



Kiruki & Kayika Advocates v Monarch Insurance Company Limited (Miscellaneous Civil Application E040 of 2024) [2025] KEHC 11034 (KLR) (24 July 2025) (Ruling)

Neutral citation: [2025] KEHC 11034 (KLR)

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA
IN THE HIGH COURT AT MURANG'A
MISCELLANEOUS CIVIL APPLICATION E040 OF 2024
TW OUYA, J
JULY 24, 2025
IN THE MATTER OF THE ADVOCATES ACT, CAP 16
AND
IN THE MATTER OF TAXATION OF COSTS BETWEEN ADVOCATE AND CLIENT**

**BETWEEN
KIRUKI & KAYIKA ADVOCATES APPLICANT
AND
THE MONARCH INSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED RESPONDENT**

RULING

1. The Applicant moved this honourable court via a Notice of Motion dated 30th April 2025 brought under Section 51 (2) of the *Advocates Act* for orders that:
 - i. Judgment be entered in favour of the Applicant against the Respondent for the sum of Ksh. 89,500.00 being the certified costs due to the Applicant as against the Respondent.
 - ii. The Respondent do pay the Applicant interest on the taxed sum from the date of filing of this Application until payment in full
2. The Application is premised on the grounds on the face of the application and the Supporting affidavit of KIRUKI MUTWIRI of even date made in support of the Application. Therein he states that the Applicant defended the interests of the Respondent in Murang'a CMCC No. 308 of 2019 *Juma Abdalla Mwalagoo v Charity Wanjitu Kamanja & Another*.
3. The Respondent failed to pay the legal fees arising from the services rendered thereby necessitating the filing of the Bill of Costs; which was taxed and a Certificate of Costs issued. The Respondent has failed and/or neglected to settle the taxed costs.



4. In the instant application the Applicant seeks that the Certificate of costs be adopted as an order and judgment of this court. The application was uncontested as the Respondent failed and or neglected to file any response despite service having been effected.
5. Upon considering the application herein and the supporting affidavit the issues that commend themselves for consideration are:
 - i. Whether the application is merited for the court to adopt the Certificate of costs and enter judgment in the sum of Kshs. 89,500.00; and
 - ii. Whether the applicant should be awarded interests on the taxed costs
6. Section 51(2) of the *Advocates Act* provides:

“the certificate of the taxing officer by whom any bill has been taxed shall unless it is set aside or altered by the court, be final as to the amount of the costs recovered thereby; and the court may make such orders in relation thereto as it thinks fit, including where the retainer is not disputed an order that judgment be entered for the sum certified to be due with costs.”
7. It is therefore not in doubt that the advocate would be entitled to apply for entry of judgment on the certificate of costs where the certificate of costs has not been set aside, where there is no dispute as to retainer and finally, where there is no pending reference filed by the respondent.
8. Therefore, the court needs to be satisfied that the Certificate of costs has not been set aside while determining whether to adopt the amount on the Certificate of costs.
9. In *Lubullellah & Associates Advocates v N. K. Brothers Limited* (2014) eKLR the court observed that:

“The law is very clear that once a taxing master has taxed the costs, issued a Certificate of Costs and there is no reference against his ruling or there has been a ruling and a determination made and not set aside and/or altered, no other action would be required from the court save to enter judgment. An applicant is not required to file suit for the recovery of costs. The certificate of costs is final as to the amounts of the costs and the court would be quite in order to enter judgment in favour of the Applicant against the Respondent herein for the taxed sum indicated in the Certificate of Taxation that was issued on 25th November 2012.”
10. In the instant case, no reference has been filed challenging the certificate of costs which is sought to be adopted as judgment on costs and no issue has been raised as to retainer. This court is therefore satisfied that the Certificate of Costs dated 11th April 2025 is uncontested.
11. Accordingly, I hereby enter judgment for the applicant advocate on the taxed costs of Kshs 89,500.00 as per the certificate of costs dated 11th April 2025.
12. Regarding the interests on the taxed costs. Rule 7 of the *Advocates Remuneration Order* provides that:

“An advocate may charge interests at 14% per annum on his disbursement and costs whether by scale or otherwise, from the expiration of one month from the delivery of his bill to the client, such claim for interests is raised before the amount of the bill has been paid or tendered in full.”



13. The above rule stipulates that such claim for interest must be raised for it to start to accrue after the expiration of one month from the delivery of the bill to the client. In the case of *Kerongo & Company Advocates v Africa Assurance Merchant Co. Limited* [2019] eKLR the court held:

“An advocate who does not provide proof that he had raised the issue of interest before the amount in the Bill of Costs has been paid or tendered in full will not be paid the interest chargeable under Rule 7 of the *Advocates Remuneration Order*. As the advocates herein had not demonstrated that they had raised the issue of interest as aforesaid, they could not therefore be awarded interest at fourteen (14%) per cent per annum.”

14. The above position and interpretation of Rule 7 of the *Advocates Remuneration Order* was also stated as follows by Mabeya J in *Kitibi & Company Advocates v Menengai Downs Limited* [2015] eKLR, persuasively:

“I will start with interest. There seems to be a misconception by legal practitioners on the award of interest on taxed costs. An Advocate is entitled to interest on the amount taxed on an Advocate/client Bill of Costs. The rate of interest awardable is 14% per Annum applicable from 30 days after the date of service of either the Block Fee Note or the Bills of Costs. This is clearly set out in Rule 7 of the *Advocates Remuneration Order* which provides.”

15. In view of the foregoing, once a judgment is entered on a certificate of costs, the decretal amount is liable to attract interest of 14% per annum from 30 days after the service of the bill and not the date of taxation. For an Advocate to be able to recover this, there must be evidence on record on the date when the bill was served upon the client.

16. In *Jackson Omwenga & Co. Advocates v Everest Enterprises Ltd* [2017], L. Njuguna J, remarked as follows:

“I have perused the *Advocates Remuneration (Amendment) Order*, Rule 7. Under the said rule, an advocate can only charge interest from the expiration of one month from the delivery of the bill to the client, providing such claim for interest is raised before the amount of the bill has been paid or tendered in full.

To comply with that provision, the applicant must prove two things:

- a. That one month has expired from the time he delivered his bill to the client;
- b. He has raised his ‘claim’ for interest before the amount of the bill has been paid or tendered in full.”

17. From a perusal of the record, there is no evidence that the Applicant ever served the Respondent with any document making a claim for interest. Therefore, in line with Rule 7, the Applicant is found to have failed to furnish proof that it had raised the claim for interest with the Respondent.

18. In *Prof Tom Ojienda & Associates v County Government of Nairobi* (Judicial Review Miscellaneous Application E027 of 2020) [2025], the court observed thus:

20. Under the cited Rule 7 of the *Advocates Remuneration Order*, to lawfully claim the 14% interest, or any part thereof, on the taxed bill of costs, the advocate must:

- a. Serve the itemized bill of costs to the client,



- b. Explicitly include a demand for interest at 14% in the bill, and
 - c. Wait for 30 days to lapse after service before interest begins to accrue.
21. If the advocate fails to include the interest demand in the bill, then:
- a. The Taxing Officer lacks jurisdiction to award that interest during taxation; and
 - b. The Court cannot include interest in the certificate of taxation or any resulting judgment adopting the certificate of costs.”
19. In the case of *Otieno, Ragot & Company Advocates v Kenindia Assurance Co. Ltd* (Civil Appeal 129 of 2019), [2023] KECA the Court of Appeal addressed this issue of whether an advocate can claim interest on taxed costs when no prior demand was made before filing the bill of costs. The court held that an advocate cannot charge the 14% per annum interest under Rule 7 of the *Advocates Remuneration Order* without notifying the client. The court emphasized that it was incumbent upon the advocate to put the client on notice that they intended to claim interest at the point at which the bill of costs was drawn. It follows that an advocate is barred from springing up a claim for 14% interest during taxation or judgment application if it was not demanded in the original bill served to the client. To hold otherwise would amount to procedural unfairness and violate the clear requirements of the *Advocates Remuneration Order*.
20. Accordingly, the prayer for interest to start accruing on the costs is found to be devoid of merit and is therefore disallowed.
21. The upshot of the matter is that the Application is disposed in the following terms:
- i. The Certificate of Costs dated 11th April 2025 is adopted as an order of the court and judgment is entered in favour of the Applicant against the Respondent for Ksh. 89,500.00;
 - ii. The prayer for interests on the taxed costs is dismissed
 - iii. Each party to bear their costs
 - iv. Decree to issue

DATED, SIGNED AND DELIVERED VIRTUALLY THIS 24TH JULY, 2025.

HON. T. W. OUYA

JUDGE

For Applicant.....Ms Kihumbs HB Mr Kamau Muriuki

For Respondent.....No Appearance

Court Assistant.....Brian

