



REPUBLIC OF KENYA



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

**Mwangi v Republic (Criminal Revision E078 of 2025)  
[2025] KEHC 10084 (KLR) (14 July 2025) (Ruling)**

Neutral citation: [2025] KEHC 10084 (KLR)

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA  
IN THE HIGH COURT AT KIBERA  
CRIMINAL REVISION E078 OF 2025**

**DR KAVEDZA, J**

**JULY 14, 2025**

**BETWEEN**

**JEDIDAH MUGURE MWANGI ..... APPLICANT**

**AND**

**REPUBLIC ..... RESPONDENT**

**RULING**

1. The applicant was charged and convicted on eight counts of offences related to personation, giving false information, making a document without authority, forgery of land transfer and obtaining by false document.
2. She was sentenced as follows. A fine of Kshs. 200,000 in count I, in respect of person contrary to section 382 of the *Penal Code*. Kshs. 200,000 in respect of giving false information to a person employed in the public service contrary to section 129 (a) of the *Penal Code* in count II. Kshs 400,000 in respect of making a document without authority contrary to section 357 (a) in count III. Kshs. 400,000 in respect of forgery of land transfer document contrary to section 350 (2) as read with section 349 of the *Penal Code* in count IV. Kshs. 300,000 in respect of uttering a false document contrary to section 353 as read with section 349 of the *Penal Code* in count V. Kshs. 300,000 in respect of uttering a false document contrary to section 353 as read with section 349 of the *Penal Code* in count VI. Kshs. 400,000 in respect of obtaining money by false pretences contrary to section 313 of the *Penal Code* in count VIII. Kshs. 400,000 in respect of obtaining money by false pretences contrary to section 313 of the *Penal Code* in count IX. And in all the counts in default she was to serve 1-year imprisonment in each count.
3. She filed the present applicant seeking sentence review. She has since reformed since her incarceration. She prayed for a non-custodial sentence.



4. I have considered the application, the grounds in support and the applicable law. From the record of the trial court, the court considered the applicant's mitigation, the time spent in remand custody and the fact that the applicant was a first offender before sentencing. Having considered the application in its totality. The sentence imposed was also legal in the circumstances of the case.
5. In my view I find no good cause or reason to revise the sentence imposed by the trial court. The application is dismissed.

Orders accordingly.

**RULING DATED AND DELIVERED VIRTUALLY THIS 14<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JULY 2025**

---

**D. KAVEDZA**

**JUDGE**

