



REPUBLIC OF KENYA

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KENYA

AT MIGORI

(Coram: A. C. Mrima, J.)

JUDICIAL REVIEW NO. 4 OF 2020

REPUBLIC.....APPLICANT

-VERSUS-

THE PRINCIPAL SECRETARY MINISTRY OF INTERIOR

THE MINISTRY OF INTERIOR AND CO-ORDINATION OF NATIONAL

GOVERNMENT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL.....RESPONDENTS

SAMWEL GISIRI MAGESI.....APPLICANT (EXPARTE)

JUDGMENT

1. Before me is a Notice of Motion evenly dated and filed on 18/02/2020. It sought the following orders: -

- a. The Honourable Court be pleased to grant an Order of Judicial Review in the nature of mandamus to issue against the Respondents herein, to compel them to proceed and pay out the decretal sum of Kshs. 295,610.00 being the General Damages, costs and interest in Migori HCCA No. 70 of 2017 whose Judgment was delivered on 7th May, 2019 and continues to attract interest at Court rates.
- b. The Honourable Court be pleased to set a timeline and/or duration within which the Respondents herein do settle the decretal sum with interest accruing until the date of payment.
- c. The Applicant be at liberty to apply to this Court for all necessary and/or consequently orders that this Honourable Court may deem fit and just to grant in the circumstances.
- d. Costs of this application to be provided for.

2. The application was based on the 17 grounds appearing on the face thereof. It was supported by the Verifying Affidavit of *Samwel Gisiri Magesi*, the *Exparte* Applicant herein, sworn on 06/01/2020.

3. The application was not opposed by the Respondents despite service. The matter therefore proceeded *exparte* on 19/03/2020.

4. The Applicant prayed that the application be allowed. He wholly relied on the record in pursuit of the success of the application.

5. Despite the fact that the application was unopposed this Court is duty-bound to consider the application as against the law. That is what the Court will religiously do.

6. The brief background of the application as gathered from the Statement and the Verifying Affidavit of the *Exparte* Applicant is that the *Exparte* Applicant sued the Honourable Attorney General and one Tabitha Muruga in **Migori Chief Magistrate’s Civil Suit No. 43 of 2013** (hereinafter referred to as **‘the suit’**).

7. The suit was dismissed. The *Exparte* Applicant preferred an appeal to the High Court at Migori in **Civil Appeal No. 70 of 2017** (hereinafter referred to as **‘the appeal’**). The appeal was allowed and the Respondents thereto, the *Honourable Attorney General* and

Tabitha Muruga were decreed to pay the Exparte Applicant a total of Kshs. 140,000/= with interests at court rates. The Exparte Applicant was also awarded costs of the suit as well as the appeal. That was on 07/05/2019.

8. The Exparte Applicant obtained a decree on 17/09/2019. He also obtained a Certificate of Order for costs against the Government on 17/12/2019. He then instituted these proceedings on 12/02/2020.

9. I will now look at the procedure to be followed in execution of money decrees against government. It is settled that before an order of mandamus is issued the elaborate procedure provided for under **Government Proceedings Act, Cap. 40** of the Laws of Kenya (*hereinafter referred to as 'the Act'*) must be strictly complied with. For ease of this discussion I hereby reproduce the said provision verbatim:

21(1) Where in any civil proceedings by or against the Government, or in proceedings in connection with any arbitration in which the Government is a party, any order (including an order for costs) is made by any court in favour of any person against the government, or against a Government department, or against an officer of the Government as such, the proper officer of the court shall, on an application in that behalf made by or on behalf of that person at any time after the expiration of twenty – one days from the date of the order or, in case the order provides for the payment of costs and the costs required to be taxed, at any time after the costs have been taxed, whichever is the later, issue to that person a certificate in the prescribed form containing particulars of the order.

Provided that if the court so directs, a separate certificate shall be issued with respect to the costs (if any) ordered to be paid to the applicant.

(2) A copy of any certificate issued under this section may be served by the person in whose favour the order is made upon the Attorney-General.

(3) If the order provides for the payment of any money by way of damages or otherwise, or of any costs, the certificate shall state the amount so payable, and the Accounting Officer for the Government department concerned shall, subject as hereinafter provided, pay to the person entitled or to his advocate the amount appearing by the certificate to be due to him together with interest, if any, lawfully due thereon.

Provided that the Court by which any such order as aforesaid is made or any court to which an appeal against the order lies may direct that, pending an appeal or otherwise, payment of the whole of any amount so payable, or any part thereof, shall be suspended, and if the certificate has not been issued may order any such direction to be inserted therein.

(4) Save as aforesaid, no execution or attachment or process in the nature thereof shall be issued out of any such court for enforcing payment by the Government of any such money or costs as aforesaid, and no person shall be individually liable under any order for the payment by the Government, or any Government department, or any officer of the Government as such, of any money or costs.

(5) This section shall, with necessary modifications, apply to any civil proceedings by or against a county government, or in any proceedings in connection with any arbitration in which a county government is a party.

10. Expounding on the foregone my Lordships **Visram** and **Ibrahim, JJ** (as they were then) discussed the rationale for the immunity against the normal execution proceedings against the Government and by extension the foregone elaborate procedure. This is what they stated in **Kisya Investments Ltd vs. Attorney General (2005) 1KLR 74** thus: -

Order 28, rules 2 (1) (a), (2) and (4) of the Civil Procedure Rules subject themselves to the provisions of the Government Proceedings Act which include provisions prohibiting execution against or attachment in respect of the Government. The said Rules themselves expressly preclude such actions. Many a times such application may indeed not attain that goal due to the effect of the said laws. On the question of abuse of the process of the court, the application of any written law cannot amount to an abuse of the process of the court however much its effect is harsh or even undesirable.... History and rationale of Government's immunity from execution arises from the following: - Firstly, there has been a policy in respect of Parliamentary control over revenue and this is threefold and is exercised in respect of (i). The raising of revenue – (by taxation or borrowing); (ii). Its expenditure; and (iii). The audit of Public accounts. The satisfaction of decrees or judgements is deemed to be an expenditure by Parliament and as a result of this must be justified in law and provided for in the Government's expenditure. It is for this reason that section 32 of the Government Proceedings Act provides that any expenditure incurred by or on behalf of the Government by reasons of this Act shall be defrayed out of the moneys provided by Parliament. Parliamentary control over expenditure is based upon the principle that all expenditure must rest upon legislative authority and no payment out of public funds is legal unless it is authorized by statute, and any unauthorized payment may be recovered. SEE HALSBURY'S LAW OF ENGLAND 4th EDN VOL. 11 PARA 970, 971 AND 1370. As a result of the foregoing, which was borrowed from the Crown proceedings Act, 1974 (section 37) of England, this is a warning that any payment by Government must be covered by some appropriation. It is said that Parliament is very jealous of its control over the expenditure and this is as it should be. No ministry or Department has any ready funds at all times to satisfy decrees or judgments. While existence of claims and decrees may be known to the Ministries and Departments, they have to notify the Ministry of Finance and Treasury of the same so that payment is arranged for or provisions made in the Government expenditure. SEE AUCKLAND HARBOUR BOARD VS. R (1924) AC 318, 326. The second situation, which arises from the above, is that once a decree or judgment is obtained against the Government, it would require some reasonable time to have it forwarded to the Ministry of Finance, Treasury, Comptroller and Auditor General etc for scrutiny and approvals for it to be paid from the Consolidated Fund. The Ministries and Departments do not have their "own" funds to settle such decrees or payments and considering the nature

of the Government structure, procedures, red tape and large number of claims, this could take a long time. If execution and/or attachment against the Government were allowed, there is no doubt that the Government will not be able to pay immediately upon passing of decrees and judgments and will be inundated with executions and attachments of its assets day in, day out. Its buildings will be attached and its plants and equipment will be attached, its furniture and office equipment will be attached, its vehicles, aircraft, ship and boats will be attached. There will be no end to the list of likely assets to be attached and auctioned by the auctioneer's hammer. No Government can possibly survive such an onslaught. The Government and therefore the state operations will ground to a halt and paralyzed and soon the Government will not only be bankrupt but it's Constitutional and Statutory duties will not be capable of performance and this will lead to chaos, anarchy and the breakdown of the Rule of Law. This is the rationale or the objective of the law that prohibits execution against and attachment of the Government assets and property.

11. The Court, Odunga, J. in Permanent Secretary Office of the President Ministry of Internal Security & Another ex parte Nassir Mwadhiri (2014) eKLR also had the following to say of the matter: -

33. It therefore follows from the foregoing discourse that the rules applicable to normal execution proceedings by way of committal to civil jail are not necessarily applicable to enforcement of an order of the Court arising from an order of mandamus by way of committal. It must be remembered that an application for an order of mandamus seeking an order compelling the Government to satisfy a decree is a very elaborate procedure. Before the Court issues such an order, there must be proof that the provisions of the Government Proceedings Act have been complied with respect to issuance of certificate of costs and certificate of order against the Government. After the issuance of the aforesaid documents, just like in any application for mandamus, there must be a demand for payment made by or on behalf of the decree holder to the relevant department seeking payment since in an application for an order of mandamus, the law as a general rule requires a demand by the applicant for action and refusal as a prerequisite to the granting of an order, though there are exceptions to the rule. See The District Commissioner Kiambu vs. R and Others Ex Parte Ethan Njau Civil Appeal No. 2 of 1960 [1960] EA 109; R vs The Brecknock And Abergavenny Canal Co. 111 ER and R vs. The Bristol and Exeter Railway Co 114 ER 859.

34. The said elaborate procedure is further meant to give adequate notice to the Government to make arrangement to satisfy the decree. The procedure, in my view is not meant to relieve the Government from meeting its statutory obligations to satisfy decrees and orders of the Court....

12. I need not re-emphasize the need for strict compliance with **Section 21** of the Act being the law of the land. In this matter a Decree and a Certificate of Order for Costs against the Government were drawn and issued.

13. In this case whereas the decree and the certificate were duly issued two issues arise for consideration. The first one relates to the parties in the decree and the certificate *vis-à-vis* the Respondents in these proceedings. The second one is on the service of the decree and the certificate.

14. On the issue of the respective parties, I note that the parties in the suit and the appeal were the Exparte Applicant against the Hon. Attorney General and Tabitha Muruga. The Respondents in these proceedings are the Principal Secretary Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government and the Hon. Attorney General.

15. The application does not draw any nexus between the Respondents and the parties in the suit and the appeal. Without an explanation to the satisfaction of the Court it becomes very difficult to convince the Court to allow the application against the Respondents who seem to have been enjoined in the proceedings at the execution stage.

16. On the issue of service, the Exparte Applicant must prove service of the decree and the certificate upon the parties named in the documents. The application vehemently decried that the Respondents had failed to satisfy the decree and the certificate. However, there was no proof of service of the documents upon the parties named therein.

17. In any litigation service upon the parties in that matter is at the heart of that litigation. It is mandatory. It is enshrined in the right to a fair hearing under **Article 50(1)** of the **Constitution**. As provided under **Article 25** of the **Constitution** the right to fair hearing is one of those rights which cannot be in anyway be limited.

18. I therefore find that the Exparte Applicant has not fully complied with the legal requirements for an order of mandamus to be availed. The application is premature and cannot stand.

19. The upshot is that the Notice of Motion dated 18/02/2020 is hereby struck out with no order as to costs.

DELIVERED, DATED and SIGNED at MIGORI this 11th day of June 2020.

A. C. MRIMA

JUDGE

Judgment delivered electronically through: -

1.roabisai@yahoo.com for the firm of Messrs. Abisai & Company Advocates for the Exparte Applicant.

2. No appearance for the Respondents.

3. Parties are at liberty to obtain hard copies of the judgment from the Registry upon payment of the requisite charges.

A. C. MRIMA

JUDGE