

IN THE HIGH COURT OF FEDERAL CAPITAL TERRITORY
IN THE ABUJA JUDICIAL DIVISION
HOLDEN AT ABUJA.

BEFORE HON. JUSTICE J.E. OBANOR
ON THURSDAY THE 22ND DAY OF JULY, 2021.

SUIT NO: FCT/HC/CV/178/2021

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION BY KABIRU ABDULLAHI
FOR AN ORDER FOR THE ENFORCEMENT OF HIS
FUNDAMENTAL RIGHTS

BETWEEN:

KABIRU ABDULLAHI

.....APPLICANT

AND

1. INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE

2. UNITED BANK FOR AFRICA (UBA)

RESPONDENTS

JUDGMENT

By a Motion on Notice filed on 25th January 2021 and predicated on Order 2 of the Fundamental Human Rights (Enforcement Procedure) Rules 2009, Sections 35, 36, 41, 46 of the 1999 Constitution(as Amended) and inherent jurisdiction of the Honourable Court the Applicant seeks for the following reliefs: -

- “1. A declaration that the business transaction between the Applicant and his customer for the sale of \$16,860 US Dollars and transfer of N8,000,000 (Eight Million Naira only) into his UBA Account No 2065267084 on 12/01/2021 is a civil business transaction within the meaning and operation of bureau de change services without any criminal undertone and does not warrant the freezing of the*

Applicant's bank account with the 2nd Respondent on the instruction of the 1st Respondent.

- (2). A declaration that unilateral freezing of the Applicant's account No 2065267084 with the 2nd Respondent on the instruction of the 1st Respondent amount to administrative oppression against the Applicant, a breach and infringement of the Applicant's Fundamental Human Rights as enshrined in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.*
- (3). An Order directing the 2nd Respondent (UBA) to quickly and immediately unfreeze and release the Applicant's bank account No 2065267084 for active operation forthwith.*
- (4). An Order restraining the Respondents either by themselves, representatives, agents or otherwise from further freezing, arresting and or detaining the Applicant on the basis of this subject matter which arose from mere civil transaction of bureau de change services with a customer.*
- (5). The sum of N30,000,000.00 (Thirty Million Naira Only) being general damages against the Respondents by reason of the breach and infringement of the Applicant's Fundamental Human Rights as enshrined in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.*
- (6). And for such further order or other orders as this Honourable Court may deem fit to make in the circumstances of this case."*

The application was filed along with the Applicant's Statement, grounds upon which the above reliefs are sought, a 24-paragraph affidavit deposed to by the Applicant himself and Written Address of the Applicant's Counsel in support of this application.

By the records of the Court, the Motion on Notice was served on the 1st and 2nd Respondents on 15th March, 2021. The 1st Respondent filed a memorandum of Conditional Appearance dated 15th day of June 2021 and filed on the 17th day of June 2021 and with the subsequent leave of this court, time having been extended for 1st Respondent to do so on 9th day of July 2021 filed a counter affidavit in vehement opposition to the Applicant's Motion on Notice along with a written address.

In response to the action, the 2nd Respondent through their solicitors on 18th June, 2021 filed a Counter Affidavit in opposition to the Applicant's Motion on Notice along with a written address.

The Applicant on 22nd June 2021 filed a further and better affidavit to the 2nd Respondent's Counter affidavit and an address.

The Originating Motion on Notice was heard with Counsel for 2nd Respondent and Applicant adopting their Written Addresses as their oral submissions as well as the 1st Respondent with the subsequent leave of the court.

In the affidavit in support of the application, the applicant avered inter alia that he is a Bureau De Change Operator with his office at Musawa House Wuse Zone 4, Abuja where he carries out his BDC business. On 12th day of January 2021, he was approached by his customer in an open market transaction for purchase of US Dollars from him. After negotiations, the client purchased a total of \$16,860 from him and made payment for the Dollars with Nigerian Naira in the sum of N8,000,000.00 (Eight Million Naira Only) which was paid through a bank transfer into his account No 2065267084 with the 2nd Respondent bank. A copy of his UBA bank statement showing the transaction was attached as Exhibit I. That in bureau de change service, anytime a BDC operator receives a transaction that he cannot fully carry out for lack of funds, the operator would secure the Dollars from his business associates to make up for the customer's demand. That in line with the above, he secured the required quantity of Dollars from his business associates to settle his customer and quickly pay

them back from funds transferred into his account. Out of the \$16,860 sold to the customer, the sum of \$10,000 was purchased from Ismail Bello a business associate of his and was also paid from the same fund transferred into his account by the customer from his UBA account 2065267084. Shortly after the transaction he received information the next day from his bankers that his bank account has been frozen by the bank on the instruction of the 1st Respondent. On further enquiry he discovered that the account was frozen on the suspicion and allegation that the sum of N8, 000.000 credited into his account (proceed of the sale of \$16,860) by the customer was from a fraudulent source. His account and the account of his business associates who received funds directly from him, from that same account on the same transaction were frozen without giving them the opportunity of been heard. That the subject matter of this case resulting in the intervention of the 1st Respondent is purely a civil transaction in an open market without any criminal intention on his part to defraud anybody. The information and identity of his customer have been captured and available for the proper investigation of his customer and not to continue to oppress and intimidate innocent citizens against their fundamental human right. He feels highly intimidated, harassed, ridiculed and embarrassed by the actions and conducts of the Respondents and their agents or representatives and is entitled to general damages against the Respondents. Unless this court grants the reliefs sought his Fundamental Human Right will continue to be infringed and violated by the Respondents without any just cause. It will be in the interest of justice that this application is granted to protect his Fundamental Right as enshrined in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

In his written addresses N. O. Eku Esq of counsel for the applicant raised a sole issue for determination thus:

“Whether or not the Applicant is entitled to the Reliefs sought in this Application.”

Arguing the above issue learned counsel submitted that the subject matter arose from a mere civil business transaction of Bureau De

Change Services by the Applicant with no Criminal flavor. He argued that the process of Nigerian Legal System has made it very possible that no individual or government agencies have the power or authority to take the laws into its hands at the detriment of any citizen. He referred to the provisions of Sections 34,35, 36 and 46 of the 1999 Constitution.

The 1st Respondent in its counter affidavit deposed to by Inspector Ati Jonah stated that he was one of the Investigating Police Officer (IPO) in the employment of the 1st Respondent. Upon clinical study of the Originating Motion and Affidavit in support he found that all the averments as it relates to 1st Respondent were false and marred with blatant falsehood in their entirety and a calculated attempt to mislead the court. The 1st Respondent did not and will never make an order authorizing the freezing of an account it knows nothing about and it has no power howsoever to make an order to freeze an account. The 1st Respondent knows that it is only a court of competent jurisdiction that has the enormous powers to make an Order of this nature. The 2nd Respondent never made any specific reference to the Order they alleged the 1st Respondent made which made the 2nd Respondent to freeze the account of the Applicant and neither did they attach the purported Order made by the 1st Respondent. 1st Respondent never authorized the freezing of the account of the Applicant as the Applicant did not exhibit anything pointing to the fact that the 1st Respondent made such an order or state who in particular specifically informed him that his account was under freeze by the verdict of the 1st Respondent. The 1st Respondent is not liable to the Applicant in damages and the Applicant is not entitled to damages as the suit is frivolous and should be dismissed.

In its written address, P. Abhulimen Esq of counsel for the 1st Respondent raised two issues for determination thus:

1. “ whether the Applicant’s fundamental human rights as guaranteed by the 1999 Constitution of Nigeria as amended and African Charter on human and people’s right has been breached or threatened by the action of the Respondents.

2. Whether the Applicant is entitled to the reliefs sought.”

Arguing issue no 1 above, learned counsel submitted that the Applicant’s fundamental rights have not in any way been infringed upon by the action of the Respondents. The Applicant’s complaint do not fall within the purview of breach to the fundamental rights guaranteed under Chapter 4 of the 1999 Constitution since these rights are qualified and not absolute. He referred to Section 35 (1)(c) of the 1999 Constitution and paragraphs 5 to 9 of the 1st Respondent’s Counter Affidavit. Counsel further submitted that although the 1st Respondent has the power to invite, interrogate, arrest and detain any person reasonably suspected to have committed an offence yet it does not include making an order which is within the exclusive right of the courts. She maintained that the Applicant’s assertion that his account with the 2nd Respondent was frozen at the Order of the 1st Respondent is nothing more than a mere speculation as the Applicant has not put forth any material facts before this Honourable Court to show or establish that his account was frozen by the 2nd Respondent at the behest of the 1st Respondent. Learned counsel referred to these authorities **Section 138 of Evidence Act 2011; PLATEAU STATE V. A.G. FEDERATION (2006) SCNJ 1; EJEZIE V. ANUWU (2008) 4SCNJ 113; FAJEMIROKEN V. CB NIG LTD (2002) 10NWLR (PT 774)P99.**

On issue no 2 learned counsel submitted that the Applicant is not entitled to the reliefs sought as the suit is an abuse of Court process. She referred to **AFRICAN REINSURANCE CORP V. JDP CONS. LTD (2003) 13 NSCQR P231.** She maintained that the Applicant never exhibited the Order which he alleged the 1st Respondent made to warrant the freezing of his account. In conclusion Counsel urged the court to hold that the Applicant has not made a case justify the grant of the reliefs sought. Finally she urged the court to dismiss the case in its entirety with humongous cost as same is misconceived, provocative and an attempt to mislead the court.

In response the 2nd Respondent in its counter affidavit deposed to by Chinasa Onah who is one of its cash officer avered inter alia that one Mr Ihemesie Ifeanyi Livinus who operates a savings account number 2027312258 domiciled with the 2nd Respondent complained and reported the loss of total sum of N8,601,075.00 (Eight Million, Six Hundred and One Thousand and Seventy Five Naira Only) on his account and demanded for an investigation and recovery of the stolen sum. Investigation on the stolen sum revealed that an NIP transfer of the sum of N8,000,000.00(Eight Million Naira Only) was made to UBA beneficiary account number 2065267084 belonging to the Applicant, Mr Kabiru Abdullahi on the 12th of January 2021. The account statement of Mr Ihemesie Ifeanyi Livinus and Mr kabiru Abdullahi are attached as Exhibits AJ1 and AJ2. The 2nd Respondent's investigation revealed that the account of the Applicant was involved in a fraudulent transaction that occurred in the account of Mr Ihemesie Ifeanyi Livinus another customer of the 2nd Respondent. It was on this basis that the 2nd Respondent involved the 1st Respondent for further investigation on the fraudulent transactions. The applicant's bank account was frozen by the 2nd Respondent on the instruction of the 1st Respondent. The 2nd Respondent in freezing the account of the Applicant did not act of its own whimsical volition but was only carrying out a lawful directive of the 1st Respondent being an agency of the Federal Government. The 2nd Respondent has a duty to perform its civil duties and obligations to the community or state it resides and carry out commercial activities. The 2nd Respondent by virtue of Section 24 (e) of the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria as Amended has obligation to render assistance to appropriate and lawful agencies in the maintenance of law and order. The 2nd Respondent by virtue of its civil responsibilities to assist law enforcement agencies in carrying out their duties assisted the 1st Respondent in its investigation on the fraudulent transaction. The action of the 2nd Respondent by temporarily freezing the account of the applicant did not breach the Fundamental Human Right of the Applicant as same was done in line with extant laws. The 2nd Respondent acted in good faith in assisting the law enforcement agency in carrying out their statutory duties. The 2nd Respondent has no personal interest or gain in restricting the applicant access to the

account but was only acting in compliance with its civic/statutory duties as a responsible corporate citizen.

In his written address in support of the counter affidavit O. Ajunwa Esq of counsel for the 2nd Respondent raised two issues for determination thus;

1. "Whether given the facts and circumstances of this case and affidavit evidence before the court, the 2nd Respondent could be held legally liable for the assistance offered to the 1st Respondent which included the temporary restriction on the Applicant's account?"
2. "Whether the Applicant has established his claims against the 2nd Respondent to entitle him to the reliefs sought?"

Arguing issue no 1 learned counsel submitted that private citizens whether individual or body corporate have a civic and legal duty to assist law enforcement agencies in carrying out their constitutional and statutory duties whenever there is a reasonable demand for such assistance by the law enforcement agency. Learned Counsel accentuated that the 2nd Respondent is under an obligation to render adequate assistance to Law enforcement agency in carrying out their statutory duties and that flowing from the duty of the 1st Respondent is also the constitutional and statutory powers and functions to prosecute allegations where a prima facie case has been established. On this position of law counsel referred to **JOLLY NY AME V. FRN (2010) 7NWLR (PT1193) 344; RT HON. ROTIMI CHIBIKE AMACHI V. INEC & 2ORS (2008) 5NWLR (PT 1080) PAGE 227 @ 307 PARA E-H; FABIYI V. STATE (2013) LPELR-21180(CA); SECTION 27 OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE ACT 2015.**

Learned Counsel submitted further that although Section 44(1) of 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (as Amended) grants citizens the right to acquire and own property which term includes money in the bank yet Section 44(2) (f) places a restriction on the acquisition of the said property.

Counsel submitted further that the 2nd Respondent did not breach the Fundamental Human Right of the Applicant but merely complied with the directive of the 1st Respondent and that the 2nd Respondent acted in good faith because by the order of the 1st Respondent, a higher duty, responsibility and obligation have been placed on the 2nd Respondent to adhere to the performance of its civic duty to the state and nothing more. Learned counsel commended to the court the cases of **WAMINI-EMI V. IGALI & ORS (2008) LPELR-5091(CA); OSONDU & ANOR V. AG ENUGU STATE & ORS (2017) LPELR-43096 (CA).**

Concluding learned counsel submitted that by the provisions of Section 24 (e) of the 1999 Constitution the 2nd Respondent has a constitutional obligation to render assistance to appropriate and lawful agencies in the maintenance of law and order and that the freezing of the applicant's account pursuant to the instruction of the 1st Respondent was not to deprive the Applicant of its property but in order to pave way for proper investigation which is the duty of the 1st Respondent. Finally he urged the court to hold in favour of the 2nd Respondent and dismiss the Applicant's case.

Furthermore, learned Counsel for the Applicant via a further and better affidavit as well as an address urged the court that all the facts stated in all the paragraphs of the counter affidavit of the 2nd Respondent are all false and a deliberate attempt to mislead the court. In his reply address learned counsel submitted that in as much as the Applicant is not unaware of the civic responsibility on private individuals to assist the law enforcement agencies in carrying out their lawful duties, however it is not the duty of the 1st Respondent to give order to the 2nd Respondent to freeze the account of the Applicant and it is not the civic duty of the 2nd Respondent to obey such illegal order. He maintained that the order from the 1st Respondent was made illegal and in bad faith and by obeying the order, the 2nd Respondent is not discharging his civic duty but aiding the 1st Respondent in violating the fundamental human right of the Applicant. Counsel referred the court to the cases of **GUARANTY TRUST V. AKINSIKU ADEDAMOLA**

(2019) 5NWLR AT PG50; FABIYI V. STATE (2013) LPELR-21180(CA) and submitted that before freezing a customer's account a bank must be satisfied that there is an Order of Court as the Police Act did not give 1st Respondent the power to unilaterally freeze the account of the Applicant in carrying out their duties and the 2nd Respondent who has been in banking business for many decades in Nigeria cannot feign ignorance of the law that the 1st Respondent have no statutory power to unilaterally give order to freeze the account of any of the 2nd Respondent's customers. Learned counsel further submitted that not even the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) or Economic and Financial Crimes Commission have the power to freeze account of any individual without the order of Court by virtue of Section 60B of Banks and Other Financial Institution (Amendment) Act 2002 & Sections 29 & 34 Economic and Financial Crimes Commission (Establishment etc) Act 2004. He stated that by Sections 44(1), 34(1), 41 and 36 of the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria (as amended) the Applicant has the right to acquire and own property which includes money and any unlawful denial of access to his money without fair hearing amounts to violation of the applicant's right which affected the applicant's freedom of movement and subjected him to unimaginable hardship against the dignity of his human person. Finally learned counsel urged the court to grant all the prayers of the Applicant and dismiss the argument of the 2nd Respondent.

I have carefully read and digested the averments in the affidavits of the parties and submissions of their learned Counsel. I have also given a serious thought to contentions of the parties vis-à-vis the evidence placed before the Court in the affidavits of the parties.

The crucial issue that calls for determination is whether or not the Applicant has made out a case to justify the grant of the reliefs sought in the Motion on Notice.

The instant action is predicated on alleged violation of the Applicant's rights as guaranteed in Sections 34, 35, 36, 41 & 44(1) of the 1999 Constitution of Nigeria. The general position of the law in our adversarial legal system is that the burden of proof first lies on the

party who asserts a state of affairs and seeks the Court's favourable finding or pronouncement on it to lead credible evidence in proof of it lest he fails. The burden of proof is however not static as it shift from party to party until the issue in contention is resolved. The burden of proof is always on the party who will fail if no further evidence is adduced. See: **Sections 131 to 133 of the Evidence Act 2011.**

In line with this, the Court in **FAJEMIROKUN V CB (CI) NIG LTD (2002) 10 NWLR (PT. 774) P. 95**, made the point that for an application alleging infringement of an Applicants' fundamental rights to succeed, the application must place before the Court all vital evidence regarding the infringement or breach of the right. It is only thereafter that the burden shifts to the Respondent to prove otherwise.

By the provision of **Section 44(1) of the 1999 Constitution of Nigeria** as amended, no moveable property or any interest in an immoveable property shall be taken possession of compulsorily and no right over or interest in any such property shall be acquired compulsorily in any part of Nigeria except in the manner and for the purposes prescribed by a law that among other things (a) requires the prompt payment of compensation thereof and (b) gives to any person claiming such compensation a right of access for the determination of his interest in the property. **Section 44(2) of the 1999 Constitution of Nigeria** provides that nothing in subsection (1) of this section shall be construed as affecting any general law relating to the temporary taking of possession of property for the purpose of any examination, investigation or enquiry. Nigerian Police is an authority created by **Section 214(1) of the 1999 Constitution** with duties and functions set out in **Section 4 of the Police Act**. Part of their duties includes prevention of crimes, investigation of crimes, detection of crimes and preservation of law and order. In execution of the above responsibilities, the Police have the discretion to investigate into any complaint made in good faith to them. **See FAWEHINMI V. INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE (2002) 7NWLR (PT. 767) 606.** However, their power to investigate, arrest or detain a person can only arise where there is reasonable suspicion of commission of crime. In **GTB v. ADEDAMOLA & ORS (2019) LPELR-47310(CA)** the sum of

N300,000 suspected to be proceed of crime was paid into the applicant's account by one Akinshiku Roy, the Economic and Financial Crimes Commissions trailed the lodgment to the Account and therefore placed restrictions on the Account. The account having been restricted for the purpose of investigation, the 1st Respondent then applied for enforcement of his fundamental Rights to secure the release of his account and restrain the Economic and Financial Crimes Commission from arresting or threatening him as well as damages for the restraint. The court in upholding the judgment of the trial court and dismissing the appeal with cost held that The Economic and Financial Crimes Commission has no powers to give direct instructions to Bank to freeze the Account of a Customer, without an order of Court, so doing constitutes a flagrant disregard and violation of the rights of a Customer and the Bank has no obligation to act on such instructions or directives without an order of court.

As aforesaid, I have given due consideration to the contentions of parties as well as the provisions of the law. I have also read and digested the averments in the Applicant's affidavit and 1st and 2nd Respondent's Counter affidavit. There is no gainsaying that the Applicant's bank account was frozen by the 2nd Respondent and that the account was frozen on the alleged suspicion and allegation that the sum of N8, 000.000 credited into the applicant's account (proceed of the sale of \$16,860) by the customer was from a fraudulent source.

By the records of the court, the 2nd Respondent admitted freezing the account of the Applicant although with the alleged instruction and directive of the 1st Respondent. The 2nd Respondent's response is that one Mr Ichemesie Ifeanyi Livinus who operates a savings account number 2027312258 domiciled with the 2nd Respondent complained and reported the loss of total sum of N8,601,075.00 (Eight Million, Six Hundred and One Thousand and Seventy Five Naira Only) on his account and demanded for an investigation and recovery of the stolen sum. The 2nd Respondent's investigation revealed that the account of the Applicant was involved in a fraudulent transaction that occurred in the account of Mr Ichemesie Ifeanyi Livinus another customer of the 2nd

Respondent. It was on this basis that the 2nd Respondent involved the 1st Respondent for further investigation on the fraudulent transaction which led to the freezing of the applicant's bank account by the 2nd Respondent on the instruction of the 1st Respondent. The 2nd Respondent in freezing the account of the Applicant was only carrying out a lawful directive of the 1st Respondent being an agency of the Federal Government. The 2nd Respondent by virtue of its civil responsibilities to assist law enforcement agencies in carrying out their duties assisted the 1st Respondent in its investigation on the fraudulent transaction. The action of the 2nd Respondent by temporarily freezing the account of the applicant did not breach the Fundamental Human Right of the Applicant as same was done in line with extant laws.

I have gone through the averments as well as the exhibits attached to the affidavit and counter affidavits of the Applicant and Respondents respectively. The 2nd Respondent therein admitted that the Applicant's bank account was frozen by them when part of the money belonging to a customer who laid complaint of loss of same was traced to the Applicant's account. The 2nd Respondent averred also that investigation revealed that the Applicant's account was involved in a fraudulent transaction that affected another customer. It is also the position of the 2nd Respondent that the freezing of the Applicant's bank account by them was in obedience to the lawful directive of the 1st Respondent. The 1st Respondent in its counter affidavit denied giving such instruction or directive to the 2nd Respondent to freeze the account of the Applicant as it does not have the power except with an order of the court to do so. With this outright denial by the 1st Respondent that it never gave such instruction or directive to the 1st Respondent to freeze the account of the Applicant, the onus shifted back to the 2nd Respondent to lead further evidence by filing a further counter affidavit exhibiting to the court the instruction or directive of the 1st Respondent to them which they acted upon and froze the Applicant's account.

I have painstakingly gone through the counter affidavit of the 2nd Respondent and the exhibits attached thereto to determine if the 2nd

Respondent is justified in freezing the bank account of the Applicant but to no avail because there is no exhibit attached to the counter affidavit showing any of the following; (a) the complaint made to 2nd Respondent by Mr Ichemesie Ifeanyi Livinus alleging loss of money and demanding an investigation, (b) the 2nd Respondent's investigation that revealed that the account of the Applicant was involved in a fraudulent transaction, (c) the instruction or directive of the 1st Respondent based on its powers under the Police Act as its general law to the 2nd Respondent to freeze the Applicant's bank account or a court order to that effect. From the above, the 2nd Respondent has failed to led credible evidence in proof of what it asserts. The general position of the law in our adversarial legal system is that the burden of proof first lies on the party who asserts a state of affairs and seeks the Court's favourable finding or pronouncement on it to lead credible evidence in proof of it lest he fails. The burden of proof is however not static as it shift from party to party until the issue in contention is resolved. The burden of proof is always on the party who will fail if no further evidence is adduced. See: **Sections 131 to 133 of the Evidence Act 2011.**

From the above foregoing, this court is convinced that the Applicant's account was frozen by the 2nd Respondent without any court order contrary to the position of the law expounded **in GUARANTY TRUST V. AKINSIKU ADEDAMOLA (SUPRA)** against the fundamental rights of the Applicant as guaranteed in Sections 36 and 44 of the 1999 Constitution of Nigeria as amended.

By reasons of the foregoing findings, the Court resolves the sole issue raised above in favour of the Applicant against the 2nd Respondents. Consequently, It is hereby declared that the freezing of the Applicant's bank account No 2065267084 with the 2nd Respondent by the 2nd Respondent without a court order is a breach of Applicant's Fundamental Human Rights as enshrined in the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

The 2nd Respondent (UBA) is hereby directed to unfreeze and release the Applicant's bank account No 2065267084 for active operation forthwith.

In order to forestall a further breach or infringement of the Applicant's right an Order of Injunction is granted restraining the Respondents by themselves, agents, servants or otherwise from freezing the Applicant's bank account No 2065267084 with the 2nd Respondent without an order of court.

The 2nd Respondent is ordered to pay the Applicant damages assessed and fixed at not N30, 000,000.00 but N2, 000.000.00.

The Applicant having succeeded shall be paid a cost assessed and fixed at N100, 000.00 by the 2nd Respondent.

Signed
Hon. Judge
22/7/2021.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIONS

1. Nicholas Eku Esq. for the Applicant.
2. Okechukwu Ajunwa Esq for the 2nd Respondent.
3. P. Abhulimen Esq for the 1st Respondent.