THE HIGH COURT OF THE FEDERAL CAPITAL TERRITORY
IN THE ABUJA JUDICIAL DIVISION
HOLDEN AT HIGH COURT 20, GUDU – ABUJA
DELIVERED ON THURSDAY THE 4TH DAY OF MAY 2023
BEFORE HIS LORDSHIP; HON. JUSTICE MODUPE.R. OSHO-ADEBIYI
SUIT NO. FCT/HC/CR/198/2022

BETWEEN
FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA……COMPLAINANT
AND
ONYEKE VINCENT ……DEFENDANT

JUDGMENT

Defendant was arraigned before this court on a 2 counts charge of rape of a minor (13 years) contrary to **Section 1 (2) (a) of the Violence Against Persons (Prohibition) Act, 2015** and placing victim under threat of physical injury contrary to **Section 4 (1) of Violence Against Persons (Prohibition) Act, 2015**. Defendant pleaded not guilty to the two count charge. Prosecution called two witnesses while 2 witnesses testified for defence. The alleged victim by name Ada and the investigating officer from National Agency for prohibition of trafficking in persons (NAPTIP) testified for prosecution. The following is a summary of the case of prosecution:

That her name is Patience Ada Sunday born on 26th September, 2008. Her aunty brought her to Abuja on 1st January, 2020 to stay with her and her husband whom PW2 calls "daddy" that the defendant is the husband to her aunty and had been having sexual relationship with her for many months, so much that she cannot count the number of times as it happens any time the aunty travels out or goes to sleep at night. That the first time defendant had carnal knowledge of PW2 he had approached her and asked her that "we should play and take off my clothes" that she obeyed because she calls him "daddy". That daddy himself tookoff his clothes and told her to lie down on the bed. PW2 said she obeyed and laid on the bed but complained and told him she did not understand the "type of play" he wanted them to indulge in but defendant told her to calm down and put his hand into her vagina, that he scratched the inside of her vagina with his hand and also inserted his penis into her private part. That thereafter having sex with her became frequent but always came with a threat from defendant not to tell anyone else he will kill her.That she obeyed because she calls him daddy. That she eventually summoned up the courage to confide in a woman who

operates point of sales terminal (POS)business around her house. That on another day when "daddy" sent her to go and buy sugar and groundnut she met the wife of the pastor of the church she attends with her aunty and daddy. That the woman operating the POS had obviously intimated the pastor's wife about what she confided in her and the pastor's wife invited her over to her house. On getting there, she told the pastor how "daddy" had been having constant and repeated sexual intercourse with her. That on the 31st December, the POS woman came to her house and physically took her outside their premises.The POS woman had come along with a team of Civil defence officers who took both herself and daddy to the Civil Defence office. That upon arrival at the civil defence office daddy whispered to her not to tell any of the officers about the sexual relationship with her. That she told the civil defence officers how defendant had been having sexual relationship with her. Thereafter, both defendant and PW2 were handed over to NAPTIP.That at NAPTIP office she likewise explained how defendant had been having sexual relationship with her on a constant basis. Under cross-exam PW2 confirmed that she wrote her statement herself at NAPTIP office and that she had been living with defendant and his wife for about 2 years prior to the incident. She confirmed that she had never had sexual relationship prior to the defendant. Under cross-exam, PW2 confirmed that defendant penetrated her vagina several times with his fingers and penis. When asked how she felt on her first sexual encounter with defendant, she replied that it was very painful and something similar to thick water was oozing out from defendant's penis.She further confirmed that the defendant penis with the thick watery discharge was inserted into her vagina. That all sexual encounters with defendant was painful and she could not count the number of times defendant penetrated her because it was too numerous to count. PW2 was 13 years old at the time she wrote her statement at NAPTIP. At NAPTIP, PW2 testified that shewrote her statement herself. Upon being transferred to NAPTIP office PW1 (the investigating police officers) he testified that the defendant wrote his statement himself, same was read over to him, defendant agreed to the contents and defendant signed, PW1 countersigned and another senior officer counter-signed. That victim could not write so PW1 wrote the statement for the victim. PW1 and some other officers at NAPTIP took PW2 to the house she was living with the defendant and his wife and the PW2 described how defendant had raped her several times in that house. PW1 testified that he took the victim to the hospital at Federal Medical Centre Gwarimpa where several tests were carried out on her. That defendant confessed to PW1 that he had sexual

relationship with PW2. That the defendant was not forced to write his statement.That he visited the scene with fellow NAPTIP officers and the PW2 showed the officers how defendant used to move her from one room to the other and rape her several times. That these various incidents of rape occurred when defendant's wife was not at home. That medial report showed that PW2 had been penetrated. PW1 was thereafter cross-examined and defence opened its case.

DW1 testified that she is defendant's wife. That the PW2 is a relation of hers and she is the daughter of a certain Mr. Sunday Ogwuchewho is a distant relation. That DW1 brought PW2 to Abuja with a promise to educate her. That she registered PW2 in school here in Abuja and placed her in Primary 4. That PW2 had been acting like she was under a spiritual and evil force and her father Mr. Sunday Ogwuchehad taken her for spiritual deliverance in a church. That she came home one day from a trip when she was told her husband had been arrested and transferred to NAPTIP for the offence of rape. That she never suspected anything nor witnessed anything. Defendant testified for himself and stated that he is a civil servant who works with Nigeria Tourism Development Corporation. That PW2 was brought from the village by his wife and he has been a father figure to PW2. That he took PW2 like his own daughter and was shocked when PW2 pointed accusing fingers at him that he had been raping her numerous times. That he started crying when PW2 said he raped her. That he never touched PW2. Under cross-exam defendant re-iterated that he did not rape PW2. Defendant admitted that he wrote his statement himself in his own handwriting and confirmed all contents of his statement as true. Nowhere in defendants' testimony did he say he was forced to write his statement neither did he say he was threatened to write his statement.

Parties filed their respective written address Prosecutor in his final written address raised a sole issue for determination:

"Whether the prosecution has proved its case beyond reasonable doubt to warrant a conviction?

Summarily, prosecution in its written address submitted that they had been able to prove the ingredients of rape to wit: that the accused had sexual relationship with the victim that the accused had the mensrea and that there was penetration and PW2 was not the wife of defendant when he raped her. That the ingredient of consent is not necessary to be proved as victim was and is still underaged. That the medical report shows hymen of

victim is no longer intact. That the defendant said in Open Court that everything he said in court and in his statement Exhibit B is nothing but the truth and defendant's statement is to the effect that he raped victim a **number of times: prosecutor relied on a number of cases:-**

1) **IFANY AMAH VS. STATE (2023) 3 NWLR (1871) 301 AT 323 PARAS B-H**
2) **MOHAMMED IBRAHIM VS. THE STATE (2015) 3 MJSC (PT. II) 85**
3) **IBRAHIM ABDULLAHI VS. STATE (2023) 2 NWLR (PT. 1869) 407**
4) **OKON ETIM AKPA VS. THE STATE (2016) 1-2 SC (PT. III) 93 AT 103 PARAS 25-35.**
5) **EMEKA VS. STATE (2002) 32 WRN 37 OR (2006) 6 SCNJ 259**
6) **POSU VS. STATE (2011) 2 NWLR (PT. 1234) 393 AT 416**
7) **ISA VS. STATE (2016) 6 NWLR (PT. 1508) 245**
8) **DANLADI VS. STATE (2019) 16 NWLR (PT. 1698) 342**

Defendant counsel in his written statement raised a sole issue for determination "whether the prosecution has proved his (sic) case in line with Section 132, 133, 134 and 135 of the Evidence Act against the defendant to secure the guilt and possible conviction of the defendant and sentencing?

Having regards to both oral and documentary evidence adduced before this Honourable Court" That the PW1 testified that he wrote the statement of the victim having gotten the consent and authority of the victim to assist in writing her statement at NAPTIP office but this was contradicted by victim who said she wrote her statement herself. That the said statement was never tendered before this court. That prosecution failed to tender the document used in transferring the defendant from the office of civil defence to the office of NAPTIP. That no medical expert was called to give evidence on the strength of the medical report tendered. That victim stated that she saw penis of defendant oozing out thick water and she felt pain on the first day of intercourse with defendant. That it is a notorious fact that if victim was a virgin she ought to have seen blood on the first day of sexual intercourse. That defendant in his statement did not admit to raping victim. Counsel to defendant relied on a number of cases which includes:-

1) **ADEKAMBI & ORS VS. ADEBISI JACKSON (2007 ALL FWLR (PT. 383) 152, BELLO VS. EMEKA (1981**
2) **DR. OLUSEGUN MIMIKO (2010 VOL.32 WRN)**

Having listenedtestimony of parties and read the written addresses of both counsels, the issue for determination is;

(1) **"Whether prosecution proved its case beyond reasonable doubt?**

Prosecutor in this case tendered 2 exhibits, Exhibit A and Exhibit B. Exhibit A is the medical report of PW2 issued at the Federal Ministry of Health, Federal Staff Hospital dated 18/1/2022. The Medical report signed by a Dr. Bright O. in plain English (devoid of medical terminology) stated that the hymen of PW2 has been broken, no bleeding noted and all necessary tests were negative.Exhibit B is the defendant's statement which he volunteered at NAPTIP on 15/01/2022. **Section 1(1) of theViolence Against PersonsACT 2015** defines rape as;

(1) A person commits the offence of rape, if:

(a)He or she intentionally penetrates the vagina, anus or mouth of another person with any other part of his or her body or anything else;

(b)The other person does not consent to the penetration;

(c)The consent is obtained by force or means of threat or intimidation of any kind or by fear of harm or by means of false and fraudulent representation as to the nature of the act or the use of any substance or additive capable of taking away the willof such person or in the case of a married person by impersonating his or her spouse.

From the above, under the **Violence Against PersonsACT, 2015** the prosecution has the burden of proving: -

(a) That defendant intentionally penetrated the vagina of the PW2 with his penis.

(b) That PW2 did not consent to the penetration

(c) That the defendant putPW2 under fear of harmor intimidation.

From the facts of the case before me, PW2 is underaged and was 13 yearsold at the time of incidenthence the 2nd leg of burden of proof expected from prosecution automatically excludes PW2 as the proof of consent to sex is not required from an underaged. This is in line with **Section 31(3) (a) of the Childs Right Act 2003**

"Where a person is charged with an offence (of lawful sexual relations with a child) under this Section (31 of the same act) it is immaterial that the offender believed the person to be of or above the age of 18 years".

While the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 (as amended) did not expressly provide for the age of consent, the Childs Right Act, 2003 being on act which embodies the fundamental human Rights of children and which the FCT Abuja has adopted states that the age of 18 years is the bench mark between an adult and a child. Hence the age of 18 years is a decisive factor as to whether consent to sex is needed or not. In essence any individual under the age of 18 years old is considered an underaged who cannot give his/her consent to sexual relations. I therefore hold that the burden of proof on prosecution to prove that victim did not consent is hereby extinguished.

Prosecution therefore have the burden to:-

(1) Establish that defendant intentionally penetrated the vagina of the PW2 with his penis

(2) That the defendant put PW2 under fear of harm, intimidation and threat.

It is worthy to note that **TheViolence Against PersonsACT, 2015**under which defendant was charged does not make it a sine qua non that there must have been a deposit of semen in the vagina it is merely sufficient that defendant penetrated thevagina of the alleged victim. The case of the prosecution is that defendant had been committing acts of rape on the person of PW2 on several occasions. So much so that PW2 testified that she could not put a figure to the number of times defendant had sex with her. PW2 testified that the first time defendant had sex with her was painful and bloody, that at all times sex with defendant was always painful. PW2 being underaged, it is important that her testimony be corroborated. PW1 being the investigating Police officer (IPO) testified that PW2 indeed told him that defendant raped her numerous times that she lost count. That these series of rape were common anytime her aunty who is defendant's wife travelled or had gone to sleep. The statement of PW2 was not tendered although she testified that she wrote her statement herself whilst PW1 testified that he wrote the statement on behalf of PW2. Prosecution in support of its case also tendered the statement of the defendant.

It is worthy to note that statement of defendant was admitted into evidence without objection from defendant counsel, moreover defendant testified under cross-exam that he wrote his statement himself in his own handwriting that he was never threatened nor forced neither was he intimidated to write his statement. Evidence of PW2 was to the effect that defendant at the initial stage started by playing with her and touching her inappropriately. That defendant thereafter started having sex with her on a

regular basis. That she was traumatized and had to confide in a certain woman who does POS business. That it was the woman who eventually invited civil defence who in turn arrested defendant. That herself and defendant were handed over by civil defence to NAPTIP. Everything PW2 said was corroborated by PW1 as his findings in the investigation carried out save and except PW1 testified that he wrote the statement of PW2 for her while PW2 testified that she wrote her statement herself.Whichever way the said statement was never tendered before this court hence it will be a waste of judicial time evaluating who wrote the statement. Nevertheless, prosecutor in support of its case tendered the statement of defendant as Exhibit B.Defendant under oath testified that he wrote his statement himself in his own handwriting and did not renege on any part of the contents of his statement. In essence statement of defendant was unchallenged and uncontroverted. A careful perusal of Exhibit E which is defendant's statement corroborates the case of prosecution that PW2 was brought to the home of defendant by his wife. Defendant in his statement wrote in his own handwriting that all of a sudden, he started playing rough play with the little girl by touching her body particularly her breast and trying to have sex with her. This also corroborate the testimony of PW1 and PW2 that defendant started initially by playing with the little girl the type of play not expected of a father figure and the nature of the "play" being sexual intercourse. Defendant in his statement further stated "playing with PW2" started since September, 2021. Defendant in his statement also stated that he had indeed kissed PW2 once and romanced her 4 times in an attempt to make love to her but that he was unable to make love to the little child because she was too small/tight to penetrate into her vagina. In defendant's words as culled from his statement;

> **"I kissed her once and romanced her up to 4 times trying to make love to her but it was impossible because it was too small to penetrate into her. I swear, it was.I wanted to have sex. But impossible"**

Prosecutor has been able to bring out contradictions in the evidence of defendant as what defendant told the court is a complete deviation from what he told NAPTIP which he reduced into his statement. Defendant in his evidence-in-chief stated that on no occasion did he as much as touch PW2. That he had always acted as a father to PW2 and was surprised that PW2 accused him of raping her several times. That he had told civil defence and NAPTIP that he never raped PW2. Under cross-examination prosecutor asked

Q: What you told the court and what you told NAPTIP is nothing but the truth

A: Yes

Q: Look at Exhibit B (defendants' statement) that is the statement you made at NAPTIP in your own handwriting

A: Yes.

From the statement of the defendant, he had tried several times to penetrate the minor but it was impossible because she was too tight/small. That he did not know what came over him and pleaded for forgiveness. Defendant wrote in his statement that **"it will never happen again, I kissed her once and romanced her up to 4 times trying to make love to her but it was not possible because it was too small to penetrate into her".** From the above prosecution has been able to bring out the following contradictions:

(1) That defendant had in his statement on several occasions romanced PW2 in a way that characterized sexual intention contrary to his oral testimony before the court that he did not touch PW2 and had never touched her.

(2) That defendant had tried several times to penetrate the PW2 as according to defendant's statement "she was too small to penetrate" this is contrary to defendant's oral testimony before this court where defendant said "I did not do it and cannot regret what I did not do".

(3) That defendant had been having sexual/carnal knowledge of PW2 with the feeble excuse that it was a spiritual force because as captured in defendant's statement that PW2 sometimes changes into the form of his wife". In his words defendant stated **"sometimes she changes to my wife form and I will realize after all that she is not my wife and started regretting my action. I am sorry about my actions".** This aspect of defendant's statement goes to prove that whenever defendant's wife is not at home, defendant makes use of PW2 as a sex slave in order to fulfil his sexual pleasures.

This contradicts defendant's oral testimony before this court wherein he said "I did not do anything to Ada". In the case of **AKPA VS THE STATE (2007) 2 NWLR (PT. 1019)** Kekere – Ekan JCA (as she then was) held

> ***"A piece of evidence contradicts another when it affirms the opposite of what the other evidence has stated, not when there is just a minor discrepancy between them. Two pieces of evidence contradict one another when they are by themselves inconsistent. On the other hand, a discrepancy may occur when a piece of evidence stops short of, or contains a little more than***

what the other piece of evidence says or contains some minor difference in detail"

The question that arises at this stage is whether prosecution has been able to bring out mere discrepancies in the evidence of defendant or contradictions. As earlier stated above per KekereEkun (JSC) in the case of **AKPAN VS STATE (Supra)** a discrepancy occurs when evidence contains major differences but from the facts before me evidence of defendant is not minor but contains major contradictions. The next question that comes to fore is whether the contradictions in defendant's evidence is material and substantial to grind a decision from the court. The Supreme Court has warned that for contradictions in the evidence of a witness to vitiate a decision, such contradictions must be so material as to cast serious doubts on the case of the defendant.See **OGUN VS AKINYOLE (20040 18 NWLR (Pt.905) 362, 392**. The contradictions as I highlighted above are not only material but substantial and the Supreme Court in the case of **NWORU VS STATE (2018) LPELR – 4464(CA)** where Ogunwumiju JCA (as she then was) held that "the court cannot pick and choose which portion of the evidence of a prosecution witness to believe. It is either the witness is a truthful witness or an outright liar whose total evidence must be evaluated as credible or incredible as the case may be".

For defendant to write in his unchallenged and uncontradictedstatement and in his own handwriting that he had pressed the breast of PW2 several times, he had attempted to make love to her and in the process unable to penetrate because she was too tight is nothing but a grave contradiction to his oral evidence before this court when he said that he had never touched PW2. This cannot be waived away as minor discrepancies rather these are major contradictions and it goes to say that defendant has not been a witness of truth. Although prosecution did not tender the statement of PW2, I do not see how it has affected the case of the prosecution adversely. In our criminal jurisprudence, it is not a requirement that the prosecution tenders the statement made by its witness as a condition precedent to fulfilling the burden of proof of prosecution case. Hence non production of the statement of PW2 is not fatal and has no adverse effect on the case of theprosecution. The most vital issue in a criminal proceedingis testimony of witnesses in courtand the opposing party given an opportunity to present its case see **PETER VS STATE (2013) LPELR – 20302.**It needs to be emphasized that prosecution is not compelled to field all its witnesses neither is prosecution compelled to tender all exhibits in their custody.

Generally when a party seeks to tender a document in possession of the adverse party, a notice to produce is served on the other party to produce those documents or better still apply to the court to grant defendants request for prosecution to produce the statement of victim and other necessary facilities required in the prosecution of defendants case.

In **NWEKE VS STATE (2017) LPELR 42103 (SC)** the Apex Courts held ***"if the appellant strongly wanted some facilities which were not made available to him. He would have applied formerly to the trial court for an order compelling Respondent (Prosecution) to make available those facilities which he required for his defence…once he becomes aware that he has a charge hanging over his neck for an infraction of the law and makes a request either orally or in writing for any facilities to prepare for his defence, the court must accede to his request and prosecution has to comply"*** per **PAUL ADAMU GALINJE JSC.**

In the matter before me, at no time did the defence counsel apply to the court that statement of PW2 (victim) be produced by the prosecution. As I stated earlier the prosecution is not compelled to produce documents except on order of the court. Prosecution is free to prosecute its case whichever way they deem fit.

The PW2 had given evidence of how defendant raped her repeatedly over a period of 2 years. PW2 had stated that the rape was so numerous that she could not count the number of times. PW1 had corroborated testimony of PW2 to the effect that investigation showed that she had indeed been raped several times by the defendant. Defendant on his part has not been a witness of truth as there are grave and material contradictions in his evidence in court on the one hand and his statement written under caution before NAPTIP officials on the other hand. It is trite that the court cannot go on a frolic of its own in order to determine which of defendant testimony is true and which one is false hence it is in my view thatdefendant's testimony before this court holds no water and I do not believe same. In a situation like this where there are grave contradictionsin defendant statement, the proper thing is for the court to hold that defendant do not have a defence to this charge and I so hold. Having held that defendant testimony is riddled with grave and material contradictions, it is only logical that the court upholds the testimony of the PW2 for the following reasons;

(1) PW2 being a victim of rape and a minor must have her evidence corroborated more so as her evidence was not sworn. It will be a mission in futility for the court to seek for an eyewitness to an

offence of rape for purposes of corroboration. It is sufficient that victim was able to confide in someone and tell the person all that transpired as evidenced in the testimony of PW1 who is the investigationPolice officer. The doctor's report tendered is devoid of any medical language and states in pure English that the hymen of the victim is no longer intact. The most incriminating corroboration provided by the prosecution is the statement of defendant himself.

(2) PW2 testified that defendant raped her on several occasions while defendant in his statement said he tried to penetrate her but was unable to penetrate because her vagina was too tight but contradicted himself in his oral testimony before the court that he had never touched her goes to prove and corroborate the evidence of PW2 that defendant indeed raped her on several occasions and that defendant is not a witness of truth.

(3) PW2 stated in her testimony that the rape went on for a long time because defendant threated to kill her if she told anyone. There is unchallenged and uncontradicted evidence before me that PW2 calls defendant daddy and also lives with defendant and his wife. That Defendant is not only a father figure to PW2 but also a person of superior authority who took advantage of his position of authority to rape PW2 several times.

(4) That hymen of PW2 was no longer intact which goes to say PW2 is no longer a virgin does not point to the fact that defendant was the one that disvirgined her. The facts surrounding this case and the circumstantial evidence points to the fact that the wife of defendant often travels leaving PW2 with her husband, that PW2 had confided in a number of people about the constant rape, that PW2 stated in her evidence that it was defendant that had been raping her on a constant basis, that defendant in his statement admitted that he had indeed romanced PW2 about four times, that he had tried to penetrate her but she was too small and tight to be penetrated and that he had kissed her but was unable to penetrate her areall circumstantial evidence which goes to prove the guilt of the defendant.

It is more damaging for defendant considering that his statement was written by himself without force or threat is enough to prove that defendant indeed penetrated PW2.It is only

sensible for any reasonable person to believe that defendant must have indeed penetrated PW2 and that is why he can confidently state in his statement that her vagina was too small and tight. It goes to show that PW2 by defendant's statement was a virgin as defendant stated that her vagina was too tight to penetrate. It goes to prove that in the course of forcing himself on PW2 and attempting to penetrate her small and tight vagina at different times, I am convinced that defendant indeed penetrated PW2.In my view defendant was so driven with lust and desire for PW2 more so as there was nobody at home to suspect foul play that he had ample opportunity to penetrate PW2 and I so hold that he indeed penetrated the vagina of PW2.

(5) PW2 was so scared for her life that defendant would kill her due to defendant's threat that she did not tell anybody for many months. PW2 stated in her exam-in-chief "He usually warned me that if I tell anyone he will kill me." At this stage, I would like to emphasis on the demeanour of PW2 whilst giving evidence. PW2 was apparently disturbed upon sighting the defendant in court. She was very panicky and upset. She was unable to look at the defendant and kept darting her eyes around the court room like someone looking for an escape route. She told the court she could not bare looking at the defendant nor being in the same room with defendant. She was scared and told the court that she did not want to call defendant "daddy" and asked for permission to call defendant "He". The court had to re-assure her that she was in a safe place before PW2 could give her evidence. PW2 eventually gave evidence to this court with her eyes closed and unable to look or glance at the defendant. This reaction of PW2 in my view culminated from the various threats that defendant had issued over the course of incessantly raping PW2 and threating to kill her if she told anybody.It is my view that defendant indeed threatened PW2 which made her keep quiet on the issue of rape for a long timewhich in turn gave defendant ample opportunity and leverage to rape PW2 on numerous occasions and I so hold.

From the above I hereby find defendant guilty of the 1st count of rape of a minor contrary to **Section 1(2) of Violence Against PersonsACT, 2015**.

I also find defendant guilty of count No 2 which is placing victim under threat of physical injury contrary to **Section 4(1)of Violence Against PersonsACT, 2015**.

ALLOCUTUS

Defendant: In all I can say, I plead with the court to use its discretion. I plead with the court to temper justice with mercy.

Section 1(2) (a)of Violence Against PersonsACT, 2015states that a person convicted of an offence of rape is liable to imprisonment for life except:

(a) Where the offender is less than 14 years of age to a maximum of 14 years

(b) In all other cases to a minimum of 12 years

It goes without saying that defendant is liable to life imprisonment or a minimum of 12 years imprisonment upon conviction.

Under the second count **Section 4 (1) of theViolence Against PersonsACT, 2015**states that a person who wilfully or knowingly places a person in fear of physical injury commits an offence and is liable on conviction to a term of imprisonmentnot exceeding 2 years or a fine not exceeding N200,000 (Two Hundred Thousand Naira only) or both.

Defendant is nothing more than a paedophile,whoknowingly took advantage of a minor and raped her incessantly. A minor who lives with him and calls him daddy. This is an offence that must not go unpunished in order to act as a deterrent to other paedophiles out there.

SENTENCING

Consequently,Defendant is hereby sentenced to 25 years imprisonment without an option of fine and I so hold.

Parties: Defendant is present.

Appearances: S. A. Langyi appearing for the prosecution. Ijonu Gabriel appearing for the Defendant.

HON. JUSTICE MODUPE R. OSHO-ADEBIYI
JUDGE
4TH MAY, 2023