



**Samoya v Republic (Criminal Review E090 of 2023)
[2024] KEHC 12972 (KLR) (25 October 2024) (Ruling)**

Neutral citation: [2024] KEHC 12972 (KLR)

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA
IN THE HIGH COURT AT ELDORET
CRIMINAL REVIEW E090 OF 2023
RN NYAKUNDI, J
OCTOBER 25, 2024**

**IN THE MATTER IN THE COURT OF APPEAL AT ELDORET;
OPRODI PETER OMUKANGA VS REPUBLIC CRIMINAL APPEAL
NO. 260 OF 2019 (UR) DELIVERED ON 14TH APRIL, 2023**

BETWEEN

ELKANA KHAMASI SAMOYA APPLICANT

AND

REPUBLIC RESPONDENT

RULING

1. The Applicant herein was charged, convicted and sentenced to death for the offence of robbery with violence contrary to section 296(2) of the Penal Code at CM's Court at Eldoret in Criminal Case No 598 of 2008.
2. The Applicant being aggrieved filed an appeal to have the conviction quashed and the sentence set aside at the High Court in Eldoret in Criminal Appeal No 117 of 2008, which appeal was dismissed in its entirety; conviction and sentence affirmed.
3. What is pending before me for determination is an undated Chamber Summons Application where the Applicant is seeking the following orders:
 - a. That the Hon. Court be pleased to review the death the death sentence imposed by the Trial Court, confirmed by the High Court and later commuted to life imprisonment to a more lenient sentence pursuant to Article 50(2)(p)(q) of the Constitution.
 - b. That, should the eventual computation result into a balance of three (3) years or less, may the Hon. Court be pleased to grant me probation orders if my circumstances so fit.
 - c. Any other order that the Hon. Court deems fit to give in the interest of justice.



4. The application is based on the grounds on the face of it among others:
 - a. That the Applicant was charged and convicted for the offence of robbery with violence contrary to section 296(2) of the [Penal Code](#) in Criminal Case No 598 of 2008 at Eldoret Law Court and sentenced to suffer Death.
 - b. That the Applicant lodged an Appeal to the High Court vide H.C.C.R.A No 117 of 2008 at Eldoret but the same was dismissed in its entirety; conviction and sentence affirmed.
 - c. That, the Applicant thus has no pending appeal.
 - d. That the Applicant was sentenced to a mandatory sentence as prescribed by section 296(2) of the [Penal Code](#) without consideration of his mitigation or the unique circumstances of his case.
 - e. That, directions issued by the Supreme Court on 6th July 2021 in [Francis Karioko Muruatetu & another v Republic](#) (2017) eKLR left it open to the High Court to her any petition that may be brought challenging inter alia mandatory minimum sentences and make a determination.
 - f. That, the supreme court did not hold that the High Court not to apply the reasoning in [Francis Karioko Muruatetu & another v Republic](#) (2017) eKLR.
 - g. That the Court of Appeal decision in [Oprodi Peter Omukanga v Republic](#) Criminal Appeal No 260 of 2019 (UR) is relevant in the present matter.
5. The application is supported by the annexed affidavit dated 13th June 2023 sworn by Elkana Khamasi Samoya the Applicant herein where he avers as follows;
 - a. That I was charged and convicted for the offence of robbery with violence contrary to section 296(2) of the [Penal Code](#) in Criminal Case No 598 of 2008 at Eldoret Law Court and sentenced to suffer Death.
 - b. That I lodged an Appeal to the High Court vide H.C.C.R.A No 117 of 2008 at Eldoret but the same was dismissed in its entirety; conviction and sentence affirmed.
 - c. That, I have no pending appeal.
 - d. That, I was sentenced to a mandatory sentence as prescribed by section 296(2) of the [Penal Code](#) without consideration of my mitigation or the unique circumstances of his case.
 - e. That, directions issued by the Supreme Court on 6th July 2021 in [Francis Karioko Muruatetu & another v Republic](#) (2017) eKLR left it open to the High Court to her any petition that may be brought challenging inter alia mandatory minimum sentences and make a determination.
 - f. That, the supreme court did not hold that the High Court not to apply the reasoning in [Francis Karioko Muruatetu & another v Republic](#) (2017) eKLR.
 - g. That the Court of Appeal decision in [Oprodi Peter Omukanga v Republic](#) Criminal Appeal No 260 of 2019 (UR) is relevant in the present matter.
 - h. That, the Hon. Court be pleased to review the DEATH sentence imposed by the Trial Court, confirmed by the High Court and Later commuted to life imprisonment to a more lenient sentence pursuant to Article 50(2)(p)(q) of the [Constitution](#).
 - i. That should the eventual computation result into a balance of three (3) years or less, may the Hon. Court be pleased to grant me probation orders if my circumstance so fit.



- j. That this Honourable Court is seized of competent jurisdiction under Article 165(3)(b) of the Constitution of Kenya to hear and determine this matter.
- k. That I am a convict hence a pauper who cannot incur any costs for the preparation of this application thus pray that such costs be waived.

Analysis and Determination

- 6. In deciding this application, I have perused and considered the judgment in Criminal Case No 598 of 2008 at Eldoret CM's Court and High Court at Eldoret in High Court Appeal No 117 of 2008 which relate to the same case. I have also considered the application and the mitigation by the applicant. The issue manifest for determination is:

Whether the sentence review is merited

- 7. Re-sentencing is neither a hearing de novo nor an appeal. It is a proceeding undertaken within the court's power to review sentence. The court will ordinarily check the legality or propriety or appropriateness of the sentence. The relevant considerations in the proceeding inter alia, are the penalty law, mitigating or aggravating factors, and the objects of punishments. In re-sentencing proceedings, conviction is not in issue.
- 8. It bears repeating that, the High Court has the mandate under Article 165 (3) of the Constitution to hear and determine matters on enforcement of rights and fundamental freedoms enshrined in the Constitution ,A further leapfrog development; under article 50(2)(p) of the Constitution:

50(2) Every accused person has the right to a fair trial, which includes the right—(p)to the benefit of the least severe of the prescribed punishments for an offence, if the prescribed punishment for the offence has been changed between the time that the offence was committed and the time of sentencing
- 9. In Philip Muke Maingi & others v Rep, Petition No E17 of 2021 specifically outlawed mandatory minimum sentence. It stated;

There is nothing which prevents the court from applying decisional law and ordering sentence review in cases where the penalty imposed was mandatory penalty in law even if the cases are finalized. To me, denying an accused the benefit of court's discretion to impose appropriate sentence is inconsistent with the right to fair trial. Fair trial includes sentencing. On that basis this court has jurisdiction to determine and/or review sentence's where appropriate.
- 10. A similar position was taken by the High Court, in Stephene Kimathi Mutunga v Republic [2019] eKLR where it was held that the High Court has unlimited jurisdiction in both Civil and Criminal matters, and was mandated to enforcing fundamental rights and freedoms as enshrined in the Constitution. The High Court thus had jurisdiction to deal with the petition for sentencing rehearing.
- 11. In Michael Kathewa Laichena & another v Republic [2018] eKLR Majanja J. stated: "by re-sentencing the petitioner, the High Court is merely enforcing and granting relief for what is in effect a violation caused by the imposition of the mandatory death sentence".
- 12. Further, the Court of Appeal sitting in Malindi in Manyeso v Republic Criminal Appeal No 12 of 2021 [2023] kECA 827 (KLR) held that mandatory life sentences are unconstitutional and are "an unjustifiable discrimination, unfair and repugnant to the principle of equality before the law under



Article 27 of the Constitution. The said decision is supported by the case of *Vinter and others v UK*, in which the European court of human rights (ECHR) reasoned that indeterminate life sentence with no hope of parole was degrading and inhuman.

13. Article 50(6) of the Constitution of Kenya 2010 states that; A person who is convicted of a criminal offence may petition the High Court for a new trial if—(a) the person’s appeal, if any, has been dismissed by the highest court to which the person is entitled to appeal, or the person did not appeal within the time allowed for appeal; and (b) new and compelling evidence has become available.
14. Sentencing is a discretion of the court. But the court should look at the facts and the circumstances of the case in it’s entirely so as to arrive at appropriate sentence. The Court of Appeal in *Thomas Mwambu Wenyi v Republic* [2017] eKLR cited the decision of the Supreme Court of India in *Alister Anthony Pereira v State of Maharesbtra* at paragraph 70-71 where the court held the following on sentencing:

“Sentencing is an important task in the matter of crime. One of the prime objectives of the criminal law is imposition of appropriate, adequate, just and proportionate sentence commensurate with the nature and gravity of crime and the manner in which the crime is done. There is no straight jacket formula for sentencing an accused person on proof of crime. The courts have evolved certain principles: twin objective of sentencing policy is deterrence and correction. What sentence would meet the ends of justice depends on the facts and circumstance of each case and the courts must keep in mind the gravity of the crime, motive for the crime, nature of the offence and all other attendant circumstances. The principle of proportionality in sentencing a crime doer is well entrenched in criminal jurisprudence. As a matter of law, proportion between crime and punishment bears most relevant influence in determination of sentencing the crime doer. The court has to take into consideration all aspects including social interest and consciousness of the society for award of appropriate sentence.”
15. Also in the case of *Francis Karioko Muruatetu & another v Republic* (*supra*) where the Supreme Court stated the guidelines and mitigating factors in a re-hearing on sentence were discussed. The judiciary has also developed *Judiciary Sentencing Policy Guidelines* lists the objectives of sentencing at page 15 paragraph 4.1 which should be considered.
16. A glimpse of the Applicant’s application clearly calls for a re-hearing of the sentence imposed. Article 50(2)(p) of the Constitution provides as follows: Every accused person has the right to a fair trial, which includes the right—
 - p. to the benefit of the least severe of the prescribed punishments for an offence, if the prescribed punishment for the offence has been changed between the time that the offence was committed and the time of sentencing; and
17. Article 50(6) further provides for conditions under which one can petition for a new trial, which in this case is a new trial only on sentence. The provision speaks in the following terms.
 - (6) A person who is convicted of a criminal offence may petition the high court for a new trial if: -
 - a. The person’s appeal, if any, has been dismissed by the highest court to which the person is entitle to appeal, or the person did not appeal within the time allowed for appeal; and
 - b. New and compelling evidence has become available.
18. The foregoing provisions are instructive in matters brought before the high court for a new trial. The application before me seeks a new trial only on sentence. So that then my mandate is to view the



application through the lens of Article 50 (2)(p) and (6) and determine whether the same is proper for a new trial only on sentence.

19. Has the application passed the test laid out in the foregoing legal provisions? Yes, I believe so. First, the applicant has exhibited that indeed his appeal was dismissed by a higher court and the court being conscious of the developments in our current jurisprudence on mandatory sentences i.e. the Muruatetu case. It then follows that the applicant ought to benefit from the least prescribed punishment as per the provisions of Article 50(2)(p).
20. There are circumstances under which the court can alter or decline to vary the sentence meted out. That is entirely at the discretion of the court. I have gone through the record of the court's decision in the criminal trial, the judgment and sentence. I have noted the circumstances under which the offence was committed. I have also read the sentencing record of the court. The petitioner's offered mitigation which the court considered before it sentenced the petitioner to the only sentence then allowed in law. In other words, the mitigation did not mean anything and that is precisely what the Supreme Court called unfair trial since with or without mitigation the court would still impose death penalty.
21. I am of the considered view that life imprisonment is such indeterminate sentence that deprives one off humane treatment and courts are now embracing sentences that will achieve the objectives of sentencing. The Court of Appeal in the case of *Manyeso v Republic* (Criminal Appeal 12 of 2021) [2023] KECA 827 (KLR)

“we are of the view that the reasoning in *Francis Karioko Muruatetu & another v Republic* [2017] eKLR equally applies to the imposition of a mandatory indeterminate life sentence, namely that such a sentence denies a convict facing life imprisonment the opportunity to be heard in mitigation when those facing lesser sentences are allowed to be heard in mitigation. This is an unjustifiable discrimination, unfair and repugnant to the principle of equality before the law under article 27 of the *Constitution*. In addition, an indeterminate life sentence is in our view also inhumane treatment and violates the right to dignity under article 28, and we are in this respect persuaded by the reasoning of the European Court of Human Rights in *Vinter and others v The United Kingdom* (Application Nos 66069/09, 130/10 and 3896/10) [2016] III ECHR 317 (9 July 2013) that an indeterminate life sentence without any prospect of release or a possibility of review is degrading and inhuman punishment, and that it is now a principle in international law that all prisoners, including those serving life sentences, be offered the possibility of rehabilitation and the prospect of release if that rehabilitation is achieved.

22. In *R v Bieber* [2009] 1 WLR 223 the Court of Appeal of the United Kingdom had held as follows:

“The legitimate objects of imprisonment are punishment, deterrence, rehabilitation and protection of the public. Where a mandatory life sentence is imposed in respect of a crime, the possibility exists that all the objects of imprisonment may be achieved during the lifetime of the prisoner. He may have served a sufficient term to meet the requirements of punishment and deterrence and rehabilitation may have transformed him into a person who no longer poses any threat to a public. If, despite this, he will remain imprisoned for the rest of his life it is at least arguable that this is inhuman treatment...”

23. From the foregoing authorities, it is evident that mandatory sentences and particularly life imprisonment is unlawful. I form the opinion that life imprisonment in its nature is pegged on the accused's balance of years until death. It results to ambiguity for both the society and the accused



person. Such indeterminacy undermines the goals of rehabilitation and is inconsistent with the principles of justice and fairness which are at the heart of our criminal justice system.

24. Having said so, I have considered The *Sentencing Policy Guidelines*, 2023 and its application which is intended to promote transparency, consistency and fairness in sentencing. The relevant considerations in the proceeding inter alia, are the penalty law, mitigating or aggravating factors, and the objects of punishments.
25. Therefore, in sentencing, the gravity of the offence and the consequences of the offence on the victim are relevant factors.
26. Section 333(2) of the *Criminal Procedure Code* provides that in sentencing, where an accused person was in remand custody the period spent in custody should be taken into account. It reads:

“Subject to the provisions of section 38 of the *Penal Code* (Cap. 63) every sentence shall be deemed to commence from, and to conclude the whole of the day of, the date on which it was pronounced, except where otherwise provided in this Code. Provided that where the person sentenced under subsection (1) has, prior to such sentence, been held in custody, the sentence shall take account of the period spent in custody.”
27. I have considered the application and all the information available. Given that mandatory sentences are now outlawed same as indeterminate sentences, I am inclined to interfere with the death imposed and substitute it with a lesser sentence of 20 years’ imprisonment. The application therefore succeeds and in considering the provisions of section 333(2) of the CPC the sentence shall run from the date of conviction at the trial court.

DATED AND SIGNED AT ELDORET THIS 25TH OCTOBER, 2024

R. NYAKUNDI

JUDGE

In the presence of:

Mr. Mugun for the DPP

