

- 2) *AN order barring the 6th Respondent from interviewing the 3rd on 7th and 8th December 2023 for the position of the vice chancellor of the 1st Respondent until this petition is determined.*
- 3) *A declaration that the advertisement, short listing, interviewing and confirmation of the 3rd Respondent as Professor of Sociology MAC 15 contravened the law and hence constitute an abuse of office and is null and void.*
- 4) *A declaration that the committee that interviewed the 3rd Respondent was not properly constituted to undertake the exercise envisaged in Statutes 3 (2, b) of the 1st Respondent.*
- 5) *An order compelling the 1st, 2nd, 3rd Respondents to produce the names of both the long and short lists of persons who applied for the position of Professor of Sociology MAC 15.*
- 6) *6) An order compelling the 1st, 2nd, 3rd Respondents to produce the minutes containing names of persons who interviewed the 3rd Defendant for the position of Professor of Sociology MAC 15.*
- 7) *An order compelling the Respondents to produce the letter appointing and or promoting the 3rd Respondent to position of full Professor of Sociology at the 1st Respondent's institution.*
- 8) *A declaration that the conduct of the Respondents to vary the terms of service of the 3rd Respondent from a five (5) year fixed term contract to permanent and pensionable breached the law.*

- 9) 9) A declaration that the Respondents do not have powers to vary the terms of service of the 3rd Respondent from a five-year fixed term contract to permanent and pensionable.
- 10) A declaration that the advertisement, short listing of the candidates for the position of Professor of Sociology MAC 15 contravened the Constitutional and statutory rights to fair labour practices.
- 11) A declaration that the advertisement, short listing and interviewing of the 3rd Respondent for the Position of Professor of Sociology MAC 15 constitute corrupt practices by the 2nd, 3rd, Respondents who are public officer and offend the intent and the spirit of Section 11 (1) and (2 c) of the Public Officers Ethics Act that bars the 3rd Respondents from conferring a benefit on himself or any member of the University Management Board.
- 12) An order prohibiting the 3rd Respondent from assuming office of Professor of Sociology MAC 15 or any other office of the 1st Respondent as long as that position was/is advertised and interviewed for when he was/is serving as the Deputy Vice Chancellor in charge of Academic Affairs, Research and Innovation of the 1st Respondent.
- 13) An order quashing the advertisement, short listing, interviewing and promotion of the 3rd Respondent to the position of Professor of Sociology MAC 15.
- 14) An order barring the Respondents from conferring any benefits on the 3rd Respondents including acting

Vice Chancellor and or professor of Sociology Grade 15 of the 1st Respondent.

15) An order barring the 1st and 2nd Respondents from hiring, instructing, retaining and or settling legal representation for the 3rd Respondent.

16) A permanent order barring the 3rd Respondents from holding public office in the Republic of Kenya.

17) Cost of this suit.

Petitioner's Case

2 The Petitioner avers that the Respondents caused to be advertised the position of Professor of Sociology and whose file number is Professor-MAC 15. The roles of the Professor of Sociology envisaged in the advertisement run counter to that provided in the 1st Respondent Statutes and Charter as it created a super professor who knows science, technology, laboratories, workshops and studios. Among other roles, the professor attends staff and students' disciplinary meetings, senate meetings, graduation planning meetings.

3 The Petitioner avers that these roles were prepared by the University Management Board where the 2nd and 3rd Respondents sit as executive members.

4 The 3rd Respondent, as divisional head of the academic is tasked with drafting of advertisements positions, roles and even job descriptions of offices within the division, which

the Petitioner presumes he accomplished by drafting and signing off the said advertisement.

- 5 The Petitioner avers that the 3rd Respondent used his position to draft, the advertisement for the position of Professor of Sociology MAC 15 so that it could exclude anyone else within the Sub Sahara region as he is interested in occupying office of the Vice Chancellor and or promoting himself as full professor of the 1st Respondent once the former falls vacant at the end of 2023.
- 6 It is the Petitioner's case that following the advertisement, the 3rd Respondent, who still has had a running fixed term contract at the 1st Respondent, forwarded his papers to be considered for the position. On receiving the job applications, the 2nd Respondent caused for verification and short listing of persons to be interviewed, however, due to the couching, phrasing and ring-fencing, the 3rd Respondent was the only person shortlisted to be interviewed for the position.
- 7 The Petitioner avers that the 4th Respondent vide a media advertisement dated 26th October 2023, titled "Vacant positions in the public universities", declared vacancies in the offices of the vice chancellor and two positions for deputy vice chancellors of the 1st Respondent.
- 8 The Petitioner avers that the 3rd Respondent is an Associate Professor of Sociology at Grade 14 on leave of absence from the University of Nairobi after he was

appointed to the 1st Respondent as Deputy Vice Chancellor in Charge of Academic Affairs, Research and Innovation on a fixed term contract, a position which is ranked as the highest academic level and whose roles do not include teaching and or research as the same is purely administrative.

- 9 The Petitioner avers that Schedule 3 (2, b) of the 1st Respondent's Statutes provide for the appointment of Professor, including the membership of the appointment committee which includes the: chairman of the 1st Respondent's Council; two members of the 1st Respondent's Council; the 2nd Respondent; Deputy Vice Chancellors including the 3rd Respondents; Dean of Faculty; two members of the senate appointed by the 2nd Respondent; chairperson of the Department; Finance Officer and Registrars. However, the committee was not properly constituted to undertake the exercise.
- 10 It is the Petitioner's case that the offices of the Registrar in charge of Research and Innovation and Finance Officers have not been filled for the last ten years; and the Dean of Faculty and the Head of the Department of Sociology were not invited to the interviewing panel.
- 11 The Petitioner avers that he wrote to the 2nd Respondent asking for list of persons who interviewed the 3rd Respondent, however, the 2nd Respondent refused or declined to share the same.

- 12 It is the Petitioner's case that though the 1st Respondent's statutes provide that the occupant of the office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor shall hold office for a period of five years and is renewable once subject to the recommendation of the Council of the 1st Respondent, the Respondents have attempted to use their offices to vary the terms of service of 3rd Respondent by creating, couching and ring-fencing the qualifications and roles of a Professor of Sociology MAC 15 to favour him despite the fact that he is due to retire as Deputy Vice Chancellor in charge of Academic Affairs, Research and Innovation.
- 13 The Petitioner asserts that the 3rd Respondent wants to use his office to create and infer a position to himself known as Professor of Sociology Grade 15 while he is still holding office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor in charge of Academic Affairs, Research and Innovation.
- 14 The Petitioner avers that the 3rd Respondent's roles include chairing Students Disciplinary Committee of the 1st Respondent and during his 10 year tenure he has demonstrated lack of empathy, human conscience and mentorship spirit while discharging his duties. Though he is an associate Professor of Sociology and an ordained church minister, he has not utilised his knowledge in sociology to resolve the small offences committed by students who are barely out of teenage.

- 15 It is the Petitioner's case that the 3rd Respondent, as the chairman of Students Disciplinary Committee, has expelled, suspended, over 500 students for offences that are prone to young people who need guidance and counselling. In a single sitting that he presided over, he recommended deregistration, discontinuation or expulsion of 32 students from the 1st Respondent without ever invoking judicial discretion or recommending less punitive punishment.
- 16 Additionally, as the chairman of Students Disciplinary Committee of the 1st Respondent, the 3rd Respondent, has not used his position to set up a working Students' Guidance and Counselling Department to aid students with social challenges but instead has invoked a crusade like cleansing and purging.
- 17 The Petitioner avers that the Faculty of Arts does not have a provision for a full professor and the 1st and 2nd Respondent have never brought to attention of the Petitioner or staff that the Statutes have been repealed, amended, ousted, changed or varied to allow a staff on a fixed term contract to promote, appoint and transfer his services to permanent and pensionable.
- 18 He avers that they expected the 3rd Respondent to complete his last year of his five-year fixed term contract and proceed on terminal leave before resuming his duties at the University of Nairobi.

- 19 He avers that the 2nd and 3rd Respondents have not found the need to promote and or confirm offices of University Librarian, Chief Legal Officer, Finance Officer, Registrar Research and Innovation among others since 2013 when they assumed office. The Respondents allowed these office holders to receive acting allowances beyond the six (6) months period provided under section C14 (1) of the Public Service Commission Human Resource Policies and Procedures Manual dated May, 2016. This denies the acting officers the legitimate expectation to be confirmed and hold office substantially thus violating their legitimate expectation of fair labour practices.
- 20 The Petitioner avers that the Respondents' action of varying the terms of service of the 3rd Respondent from a five-year fixed contract to permanent and pensionable breaches the provision of Statutes 2, 3, 5, 9, of the 1st Respondent.
- 21 Further, by allowing the 3rd Respondent to create a ring-fenced position of a Professor of Sociology Grade 15, the Respondents have shown biasness in violation of Articles 27 and 47 of the Constitution and Section 4 of the Fair Administrative Actions Act providing a right to efficient administrative action. It also offends the intent and the spirit of Section 11 (1) and (2 c) of the Public Officers Ethics Act which bars the 3rd Respondents from conferring a benefit on himself or any member of the University Management Board._

3rd Respondent's Case

- 22 In opposition to the Petition, the 3rd Respondents filed a Replying Affidavits dated 20th September 2024.
- 23 The 3rd Respondent avers that the Amended Petition is an abuse of court process as it is clearly intended to influence or guide the process of recruitment of a Vice Chancellor of the Multimedia University, a process which is ongoing as guided by the Universities Act and other applicable laws and regulations.
- 24 The 3rd Respondent avers that the Petitioner has never complained about any administrative issue within the management of the university to the established forums of first instance being the university senate and council under the university statutes before coming to court. It is trite law that a party aggrieved by any administrative action on the part of a public body must invoke the internal dispute resolution mechanisms in the first instance before coming to court. The petition is incompetent and should be struck out.
- 25 The 3rd Respondents avers that the petition are personal attacks on his character, academic qualifications and competence as a Professor of Sociology as well as a former Deputy Vice Chancellor of the university which are untrue in fact and not founded on any evidence.

- 26 The 3rd Respondent contends that the allegations are a figment of the Petitioner's imagination intended to taint his character and also promote his clearly preferred candidate for the position of Vice Chancellor which is apparent from the pleadings and the amendments made to the petition.
- 27 The 3rd Respondent avers that he was invited for an interview for the position for the Office of Vice Chancellor by the 4th Respondent, together with other candidates. He is aware that the results thereof were relayed to the Council of the 1st respondent for consideration and that the court should be guided only by the recommendations of the Public Service Commission and which have also been omitted from this petition.
- 28 The 3rd Respondent avers that the petition raise completely unrelated issues and the Petitioner appears to be generally complaining and ranting about how the university is managed and which cannot find basis of constitutional petition. The petition does not make any specific allegations and set out particulars of violations against him.

4th Respondent's Case

- 29 The 4th Respondent filed a replying affidavit dated 14th October 2024 sworn by its Secretary/CEO, Paul Famba, MBS.

30 The 4th Respondents avers that Section 35 (1) of the Universities Act Cap. 210 provides that:

“In addition to the provisions of its Charter, a university shall establish the following organs of governance or their equivalent—

(a) a Council, which shall—

(i) employ staff;

(ii) approve the statutes of the University and cause them to be published in the Kenya Gazette;

(iii) approve the policies of the University;

(iv) approve the budget;

(v) in the case of public universities, appoint Vice-Chancellor, Deputy Vice-Chancellors and Principals and Deputy Principals of Constituent Colleges, in consultation with the Cabinet Secretary, after a competitive process conducted by the Public Service Commission; and

(vi) undertake other functions set out under this Act and the Charter.”

31 In exercise of this mandate, the 4th Respondent advertised for the positions of Vice Chancellor, Deputy Vice Chancellor-Academic Affairs, Research and Innovation and Deputy Vice Chancellor- Administration, Finance and Planning of the 1st Respondent on 26th October 2023.

32 The 4th Respondents avers that it processed the recruitment for the position of Vice Chancellor and forwarded the final report to the Chairperson of the

University Council through a letter dated 15th December, 2023.

- 33 It is the 4th Respondent's case that the Court cannot issue order 1 and 2 as sought by the Petitioner in his Amended Petition as the same have been overtaken by events.
- 34 The 4th Respondent avers that the Amended Petition is unmeritorious, bad in law and thus be dismissed with costs to it.

Petitioner's Submissions

- 35 The Petitioner submitted that on four issues: whether the advertisement of the position of Vice-Chancellor at the 1st Respondents institution followed the due process in a manner consistent with the law; whether the 3rd Respondent was qualified to hold the position of a Professor of sociology at the time he was still a Deputy Vice Chancellor at the 1st Respondent; whether the 3rd Respondent's appointment by the 1st , 2nd and 4th met integrity test, and the values and principles of public service, under Article 232 of the Constitution and Public interest; and whether the Petitioner is entitled to cost.
- 36 On the first issue, the Petitioner submitted that the 3rd Respondent, as divisional head of the academic of the 1st Respondent, was expected to take a lead role in drafting of advertisements for the positions. These would include

roles and even job descriptions of offices within the division and the Petitioner believes that the 3rd Respondent executed the task.

37 It was submitted that though the 3rd Respondent was not in charge of human resources, finance and or administration affairs of the 1st Respondent, he signed off the said advertisement and went ahead to shortlist the candidates as the divisional head. To that effect, the Petitioner invited the court to peruse the signatures in the 3rd Respondent Application Letter dated 14th November 2023 contained in the 4th Respondent's Replying Affidavit and Notice of External Vacancy Advertisement dated 7th November 2022.

38 The Petitioner submitted that 4th Respondent filed a replying Affidavit dated 11th February 2025 and attached the CV and Application letter of the 3rd Respondent. In the said letter, the 3rd Respondent admits in the introductory paragraph that *"since 2014, I work at Multimedia University of Kenya as the Deputy Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs, Research and Innovation."* Thus, from his own written words, it is clear that the 3rd Respondent, who was still running fixed term contract at the 1st Respondent, forwarded his papers to be considered for the position of Professor of Sociology MAC 15.

- 39 Reliance was placed in ***Kithuka v Meru University of Science & Technology (Employment and Labour Relations Petition E001 of 2023) [2024] KEELRC 298 (KLR) (16 February 2024) (Judgment)*** wherein the court held that: - *“the impugned recruitment and appointment of the two officers was done contrary to the national values and principles of governance and public service as enshrined under Article 10 and 232 of the Constitution. It was also done contrary to the principles of leadership and integrity as enshrined under Article 73 read with Article 80 of the Constitution. Since the said appointments were inconsistent with the Constitution, then the same were unconstitutional, null and void ab initio.”*
- 40 The Petitioner submitted that the 2nd Respondent issued a memo to the staff of the 1st Respondent on 1st January 2024, appointing Prof R.O Maranga as acting Deputy Vice Chancellor Academic Affairs, Research and Innovation a position held by the 3rd Respondent who had suddenly moved to Faculty of Arts and Technology as a professor of sociology. It therefore follows that the 3rd Respondent could only become a full professor of Sociology on or after 1st January 2024.
- 41 It is the Petitioner’s submission that the advertisement, short listing, interviewing and confirmation of the 3rd Respondent as Professor of Sociology MAC 15 contravened the law and hence constituted an abuse of office, null and void.

- 42 The Petitioner submitted that the Respondents actions demonstrated acts of biasness in violation of Articles 27 and 47 of the Constitution and Section 4 of the Fair Administrative Actions Act on right to fair and efficient administrative action.
- 43 The Petitioner submitted that the Respondents are duty bound to act with high standards of professionalism and make appointments under the provisions of the Constitution, Employment Act, Public Service Act, Public Officers and Ethics Act, Leadership and Integrity Act, Ethics and Anti-Corruption Act, Universities Act, Multimedia University Charter and Statutes which promote open and competitive processes in order to bring honour and dignity to the State and the office. The said recruitment process was opaque and did not promote public confidence and the integrity of the office of the vice- chancellor and the Respondents acted without compliance with due process and contrary to the values and principles enshrined in the Constitution.
- 44 On the second issue, the Petitioner submitted that the 4th Respondent vide media advertisement dated 26th October 2023, declared vacancies in the offices of the vice-chancellor and two positions for deputy vice chancellors of the 1st Respondent. The 3rd Respondent, who was still an Associate Professor on leave of absence from the University of Nairobi applied for the said position and he was shortlisted by the 4th Respondent although it required

one to have been a full professor; not an associate professor.

45 The Petitioner submitted that the position of a deputy vice chancellor is ranked as the highest administrative office in academic division of the 1st Respondent. The roles of a deputy vice chancellor as performed by the 3rd Respondent did not include teaching and/or researching as the same were purely administrative duties

46 The Petitioner further submitted that the court should take judicial notice of the failure by the Respondents to comply with the directions on Notice to Produce Documents. In their replies to Notice to Produce Documents, the Respondents did not tender the letter appointing the 3rd Respondent to the position of full Professor of Sociology, resignation letter of the 3rd Respondent from the office of the Deputy Vice Chancellor in charge of Academic Affairs, Research and Innovation or appointment letter issued by the 1st Respondent employing the 3rd Respondent as the Deputy Vice Chancellor in charge of Academic Affairs, Research and Innovation.

47 It is the Petitioner's submission that the advertisement, short listing and interviewing of the 3rd Respondent for the Position of Professor of Sociology MAC 15 constitute corrupt practices by the Respondents who are public officer and offend the intent and the spirit of Section 11 (1) and (2 c) of the Public Officers Ethics Act on no improper enrichment that: - *"A public officer shall not use*

his office to improperly enrich himself or others; Without limiting the generality of subsection (1), a public officer shall not—(c) For the personal benefit of himself or another, use or allow the use of information that is acquired in connection with the public officer’s duties and that is not public.” Therefore, the law clearly bars the Respondent from conferring a benefit on himself or any member of the University Management.

48 The Petitioner submitted that it was illegal and un-procedural for the 3rd Respondent to be interviewed and be allowed to assume the office of Professor of Sociology MAC 15 or any other office of the 1st Respondent as long as that position was advertised and interviewed for when he was serving as the Deputy Vice Chancellor in charge of Academic Affairs, Research and Innovation of the 1st Respondent on fixed term contract.

49 The Petitioner cited ***Asiago v Mbatia & 2 others (Petition E075 of 2024) [2024] KEELRC 2441 (KLR)(4 October 2024) (Ruling)*** where the court upheld or granted an order restraining the 1st Respondent (the 3rd Respondent herein) from accepting or assuming appointment or carrying out any functions of the vice chancellor of the 2nd respondent university as he fails to meet the standard’s outlined in chapter 6 of the Constitution of Kenya, 2010. It is the Petitioner’s case that this ruling impeached the character of the 3rd Respondent and that court considers the said ruling in the Asiago case.

50 On the third issue, the Petitioner submitted that the committee that interviewed the 3rd respondent was not properly constituted to undertake the exercise envisaged in Statutes 3 (2, b) of the 1st Respondent, a position that has not been rebutted by the Respondents. the offices of the Registrar in charge of Research and Innovation and that of Finance Officers had not been filled for the last ten years or by the time the interviews were said to be done. Further, the Deputy Vice Chancellor in charge of Academic Affairs, Research and Innovation, who is the 3rd Respondent was required to sit in the interview as the titular head of academic division of the 1st Respondent. But ironically, he was at the interviewee chair.

51 It is the Petitioner's submission that There is no evidence that senate of the 1st Respondent seconded another person of similar or higher rank to sit in the space of the 3rd Respondent during the interview of the 3rd Respondent. The Petitioner thus contends that the 3rd Respondent interviewed himself.

52 The Petitioner further submitted that there is no evidence that the Dean of Faculty of Arts and Technology and the Head of the Department of Sociology were invited to the interviewing panel. The drafters of the 1st Respondent statutes did not foresee a situation where the Dean of Arts and Technology and Head of Department would be interviewing the Deputy Vice Chancellor, who is their boss, for position of a full professor.

- 53 The Petitioner submitted that it is unlawful for interviewing and promoting the 3rd Respondent to the position of full professor of Sociology at Grade 15 while still holding the position of Deputy Vice Chancellor in charge of Academic Affairs, Research and Innovation of the 1st Respondent, the 3rd Respondent was engaged in two gainful employments.
- 54 The Petitioner submitted that the 1st and 2nd Respondents ostensibly repealed, amended, ousted, changed or varied the Statutes of the 1st Respondent to allow a staff on a fixed term contract to enjoy two different employments tenures of fixed term contract as deputy vice chancellor and permanent and pensionable position of a full professor of sociology without losing the benefits of either one of them.
- 55 The Petitioner submitted that the 1st and 2nd Respondents did not have powers to vary the terms of service of the 3rd Respondent from a five-year fixed term contract to permanent and pensionable contrary to Statutes 2, 3, 5, 9, of the 1st Respondent institution without following the law that required the 3rd Respondent to tender a six (6) month resignation notice or pay the 1st Respondent money equivalent to six-month salary.
- 56 On costs, the Petitioner placed reliance in ***Morgan Air Cargo Limited v Evrest Enterprises Limited [2014] eKLR*** wherein the court noted that; *“The exercise of the discretion, however, depends on the circumstances of each case. Therefore, the law in designing the legal*

phrase that “cost follow the event” was driven by the fact that there could be no “one-size-fit-all” situation on the matter. That is why section 27(1) of the Civil Procedure Act is couched the way it appears in the statute; and even all literally works and judicial decisions on costs have recognized this fact and were guided by and decided on the facts of the case respectively. Needless to state, circumstances differ from case to case.”

- 57 The 3rd respondent filed their submissions on 4/11/2025 which was late considering the ruling of the court on 29/9/25 where the court declined to grant the respondents more time to file their submissions considering their failure to file submissions due directions of 24/7/25 and further of 22/9/25. In the circumstances, this court did to take into consideration the said submissions of the 3rd respondent filed on 4/11/25.
- 58 That notwithstanding, this court has considered the documents of the parties and submissions filed by the petitioners.
- 59 The main complaint by the petitioners exemplified in the amended petition is that the respondent advertised for position of Vice Chancellor, DVC (Academic affairs, Research and Innovation) and Deputy Vice Chancellor (Administration and Finance of the 1st respondent). He contends that among the requirements for one to be a Vice Chancellor, of the 1st respondent is that one must be

a full professor a qualification which the 3rd respondent does not possess.

60 He averred that the advert was also schewed in favour of the 3rd respondent. I have looked at the advertisement for the position of Vice Chancellor, published pursuant to the provision of section 35(1) (a) (v) of the Universities Act 2012 amended through statute law (Miscellaneous amendments) act No 18 of 2018 by the Public Service Commission.

61 It is indeed true that the holder of the office of Vice Chancellor, was to be at least a full professor in a university recognized in Kenya amongst other qualifications. It is also true that the 3rd respondent herein Prof Paul Mbatia was one of the shortlisted candidates and was scheduled for interview on 7/12/2023 under the University statute.

62 As to whether the 3rd respondent possessed qualifications for appointment or not, in the replying affidavit in opposition to the petition the 3rd respondent averred that he was promoted to full Professor of Sociology at Multi Media University in 2023. He indicated that he has over 30 years of academic and research.

63 The PSC the 4th respondent herein aver that they processed the advertisements and as per their letter of 15th December 2023 they indicate they conducted the interviews and made their recommendation to the

Chairman of the University Council for appointments to be made in consultation with the Cabinet Secretary for Education. The 3rd respondent further averred that he possesses the requisite qualifications for appointment as VC as he held a full Professor's position since 2023.

64 The applicant aver that the 3rd respondent was never qualified for the position of VC which is denied by the 3rd and 4th respondents and the onus of proving otherwise rests on one who alleges otherwise. There is no any evidence to the contrary that the 3rd respondent was not a qualified candidate for position of VC and the 4th respondent shortlisted and recommended for appointment of VC of the 3rd respondent on that understanding. The averment that the 3rd respondent did not possess the qualification for appointment as VC is therefore without any evidence or proof. It is also true that the petition sought prayers to bar interviewing of the 3rd respondent on 7th and 8th December 2023 which prayers have been overtaken by events.

65 The petition also sought an order to quash the advertisement, shortlisting, interviewing and promotion of 3rd respondent to the position of professor of sociology MAC 15 and also an order to prohibit him from assuming office of professor of sociology MAC 15 amongst other prayers. All these prayers have actually been overtaken by events as the shortlisting, interviewing of the 3rd as VC took place and there is no indication that there is any interview for him as professor of sociology MAC 15 nor

even assumption of office of professor of sociology MAC 15.

66 The petitioner has not in any event demonstrated the constitutional breaches he avers were breached as envisaged under the constitution and as per **Anarita Kiriimi** case, the petition must therefore fail on that account. I therefore find the petition not merited and is dismissed accordingly. There shall be no order of costs.

Dated, Signed and Delivered Virtually at Nairobi this 5th Day of November 2025.

**HELLEN WASILWA
JUDGE**