrary to section 296(2) of the Penal Code and dismissed the appeal. The sentence of imprisonment was declared illegal and a sentence of death was substituted.

The appellant filed this second appeal in which his advocate stated that the identification parade forms had not been produced in court and that he had not been positively identified as one of the alleged robbers. It was further argued that there had been no violence used during the said robbery and that the trial magistrate was right in reducing the offence to simple robbery.

Held:

	<p>1. Whilst there was some justification for the complaint that the prosecution had failed to produce evidence of the identification parade, the failure to call the officer who carried out the parade was not fatal to the prosecution's case as the other evidence on record was sufficient to support the appellant's conviction.</p> <p>2. The two lower courts found that the appellant was in the company of the robbers and that he was known to Jamlick and his wife. There was no proper basis on which this Court could fault the lower courts on that finding. This was a second appeal where only issues of law could be dealt with.</p> <p>3. While the issue of identification is an issue of mixed law and fact, this Court could not discern any error on the part of the two lower courts on that issue which could warrant it to rule otherwise.</p> <p>4. There may have been no violence used during the robbery but section 296(2) of the Penal Code envisages that when the robbery is committed by more than one person one of the ingredients of the offence of robbery with violence under that subsection is satisfied. That being the case, the reduction of the charge to simple robbery by the trial magistrate was a misdirection and the sentence meted out by the High Court was the legal one.</p> <p><i>Appeal dismissed.</i></p> <p>Cases</p> <p>No cases referred to.</p> <p>Statutes</p> <p>Penal Code (cap 63) sections 251, 296(2)</p> <p>Advocates</p> <p><i>Mr Kigotho</i> for the Appellant.</p>
Court Division:	Criminal
History Magistrates:	-
County:	Nyeri

Docket Number:	-
History Docket Number:	Criminal Appeal No 250 of 1998
Case Outcome:	Appeal dismissed.
History County:	Nyeri
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

AT NYERI

(CORAM: SHAH, BOSIRE & OWUOR JJ A)

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO 108 OF 2000

BETWEEN

ANDREW NDAMBUKI MUTHIKE.....APPELLANT

AND

REPUBLICRESPONDENT

(Appeal from a judgment of the High Court at Nyeri, Juma & Mulwa JJ dated June 6, 2000

in

High Court Criminal Appeal No 250 of 1998)

JUDGMENT OF THE COURT

This is a second appeal from the decision of the High Court of Kenya at Nyeri. The appeal before the High Court was lodged by two appellants, Andrew Ndambuki Muthike and David Mbogo Bundi. When the appeal came on for hearing, Bundi the second appellant in that court withdrew his appeal when he was warned that in the event his appeal against conviction was unsuccessful the sentence of imprisonment could be set aside and be substituted by the mandatory death sentence as the facts disclosed an offence contrary to Section 296(2) of the Penal Code. Andrew Ndambiri Muthike, the appellant now before us, decided not to withdraw his appeal. His appeal there was dismissed and the sentence of imprisonment was declared illegal. He was then sentenced to suffer death. He is now therefore before this Court.

There were two accused persons in the Senior Resident Magistrate's court at Kerugoya, that is, Bundi and Muthike. They were charged with 5 counts, two being those of robbery with violence, contrary to Section 296(2) of the Penal Code and the other three being those of assault causing actual bodily harm contrary to Section 251 of the Penal Code. The alleged victims were Abel Muchiri Munyi, Titus Gachoki Shem and Alice Wanothare Ngare. Both the accused persons were acquitted in respect of assault charges. They were convicted in respect of count 2 which reads:

"1. David Mbogo Bundi, 2. Andrew Ndambiri Muthike on the 6th day of September, 1997 at Rwangondu village in Kirinyaga District of the Central Province, jointly with others not before the court, robbed Jamlick Muriithi Gichobi of cash Kshs.5,000/= immediately (sic) before or immediately after the time of such robbery used actual violence to the said Jamlick Muriithi Gichobi." J

amlick Muriithi Gichobi (PW2) (Jamlick) recalled in the witness box that on 6th September, 1997 at 2.10 am he was in his shop with his wife, Caroline Waguthii Muriithi (PW3) (Caroline) when he heard

footsteps outside. The footsteps stopped at the rear door. The intruders broke open the door. Jamlick screamed. He had a whip and a torch. The intruders beat him up with clubs and took him to the front of the shop. They took Shs.7,000/= from him. They also took his torch, radio cassette and left. The radio cassette was recovered next day in a nearby coffee farm. The intruders were many, about 9 of them, Jamlick said. They stayed inside the shop for about 30 minutes. Jamlick testified that he recognized two of the intruders, as Bundi and Muthike. He later identified them at identification parades. Jamlick stated that he knew Muthike as a barber at Ithare market. The shop in question was lit with a lamp. Jamlick had a torch. Jamlick's evidence was corroborated by that of Caroline who also knew the appellant, Muthike, as a barber.

Mr. Kigotho who appeared for the appellant argued that the appellant may have been framed or else it was a case of mistaken identity. The identification could well be mistaken in view of poor lighting in the shop, he urged. He complained that identification parade form or forms were not produced in evidence. Having narrated the circumstances which in his view negated a proper identification Mr. Kigotho argued that there was in reality no positive identification of the appellant. He lamented that no weapons of assault were produced in court, nor was there a police 3 (P3) form to show what injuries Jamlick suffered. He also lamented that the recovered radio cassette should have but was not subjected to finger print tests. In his view, there was not enough evidence to show that the appellant was one of the robbers.

The Senior Resident Magistrate dealt with the evidence of Jamlick and Caroline as well as the defence as follows:

"I have considered the defence evidence and any relevant material particulars. The defence evidence amounts to a mere denial. It is unbelievable in view of the identification by PW2 and PW3 (Jamlick & Caroline). I reject the defence evidence. I find ample evidence to prove that the two accuseds (sic) participated in the robbery at the premises of one Jamlick Muriithi Gichobi."

The learned Magistrate was satisfied that Jamlick and Caroline could not concoct the story of the appellant being there. He was known to them. He was with them inside the shop for about 30 minutes.

The first appellate court dealt with the evidence of identification as follows:

"In the instant case, the appellant was identified or recognized by the complainant and his wife. He immediately told those who came to his rescue that he had recognized two of the robbers. The complainant's wife stated that they left the lamp burning in the room as they had a child. In our view a lamp provides sufficient light for one to see. After all, in the countryside we all use lamps. That is the mode of lighting and it assists people in seeing or recognizing other people. It would be unrealistic on our part to insist that one can only be recognized where there is an electric light."

Mr. Kigotho, like Mr. Mahan who appeared for the appellant in the superior court, as pointed out earlier, took issue on lack of identification parade evidence. Whilst there is some justification in this complaint we are of the view, as were the judges of the superior court, that the failure to call the officer who carried out the identification parade was not fatal to the prosecution's case as the other evidence on record is sufficient to support his conviction. In any event, the judges pointed out, the appellant in his own evidence stated that he had been identified at the Police Station.

Both courts below found as fact that the appellant was one of the robbers; that he was known to Jamlick and Caroline. We cannot fault the two courts below for doing so as we have no basis or proper basis for doing so. This, as already pointed out, is a second appeal where issues of law only can be dealt with.

Whilst the issue of identification is an issue of mixed law and fact, we cannot discern any error or errors on the part of the two courts below to make us rule otherwise.

Mr. Kigotho took up the issue of there being no violence used and there being no proof of injury. He urged that on that the Magistrate was right in reducing the offence to that of simple robbery contrary to Section 296(1) of the Penal Code. That may be so, but Section 296(2) of the said Code envisages that when the robbery is committed by more than one person one of the ingredients of an offence under that sub-section is satisfied. That being so the sentence meted out by the superior court was the legal one. The reduction of the charge to simple robbery by the Magistrate was a misdirection.

Mr. Kigotho complained that the Judges of the superior court failed to formally enter a conviction under Section 296(2) of the Penal Code. That is so but it is clearly implicit from their judgment that they were substituting a conviction under Section 296(1) to one under Section 296(2). Quite clearly the conviction was for an offence under Section 296(2) of the Penal Code.

In the final analysis we see nothing to interfere with the judgments of the two courts below.

This appeal is ordered dismissed.

Dated and delivered at Nyeri this 13th day of December, 2002

A.B SHAH

.....

JUDGE OF APPEAL

S.E.O. BOSIRE

.....

JUDGE OF APPEAL

E. OWUOR

.....

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](#)