



REPUBLIC OF KENYA



**Peter v Republic (Criminal Revision E064 of 2024)  
[2024] KEHC 5226 (KLR) (17 May 2024) (Ruling)**

Neutral citation: [2024] KEHC 5226 (KLR)

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA  
IN THE HIGH COURT AT LODWAR  
CRIMINAL REVISION E064 OF 2024  
RN NYAKUNDI, J  
MAY 17, 2024**

**BETWEEN**

**RIEK PETER ALIAS LIGHTER ..... APPLICANT**

**AND**

**REPUBLIC ..... RESPONDENT**

*(Being Review on Sentence from the Decision in Cr.  
Case No. E472 of 2023 by I.K Rono on 22.11.2024)*

**RULING**

1. The applicant was charged with the offence of stealing contrary to section 275 of the Penal Code. The particulars of the offence are that on 18<sup>th</sup> November, 2023 at unknown time of the night at Kakuma refugee camp in Turkana west sub-county within Turkana County, the applicant stole a sign-board labeled Don Bosco Technical Institute valued at Kshs. 2,000/= the property of Don Bosco Technical Institute
2. The applicant pleaded guilty to the offence before Hon. I.K. Rono on 22<sup>nd</sup> November, 2023 and as a consequence, he was convicted on his own plea of guilty and sentenced to 1 year imprisonment.
3. The applicant has approached this court pursuant to sections 357,362,364& 382 of the Criminal Procedure Code as construed with Article 50(2) (p) & (q) as conjunctively read with Article 50(6)(a) &(b) of the Constitution.
4. The applicant seeks a sentence review based on the sentence review report on record. The report is positive. According to report, the applicant is remorseful and he regrets his past actions and lack of peer resistance. It is indicated that he is a south Sudanese who came to Kenya in 2005 with his mother, he developed mental illness and dropped out of Mogadishu primary school, whose family has blamed his friends for dragging him into the matter. Considering the aforementioned circumstances, the probation officer recommended a community service order at Clinic 4 in the refugee camp.



5. From the onset, I am of the considered view that crimes of such nature and especially where the items stolen have been recovered, courts should consider non-custodial sentences. The applicant for instance in this case is of a young age who I believe could benefit more from a well laid out program in a non-custodial sentence.
6. In determining whether to impose a custodial or non-custodial sentence, the court is required to take into account the following factors: -
  - a) Gravity of the offence: - sentence of imprisonment should be avoided for misdemeanour.
  - b) Criminal history of the offender. Taking into account the seriousness of the offences, first offenders should be considered for non-custodial sentence.
  - c) Character of the offender: - non-custodial sentence are best suited for offenders who are already remorseful and receptive to rehabilitative measures.
  - d) Protection of the community: - where the offender is likely to pose a threat to the community.
  - e) Offender's responsibility to third parties: - where there are people depending on the offender.

Turning to the issue of sentence the court wants to remind itself and the Lower Court that sentencing should always follow the provisions of the statute, the Sentencing policy guidelines published in 2023 and the Principles laid down in the various case law. It is trite that the basis on which Appeal's Court exercise jurisdiction to review or overturn the sentence is basically on factors of the sentence being manifestly excessive or in adequate likely to send shock waves to the public and the offender. The *constitution* 2010 also enacted Article 25 (a) dealing with rights and fundamental freedoms guarantees of citizens from torture and cruel, inhuman, or degrading treatment or punishment. That fundamental right should be borne in mind in sentencing an offender upon conviction for that particular offence. In some also as a matter of principle in sentencing any verdict, sanction or punishment must be proportionate to the crime for which the accused person has been convicted. It is also clear from the objectives and principles of sentencing, that the accused being a first offender or has entered a plea of guilty to the offence should count for something to reduce his or her sentence. Generally, for first offenders, it is very unlikely that if they are placed on non-custodial sentence they would be re-offending hence impacting negatively public law and order in our communities. The trial courts ought to focus more on rehabilitation of offenders than deterrence with lengthy sentences that may not aid in the transformation of the offender. There are various sentencing provided in our penal system which are rarely invoked as measures to punish crime by the trial courts. The non-custodial measures are fashioned around the Tokio rules 8.1 & 8.2 (a-m) which provide inter-alia Verbal sanctions, such as admonition, reprimand and warning Conditional discharge Status Penalties Economic sanction and donetary penalties, such as fines and day-fines Confiscation or an expropriation order Restitution to the victim or a compensation order Suspended or differed sentence Probation and judicial supervision A community service order Referral to an attendance center House arrest Any other mode of non-institutional treatment, or Some combination of these measures.

Just as the offender's person need and interests have to be weighed against society's interest at the pre-trial stage, so the offenders "rehabilitative needs" at the sentencing stage must be balanced against eh need to protect society and "the interests of the victim the list of non-custodial measures in Rule 8.2 while not exhaustive, contains a wide range of non-custodial measures to suit different circumstances and achieve different objectives



7. Further to the aforementioned, the *Community Service Orders Act* makes it possible for courts to issue an order requiring the offender to perform community service. This option is available to court when the offender is convicted of an offence punishable by imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years or imprisonment for a term exceeding three years but for which the court determines that any of that term as would be appropriate be served within the community on unpaid public works.
8. The circumstances of this case are a perfect fit for a community service order. Consequently, the effective measure as recommended by the probation officer is to have the applicant serve a community service order at Clinic 4 in the refugee camp. The period served in custody I believe has shaped the applicant to better person and therefore 2 months on CSO will suffice. Monthly reports shall be filed in court by the supervisor of the applicant through the probation officer.

**SIGNED, DATE AND DELIVERED AT LODWAR THIS 17<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF MAY 2024.**

In the Presence of

Bungei K. Jonathan for the State

Appellant

.....

**R. NYAKUNDI**

**JUDGE**

