



REPUBLIC OF KENYA



KENYA LAW
THE NATIONAL COUNCIL FOR LAW REPORTING
Where Legal Information is Public Knowledge

**Estok v Republic (Criminal Revision E299 of 2025)
[2025] KEHC 17983 (KLR) (3 December 2025) (Ruling)**

Neutral citation: [2025] KEHC 17983 (KLR)

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA
IN THE HIGH COURT AT ELDORET
CRIMINAL REVISION E299 OF 2025
RN NYAKUNDI, J
DECEMBER 3, 2025**

BETWEEN

MICHAEL ESTOK APPLICANT

AND

REPUBLIC RESPONDENT

RULING

1. The Applicant was charged with stealing contrary to Section 268(1) as read with Section 275 of the Penal Code. The brief facts of the particulars are that on the 30th day of July 2025 at around 0200hrs at Kipkaren River centre, Ngenyilet location Turbo sub-county within Uasin Gishu with others not before court stole one motor cycle make TVS HLX 100 Blue in colour Registration No. KMFU 899V valued at Ksh 55,000/= the property of Wellington Okoko Ainea. On the alternative charge he was charged with neglect to prevent a felony contrary to Section 392 of the Penal Code. The facts being that on the 30th day of July 2025 at Kipkaren River market Ngenylel location turbo Sub County within Uasin Gishu county failed to use all reasonable cause to prevent the theft of Motor cycle make TVS HLX 100 Blue in colour Registration No. KMFU 899V valued at Ksh 55,000/= the property of Wellington Okoko Ainea.
2. The Applicant was convicted on plea of guilty and was sentenced to serve 3 years imprisonment on 18th August 2025.

Decision

3. The Superior Courts have delved into the issue of sentencing which is one of the core functions of trial Courts within our Criminal justice system. In the Fatuma Hassan Salo v Republic [2006] eKLR Makhandia J as he then was remarked; Thus, the court should be guided by evidence and sound legal principles when it comes to the arrival of its decision. He also stated that the court should put into consideration all the relevant factors and exclude the irrelevant factors. In addition, the Court in Peter



M. Kariuki v Attorney General, [2016] eKLR also made the following observations; That a Court has been granted discretion in a manner that is both judicial and reasonable – not upon caprice or personal opinion. This has been emphasized in the judgments of other cases to be useful to the appeal court when analyzing the judgment of a Lower Court.

4. The Sentencing Guidelines of 2023 provide a foundation and a reference point for Judges and Magistrates in exercising discretion. The Policy Guidelines provides for a three-step approach that is to be applied by a trial Court in individualizing specific sentences befitting specific offences.
 - a. Sentencing options – The Court is meant to consider the sentencing options that are provided for by the statute where the crime falls under. This means a reference to the statute that provides for the crime in question.
 - b. Custodial v non-custodial – For the statutes that provide for both custodial and non-custodial options, the guidelines give principles that are to be considered in analyzing which of these two orders would be the most appropriate.
 - c. The third step is twofold, the choice that is to be considered depends on which option was made in step 3.
 - i. For a non-custodial sentence, the guidelines have also provided a policy through which the Courts discretion is to be applied in choosing the most appropriate non-custodial sentence and eventually mitigation and aggravating circumstances are expected to be put into consideration
 - ii. For imprisonment, the same applies, that the guidelines have provided for a policy to be used in determining how long the term of imprisonment should be after the consideration of aggravating and mitigating circumstances.
5. A proper recrafted legal framework is needed to meet the challenging task of appropriate sentencing given the disparities on the various sanctions of what one considers to be the same offence with the prescribed sentence by the Legislature.
6. Having been in this space as a legal professional involved in adjudication of cases within the scope of criminal law, I am of the view that there is an urgent need to carefully study other theories or objectives of sentencing when it come to punishment in order to determine which ones are acceptable as justifications for punishing the various wrongdoers in specific offences. It serves no purpose to put emphasis on deterrence and abandon the rehabilitative principle or objective if it is thoughtlessly just replaced without very clear guidelines or reasons. There are those who maintain that every different punitive measure taken by the various Courts can be satisfied by a single sentencing scheme, but practically it is difficult to accomplish transformative justice on sentencing by placing emphasis on just one objective. The Courts in Kenya tend to hinge more towards deterrence of an offender than rehabilitation. The common philosophical justifications for the institutional punishments include the following:
 - a. Retribution – punishment is justified merely because the offender has committed a wrong.
 - b. Deterrence – punishment is justified in order to clear the offender from committing further crimes in the future and to deter other members of society in general.
 - c. Rehabilitation – the offender needs to be rehabilitated so that he will behave in a socially acceptable manner.
 - d. Incapacitation – justifies the incarceration of the offender for the protection of society.



- e. Condemnation – the infliction of punishment upon the guilty person is the symbolic condemnation by society of the individual.
7. The Maximum Prisons facilities in Kenya were designed to hold fewer people than they do at the moment. Apparently, the correctional facilities do not have adequate infrastructure to hold the additional population of inmates hence there is an urgent need to revisit the issue of sentencing regime in Kenya to avoid a catastrophe so that petty offenders should be a subject of non-custodial sentences. It is trite that under the rehabilitative theory judicial discretion has been quite abroad, based on the idea that the punishment should fit the criminal and not the crime. Sentencing should be “individualized” depending upon such factors as the particular circumstances of the crime, the prisoner’s previous criminal record, and the chances that another crime will be committed. Consequently, the Judge or Magistrate must have a great deal of discretion in order to treat offenders on a more individual basis.
8. I have reviewed the record of this application as reviewed and the same seems to have been compromised during the pendency of the processing of the typed proceedings rendering the Applicant to comply with the order of trial court on sentencing. The Application is therefore dismissed under Section 382 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

DELIVERED, DATED AND SIGNED AT ELDORET ON THIS 3RD DAY OF DECEMBER, 2025

.....

R. NYAKUNDI
JUDGE

