REPUBLIC OF KENYA

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KENYA AT NAIROBI

JUDICIAL REVIEW DIVISION

JR CASE NO. 437 OF 2014

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPLY FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW ORDERS OF CERTIORARI, PROHIBITION & MANDAMUS

AND

IN THE MATTER OF THE LAW REFORM ACT AND THE CIVIL PROCEDURE ACT

AND

IN THE MATTER OF THE LAW SOCIETY OF KENYA DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL CAUSE 083 OF 2013

LEONARD GETHOI KAMWETI...APPLICANT

VERSUS

LAW SOCIETY OF KENYA DISCIPLINARY TRIBUNAL................................RESPONDENT

AND

AHMEDNASIR ABDULLAHI.. INTERESTED PARTY

RULING

Introduction

1. By a Chamber Summons dated 17th November, 2014, the applicant herein, **Leonard Gethoi Kamweti,** seeks leave to apply for an order of certiorari do issue to bring to this Court for purposes of being quashed the proceedings, decisions and order and all consequential orders made therein by the Respondent in its Disciplinary Cause No. 083 of 2013 on 27th October 2014, Prohibition barring the Respondent from issuing any communications to the Chief Justice requesting him to constitute a committee pursuant to section 19 of the ***Advocates Act*** (hereinafter referred to as the Act) to hear and determine the complaint, and an order of mandamus to compel the Tribunal to exercise its judicial authority and to expeditiously hear and determine the complaint on its substantive merits. The applicant also sought an order that the grant of leave do operate as a stay of the order in question.

Applicant's Case

2. The applicant in this case contends that he lodged a complaint against the interested party with the Respondent on 8th February, 2012. However by a ruling delivered on 27th October, 2014, the Respondent terminated the disciplinary proceedings against the interested party herein on the ground that the interested party having acquired the status of Senior Counsel, section 19 of the Act ousts the jurisdiction of the Respondent in respect of disciplinary matters on Senior Counsel and confers that jurisdiction on the Committee of three set out thereunder. According to the Respondent the said section applies when a Complaint is made and the Complaint having been made on 13th June 2013 when the interested party was already a Senior Counsel the Respondent lacked jurisdiction and hence the matter was terminated and the secretary of the Law Society directed to formally write to the Chief Justice requesting him to constitute a Committee pursuant to the said section to hear and determine the said Complaint.
3. According to the applicant the interested party became a Senior Counsel on 3rd June, 2013 which was 395 days after he lodged his complaint against the interested party.
4. It was therefore the applicant's case that by finding that the complaint was lodged after the interested party became Senior Counsel, the Respondent misdirected itself both in fact and in law and its decision was contrary to existing evidence on the face of the record and that it took into account irrelevant evidence and inapplicable considerations. It was further contended that the Respondent's findings were perverse and contrary to evidence.

Interested Party's Case

5. On behalf of the Interested Party, it was contended that whereas the interested party was appointed Senior Counsel vide Gazette Notice dated 4th June 2013 on 14th June, 2013, the complaint was in fact filed on 26th June, 2013 by way of private prosecution which was two months after Gazettement. It was submitted that before the plea was taken there are no proceedings before the Respondent.
6. It was therefore contended that the Respondent did not have jurisdiction and could not have acted against the law hence this Court cannot compel it to act against the law. It was further averred that the complaint was not dismissed but was referred to the Chief Justice. While admitting that the decision to refer the complaint to the Chief Justice may have been in excess of jurisdiction, **Mr Issa**, learned counsel for the interested party submitted that what is being sought is to sustain the complaint before a body without jurisdiction.
7. It was further contended that since the complaint was by the National Bank of Kenya, the applicant herein has no locus standi to bring these proceedings on behalf of the Bank.

Determinations

8. I have considered the positions adopted by the respective parties to this application. It is important to note that the matter before me is a determination whether leave to commence judicial review proceedings ought to be granted to the applicant and whether the grant of that leave, if so granted, ought to operate as a stay of the proceedings in question.
9. The requirement for leave was explained by a three judge bench comprising **Bosire, Mbogholi-Msagha & Oguk, JJ** in **Matiba vs. Attorney General Nairobi H.C. Misc. Application No. 790 of 1993** in which the Court held that it is supposed to exclude frivolous vexatious or applications which *prima facie* appear to be abuse of the process of the Court or those applications which are statute barred. Similarly, in **Republic vs. Land Disputes Tribunal Court Central Division and Another Ex Parte Nzioka [2006] 1 EA 321,** **Nyamu,J** (as he then was) held that leave should be granted, if on the material available the court considers, without going into the matter in depth, that there is an arguable case for granting leave and that leave stage is a filter whose purpose is to weed out hopeless cases at the earliest possible time, thus saving the pressure on the courts and needless expense for the applicant by allowing malicious and futile claims to be weeded out or eliminated so as to prevent public bodies being paralysed for months because of pending court action which might turn out to be unmeritorious. See also **Republic vs. The P/S Ministry of**

Planning and National Development Ex Parte Kaimenyi [2006] 1 EA 353.

10. **Waki, J** (as he then was), on the other hand, in **Republic vs. County Council of Kwale & Another Ex Parte Kondo & 57 Others Mombasa HCMCA No. 384 of 1996** put it thus:

"The purpose of application for leave to apply for judicial review is firstly to eliminate at an early stage any applications for judicial review which are either frivolous, vexatious or hopeless and secondly to ensure that the applicant is only allowed to proceed to substantive hearing if the Court is satisfied that there is a case fit for further consideration. The requirement that leave must be obtained before making an application for judicial review is designed to prevent the time of the court being wasted by busy bodies with misguided or trivial complaints or administrative error, and to remove the uncertainty in which public officers and authorities might be left as to whether they could safely proceed with administrative action while proceedings for judicial review of it were actually pending even though misconceived… Leave may only be granted therefore if on the material available the court is of the view, without going into the matter in depth, that there is an arguable case for granting the relief claimed by the applicant the test being whether there is a case fit for further investigation at a full *inter partes* hearing of the substantive application for judicial review. It is an exercise of the court's discretion but as always it has to be exercised judicially".

11. This position was confirmed by the Court of Appeal in **Meixner & Another vs. Attorney General [2005] 2 KLR 189** in which the Court held that the leave of the court is a prerequisite to making a substantive application for judicial review and that the purpose of the leave is to filter out frivolous applications hence the granting of leave or otherwise involves an exercise of judicial discretion.
12. The circumstances which guide the grant of leave to apply for judicial review remedies were enumerated in **Mirugi Kariuki vs. Attorney General Civil Appeal No. 70 of 1991 [1990-1994] EA 156; [1992] KLR 8** as follows:

"The law relating to judicial review has now reached the stage where it can be said with confidence that, if the subject matter in respect of which prerogative power is exercised is justiciable, that is to say if it is a matter on which the Court can adjudicate, the exercise of the power is subject to review in accordance with the principles developed in respect of the review of the exercise of statutory power…the controlling factor in determining whether the exercise of prerogative power is subject to judicial review is not its source but its subject matter… It is not the absoluteness of the discretion nor the authority of exercising it that matter but whether in its exercise, some of the person's legal rights or interests have been affected. This makes the exercise of such discretion justiciable and therefore subject to judicial review. In the instant appeal, it is of no consequence that the Attorney General has absolute discretion under section 11(1) of the Act if in its exercise the appellant's legal rights or interests were affected. The applicant's complaint in the High Court was that this was so and for that reason he sought leave of the court to have it investigated. It is wrong in law for the Court to attempt an assessment of the sufficiency of an applicant's interests without regard to the matter of his complaint. If he fails to show, when he applies for leave, a *prima facie* case, on reasonable grounds for believing that there has been a failure of public duty, the Court would be in error if it granted leave. The curb represented by the need for the applicant to show, when he seeks leave to apply, that he has a case, is an essential protection against abuse of the legal process. It enables the Court to prevent abuse by busybodies, cranks and other mischief-makers… In this appeal, the issue is whether the appellant in his application for leave to apply for orders of certiorari and mandamus demonstrated to the High Court a *prima facie* case for the grant of those orders. Clearly, once breach of the rules of natural justice was alleged, the exercise of discretion by the Attorney General under section 11(1) of the Act was brought into question. Without a rebuttal to these allegations, the appellant certainly disclosed a *prima facie* case. For that, he should have been granted leave to apply for the orders sought."

13. In **R vs. Communications Commission of Kenya & 2 Others Ex Parte East Africa Televisions Network Ltd. Civil Appeal No. 175 of 2000 [2001] KLR 82; [2001] 1 EA 199**, the Court of Appeal was of the view that leave should be granted if, on the material available, the Court considers, without going into the matter in depth, that there is an arguable case for granting leave.
14. In **Re Bivac International SA (Bureau Veritas) [2005] 2 EA 43 (HCK)**, the Court stated:

"Application for leave to apply for orders of judicial review are normally *ex parte* and such an application does restrict the Court to threshold issues namely whether the applicant has an arguable case, and whether if leave is granted, the same should operate as a stay. Whereas judicial review remedies are at the end of the day discretionary, that discretion is a judicial discretion and, for this reason a court has to explain how the discretion, if any, was exercised so that all the parties are aware of the factors which led to the exercise of the Court's discretion. There should be an arguable case which without delving into the details could succeed and an arguable case is not ascertained by the court by tossing a coin or waving a magic wand or raising a green flag, the ascertainment of an arguable case is an intellectual exercise in this fast growing area of the law and one has to consider without making any findings, the scope of the judicial review remedy sought, the grounds and the possible principles of administrative law involved and not forget the ever expanding frontiers of judicial review and perhaps give an applicant his day in court instead of denying him…. Although leave should not be granted as a matter of routine, where one is in doubt one has to consider the wise words of Megarry, J in the case of *John vs. Rees [1970] Ch 345 at 402.* In the exercise of the discretion on whether or not to grant stay, the court takes into account the needs of good administration."

15. What comes out clearly from the foregoing is that the grant of leave to commence judicial review proceeding is not a mere formality and that leave is not granted as a matter of course. The applicant for leave is under an obligation to show to the court that he has a prima facie arguable case for grant of leave. Whereas he is not required at that stage to go into the depth of the application, he has to show that he has not come to court after an inordinate delay and that the application is not frivolous, malicious and futile. As was held in **Re: Kenya National Federation of Co-Operatives Ltd & Others [2004] 2 EA 128** based on ***Judicial Review Handbook*** **(3 Ed) By Michael Fordham:**

"A claimant for permission is under an important duty to make frank disclosure to the Court of all material facts and matters and it is especially important to draw attention to matters which are adverse to the claim, in particular: (1) any statutory restriction on the availability of judicial review; (2) any alternative remedy; (3) any delay/ lack of promptness and so need for an extension of time. In facing up to adverse points, the claimant will have an early opportunity to explain why those points are not fatal and why the case should be permitted to proceed (that is a "confess and avoid"). The duty of "full and frank" disclosure harks back to the time when permission for judicial review was *ex parte."*

16. The purpose of judicial review is to check that public bodies do not exceed their jurisdiction and carry out their duties in a manner that is detrimental to the public at large. It is meant to uplift the quality of public decision making, and thereby ensure for the citizen civilised governance, by holding the public authority to the limit defined by the law.Judicial review is therefore an important control, ventilating a host of varied types of problems. The focus of cases may range from matters of grave public concern to those of acute personal interest; from general policy to individualised discretion; from social controversy to commercial self-interest; and anything in between. As a result, judicial review has significantly improved the quality of decision making. It has done this by upholding the values of fairness, reasonableness and objectivity in the conduct of management of public affairs. It has also restrained or curbed arbitrariness, checked abuse of power and has generally enhanced the rule of law in government business and other public entities. Seen from the above standpoint it is a sufficient tool in causing the body in question to remain accountable.
17. Judicial review is a constitutional supervision of public authorities involving a challenge to the

legal validity of the decision. It does not allow the court of review to examine the evidence with a view of forming its own view about the substantial merits of the case. It may be that the tribunal whose decision is being challenged has done something which it had no lawful authority to do. It may have abused or misused the authority which it had. It may have departed from procedures which either by statute or at common law as a matter of fairness it ought to have observed. As regards the decision itself it may be found to be perverse, or irrational, or grossly disproportionate to what was required. Or the decision may be found to be erroneous in respect of a legal deficiency, as for example, through the absence of evidence, or through a failure for any reason to take into account a relevant matter, or through the taking into account of an irrelevant matter, or through some misconstruction of the terms of the statutory provision which the decision maker is required to apply. While the evidence may have to be explored in order to see if the decision is vitiated by such legal deficiencies, it is perfectly clear that in a case of review, as distinct from an ordinary appeal, the court may not set about forming its own preferred view of the evidence. See **Reid vs. Secretary of State for Scotland [1999] 2 AC 512.**

18. Judicial review is concerned with the decision making process and illegality or otherwise of the decision rather than with the merits thereof. As was held in **Municipal Council of Mombasa vs. Republic & Umoja Consultants Ltd Civil Appeal No. 185 of 2001**:

"Judicial review is concerned with the decision making process, not with the merits of the decision itself: the Court would concern itself with such issues as to whether the decision makers had the jurisdiction, whether the persons affected by the decision were heard before it was made and whether in making the decision the decision maker took into account relevant matters or did take into account irrelevant matters…The court should not act as a Court of Appeal over the decider which would involve going into the merits of the decision itself-such as whether there was or there was not sufficient evidence to support the decision…It is the duty of the decision maker to comply with the law in coming to its decision, and common sense and fairness demands that once the decision is made, it is his duty to bring it to the attention of those affected by it more so where the decision maker is not a limited liability company created for commercial purposes but it a statutory body which can only do what is authorised by the statute creating it and in the manner authorised by statute."

19. It is therefore clear that the grounds which would justify the grant or judicial review remedies include situations where the decision is found to be perverse, or irrational, or grossly disproportionate to what was required. Similarly where the decision is found to be erroneous in respect of a legal deficiency, as for example, through the absence of evidence, or through a failure for any reason to take into account a relevant matter, or through the taking into account of an irrelevant matter, or through some misconstruction of the terms of the statutory provision which the decision maker is required to apply, that would warrant the grant of judicial review remedies. These are the grounds upon which the substantive application for judicial review will be based.
20. Having considered the submissions of counsel, I cannot say that the applicant has no case. The Respondent in their decision clearly stated that section 19 of the Act comes into force when a complaint is made but found that the complaint was made on 13th June, 2013. From the evidence on record, the applicant's contention that this finding was perverse cannot at this stage be said to be frivolous.
21. Apart from that there is the issue whether the Respondent, having found whether rightly or wrongly that it had no jurisdiction in the matter before it, it could competently proceed to refer the matter to the Chief Justice purportedly under section 19 of the Act. In **Owners of the Motor Vessel "Lilian S" vs. Caltex Oil (Kenya) Limited [1989] KLR 1** **Nyarangi, JA** expressed himself as follows:

"Where the court takes it upon itself to exercise a jurisdiction which it does not possess, its decision amounts to nothing. Jurisdiction must be acquired before judgement is given...Jurisdiction is everything. Without it, a Court has no power to make one more step. Where a court has no jurisdiction there would be no basis for a continuation of proceedings pending other evidence. A Court of law downs its tools in respect of the matter before it the moment it holds the opinion that it

is without jurisdiction".

22. If the Respondent had no jurisdiction, the above authority is clear that it had no power to take one more step in the matter.
23. It was contended that the applicant had no locus in the matter before this Court. In The issue of standing was recently dealt with by **Nyamu, J** (as he then was) in **<u>Mureithi & 2 Others (for Mbari ya Murathimi Clan) vs. Attorney General & 5 Others Nairobi HCMCA No. 158 of 2005 [2006] 1 KLR 443</u>** as follows:

"The function of standing rules include: to restrict access to judicial review; to protect public bodies from vexatious litigants with no real interest in the outcome of the case but just a desire to make things difficult for the Government. Such litigants do not exist in real life – if they did the requirement for leave would take care of this; to prevent the conduct of Government business being unduly hampered and delayed by excessive litigation; to reduce the risk that civil servants will behave in over cautious and unhelpful ways in dealing with citizens for fear of being sued if things go wrong; to ration scarce judicial resources; to ensure that the argument on the merit is presented in the best possible way, by a person with a real interest in presenting it (but quality of presentation and personal interest do not always go together); to ensure that people do not meddle paternalistically in affairs of others……Judicial review courts have generally adopted a very liberal approach on standing for the reason that judicial review is now regarded as an important pillar in vindicating the rule of law and constitutionalism. Thus a party who wants to challenge illegality, unreasonableness, arbitrariness, irrationality and abuse of power just to name a few interventions ought to be given a hearing by a court of law…..The other reason is that although initially it was feared that the relaxation of standing would open floodgates of litigation and overwhelm the Courts this has in fact not happened and statistics reveal or show that on the ground, there are very few busybodies in this area. In addition, the path by eminent jurists in many countries highlighting on the need for the courts being broadminded on the issue….Under the English Order 53 now replaced in that country since 1977 and which applies to us by virtue of the Law Reform Act Cap 26 the test of locus standi is that a person is aggrieved. After 1977 the test is whether the applicant has sufficient interest in the matter to which the application relates. The statutory phrase "person aggrieved" was treated as a question of fact – "grievances are not to be measured in pounds and pence"……..Although under statute our test is that of sufficient interest my view is that the horse has bolted and has left the stable – it would be difficult to restrain the great achievements in this area, which achievements have been attained on a case to case basis. It will be equally difficult to restrain the public spirited citizen or well organised and well equipped pressure groups from articulating issues of public law in our courts. It is for this reason that I think Courts have a wide discretion on the issue of standing and should use it well in the circumstances of each case. The words person aggrieved are of wide import and should not be subjected to a restricted interpretation. They do not include, if course, a mere busybody who is interfering in things that do not concern him but this include a person who has a genuine grievance because an order has been made which prejudicially affects his interests and the rights of citizens to enter the lists for the benefit of the public or a section of the public, of which they themselves are members. A direct financial or legal interest is not required in the test of sufficient interest……….In my view the Courts must resist the temptation to try and contain judicial review in a straight jacket. Even on the important principle of establishing standing for the purposes of judicial review the Courts must resist being rigidly chained to the past defined situations of standing and look at the nature of the matter before them……..The applicants are members of a Kikuyu clan which contends that during the Mau Mau war (colonial emergency) in 1955 their clan land was unlawfully acquired because the then colonial Governor and subsequently the presidents of the Independent Kenya Nation did not have the power to alienate clan or trust land for private purpose or at all. In terms of Order 53 they are "persons directly affected". I find no basis for giving those words a different meaning to that set out in the case law above. The Court has to adopt a purposive interpretation. I have no hesitation in finding that the clan

members and their successors are sufficiently aggrieved since they claim an interest in the parcels of land which they allege was clan and trust land and which is now part of a vibrant Municipality. I find it in order that the applicants represent themselves as individuals and the wider clan and I unequivocally hold that they have the required standing to bring the matter to this Court. Moreover in this case I find a strong link between standing and at least one ground for intervention – the claim that the land belonged to the clan and finally there cannot be a better challenger than members of the affected clan."

24. At this stage I am not prepared to find that the applicant has no locus in the matter before me taking into account that that was not the reason the proceedings before the Respondent were terminated.
25. Having considered the issues raised in this application I am of the view that the applicant has established a *prima facie* case.
26. With respect to the direction that the leave granted do operate as a stay, this Court has held in Miscellaneous Application No. 363 of 2013 **In Re: Meridian Medical Centre:**

"....it is only where the imminent outcome of the decision challenged is likely to render the success of the judicial review nugatory or an academic exercise that the Court would stay the said proceedings the strength or otherwise of the applicant's case notwithstanding......It must be shown that the probability of a determination being made in the challenged proceedings, are high and such probability cannot be said to have been achieved on mere conjecture and speculation. It follows that the stage at which the said proceedings have reached may be crucial in determining whether or not to grant the stay sought though that is not the determinant factor."

27. In this case the applicant intends to apply for certiorari to bring to this court and quash the Respondent's decision referring the complaint to the Chief Justice. As was held in **David Morton Silverstein vs. Atsango Chesoni Civil Application No. Nai. 189 of 2001[2002] 1 KLR 867; [2002] 1 EA 296** where the Court of Appeal cited **Kenya Commercial Bank Ltd vs Benjoh Amalgamated Ltd & Another Civil Application No Nai 50 of 2001**:

"We remind ourselves that each case depends on its own facts and we find it difficult to be persuaded that the appeal on the facts of the present case would be rendered nugatory if stay is not granted. The appeal may be heard and, if successful, the proceedings in the superior court would be determined in accordance therewith. The hearing in the superior court might have been unnecessary for which appropriate costs can be ordered but the appeal will not have been worthless…These remarks aptly apply to the application before us. What will happen if we do not grant the stay sought is that the appeal in the High Court will be heard and may well be determined. But when the appeal already lodged is heard, determined and, if it succeeded, what would automatically follow is that the proceedings in the High Court would have been rendered unnecessary, but an appropriate order for costs can be made to remedy that. However, the appeal in this Court would not have been rendered nugatory".

28. Similarly, if the applicant succeeds in the intended judicial review proceedings, the impugned decision would thereby be quashed with the consequence that the proceedings pursuant thereto would be set aside. In other words the proceedings if any that shall have been undertaken pursuant to section 19 of the Act would be inconsequential.
29. In the premises, whereas I grant leave as sought in the Chamber Summons dated 17th November, 2014, I decline at this stage to direct that the grant of leave shall operate as a stay of the proceedings in question.
30. The costs of the Chamber Summons shall be in the substantive Motion which I direct to be filed and served within 14 days.

Dated at Nairobi this 15th day of December, 2014.

G V ODUNGA

JUDGE

Delivered in the presence of:

Mr Kamweti, the applicant

Miss Mugo for Mr Issa for the Interested Party

Cc Richard