



**REPUBLIC OF KENYA**

**IN THE ENVIRONMENT AND LAND COURT AT KAKAMEGA**

**ELC CASE NO. 50 OF 2016**

**YAKOBET NECHESA WABUKO.....PLAINTIFF/RESPONDENT**

**VERSUS**

**HUMPHREY OLWISI MURANDA**

**EVERLYNE OMUSINDE OMUNGO.....DEFENDANTS/RESPONDENTS**

**RULING**

The application is dated 24<sup>th</sup> October 2018 and is brought under order 22 rule 22 and 24, order 51 rule 1 and 12 and order 9 rule 9 of the Civil Procedure Rules and sections 1A, 3, 3A, 18 and 63 (e) of the Civil Procedure Act seeking the following orders:-

1. That this application be certified as urgent and its service be dispensed with in the first instance.
2. That the firm of Melly & co. Advocates be allowed to come on record on behalf of the applicants/Defendants in this matter.
3. That there be stay of execution of the judgment of this honourable court in Kakamega Environment & Land Court Cause No. 50 of 2016 delivered on 26/9/2018 and all its consequential orders pending the hearing and determination of the intended appeal.
4. Costs be in the cause.

It is based on the annexed affidavit of Humphrey Olwisi Muranda and the following grounds that, the applicants/Defendants being aggrieved and dissatisfied with the judgment of the honourable court intends to file an appeal. That there is need for an order of stay of execution of the decree/judgment pending the hearing and determination of the intended appeal. That unless the orders of stay of execution are granted, the said appeal will be rendered nugatory. That the respondent shall not be prejudiced in any way if the orders sought are granted. That the applicants intended appeal has very high chance of success.

The respondent submitted that, the applicants' application seeking stay of execution as prayed in prayer (c) of the said Notice of Motion being sought in a wrong forum as this court has no jurisdiction to grant such prayers. In the alternative the applicants have not met or satisfied the conditions set out under order 42 rule (6) (2) to warrant them orders of stay.

This court has carefully considered the application and the submissions herein. The principles for granting stay of execution are provided for under **Order 42 rule 6 (1)** of the **Civil Procedure Rules** as follows:

**“No appeal or a second appeal shall operate as a stay of execution or proceedings under a decree or order appealed from except in so far as the Court appealed from may order, but the Court appealed from may for sufficient cause order stay of execution of such decree or order and whether the application for such stay shall have been granted or refused by the Court appealed from, the Court to which such appeal is preferred, shall be at liberty, on an application being made, to consider such application and to make such orders thereon as may to it seem just, any person aggrieved by an order of stay made by the Court from whose decision the appeal is preferred may apply to the appellate Court to have the orders set aside.”**

**Order 42, rule 6** states:

**“No order for stay of execution shall be made under sub-rule (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.”**

The appellants need to satisfy the Court on the following conditions before they can be granted the stay orders:

1. Substantial loss may result to the applicant unless the order is made.
2. The application has been made without unreasonable delay, and
3. Such security as the Court orders for the due performance of the decree or order as may ultimately be binding on the applicant has been given by the applicant.

The principles governing the exercise of the court’s jurisdiction are now well settled. Firstly, the intended appeal should not be frivolous or put another way, the applicants must show that they have an arguable appeal; and second, this Court should ensure that the appeal, if successful, should not be rendered nugatory. These principles were well stated in the case of **Reliance Bank Ltd (In Liquidation) vs. Norlake Investments Ltd – Civil Appl. No. Nai. 93/02 (UR)**, thus:

*“Hitherto, this Court has consistently maintained that for an application under rule 5(2) (b) to succeed, the applicant must satisfy the court on two matters, namely:-*

1. *That the appeal or intended appeal is an arguable one, that is, that it is not a frivolous appeal,*
2. *That if an order of stay or injunction, as the case may be, is not granted, the appeal, or the intended appeal, were it to succeed, would have been rendered nugatory by the refusal to grant the stay or the injunction.”*

The question of stay pending appeal has been canvassed at length in various authorities, such as in the Court of Appeal decision in **Chris Munga N. Bichange Vs Richard Nyagaka Tongi & 2 Others eKLR** where the Learned Judges stated the principles to be applied in considering an application for stay of execution as thus:-

**“..... The law as regards applications for stay of execution, stay of proceedings or injunction is now well settled. The applicant who would succeed upon such an application must persuade the court on two limbs, which are first, that his appeal or intended appeal is arguable, that is to say it is not frivolous. Secondly, that if the application is not granted, the success of the appeal, were it to succeed, would be rendered nugatory. These two limbs must both be demonstrated and it would not be enough that only one is demonstrated.....”**

In the case of **Mohamed Salim T/A Choice Butchery Vs Nasserpuria Memon Jamat (2013) eKLR**, the court stated that:-

**“That right of appeal must be balanced against an equally weighty right, that of the plaintiff to enjoy the fruits of the judgment delivered in his favour. There must be a just cause for depriving the plaintiff of that right .....**”

We are further guided by this court’s decision in **Carter & Sons Ltd vs Deposit Protection Fund Board & 2 Others Civil Appeal No. 291 of 1997, at Page 4** as follows:

*“ . . . the mere fact that there are strong grounds of appeal would not, in itself, justify an order for stay. . .the applicant must establish a sufficient cause; secondly the court must be satisfied that substantial loss would ensue from a refusal to grant a stay; and thirdly the applicant must furnish security, and the application must, of course, be made without unreasonable delay.”*

From the grounds, the applicant/defendant was aggrieved by the order/judgment Kakamega Environment & Land Court Cause No. 50 of 2016 delivered on 26/9/2018. That the defendant/applicant had filed his Notice of appeal pending compiling appeal record. This **court is not persuaded, that the appeal or intended appeal is arguable, that is to say it is not frivolous. Secondly, I am not persuaded that if the application is not granted, the success of the appeal, were it to succeed, would be rendered nugatory.** I find that the applicant has not fulfilled any of the grounds to enable me grant the stay. I find this application has no merit and I dismiss it with costs.

It is so ordered.

**DELIVERED, DATED AND SIGNED AT KAKAMEGA IN OPEN COURT THIS 27<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY 2019.**

**N.A. MATHEKA**

**JUDGE**