



REPUBLIC OF KENYA

High Court at Nairobi (Nairobi Law Courts)

Judicial Review 398 of 2012

REPUBLIC.....APPLICANT

VERSUS

CITY COUNCIL OF NAIROBI.....RESPONDENT

DAVID PETER NDAMBUKI.....APPLICANT

EX PARTE

JUDGEMENT

1. By a Notice of Motion dated 17th December 2012 filed in this Court on 18th December 2012, the ex parte applicant herein seeks the following orders:

- 1. That an order for mandamus do issue directing the respondent herein to satisfy the decree issued in Nairobi CMCC No. 8301 of 2007 whereby the Respondent was ordered to pay the full amount of the decretal sum being Kshs. 1,142,525.00/= together with interest thereon until payment in full.
- 2. That the costs of this application be provided for

2. The Motion is based on the grounds set out in the statutory statement and verifying affidavit filed herein on 2nd November 2012. According to the said documents, judgement was entered against the defendant on the 17th February 2012 for an amount of Kshs 700,000.00 together with costs and a decree issued thereon on 17th April 2012 for Kshs 1,139,775.55. Although at the execution thereof the sum was Kshs 1,142,525.00 and despite service on the defendant, it failed to settle the said amount since April 2012. Despite notice to show cause having been taken the same amount remains unpaid hence the instant proceedings.

3. Although the Respondent was duly served, there were no documents filed on its behalf in opposition to the application.

4. It was therefore submitted on behalf of the applicant that the application is unopposed hence it is only fair and just that a successful litigant be allowed to reap the fruits of his judgement. In support of his submissions, the ex parte applicant relied on Republic vs. City Council of Nairobi & Another ex parte Mau Technical Agencies Limited [2012] eKLR; Charles Malenya vs. Nairobi City Council [2007] eKLR and Muciimi Mbaka & Co. Advocates vs. Town Clerk, City Council of Nairobi [2012] eKLR. In the latter case, **Githua, J** expressed herself as follows:

“An order of mandamus is issued to compel performance of a public duty or a duty imposed by statute where there has been failure to perform the said duty to the detriment of an aggrieved party. A local authority has a legal obligation and a public duty to satisfy decrees issued against it and the person entrusted with this task is the Clerk to the Local Authority who according to section 129(1) of the Local Government Act is the Chief Executive and Administrative Officer in-charge of coordinating the operations of a Local Authority...Section 263A of the Local Government Act requires the Clerk of a Local Authority to pay without delay sums awarded in a judgement or order to the person entitled out of the revenue of the Local Authority. As the Respondent has failed or refused to pay the Applicant the monies decreed...it is evident that he is in blatant breach of the express duty imposed on him by statute to satisfy decrees issued against the City Council of Nairobi out of the revenue generated by the Council. I do not see any reason why the respondent should not be compelled to pay the Applicant without delay, the decretal sums due out of the revenue of the City Council of Nairobi”.

5. The law as it stands presently is that no execution can be levied against the property of a local authority in settlement of a decree in a civil case and hence the only recourse available to a decree holder is to apply for *mandamus* against the Chief Officer of the Local Authority, and upon obtaining such orders, the decree holder will be at liberty to apply for committal of the Chief Officer if the order of *mandamus* is not complied with. See **Republic vs. Town Clerk, Kisumu Municipality, Ex Parte East African Engineering Consultants[2007] 2 EA 441** where it was held:

“The orders are issued in the name of the Republic and in the case of mandamus order its officers are compelled to act in accordance with the law. The state so to speak by the very act of issuing the orders frowns upon its officers for not complying with the law. The orders are supposed to be obeyed by the officers as a matter of honour/ and as ordered by the State. Execution as known in the Civil Procedure process was not contemplated and this includes garnishee proceedings. There is only one way of enforcing the orders where they are disobeyed i.e. through contempt proceedings. The applicant should therefore have enforced the *mandamus* order using this method. There is only one rider – an officer can only be committed where the public body he serves has funds and where he deliberately refuses to pay or where a statute has earmarked funds for payment since an officer does not incur personal liability...Local Authorities Transfer Fund Act, which provides funds to local authorities, part of which should be used to pay debts does not provide for their attachment since section 263A of the Local Government Act prohibits it. It just enables the Local Authorities to honour their debt obligations including those covered by a mandamus order. The Local Authorities have to pay as a matter of statutory duty or in the case of mandamus in obedience to the order from the state or the Republic. There is no provision in the LATF Act for attachment or execution”.

6. That was the position in the English case of **R (Regina) vs. Dudsheath, ex parte, Meredith [1950] 2 ALL E.R. 741, at 743**, in which Lord Goddard C. J. held:-

"It is important to remember that "mandamus" is neither a writ of course nor a writ of right, but that it will be granted if the duty is in the nature of a public duty, and specially affects the rights of an individual, provided there is no more appropriate remedy. This court has always refused to issue a mandamus if there is another remedy open to the party seeking it. This is one of the reasons, no doubt, why, where there is a visitor of a corporate body, the court will not interfere in a matter within the province of the visitor, and especially this is so in matters relating to educational bodies such as colleges."

7. This procedure was dealt with extensively in **Shah vs. Attorney General (No. 3) Kampala HMC No. 31 of 1969 [1970] EA 543** where Goudie, J eloquently, in my view, expressed himself, *inter alia*, as follows:

“Mandamus is essentially English in its origin and development and it is therefore logical that the court should look for an English definition. Mandamus is a prerogative order issued in certain cases to compel the performance of a duty. It issues from the Queen’s Bench Division of the English High Court where the injured party has a right to have anything done, and has no other specific means

of compelling its performance, especially when the obligation arises out of the official status of the respondent. Thus it is used to compel public officers to perform duties imposed upon them by common law or by statute and is also applicable in certain cases when a duty is imposed by Act of Parliament for the benefit of an individual. *Mandamus* is neither a writ of course nor of right, but it will be granted if the duty is in the nature of a public duty and especially affects the rights of an individual, provided there is no more appropriate remedy. The person or authority to whom it is issued must be either under a statutory or legal duty to do or not to do something; the duty itself being of an imperative nature... In cases where there is a duty of a public or quasi-public nature, or a duty imposed by statute, in the fulfilment of which some other person has an interest the court has jurisdiction to grant *mandamus* to compel the fulfilment...The foregoing may also be thought to be much in point in relation to the applicant's unsatisfied judgement which has been rendered valueless by the refusal of the Treasury Officer of Accounts to perform his statutory duty under section 20(3) of the Government Proceedings Act. It is perhaps hardly necessary to add that the applicant has very much of an interest in the fulfilment of that duty...Since *mandamus* originated and was developed under English law it seems reasonable to assume that when the legislature in Uganda applied it to Uganda they intended it to be governed by English law in so far as this was not inconsistent with Uganda law. Uganda, being a sovereign State, the Court is not bound by English law but the court considers the English decisions must be of strong persuasive weight and afford guidance in matters not covered by Uganda law...English authorities are overwhelmingly to the effect that no order can be made against the State as such or against a servant of the State when he is acting "simply in his capacity of servant". There are no doubt cases where servants of the Crown have been constituted by Statute agents to do particular acts, and in these cases a *mandamus* would lie against them as individuals designated to do those acts. Therefore, where government officials have been constituted agents for carrying out particular duties in relation to subjects, whether by royal charter, statute, or common law, so that they are under a legal obligation towards those subjects, an order of *mandamus* will lie for the enforcement of the duties...With regard to the question whether *mandamus* will lie, that case falls within the class of cases when officials have a public duty to perform, and having refused to perform it, *mandamus* will lie on the application of a person interested to compel them to do so. It is no doubt difficult to draw the line, and some of the cases are not easy to reconcile... It seems to be an illogical argument that the Government Accounting Officer cannot be compelled to carry out a statutory duty specifically imposed by Parliament out of funds which Parliament itself has said in section 29(1) of the Government Proceedings Act shall be provided for the purpose. There is nothing in the said Act itself to suggest that this duty is owed solely to the Government...Whereas *mandamus* may be refused where there is another appropriate remedy, there is no discretion to withhold *mandamus* if no other remedy remains. When there is no specific remedy, the court will grant a *mandamus* that justice may be done. The construction of that sentence is this: where there is no specific remedy and by reason of the want of specific remedy justice cannot be done unless a *mandamus* is to go, then *mandamus* will go... In the present case it is conceded that if *mandamus* was refused, there was no other legal remedy open to the applicant. It was also admitted that there were no alternative instructions as to the manner in which, if at all, the Government proposed to satisfy the applicant's decree. It is sufficient for the duty to be owed to the public at large. The prosecutor of the writ of *mandamus* must be clothed with a clear legal right to something which is properly the subject of the writ, or a legal right by virtue of an Act of Parliament... In the court's view the granting of *mandamus* against the Government would not be to give any relief against the Government which could not have been obtained in proceedings against the Government contrary to section 15(2) of the Government Proceedings Act. What the applicant is seeking is not relief against the Government but to compel a Government official to do what the Government, through Parliament, has directed him to do. Likewise there is nothing in section 20(4) of the Act to prevent the making of such order. The subsection commences with the proviso "save as is provided in this section". The relief sought arises out of subsection (3), and is not "execution or attachment or process in the nature thereof". It is not sought to make any person "individually liable for any order for any payment" but merely to oblige a Government officer to pay, out of the funds provided by Parliament, a debt held to be due by the High Court, in accordance with a duty cast upon him by Parliament. The fact that the Treasury Officer of Accounts is not distinct from the State of which he is a servant does not necessarily mean that he cannot owe a duty to a subject as well as to the Government which he

serves. Whereas it is true that he represents the Government, it does not follow that his duty is therefore confined to his Government employer. In *mandamus* cases it is recognised that when statutory duty is cast upon a Crown servant in his official capacity and the duty is owed not to the Crown but to the public any person having a sufficient legal interest in the performance of the duty may apply to the Courts for an order of *mandamus* to enforce it. Where a duty has been directly imposed by Statute for the benefit of the subject upon a Crown servant as *persona designata*, and the duty is to be wholly discharged by him in his official capacity, as distinct from his capacity as an adviser to or an instrument of the Crown, the Courts have shown readiness to grant applications for *mandamus* by persons who have a direct and substantial interest in securing the performance of the duty. It would be going too far to say that whenever a statutory duty is directly cast upon a Crown servant that duty is potentially enforceable by *mandamus* on the application of a member of the public for the context may indicate that the servant is to act purely as an adviser to or agent of the Crown, but the situations in which *mandamus* will not lie for this reason alone are comparatively few...*Mandamus* does not lie against a public officer as a matter of course. The courts are reluctant to direct a writ of *mandamus* against executive officers of a government unless some specific act or thing which the law requires to be done has been omitted. Courts should proceed with extreme caution for the granting of the writ which would result in the interference by the judicial department with the management of the executive department of the government. The Courts will not intervene to compel an action by an executive officer unless his duty to act is clearly established and plainly defined and the obligation to act is peremptory...On any reasonable interpretation of the duty of the Treasury Officer of Accounts under section 20(3) of the Act it cannot be argued that his duty is merely advisory, he is detailed as *persona designate* to act for the benefit of the subject rather than a mere agent of Government, his duty is clearly established and plainly defined, and the obligation to act is peremptory. It may be that they are answerable to the Crown but they are answerable to the subject...The court should take into account a wide variety of circumstances, including the exigency which calls for the exercise of its discretion, the consequences of granting it, and the nature and extent of the wrong or injury which could follow a refusal and it may be granted or refused depending on whether or not it promotes substantial justice... The issue of discretion depends largely on whether or not one should, or indeed can, look behind the judgement giving rise to the applicant's decree. Therefore an order of *mandamus* will issue as prayed with costs."

8. I fully associate myself with the learned Judge's views in the said matter.

9. In High Court Judicial Review Miscellaneous Application No. 44 of 2012 between the Republic vs. The Attorney General & Another ex parte James Alfred Kosoro, I expressed myself as hereunder:

"...the present case the ex parte applicant has no other option of realising the fruits of his judgement since he is barred from executing against the Government. Apart from *mandamus*, he has no option of ensuring that the judgement that he has been awarded is realised. Unless something is done he will forever be left baby sitting his barren decree. This state of affairs cannot be allowed to prevail under our current Constitutional dispensation in light of the provisions of Article 48 of the Constitution which enjoins the State to ensure access to justice for all persons. Access to justice cannot be said to have been ensured when persons in whose favour judgements have been decreed by courts of competent jurisdiction cannot enjoy the fruits of their judgement due to roadblocks placed on their paths by actions or inactions of public officers. Public offices, it must be remembered are held in trust for the people of Kenya and Public Officers must carry out their duties for the benefit of the people of the Republic of Kenya. To deny a citizen his/her lawful rights which have been decreed by a Court of competent jurisdiction is, in my view, unacceptable in a democratic society. Public officers must remember that under Article 129 of the Constitution executive authority derives from the people of Kenya and is to be exercised in accordance with the Constitution in a manner compatible with the principle of service to the people of Kenya, and for their well-being and benefit.....The institution of judicial review proceedings in the nature of *mandamus* cannot be equated with execution proceedings. In seeking an order for *mandamus* the applicant is seeking, not relief against the Government, but to compel a Government official to do what the Government, through Parliament, has directed him to do. The relief sought is not

“execution or attachment or process in the nature thereof”. It is not sought to make any person “individually liable for any order for any payment” but merely to oblige a Government officer to pay, out of the funds provided by Parliament, a debt held to be due by the High Court, in accordance with a duty cast upon him by Parliament. The fact that the Accounting Officer is not distinct from the State of which he is a servant does not necessarily mean that he cannot owe a duty to a subject as well as to the Government which he serves. Whereas it is true that he represents the Government, it does not follow that his duty is therefore confined to his Government employer. In *mandamus* cases it is recognised that when statutory duty is cast upon a Public Officer in his official capacity and the duty is owed not to the State but to the public any person having a sufficient legal interest in the performance of the duty may apply to the Courts for an order of *mandamus* to enforce it. In other words, *mandamus* is a remedy through which a public officer is compelled to do a duty imposed upon him by the law. It is in fact the State, the Republic, on whose behalf he undertakes his duties, that is compelling him, a servant, to do what he is under a duty, obliged to perform. Where therefore a public officer declines to perform the duty after the issuance of an order of *mandamus*, his/her action amounts to insubordination and contempt of Court hence an action may perfectly be commenced to have him cited for such. Such contempt proceedings are no longer execution proceedings but are meant to show the Court’s displeasure at the failure by a servant of the state to comply with the directive of the Court given at the instance of the Republic, the employer of the concerned public officer and to uphold the dignity and authority of the court.”

10. I see no reason to depart from the said reasoning which I adopt in this case.

11. Having considered the material on record and in the absence of any impediment, I do not see why the respondent should not be compelled to perform its statutory duty by settling the sums due from it to the applicant.

12. In the result I allow the application the Notice of Motion dated 17th December 2012 and issue an order of *mandamus* directed to the Respondent herein compelling it to satisfy the decree issued in Nairobi CMCC No. 8301 of 2007 pursuant to the decree issued on 17th April 2012 a copy of which is annexed to the affidavit in support of these proceedings. The ex parte applicant will also have the costs of this application.

Dated at Nairobi this 15th day of April 2013

**G V ODUNGA
JUDGE**

Delivered in the absence of the parties duly notified