



REPUBLIC OF KENYA
IN THE HIGH COURT OF KENYA AT EMBU
CRIMINAL CASE NO. 9 OF 2016

REPUBLICPROSECUTOR

VERSUS

ANTONY KARANJA NJERU.....ACCUSED

RULING

1. By his notice of motion dated 27th June 2016, the accused person through his counsel has applied for bail pending his trial on charge of murder contrary to section 204 as read with 203 of the Penal Code (Cap 63) Laws of Kenya. He has brought his application under the provisions of Article 49 (h) and 51 (I) of the 2010 Constitution of Kenya and under sections 356 and 357 of the Criminal Procedure Code (Cap 75) Laws of Kenya.
2. The state does not oppose their application.
3. The applicant's application is supported by his affidavit dated 28th June 2016. According to his affidavit the accused has deponed that he is presumed innocent until proved guilty (paragraph 5). He has also deponed that he has high chances of being acquitted of the murder charge against him. Furthermore, he has deponed that he will abide by the bail/bond terms set by the court if granted bail/bond and will also attend the court as and when required until judgement and sentence passed.
4. Additionally he has deponed that he is charged with a bailable offence in terms of 2010 Kenya Constitution. He has further deponed that following information from his advocate, which he believed, his case is will take a long time before it is tried and finally determined.
5. According to the **2010 Constitution in Article 49 (1) (h)** a person who has been arrested has a right to be released on bail or bond on reasonable conditions pending a charge or trial unless there are compelling reasons against the release of such person.
6. It is clear that the right to be released on bail is a constitutionally guaranteed right. It is also clear that all offences are bailable under the 2010 Constitution of Kenya. The Constitution requires that persons who are arrested are released on bail unless there are compelling reasons that militate against their release.
7. The reasons for this constitutional provision is that every person, who is charged with an offence is constitutionally presumed to be innocent in terms of **Article 50 (2) (a) of the 2010 Constitution**. It follows from this presumption of innocence that such a person should not lose his freedom lightly.
8. In considering whether or not a person should be released on bail or bond the court is required to

exercise its discretion judicially. A major consideration in matters of bail is whether or not the accused will attend his trial if he is released. Once it is shown that an accused is likely to attend his trial if released on bail, he should be released, unless there are conditions that militate against his release.

9. Once such militating factor is interference with witnesses. It has long been recognized that an accused who interferes with witnesses does not qualify to be granted bail. In ***Panju v R (1973) E.A. 282*** the High Court held that where an allegation of interference with witnesses is used as a ground of opposing release on bail, the prosecution must produce evidence. This was the practice under the independence Constitution of 1963. The requirement to produce evidence to support an allegation of interference with witnesses is in principle good law. The reason being that a decision of a court must be based on evidence.

10. In ***R v Joktan Mayende & 4 Others the High Court (at Bungoma) in Criminal Case No. 55 of 2007*** the accused person therein was denied bail on the ground of interference with witnesses. That decision was based upon the provisions of Article 49 (1) (b) of the 2010 Constitution.

11. Furthermore, in terms of ***section 123 (2) of the Criminal Procedure Code (Cap 75) of the Laws of Kenya, "the amount of bail shall be fixed with due regard to the circumstances of the case and shall not be excessive."***

12. It is important to point out that ***sections 356 and 257 of the Criminal Procedure Code*** do not apply to this case. They apply to situations where the accused has been convicted and applies for bail pending the entering (filing) of appeal to the convicting court in terms of ***section 356 of the Criminal Procedure Code***. After the appeal has been entered (filed) the applicant is then entailed to file an application for bail pending appeal in ***terms of section 357 of the Criminal Procedure Code***.

13. I have considered the affidavit evidence of the accused. I find that it is credible. I also find that he will abide by the bail/bond terms which the court may impose. Finally, I find that the accused will attend his trial as and when required to do so.

14. In the circumstances of this case, taken together with the offence charged, I find that this is a proper case for the release of the accused person on bail pending his trial on a charge of murder. I also find that there are no factors militating against his release on bail.

15. In the light of the constitutional provisions and the principles set out in the foregoing cases, I find that the accused person has met the constitutional threshold in terms of ***Article 49 (1) (h)*** for his release on bail pending his trial on a charge of murder.

16. The upshot of the above is that the accused person is hereby granted bail in the sum of Kshs 300,000/- with a surety of a similar amount pending the hearing and determination of his trial.

RULING DATED, SIGNED and DELIVERED in open court at **EMBU** this **13th** day of **JUNE 2016**

In the presence of Ms Mbae for the State and Ms Muriuki for the Accused person.

Court clerk Njue

J.M BWONWONGA

JUDGE

13.06.16