



**REPUBLIC OF KENYA**

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

**[Coram: A. C. Mrima, J.]**

**CIVIL APPEAL NO. 80 OF 2018**

**BETWEEN**

**TRANS MARA SUGAR CO. LTD.....APPELLANT**

**AND**

**JAMES OMONDI OBUDHO.....RESPONDENT**

***(Being an appeal from the judgment and decree by Hon. C. M. Kamau Resident Magistrate in Rongo Magistrate's Civil Suit No. 236 of 2016 . delivered on 9/05/2018)***

**JUDGMENT**

1. **James Omondi Obudho**, the Respondent herein, filed *Rongo Senior Resident Magistrate's Court Civil Suit No. 236 of 2016* (hereinafter referred to as '**the suit**') against **Trans Mara Sugar Co. Ltd**, the Appellant herein. The Respondent claimed that by a Sugarcane Growing and Supply Contract entered into on 31/10/2011 (hereinafter referred to as '**the Contract**') the Appellant contracted the Respondent to grow and sell to it sugarcane at the Respondent's parcel of land in North Kanyajuok Sub-Location, South Kamagambo Location measuring 0.3 Hectare within Migori County.
2. The Respondent pleaded that the Contract was for a period of six years or until one plant crop and two ratoon crops of the sugarcane were harvested from the subject parcel of land whichever event occurred first. The Respondent further pleaded that he discharged his part of the contract until the plant crop was ready for harvesting and that the Appellant harvested only part of it. The Respondent further contended that the Appellant abandoned the harvesting of the other part of the plant crop thereby compromising the development of the ratoon crops. The Appellant posited that he suffered loss of the plant crop and the two ratoon crops.
3. Aggrieved by the alleged breach of the contract the Respondent filed the suit. He sought for appropriate compensation on the loss with costs and interest at court rates.
4. The suit was accordingly defended.
5. The suit was finally settled down for hearing where both parties were represented by Counsels. The Respondent was the sole witness who testified and adopted his Statement as part of his testimony. He also produced the documents in his List of Documents as exhibits. The Appellant closed its case without calling any witness.
6. The trial court rendered its judgment on 09/05/2018. The suit was allowed at Kshs. 284,700/= with costs and interest from the date of filing of the suit.
7. The Appellant was aggrieved by the judgment and preferred an appeal. It filed a Memorandum of Appeal on 02/07/2018. In praying that the appeal be allowed and the suit be dismissed with costs the Appellant proposed 16 grounds.
8. Directions were taken, and the appeal was disposed of by way of written submissions. Both parties duly complied. The Appellant challenged the finding of the trial court vigorously. It expounded on the grounds of appeal. It relied on 20 decisions and 25 written materials in support of the appeal.
9. The Respondent opposed the appeal. It supported the judgment and prayed for the dismissal of the appeal with costs. The Respondent submitted that the appeal was a non-starter as it was filed out of time without leave of the Court. It was also submitted that a copy of the decree was not part of the record of appeal. The Respondent also relied on various decisions.

10. As the first appellate Court, the role of this Court is to revisit the evidence on record, evaluate it and reach its own conclusion in the matter. (See the case of **Selle & Ano. vs. Associated Motor Boat Co. Ltd (1968) EA 123**). This Court nevertheless appreciates that an appellate Court will not ordinarily interfere with findings of fact by the trial Court unless they were based on no evidence at all, or on a misapprehension of it or the Court is shown demonstrably to have acted on wrong principles in reaching the findings. This was the holding in **Mwanasokoni – versus- Kenya Bus Service Ltd. (1982-88) 1 KAR 278** and **Kiruga –versus- Kiruga & Another (1988) KLR 348**).

11. I have certainly perused and understood the contents of the pleadings, proceedings, judgment, grounds of appeal, submissions and the decisions referred to by the parties.

12. I have also perused the lower court file. I did not come across any decree extracted from the judgment. I also did not come across any order granting leave to appeal.

13. I will now deal with the effect of the absence of the decree and the order granting leave to appeal, if any, in the record of appeal.

14. **Section 65(1)** of the **Act** is the basis of appeals from the subordinate courts to the High Court. It provides as follows: -

**Except where otherwise expressly provided by this Act, and subject to such provision as to the furnishing of security as may be prescribed, an appeal shall lie to the High Court-**

**(a) (Deleted by 10 of 1969, Sch.);**

**(b) from any original decree or part of a decree of a subordinate court, other than a magistrate's court of the third class, on a question of law or fact;**

**(c) from a decree or part of a decree of a Kadhi's Court, and on such an appeal the Chief Kadhi or two other Kadhis shall sit as assessor or assessors.**

15. Appeals from orders are provided for in **Sections 75 and 76** of the **Act** and **Order 43** of the **Rules**. **Order 42 Rule 1** of the **Rules** provide that an appeal to the High Court shall be in the form of a Memorandum of Appeal signed in the same manner as a pleading.

16. Once an appeal is lodged aforesaid, a Record of Appeal is then filed. The contents of the Record of Appeal are provided for in **Order 42 Rule 13(4)** of the **Rules** as follows: -

**Before allowing the appeal to go for hearing the judge shall be satisfied that the following documents are on the court record and that such of them as are not in the possession of either party have been served on that party that is to say:**

**(a) the memorandum of appeal;**

**(b) the pleadings**

**(c) the notes of the trial magistrate made at the hearing;**

**(d) the transcript of any official shorthand, typist notes electronic recording or palantypist notes made at the hearing;**

**(e) all affidavits, maps and other documents whatsoever put in evidence before the magistrate;**

**(f) the judgment, order or decree appealed from, and, where appropriate, the order (if any) giving leave to appeal;**

**Provided that-**

**(i) a translation into English shall be provided of any document not in that language;**

**(ii) the judge may dispense with the production of any document or part of a document which is not relevant, other than those specified in paragraphs (a), (b) and (f).**

17. A Record of Appeal is essentially supposed to be complete with all necessary documents. Courts have severally dealt with cases of incompleteness of Records of Appeal.

18. The Supreme Court in *Civil Application No. 20 of 2014 Bwana Mohamed Bwana v Silvano Buko Bonaya & 2 Others (2014) eKLR* referred to its earlier finding in *Law Society of Kenya vs Centre for Human Rights and Democracy & Others, Supreme Court Petition No. 14 of 2013* as follows: -

**[16] For a competent appeal to lie before this Court it must comply with the provisions of Rule 33(1) of the Supreme Court Rules, 2012 which provides that:**

***An appeal to the Court shall be instituted by lodging in the registry within thirty days of the date of filing of the notice of appeal –***

- (a) a petition of appeal;
- (b) a record of appeal; and
- (c) the prescribed fee.

[17] .....

[36] *The use of the word 'shall' in Rule 33(1) suggests the mandatory nature of the rule, requiring strict adherence to the completeness of the rule. Thus, a strict reading of rule 33(1) leads to the conclusion that an appeal comprises the Petition, the Record of Appeal, and the prescribed fee.*

[37] .....

[38] *The Record of Appeal is the complete bundle of documentation, including the pleadings, submissions, and judgment from the lower Court, without which the appellate Court would not be able to determine the appeal before it.*

19. The Court further held, at paragraph 39, that:

[39] *If an intending appellant were to present the Court with a Notice and Petition of Appeal, but without the Record of Appeal, and expect the Court to determine 'the appeal' on the basis of these two, such an appeal would be incomplete and hence incompetent. Indeed, this is the gist of Rule 33(1) of the Supreme Court Rules.*

20. **Ngaah, J** in *Nyeri High Court Civil Appeal No. 51 of 2013 Ndegwa Kamau t/a Sideview Garage v Fredrick Isika Kalumbo (2016) eKLR* dealt with how the Court of Appeal in *Kyuma vs Kyema (1988) KLR 185* dealt with the interpretation of Section 79G of the Act. Before looking at what the Court said I will first reproduce the said Section.

**Every appeal from a subordinate court to the High Court shall be filed within a period of thirty days from the date of the decree or order appealed against, excluding from such period any time which the lower court may certify as having been requisite for the preparation and delivery to the appellant of a copy of the decree or order:**

**Provided that an appeal may be admitted out of time if the appellant satisfies the court that he had good and sufficient cause for not filing the appeal in time.**

21. The Court of Appeal then held as follows: -

*The question is what documents must the appellant file within thirty days or within the time lawfully extended by the certificate of delay" Since the question contemplates that the appeal is against a decree or order, the appellant is obliged to apply first, Memorandum of Appeal in the form set out in appendix F No. 1 of the Civil Procedure Rules and second, a copy of the formal order of the court, if available. Rule 1A of Order 41 permits this latter document to be filed as soon "as possible and in any event within such a time as the court may order". Therefore, a certificate of delay within the true intendment of section 79G must certify the time it took to prepare and deliver to the appellant "a copy of the order" of the magistrate. But the certificate of delay exhibited by the appellant, did not speak of a decree or order. No such order was sought or extracted. What the appellant, in error, sought and what the court dutifully supplied, were the proceedings and judgment".*

22. **Sitati, J** in *Kakamega Election Petition Appeal No. 3 of 2018 Elvis Anyimbo Sichenga v Orange Democratic Movement & 4 Others (2016) eKLR* dealt with the same issue in an election petition appeal from the subordinate court. In that appeal the Record of Appeal did not include the decree of the judgment appealed against. The Learned Judge held as follows: -

*32. What then am I saying about the failure by the appellant to attach a certified copy of the decree appealed from? I am saying that that omission is not a mere technicality for if it were so, the drafters of the rules would not have made its attachment a mandatory requirement. I am therefore satisfied that the applicant has satisfied this court that the said omission is fatal to the petition and I so find.*

23. I will also add my voice on the subject. **First**, from the reading of **Section 65(1)** of the **Act** it is the decree or part thereof that is appealed from the subordinate court to the High Court. **Second**, under **Order 42 Rule 13(4)** of the **Rules** a Court may dispense with any document to be part of the Record of Appeal except the memorandum of appeal, the pleadings and the judgment, order or decree appealed from and in appropriate cases the order giving leave to appeal. **Third**, the saving grace under **Article 159(2)(d)** of the **Constitution** is inapplicable in this case. That is because the provision only applies to matters relating to procedure or form and not the substance thereof. **Fourth**, despite clear provisions on extension of time the Appellant never sought for any extension of time to file the decree neither did it explain any difficulty in obtaining the decree. The appeal was filed around 60 days post the delivery of the judgment appeal against. That was clearly out of the stipulated time.

24. The Record of Appeal is therefore incomplete. In the words of the Supreme Court in *Civil Application No. 20 of 2014 Bwana Mohamed Bwana* (supra) '*such an appeal would be incomplete and hence incompetent.*'

25. Having said so, there is no competent appeal for consideration. The appeal is therefore struck out with costs.

Orders accordingly.

**DELIVERED, DATED and SIGNED at MIGORI this 28<sup>th</sup> day of May, 2020.**

**A.C. MRIMA**

**JUDGE**

**Judgment delivered electronically: -**

1. [ronaldoyagi@rediffmail.com](mailto:ronaldoyagi@rediffmail.com) for Oyagi, Ong'uti, Magiya & Company Advocates for the Appellant.
2. [capisomolo@yahoo.com](mailto:capisomolo@yahoo.com) for Gembe & Company Advocates for the Respondent.
3. Parties are at liberty to obtain hard copies of the Ruling from the Registry upon payment of the requisite charges.

**A.C. MRIMA**

**JUDGE**