



**Ogata v Nyandika & 4 others (Environment and Land Appeal  
7 of 2021) [2023] KEELC 20615 (KLR) (11 October 2023) (Ruling)**

Neutral citation: [2023] KEELC 20615 (KLR)

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA  
IN THE ENVIRONMENT AND LAND COURT AT NYAMIRA  
ENVIRONMENT AND LAND APPEAL 7 OF 2021  
JM KAMAU, J  
OCTOBER 11, 2023**

**BETWEEN**

**JAMES OGATA ..... APPELLANT**

**AND**

**EVANS MOKUA NYANDIKA ..... 1<sup>ST</sup> RESPONDENT**

**JOYCE KERUBO ONSONGO ..... 2<sup>ND</sup> RESPONDENT**

**DIRECTOR OF SURVEYS ..... 3<sup>RD</sup> RESPONDENT**

**SETTLEMENT FUND TRUSTEE ..... 4<sup>TH</sup> RESPONDENT**

**ATTORNEY GENERAL ..... 5<sup>TH</sup> RESPONDENT**

*(Being an Appeal against the Ruling of Hon. B. M. Kimtai – PM  
Keroka dated and signed on the 23rd day of June 2021 in the original  
Keroka Principal Magistrate’s Court ELC Case No. 11 of 2018)*

**RULING**

1. In the Application dated 23/12/2022 premised on Section 80 of the [Civil Procedure Act](#) and Order 45, Rule 1 of the [Civil Procedure Rules](#), the Appellant prays that this court does review its Judgment delivered on 28/07/2022, set the same aside and substitute it with an order allowing the Appeal. The grounds upon which the same is founded are that the fact that there was mention of Kisii High Court Civil Suit No. 95 of 1987 was not a bar to file the case in Keroka CMCC as the new case did not offend the provisions of Section 7 of the [Civil Procedure Act](#). The other ground is that there is no Decree or Order from Kisii High Court stating that Civil Suit No. 95 of 1987 Kisii High Court was ever concluded by a court of competent jurisdiction. The Respondents opposed the Application vide their Grounds of opposition dated 23/03/2023 as follows: -



1. The 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Respondents will contend at the hearing hereof that the provisions of law under which the Notice of Motion has been mounted do not apply.
  2. That the Appellant/Applicant's Appeal to this Court having been dismissed, this court, being the Appellate Court is not seized with jurisdiction to review its Appellate decision.
  3. That the Appellant/Applicant, having taken the option to appeal against the decision and Judgment of the trial court is bound by the outcome of his own appeal and this court has nothing to review.
  4. That the Appellant/Applicant has not stated what is new and important matter or evidence that was not before the court during the trial and execution of his appeal that he has now laid his hands onto warrant a review.
  5. That an Appellate Court being not a court of original jurisdiction cannot review its Judgment on appeal – its function ends once Judgment is rendered.
  6. That there is no mistake or error apparent on the face of the record in the Judgment of the court.
  7. That in the circumstances the Notice of Motion as filed is frivolous and should be struck out and dismissed with costs to the Respondents.
2. I invited both counsel to file their written Submissions which I have carefully considered before writing this Ruling.

Section 80 of the *Civil Procedure Act* Cap 21 provides as follows: -

Any person who considers himself aggrieved—

- a. by a decree or order from which an appeal is allowed by this Act, but from which no appeal has been preferred; or
- b. by a decree or order from which no appeal is allowed by this Act, may apply for a review of judgment to the court which passed the decree or made the order, and the court may make such order thereon as it thinks fit.”

Order 45 Rule 1 of the *Civil Procedure Rules*, 2010 provides as follows: -

(1) Any person considering himself aggrieved—

- a. by a decree or order from which an appeal is allowed, but from which no appeal has been preferred; or
- b. by a decree or order from which no appeal is hereby allowed, and who from the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the decree was passed or the order made, or on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record, or for any other sufficient reason, desires to obtain a review of the decree or order, may apply for a review of judgment to the court which passed the decree or made the order without unreasonable delay.”



3. In *Republic v Public Procurement Administrative Review Board & 2 others* [2018] eKLR it was held: -
 

"Section 80 gives the power of review and Order 45 sets out the rules. The rules restrict the grounds for review. The rules lay down the jurisdiction and scope of review limiting it to the following grounds;

  - (a) discovery of new and important matter or evidence which after the exercise of due diligence, was not within the knowledge of the applicant or could not be produced by him at the time when the decree was passed or the order made or;
  - (b) on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record, or
  - (c) for any other sufficient reason and whatever the ground there is a requirement that the application has to be made without unreasonable delay."
  
4. In *Pancras T. Swai v Kenya Breweries Limited* [2014] eKLR the Court of Appeal held: -
 

"Order 44 rule 1 (now Order 45 rule 1 in the 2010 *Civil Procedure Rules*) gave the trial Court discretionary power to allow review on the three limbs therein stated or "for any sufficient reason....."
  
5. In *Sarder Mohamed v. Charan Singh Nand Sing and Another* (1959) EA 793 the High Court held that Section 80 of the *Civil Procedure Act* conferred an unfettered discretion in the Court to make such order as it thinks fit on review and that the omission of any qualifying words in the Section was deliberate.
  
6. Discussing the scope of review, the Supreme Court of India in the case of *Ajit Kumar Rath vs State of Orisa & Others*, 9 Supreme Court Cases 596 at Page 608 had this to say:-
 

"the power can be exercised on the application of a person on the discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within his knowledge or could not be produced by him at the time when the order was made. The power can also be exercised on account of some mistake or error apparent on the face of the record or for any other sufficient reason. A review cannot be claimed or asked merely for a fresh hearing or arguments or correction of an erroneous view taken earlier, that is to say, the power of review can be exercised only for correction of a patent error of law or fact which stares in the face without any elaborate argument being needed for stabling it. It may be pointed out that the expression "any other sufficient reason" ..... means a reason sufficiently analogous to those specified in the rule"

In *Tokesi Mambili and others vs Simion Litsanga* the Court held as follows: -

  - i. In order to obtain a review an applicant has to show to the satisfaction of the court that there has been discovery of new and important matter or evidence which was not within his knowledge or could not be produced at the time when the order to be reviewed was made. An applicant may have to show that there was a mistake or error apparent on the face of the record or for any other sufficient reason.
  - ii. Where the application is based on sufficient reason it is for the Court to exercise its discretion.
  
7. In *Republic v Advocates Disciplinary Tribunal Ex parte Apollo Mboya* [2019] eKLR High Court of Kenya Nairobi Judicial Review Division Misc. Application No. 317 of 2018 John M. Mativo Judge culled out the following principles from a number of authorities: -



- i. A court can review its decision on either of the grounds enumerated in Order 45 Rule 1 and not otherwise.
  - ii. The expression "any other sufficient reason" appearing in Order 45 Rule 1 has to be interpreted in the light of other specified grounds.
  - iii. An error which is not self-evident and which can be discovered by a long process of reasoning cannot be treated as an error apparent on the face of record justifying exercise of power under Section 80.
  - iv. An erroneous order/decision cannot be corrected in the guise of exercise of power of review.
  - v. A decision/order cannot be reviewed under Section 80 on the basis of subsequent decision/judgment of a coordinate or larger Bench of the tribunal or of a superior court.
  - vi. While considering an application for review, the court must confine its adjudication with reference to material, which was available at the time of initial decision. The happening of some subsequent event or development cannot be taken note of for declaring the initial order/decision as vitiated by an error apparent.
  - vii. Mere discovery of new or important matter or evidence is not sufficient ground for review. The party seeking review has also to show that such matter or evidence was not within its knowledge and even after the exercise of due diligence, the same could not be produced before the court/tribunal earlier.
  - viii. A mistake or an error apparent on the face of the record means a mistake or an error, which is prima-facie visible and does not require any detail examination. In the present case the petitioner has not been able to point out any error apparent on the face of the record.
  - ix. Section 80 of the [Civil Procedure Code](#) provides for a substantive power of review by a civil court and consequently by the appellate courts. The words occurring in Section 80 mean subject to such conditions and limitations as may be prescribed thereof and for the said purpose, the procedural conditions contained in Order 45 Rule 1 must be taken into consideration. Section 80 of the [Civil Procedure Code](#) does not prescribe any limitation on the power of the court, but such limitations have been provided for in Order 45 Rule 1.
  - x. The power of a civil court to review its judgment/decision is traceable in Section 80 [CPC](#). The grounds on which review can be sought are enumerated in Order 45 Rule 1.
8. The case herein is not one of discovery of new and important matter or evidence which, after the exercise of due diligence, was not within the Plaintiffs' knowledge.

The Application could also not pass the Test of:

".....or for any other sufficient reason...."

which reasons leading authorities hold must be analogous to the other grounds mentioned under the Act and rules, a reason sufficiently analogous to those specified in the rule"



9. In the case of *Evan Bwire v Andrew Aginda* Civil Appeal No. 147 of 2006 cited in the case of *Stephen Gitbua Kimani v Nancy Wanjira Waruingi T/A Providence Auctioneers* (2016) eKLR the Court of Appeal held as follows:

" An application for review will only be allowed on strong grounds particularly if its effect will amount to re-opening the application or case afresh. ...."

10. The current Application falls under the above category. The effect of allowing it would amount to re-opening the case afresh. Litigation must come to an end. Parties must present all the facts, documents and evidence in Court at the appropriate time before the Court retires to write its Judgment. Time and time again Courts have advised litigants that they are bound by their pleadings and that you do not prosecute your case piecemeal. What is demonstrated by the Application is a case of poor pleading which is not what was envisaged by Section 80 of the *Civil Procedure Act* nor the *Rules* under Order 45.

11. Finally, the Application is irregularly in Court since an Applicant in an Application for Review ought to have annexed a formal extracted Decree or order in respect of which the review is sought.

12. In the case of *Suleiman Murunga v Nilestar Holdings Limited & Another* (2015) eKLR the court held as follows:

"The plain reading of the above provision (referring to Order 45 Rule 1) is that an applicant for review ought to have annexed a formal extracted decree or order in respect of which the review is sought. In essence, judgment or ruling. Thus, where an applicant fails to annex the order sought to be reviewed, an application is defective. In the present application the order that the Defendants sought to be reviewed was not annexed with the result that the Defendant's application was fatally defective. I agree that a formal decree or order is a prerequisite before an applicant can bring himself/herself within the ambit of order 45 of the *Civil Procedure Rules* as relates to review of the decree or order"

13. No such a Decree was attached to the present Application which makes the Application fatally defective.

14. An issue which went through the entire motion of preparing pleadings, interrogatories, trial conference and Hearing such as in this case cannot be reviewed by the same Court which had adjudicated upon it. If that is done it would set a very unsustainable precedence.

15. The Appellant's/Applicants' Application dated 23/12/2022 is therefore dismissed with costs. It is so ordered.

**RULING DATED, SIGNED AND DELIVERED AT NYAMIRA THIS 11<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF OCTOBER, 2023**

**MUGO KAMAU**

**JUDGE**

**In the Presence of:-**

Sibota - Court Assistant

N/A - Appellant

Mr. Ranah for the 3<sup>rd</sup> & 5<sup>th</sup> Respondents

