



REPUBLIC OF KENYA



KENYA LAW
THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR LAW REPORTING
Where Legal Information is Public Knowledge

In re Estate of Kipraisi Chemwetich (Deceased) (Miscellaneous Succession Cause 1 of 2020) [2025] KEHC 7270 (KLR) (22 May 2025) (Judgment)

Neutral citation: [2025] KEHC 7270 (KLR)

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA
IN THE HIGH COURT AT KABARNET
MISCELLANEOUS SUCCESSION CAUSE 1 OF 2020**

RB NGETICH, J

MAY 22, 2025

BETWEEN

JOHNSTONE KIGEN CHELAI 1ST OBJECTOR

OSSEN KANGOGO 2ND OBJECTOR

AND

PETER KIPKENEI KIPRAISI PETITIONER

JUDGMENT

1. The objectors filed an application for revocation of grant vide the summons dated 11th March 2020 and sought the following orders:-
 - a. Spent.
 - b. That pending the hearing of this application, this honourable court be pleased to issue an order prohibiting any dealings in respect of parcel Baringo/Kewamoi "A"/175 measuring 1.7 ha.
 - c. That pending the hearing and determination of this application, this honourable court be pleased to issue an order restraining the respondent from subdividing, leasing, selling and/or dealing with the parcel number Baringo/Kewamoi "A"/175.
 - d. That the grant of letters of administration issued to Peter Kipkenei Kipraisi and confirmed on 5th February 2019 in the Principal Magistrate's Court at Kabarnet in Succession cause no 22 of 2017 be revoked.
 - e. That costs of this application be provided for.
2. On 26th April, 2022, the court directed that the parties herein to file their respective witness statements and the matter to proceed by way of viva voce evidence.



3. The application was supported by the affidavit of the 1st objector sworn on the same date. The gist of the objectors' application is that the letters of Administration issued to the petitioner in the estate of Kipraisi Chemwetich were obtained fraudulently to the exclusion of the other beneficiaries by concealment of material facts from the court.
4. The Objectors aver that the Petitioner misled the Area Assistant chief that they were the only heirs of the estate yet they were well aware that the property belonged to the late Talai Chemwetich who was the father of the deceased.
5. That the deceased did not disclose that he was holding the property in trust of other beneficiaries who included the second and the third houses and has unlawfully transferred the property leaving other beneficiaries.

Response

6. The petitioner filed affidavit sworn on 7th February 2022 in response to the petition denying the objectors' assertions and averred that the objectors are not dependent's and /or beneficiaries of the estate of the late Kipraisi Chemwetich.
7. The petitioner stated that the property subject to succession belonged to his late grandfather the late Chemwetich Kimereu and was registered in the name of his late grandmother Talai Chemwetich to hold in trust for the late Kipraisi Chemwetich and therefore the objectors are not entitled to benefit.

Objector's Case

8. Pw 1 Johnstone Kigen Chelal aged 70 years old testified that his late father is Kigen Chelal and that he filed objection in respect to succession filed by the petitioner Peter Kipraisi Chepngetich in respect to parcel Kewamoi No.175 registered in the name of Talai Chemwetich who was married to mzee Kimereu and they got a son called Kipraisi Chepngetich. That mzee Kimereu died and mzee Chelal Kipchor married Talai Chepngetich and they got two children namely Kangogo Chelal and Kigen Chelal whereby Kangogo Chelal was older than Kigen Chelal.
9. He said that he is the son of Kigen Chelal who is deceased and a grandchild of Talai Chemwetich. He said that Chelal had two wives and he built for Talai and the land belonging to Kimereu remained after Talai went to live with Chelal. That during demarcation, Kipraisi was given land which belonged to Kimereu and the land was registered in his name. That Kangogo Chelal was registered in his own parcel and Kigen was registered in his mother's land being her last-born son. He stated that the land is the one which was for Talai's second husband Chelal which was registered in the name of his mother Talai Chemwetich which is parcel number A/175. He said that parcel A/175 is the subject of this succession in this case. That Peter Kipraisi filed succession in respect of the land and that there is no one living in the land.
10. That his brother planted sisal and they used the land for grazing and that Peter Kipraisi does not live in the land. That he had inherited from his father and he gave it to his son who sold it. He said that it is not true that parcel No. A/175 was not for Chemwetich Kimereu but it belongs to Chelal. That Kimereu's land borders land parcel A/175 and it is not true that Chelal moved in to live in the land of Chemwetich Kimereu with Talai Chemwetich. He said that Talai Chemwetich was buried at Bartolimo. That his prayer is to have the land shared amongst the three families of Kipraisi family, Kangogo family and Kigen family.



11. PW 2 Hussein Kangogo testified that he was born in 1959 and he knows parcel 175 as Talai Chemwetich is his grandmother. He said that he is a son to Kangogo Chelal and Kipraisi was the 1st son, Kangogo the second and Chelal the third born.
12. That parcel Kewamoi A/175 was for Chelal who is his uncle and his uncle Chelal gave the land to kogo Talai. He said that his grandfather Kangogo got land which was bordering 175 and Chelal had another wife who lived in a land near parcel No. 175.
13. He said that Kipraisi Chemwetich had land registered in the name of Kipraisi but it was sold. That Kipraisi gave the land to his son who sold it. He said that he heard of Mzee Kimereu but he did not know where he lived. That the children of Chelal needs to agree on how to divide the land which initially belonged to Chelal. He said that no one is living on the land and it being used for grazing.
14. PW 3 Gedion Kipkemoi Chelal testified that the 1st objector is a brother to his father and the 2nd Objector is a cousin to his father. That the Petitioner Peter Kipkenei Kipraisi is a distant cousin to his father and to the two objectors. He said that Parcel No. Kewamoi A/175 is registered in the name of the late Talai Barmagon Chemwetich and there is a green card showing that Kewamoi 175 was owned by Talai Chemwetich who was initially married to Kimereu Chemwetich and were blessed with one son Kipraisi Chemwetich.
15. That at the same time Chelal Kipchor was married to his wife Kapchebotibin and that Chelal Kipchor was suspected to have an affair with Talai Chemwetich after which Kimereu Chemwetich died and Talai was excommunicated from the estate of Kimereu Chemwetich. That Kimereu Chemwetich committed suicide after learning that his wife had an affair with Chelal Kipchor. That after excommunication, Talai lived with Chelal Kipchor.
16. He said Talai Chemwetich had in total 3 children the first son being Kipraisi Chemwetich from 1st marriage and two from the second marriage being Kangogo Chelal who is a father to the 2nd Objector and Kigen Chelal who was a father to the 1st Objector. That parcel Baringo Kewamoi A/175 belonged to Talai Chemwetich and the land is now vacant though there were several attempts by the family of Kipraisi Chemwetich to get into the land.
17. He said that succession cause was filed in 2017 in respect to parcel No. 175 and it was done by Peter Kipraisi the Petitioner herein. That the 1st succession was done in 1987 with the claim that Kipraisi Chemwetich was the only child to Talai Chemwetich. That in that succession, it was said that Talai died in Kabarnet whereas she died in Kabartonjo in the hands of her son Kigen Chelal and she did not have land in Kabartonjo.
18. He further stated that Kimereu Chemwetich owned parcel Numbers 2029, 2428, 2427, 2246, 2247, 2248, 701 and other several parcels of land but unfortunately the family of Kipraisi Chemwetich sold the parcels of land owned by the father of the Petitioner. That the Petitioner's father had only one child and he moved to Turko where he lived until the time of his death and the Petitioner lives there. He said that land parcel No. A/175 is still vacant and nobody lives there. He prayed that the 2nd succession be revoked and the opportunity be given to the children of Talai to do clearance before they agree on what to do with the property. That the property is registered in the name of the mother of the three children and it is not true that Talai Chemwetich was holding it in trust for Kipraisi Chemwetich and during adjudication Kipraisi and his children were registering properties belonging to his late father.



Petitioner's Case

19. The Petitioner Peter Kipraisi Chemwetich Kimereu testified as DW1. He said his father is Kipraisi Chemwetich Kimereu and his grandmother was Talai Chemwetich who had 2 children with Chemwetich Kimereu being Chesang Chemwetich and Kipraisi Chemwetich. That Chesang Chemwetich died at around 10 years and Kipraisi remained alone. That they were living in parcel Kewamoi 175 and that his grandfather was buried in parcel No. Kewamoi 175 after committing suicide because his grandmother had an affair with Chelal and after his grandfather's death her grandmother got two other children Kangogo Chelal and Kigen Chelal who were born in parcel No. 175 and were brought up with him, he said the two left parcel 175 after being circumcised and were settled by Chelal in their land while Talai remained in parcel No. 175.
20. He said that his father was not present during adjudication which was done on 22nd September, 1976. That Reuben Kigen Chelal represented his father Kigen Chelal while Kiprotich Kangogo represented Kangogo Chelal and Talai Chemwetich represented his father. That it is not true that his father was adjudication committee member and drew his own land. He said that his father lived in parcel No. 175 but he had a problem of children dying and he was advised to leave as the shade of Chelal and Kangogo was affecting them.
21. He said that Kigen Chelal has not entered the land and that he had a land dispute with his father on 15th April, 1985 on the ground and elders said that the land was for Chemwetich who is a father to Kipraisi who then filed succession which Kigen Chelal did not object and the land has remained vacant. He said that parcel number 345 was for Kigen Chelal and it is in the name of Jackson Chelal. That parcel No. 167 is where Gideon lives and Kangogo also got land. He said that Ossen Kangogo's land is big but he has sold most of it.
22. That Kigen Chelal's parcel Numbers 167, 166 and 349 have not been sold and Johnstone Kigen (1st Objector) should claim from parcel No. 349 belonging to his father but not parcel No. 175.
23. He said that Talai died in Bartolimo and she was buried there as she was taken there by her son Kigen Chelal. He said he is opposed to objectors being allocated parcel 175. He said that Kigen Chelal was alive when his father was doing the succession and that he died in year 2017. He denied that they had sold their own portion and confirmed that no one has moved to the land.
24. DW2 Martin Chemjor Kibet testified that he knows the objectors Johnstone Kigen Chelal and Ossen Kangogo who were sons to Kigen Chelal and Kangogo Chelal respectively. He said that Peter Kipraisi is the son of Kiraisi Chemwetich and the grandfather of Johnstone Chelal is Chelal Kipchor. He said that Talai Chewetich was the wife of Kimwetich Kimereu and was blessed with 2 children with him being Kipraisi Chemwetich and Jesang Chemwetich who died long ago. That Talai Chemwetich was married twice, the first husband was Chemwetich Kimereu and the second husband was Chelal Kipchor.
25. He said that Baringo Kewamoi A/175 belonged to Chemwetich Kimereu and that Chelal Kipchor had his land which he distributed to his children. That the land of Chemwetich Kimereu was registered in the name of Kogo Talai Chemwetich because her son Kipraisi Chemwetich was not around during demarcation in April, 1985. He said that there was a meeting done and it was decided that the land which was in dispute was for Kipraisi Chemwetich and the land registered in the name of Talai Chemwetich should be given to Kipraisi Chemwetich because he was the only child of Chemwetich.
26. He confirmed that no one is living in parcel number Baringo Kewamoi A/175 and that Kimwetich Kipraisi was born on that land and it is not true that Kipraisi Chemwetich sold his land and that his land is No. 175.



27. DW3 Fredrick Chepkongo Chebor testified that he was Chief between 1982 and 1997 and that he knows Johnstone Kigen Chelal and Ossen Kangogo; and also Peter Kipkenei Kipraisi, Kigen Chelal and Kipraisi Chemwetich who lived in his location. That there was a case between Kipraisi Chemwetich and Kigen Chelal and it was decided that the land was for Kipraisi Chemwetich. He said the land belonged to Chemwetich Kimereu but was registered in the name of Talai Chemwetich because her husband had died and her son Kipraisi Chemwetich was not around.
28. He further stated that the complainant in the case was Kipraisi Chemwetich who complained that Kigen Chelal had entered the land and that Kigen Chelal was satisfied with the verdict. He said he appealed to the D.O Kabarnet where the D.O, the elders and the Land registrar adopted the decision of the elders. That each party had their children and the land registrar and the surveyor availed documents. He said that the land registrar said that the land is registered and Kigen and Kangogo Chelal had their parcels of land and after the decision of the D.O, Kipraisi Chemwetich was allowed to go on with succession and he was given a letter by the D.O.

Submissions

29. The Petitioners identified issues for determination as hereunder:-
- Who among the deceased two husbands Chemwetich Kimereu and Chelal Kipchor did the property parcel no Baringo/Kewamoi A/ 175 belonged to?
 - Whether the objectors are entitled to a share of parcel No. Baringo/Kewamoi A/175.
 - Whether the petitioner fraudulently obtained the grant by concealment of material facts?
 - Whether the honourable court has jurisdiction to entertain this application?
 - Whether the objector's application is properly before the court?
30. On ownership of parcel no Baringo/Kewamoi A/ 175 between Chemwetich Kimereu and Chelal Kipchor who were 1st and 2nd husband of the deceased respectively, the petitioner testified that this is a matter grounded on Tugen Customary Law and should not be treated like normal succession case. The petitioner submit that the late Talai Chemwetich died on 18th February 1981 as per the death certificate in Kabarnet succession cause No. 3 of 1987 and therefore customary law applies by dint of section 2 (2) of the [law of succession Act](#) since she died before 1st July 1981. That Section 2 (2) of the [law of succession Act](#) state as follows:
- “The estate of persons dying before the commencement of this Act are subject to the written laws and customs applying at the date of death, but nevertheless the administration of their estate shall commence or proceeds so far as possible in accordance with this Act”
31. That it therefore means that the marital status of the late Talai Chemwetich has to be taken into consideration when determining ownership of the property and submit that they have demonstrated that the deceased was the first wife of Chemwetich Kimereu and out of the said marriage they had two issues, one of them having died in infancy leaving the late Kipraisi Chemwetich and it is not disputed that the late Chemwetich Kimereu had established his matrimonial home in parcel number Baringo/ Kewamoi “A”/ 175 and that he committed suicide after finding that the deceased herein committed adultery with Chelal Kipchor the grandfather of the objectors herein and was buried on the property; and PW3 the great grandson of the late Chelal Kipchor confirmed that.



32. Petitioner further submit that it is not disputed that after the demise of Chemwetich Kimereu, Chelal Kipchor married Talai Chemwetich and out of the said marriage, they had two issues namely Kangogo Chelal the father of the 2nd objector and Kigen Chelal the father of the 1st Objector. That the elders from the petitioner's clan cleansed Talai Chemwetich and allowed her to marry the grandfather of the objectors.
33. They submit that the two issues of the 2nd marriage were raised on the matrimonial home of the late Chemwetich Kimereu and when they were of circumcision age, their father Chelal Kipchor took them to his parcel of land circumcised and settled them therein.
34. That Kangogo Chelal settled in parcel number Baringo/Kewamoi A/3161 which was a huge parcel of land, and has progressively subdivided and sold resting with the aforesaid number and another son of Kangogo Chelal, Kiprotich Kangogo owns parcel number Baringo/Kewamoi A/1101 among others.
35. They submit that the late Kigen Chelal settled in his father's ancestral land in Bartolimo while his sons own parcels numbers Baringo/Kewamoi A/166,167 and 1059 among others and in proof of ownership of the aforesaid parcels, the petitioner did exhibits some of the green cards which were not controverted by the objectors, save for the allegation that the property in issue belonged to their late grandmother.
36. The petitioner further submits that during adjudication in 1975, Talai Chemwetich registered the parcel herein in her name to hold in trust for her son Kipraisi Chemwetich from her 1st marriage as she had already been married off to her 2nd husband Chelal Kipchor.
37. The petitioner submits that there is no evidence adduced to show that the objectors inherited the property from her 2nd husband Chelal Kipchor and/or that the property belonged to their grandfather; further, the property is adjacent to and/or is surrounded by the aforesaid parcels of land belonging to the objectors and/or their siblings as aforesaid.
38. That furthermore, the issue of ownership of the property was tested in 1980 when the 1st objector's late father Kigen Chelal trespassed onto it and Kipraisi Chemwetich immediately confronted and reported him to the chief and the issue of ownership was heard by the elders in the presence of the chief and some of the adjudication committee members determined that the property belonged to Chemwetich Kimereu and by extension his son as he was not present at the time of adjudication and therefore Talai Chemwetich was holding it in trust for him.
39. That the decision of the elders was affirmed by the District Officer who confirmed that the property belonged to the late father of Kipraisi Chemwetich and instructed him to take out letters of administration of his late mother and have the property transmitted to him which he did vide kabarnet succession cause No. 3 of 1987 which was not objected to by Kigen Chelal and/or the objectors herein as they were at all material times aware of the said succession cause as can be gleaned from their pleadings and express admission in court.
40. That had the property belonged to the late Talai Chemwetich as alleged by the objectors, nothing would have prevented her from subdividing and distributing it to her three sons and/or their dependants during adjudication and registration which is manifestly clear from the exhibits and titles and/or green cards presented by the petitioner that the adjacent parcels are registered in the names of the children of Kangogo Chelal and Kigen Chelal respectively save for the 1st objector who has inherited the Bartolimo parcel of land.
41. The petitioner submit that there is no plausible reason given why the deceased choose to register this particular property in her name and not the other properties belonging to her 2nd husband yet he was



- deceased at the time of registration, instead she instructed her grandchildren from the 2nd marriage to register them.
42. The petitioner further submit that the objectors have been unable to show any parcel of land registered in the names of either the late Chemwetich Kimereu and or his son the late Kipraisi Chemwetich within the vicinity but only allege that he has other parcels without any proof. Further that the objectors have never attempted to encroach in the parcel herein.
 43. It is their submission that the property parcel number Baringo/Kewamoi A/ 175 belongs to the late Chemwetich Kimereu and Talai Chemwetich was merely holding it in trust for Kipraisi Chemwetich and objectors are not entitled to it as they are not the grandsons of Chemwetich Kimereu but Chelal Kipchor and not therefore dependants and/or beneficiaries of the estate of Chemwetich Kimereu; that the degree of consanguinity espoused in section 38 of the Act does not apply to them.
 44. That if they were to adopt the objectors' arguments that the property belonged to the estate of the late Talai Chemwetich and ought to be shared equally among her three sons and or their dependants, then the estate of the late Chemwetich Kimereu and his dependants will suffer double jeopardy in that not only did the late Chemwetich Kimereu hang himself for the actions of the objectors grandfather ,but the objectors will benefit from the said action by getting a share of his property pursuant to their grandfather's misdeeds.
 45. That it is manifestly clear that the late Kigen Chelal recognized this position and abandoned his quest to have a share of the estate hence his failure to file any objection to the succession cause no. 3 of 1987 yet he was aware that his step brother had taken out letter of administration of the estate of their mother and objectors are not therefore entitled to the said property.
 46. On whether the petitioner fraudulently obtained the grant by concealment of material facts, the petitioner submit that the objectors are not the dependants and/or beneficiaries of the estate of the late Kipraisi Chemwetich and therefore there is no fraud and/or concealment of facts and/or the making of a false statement by the petitioner in that he simply stated the truth in the petition as he was succeeding the estate of his late father.
 47. And the chief's letter annexed to the petition clearly shows that the objectors are not the dependants of the estate of the deceased and the objectors' averments in the objection are misplaced as they ought to have been made in Kabarnet succession cause No. 3 of 1987 and not in this petition. That at any rate they do not accuse the late Kipraisi Chemwetich of any fraud and/or concealment of material facts and objectors' allegation of fraud, concealment of material facts and/or the making of a false statement are unfounded and are made in the wrong forum.
 48. On whether this court has jurisdiction to entertain this application, the Petitioner/ Respondent submits that the petition which is the subject of this application was filed in the lower court and therefore the objectors' application ought to have been filed in the same court. That Section 23 of the Magistrates' Court *Act No. 26 of 2015* provides that:

“The *Law of Succession Act* is amended, by repealing section 48(1) and substituting therefore the following new subsection – Notwithstanding any other written law which limits jurisdiction, but subject to the provisions of section 49, a magistrate shall have jurisdiction to entertain any application and to determine any dispute under this Act and pronounce such decrees and make such orders therein as may be expedient in respect of any estate the gross value of which does not exceed the pecuniary limit prescribed under section 7 (1) of the *Magistrates' Courts Act, 2015*”.



49. The petitioner further rely on the case of Migori Succession Cause No. 41 Of 2016, Patrick Arasa Magangi v Johnes Gati O'Boke to support their argument that the Magistrate's court can handle disputes of this nature provided it is within their pecuniary jurisdiction and objectors ought to have filed objection in the lower court as first place of call before moving to High which has appellate jurisdiction as value of the asset does not exceed the pecuniary jurisdiction of the lower court.
50. Further that the petitioner has demonstrated that the late Kipraisi Chemwetich had taken out letters of administration of the estate of her mother Talai Chemwetich vide kabarnet succession No.3 of 1987 and caused the estate asset to be transmitted to him.
51. That it is manifestly clear as earlier stated that the objectors were aware of the aforesaid succession cause and chose not to object to it for the flimsy reason that the late Kipraisi Chemwetich was holding the property in trust for them and/or that Kigen Chelal was unwell. That instead they choose to confront a secondary succession cause instead of the primary succession cause no. 3 of 1987 which is still in situ to date. That at any rate, they have no issue with that succession cause as they aver that the deceased the late Talai Chemwetich was holding the property in trust for them as aforesaid.
52. That the petitioner herein was already the administrator of the estate of the late Kipraisi Chemwetich and the contest ought to be in Kabarnet succession cause no. 3 of 1987 and not the present petition and having failed to file objection in the said succession cause, the present objection is frivolous and an abuse of the court process as it is not properly before the right cause and ought to be struck out with costs.
53. In conclusion, the petitioner submit that the property subject to this succession belongs to the late Chemwetich Kimereu and its registration in the name of Talai Chemwetich was merely to hold it in trust for her son Kipraisi Chemwetich, hence it is not available for distribution to her grandchildren from her second marriage.

Analysis And Determination

54. I have considered evidence adduced herein together with submissions filed and find the following as issues for determination by this court:-
 - i. Whether the objectors should inherit parcel of number Baringo/Kewamoi A/175 registered in the name of the deceased herein
 - ii. How the property should be distributed
55. From evidence adduced it is not disputed that the deceased herein the late Talai Chemwetich is the registered owner of the property Baringo Kewamoi A/175. There is also no dispute that the deceased was first married to Chemwetich Kimereu and together sired two children one who died in infancy and the second Kipraisi Chemwetich who is the grandfather of the petitioner herein; and after Chemwetich Kimereu committed suicide following Talai Chemwetich's adulterous act with Chela Kipchor, the deceased herein Talai Chemwetich married Chela Kipchor and sired two sons namely Kangogo Chelal and Kigen Chelal the fathers of the 2nd and 1st objectors respectively.
56. From the foregoing, the petitioner and the Objectors herein are grandchildren of the deceased born from her 3 sons the Petitioner's father being her first born son with Chemwetich Kimereu and her other 2 sons being fathers to objectors fathered by Chelal Chepchor.
57. Upon this matter being referred to mediation on the 8th May,2024 partial settlement agreement reached was that the petitioner and objectors were all the grand children of Talai Chemwetich the deceased



herein but referred distribution of the Parcel No. Baringo/Kewamoi A/175 registered in the name of the deceased herein Talai Chemwetich to court to determine.

58. The Petitioner alleges that during Land Adjudication at Kewamoi “A” adjudication Section in 1975, Talai Chemwetich registered her 1st late husband parcel of land in her name as Baringo/Kewamoi “A’ / 175 holding it in trust for Kipraisi Chemwetich the father of the Petitioner herein who was not present at the time of registration. That though it is alleged by the petitioner that there was a dispute between his father and the father of the 1st Objector over the land and it was resolved that the Petitioner’s father was the owner of the land, the to date it is still in the name of the deceased.
59. From evidence adduced, the parcel Baringo/Kewamoi “A’/175 Was first registered in the name of the deceased herein Talai Chemwetich. The petitioner argue that she registered it in her name to hold in trust for the petitioner Kipraisi Chemwetich a son from her first husband Chemwetich Kimereu. The title does not indicate that the deceased was holding it in trust for the petitioner. There is also no evidence that the parcel initially belonged to Chemwetich Kimereu. The fathers of the two objectors were sons of Talai Chemwetich. The deceased Talai Chemwetich had 3 sons with petitioner’s father being from her first husband and the other two sons being parents to objectors from her second husband.
60. In view of the fact that the property herein was registered in the name of the deceased who is the mother of petitioner and objectors’ parents, in my view the property ought to be distributed between the 3 sons of the deceased equally.
61. Final Orders: -
- a. The deceased herein is the owner of parcel number Baringo/Kewamoi “A’ / 175
 - b. Parcel No. Baringo/Kewamoi “A’ / 175 to be distributed equally between the deceased’s 3 sons Kipraisi Kimereu, Kangogo Chelal and Kigen Chelal
 - c. Each party to bear own costs of this succession cause

JUDGMENT DELIVERED, DATED AND SIGNED VIRTUALLY AT ELDAMA RAVINE HIGH COURT (SUB-REGISTRY) THIS 22ND DAY OF MAY 2025.

.....

RACHEL NGETICH

JUDGE

In the presence of:

Mr. Chebii for Petitioner.

Mr. Chepkilot for Objectors.

CA, Elvis.

