



REPUBLIC OF KENYA

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KENYA AT NAKURU

SUCCESSION CAUSE NUMBER 184 OF 2016

IN THE MATTER OF THE ESTATE OF JOHN KIRUKI WANUTHU (DECEASED)

VERONICA WANGUI WAMBUGU.....PETITIONER/ADMINISTRATOR

VERSUS

BETH WANJIRU MAINA.....PROTESTOR

J U D G M E N T

1. The deceased, John Kiruki Wanuthu, died intestate on 1st January, 2016.
2. Veronica Wangui Wambugu and Margaret Wangeci Wambugu, deceased's widow and her sister respectively filed a petition for letters of administration intestate on 16th March 2016. The Petition was accompanied by an Affidavit in Support of the Petition for Letters of Administration.
3. According to the Affidavit in Support of the Petition, the Deceased was survived by:
 1. Veronica Wangui Wambugu - Wife/Petitioner
 2. Catherine Nyambura Kiruki - Daughter (Adult)
 3. CMK - Daughter (Minor)
4. According to the Form P&A 5 the estate is made up of the following assets;
 - (a) Title No. Kinamba Mithiga Block 2/287(Mithiga) Approximately 1.443 Ha.
 - (b) Title No. Laikipia/Lariak/452 Approximately 0.800 Ha.
 - (c) Title No. Pioneer/Ngeria Block 1 (Eatec)/8962 Approximately 0.10ha
 - (d) Equity Bank A/C No.0160xxxxxxxx
 - (e) Co-Operative Bank A/C No. 0111xxxxxxxx
 - (f) Mwalimu National Sacco A/C No.302xxxxx.
 - (g) Barclays Bank A/C No.003xxxxxx.
 - (h) 120 Shares At National Bank Of Kenya Ltd
 - (i) 33 Shares At Kenya Commercial Bank Ltd
 - (j) 532 Shares At Kenya Commercial Bank Ltd.
 - (k) CDSC Shares At Co-Operative Bank Limited

(l) Kshs.200,000/= loaned to Fedha Micro Investment Ltd

(m) Kshs.150, 000/= investment plan with Old Mutual.

(n) Safaricom Cellphone No.0721xxxxxx.

(o) Mwalimu Sacco Shares.

(p) Death Gratuity/Pension from Teachers Service Commission.

5. The Grant was issued to the Petitioners on 27th June, 2016.

6. On the 5th of September, 2016, Beth Wanjiru Maina, filed Summons for Revocation of grant seeking the following orders;

(a) Spent

(b) THAT the Honorable court do revoke/ annul the Grant of Letters of Administration issued to the respondents on 27th June 2016.

(c) THAT costs of this Application be provided for.

7. The application was supported by grounds on its face and a Supporting Affidavit of the protestor herein sworn on 5th September 2016.

8. She deponed that the grant of probate was issued by this court on 27th June 2016 to Veronica Wangui Wambugu and Margaret Wangeci Wambugu based on a letter dated 14th January 2016 from the chief, Gikingi Location which omitted her and her child NMK as the deceased's wife and child respectively and as the rightful beneficiaries to the deceased's estate.

9. She stated that the dispute between herself and the petitioner herein was reported by the County Commissioner Gatimu Division to the Director Teachers Service Commission who undertook to resolve their dispute.

10. The application was opposed by the petitioner Veronica Wangui Wambugu vide her Replying Affidavit sworn on 24th October 2016.

11. She deponed that she was one of the administrators to the estate of the John Kiruki Wanuthu who died intestate on 1st January, 2016 and that she got married to the deceased in 2001 and were blessed with two children namely; Catherine Nyambura born on 18th November, 1995 and CM born on 3rd August, 2005.

12. It was her position that that the deceased never contracted another marriage and the allegation by the protestor that she was also a wife is misleading. She stated that if the protestor was married to the deceased nothing could have stopped her from taking part in his burial plans and ceremony which she never did.

13. She deposed that any beneficiaries claiming to have been omitted had an opportunity to file objection to the petition at the appropriate time, which the applicant never did. That she complied with the provisions of **Section 51(2) of the Law of Succession Act** and **Rule 7 of the Probate and Administration Rules** when presenting the petition and hence the allegation that she obtained the grant fraudulently was misleading and devoid of factual basis.

14. She asserted that the applicant is a stranger out to stake claim to the estate of the deceased and her application is made in bad faith, devoid of fact and should be dismissed.

15. The matter was heard by way of oral evidence.

16. The protestor herein testified that she got married to the deceased in 1997 under Kikuyu Customary Law and together they were blessed with a daughter NMK. That not all marriage ceremonies were conducted and they lived with the deceased intermittently.

17. She said the deceased was a teacher whom she met and cohabited with in Nakuru, and later relocated to Eldoret where the deceased used to teach. She recognized the petitioner as a co-wife and she prayed that the property be shared equally between them.

18. She testified that she did not participate in the deceased's burial arrangement as she was informed of the deceased's death very late by a friend and only attended it briefly. She confirmed the petitioner not only attended the burial but also participated in the arrangements for the same. She told the court that they bought a property with the deceased at Eldoret and deceased also informed her that he had bought another property at Karandi in Nyahururu.

19. She confirmed the deceased built a house for the petitioner but not for her. That after the deceased's death, together with the petitioner they made claims for the pension and shares, the Chief's Letter dated 28th November, 2016 written to the Director of Pensions indicated that she was the separated first wife and the petitioner was a second wife to the deceased.

20. She stated that another letter by the chief dated 27th January, 2016 named the petitioner and her two daughters as deceased's

beneficiaries. She referred the court to a letter by Assistant County Commissioner Gathiru Division to the director Teachers Service Commission (TSC) indicating that her and her child were the deceased's beneficiaries in the capacity of a wife and child respectively.

21. During cross examination, she stated that she requested the chief to write the letter dated 28th November, 2016 to Pension Department TSC purposely to help her get deceased's pension. She mentioned to the chief that the petitioner herein plus her children are also the deceased's beneficiaries. She confirmed that the letter dated 27th January, 2016 was written by the same chief at the point which he did not know her and that he knew her in February.

22. She told court that she first met with the deceased in 1985 at Club Dimples, the deceased would stay with her every weekend and during school holidays. That the deceased and his people met her parents in the year 2000 and thereafter she went to live with the deceased in Eldoret. She lived with the deceased in Eldoret for two years, gave birth to NMK before she was transferred to Karatina. She said the deceased used to visit her at Karatina. That when her father in law died in 2005 she did not attend his funeral. She could only remember him by one name. She stated that the deceased's family members never informed her about the deceased death which occurred on 1st January, 2016. She attended the funeral and never requested to be recognized as his wife. She confirmed the petitioner was also present during deceased's burial and she was recognized as the deceased's wife.

23. On re-examination, she stated that deceased family knew her place of work to be Nyeri but when she left the said place she never told them and that was the reason she was not informed of the deceased's death. She said when the deceased's parents visited her parents, they introduced themselves as her parents in law.

24. **PW2, David Kariuki Wanuthu**, the eldest brother to the deceased, testified that the deceased had two wives, which is the protestor and the petitioner herein. He knew the protestor in the year 1997 when the deceased introduced her to him when the protestor was then working for Post Bank Nakuru. He stated that the deceased set a matrimonial home in Nakuru and he lived there with the protestor, when he visited him he found the protestor whom the deceased introduced as his wife. In 1998, the deceased and the protestor were blessed with one child. He said the protestor continued living with the deceased however they had ordinary marriage wrangles necessitating the protestor to take a "marital hiatus" but they never parted ways and neither were they formally informed of any break up.

25. He said in 2001 the deceased married the petitioner as his 2nd wife and introduced her as such in his family. That the marital issues between the protestor and the deceased, prompted the deceased to marry a second wife. He knew about the same since he was very close to the deceased. He stated that the deceased had two biological children i.e. NM and CM.

26. During cross examination, he testified that when the deceased died he was in the prison and could not attend his funeral and therefore he did not know the people who were present during his burial. He said around the year 1998, he did not accompany his parents when they visited the protestor's parents. That the deceased used to visit the protestor's parents and in those visits he would pay dowry. He said the deceased did not build a house for the protestor; that the eulogy only mentioned the petitioner and her children as the wife and children to the deceased respectively. He told court that the protestor is recognized in their family as the deceased's wife.

27. **PW3, Ruth Muthoni** a mother to the deceased testified that the deceased had two wives. The protestor and the petitioner herein. That the protestor was the 1st wife while the petitioner was the 2nd wife. She confirmed she went to protestor's home and paid Ksh. 30,000/= as dowry and Ksh. 3000/- for food. She could not recall the exact date of the visit. She stated that at protestor's house they found her parents all who are now deceased and that the deceased and the protestor had started living together before marriage and they continued living as a husband and wife. She said the protestor and the deceased were blessed with a child named N. She could not recall when the petitioner was married to the deceased and that her late husband and DW1 also visited the petitioner's home and they took Ksh. 10,000/= to her parents. She confirmed that the protestor and the deceased at one point separated but he used to visit her. That the deceased and the protestor had a matrimonial home at Eldoret and when they moved the deceased went to Nyahururu where he lived with the petitioner. She proposed that the deceased property be shared equally between the two wives.

28. During cross examination she stated that deceased had land and money at the bank. He had two (2) acres at Tandare and three (3) acres at Karandi and that the deceased had not built on any of these two (2) pieces of land. The deceased had a house at Nyahururu where he was living with the petitioner and another house in Eldoret where he had built for the protestor even though she was uncertain whether the later house was still there. She said at the time of deceased's death he had separated with the protestor. She did not know the period of such separation.

29. On re-examination, she stated that the protestor had not parted ways with the deceased and when the deceased used to go mark exams in Nairobi where the protestor resides he would sleep at her house.

30. **PW4, Joseph Wanuthu**, elder brother to the deceased stated that when the deceased died he was under the care of their niece one Rosemary Wanjugu.

31. On cross examination he stated that the protestor was married by the deceased under Kikuyu Customary Law. He said other than the introduction there was no marriage ceremony conducted. He confirmed that the deceased death was announced on radio and the protestor was not included as a wife in the eulogy or in the radio advertisement.

32. The witness for the Petitioner **DW1, Francis Ndungu Mwihi**, a neighbour to the deceased testified that sometime in 2004 the deceased parents requested him to go to the family of the petitioner to officially inform her parents that the petitioner had moved in to stay with the deceased in Eldoret where deceased worked as a teacher. That the petitioner's parents accepted and again on 29th September 2005 he accompanied the deceased's late father Robert Wanuthu to petitioner's home, met her parents and gave them a token of Ksh. 10,000/=.

33. That the deceased and the petitioner cohabited together as a husband and a wife and they would occasionally visit their parents' home at Muteta Village and he used to see them whenever they visited.

34. That he was part of the burial team and he confirmed that the petitioner was present as the deceased's wife and no other wife showed up during burial preparations or on the burial date claiming to be the wife to the deceased. He stated that the deceased death was broadcasted on Inooro Radio and anyone interested could have heard of his death. To the best of his knowledge the deceased had only one wife who is the petitioner herein.

35. On cross examination he could not remember the year he was sent to the petitioner's home and that he would not know if there was another woman married to the deceased. He said there was no other marriage ceremony he attended between the deceased and the petitioner.

36. **DW2, the petitioner herein** testified that she started cohabiting with the deceased in early 1990's and in 2001 their union was officiated under Kikuyu Customary Law. She lived with the deceased in the various places in Oljabet, Eldoret, Kimumu and in Nyahururu.

37. That their union was blessed with two children namely Catherine Nyambura aged twenty-three (23) years and CM aged thirteen (13) years old. She said her husband passed on 1st January 2016 and she was acknowledged as the only wife in both the eulogy and the radio advertisement, that her children were acknowledged as deceased's children. She said from the time of the death of the deceased till his burial no one came forward to claim to be his other wife. She said she first learnt of the protestor as an alleged co-wife on 4th February 2016 and in mid-February with the assistance of the deceased family, the protestor obtained deceased Death Certificate without her knowledge, an act she found to be mischievous. She said she filed this succession cause and all the properties listed therein were acquired jointly by her and the deceased and to her best of knowledge the deceased had no other wife.

38. During cross examination she testified that she started living with the deceased in the year 1994. She did not know the deceased had another child by the name NM, acknowledged she did not disputed her paternity.

39. She said she had parted ways with the deceased two weeks to his death and he died while under the care of his niece Rosemary as was stated by PW4. She stated that other than the introduction bit there were no other marriage ceremonies conducted between her and the deceased.

40. The protestor did not file her submissions.

41. The Petitioner submitted that the main question before the court arising from the pleadings was whether Beth Wanjiru Maina and NM were wife and daughter respectively of the deceased John Kiruki Wanuthi.

42. That the protestor had the onus of proof to the satisfaction of the court that she was indeed married under Kikuyu Customary Law as alleged.

43. It was the petitioner's position that the protestor never discharged the above burden of proof for the following reasons;

- i. Not all customary marriage ceremonies were conducted.
- ii. The Protestor never participated in the deceased's burial arrangements.
- iii. The Chief's Letter dated 27th January 2016 never listed her and her child as the deceased's beneficiaries.
- iv. The Protestor was not acknowledged as the deceased's wife in the deceased's obituary, eulogy and Radio advertisement.
- v. The deceased never built a house for her.
- vi. The protestor and her witnesses never led any evidence of what constituted the Kikuyu Customary Marriage requirements.
- vii. DW1 who was the deceased's neighbor never knew of existence of the protestor as the deceased's wife.

44. In support of her case the petitioner relied on the case of **Estate of the late Symon Kipngeny Koima (Deceased) Nakuru Succession Cause No.461 of 2014** where this court held as follows on proving a customary marriage;

“It is noteworthy that not a single member of her family testified of being present when dowry was paid. Surprisingly even the brother who represented her parents was never named, and she herself did not want to commit to the fact of the dowry being paid.... there is no explanation why no member of the 1st objector's family was present in court to confirm that indeed they received Ksh.4, 000/= at the alleged negotiations, and that they even received dowry of a cow and calf much later on an unknown date? This renders the whole testimony about a customary marriage questionable and incredible”

45. The petitioner thus argued that she was the only one recognized as customarily married to the deceased.

46. The petitioner also placed reliance on the case of **Mary Wanjiku Gachigi vs Ruth Muthoni Kamau [2003]eKLR** which court held as follows;

“Firstly, that the objector claimed to have been married to the deceased for a period of almost 21 years and yet there was nobody else who she called to support her story except her alleged mother-in-law. Her own father and mother, the people who had

allegedly received the dowry were alive and yet neither of them testified, nor was anybody else that took the dowry to her family called as a witness. Then there was the issue as to where the deceased lived in Nakuru.

There was no evidence to support the objector's allegation that she cohabited with the deceased as husband and wife in the house at Section 39 in Nakuru. The evidence that emerged was that indeed and in fact the deceased had a house at KITI in which he lived and in which the respondent visited him every now and then. That house according to the evidence, was broken into and some of the deceased's documents stolen.

Finally, there was the evidence from the organizers of the funeral as to what transpired at the funeral. Contrary to what the appellant said, none of the witnesses who arranged for the funeral, programme and eulogy knew of the existence of the objector or her children. She was not at the funeral as a wife. She took no part in the heavy responsibility that accompany a funeral. Her children were not present at their alleged father's funeral, and more importantly she was not included in the "pictures" taken of the relatives of the deceased.

The only wife known to everybody, the Chief, Chairman of the committee, people who grew up with the deceased and were his neighbours, was the respondent. We cannot fault the learned Judge in coming to the conclusion that he came, that the appellant had not established her case and she was not a wife of the deceased.”

47. The petitioner urged this court to be guided by the above reasoning and find that the protestor failed to discharge the evidential burden of prove that she was married to the deceased.

48. Regarding the proof that the protestor's child was the deceased's child, the petitioner submitted that paternity or dependency is a condition precedent to the exercise of the discretion in **Section 29(a) and (b) of the Law of Succession Act.**

49. In this case there was no evidence to prove that the child was born by the deceased or that she depended on him.

ISSUES FOR DETERMINATION

50. The issues for determination in this matter are:-

- a) **Whether the protestor was customarily married to the deceased and thus a beneficiary of his estate.**
- b) **Whether protestor's child NMK was a child of the deceased for purposes of succession.**
- c) **Whether this court should revoke/ annul the Grant of Letters of Administration issued to the respondents on 27th June 2016.**

51. **Section 29** of the **Law of Succession Act**, defines a dependant as:

- “(a) The wife or wives, or former wife or wives, and the children of the deceased whether or not maintained by the deceased immediately prior to his death;**
- (b) Such of the deceased's parents, step-parents, grand- parents, grandchildren, step-children, children whom the deceased had taken into his family as his own, brothers and sisters, and half-brothers and half-sisters, as were being maintained by the deceased immediately prior to his death; and**
- (c) Where the deceased was a woman, her husband if he was being maintained by her immediately prior to the date of her death.”**

52. The applicant's case is that she was married under Kikuyu Customary Law to the deceased. The onus of proving a customary marriage rests on the party claiming it. In the case of **Njoki vs Mathara and Others Civil Appeal No. 71 of 1989 (UR)**, **Kneller J. A** reading the judgment of the court held that: -

- “a) The onus of proving a customary marriage is on the party who claims it.**
- b) The standard of proof is the usual one for civil action, balance of probabilities.**
- c) Evidence as to the formalities required for a customary law marriage must be proved to the above standard.”**

53. Further in the case of **Hortensiah Wanjiku Yawe vs The Public Trustee, Civil Appeal No. 13 of 1976**, the court held: -

“The onus of proving customary law marriage is generally on the party who claims it. The standard of proof is the one usually for a civil action namely “on the balance of probabilities.” Evidence as to the formalities required for a customary law marriage must be proved to that standard. Long cohabitation as a man and wife gives rise to a presumption of marriage in favour of the party asserting it. Only cogent evidence to the contrary can rebut the presumption. If specific ceremonies and rituals are not fully accomplished this does not invalidate such a marriage”.

54. In Mary Wanjiru Githatu vs Esther Wanjiru Kiarie (Court of Appeal at Eldoret in Civil Appeal No. 20 of 2009) the court stated:

“It is important to observe that customary law marriages have some important ingredients without which they cannot possibly qualify as such. The ingredients are essentials in the making of a customary law marriage. A customary law marriage is a covenant of marriage sealed by the necessary customary ingredients and for the Kikuyu these ingredients are well known and documented. If the courts were to fail to take this into account, they would be giving recognition to the ‘come we stay’ marriages which are neither customary nor statutory”

55. The Court of Appeal in Gituanja vs Gituanja (1983) KLR 575 and in Kimani vs Gikanga [1965] EA 735 held that the existence of a customary marriage is a matter of fact, to be proved through evidence.

56. Section 107 of the Evidence Act provides that: -

“(1) whoever desires any court to give judgment as to any legal right or liability dependent on the existence of facts which he asserts must prove those facts exist.”

57. The cases of In the Matter of the Estate of Karanja Kigo [2015] eKLR and Priscilla Waruguru Gathigo vs Virginia Kanugu Gathigo [2004] eKLR mention at least five elements:

(a) Capacity which includes age, physical and mental conditions and marital status;

(b) Consents of the family of the couple and, if the intended bride is a second or subsequent wife, the consent of the senior wife;

(c) The ceremonial slaughtering of a ram in a rite called Ngurario;

(d) Ruracio (bride price) partly paid;

(e) Commencement of cohabitation.

58. However, in the Eliud Maina Mwangi Case, the Court of Appeal opined that customary law evolves with time. The Court stated thus:

“Customary law is certainly not static. Like all other human inventions, it is dynamic and keeps evolving from generation to generation. Customary ceremonies cannot therefore be expected to be conducted in 2013 in exactly the same way that they were conducted in, say, 1930. To insist on rigid customary ceremonies at all times is the surest way of rendering customary law obsolete. For example, essential steps like payment of dowry may be satisfied by payment of the monetary equivalent of such items as goats and cows instead of delivery to the prospective in-laws every item in kind, such as beer, honey, live goats and cows. The bottom line appears to be that the essential steps and ceremonies must be performed, irrespective of the form in which they are performed.”

59. To prove customary marriage, the protestor produced a letter from the chief dated 14th January 2016 which noted at the bottom that the deceased had two wives. In that letter the protestor herein is not expressly listed as a beneficiary. The protestor also produced a letter from the Assistant County Commissioner acknowledging that the deceased hailed from his area of jurisdiction and that he had a daughter with the protestor by the name NM. This letter too doesn't show that the protestor was a wife to the deceased.

60. The protestor testified that she was married to the deceased in the year 1997 and that the deceased's parents went to her home and paid Kshs. 10,000/= as dowry to her parents. That they met with the deceased in Nakuru lived together before moving to Eldoret where they continued living together as a husband and a wife for two years before being transferred to Karatina. She acknowledged they had marital issues with the deceased and by the time he died they had separated. She however stated that there was no official separation and she was still married to the deceased as the 1st wife.

61. PW2 and 4 who were the deceased brothers all testified in favour of the protestor. They acknowledged the protestor as the deceased's first wife. They all stated that the deceased paid dowry to the protestor's parents and that the protestor lived with the deceased in Nakuru and Eldoret. PW3, mother to the deceased also testified in favour of the protestor. The pertinent issue that stood out in her testimony was that in company of her late husband, the deceased herein and deceased's friend they visited the protestors home and paid dowry of Kshs.30, 000/= and another Kshs.3000/= for food. She confirmed that they met the protestor's parents and the deceased thereafter continued living together with the protestor as a husband and a wife and that the customary marriage ceremony between the protestor and the deceased was incomplete. That there was no official breakup between the deceased and the protestor.

62. DW1 who was the neighbour to the deceased confirmed that he wouldn't know whether the deceased had another child or a wife. The only woman he knows was married to the deceased and blessed with two children is the petitioner herein.

63. The petitioner too disputed the deceased had another wife and a child she said she was the only one acknowledged in the radio advert and the eulogy as the deceased wife and her children the beneficiaries. She stated that she knew about the protestor after the burial as no issue had been raised during deceased's death and at his burial.

64. It is noteworthy that the protestor testified of being the 1st wife. The deceased's members of the family also took the same stand. Their position is contradicted by their own actions and evidence. She conceded that though she was the first wife, she and the deceased did not

have a matrimonial home. The brothers of the deceased who were ready to testify that she was the wife of their brother and son forgot that at the point of the death of the deceased they wrote the eulogy, they wrote the radio announcements they never mentioned the protester nor the protester's child. Is it not strange taking into consideration that it is their position that the protester's child is named after the mother to the deceased? What is the answer to this conduct? It cannot be that at that time they were all under some amnesia not to recall that their brother and son had another family? It can only have come as an afterthought that the deceased had another wife. That can only be the explanation for the contradiction between their own words and their actions.

65. It is also noteworthy that the protester did not call any witness from her family or the days she lived with the deceased or even the deceased colleagues she claimed knew her as his wife. It can only be concluded that these persons would not have supported her case.

(b) Whether protester's child NMK was a child of the deceased for purposes of succession.

66. A consent was entered into on the 10th of October 2018 that the dependency of N was not in contest.

(c) Whether this court should revoke/ annul the Grant of Letters of Administration issued to the respondents on 27th June 2016.

67. The circumstances in which a grant may be revoked or annulled are set out in **Section 76 of the Law of Succession Act** as follows:

“S. 76 Revocation or annulment of grant, a grant of representation, whether or not confirmed, may at any time be revoked or annulled if the court decides, either on application by any interested party or of its own motion—

- a. that the proceedings to obtain the grant were defective in substance;**
- b. that the grant was obtained fraudulently by the making of a false statement or by the concealment from the court of something material to the case;**
- c. that the grant was obtained by means of an untrue allegation of a fact essential in point of law to justify the grant notwithstanding that the allegation was made in ignorance or inadvertently;**
- d. that the person to whom the grant was made has failed, after due notice and without reasonable cause either—**
 - i. to apply for confirmation of the grant within one year from the date thereof, or such longer period as the court order or allow; or**
 - ii. to proceed diligently with the administration of the estate; or**
 - iii. to produce to the court, within the time prescribed, any such inventory or account of administration as is required by the provisions of paragraphs (e) and (g) of section 83 or has produced any such inventory or account which is false in any material particular; or**
- e. that the grant has become useless and inoperative through subsequent circumstances.”**

68. In the circumstances of this case having found that the protestor did not establish that she was a wife of the deceased, there would be no reason to revoke the grant.

69. Hence the protest fails to the extent that the protester claims that she was a wife of the deceased.

70. Regarding N, the petitioner will file an amended for P & A 5, to include N, and file, within thirty (30) days hereof an amended Summons for Confirmation of grant including N as a beneficiary.

71. No orders as to costs.

72. Orders Accordingly.

DATED, SIGNED AND DELIVERED THIS 24TH DAY OF FEBRUARY 2022.

MUMBUA T MATHEKA

JUDGE

CA Edna

B.O Akang'o Advocates for the Petitioner

Njeri Njagua & Co, Advocates for Protester