**REPUBLIC OF KENYA**

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KENYA AT MACHAKOS**

**APPELLATE SIDE**

**(Coram: Odunga, J)**

**CIVIL APPEAL NO. E054 OF 2021**

**JOSHUA KITONYI NDAMBUKI..... APPELLANT**

**-VERSUS-**

**STELLAMARIS NDUNGE YENGE**

**AND ONESMUS MUTHUKA NDOLO (Suing as the Personal Reps of the**

**Estate of FRANCIS NDOLO MUTHUKA- Deceased).....RESPONDENTS**

**RULING**

1. By a Motion on Notice dated 3rd May, 2021, the applicant herein substantially seeks that this court stays execution of the decree in Kithimani CMCC No. 127 of 2019 pending the hearing and determination of this appeal.

2. The Application was supported by an affidavit sworn by **Linda Chorio**, the legal officer, APA Insurance Company Ltd. According to the deponent, the Applicant was insured by APA Insurance Company Ltd against the subject claim which insurance company instructed advocates to handle the matter on behalf of the Applicant.

3. Following the delivery of the judgement, it was averred, the said insurance company felt that the award on quantum was excessive and instructed the advocates on record to appeal against the judgement. According to the deponent, the appeal raises arguable issues with high chances of success as evidenced by the grounds raised in the appeal.

4. It was deposed that unless the stay sought is granted, the appeal will be rendered nugatory and the Applicant will suffer injustice and considering that the amount involved is high, the Respondents will be highly prejudiced since the Respondents are unlikely to be able to refund the decretal sum if the appeal succeeds. It was averred that the amount in question is high. It was disclosed that the Applicant's insurance company is ready and willing to offer security within the policy terms and limits and is ready to abide by any conditions set by this court pending the hearing and determination of the appeal. On the other hand, it was averred that the Respondents will not be prejudiced as they will have security in the event that the appeal does not succeed and will enjoy the full fruits of the judgement.

5. In opposing the application, the Respondents relied on an affidavit sworn by **Stellamaris Ndunge Yenge**, the 1st Respondent. According to her, the application is fatally defective having been sworn by a non-party to the proceedings who is unable to prove the facts deposed to. On that basis it was averred that the averments by the deponent of the supporting affidavit that the Respondents are unable to refund the decretal sum if the appeal succeeds due to their financial instability were unsupported. It was averred by the deponent that it is not her duty to prove her financial ability and the burden was on the Applicant to prove the opposite.

6. It was averred by the deponent that based of the annextures to the supporting affidavit, the Applicant is not serious about the appeal and that the appeal is simply filed to arm-twist the Respondents to negotiate the award. It was therefore submitted that the Applicants have not proved the substantial loss he stands to suffer if the decretal sum is paid over to the Respondents.

7. It was therefore averred that the Applicant should be compelled to pay the full decretal amount of Kshs 3,205,483/- plus costs and interests. In the Respondents' view, should the court be amenable to granting the stay, it should do so on condition that half the decretal sum amounting to Kshs 1,602,742/- is paid to them and the other half is deposited in a joint interest earning account in the names of the respective advocates for the parties herein.

**Determination**

8. I have considered the application, the supporting and replying affidavits and the submissions filed as well as the authorities relied upon.

9. The principles guiding the grant of a stay of execution pending appeal are well settled. These principles are provided under Order 42 rule 6(2) of the ***Civil Procedure Rules*** which provides as follows:

> ***No order for stay of execution shall be made under subrule (1) unless—***
>
> ***(a) the court is satisfied that substantial loss may result to the applicant unless the order is made and that the application has been made without unreasonable delay; and***
>
> ***(b) such security as the court orders for the due performance of such decree or order as may ultimately be binding on him has been given by the applicant.***

10. In **Vishram Ravji Halai vs. Thornton & Turpin Civil Application No. Nai. 15 of 1990 [1990] KLR 365,** the Court of Appeal held that whereas the Court of Appeal's power to grant a stay pending appeal is unfettered, the High Court's jurisdiction to do so under Order 41 rule 6 of the ***Civil Procedure Rules*** is fettered by three conditions namely, establishment of a sufficient cause, satisfaction of substantial loss and the furnishing of security. Further the application must be made without unreasonable delay. To the foregoing I would add that the stay may only be granted for sufficient cause and that the Court in deciding whether or not to grant the stay and that in light of the overriding objective stipulated in sections 1A and 1B of the ***Civil Procedure Act***, the Court is no longer restricted to the foregoing provisions. The courts are now enjoined to give effect to the overriding objective in the exercise of its powers under the ***Civil Procedure Act*** or in the interpretation of any of its provisions. According to section 1A(2) of the ***Civil Procedure Act*** "the Court shall, in the exercise of its powers under this Act or the interpretation of any of its provisions, seek to give effect to the overriding objective" while under section 1B some of the aims of the said objective are; the just determination of the proceedings; the efficient disposal of the business of the Court; the efficient use of the available judicial and administrative resources; and the timely disposal of the proceedings, and all other proceedings in the Court, at a cost affordable by the respective parties.

11. It therefore follows that all the pre-Overriding Objective decisions must now be looked at in the light of the said provisions. This does not necessarily imply that all precedents are ignored but that the same must be interpreted in a manner that gives effect to the said objective. What is expected of the Court is to ensure that the aims and intendment of the overriding objective as stipulated in section 1A as read with section 1B of the ***Civil Procedure Act*** are attained. It is therefore important that the Court takes into consideration the likely effect of granting the stay on the proceedings in question. In other words, the Court ought to weigh the likely consequences of granting the stay or not doing so and lean towards a determination which is unlikely to lead to an undesirable or absurd outcome. What the Court ought to do when confronted with such circumstances is to consider the twin overriding principles of proportionality and equality of arms which are aimed at placing the parties before the Court on equal footing and see where the scales of justice lie considering the fact that it is the business of the court, so far as possible, to secure that any transitional motions before the Court do not render nugatory the ultimate end of justice. The Court, in exercising its discretion, should therefore always opt for the lower rather than the higher risk of injustice. See **Suleiman vs. Amboseli Resort Limited [2004] 2 KLR 589.**

12. I agree with the position in **John Gachanja Mundia vs. Francis Muriira Alias Francis Muthika & Another [2016] eKLR** that:

> **"There is doubt the Applicant has shown that substantial loss would occur unless stay is granted. However, I will be guided by a greater sense of justice. Courts of law have said that, with the entry of the overriding principle in our law and the anchorage of substantive justice in the Constitution as a principle of justice, courts should always take the wider sense of justice in interpreting the prescriptions of law designed for grant of relief."**

13. This was the position in **Jason Ngumba Kagu & 2 Others vs. Intra Africa Assurance Co. Limited [2014] eKLR** where it was held that:

> **"The possibility that substantial loss will occur if an order of stay of execution is not granted is the cornerstone of the jurisdiction of court in granting stay of execution pending appeal under Order 42 rule 6 of the Civil Procedure Rules. The Court arrives at a decision that substantial loss is likely to occur if stay is not made by performing a delicate balancing act between the right of the Respondent to the fruits of his judgment and the right of the Applicant on the prospects of his appeal. Even though many say that the test in the High court is not that of ''the appeal will be rendered nugatory'', the prospects of the Appellant to his appeal invariably entails that his appeal should not be rendered nugatory. The substantial loss, therefore, will occur if there is a possibility the appeal will be rendered nugatory. Here, it is not really a question of measuring the prospects of the appeal itself, but rather, whether by asking the Applicant to do what the judgment requires, he will become a pious explorer in the judicial process."**

14. It was therefore appreciated by **Warsame, J** (as he then was) in **Samvir Trustee Limited vs. Guardian Bank Limited Nairobi (Milimani) HCCC 795 of 1997** that:

> **"Every party aggrieved with a decision of the High Court has a natural and undoubted right to seek the intervention of the Court of Appeal and the Court should not put unnecessary hindrance to the enjoyment and exercise of that right by the defendant. A stay would be overwhelming hindrance to the exercise of the discretionary powers of the court…The Court in considering whether to grant or refuse an application for stay is empowered to see whether there exist any special circumstances which can sway the discretion of the court in a particular manner. But the yardstick is for the court to balance or weigh the scales of justice by ensuring that an appeal is not rendered nugatory while at the same time ensuring that a successful party is not impeded from the enjoyment of the fruits of his judgement. It is a fundamental factor to bear in mind that, a successful party is *prima facie* entitled to the fruits of his judgement; hence the consequence of a judgement is that it has defined the rights of a party with definitive conclusion. The respondent is asserting that matured right against the**

**applicant/defendant…For the applicant to obtain a stay of execution, it must satisfy the court that substantial loss would result if no stay is granted. It is not enough to merely put forward mere assertions of substantial loss, there must be empirical or documentary evidence to support such contention. It means the court will not consider assertions of substantial loss on the face value but the court in exercising its discretion would be guided by adequate and proper evidence of substantial loss… Whereas there is no doubt that the defendant is a bank, allegedly with substantial assets, the court is entitled to weigh the present and future circumstances which can destroy the substratum of the litigation…At the stage of the application for stay of execution pending appeal the court must ensure that parties fight it out on a level playing ground and on equal footing in an attempt to safeguard the rights and interests of both sides. The overriding objective of the court is to ensure the execution of one party's right should not defeat or derogate the right of the other. The Court is therefore empowered to carry out a balancing exercise to ensure justice and fairness thrive within the corridors of the court. Justice requires the court to give an order of stay with certain conditions."**

15. On the first principle, **Platt, Ag.JA** (as he then was) in **Kenya Shell Limited vs. Kibiru [1986] KLR 410**, at page 416 expressed himself as follows:

**"It is usually a good rule to see if Order XLI Rule 4 of the Civil Procedure Rules can be substantiated. If there is no evidence of substantial loss to the applicant, it would be a rare case when an appeal would be rendered nugatory by some other event. Substantial loss in its various forms, is the corner stone of both jurisdictions for granting a stay. That is what has to be prevented. Therefore without this evidence it is difficult to see why the respondents should be kept out of their money".**

16. On the part of **Gachuhi, Ag.JA** (as he then was) at 417 held:

**"It is not sufficient by merely stating that the sum of Shs 20,380.00 is a lot of money and the applicant would suffer loss if the money is paid. What sort of loss would this be? In an application of this nature, the applicant should show the damages it would suffer if the order for stay is not granted. By granting a stay would mean that status quo should remain as it were before judgement. What assurance can there be of appeal succeeding? On the other hand, granting the stay would be denying a successful litigant of the fruits of his judgement."**

17. Dealing with the contention that the fact that the respondent is in need of finances is an indication that he would not be in position to refund the decretal sum, **Hancox, JA** (as he then was) in the above cited case when he expressed himself as follows:

**"I therefore think in the circumstances that these comments were unfortunate. Nevertheless, having considered the matter to the full, and with anxious care, there is in my judgement no justification whatsoever for holding that there is a likelihood that the respondents will not repay the decretal sum if the appeal is successful and that the appeal will thereby be rendered nugatory. The first respondent is a man of substance, with a good position and prospects. It is true his house was, in his words, reduced to ashes, but I do not take that against him. Both seem to me to be respectable people and there is no evidence that either will cease to be so, in particular that the first respondent will not remain in his job until pensionable age."**

18. Therefore, the mere fact that the decree holder is not a man of means does not necessarily justify him from benefiting from the fruits of his judgement. On the other hand, the general rule is that the Court ought not to deny a successful litigant of the fruits of his judgement save in exceptional circumstances where to decline to do so may well amount to stifling the right of the unsuccessful party to challenge the decision in the higher Court. In **Machira T/A Machira & Co Advocates vs. East African Standard (No 2) [2002] KLR 63** it was held that:

**"to be obsessed with the protection of an appellant or intending appellant in total disregard or flitting mention of the so far successful opposite party is to flirt with one party as crocodile tears are shed for the other, contrary to sound principle for the exercise of a judicial discretion. The ordinary principle is that a successful party is entitled to the fruits of his judgement or of any decision of the court giving him success at any stage. That is trite knowledge and is one of the fundamental procedural values which is acknowledged and normally must be put into effect by the way applications for stay of further proceedings or execution, pending appeal are handled. In the application of that ordinary principle, the court must have its sight firmly fixed on upholding the overriding objective of the rules of procedure for handling civil cases in courts, which is to do justice in accordance with the law and to prevent abuse of the process of the court".**

19. Where the allegation is that the respondent will not be able to refund the decretal sum the burden is upon the applicant to prove that the Respondent will not be able to refund to the applicant any sums paid in satisfaction of the decree. See **Caneland Ltd. & 2 Others vs. Delphis Bank Ltd. Civil Application No. Nai. 344 of 1999.**

20. In my view, a mere averment that the Respondent's means are unknown is not enough to shift the burden to the Respondent to swear an affidavit of means. There must be grounds upon which it is believed that the Respondent will be unable to refund the decretal sum if paid over to him. He is the successful party as at that time and is entitled to the fruits of his judgement and ought not to be prevented from doing so on bare averments.

21. The law, however appreciates that it may not be possible for the applicant to know the respondent's financial means. The law is therefore that all an applicant can reasonably be expected to do, is to swear, *upon reasonable grounds*, that the Respondent will not be in a position to refund the decretal sum if it is paid over to him and the pending appeal was to succeed but is not expected to go into the bank accounts, if any, operated by the Respondent to see if there is any money there. The property a man has is a matter so peculiarly within his knowledge that an applicant may not reasonably be expected to know them. In those circumstances, the legal burden still remains on the applicant, but the evidential burden would then, in those circumstances, where the applicant has reasonable grounds which grounds must be disclosed in the application that the Respondent will not be in a position to refund the decretal sum if the appeal succeeds, have shifted to the Respondent to

show that he would be in a position to refund the decretal sum. **See Kenya Posts & Telecommunications Corporation vs. Paul Gachanga Ndarua Civil Application No. Nai. 367 of 2001; ABN Amro Bank, N.K. vs. Le Monde Foods Limited Civil Application No. 15 of 2002.**

22. The same sentiments were expressed in Civil Application No. 238 of 2005; **National Industrial Credit Bank Ltd vs. Aquinas Francis Wasike** in which the Court of Appeal expressed itself at Page 3 Paragraph 2 as follows:-

> **"This court has said before and it would bear repeating that while the legal duty is on an applicant to prove the allegations that an appeal would be rendered nugatory because the respondent would be unable to pay back the decretal sum, it is unreasonable to expect such an applicant to know in detail the resources owned by a respondent or the lack of them. Once an applicant expresses a reasonable fear that a respondent would be unable to pay back the decretal sum, the evidential burden must then shift to the respondent to show what resources he has since that is a matter which is peculiarly within his knowledge."**

23. I therefore appreciate the sentiments expressed by the High Court in **John Gachanja Mundia vs. Francis Muriira Alias Francis Muthika & Another [2016] eKLR** that:

> **"There is doubt the Applicant has shown that substantial loss would occur unless stay is granted. However, I will be guided by a greater sense of justice. Courts of law have said that, with the entry of the overriding principle in our law and the anchorage of substantive justice in the Constitution as a principle of justice, courts should always take the wider sense of justice in interpreting the prescriptions of law designed for grant of relief."**

24. What amounts to reasonable grounds for believing that the respondent will not be able to refund the decretal sum is a matter of fact which depends on the facts of a particular case. In my view even if it were shown that the respondent is a man of lesser means, that would not necessarily justify a stay of execution as poverty is not a ground for denial of a person's right to enjoy the fruits of his success. Suffice to say as was held in **Stephen Wanjohi vs. Central Glass Industries Ltd. Nairobi HCCC No. 6726 of 1991,** financial ability of a decree holder solely is not a reason for allowing stay; it is enough that the decree holder is not a dishonourable miscreant without any form of income.

25. In the case of **Tropical Commodities Suppliers Ltd and Others vs. International Credit Bank Limited (in liquidation) (2004) E.A. LR 331**, the Court defined substantial loss in the sense of Order 42 rule 6 as follows:

> **"…Substantial loss does not represent any particular mathematical formula. Rather, it is a qualitative concept. It refers to any loss, great or small, that is of real worth or value as distinguished from a loss without value or a loss that is merely nominal…"**

26. Substantial loss may be equated to the principle of negation of the success of the intended appeal. Dealing with the latter, it was held in the case of **Kenya Airports Authority vs. Mitu-Bell Welfare Society & Another (2014) eKLR**, that:

> **"The nugatory limb is meant to obviate the spectre of a meritorious appeal, when successful, being rendered academic the apprehended harm, loss or prejudice having come to pass in the intervening period. Our stay of execution jurisdiction is meant to avoid such defeatist eventualities in deserving cases."**

27. It was therefore held in the case of **Tabro Transporters Ltd. vs. Absalom Dova Lumbasi [2012] eKLR**, thus:

> **"The discretionary relief of stay of execution pending appeal is designed on the basis that no one would be worse off by virtue of an order of the court; as such order does not introduce any disadvantage, but administers the justice that the case deserves. This is in recognition that both parties have rights; the Appellant to his appeal which includes the prospects that the appeal will not be rendered nugatory; and the decree holder to the decree which includes full benefits under the decree. The court in balancing the two competing rights focuses on their reconciliation which is not a question of discrimination."**

28. I agree with the position adopted in Bungoma High Court Misc Application No 42 of 2011 - **James Wangalwa & Another vs. Agnes Naliaka Cheseto** that:

> **"The applicant must establish other factors which show that the execution will create a state of affairs that will irreparably affect or negate the very essential core of the Applicant as the successful party in the appeal. This is what substantial loss would entail.''**

29. In this case, the Applicant has not shown the basis upon which it is believed that the Respondents will be unable to refund the decretal sum. Similarly, it has not been shown what hardship, if any, the Applicants stands to suffer if the decretal sum is paid over to the Respondents. The mere fact that the Decree Holder intends to execute the decree, and it is his right to do so otherwise there is no point in obtaining a decree, does not by itself constitute substantial loss. As was appreciated in **James Wangalwa & Another vs. Agnes Naliaka Cheseto [2012] eKLR**:

> **"No doubt, in law, the fact that the process of execution has been put in motion, or is likely to be put in motion, by itself, does not amount to substantial loss. Even when execution has been levied and completed, that is to say, the attached properties have been sold, as is the case here, does not in itself amount to substantial loss under Order 42 Rule 6 of the CPR. This is so because execution is a lawful process. The applicant must establish other factors which show that the execution will create a state of affairs that will irreparably affect or negate the very essential core of the applicant as the successful party in the appeal ... the issue of substantial loss is the cornerstone of both jurisdictions. Substantial loss is what has to be prevented by**

**preserving the status quo because such loss would render the appeal nugatory"**

30. What has troubled me however, is the fact that the Respondents are suing in their capacity as the administrators of the estate of a deceased person. Whereas, the Respondents in their individual capacities may well be able to refund the decretal sum, when it comes to their representative capacities, it is another issue altogether. There is no averment at all in the replying affidavit regarding the ability of the estate itself to refund the decretal sum once paid over. It is however not lost on me that, from the averments in the supporting affidavit as well as the annextures, the Applicants are more concerned with the assessment of damages. In those circumstances, it boils down to how much the court ought to have awarded as opposed to whether any award ought to have been made at all.

31. Accordingly, the order which commends itself to me and which I hereby grant is that there will be stay of execution pending the hearing of this appeal on condition that the Appellant pays half of the decretal sum to the respondent and deposits the balance in a joint interest earning account in the names of the advocates for the respective parties in Kenya Commercial Bank, Machakos. Both conditions to be complied with within 30 days from the date of this ruling and in default this application shall be deemed to have been dismissed with costs to the Respondent.

32. The costs of this application are awarded to the Respondent in any event.

33. It is so ordered.

**READ, SIGNED AND DELIVERED IN OPEN COURT AT MACHAKOS THIS 30TH DAY OF JULY, 2021.**

**G V ODUNGA**

**JUDGE**

**Delivered in the presence of:**

**Miss Wangari for Miss Muchemi for the Applicant**

**Mr Mwihia for the Respondent**

**CA Simon**