THE HIGH COURT OF THE FEDERAL CAPITAL TERRITORY <u>HOLDEN AT ABUJA</u>

THIS TUESDAY, THE 16TH DAY OF MAY 2023

BEFORE: HON. JUSTICE ABUBAKAR IDRIS KUTIGI – JUDGE

SUIT NO: FCT/HC/CV/1178/2016

BET	W.	$\mathbf{E}\mathbf{F}$:
-----	----	------------------------	--	---

AND

1. CHAIRMAN, KARU L.G.A OF NASARAWA

STATE

..... DEFENDANTS

2. MRS. HELEN KASLONG

<u>RULING</u>

I have carefully considered the submissions made by counsel. The narrow issue is whether the map sought to be tendered is relevant. The question of relevance is one to be determined on the basis of the facts and issues streamlined on the pleadings.

The case of the plaintiff is rooted on claim to a parcel of land within the FCT and other ancillary claims. The case of the 1st defendant essentially apart from the projection that it has no dealings with plaintiff is that the land subject of this dispute belongs to Nasarawa State.

On the records, the court equally visited the locus-in-quo to situate the contested assertion with respect to the precise location of the disputed land. It is therefore clear that the question of the location of the disputed land and where it is situated is a defined issue and provides or situates the relevance of the **map** sought to be tendered.

It cannot therefore be argued that the map has no role as the court determines the contested assertion with respect to ownership because the jurisdiction of this court is essentially territorial or the F.C.T and cannot extend to land or subject matter in a different state.

On the issue of maker which was not seriously contested, it is clear that the map is a public document and was certified. There is therefore no requirement of a maker as a condition for admissibility particularly when dealing with public documents.

The objection to the admissibility of the map is discountenanced. The map FCT (Abuja) Nasarawa State Boundary delineation is relevant and is admitted as **Exhibit D3**.

Signed Hon. Judge 16th May, 2023