



REPUBLIC OF KENYA

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KENYA

AT MAKUENI

HCCC. MISC APPL NO. E022 OF 2020

JAMES KAMAU NJENGA.....APPLICANT

-VERSUS-

PETER NDAMBUKI MUTUNGA.....RESPONDENT

RULING

1. Before me is an application by way of Notice of Motion dated 23rd November 2020 filed by James Kamau Njenga through counsel M/s Kimondo Gachoka & company advocates.

2. The application was brought under section 3A, 79G, and 95 of the Civil Procedure Act (cap.21) and Order 22 Rule 22, Order 42 Rule 6, Order 50 Rules 6 and Order 51 Rule 1 and 3 of the Civil Procedure Rules, and has five (5) prayers, some of which have been spent as follows

1) (spent)

2) That this court be pleased to grant leave to the applicant to appeal out of time against the judgment of the honourable magistrate Mayamba C.A in Kilungu PMCC No. 268 of 2019 and judgment delivered on 25th September 2020.

3) (spent)

4) That the honourable court be pleased to stay execution of the judgment and decree in Kilungu PMCC No. 268 of 2019 pending the hearing and determination of the intended appeal herein.

3. The application has grounds on the face of the Notice of Motion that the 30 days within which appeal is to be filed have lapsed, that the applicant is aggrieved by the quantum of damages awarded in the judgment and that the applicant is likely to suffer irreparable and substantial loss as there is a likelihood that the applicant will be unable to recover the decretal amount from the respondent if stay is not granted.

4. The application was filed with a supporting affidavit sworn by Kelvin Nguni the Legal Counsel of Directline Assurance Company Ltd the insurers of motor vehicle KCH 072Q, that the advocate who handled the case left the firm without proper handover leading to the delay, that though the time allowed to file appeal had lapsed, the intended appeal is merited and arguable, and that the respondent will not suffer prejudice if the orders sought are granted. The affidavit annexes a draft unsigned memorandum of appeal.

5. The application is opposed through a replying affidavit sworn by the respondent Peter Ndambuki Mutunga on 28th January 2021 in which it was deponed that no plausible reason had been given why the appeal was not filed within time, that the applicant has not satisfied the requirements to warrant of stay of execution order pending appeal, that as the intended appeal merely seeks to challenge quantum, the applicant should pay the respondent half of the decretal amount. The affidavit annexes copy of a demand letter dated 26/9/2020 addressed to counsel for the applicant for payment of the decretal sum and costs.

6. The application was canvassed by way of filing written submissions. I have perused and considered the written submissions filed by the applicant's counsel Kimondo Gachoka and Company, as well as submissions of counsel for the respondent M/s Waiganjo Wachira & company.

7. This is an application for extension of time to appeal, as well as an application for stay of execution of judgment or decree pending appeal.

8. I will start with the request for leave to appeal out of time. With regard to the delay in filing the appeal, the applicant has blamed the advocate who handled the matter who is said to have left the firm of lawyers without proper handover. I will thus give the applicant the benefit of the doubt in that respect as Article 159(2) of the Constitution of Kenya 2010 enjoins courts to be more inclined to render substantive justice rather than determining matters on technicalities. I will allow the applicant a chance to file and argue their appeal, as section 79G of the Civil Procedure Act confers on this court powers to extend time to appeal.

9. With regard to the request for stay of execution pending appeal, the parameters to be taken into account by the court in determining such an application are contained in Order 42 Rule 6(2) of the Civil Procedure Rules, which provides as follows –

6(2) No order for stay of execution shall be made under subrule (1) unless –

a) The court is satisfied that substantial loss may result to the applicant unless the order is made and that the application has been made without unreasonable delay; and

b) Such security as the court orders for the due performance of such decree or order as may ultimately be binding on him has been given by the applicant.

10. The applicant has admitted to delay in filing the appeal and thus also to filing this application for stay. However, reasons for the delay have been given and the delay is not excessive. I thus find that the delay herein is not unreasonable.

11. With the applicant suffer substantial loss if the stay orders sought are not granted? This is a money decree for an amount which has been determined by the trial court. The intended appeal is on quantum of damages. I thus find that the applicant may stand to suffer substantial loss if stay is not granted, but since the appeal is on quantum, the respondent will suffer prejudice if no amount is paid to him in the meantime. I will thus grant stay, but order that part of the decretal amount be paid to the respondent.

12. With regard to provision of security by the appellant in my view, the portion of the decretal amount to be paid to the respondent hereunder satisfied the requirement of provision of security by the applicant.

13. Consequently, and for the above reasons, I order as follows –

i. The applicant is granted 14 days from today to file appeal.

ii. Stay of execution of decree or judgment is granted pending determination of appeal, provided the applicant pays the respondent part of the decretal amount Kshs.70,000/= within 30 days from today.

iii. In default of either (i) or (ii) above, the stay orders herein granted will automatically lapse.

iv. Costs of the application awarded to the respondent.

Orders accordingly.

DELIVERED, SIGNED AND DATED THIS 7TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2021 IN OPEN COURT AT MAKUENI.

.....

GEORGE DULU

JUDGE