



Karani & another v Director of Public Prosecution (Criminal Revision E341 of 2025) [2025] KEHC 16390 (KLR) (14 November 2025) (Ruling)

Neutral citation: [2025] KEHC 16390 (KLR)

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA
IN THE HIGH COURT AT ELDORET
CRIMINAL REVISION E341 OF 2025
RN NYAKUNDI, J
NOVEMBER 14, 2025
CORAM: BEFORE JUSTICE R. NYAKUNDI
M/S SIDI KIRENGE FOR THE STATE**

BETWEEN

JOHN KARANI 1ST APPLICANT

EMMANUEL SHIKUKU 2ND APPLICANT

AND

DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTION RESPONDENT

RULING

1. The Applicants were charged of trafficking in narcotic drugs contrary to Section 4(a)(ii) of the Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances Control (Amended) Act No. 4 of 2022. The brief facts are on the 31st day of May 2025, in Jua kali area Turbo Sub County within Uasin Gishu County was found trafficking in narcotic drugs namely cannabis (bhang) to wit 2.023kgs (2023 grams) valued at Kshs. 101,150/= by storing in their mabati residential house in contravention of the said act. He pleaded guilty to the offence convicted and sentenced to 6 years imprisonment.

Decision

2. This application has been considered under Art 50(2)(p)(q), 6(a)(b) as read with Section 362 & 364 of the Criminal Procedure Code.
3. The guiding principles on review of sentence post-conviction is well articulated by the Court of Appeal in Bernard Gacheru v Republic [2002] eKLR the Court held that:

“It is now settled law, following several authorities by this Court and by the high Court, that sentence is a matter that rests in the discretion of the trial Court. Similarly, sentence must



depend on the facts of each case. On appeal, the appellate Court will not easily interfere with sentence unless, the sentence is manifestly excessive in the circumstances of the case, or that the trial Court overlooked some material factor, or took into account some wrong material, or acted on a wrong principle. Even if, the Appellate Court might itself not have passed that sentence, these alone are not sufficient grounds for interfering with the discretion of the trial Court on sentence unless, anyone of the matters already states is shown to exist.”

4. This was also the position taken by the Court in *S vs. Malgas* 2001 (1) SACR 469 (SCA) held that:

“A Court exercising appellate jurisdiction cannot, in the absence of material misdirection by the trial Court, approach the question of sentence as if it were the trial Court and then substitute the sentence arrived at by it simply because it prefers it. To do so would be to usurp the sentencing discretion of the trial Court...However, even in the absence of material misdirection, an appellate Court may yet be justified in interfering with the sentence imposed by the trial Court. It may do so when the disparity between the sentence of the trial Court and the sentence which the appellate Court would have imposed had it been the trial Court is so marked that it can properly be described as “shocking”, “startling” or “disturbingly inappropriate”

5. The doctrine of proportionality in sentencing is one of the fundamental aspect which actually must define the trial Courts discretion in imposing a fair and appropriate sentence. The Court in *Tarry v Pryce* (1987) 24 A Crim R 394, 402 had this to say:

Although the discretionary aspect of sentencing is of great importance, there is to my mind no doubt that there is scope for a more scientific approach. A lack of consistency between sentencers dealing with run-of-the-mill cases cannot be supported by reliance on the discretionary power to sentence. The need for consistency in the punishment in like cases of like persons overrides the right of the sentencers to impose his idiosyncratic view.

6. From the foregoing, the factors that are relevant to the decision making of the issues raised in the application must be assessed within the principles which have been discussed elsewhere in this ruling. In matters of this nature, seriousness of a crime has two dimensions; harm and culpability. Harm refers to the injury done or risked by the act; culpability to the factors of intent, motive and circumstances that determine the extent to which the offender should be held accountable for the act.

7. In short the Applicant has not met the criteria to review the sentence imposed by the trial Court for the same has been fully served. Hence the subject matter is lost. As a consequence of which the application is dismissed under Section 382 the Criminal Procedure Code and the case file shall be marked as closed.

GIVEN UNDER MY HAND AND SEAL OF THIS COURT THIS 14TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2025

..... ..

R. NYAKUNDI
JUDGE

