



**Republic v Kajiado County Land Adjudication and Settlement Officer & another;
 Ngaru & 10 others (Interested Parties); Nkama Group Ranch (Suing through
 its Registered Officials and Group Representatives being Kerempu Ole Kaata,
 Noonkileti Ole Kaiyaa, Storia Ole Tepatet) (Ex parte Applicant) (Judicial Review
 E002 of 2025) [2025] KEELC 8582 (KLR) (3 December 2025) (Judgment)**

Neutral citation: [2025] KEELC 8582 (KLR)

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA
 IN THE ENVIRONMENT AND LAND COURT AT KAJIADO**

JUDICIAL REVIEW E002 OF 2025

LC KOMINGOI, J

DECEMBER 3, 2025

**IN THE MATTER OF: THE IRREGULAR EXERCISE OF POWER
 AND DISCRETION BY THE PURPORTED APPOINTMENT AND/OR
 ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE “TRUSTEES” OF NKAMA GROUP RANCH BY
 THE KAJIADO COUNTY LAND ADJUDICATION & SETTLEMENT OFFICER.**

**IN THE MATTER OF: JUDICIAL REVIEW PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO ARTICLE
 47 AND 162 (2) (B) OF THE CONSTITUTION OF KENYA, SECTIONS 13 (2) AND (7) (B)
 AND (H) OF THE ENVIRONMENT & LAND COURT ACT, SECTIONS 4, 7 & 9 OF THE
 FAIR ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS ACT, SECTION 8 AND 9 OF THE LAW REFORM ACT
 AND ORDER 53 RULE 1 OF THE CIVIL PROCEDURE (AMENDMENT) RULES, 2020.**

**IN THE MATTER OF: AN APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO APPLY FOR JUDICIAL
 REVIEW ORDERS OF DECLARATION, CERTIORARI, MANDAMUS & PROHIBITION.**

BETWEEN

REPUBLIC PROSECUTION

AND

**KAJIADO COUNTY LAND ADJUDICATION AND SETTLEMENT
 OFFICER 1ST RESPONDENT**

ATTORNEY GENERAL 2ND RESPONDENT

AND

TAIKO OLE MONGOINE NGARU INTERESTED PARTY

SALAASH RISA NAKAYA INTERESTED PARTY

MARAO OLE KISAMPEI MPARO INTERESTED PARTY



MATINKOE OLE LEKAPU KORUTA INTERESTED PARTY
MANKUSHA OLE MOROSUA INTERESTED PARTY
SEET OLE KINGERRERE KAILOL INTERESTED PARTY
RISIET NTITANIAN NAKIOOI INTERESTED PARTY
PARTEYIE OLE MURUNCHA TIMAIYO INTERESTED PARTY
ITA OLE SOLITEI SIMINTEI INTERESTED PARTY
LEMAAMA OLE KIPOLONGA INTERESTED PARTY
PARTEYIE EMMANUEL OSHUMU INTERESTED PARTY

AND

**NKAMA GROUP RANCH (SUING THROUGH ITS REGISTERED
OFFICIALS AND GROUP REPRESENTATIVES BEING KEREMPU
OLE KAATA, NOONKILETI OLE KAIYAA, STORIA OLE
TEPATET) EX PARTE APPLICANT**

JUDGMENT

1. This Judgement is in respect of the Notice of Motion dated 5th February 2025 pursuant to the leave granted by this Court on 17th January 2025 for institution of Judicial Review proceedings against the Administrative decision of the 1st Respondent.
2. The Substantive Motion is brought pursuant to Article 47 and 162 (2) (b) of *the Constitution*; Sections 4, 7 and 9 of the Fair Administrative Actions Act; Sections 13 (2) and (7) (b) and (h) of the *Environment and Land Court Act*; Sections 4, 7 & 9 of the Fair Administrative Actions Act; Section 8 and 9 of the *Law Reform Act*; Order 53 Rule 1 of the Civil Procedure (Amendment) Rules, 2020, and all other enabling provisions of the law.
3. It seeks orders that:
 - i. Spent.
 - ii. A declaration be and is hereby made that the bona fide Group Representatives of Nkama Group Ranch are the persons listed in the Certificate of Incorporation of the Nkama Group Ranch dated 9th November 1993.
 - iii. An order of certiorari be and is hereby issued to bring into this Honourable Court for purposes of quashing the letters dated 17th December 2024 Ref. No. GR/KAJ/5/5/323 and 7th January 2025 Ref. No. GR/KAJ/5/5/324 issued by the Kajiado County Land Adjudication and Settlement Officer acknowledging the Interested Parties as trustees of Nkama Group Ranch.
 - iv. An order of mandamus be and is hereby issued and directed to the Kajiado County Land Adjudication and Settlement Officer compelling the Kajiado County Land Adjudication and Settlement Officer to recall any letters and/or notifications and/or instruments conferring upon the Interested Parties herein the status of officials and/or trustees of Nkama Group Ranch and mandating them to act as such.



- v. An order of prohibition be and is hereby issued restraining the Interested Parties from acting pursuant to the letters dated 17th December 2024 Ref. No. GR/KAJ/5/5/323 and 7th January 2025 Ref. No. GR/KAJ/5/5/324 and any other or further letters and/or notifications and/or instruments issued by the Kajiado County Land Adjudication and Settlement Officer conferring upon them the status of officials and/or trustees of Nkama Group Ranch, or in any other manner acting as officials and/or trustees of Nkama Group Ranch.
 - vi. Such further and/or other appropriate orders and/or reliefs that the Honourable Court may deem just and expedient to grant in the circumstances of the case.
4. The grounds are on the face of the application as set out in paragraphs 1 to 26. The Notice of Motion is supported by the sworn Affidavit of William Noonkileti Ole Kayiaa, the Secretary of the Ex parte Applicant herein.
 5. It is the Exparte Applicant's case that Nkama Group Ranch was incorporated and group representatives registered under the repealed Land (Group Representatives) Act. Through the application dated 27th September 1990, the Ex-Parte Applicant applied to dissolve the Group Ranch by subdividing the group land into individual holdings and allocating the land among its registered members. By a letter dated 21st November 1990, the Director for Land Adjudication consented to dissolve the Group Ranch and directed that the Officials of the Group Ranch remain in Office until the exercise of subdividing the land among all the registered members was over. Following this, the Group Ranch's land was subdivided and allocated among the registered members and title deeds issued. However, issuance of title deeds in respect of public utilities was still pending and no certificate of dissolution has ever been issued due to this pending issue.
 6. Through a letter dated 17th December 2024 Ref. No. GR/KAJ/5/5/323, the 1st Respondent - Kajiado County Land Adjudication and Settlement Officer- recognised the Interested Parties as the new trustees of Nkama Group Ranch and that they would work with them in winding up the Group Ranch activities. The letter further claimed that the Interested Parties had been mandated by a Court order to correct and finish the work left by the former Group Ranch Representatives following an election as Nkama Group Ranch Trustees by members of Nkama Group Ranch. By another letter dated 7th January 2025, the 1st Respondent directed the Chairman of Nkama Group Ranch to hand over any group document in his custody to the Interested Parties by 16th January 2025.
 7. The Ex parte Applicant claims that these letters illegally and unreasonably purported to remove the group officials from office and that the Interested Parties were not group members and could not hold any leadership positions. They were not the elected officials. It is also stated that the group ranches do not have trustees but officials or management committees, elected by members of the group ranch. Therefore, any alleged appointment in absence of a certificate from the 3rd Respondent confirming that the Interested Parties were the duly elected officials of the Group ranch, was illegal and irregular. The Applicant further claimed that the 2nd Respondent in the letter dated 5th April 2024 contested being aware of a category of officials of the Group ranch known as 'trustees'.
 8. The Exparte Applicant averred that in Kajiado MCELC No. E114 of 2024 Paul Salash Rissa and Others vs. Kerempu Ole Kaata and Others, the Court on 12th November 2024 issued a mandatory injunction compelling the parties to jointly appoint a surveyor to conduct an independent forensic audit of the shares in the Applicant to ascertain any unallocated shares. And that no court of law has ever acknowledged the Interested Parties as elected "trustees" of the Ex-Parte Applicant, or issued an order mandating the Interested parties, to correct and finish the work left by the former Group Ranch Representatives, as alleged in the Letters issued by the 1st Respondent.



9. As such, the 1st Respondent's administrative decision through the letters was unprocedural and illegal because no election had been conducted; and that no Court had issued any orders appointing, directing or mandating the Interested Parties to finish the Group Ranch's work. If the orders sought are therefore not granted, the Interested Parties would assume their alleged trustees role which would be prejudicial to the group ranch's affairs and the group ranch would suffer irreparable hardship disproportionate to what the respondents or Interested Parties would suffer.
10. The 1st Respondent in the Replying Affidavit sworn by Elizabeth N. Wekesa the Land Adjudication & Settlement Officer at Kajiado, contested the Application on grounds that Nkama Group Ranch was no longer in existence having been dissolved on 27th September 1990 through the consent for dissolution dated 21st November 1990. And that the representatives were to remain in office to facilitate transfer of individualized parcels of land to members after which they were to cease to hold office. However, according to the group ranch membership area list the ranch had 547 members however only 545 plots had been demarcated with 494 plots being allotted to the members leaving out 53 members without plots of land. She also deponed that the list was never matched with plot owners hence difficult to know the owners of specific parcels and whether they were members or non members.
11. Through the letters dated 15th February 2023 and 8th May 2024, the Exparte Applicant wrote to the Land Registrar seeking clarification on ownership which prompted the Land Registrar to seek further validation from the Land Adjudication Office but the area list was not of much assistance. In response to the letter dated 8th May 2024, and after consultation with different departments, the Adjudication officer was advised to ask the Applicants to avail names of the owners to be matched with parcel numbers so as to form a complete area list. A template of the format to be followed was issued to the Chairman but he failed/refused to provide the names and parcel numbers as requested. After further follow up and compilation of beneficiary list using information from other departments, it was discovered that some plots were vacant, un-numbered, some plots were numbered but without owners and one plot had been allocated to two persons. It was also discovered that the representatives had been selling part of the ranch without informing members, without reasons for the sale and without the sale being ratified in an Annual General Meeting.
12. The 1st Respondent therefore issued the letters under its mandate to safeguard members' interests pointing out that it was improper for the ranch to have vacant land while some of its members did not have land.
13. The 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th Respondents through the Replying Affidavit sworn by Salaash Nika Nakaya, indicated that Nkama Group Ranch was yet to be registered under Section 6 of the [Community Land Act](#) and it was therefore non-existent having been dissolved on 21st November 1990. As such, the Applicants did not have locus standi to file this suit. It was also argued that Article 63(3) of [the Constitution](#) provided that any unregistered community land should be held by the County Government on behalf of communities and Article 64 prohibited its disposition except in the circumstances provided. Therefore, the land held by group representatives was not supposed to be sold, leased or converted into private land before registration under the Act and any such action was an illegality. The Applicants had therefore committed illegalities as they were disposing land belonging to the group without members consent and their actions were under investigations by the DCI through a report OB No. OB:10/29/01/24 and a letter dated 22nd March 2024 by the DCI on a possible charge of obtaining money by false pretences.
14. The deponents thus contended that the Exparte Applicants had not demonstrated under what regime they were operating since they did not have any licence to act on behalf of the Nkama Community. It was further deponed that this dispute related to land resource belonging to Nkama Community



which the Interested Parties filed Kajiado ELC No. E114 of 2024 to safeguard the interests of the community and ensure a proper transition process had taken place as outlined in the [Community Land Act](#). The lower court granted a temporary injunction, and noted that if the group land resource was not preserved, there was likely to be irreparable injury to the community in relation to the property and to other members of the Group Ranch.

15. Since there were no officials to act on behalf of the ranch, the members held an election to appoint trustees to run the Nkama Community Land with the sole mandate of ensuring that the property belonging to the Ranch was preserved, and this is when the IPs were elected as the officials. It was also argued that the issues raised in this JR were similar to the issues in the appeal against the ruling rendered by the lower court in being Kajiado ELC Appeal No E051 of 2025. They pray that the Notice of Motion be dismissed with costs.
16. The Notice of Motion was canvassed by way of written submissions.

Submissions of the Ex parte Applicant

17. On whether the 1st Respondent's actions were ultra vires and lacked jurisdiction, it was submitted that a public body was a creature of statute and could only undertake functions only authorised by law and any actions outside the confines of its statutory power were null and void as held in Kenya National Examination Council v Republic Ex Parte Geoffrey Gathenji Njoroge & 9 others [1997] eKLR. It was submitted that Section 47 of the [Community Land Act](#) provided a transitional pathway for group ranches vesting leadership in a Community Land Management Committee, elected by the Community Assembly in a process overseen by the Community Land Registrar. Not trustees. And that the 1st Respondent had no statutory power to appoint or recognise group ranch officials but their role was only on adjudication and settlement. Therefore, the power to install leadership arrogated by itself was excess in jurisdiction and since the alleged election was not publicly conducted, the 1st Respondent sanitised and illegality which was erroneous as held in MacFoy v United Africa Co Ltd [1961] 3 All ER 1169.
18. On whether the 1st Respondent's decision was illegal, irrational, and procedurally unfair, it was submitted that Section 7 of the [Fair Administrative Action Act](#), provided for when Judicial Review proceedings would be instituted and the 1st respondent's decision was within the espoused reasons due to its illegality, irrationality and procedural impropriety. Reference was made to Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd v Wednesbury Corporation [1948] 1 KB 223 and David Oloo Onyango v Attorney-General [1987] KECA 56 (KLR) to support this ground.
19. The Ex parte Applicant went on to submit that the averments in the Interested Parties Replying Affidavit were false since they had locus standi to institute this Motion because the 1st Respondent's decision directly affected their authority as held in Alfred Njau & 5 Others v City Council of Nairobi [1983] eKLR. It was also submitted that the letter from the Director of Criminal Investigation was a request for bank details and not proof of any illegality. It was added that Section 47(1) of the [Community Land Act](#) recognized existence of such group ranches and provided for their transition and until the transition was complete, the group ranch and its officials' mandate remained legally intact. It was also submitted that ELC Appeal No. E051 of 2024 challenged the temporary injunction concerning an audit of shares, but these proceedings challenged the lawfulness of a subsequent and distinct administrative action. Therefore, the issues were fundamentally different. And the Court should issue the reliefs sought as explained in Kenya National Examination Council v Republic Ex Parte Geoffrey Gathenji Njoroge & 9 others.



Submissions of the 1st Respondent

20. On whether the letters dated 17th December 2024 and 7th January 2025 were illegally issued, it was submitted that the 1st Respondent was within its authority to issue the impugned letters as per its mandate under the [Land Adjudication Act](#) which was to ensure proper and equitable resolution of land ownership issues within the group.
21. On whether the 1st Respondent acted outside its mandate, reference was made to Republic vs. Kenya Power & Lighting Company Limited & Another (2013) eKLR submitting that the ex parte applicants claim of illegality of the decision made by the 1st Respondent had not been proved or demonstrated. It was also added that administrative breach, bias or unreasonableness had also not been proved as per the test of unreasonableness set out in Associated Provincial Picture Houses Ltd vs Wednesbury Corporation. [948] 1 KB 223.
22. On whether the Applicants had met the threshold for the prayers sought, it was submitted that a judicial review is about the decision-making process, not the decision itself. And if the processes followed by the decision-maker are proper, and the decision is within the confines of the law, a court should not interfere as held in Republic vs Attorney General & 4 others ex-parte Diamond Hashim Lalji and Ahmed Hasham Lalji [2014] eKLR among other referenced cases. Therefore, since no evidence was tabled to show that the decision was unlawful or beyond the 1st Respondent's powers then, the applicant was not entitled to the orders sought and the application should be dismissed with costs.
23. The 1st -4th Interested submissions are dated 14th October 2025 counsel submitted that the Applicants have committed a lot of illegalities as they are disposing land belonging to the Group Ranch without consent from the members and are under investigations of possible fraudulent dealings by DCI.
24. It is further submitted that the Applicants have not demonstrated under what regime they are operating as they do not have any licence to act on behalf of Nkama Community.
25. It is submitted that because of lack of officials to -----behalf of the ranch the members held an election to appoint trustees to run the Nkama Community with the sole mandate of ensuring that the property belonging to the Ranch is well preserved.
26. It is also submitted that the issues raised in this application have been raised in ELCLA E051 OF 2024; Kerempu Ole Kaata & 30 others Vs. Paul Salash Rissa & 5 others.
27. Counsel submitted that Judicial Review applications -----to scrutinize the lawfulness actions, ensuring public bodies act within their legal and constitutional powers their role includes protecting citizens from arbitrary decisions, uphold the rule of law and ensuring fairness through procedural propriety and due process. Reliance is placed on the case of Nicholas Kiptoo Arap Kora Salat Vs. IEBC & 6 Others (2013) eKLR; Republic Vs. AG & 4 others Exparte Diamond Hashim Lalji & Ahmed Hasama Lalfi (2014) KEHC 3713 (KLR).
28. It is submitted that Group Ranches should be registered because it provides them with legal status to provide, allow them to own property and ensures collective land management.
29. It is also submitted Nkama Group Ranch does not exist. They pray that the Application be dismissed with costs.



Submissions of the Interested Parties

30. The 1st to 4th Interested submissions are dated 14th October 2025 counsel submitted that the Applicants have committed a lot of illegalities as they are disposing land belonging to the Group Ranch without consent from the members and are under investigations of possible fraudulent dealings by Director of Criminal Investigation.
31. It is further submitted that the Applicants have not demonstrated under what regime they are operating as they do not have lice to act on behalf of Nkama Community.
32. It is submitted that because of lack of officials to act on behalf of the ranch the members held an election to appoint trustees to ran the Nkama Community with the sole mandate of ensuring that the property belonging to the Ranch is well preserved.
33. It is also submitted that the issues raised in this application have been raised in ELCLA E051 of 2024; Kerempui Ole Kaata & 3 others Vs. Paul Salash Rissa & 5 others.
34. Counsel submitted that Judicial Review application serve to sanitize the lawfulness actions, ensuring public bodies act within their legal and constitutional powers their role includes protecting citizens from arbitrary decisions, upholding the rule of law and ensuring fairness through procedural propriety and due process. Reliance is placed on the case of Nicholas Kiptoo Arap Kora Salat Vs. IEBC & 6 Others (2013) eKLR; Republic Vs. AG & 4 Others Exparte Diamond Hashim Lalji & Ahmed Hasham Lalji (2014) KEHC 3713 (KLR).
35. It is submitted that Group Ranches should be registered because it provides them with legal status to provide, allow them to own property and ensures collective land management.
36. It is also submitted Nkama Group Ranch does not exist. They pray that the Application be dismissed with costs.

Analysis and determination

37. I have considered the Notice of Motion, the Affidavit in support, the responses thereto, the written submissions and the authorities cited. I find that the issues for determination are:
 - i. Whether the Exparte Applicants is entitled to the orders of certiorari, mandamus and prohibition as sought in the Notice of Motion.
 - ii. What orders should issue?.
 - iii. Who should bear the costs of this application?
38. The Exparte Applicant has filed this Application on grounds that the 1st Respondent made an erroneous decision in the letters dated 17th December 2024 and 7th January 2025. In the letter dated 17th December 2024 addressed to the Deputy County Commissioner Mashuru Sub County and the Chairman Nkama Group Ranch, from the Land Adjudication and Settlement Officer, indicated that following elections conducted, the 11 persons listed in that letter had been duly elected as the Group Ranch Trustees. They had thus been mandated to correct and finish the work left by the Group Ranch Representatives and that the Office of the Land Adjudication and Settlement Officer had recognise them as the duly elected trustees.
39. From the documents filed in Court, there was no evidence that elections had been conducted as slated in the above letter.



40. In the letter dated 7th January 2025 addressed to the Chairman- Nkama Group Ranch, the Land Adjudication and Settlement officer asked the representatives to hand over the documents of the Group Ranch to the Trustees to correct and finish any work that might have been left as mandated by the Court.
41. This letter makes reference to a Court order and parties have also made reference to MCELC No. E114 of 2024 between Paul Salash Rissa vs Kerempu Ole Kaata. It is worth noting that Paul Salash Rissa is the 2nd Interested Party in this suit, and Kerempu Ole Kaata is one of the Applicants herein. In the MCELC 114 of 2024, the applicants sought injunctive reliefs against the Respondents from trespassing or dealing with parcels Kajiado/Kaputei South/0247, 1916, 1982, 1981, 2252, 1910, 1912, 1991, 2245, 2247, 1916, 1919, 1778, 2251, 1798, 2250, 1818, 1870 and 2249 amongst other un-allocated shares; and appointment of a surveyor to conduct an independent forensic audit of the shares in Nkama Group Ranch to ascertain the unallocated shares. The premises of this Application was that the Applicants were the current officials of the Nkama Group Ranch having been elected on 14th December 2021 after the members of the Group Ranch passed a vote of no confidence against the Respondents and that the Respondents mandate lapsed in 1990 when the Group Ranch was dissolved.
42. The Respondents opposed this application on grounds that it had not exhausted the stipulated dispute resolution mechanisms and that they were at the tail end of the dissolution of the Group Ranch and that no elections had been conducted.
43. The Lower Court granted an injunctive order restraining the Respondents therein (who are the Applicants) in this suit from dealing with parcels Kajiado/Kaputei South/ 0247, 1916, 1982, 1981,2252, 1910, 1912, 1991,2245, 2247, 1916, 1919,1778, 2251, 1798,2251,2250,1798, 1818,1870 and 2249 amongst other un-allocated shares. It went on to direct for appointment of a surveyor to conduct an independent forensic audit of the shares in Nkama Group Ranch to ascertain the unallocated shares.
44. It is on record that this decision was appealed against in ELC LA E051 of 2024 as per the Memorandum of Appeal annexed as evidence. In the said Memorandum of Appeal, reference is made to another case involving Nkama Group Ranch cited as Kajiado ELC No. 667 of 2017 Nokoret Ole Meirag & 3 others vs Nkama Group Ranch & 5 others.
45. This being a judicial review, the Court should focus on the decision making process and whether it was lawful, valid and correct. See *Matemu v Trusted Society of Human Rights Alliance & 5 others* [2013] KECA 445 (KLR). From the above summary, it is on record that there were no subsisting Court orders. On what grounds therefore, did the Land Adjudication and Settlement Officer arrive at a decision that the Interested Parties were duly elected officials/ trustees of Nkama Group Ranch and that they should correct and finish pending works as per the Court order? If the Court order in reference is the order issued on 12th November 2024, a reading of the same, which has also been summarised herein above shows that the Lower Court only ordered for independent forensic audit of the activities of the ranch and stopped any further dealings with the Group Ranch until the suit was determined.
46. The decision and letters by the 1st Respondent were therefore against the Lower Court directive by bestowing upon the Interested Parties duties and mandate contrary to what the Court had ordered. It is on record that the issue of election was also raised at the Lower Court, but the same was not determined at the interim stage. The 1st Respondent's decision and letters were therefore jumping the gun and erroneous until the issues are heard and determined conclusively.



47. The Exparte Applicants have sought a declaration that they are the bona fide Group Representatives of Nkama Group Ranch. As no elections have been held, in my view is that they remain in office until such time when elections will be held.
48. In conclusion, I find merit in the Notice of Motion I give the orders;
- i. That an order of certiorari is hereby issued to bring before this court the letters dated 17th December 2024 Ref. No. GR/KAJ/5/5/323 and 7th January 2025 Ref. No. GR/KAJ/5/5/324 issued by the Kajiado County Land Adjudication and Settlement Officer acknowledging the Interested Parties as trustees of Nkama Group Ranch for quashing and are hereby quashed.
 - ii. That an order of mandamus is hereby issued directed to the Kajiado County Land Adjudication and Settlement Officer compelling the Kajiado County Land Adjudication and Settlement Officer to recall any letters and/or notifications and/or instruments conferring upon the Interested Parties herein the status of officials and/or trustees of Nkama Group Ranch and mandating them to act as such.
 - iii. That an order of prohibition is hereby issued restraining the Interested Parties from acting pursuant to the letters dated 17th December 2024 Ref. No. GR/KAJ/5/5/323 and 7th January 2025 Ref. No. GR/KAJ/5/5/324 and any other or further letters and/or notifications and/or instruments issued by the Kajiado County Land Adjudication and Settlement Officer conferring upon the Interested Parties the status of officials and/or trustees of Nkama Group Ranch, or in any other manner acting as officials and/or trustees of Nkama Group Ranch.
 - iv. That each party do bear own costs.

DATED, SIGNED AND DELIVERED VIRTUALLY AT KAJIADO THIS 3RD DAY OF DECEMBER 2025.

L.KOMINGOI

JUDGE.

In The Presence Of:

Mr. Akhaabi for the Exparte Applicants.

N/A for the Respondents.

Ms. Nyabio for the Interested Parties.

Court Assistant – Peter.

