



REPUBLIC OF KENYA

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KENYA AT NAIROBI

CIVIL DIVISION

HIGH COURT CIVIL MISC APPL. NO. 98 OF 2018

GITHINJI, KIMAMO & CO ADVOCATES.....APPLICANT

VERSUS

ENDMOR STEEL MILLERS LIMITED.....RESPONDENT

RULING

1. The application dated 20th August, 2019 principally seeks the following orders:

- 1. That judgment be entered for the Applicant against the Respondent for the sum of Ksh.34,536.38/= together with interest thereon at 14% per annum from 25th October, 2018 until payment in full.**
- 2. That the Applicant be at liberty to execute against the Respondent.**
- 3. That costs of this application be borne by the Respondent.**

2. It is stated that the Bill of Costs herein was taxed at Ksh.34,536.38 and a Certificate Taxation issued. That the Certificate of Taxation has not been set aside or varied but the Respondent has failed to settle the same.

3. The application is opposed as per the grounds of opposition dated 19th September, 2019 which states as follows:

- “1. The application is a blatant and egregious abuse of the court process and is only meant to circumvent justice.**
- 2. That the Applicant’s motion seeks interest at 14% from the date of taxation despite the fact that Section 51(2) of the Act makes express provision on interest; that if there is any entitlement on interest under Section 51(2), the same should be at the expiration of thirty (30) days from the date of delivery of the taxed Bill to the client.**
 - 3. The application is devoid of any merit and misconceived.**
 - 4. The Applicant ought to file a fresh suit if at all since retainer has always been disputed.**
 - 5. The application is frivolous, vexatious and fatally defective.**
 - 6. That the Application has no legal basis.**
 - 7. That the Application is fundamentally and incurably defective.”**

4. I have considered the application, the response and the submissions filed by the respective counsel for the parties.

5. The uncontroverted evidence that the Bill of Cost was taxed and the Certificate of Costs issued is supported by the record. On the ground of opposition raised that there was no retainer, the taxation was not challenged as envisaged under rule 11 of the Advocates Remuneration Order.

6. Section 51 (2) of Advocate Act Cap 16 Laws of Kenya provides as follows:

“(2) The certificate of the taxing officer by whom any bill has been taxed shall, unless it is set aside or altered by the Court, be final as to the amount of the costs covered thereby, and the Court may make such order in relation thereto as it thinks fit, including, in a case where the retainer is not disputed, an order that judgment be entered for the sum certified to be due with costs.”

7. Rule No. 7 of the Advocates Remuneration Orders reads as follows:

“An advocate may charge interest at 14% per annum on his disbursements and costs, whether by scale or otherwise, from the expiration of one month from the delivery of his bill to the client, providing such claim for interest is raised before the amount of the bill has been paid or tendered in full.”

8. The Applicant herein as claimed 14% interest from 25th October, 2018 when the costs were taxed. The record shows that the Respondent’s Advocate had filed a Notice of Appointment herein on 11th July, 2018. The Applicant’s claim for interest is therefore merited.

9. With the foregoing, I allow the application as prayed.

Dated, signed and delivered in Nairobi this 29th day of May, 2020

B. THURANIRA JADEN

JUDGE