

**THE HIGH COURT OF THE FEDERAL CAPITAL TERRITORY  
IN THE ABUJA JUDICIAL DIVISION**

**HOLDEN AT JABI**

**THIS WEDNESDAY, THE 9<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF FEBRUARY, 2022**

**BEFORE: HON. JUSTICE ABUBAKAR IDRIS KUTIGI – JUDGE**

**SUIT NO: FCT/HC/CV/1672/17**

**BETWEEN:**

**MISS TITILAYO ADEYINKA ADEKOYA .....PLAINTIFF**

**AND**

**1. ALHAJI MURITALA ISSA  
2. STELLA UCHE OFORDU  
3. HON. MINISTER OF THE FEDERAL CAPITAL  
TERRITORY  
4. FEDERAL CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT  
AUTHORITY** } **..DEFENDANTS**

**RULING**

We have carefully considered the objection raised by counsel to the plaintiff on the admissibility of the Deed of Assignment on the ground that what was frontloaded is different from what is been tendered. Counsel for the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> Defendants contends that the document are the same.

Now it is settled principle of general application that three (3) criteria govern admissibility:

1. Is the document pleaded?
2. Is it relevant?
3. Is it admissible in law?

The objection raised by counsel do not fall within any of the above streamlined criteria.

It is true that the Rules provide for the frontloading of documents but that frontloading by itself does not determine whether a document is admissible, it is not the Rules of Court that determine admissibility. What frontloading does in addition to the pleading of the document is to allow the adversary the document that will ultimately be used or tendered at trial. To the extent that the document is pleaded, relevant and admissible, any complaints with respect to the contents between what was tendered vis-à-vis what was frontloaded will ultimately go to the weight and probative value that will be attached ultimately to the document.

Admissibility in law again, it must be underscored is different from weight that will enure to the document.

On the whole, the objection fails. The Deed of Assignment is admitted in evidence and marked as **Exhibit D7**.

**Signed**

**Hon. Judge**