



**REPUBLIC OF KENYA**

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KENYA AT MIGORI**

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

**CIVIL APPEAL NO. 99 OF 2018**

**SOUTH NYANZA SUGAR CO. LTD .....APPELLANT**

**VERSUS**

**PAMELA NANJALA OMOLO.....RESPONDENT**

***(Being an appeal from the judgment and decree by Hon. M. M. Wachira, Senior Resident Magistrate in Migori Chief Magistrate's Civil Suit No. 440 of 2005 delivered on 05/07/2018)***

**JUDGMENT**

1. The Respondent herein, *Pamela Nanjala Omolo*, filed **Migori Chief Magistrate's Court Civil Suit No. 440 of 2014** (hereinafter referred to as '**the suit**') on the 24/10/2014. She averred that by a Growers Cane Farming and Supply Contract dated 09/03/2004 (hereinafter referred to as '**the Contract**') the Appellant herein, **South Nyanza Sugar Co. Ltd**, contracted her to grow and sell to it sugarcane at her parcel of land Plot No. 66A Field No. 17 in Nyarongi Sub-Location within Migori County.
2. It was alleged that the contract was for a period of five years or until one plant crop and two ratoon crops of the sugarcane were harvested from the subject parcel of land whichever event occurred first. The Respondent alleged that there was a breach of the contract by the Appellant in failing to harvest the mature cane and as a result she suffered loss. She then filed the suit.
3. The suit was defended. The Appellant entered appearance and filed a Statement of Defence dated 04/12/2014. It denied the contract as well as the alleged breach.
4. The suit was finally settled down for hearing. Both parties were represented by Counsels. The Respondent was the sole witness who testified and adopted her statement as part of his testimony. She also produced the documents in his List of Documents as exhibits. The documents included the contract. The Appellant called its Senior Field Supervisor as its sole witness.
5. The trial court rendered its judgment on 05/07/2018. It allowed the suit and awarded Kshs. 601,000/= as compensation. That is the judgment subject of this appeal.
6. The Appellant in praying that the appeal be allowed and the suit be dismissed proposed 10 grounds in the Memorandum of Appeal dated 24/07/2018 and filed in Court on 25/07/2018.
7. Directions were taken, and the appeal was disposed of by way of written submissions where the parties duly complied. They also relied on various decisions in support of their rival positions.
8. As the first appellate Court, it is now well settled that the role of this court is to revisit the evidence on record, evaluate it and reach its own conclusion in the matter. (See the case of ***Selle & Ano. vs. Associated Motor Boat Co. Ltd (1968) EA 123***). This court nevertheless appreciates that an appellate Court will not ordinarily interfere with findings of fact by the trial Court unless they were based on no evidence at all, or on a misapprehension of it or the Court is shown demonstrably to have acted on wrong principles in reaching the findings. This was the holding in ***Mwanasokoni -versus- Kenya Bus Service Ltd. (1982-88) 1 KAR 278*** and ***Kiruga -versus- Kiruga & Another (1988) KLR 348***.
9. I have certainly perused and understood the contents of the pleadings, proceedings, judgment, grounds of appeal, submissions and the decisions referred to by the parties.
10. I will first deal with the issue of the contract in this matter. The contract was denied by the Appellant in its pleading. The Appellant also denied breaching the contract. However, when the Appellant's witness testified before the trial court he admitted the existence of the contract

between the parties.

11. On her part the Respondent listed the contract as one of the documents in her list of documents. She also produced the contract as an exhibit. I have looked at the contract as produced.

12. The contract which is now part of the evidential record in this case contains 4 pages. The first page is the outer cover. The second page is Schedule A which contains the details of the farmer and the particulars of the plot. The third page comprises the parties to the contract and some three definitions of words and expressions as used in the contract. The fourth page is the execution part. The contract as produced does not have the obligations of the parties thereto.

13. The basis of the suit was the allegation that the Appellant in breach of the contract failed and/or refused to harvest the cane when it was mature. The Appellant denied as such.

14. It is a longstanding principle of law that parties to a contract are bound by the terms and conditions thereof and that it is not the business of the Courts to rewrite such contracts. In **National Bank of Kenya Ltd vs. Pipe Plastic Samkolit (K) Ltd (2002) 2 E.A. 503, (2011) eKLR** the Court of Appeal at page 507 stated as follows: -

*A court of law cannot rewrite a contract between the parties. The parties are bound by the terms of their contract, unless coercion, fraud or undue influence are pleaded and proved.*

15. In **Pius Kimaiyo Langat vs. Co-operative Bank of Kenya Ltd (2017) eKLR** the Court of Appeal further stated that: -

*We are alive to the hallowed legal maxim that it is not the business of Courts to rewrite contracts between parties, They are bound by the terms of their contracts, unless coercion, fraud or undue influence are pleaded and proved.*

16. In this case the terms of the contract between the parties are missing. Several questions hence arise: How will a Court interrogate any alleged breach of the contract? On what basis will a Court find a party in breach in the absence of the terms of that contract?

17. As Courts are only called upon to interrogate the terms of contracts in cases of alleged breach of such contracts a Court will not be able to discharge such a duty in the absence of the terms of the contract.

18. In the impugned judgment the trial court dealt with several obligations of the parties. It eventually found the Appellant guilty of failing to 'harvest the cane as provided in the contract'. The court concluded that the Appellant was in breach of the contract.

19. From the foregone discussion I find and hold that the trial court erred in imputing imaginary terms into the contract. The position was that the parties never availed any such terms of the contract and the court ought to have so found.

20. The suit was hence not proved. There was no legal basis for finding the Appellant in breach of the contract.

21. The foregone finding is sufficient to dispose the appeal. A consideration of the other issues would be academic. Accordingly, the appeal is allowed and the judgment of the trial court rendered on 05/07/2018 is hereby set aside. I substitute that finding with an order dismissing the suit with costs to the Appellant. The Appellant shall as well have costs of the appeal.

Orders accordingly.

**DELIVERED, DATED and SIGNED at MIGORI this 11<sup>th</sup> day of June 2020.**

**A. C. MRIMA**

**JUDGE**

**Judgment delivered electronically through: -**

1. [okongowadangaomigori@gmail.com](mailto:okongowadangaomigori@gmail.com) for the firm of Messrs. Okong'o Wandago & Company Advocates for the Appellan.

2. [kerario@gmail.com](mailto:kerario@gmail.com) for the firm of Messrs. Kerario Marwa & Company Advocates for the Respondent.

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**