

**REPUBLIC OF KENYA**  
**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KENYA AT MACHAKOS**  
**SUCCESSION CASE NO. E042 OF 2024**  
**IN THE ESTATE OF DOROTHY JUSTUS KIVONDO**  
**(DECEASED)**

**JOSEPHAT MUSYOKA MUA .....  
APPLICANT**

**VERSUS**

**LILIAN NDINDA MUA .....1<sup>ST</sup>  
RESPONDENT**

**LUCY MUTHEU MUA ..... 2<sup>ND</sup>  
RESPONDENT**

**STEPHEN KIVONDO MUA ..... 3<sup>RD</sup>  
RESPONDENT**

**RULING**

1. Before this court for determination are two applications and one preliminary objection all filed by the Applicant.
2. The first application is dated 12<sup>th</sup> September 2025 and supported by the applicant's affidavit seeking the court's intervention to halt the ongoing succession proceedings. The applicant alleges a coordinated scheme of fraud, professional misconduct and abuse of the court process involving several advocates and public officials. He therefore prays for an immediate stay of all proceedings in Succession Cause No. E042 of 2023, pending investigation into the alleged misconduct. The applicant further seeks that the court summons and investigates several advocates

Kwamboka Mongare, Douglas Mutua Muumbi, Paul Loki Tunga and Benjamin Kyalo for professional misconduct, conflict of interest, fraud and conspiracy to defeat justice and that they be disqualified and barred from further participation in the proceedings.

3. Additionally, the Applicant seeks referrals of the advocates and certain public officers including the local chief and a county officer to investigative and disciplinary bodies, namely the Director of Public Prosecutions (DPP), the Ethics and Anti-Corruption Commission (EACC), and the Law Society of Kenya Disciplinary Tribunal. He also seeks findings that actions taken by some advocates after termination of their retainer are null and void together with orders for restitution of legal fees, damages, and costs.
4. The grounds in support of the application rest on allegations of a systematic scheme involving advocates and third parties aimed at defrauding the Applicant and disinherit him from the estate. He contends that his former advocates acted without lawful authority after termination of their retainer, failed to properly withdraw from record and continued to participate in the proceedings thereby rendering such actions invalid. He argues that this conduct amounts to impersonation, misrepresentation to the Court, and a fundamental breach of the advocate-client relationship.

5. The Applicant further alleges serious breaches of fiduciary duty, including failure to follow instructions, deliberate withholding of documents, refusal to facilitate representation by other counsel, and collusion with opposing counsel to sabotage his case. He maintains that these actions caused prejudice, including loss of legal opportunities and adverse outcomes in related proceedings. A central issue raised is the alleged concealment of pleadings and failure to comply with mandatory e-filing and service requirements, which he argues was intended to secure ex parte orders and a fraudulent grant of representation. He also alleges coercion and extortion, claiming that one advocate demanded legal fees under threat of non-attendance in court, thereby holding the proceedings at ransom. He asserts that no fees are recoverable where services are tainted by illegality, bad faith, or professional misconduct. He claims prosecutorial decisions were influenced to shield wrongdoing, and that the legal process was weaponized against him through threats of arrest, malicious proceedings, and manipulation of court processes, conduct he characterizes as “lawfare.”
6. He also contends that his right to a fair hearing under Article 50 of the Constitution was violated through exclusion from proceedings, lack of service, and misrepresentation before the Court. The continued participation of an advocate without locus standi, he argues,

undermined the integrity of the proceedings and resulted in a miscarriage of justice. He attributes the delay in raising these issues to logistical constraints, including being outside the jurisdiction and facing technological barriers and urges the Court to exercise its inherent jurisdiction to prevent abuse of its process and to safeguard the integrity of the administration of justice.

7. In his supporting affidavit, the applicant states that his sister-in-law, a former county official, interfered with the family's succession affairs by influencing the area chief to act beyond his mandate. He avers that the chief summoned family members, demanded production of title documents, and allegedly received money from a family member in connection with land transactions. He further states that he was not served with key court documents, including applications filed on 1<sup>st</sup> August 2025, and only became aware of certain proceedings after conducting a search at the Machakos court registry. He adds that several pleadings and orders were not uploaded onto the Judiciary's e-filing system, contrary to mandatory requirements, which he believes was intended to conceal the proceedings.
8. He deposes that he reported alleged criminal acts, including destruction of property and fraud relating to titles, to Katuaa Police Station and to the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, but no action has been taken. He states that he had instructed the firm of Loki Tunga & Company

Advocates to act on his behalf, but lost confidence in the advocate due to alleged misconduct. He avers that the advocate engaged in undisclosed meetings with the opposing party, advised him not to return to Kenya on account of an alleged scheme to have him arrested, filed a matter out of time without leave, and failed to respond to applications in the present proceedings, thereby leaving his case undefended.

9. He further deposes that he subsequently engaged Advocate Kwamboka Mongare but later discovered that she was allegedly acting in concert with the opposing counsel. He states that she failed to follow his instructions, including filing a supplementary brief, and that from 8<sup>th</sup> July 2024 she no longer had lawful instructions to act for him. He avers that on 26<sup>th</sup> July 2024, the said advocate communicated that she could no longer act for him and indicated that she would file an application to cease acting, while also demanding payment of Kshs. 150,000. He states that despite this communication, she did not formally withdraw from the record and instead continued to act in the matter, including initiating court processes, which he contends were undertaken without authority. He further states that the advocate demanded payment on multiple occasions, indicating that failure to pay would result in non-attendance in court, which he characterizes as coercive.

10. He deposes those subsequent actions taken by the advocate after cessation of instructions were without authority, conflicted with his interests, and were undertaken in collusion with the opposing advocate. He further states that other advocates, including one who allegedly failed to provide him with a virtual hearing link, excluded him from proceedings, thereby denying him an opportunity to be heard. He avers that certain court processes, including gazetteement and orders, were obtained without service upon him and without compliance with the e-filing system, which he contends amounted to concealment and fraud upon the court. He also asserts that no proper change of advocates was effected in compliance with Order 9 Rule 9 of the Civil Procedure Rules in related proceedings, and that certain advocates acted without filing notices of appointment or obtaining court approval, thereby rendering the court record irregular.

11. He deposes that despite termination of instructions, Advocate Kwamboka Mongare remained on record in multiple proceedings, which he states corrupted the court record and undermined procedural integrity. He adds that in a related matter, the court noted the absence of key documents in the file, including taxation records. He states that the said advocate's actions included refusal to withdraw, interference with court documents, and conduct intended to sabotage his case. He further avers that the

advocate issued demands for payment while proceedings were ongoing and threatened taxation.

12. He contends that the conduct of the advocates amounted to breaches of professional and ethical obligations, including failure to act in his best interests, conflict of interest and lack of candour to the court. He maintains that no legal fees are recoverable in light of such conduct and seeks reimbursement of sums paid. He further alleges collusion among several advocates to undermine his case and facilitate the unlawful handling of the estate, which he characterizes as a fraud upon the court.

13. The Applicant has also filed a further affidavit sworn on 24<sup>th</sup> September 2025 stating that he is a son of the deceased and a beneficiary of the estate and that he has all long been involved in the welfare and management of the family affairs in accordance with the wishes of the deceased. He states that he opposes the appointment of the proposed administrators on account of their alleged lack of integrity, violent conduct and actions prejudicial to the estate. He further raises concerns regarding the conduct of their advocate, whom he accuses of engaging in unethical practices aimed at influencing the proceedings. He avers that he has, over the years, financially supported members of the family, including educating the proposed administrators and their children, and that such support was rendered in good faith with the expectation of family

unity, an expectation he states has instead been met with hostility, threats, and betrayal. He further states that the deceased had instructed him to oversee and manage the family estate with a view to generating income and preserving it for the benefit of all beneficiaries, and that the appointment of the proposed administrators would be contrary to those wishes.

14. He contends that previous legal representatives acted contrary to his instructions, including causing the estate to be gazetted without his knowledge and misrepresenting documents presented to him for execution. He alleges collusion between advocates which resulted in the transfer of certain property to one of the proposed administrators. He asserts that the grant was obtained through fraudulent concealment of a will said to have been executed by the deceased while abroad, and that this material fact was not disclosed to the Court.

15. He further alleges that the Court has been misled through false affidavits regarding his participation in family discussions and the status of developments on the estate. He challenges the applicability of the doctrine of *res judicata* on the basis that previous proceedings were allegedly tainted by fraud. He attributes the family dispute to a broader alleged conspiracy involving certain family members and third parties, including claims of interference with the estate, unlawful intermeddling, and corruption of

public officials. He further alleges that the proposed administrators breached a family agreement, engaged in acts of fraud relating to estate property, collected income without accounting, excluded other beneficiaries from decision-making and participated in the sale and misappropriation of estate assets. He also alleges that defamatory material concerning him has been circulated and filed in court. He states that there has been discriminatory conduct directed at his spouse, and refers to documents said to reveal a scheme to dispossess beneficiaries of family land. He reiterates that there exists a valid will and power of attorney executed by the deceased which, in his view, render the current succession proceedings unnecessary and defective. He further sets out complaints regarding the conduct of counsel for the proposed administrators, including allegations of interference with family mediation, failure to serve court documents, and collusion with other advocates to undertake actions prejudicial to his interests.

16. He maintains that the proposed administrators lack the integrity required of fiduciaries, citing allegations of criminal conduct including theft, destruction of property, threats, and mismanagement of estate resources. He further alleges substance abuse affecting their judgment. He makes specific allegations of violent conduct, threats, destruction of estate property, and unlawful dealings with

estate assets on the part of one proposed administrator, and alleges a pattern of dishonesty, misrepresentation, and misappropriation of property on the part of another, including the use of multiple identities and involvement in prior fraudulent dealings. He also raises allegations against another family member, stating that she engaged in forgery and misappropriation of funds entrusted to her. He further alleges that the proposed administrators have abused law enforcement processes through false reports and unlawful arrests, and that there has been a pattern of intimidation directed at him and other individuals associated with the estate.

17. He reiterates that the conduct of the proposed administrators and their advocate demonstrates bad faith and an intention to misuse the court process, and maintains that their appointment would result in the dissipation of the estate. He concludes by stating that he has acted in accordance with the wishes of the deceased and in the interest of preserving the estate, and that unless the Court intervenes, there is a risk of loss of estate assets and prejudice to the beneficiaries.

18. The Respondents opposed the first application through an affidavit sworn on 7<sup>th</sup> October 2025 by Lilian Ndinda Mua. She states that the further affidavit sworn by the Applicant contains allegations that are frivolous, vexatious, defamatory, and unsupported by evidence, and urges that

the impugned portions be struck out for being irrelevant and abusive. She contends that several of the matters raised constitute new issues which were not part of the original application or prior responses and are therefore improperly introduced at this stage. She responds to the allegations made against the advocates by stating that they amount to a smear campaign against individuals who are not parties to the proceedings, and avers that complaints previously lodged by the Applicant against the said advocates were found to be without merit and motivated by an attempt to avoid payment of legal fees.

19. The Respondent disputes the existence of any valid will, stating that no such claim had been raised since the commencement of the proceedings, and that the alleged will is a forgery with no legal effect. She further states that the deceased was domiciled in Kenya and that no other beneficiary is aware of the alleged will. She contends that the issue has only been raised after the court declined to appoint the Applicant as sole administrator. She maintains that the Applicant has been uncooperative, has declined to participate in discussions on distribution, and is intent on having the entire estate allocated to himself. She further characterizes the allegations made against other family members and third parties as malicious, unsupported, and directed at individuals who are not parties to the proceedings.

20. She denies the allegations of fraud, conspiracy and misconduct attributed to the Respondents, stating that the matters raised are unsubstantiated and amount to rumor and propaganda. She further asserts that the Applicant has engaged in character assassination and harbors a personal vendetta against one of the beneficiaries, noting that previous complaints made by him were dismissed for lack of evidence. She also disputes the allegations relating to arrests and criminal conduct, stating that any such incidents involving the Applicant arose from complaints made by third parties and were unrelated to the Respondents or their advocate. She challenges the references made by the Applicant to his spouse, asserting that the said individual is not known to the family and is not a beneficiary of the estate.

21. She contends that the various allegations of misconduct, criminal activity and unfitness on the part of the proposed administrators are repetitive, unsubstantiated and intended to portray them negatively before the Court, and urges that such allegations be disregarded. She asserts that the Applicant's conduct demonstrates a pattern of filing numerous complaints and making generalized accusations without specificity, and urges that he be declared a vexatious litigant and barred from filing further applications on the same issues. She maintains that the Respondents and their advocate have acted with integrity and professionalism

throughout the proceedings, and attributes the Applicant's difficulties with legal representation to his conduct and expectations of counsel.

22. She concludes by reiterating that the alleged will should be disregarded as a forgery, and urges the Court to dismiss the allegations made in the further affidavit and allow the matter to proceed to distribution.

23. The Applicant filed a supplementary affidavit dated 29<sup>th</sup> September 2025 noting that in his earlier further affidavit and submissions he inadvertently failed to include several annexures which he considers crucial to the proper determination of the matter. He identifies the omitted documents as including a Gazette Notice relating to the estate, an affidavit allegedly signed under duress, and materials concerning developments on certain property and communications with his former advocates. He states that he has now produced these documents together with additional annexures, including correspondence, affidavits, and materials which he contends demonstrate the existence of testamentary documents executed by the deceased, as well as communications indicating his involvement in the establishment and management of certain estate assets. He avers that the said documents are essential to substantiate the factual matters previously raised, and are necessary to enable the court to have a complete and accurate understanding of the estate, the

intentions of the deceased, and the disputes among the beneficiaries.

24. He further states that he has identified what he considers material misrepresentation by certain advocates regarding the contents and legal effect of a Gazette Notice published in respect of the estate. He explains that the omission of the earlier annexures was inadvertent, and that the additional documents are necessary in order to correct what he describes as false or misleading information placed before the Court. He maintains that no prejudice will be occasioned to the Respondents if the documents are admitted, as any inconvenience can be compensated by costs, whereas he would suffer prejudice if the Court were to determine the matter on the basis of an incomplete record.
25. He urges that the inclusion of the omitted and additional annexures is necessary in the interests of justice, for the proper administration of the estate, and to ensure that the Court reaches a fair and informed determination.
26. The second application for determination is dated 29<sup>th</sup> September 2025. In it, the applicant seeks leave of the Court to place additional material on record for purposes of the determination of this cause. Specifically, he seeks to include annexures inadvertently omitted from his earlier affidavit, namely documents marked as JMM20, JMM21 and JMM22. He also seeks leave to file further documents

which he states have become necessary to address and clarify what he describes as material misrepresentation made to the court in relation to a Gazette Notice dated 6<sup>th</sup> September 2024. He contends that the said documents are crucial to the issues in dispute, including matters relating to gazettelement of the estate, the conduct of advocates previously on record, the existence of testamentary documents allegedly executed by the deceased, and his financial involvement in the development and management of estate property. He maintains that the additional material is necessary to enable the court to have a complete and accurate record, and to determine the matter on the merits.

27. In his supporting affidavit sworn on 29<sup>th</sup> September 2025, the Applicant reiterates that he had earlier filed a further affidavit and submissions on or about 24<sup>th</sup> September 2025 but inadvertently failed to include certain annexures. He identifies the omitted documents as including a Gazette Notice an affidavit allegedly signed under duress, and documents relating to improvements made to certain property which had been shared with his former advocate but not presented to the Court. He further seeks to introduce additional annexures, including correspondence and documents which he contends demonstrate that his former advocate was aware of testamentary documents executed by the deceased while abroad, and that the said

advocate had ceased acting prior to the gazettelement of the estate. He avers that the documents are important in substantiating the matters raised in his earlier affidavit, and are necessary to enable the Court to have a full and accurate understanding of the estate, the intentions of the deceased, and the disputes between the parties. He further contends that there has been misrepresentation to the court regarding the contents and legal effect of the Gazette Notice, and that additional documents are necessary to clarify that position and demonstrate the alleged conduct of the advocates involved. He explains that the omission of the annexures was inadvertent, and that the need for the additional documents has arisen in order to correct what he describes as a material falsehood placed before the Court. He states that no prejudice will be occasioned to the Respondents if the application is allowed, as any inconvenience can be compensated by costs, whereas he would suffer prejudice if the Court were to determine the matter on the basis of an incomplete or inaccurate record. He therefore urges the Court to allow the application in the interests of justice, the fair administration of the estate, and the integrity of the court process.

28. In reply, the Respondent filed a replying affidavit sworn on 7<sup>th</sup> October 2025 stating that the application is devoid of merit, containing fabrications and constitutes an abuse of the court process. She contends that the applicant has filed

multiple frivolous applications with the aim of frustrating the succession process, and urges the Court to bar him from filing further applications until the matter is finalized. She further asserts that the applicant has consistently attempted to scandalize his former advocates for performing their professional duties and for refusing to follow unethical instructions, and that his attacks against advocates Kwamboka Mongare and Douglas Muumbi are unjustified.

29. She refutes the applicant's claims regarding ownership or transfer of any property, stating that he owns no property in Kenya and dismisses allegations of a will purportedly executed by the deceased as false and intended to position himself as sole administrator. She also contends that the emails alleged to be from the deceased and the building quotations attached by the applicant are forgeries or manufactured evidence with no relevance. She emphasizes that the appointment of four administrators was settled in 2023, and that any attempt to revisit it is barred by the principle of *res judicata*. She concludes that the applicant's current application is aimed solely at stalling the distribution of the estate for personal motives, and prays that it be dismissed with costs so that the matter can proceed to distribution.
30. Both applications were canvassed by way of written submissions.

## The Preliminary Objection

31. Before the matter was scheduled for highlighting of submissions and for the court to reserve a Ruling of the pending applications, the Applicant filed a Preliminary Objection dated 14<sup>th</sup> October 2025. He seeks among others orders, that the affidavit sworn by Advocate Douglas Mutua Mumbi be struck out for being filed out of time, procedurally defective and an abuse of the court process. The Applicant argues that the Respondents' Replying Affidavit and supporting documents were submitted well beyond the deadline set by the Court and without leave, rendering them null and void. He contends that these filings are part of a deliberate scheme, involving unethical conduct by Advocate Douglas Mutua Muumbi and local officials, intended to mislead the Court, delay proceedings, and unjustly benefit from the estate.
32. The Applicant also challenges the Respondents' legal standing asserting they have no recognized interest in the estate under the Law of Succession Act. He further highlights the contributions of his wife, Francoise Vandenplas, to the family and the estate, arguing that any attempt to exclude her is discriminatory, inequitable, and contrary to constitutional protections against discrimination and the principles of equity.
33. In conclusion, the Applicant seeks orders striking out the Respondents' out-of-time documents, recognizing his wife's

beneficial interest in the estate, awarding costs of the application, and granting any further orders necessary to safeguard the administration of justice and the integrity of the proceedings.

34. In response to this preliminary objection, Counsel Mumbi stated that the applicant sought leave to file a further affidavit which he filed on 25<sup>th</sup> September 2025 new issues such as existence of a will. Counsel explained that he therefore had to file a supplementary affidavit addressing those new issue, but ran late by two days while seeking instructions from the administrators. He prayed that the supplementary affidavit be admitted in the interest of justice and added that if the Applicant objects to its admission, then he should withdraw his own application which introduced new issues and personal grievances. .

### **Analysis and Determination**

35. From the above, the court is tasked with determining:

- i. The application dated 12<sup>th</sup> September 2025 seeking suspension of succession proceedings and investigation into alleged misconduct by advocates and public officials;
- ii. The application dated 29<sup>th</sup> September 2025 seeking leave to file additional documents to correct alleged misrepresentations; and
- iii. The Preliminary Objection dated 14<sup>th</sup> October 2025 challenging the timeliness and propriety of

the Respondents' affidavit and supporting documents, while also asserting the beneficial interest of the Applicant's wife.

36. From the materials filed and the submissions of the parties, the issues for determination can be summarized into three broad categories:

- a. Whether the applications filed by the Applicant have merit or constitute an abuse of the court process.**
- b. Whether the Respondents' affidavit and supporting documents were filed out of time and should be struck out.**
- c. Whether the Applicant's claims regarding the recognition of his wife's interest in the estate are legally tenable.**

**Whether the applications filed by the Applicant have merit or constitute an abuse of the court process.**

37. On the first issue concerning the merit and propriety of the Applicant's applications, the court notes that the Applicant has filed extensive, and detailed and convoluted applications supported by numerous affidavits and annexures. While diligence in compiling documents is acknowledged, the overall substance of the applications reveals a pattern of persistent, repetitive complaints aimed

more at delaying the progression of the succession proceedings than at resolving substantive disputes.

38. The Applicant alleges fraud, conspiracy, misrepresentation, and professional misconduct against former advocates and public officials, alongside assertions of coercion, extortion and abuse of office. He also repeatedly raises the issue of a purported will allegedly executed by the deceased while abroad, claiming it was suppressed. However, these allegations lack specificity, independent corroboration and clear evidentiary support. Many of the claims are directed at third parties who are not formally respondents in these proceedings, rendering them irrelevant for purposes of this court's determination in the succession cause.

39. Most importantly, allegations of professional misconduct by advocates, including claims of fraud, conflict of interest, or acting without authority, are matters that fall squarely within the jurisdiction of the Law Society of Kenya's Advocates Disciplinary Tribunal. The court emphasizes that the Applicant has an established avenue to seek redress against his former advocates through that specialized tribunal. Attempting to litigate such grievances within the succession proceedings is procedurally improper and amounts to conflating unrelated disputes with the administration of the estate.

40. The court further observes that the Applicant has filed multiple applications in rapid succession, each introducing

new issues , despite having been afforded opportunities to present his case comprehensively. This pattern suggests a strategy intended to obstruct the administration of the estate rather than to facilitate the resolution of legitimate disputes. The repeated references to personal grievances, family disagreements and unverified allegations of criminality underscore that the filings are largely speculative and personal in nature, rather than grounded in admissible evidence.

41. Consequently, the court finds that the applications constitute an abuse of the court process. While litigants are entitled to raise genuine complaints, there is a judicial duty to guard against repetitive, vexatious or frivolous filings that impede the administration of justice. The Courts have consistently affirmed that succession proceedings must be conducted efficiently to protect the estate from dissipation and to safeguard the rights of all beneficiaries. The Applicant's conduct, in this instance, falls short of all that standard and undermines the orderly progression of the matter.

**Whether the Respondents' affidavit and supporting documents were filed out of time and whether they should be struck out.**

42. The Preliminary Objection challenges the filing of the Respondents' affidavit by Advocate Douglas Mutua

Muumbi, alleging that it was filed out of time and constitutes an abuse of the court process. The Respondents contend that the supplementary affidavit was necessitated by new issues introduced by the Applicant, including claims regarding a will, and that the slight delay was occasioned by consultation with the administrator.

43. The court has carefully reviewed the timeline of filings and the submissions of counsel. While it is noted that the Respondents filed their supplementary affidavit marginally beyond the deadline initially set, the delay was minor and adequately explained. More importantly, the affidavit was filed to respond to fresh matters raised by the Applicant himself. A litigant cannot introduce new factual or legal issues then seek to bar the opposing party from responding. To do so would offend the principles of fairness and the right to be heard under Article 50 of the Constitution.

44. On this basis, the court finds no merit in the Preliminary Objection seeking to strike out the Respondents' documents. The filing, though slightly delayed, was made in good faith, in the interest of clarity and justice and does not amount to an abuse of the court process.

**Whether the Applicant's claims regarding the recognition of his wife's interest in the estate are legally tenable.**

45. The Applicant seeks recognition of his wife, Francoise Vandenplas, as having a beneficial interest in the estate, citing her financial contributions and moral support to the family. While the court acknowledges the Applicant's submissions, the claims are unsupported by documentary evidence establishing a legally enforceable interest under the Law of Succession Act.

46. Section 29 of the Law of Succession Act defines a dependant for purposes of inheritance. Contributions made by a spouse to the Applicant or to the family do not, without more create a proprietary interest in the deceased's estate. Any claim must be grounded in law including proof of maintenance by the deceased or a valid testamentary disposition. In the absence of such proof, the Court cannot grant the relief sought as this will be extending succession rights beyond the statutory framework.

47. Based on the foregoing, it is hereby ordered that;

- a. The applications dated 12<sup>th</sup> September 2025 and 29<sup>th</sup> September 2025 are dismissed for being frivolous, vexatious, and constituting an abuse of the court process.
- b. The Preliminary Objection dated 14<sup>th</sup> October 2025 is dismissed.
- c. The succession proceedings in Cause No. E042 of 2023 to proceed without any further delay.
- d. The Applicant to pay costs of the applications.

Orders accordingly.

Dated, signed and delivered at Machakos this 9<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2026

**RHODA RUTTO**

**JUDGE**

**In the presence of;**

.....Applicant

.....Respondent

Selina court Assistant