



REPUBLIC OF KENYA

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KENYA AT MERU

[CORAM: MRIMA, J.]

CIVIL APPEAL NO. 73 OF 2019

1. GILBERT KIRIMA KUBANIA

2. JOYCE MUTEA MWAROMO.....APPELLANTS

-VERSUS-

STELLA MUKAMI KARIMBA.....RESPONDENT

(Being an appeal from the judgment and decree by Hon. J. Irura, Principal Magistrate in Nkubu Principal Magistrate's Civil Suit No. 39 of 2017 delivered on 12/06/2019)

JUDGMENT

1. The duty of the first appellate 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**). The Court must nevertheless appreciate that it 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 appellate Court is shown demonstrably that the trial court acted on wrong principles in reaching the findings. That was the holding in **Mwasokoni - versus- Kenya Bus Service Ltd. (1982-88) 1 KAR 278** and **Kiruga –versus- Kiruga & Another (1988) KLR 348**).

2. The appeal subject of this judgment was ordered to be heard by way of written submissions. Both parties duly complied. The Respondent raised a preliminary point on the competence of the appeal. I will deal with the issue first.

3. The Respondent framed the issue as follows:

Whether the Appellants Record of Appeal dated 21st August 2019 is incompetent due to failure to include the decree appealed against.

4. In urging the issue, the Respondent referred to the law and decisions. **Sections 65(1)(b)** and **79G** of the **Civil Procedure Act, Cap. 21** Laws of Kenya (hereinafter referred to as '**the Act**') and **Order 42 Rule 13(i)** and **(4)** of the **Civil Procedure Rules, 2010** (hereinafter referred to as '**the Rules**') were submitted as the basis of the issue. The decisions in **Ndegwa Kamau t/a Sideview Garage vs. Fredrick Isika Kalumbo (2016) eKLR** and **Nancy Wamuny Gichobi v Jane Wawira Gichobi (2018) eKLR** were cited in buttressing the preliminary issue.

5. This Court was then asked to strike out the appeal with costs.

6. The Appellants did not respond to the issue.

7. I have carefully considered the issue. It is a point of law capable of disposing of the matter if sustained. It ordinarily ought to have been raised by way of a preliminary objection. Nevertheless, I will deal with it.

8. **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.

9. 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.

10. 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).

11. 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.

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. 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.

79G 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.

15. 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”.

16. 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.

17. 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 Appellants never sought for any extension of time to file the decree neither did they explain any difficulty in obtaining the decree. The Appellants simply did not see the necessity of the decree. That may explain why they did not even respond to the issue when it was raised by the Respondent.

18. 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.’ I so find.

19. The appeal is therefore struck out with costs.

20. Orders accordingly.

SIGNED BY:

A. C. MRIMA

JUDGE

DATED, COUNTERSIGNED and DELIVERED at MERU this 30th day of October, 2019.

A. MABEYA

JUDGE

Judgment delivered in open Court and in the presence of: -

.....for the Appellants.

.....for the Respondent.

.....Court Assistant