IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE FEDERAL CAPITAL TERRITORY

IN THE ABUJA JUDICIAL DIVISION

HOLDEN AT MAITAMA

BEFORE HIS LORDSHIP: HON. JUSTICE Y. HALILU

COURT CLERKS : JANET O. ODAH & ORS

COURT NUMBER : HIGH COURT NO. 14

CASE NUMBER : SUIT NO: CV/892/17

DATE: : TUESDAY 14TH DECEMBER, 2021

BETWEEN

MAIDA CONSULTANTS LIMITED ….. PLAINTIFF

AND

1. HOIL SUITES AND APARTMENT LTD DEFENDANTS
2. FEDERAL CAPITAL DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
3. KUJE AREA COUNCIL
4. TROUTED INTERNATIONAL PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT LTD.

JUDGMENT

The Plaintiff vide a statement of claim filed on the 9th June, 2017 sought against the Defendants the following reliefs;

1. A Declaration of Court that the Plaintiff is the allottee and owner of the 1.3006 hectares of land situate at Kuje, Plot A2, Cluster 6, Abuja.

2. A Declaration of court that the Plaintiff is entitled to undisturbed and peaceable possession of the 1.3006 hectares of land situate at Kuje, Plot A2, cluster 6, Abuja.

3. An Order of perpetual injunction restraining the Defendants, their servant, privies, agents or assign from further trespassing into the 1.3006 hectares of land situate at Kuje, Plot A2, Cluster 6, Abuja.

4. The sum of N10,000,000.00 (Ten Million Naira) being general damages.

The case of the Plaintiff as distilled from the statement of claim and the evidence adduced is that sometime in July, a letter of allocation dated 6th July, 1993, with Ref No. FCT/KAC/AA2/B6, Kuje Area Council granted to the Plaintiff about the 1.3006 hectares of land situate at Kuje, Plot A2, Cluster 6, beside Dunamis Church, Abuja.

That the same customary certificate was duly regularized and signed by the Federal Capital Territory Administration on 28th February, 2007.

That, the right of occupancy with Ref. No: FCT/KAC/AA2/B6 was granted in 6th of July, 1993 and given under the hand of the Deputy Mayor of Kuje Area Council, Kuje – Abuja.

The Plaintiff further avers that the company was issued with acknowledgement for regularization of land titles and documents dated 28th February, 2007 with a New File No. Misc 95838 and that prior to the regularization it was issued with an offer terms of grant/conveyance of approval dated 6th April, 1993.

That the 1st Defendant has till date refused to respond to any of petition, warning or protest levied against them at each given time.

That an attempt by the Plaintiff to get the 1st Defendant to proof their title through several correspondences in relation to the 1.3006 hectares of land situate at Kuje, Plot A2, Cluster 6, beside Dunamis Church, Abuja was abortive.

The Plaintiff tendered the following documents;

a. Customary Certificate of Occupancy.

b. Offer of Terms of Grant/Conveyance of Provisional Approval.

c. Two Solicitor's letters.

Learned counsel for the Defendants cross – examined PW1, whereupon Plaintiff closed its case to pave way for the Defendants to open its defence.

Defendants in their statement of Defence/Counter Claim denied paragraphs 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11,12, 13, 14 and 15 of the Plaintiff statement of claim.

That contrary to paragraph 3 of the statement of claim, the 2nd Defendant is not the "FCT land planning and survey department, FCDA Area 11".

Defendants further stated that the 1st Defendant is the lawful Attorney of the 4th Defendant, the lawful allottee of the land in dispute before the court.

That the 3rd Defendant allotted the land in dispute to the 4th Defendant as Block No.6, Phase AA2, Layout, Kuje Area Council, Abuja vide a conveyance of provisional approval dated 16th June, 1993 with reference number: RLACK/KAC/FCDA/P&S/20/1/MISC/17236 and the old file number regarding the said allotment was MISC. 17236.

That the Plaintiff was not at any time allotted any parcel of land beside Dunamis Church, Kuje District, Abuja and there is no parcel of land beside Dunamis Church, Kuje District, Abuja known or described as "Kuje plot A2, Cluster 6, beside

Dunamis Church, Abuja" measuring about 1.3006 hectares or any other size.

The Defendants stated that the Plaintiff's alleged parcel of land as shown in her letter of allocation dated 1st April, 1993 and customary certificate of occupancy dated 6th July, 1993 is not situate beside Dunamis Church, Kuje District, Abuja as it is Block No. 6 Phase AA2, Layout, Kuje Area Council, Abuja belonging to the 4th Defendant by virtue of her letter of allocation dated 16th June, 1993 that is situate beside Dunamis Church, Kuje District, Abuja. That the said parcel of land has been developed by the 1st Defendant with the full consent and authority of the 4th Defendant.

That the parcel of land beside Dunamis Church, Kuje District, Abuja to which the Plaintiff lays claim

is not the same parcel of land shown in the alleged letter of allocation dated 6th July, 1993 as well as the customary certificate of occupancy relied upon by the Plaintiff.

DW1 tendered the followings documents in evidence;

i. Letter of Offer/Conveyance of provisional Approval.

ii. Recertification of title document acknowledgment.

iii. 4 receipt from Kuje Area Council.

iv. Land Development Agreement.

DW1 was then cross – examined.

1st and 4th Defendants similarly counter – claimed as follows against the Plaintiff:-

a. A Declaration that the counter claimant is the holder of the Customary Right of Occupancy over the parcel of land which is described and known as Block No. 6, Phase AA2, Layout, Kuje Area Council, Abuja measuring approximately 1.05Hectres and bound by beacon numbers PB1795, PB1796, PB1797, PB1798, PB1799, PB1800 and back to the starting point.

b. An Order of perpetual injunction restraining the Plaintiff/Defendant to the Counter Claim either by herself, agents or privies howsoever from interfering with the Counter Claimant's exercise of proprietary rights over the said Block No. 6, Phase AA2, Layout, Kuje Area Council, Abuja measuring approximately 1.05Hectres and bound by beacon numbers PB1795, PB1796,

PB1797, PB1798, PB1799, PN1800 and back to the starting point.

c. The sum of N40,000,000.00 (Forty Million Naira) only being general damages against the Plaintiff/Defendant to the Counter Claim.

Parties closed their respective cases and same was adjourned for filing and adoption of final written address.

Defendants filed their final written address and formulated 2 issues for determination to wit;

a. Whether the Kuje Area Council is competent to grant the Customary Right of Occupancy it purportedly granted to the Plaintiff over "Kuje plot A2 Cluster 6, beside Dunamis Church, Abuja vide the Conveyance of Provisional Approval dated 1st April, 1993;and the

Customary Certificate of Occupancy dated 6th July, 1993 by reason of the extant provisions of the Land Use Act and the decided cases on the point that it is only the Minister of the Federal Capital Territory that is vested with the powers to grant title over any parcel of land within the Federal Capital Territory.

b. Whether the Claimant has discharged the burden of proof on her to entitle her to the declaration of title sought in its amended statement of claim.

On issue 1, learned counsel submit that Kuje Area Council lacks the power to grant Exhibit "A" and "B" to the Claimant; and that the said Exhibits "A" and "B" conferred no title interest known to law over "Kuje Phase A2, Cluster No. 6, measuring about 1.3006 Hectares or any parcel of land on the

Claimant. Declaration of titles over parcels of land within the Federal Capital Territory can only be made in respect of a grant of statutory right of occupancy by the Hon. Minister of the FCT and not by mere conjuncture or speculation. Section 299 (2) and 304 of the 1999 constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria; Section 1(3) and 18 of the Federal Capital Territory Act, Abuja. Section 51(2) of the Land Use Act; ***ONA VS ATENDA (2000) 5 NWLR (Pt. 656) 244 at 275 Paragraphs C-D; MADU VS MADU (2008) 6 NWLR (Pt. 1083) 296 were cited.***

Learned counsel submit on issue 1, that the Plaintiff having failed to produce any instrument of grant of right of occupancy issued to her over the alleged "Kuje Phase A2, Cluster No. 6", her case is bound to

fail. Counsel urge the court to resolve the 1st issue against the Plaintiff and this be dismissed.

On issue 2, learned counsel argued that it is settled that the burden of proof rests on the person who will fail if no evidence is led at all in the matter. The general and settled position of the law is that a party who seeks a declaratory relief must succeed or fail on the strength of his/her case, and not on weakness of the defence. ***UTB NIGERIA LTD VS AJAGBULE (2006) 2 NWLR (Pt. 965) 447 at 475 paragraphs D-G; FALEYE VS DADA (2016) 15 NWLR (Pt. 80) at 123 – 124 Paragraphs G-D; OGBORU VS OKOWA (2016) 11 NWLR (Pt. 1522) 84 at 123 Paragraphs F-G were cited.***

Counsel submits that the law is settled that a Plaintiff in an action for declaration has the onus to

identify the area of land with certainty and prove the boundaries of the land in dispute. Thus, the Plaintiff in this case failed woefully to identify the specific parcel of land for which it seeks the declaratory reliefs from the court. ***DABUP VS KOLO (1993) 9 NWLR (Pt. 317) 254 at 269 paragraphs E-F, was cited.***

Learned counsel further submit that it is settled law that where the Defendants dispute the title or name of the land, the size of the plot and the boundaries as pleaded by the Plaintiff, the identity of the land becomes an issue which must be proved by the Claimant if he or she is to succeed in an action for declaration of title. ***OKUNLADE VS ADEMILOYO (2011) 15 NWLR (Pt. 1269) 72 at 95 – 96 paragraphs F-A;***

ILONA VS IDAKWO (2003) 11 NWLR (Pt. 830) 33 at 85 paragraphs B-D were cited.

On the whole, learned counsel submits that the Plaintiff has failed to establish any nexus between Exhibits "A" and "B". By the disparity and inconsistency in the content of the said Exhibits "A" and "B", they were not issued in respect of the same parcel of land. ***IGYUSE VS OCHOLI (1997) 2 NWLR (Pt. 487) 352 at 365 paragraphs D-E; ODUNZE VS NWOSU (2009) 13 NWLR (Pt. 1050) 1 at 34 – 35 paragraphs B-E were cited.***

Counsel urges the court to dismiss the Plaintiff's entire claims for lack of proof.

On their part, learned counsel for the Plaintiff formulated a sole issue for determination to wit;

Whether the Claimant is entitled to the reliefs sought.

Counsel to the Plaintiff in his submissions refer to the mode of proving title or ownership and land wherein;

- Proof of traditional history or evidence.
- Proof by grant or the production of document of title.
- Proof of acts of ownership extending over a sufficient length of time, numerous and positive enough as to warrant the inference that the persons exercising such acts is true owner(s) of the land;
- Proof of act of long possession; and

- Proof by possession of connected or adjacent land in circumstances rendering it probable that the owner of such land would in addition, be the owner of land in dispute. ***KABURU PADA VS WOYA GALADIMA & ORS (2018) 3 NWLR (Pt. 1607)436 at 455 A-G; MADU VS MADU (2008) LPELR – 1806 (SC); OTUNLA VS OGUNOWO (2004) 6 NWLR (Pt. 868) 184 at 198 were cited.***

Counsel submit further that Kuje Area Council granted to the Claimant a customary Right of Occupancy via a conveyance of provisional Approval dated 1st of April, 1993 and customary certificate of occupancy dated 6th July, 1993 in respect of the subject matter of this suit. The 1st and 3rd Defendants on the other hand tendered a conveyance of provisional approval dated the

6th June, 1993, that is morethan 3 month after the date of the Claimant's conveyance of provisional approval.

Counsel alluded that the Claimant has shown that the right of occupancy over the said piece of land situate beside Dunamis Church, Kuje was granted to her via the conveyance of provisional approval dated 1st of April, 1993 and a certificate of occupancy issued to her as well.

Counsel therefore urges the court to grant their prayers.

COURT:-

I have gone through the pleading of the Plaintiff and corresponding evidence of both parties, oral and

documentary tendered by the Plaintiff and that of the Defendants on the other hand.

Indeed, a party who seeks judgment in his favour is required by law to produce evidence to support his pleading.

It is an established position of law that in cases where declaratory reliefs are claimed as in the present case, the Plaintiff must satisfy the court by cogent and reliable proof of evidence in support of his claim.

See ***AGBAJE VS FASHOLA & ORS (2008) 6 NWLR (Pt. 1082).***

In proving its case in line with the above position of the law, the Plaintiff called a sole witness and tendered the following documents in evidence;

1. Customary certificate of occupancy.
2. Offer of Terms of Grant/Conveyance of provisional approval.
3. Two solicitor's letters.

On their part, Defendants/counter claimant also called a sole witness and tendered the following in evidence.

i. Letter of Offer/Conveyance of Provisional Approval.
ii. Recertification of title document acknowledgment.
iii. 4 receipt from Kuje Area Council.
iv. Land Development Agreement.

It is trite position of the law that where a claim for trespass coupled with a claim for perpetual injunction is in issue, it automatically puts title of the parties in issue. ***MORENIKEJI VS ADEGBOSIN (2003) 25 WRN VOL. 25.***

Let me state also that it is well established position of law that a parties seeking for a declaration of title to land bears the onerous duty in law to adduce credible and admissible evidence in establishment of such title. The Plaintiff must succeed on the strength of his own case except where the evidence adduced by the Defendant strongly supports his case. It had, equally been stated in plethora of case that for a Plaintiff to succeed in such a case, he could prove his ownership of the said land or title therein through any of the five different ways long entrenched by the Supreme Court for proving the same, that is to say;

a. By traditional evidence.

b. By production of document of title

c. By various acts of ownership and possession.

d. By acts of long possession and enjoyment of land.

e. By proof of possession of adjacent land in such circumstances which render it probable that the owner of the adjacent land is the owner of the land in dispute.

OLALEYE VS TRUSTEES OF ECWA (2011) 2 NWLR (Pt. 1230) page 38 – 39 Paragraphs G – B.

The Supreme Court in ***NWOKOROBIA VS NWOGU (2009) 5 NJSC (Pt. 1) page 7 held thus;***

> ***"A party claiming title to land need not plead and prove more than one of the five methods of***

proving title. Any one of the five different ways of establishing title to land, is the minimum that the law requires."

Parties to this case tendered various documents to prove ownership of the land in dispute. The law is well settled that documentary evidence is the hanger where oral evidence can be access.

However, it is instructive to note that both the Plaintiff and the Defendants claimed their title from the same root,i.eKuje Area Council. The Plaintiff's title over the subject matter was granted on 1st April, 1993 while the Defendants' title over the subject matter was granted on 16th June, 1993. The former is in the name of Maida Consultants Ltd and the latter in the name of Trusted International Property Development Limited.

The Plaintiff's title over the subject matter was registered with customary Right of Occupancy **No. FCT/KAC/AA2/B6** whilst Defendants registered title bears Conveyance of Provisional Approval**No.RLACK/KAC/FCDA/P&S/20/1/MIS C/17236.**Both parties registered their documents with the common grantor i.eKuje Area Council.

I need only state at this juncture that the Federal Capital Territory came into being by decree No. 6 of 1976, with 4th February, 1976 as the commencement date.

Section 297 (2) of the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria as amended vests absolute ownership of land within the Federal Capital Territory in the Federal Government of Nigeria.

The said provision is in agreement with section 1(3) of the Federal Capital Territory Act, 2004.

For ease of reference, I shall attempt to reproduce the said section 297 (2) of the 1999 constitution of Federal Republic of Nigeria as amended and 1(3) of the FCT Act.

Section 1(3) FCT Act.

> "***The Area contained in the Capital Territory shall, as from the commencement of this Act, cease to be a portion of the states concerned and shall henceforth be governed and administered by or under the control of the Government of the Federation to the exclusion of any other person or authority whatsoever and the ownership of the lands comprised in the Federal Capital Territory shall likewise vest***

absolutely in the Government of the Federation."

Section 297(2) of the 1999 Constitution.

"***The ownership of all lands comprised in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja shall vest in the Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria."***

For all intents and purposes, the intention of the law makers on the status of Federal Capital Territory is deliberate.

What government and the makers of the Federal Capital Territory Act intended was for a verse espance of land devoid of any form of cultural or hereditary inclination to be set aside for the development of the capital city of Nigeria.

More elucidating is the fact that even the original inhabitants who had occupied their ancestral lands were merely paid compensation and asked to move-on, regardless of the fact that generations of their ancestors were buried on such lands. Section 6 of the Federal Capital Territory Act is instructive in this regard.

There is no gain saying that the issue of deemed grant which is a product of the Land Use Act, 1978 was deliberately made inapplicable to lands within the Federal Capital Territory from the construction of the preamble to the Land Use Act and Section 49 of the same Act.

The Land Use Act must not be read in isolation. Were the Land Use Act meant to apply to Federal Capital Territory, the original inhabitants would

have been granted deemed grant and remained on their various lands within the Territory.

It therefore presupposes that where the language and intent of an enactment or contract is apparent, a trial court must not distort their meaning.

See ***OLATUNDE VS OBAFEMI AWOLOWO UNVERSITY (1998) 5 NWLR (Pt. 549) 178.***

Poser… Who issued the said customary Right of Occupancy in respect of plot A2, Cluster 6, beside Dunamis Church, Kuje, Abuja to the Plaintiff and the title of Defendants?

Poser..Was it the Federal Capital Territory Minister?

It is clear from the preamble to the Land Use Act (LUA) and the provision of section 1 of the Land Use Act (LUA) that the provision of the Act are

meant to vest all land in the territory of each state, excluding land vested in Federal Government or its agencies, in state governors who would hold same in trust for the people of the said state.

It follows therefore, that in line with position expressed in the preamble and section 1 of Land Use Act (LUA), section 49 (1) of Land Use Act (LUA) specifically excludes the application of the said Act to title to land held by the Federal Government or any agency of the Federal Government at the commencement of the Act.

In the same analysis, it is most crystal clear from both the preamble to the FCT Act and section 1(3) of the Act that all land comprised in the Federal Capital Territory vest absolutely in the Federal Government of Nigeria.

For the purpose of clarity, I shall re – produce the preamble to the Land Use Act (LUA) 1978 and FCT Act respectively.

Preamble to FCT Act

> ***"An Act to establish for Nigeria, a Federal Capital territory and to provide for the constitution of a Federal Capital Development Authority for the purpose of exercising the various powers set out in this Act, to execute other projects connected therewith, to provide for the laws applicable to that Territory and for appeals from the Upper Area Court and the law applicable thereto; and to provide for the delegation to the Minister of Federal Capital Territory of the executive powers vested in the President and those vested in him and the***

Government of a State under the applicable laws."

Preamble to Land Use Act

"An Act to vest all land comprised in the territory of each State (except land vested in the Federal Government or its agencies) solely in the Government of the State, who would hold such land in trust for the people and would henceforth be responsible for allocation of land in all urban areas to individuals resident in the State and to organizations for residential, agricultural, commercial and other purposes while similar powers with respect to non – urban areas are conferred on Local Government."

It is instructive to note the settled fact that ownership of land in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja vests absolutely in the Federal Government of Nigeria, who through the Federal Capital Territory Minister grant statutory rights of occupancy to any person/persons.

It follows, naturally and legally speaking, therefore, that ownership of land within the Federal Capital Territory vests in the Federal Government of Nigeria who through the Minister of Federal Capital Territory vest same to every citizen individually upon application.

If therefore, there is no non – urban land in the Federal Capital Territory, it presupposes that the only title validly and legally acceptablewithin the

Federal Capital Territory is the statutory allocation by the Federal Capital Territory Minister.

From the foregoing therefore, it is clear that no Area Council Chairman/Administrator within the Federal Capital Territory has the power to vest any title on land to any person or group of persons as no suchland within the Federal Capital Territory exist as non – Urban Land where customary title could be conferred.

Consequently, to the extent of non – compliance with the statutory provision, of law, any of such allocation so made, is null, void and unconstitutional.

Let it be known to all and sundry that the mere brandishing of acknowledgment letter from Abuja Geographic Information Systems (AGIS) as

evidence of submission area council title documents for regularization does not amount to validation of such a title.

For all intents and purposes, for any such area council allocation, so called, to be in conformity with the statutory provisions of law, the Federal Capital Territory Minister ought to withdraw the said so called Area Council allocation and issue a statutory title.

Once that is not done, the said customary title, so called, is ineffective, null and void, the title held by Plaintiff and Defendant in this case, inclusive.

Poser … Why are all Area Council allocation being regularized?

Certainly it is to bring them in conformity with the provision of law on the issue of allocation which is

the exclusive preserve of the Federal Capital Territory Minister who enjoys the delegated powers of the President Federal Republic of Nigeria, under section 18 of Federal Capital Territory Act.

I am not a member of either of the upper or lower chambers of the National Assembly where laws are made but an interpreter of law made by the legislators.

The objective of any interpretation is to unravel the intention of the law maker which often, can be deduced from the usage of language.

The duty of court is to interpret and give adequate and as close as possible accurate and ordinary meaning of the words used. At best, both Plaintiff and Defendants are trespasser on the land in question.

Having held that both Plaintiff and Defendants are both trespassers and therefore not entitled to the land in issue and could not have been the beneficial owners in that respect, I shall now gravitate to the evidence on record showing who was the first trespasser on the land, since the law gives even a trespasser protection to sue all but except a true owner of such land.

A trial court has the onerous duty of considering all documents placed before it in the interest of Justice. It has a duty to closely examine documentary evidence placed before it in the course of its evaluation and comment and act on it. Document tendered before a trial court are meant for scrutiny or examination by the court, documents are not tendered merely for the sake of tendering but for the purpose of examination and evaluation. ***OMEGA***

BANK (NIG) PLC VS O .B. C LTD (2002) 16 NWLR (PT. 794) 483.

Itis the law that a person can sue for trespass even if he is neither the owner nor a privy of the owner. This is because exclusive possession of the land gives the person in such possession the right to retain it and to undisturbed enjoyment of it against all wrong doers except a person who could establish a better title. Therefore, anyone other than the true owner, who disturbs his possession of the land, can be sued in trespass and in other action. See ***PIUS AMAHOR VS BENEDICT OBIEFINA (1974) LPELR 452 (SC).***

Plaintiff stated in paragraph 10 of its statement of claim that the 1st Defendant (**Hoil Suite and**

Apartments Ltd) is in possession of the land in question.

Even though 1st Defendant insists the land they are in occupation of isn't that of the Plaintiff, Plaintiff not being a beneficial owner cannot disturb the occupation of 1st Defendant who though also a trespasser, has however shown that they have built on the land which is enough evidence of exercise of possession.

As stated in the preceding part of this judgment, a trespasser can maintain an action against the whole world but not against a true owner who has a better title to the land in issue. See ***GBADAMOSI VS OKEGE & ORS (2010) LPELR – 4190 (CA).***

Plaintiff who seeks the indorsed reliefs afore – reproduced in the body of this judgment, being not a

beneficial owner and not being in possession of the subject matter in dispute, shall not be granted the said reliefs which are declaratory in nature and shall only be granted on the strength of the evidence so adduced and not on the weakness of Defence or absence of Defence.

Eventhough, Plaintiff's allocation was first in time, the said title, so called, having been nullified, Plaintiff cannot be granted the said reliefs, moreso that Plaintiff is not in possession of the subject matter…Possession is key in this situation.

On the whole, I shall refuse and dismiss the reliefs sought by Plaintiff for the reason advanced... Same is refused and dismissed.

Next is the Counter Claim of the Defendants/Counter Claimant for;

1. A Declaration that the Counter Claimant is the holder of the Customary Right of Occupancy over the parcel of land known and described as block No. 6 AA2 Layout, Kuje Area Council, Abuja measuring approximately 1.051.05Hectres and bound be beacon numbers PB1795, PB1796, PB1797, PB1798, PB1799 and PB1800 and back to starting point;

2. An Order of perpetual injunction and

3. Damages in the sum of N40,000,000.00 (Forty Million Naira) against the Plaintiff.

From the available evidence before me, 1st Defendant who placed reliance of his right over the subject matter pursuant to the Kuje Area Council allocation which I have mentioned in the preceding part of this judgment. Having nullified the said title,

I cannot declare Counter Claimant's title as valid over the said land. Counter Claimant is still a trespasser in the eyes of the law who's occupation of the land remain temporary.

The next is the relief for perpetual injunction.

Perpetual Injunction is usually granted after ascertaining the rights of parties as done in this matter. It is usually to restrain for life Plaintiff and all those that would claim after him from laying any further such claim over the subject matter.

This relief is desirably earned against Plaintiff and his successors in title only.

On the issue of damages, I make no such Order in view of the fact that Defendantsare in possession.

Justice Y. Halilu
Hon. Judge
14th December, 2021

APPEARANCES

J.K Etuk, Esq. – for the Claimant.

C.S Ekeocha, Esq. – for the 1st and 3rd Defendants.

Other Defendants not in Court and not represented.