

REPUBLIC OF KENYA

IN THE ENVIRONMENT AND LAND COURT AT KERICHO

ELC CASE NO. E011 OF 2025

**PETER CHERUIYOT KERICH.....1ST
PLAINTIFF**

**HANAH CHEPKOECH CHEBOMOI.....2ND
PLAINTIFF**

VERSUS

**KENYA RURAL ROADS AUTHORITY.....1ST
DEFENDANT**

**MAYTRAIL INVESTMENT.....2ND
DEFENDANT**

**NATIONAL LAND COMMISSION.....INTERESTED
PARTY**

AND

**DAVID KIPNGETICH MITEI.....2ND PROPOSED INTERESTED
PARTY**

**LEONARD KIPKEMOI KOSKEY.....3RD PROPOSED INTERESTED
PARTY**

**ROBERT KIPCHIRCHIR TOO.....4TH PROPOSED INTERESTED
PARTY**

RULING .

Introduction.

1. This ruling is in respect of the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants Notice of Motion application dated 17th March, 2025.
2. The application is expressed to be brought under **Order 1 Rule 10(2) & Order 51 Rules 1 & 3** of the Civil Procedure Rules and **Article 159(2)** of the Constitution of Kenya.
3. The application seeks the following orders;
 - a. This Honourable Court be pleased to grant leave to the Applicants to be joined in the proceedings as Interested Parties.*
 - b. This Honourable Court be pleased to grant leave to the Proposed Interested Parties to submit affidavits as well as written and oral arguments in the proceedings.*
 - c. The Honourable Court grant leave to the Proposed Interested Parties*

to file their Replying Affidavits and Responses to the suit.

d. This Honourable Court be pleased to grant leave to the Proposed Interested Parties to submit any other information or documentation they deem important and relevant for the just disposition of the proceedings.

e. There be no order as to costs in relation to this application.

4. The application is based on the grounds on its face and the Supporting Affidavit of **Leonard Kipkemoi Koskey** that is sworn on 17th March, 2025.

Factual Background.

5. The Plaintiffs/Respondents commenced the present proceedings vide the Plaint dated 21st February, 2025 where they seek the following prayers;

a. A declaration that the Defendant's (sic) action in the encroaching the Plaintiff's parcel of the suit land and

constructing a road thereon without first acquiring the said portion in line with the provisions of Section 23 of the Kenya Roads Act was illegal unlawful and an affront to sanctity of title. (sic)

b. A permanent injunction, restraining the Defendants either by themselves, agents, servants from entering upon, re-entering, encroaching, trespassing onto, cultivating, building structures, interfering with and/or in any other manner dealing with LR No. Kericho/Kipsonoi S S/2164.

c. A restitution of portions measuring approximately 0.68 acres on Kericho/Kipsonoi S.S/2164 and or compensation with an amount equal to the current market value.

d. General and exemplary damages for trespass loss of use, mesne profits, and violation of the Plaintiff's (sic) right to property.

e. Special damages suffered by the 1st and 2nd Defendants. (sic)

f. Costs of this suit be borne by the Defendants.

g. Such further and/or other relief as the Honourable Court may deem fit and expedient so to grant.

6. As at the time of writing of this ruling, neither the 1st and 2nd Defendants/Respondents nor the Interested Party/Respondent have filed their Statements of Defence.
7. On 15th July, 2025 Counsel for 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants informed the Court that they filed the application dated 17th March, 2025.
8. Counsel for the 1st Defendant/Respondent, the 2nd Defendant/Respondent and the Interested Party/Respondent informed the Court that they would not be opposing the said application.
9. The Court issued directions that the application be canvassed by way of written submissions.

10. The matter was mentioned severally to confirm filing of submissions and on 9th December, 2025 it was reserved for ruling.

The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants Contention.

11. The affidavit in support of the application is sworn by **Leonard Kipkemoi Koskey** the 3rd Proposed Interested Party/Applicant.

12. He contends that he has the authority of the 2nd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants to swear the affidavit on their behalf and adds that they are the managers of Kapkawa Village, Kipketii Village and Koita Village respectively.

- 13.** It is his contention that the said villages have benefitted from the construction of Makutano (Junction C753) Kipketi-Kipsonoi River Road Project.
- 14.** He further contends that by virtue of being village managers, they are representatives of their communities at the village level.
- 15.** It is his contention that on or about 8th February, 2025, the 1st Defendant/Respondent conducted a public participation exercise and goes on to state that the Bomet County Commissioner, the Bomet Land Registrar, the County Surveyor, the Plaintiffs/Respondents and other community members were present during the public participation exercise.
- 16.** It is also his contention that during the public participation exercise, the Bomet County Surveyor informed them that the road reserve width was 15 meters.

- 17.** It is further his contention that they have filed the application under consideration in order to advance public interest, their interest in the subject matter and the interests of approximately 1000 members of their community.
- 18.** He contends that it would be prudent for the Court to allow the present application in order to avert the need to file a similar matter against the Plaintiffs/Respondents who are attempting to derail the road project that is meant to benefit their community.
- 19.** He also contends that the Court should allow the application under consideration so that the Community which is benefiting from the road project is not condemned unheard.
- 20.** He further contends that their participation in the present suit will enable the Court to arrive at a just determination.

- 21.** It is his contention that they will be adversely affected by the orders that will be granted by the Court in disposing off the pending application.
- 22.** It is also his contention that the averments by the Plaintiffs/Applicants are not in tandem with public interest and specifically the communities they represent as village managers.
- 23.** It is further his contention that they intend to demonstrate that the road construction and streetlighting on the Makutano (Junction C753) Kipketii -Kipsonoi river road is for the benefit of their community and specifically the school going children of Kipketii Primary School and Kipketii African Gospel Church.
- 24.** He contends that no private land was required for the expansion of the road.

- 25.** He also contends that if they are joined to the suit, they will demonstrate that no notice for expansion was required to be issued to the community members as the road expansion was done on the road reserve. He goes on to state that this is contrary to the Plaintiffs/Respondents averments.
- 26.** He further contends that the Court should adjudge and find that they are necessary parties to the present proceedings and join them to this suit.
- 27.** It is his contention that they will be greatly prejudiced if they are not joined to the present proceedings.
- 28.** He ends his deposition by stating that the Plaintiffs/Respondents will not be prejudiced in any way if the application is allowed as prayed.

The 1st Plaintiff/Respondent's response.

- 29.** In response to the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants application, the 1st Plaintiff/Respondent filed a Replying Affidavit sworn on 23rd June, 2025.
- 30.** He deposes that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants are seeking to be joined to the present proceedings but have failed to disclose their interest.
- 31.** He also deposes that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants contend that they are village managers of Kapkawa, Kipketii and Koita villages but they have not availed any evidence affirming that they are residents and/or representatives of the said villages.
- 32.** He further deposes that there is nothing to manage in the said villages as each villager manages their own families and farms.

- 33.** It is his deposition that the position of village managers is not known in law and therefore the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants should inform the Court on whose authority they are acting for, outline the appointing authority and the scope of their work.
- 34.** It is also his deposition that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have not attached any notices and/or evidence in support of their averments at paragraph 6 of the affidavit in support of the application.
- 35.** It is further his deposition that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have not attached any minutes and/or a surveyor's report in support of their contention at paragraph 7 of the affidavit in support of the application. He goes on to state that the contents of the said paragraph are mere allegations and are not substantiated.

36. He deposes that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have not attached any evidence to show that they have the authority of over 1,000 members of their community as alleged in paragraph 8 of the affidavit in support of the application.

37. In response to paragraphs 9 and 10 of the affidavit in support of the application, the 1st Plaintiff/Respondent sets out the prayers sought in the Plaint.

38. He also deposes that the prayers sought in the Plaint are personal in nature and are meant to protect and/or uphold his property rights. He goes on to state that he does not in any way seek to derail the community project as alleged by the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants.

39. He further deposes that if the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants intend to sue him for any commissions or omissions, then they should do so in a

separate suit. He goes on to state that they should not drag their issues to the present suit.

40. It is his deposition that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have not demonstrated how they intend to assist this Court to arrive at a just decision as alleged at paragraphs 11 and 12 of the affidavit in support of the application.

41. It is also his deposition that from the foregoing, it is evident that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants do not have any recognizable stake in this suit.

42. It is further his deposition that he is advised by his advocates on record that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants are not necessary parties to the present proceedings as they have not stated how they will be affected by the prayers sought in the present suit.

- 43.** He deposes that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants are not going to assist the Court to effectually adjudicate and settle the issues in dispute. He goes on to state that instead, they will unnecessarily burden the Court with irrelevant issues.
- 44.** He also deposes that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have not demonstrated whether they own any parcels of land in the aforementioned villages and even if they do, they have no claim over his parcel of land and the reliefs sought in the present suit.
- 45.** He further deposes that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants will not suffer any prejudice if they are not joined to the suit.

46. It is his deposition that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have not demonstrated the damage they will suffer if they are not joined to the suit.

47. He ends his deposition by stating that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants application lacks merit and should be dismissed with costs.

The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants Response to the 1st Plaintiff/Respondent's Replying Affidavit.

48. In response to the 1st Plaintiff/Respondent's Replying Affidavit, the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants filed a Further Affidavit sworn by **Leonard Kipkemoi Koskey** on 1st September, 2025.

49. He deposes that he has been authorized by the 2nd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants to swear the affidavit.

- 50.** He reiterates the averments in the affidavit in support of the application and deposes that by virtue of being village managers, they represent their communities.
- 51.** He also deposes that the people who live along the road corridor will be affected by the prayers sought in the plaint as there is a likelihood that their constitutional rights will be infringed.
- 52.** He further deposes that by virtue of being the representatives of the aforementioned villages, they are the direct representatives of the affected communities. He goes on to state that this is in response to paragraphs 7, 8 and 9 of the 1st Plaintiff/Respondent's Replying Affidavit.
- 53.** It is his deposition that the prayers sought by the Plaintiffs/Respondents have a ripple effect to not only themselves but also the members of the villages whom they represent. He goes on to state that this is in response to

paragraphs 10, 11 and 12 of the 1st Plaintiff/Respondent's Replying Affidavit.

- 54.** It is also his deposition that they qualify as Interested Parties as they seek to advance public interest, their own interest and the interests of the communities they represent. He goes on to state that this is in response to paragraphs 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17 of the 1st Plaintiff/Respondent's Replying Affidavit.
- 55.** It is further his deposition that the Court in allowing their application will ensure that the community that is benefiting from the project is not condemned unheard.
- 56.** The 1st Plaintiff/Respondent reiterates his averments in the affidavit in support of the application and deposes that if joined to the suit, they will demonstrate that the Plaintiffs/Respondents averments are not in tandem with

public interest and specifically the communities they represent as village managers.

- 57.** He ends his deposition by stating that it is in the interest of justice that they be joined to the suit.

Issues for Determination

- 58.** The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants filed their submissions on 24th November, 2025 while the 1st Plaintiff/Respondent filed his submissions on 25th October, 2025.
- 59.** The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants rely on the judicial decision of **Francis Kariuki Muruatetu & Another vs Republic & 5 others [2016] eKLR** and submit that they should be joined to this suit as interested parties as they intend to protect their identifiable interest and that of the communities they represent as village managers.

- 60.** The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants submit that they have demonstrated their interest and stake in the present proceedings.
- 61.** They reiterate that they are the representatives of Koita, Kipketii and Kapkawa communities who have a personal stake in the outcome of the present proceedings.
- 62.** The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants also reiterate that the ongoing construction of the Makutano (Junction C753) Kipketii – Kipsonoi River Road is for the benefit of their community and the school going children.
- 63.** The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants reiterate their averments in the affidavit in support of the application and submit that they will be prejudiced if they are not joined to the suit.
- 64.** They submit that the first prejudice they are likely to suffer is that the communities benefitting from the project will be

denied their constitutional right to be heard. Secondly, if they are not joined to the suit, they will be condemned unheard and thirdly, the prayers sought in the Plaint have a direct impact on their community.

- 65.** The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants conclude their submissions by urging the Court to allow their application as prayed.
- 66.** The 1st Plaintiff/Respondent reiterates his averments in his Replying Affidavit and submits that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have not set out in detail their scope of work and neither have they demonstrated the legitimacy of their offices.
- 67.** The 1st Plaintiff/Respondent also submits that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have not availed the purported evidence they intend to produce for the Court to scrutinize it and determine whether it is viable and

whether it will assist the Court in determining the issues herein.

- 68.** The 1st Plaintiff/Respondent further submits that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have not availed any evidence in support of their contention that public participation was conducted in respect of the said road project.
- 69.** It is the 1st Plaintiff/Respondent's submissions that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have not availed any minutes to show that indeed a public participation meeting took place and they have also not furnished a Surveyor's report to show that a survey was done prior to the commencement of the road project.
- 70.** The 1st Plaintiff/Respondent then reiterates his averments in his Replying Affidavit and relies on **Section 3A** of the Civil

Procedure Rules and **Order 1 Rule 10 (2)** of the Civil Procedure Rules.

- 71.** The 1st Plaintiff/Respondent relies on the judicial decision of **Francis Karioki Muruatetu and another versus Republic & 5 Others [2016] eKLR** and submits that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants must meet the criteria set out by the Supreme Court before they are joined to this suit.
- 72.** The 1st Plaintiff/Respondent relies on **Section 107(1)** of the Evidence Act, the judicial decision of **Anne Wambui Ndiritu vs Joseph Kiprono Ropkoi & another [2005] 1 EA 334** and reiterates that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants has failed to demonstrate sufficient interest in the subject matter of this suit to warrant their joinder.

- 73.** The 1st Plaintiff/Respondent also submits that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have failed to demonstrate how their presence in this suit will enable the Court to effectively adjudicate the issues in dispute.
- 74.** The 1st Plaintiff/Respondent further submits that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have failed to outline the prejudice they are likely to suffer if the orders sought are not granted.
- 75.** It is the 1st Plaintiff/Respondent's submissions that he will suffer prejudice if the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants are joined to the suit as his matter will not be heard expeditiously.
- 76.** The 1st Plaintiff/Respondent concludes his submissions by urging the Court to dismiss the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants' application with costs.

Analysis and Determination.

77. Having considered the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants application, the response thereto, the further affidavit and the rival submissions, my view is that the following issues arise for determination;

a. Whether David Kipngetich Mitei, Leonard Kipkemoi Koskey and Robert Kipchirchir Too should be joined to the suit as Interested Parties.

b. Whether David Kipngetich Mitei, Leonard Kipkemoi Koskey and Robert Kipchirchir Too should be granted leave to file responses in the present proceedings.

c. Who should bear costs of the application.

A. Whether David Kipngetich Mitei, Leonard Kipkemoi Koskey and Robert Kipchirchir Too should be joined to the suit as Interested Parties.

- 78.** The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants contend that they are village managers of Kapkawa, Kipketii and Koita villages respectively.
- 79.** The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants also contend that they represent about 1,000 persons who live in their community.
- 80.** The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants further contend that a public participation meeting was held on 8th February, 2025 where they were informed of the construction of a road within the road reserve limit of fifteen meters.
- 81.** It is their contention that members of the villages they manage are directly benefiting from the construction of the said road which is referred to as the Makutano (Junction C753) Kipketii – Kipsonoi River Road Project.

- 82.** It is also their contention that the Plaintiffs/Applicants herein are intending to derail the said the road project which is benefiting their entire community and most especially the school going children around Kipketii Primary School.
- 83.** It is further their contention that they should be joined to the present proceedings as they will be adversely affected by any orders that will be issued by this Court.
- 84.** In response, the 1st Plaintiff/Respondent contends that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have not availed any evidence to show that they manage Kapkawa, Kipketii and Koita villages.
- 85.** The 1st Plaintiff/Respondent also contends that the alleged position of Village Managers is not known in law and the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have not adduced any evidence to show that they represent the over 1,000 members of their community.

86. The 1st Plaintiff/Respondent further contends that the prayers sought in the Plaint are personal in nature as is he is seeking to protect his property rights.

87. It is the 1st Plaintiff/Respondent's contention that the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have not demonstrated a recognizable stake in the present proceedings and neither have they demonstrated how they will assist this Court in determining the issues herein.

88. Order 1 Rule 10(2) of the Civil Procedure Rules provides as follows:-

"The Court may at any stage of the proceedings, either upon, or without the application of either party, and on such terms as may appear to the Court to be just, order that the name of any party improperly joined, whether as Plaintiff or Defendant be struck out, and that the name of any person who ought to have been

joined, whether as Plaintiff or Defendant or whose presence before the Court may be necessary in order to enable the Court effectually and completely to adjudicate upon or settle all questions involved in the suit, be added. (Emphasis mine)

89. The Supreme Court in **Francis K. Muruatetu and another v. Republic & 5 others [2016] eKLR** set out the following elements the Court has to consider when determining an application for joinder of an Interested Party;

“a. The Personal interest or stake that the party has in the matter must be set out in the application.

The Interest must be clearly identifiable and must be proximate enough, to stand apart from anything that is merely peripheral.

b. The prejudice to be suffered by the intended Interested Party in case of non-joinder, must also be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Court. It must also be clearly

outlined and not something remote.

c. Lastly, a party must, in its application, set out the case and/or submission it intends to make before the Court, and demonstrate the relevance of those submissions. It should also demonstrate that these submissions are not merely a replication of what the other parties will be making before the Court. (Emphasis mine)

- 90.** In the judicial decision of **Skov Estate Limited & 5 others v Agricultural Development Corporation & another** [2015] eKLR the Court held as follows;

“In my view, for one to convince the Court that he/she needs to be enjoined to the suit as interested party, such person must demonstrate that it is necessary that he/she be enjoined in the suit, so that the Court may settle all

questions involved in the matter. It is not enough for one to merely show that he/she has a cursory interest in the subject matter of litigation. Litigation invariably affects many people. A judgment or order in most cases does not only affect the litigants in the matter. It does have ramifications for others as well and one may very well argue that these others have an interest in the litigation. That is a fair argument, but a mere interest, without a demonstration that the presence of such party will assist in the settlement of the questions involved in the suit, is not enough to entitle one be enjoined in a suit as interested party.

In other words, there needs to be a demonstration that the interest of the person goes further than "merely being affected" by the judgment or order. It must be shown that the presence of that person is

necessary, so that the issues in the suit may be settled, and that if the person is not enjoined, the Court may not be fully equipped to settle the questions in the suit or may be handicapped in one way or another.

A joinder may also be allowed if the intended interested party has a claim of his own, which in the circumstances of the matter, needs to be tried, or is convenient to be tried alongside the claims of the incumbent plaintiff and defendant. The threshold for joinder of an interested party should not be too low, or else, this is prone to open doors for busybodies to be joined to proceedings, merely to spectate or confuse the issues in the matter.

Apart from the above, whether or not to enjoin a person as an interested party, must be looked at within the context and surrounding circumstances of each particular case.” (Emphasis mine)

91. As was held in the above cited judicial decisions, the Court in determining whether to join a proposed Interested Party to a suit must consider the stake the said party has in the suit, the prejudice they are likely to suffer and the case they intend to make before the Court and also demonstrate that they case they intend to make is not replication of the case made by the other parties.

92. The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants submit that they are village managers of Koita, Kipketii and Kapkawa villages whose members will be directly affected by any orders made by this Court with regard to the Makutano (Junction C753) Kipketii - Kipsonoi Road project that the Plaintiffs/Respondents are allegedly intending to derail, vide the present proceedings.

93. The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have attached to the affidavit in support of the application, a

copy of an authority to sign that they have signed and which gives **Leonard Kipkemoi Koskey** the authority to appear, plead and act on their behalf.

- 94.** The 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have also attached a bundle of black and white photographs. Some of the Photographs are of a road that appears to be under construction, others are of pupils walking on the said road and one is of a building of Kipketii Primary School.
- 95.** As submitted by the 1st Plaintiff/Respondent, the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants have not availed any evidence to show that they are the village managers of the Koita, Kipketii and Kapkawa villages or that they have authority to appear in court on their behalf.
- 96.** It is important to note that their joinder is predicated on their alleged positions as village managers and their alleged

representation of the members of their Community; for which they have no evidence.

- 97.** Further the Applicants have failed to demonstrate that they have a stake in the present suit and/or how their presence will assist this court in the determination of the issues in dispute.
- 98.** The applicants have also failed to set out the prejudice they are likely to suffer if they are not joined to this suit.
- 99.** In view of the foregoing, I decline to join the 2nd, 3rd and 4th Proposed Interested Parties/Applicants to this suit.

B. Whether David Kipngetich Mitei, Leonard Kipkemoi Koskey and Robert Kipchirchir Too should be granted leave to file responses in the present proceedings.

100. This issue answers prayers (2), (3) and (4) of the application under consideration.

101. Given my finding on issue (a) above, the said prayers cannot be granted.

C. Who should bear costs of the application.

102. On the question of costs of the application, the general rule is that costs shall follow the event in accordance with the provisions of **Section 27** of the **Civil Procedure Act (Cap 21)**. A successful party should ordinarily be awarded costs of an action unless the Court for good reason, directs otherwise.

Disposition.

103. Taking the foregoing into consideration, the application dated 17th March, 2025 lacks merit and it is hereby dismissed with costs.

104. It is so ordered.

**DATED, SIGNED AND DELIVERED VIRTUALLY AT KERICHO
THIS 5TH DAY OF MARCH, 2026.**

**L. A. OMOLLO
JUDGE.**

In the presence of: -

Mr. Chumba for the Plaintiffs.

Mr. Chesuru for Miss Kigen for 1st defendant

Mr. Malel for 2nd Defendant/Respondent

Mr. Lesikito for Mr. Ngetich for proposed interested party/Applicants.

Court Assistant; Mr. Joseph Makori.

ORIGINAL COPY