COMMUNITY COURT OF JUSTICE,
ECOWAS
COUR DE JUSTICE DE LA COMMUNATE,
CEDEAO
TRIBUNAL DE JUSTICA DA COMMUNIDADE,
CEDEAO



No. 1164 JOSEPH GOMWALK
STREET, GUDU 900110 FCT, ABUJA-
NIGERIA. PMB 567 GARKI, ABUJA
TEL: 234-9-78 22 801
Website: www*courtecowas.org*

THE COMMUNITY COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE ECONOMIC COMMUNITY OF WEST AFRICAN STATES (ECOWAS)

In the Matter of

KOLAWOLE O.A. KOIKI

(APPLICANT)

V

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA

(RESPONDENT)

Application No. **ECW/CCJ/APP/46/21;** *Judgt No.* **ECW/CCJ/JUD/45/25**

JUDGMENT

ABUJA

17 NOVEMBER 2025

THE COMMUNITY COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE
ECONOMIC COMMUNITY OF WEST AFRICAN STATES (ECOWAS)
HOLDEN AT ABUJA, NIGERIA

Application No: **ECW/CCJ/APP/46/21**; *Judgt No*. **ECW/CCJ/JUD/45/25**

BETWEEN

KOLAWOLE O.A. KOIKI **-APPLICANT**

AND

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA **-RESPONDENT**

COMPOSITION OF THE COURT:
Hon. Justice Sengu Mohamed **KOROMA** - Presiding
Hon. Justice Dupe **ATOKI** - Member
Hon. Justice Edward Amoako **ASANTE** - Judge Rapporteur

ASSISTED BY:
Mr. Gaye **SOWE** - Ag. Deputy Chief Registrar

REPRESENTATION OF PARTIES:

Femi Falana, SAN
Marshall Abubakar, Esq - Counsel for APPLICANT

Mrs. Maimuna L. Shiru, Esq -Counsel for RESPONDENT

I. JUDGMENT

1. This is a judgment of the Court read virtually in open court pursuant to Article 8(1) of the Practice Directions on Electronic Case Management and Virtual Court Sessions, 2020.

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE PARTIES

2. The Applicant, Mr Kolawole O.A. Koiki, is a Nigerian citizen resident at Ikeja, Lagos, Nigeria.

3. Respondent, the Federal Republic of Nigeria, is an ECOWAS Member State.

III. INTRODUCTION

Subject Matter of the Proceedings

4. The Applicant alleges that the Respondent, through its National Human Rights Commission (NHRC), failed to conclude the hearing and determination of a complaint he lodged with the Commission. The said complaint concerned the seizure, in 1978, of the Applicant's shares in the New Nigeria Salt Company Ltd by the Government of Nigeria under a law which expressly ousts the jurisdiction of any court to entertain any legal proceeding challenging the seizure of the company. The Applicant contends, and requests the Court to declare, that the failure of the Respondent's National Human Rights Commission to complete the hearing and determination of his complaint about the seizure of his shares in the New Nigeria Salt

Company Ltd violates his fundamental right to a fair hearing under Article 7(1) of the African Charter.

IV. PROCEDURE BEFORE THE COURT

5. Applicant commenced this proceeding by an Initiating Application dated 7 June 2021 which was filed at the Registry of the Court on 6 August 2021 and served on the Respondent on 7 August 2021.

6. On 13 July 2023, Applicant filed an application to amend the Initiating Application together with his Amended Initiating Application dated 9 July 2023. The two documents were served on the Respondent on 17 July 2023.

7. On 3 July 2024, the Applicant filed an application for default judgment which was served on the Respondent the same day.

8. On 8 July 2024, the Respondent filed an application for extension of time to enable it to file a Preliminary Objection and Defence to the Application. This was accompanied by the Respondent's prepared Preliminary Objection and Statement of Defence. They were electronically served on the Applicant on the same day.

9. At a session of the Court on 11 July 2024 during which both parties were represented, the Applicant's counsel moved the application for amendment of the Initiating Application which was granted by the Court. The Court, thereafter, adjourned the proceedings to enable the Applicant's counsel to better familiarize himself with the case.

10. On 23 July 2024, the Applicant filed an application seeking leave of the Court to further amend his Amended Initiating Application. This was filed together with the Further Amended Initiating Application. Both documents were served on the Respondent on 24 July 2024.

11. On 9 August 2024, the Respondent filed a Preliminary Objection to the Amended Initiating Application and a Defence to the Applicant's Further Amended Initiating Application. They were served on the Applicant on 12 August 2024.

12. At a session of the Court on 26 September 2024, during which both parties were represented, the Applicant's counsel requested for an adjournment which was not opposed by the Respondent's counsel. It was accordingly granted by the Court.

13. On 20 November 2024, the Applicant filed an Affidavit dated 20 November 2024 and a Written Submission in Response to the Respondent's Preliminary objection to the Amended Initiating Application.

14. At a session of the Court on 11 March 2025, during which both parties were represented, the Applicant's counsel withdrew the application for Default Judgment. The Court heard Respondent's submissions on its preliminary objection urging the Court to dismiss the case and the Applicant's response to the objection. In a ruling delivered, the Court dismissed the Respondent's objection. Thereafter, it granted the

Applicant's request to further amend his Amended Initiating Application, heard both parties on the merits of the case, and adjourned for deliberation and judgment.

V. APPLICANT'S CASE

a. Summary of Facts

15. The Applicant states that he owned 216,000 shares out of the 480,000 shares in the New Nigeria Salt Company Ltd, a company that was incorporated in 1973. In 1978, the Federal Government of Nigeria took over his shares through the New Nigeria Salt Company Limited (Takeover) Decree No. 27 of 1978, which is now known as the New Nigeria Salt Company Limited (Takeover) Act, CAP 289, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria, 1990.

16. According to the Applicant, his shares were taken over under the law without any lawful reason. He explains that for many years, he could not obtain justice in Nigeria because the Act barred the courts from hearing any case or complaint about the government's seizure of his shares.

17. When democracy returned to Nigeria in 1999, the Applicant says that he submitted a complaint to the Human Rights Violations Investigation Commission, popularly known as the Oputa Panel. He complained that the government's action violated his right to own

property. However, the Panel's report was never published or officially released, and no decision was made on his complaint.

18. Meanwhile, after the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) Act was amended in 2010 to give the Commission power to hear and determine complaints of human rights violations, the Applicant states that he lodged a fresh complaint against the Nigerian government for the unlawful takeover of his property. Under the NHRC Act, only the Commission's Governing Council can investigate and decide on such complaints. The NHRC began investigating the case and even visited the site of the Salt Company in 2015. However, the Council handling the Applicant's case was dissolved in 2015.

19. Due to this, the Applicant states that in 2018, he attempted to obtain from the Federal Ministry of Justice a copy, if any, of the report of the Oputa Panel to which he had earlier submitted his complaint, but his request was denied.

20. Subsequently in February 2021, the Applicant says that his lawyers wrote to the NHRC reminding it to conclude his case. Despite this, the NHRC has still not heard or determined his complaint as required by the NHRC Act, 1995 (as amended).

21. The Applicant, who was 94 years old (at the date of the Application) and lives in Lagos, says that his ability to pursue the matter has been limited by distance from Abuja, where the NHRC headquarters is located, and by restrictions caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. He

therefore requests that his case be fully heard and determined by this Court while he is still alive, in the interest of justice.

b. Pleas in Law

22. The Applicant submits the following point of law:

(i) That the Respondent violated his right to a fair hearing under Article 7 of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights.

c. *Reliefs sought*

23. The Applicant requests the Court for the following reliefs:

(i) A declaration that the failure and refusal of the National Human Rights Commission of Nigeria to conclude the hearing and determination of the complaint by the Applicant is a violation of the fundamental human right to fair hearing of the Applicant as contained in [Article 7] of The African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights; Articles 3 [and] 8 of the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948 ; and section 33 of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999 (as altered) together with the Revised EOWAS Treaty and all other applicable ECOWAS Protocols.

(ii) An order of [the] Court directing the Respondent to compensate the Applicant with the sum of N5,000,000,000

(Five Billion Naira) as damages for the total deprivation of the Applicant's right to fair hearing.

(iii) And for such further or other orders as the court may deem fit to make in the circumstance.

VI. RESPONDENT'S CASE

a. Summary of Facts

24. The Respondent denies all the material allegations made in the Applicant's Initiating Application. Specifically, in response to the Applicant's claims that the government failed to publish the Oputa Panel report, that the NHRC's Governing Council was dissolved while his case was pending, and that no further steps were taken to determine his complaint, the Respondent states that the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) only received a complaint from the law firm of Falana & Falana on behalf of the Applicant on 11 March 2014. The complaint concerned the alleged forfeiture of his shares and property in the New Nigeria Salt Company Ltd and alleged human rights violations.

25. The Respondent confirms that the Federal Military Government took over ownership of all shares in the New Nigeria Salt Company Ltd through Decree No. 27 of September 1978, except for those already held by the Federal Government. The Respondent further states that

the takeover was not limited to the Applicant's shares but applied to all shareholders of the company.

26. According to the Respondent, the takeover was carried out under a military decree that expressly barred any legal action against the government in connection with that policy decision. The decree, issued in 1978, was made in what the government considered to be the overriding public interest. Therefore, any attempt by an individual or entity to reclaim equity in the defunct New Nigeria Salt Company Ltd would be futile and contrary to the decree, which was the applicable law at the time. Accordingly, the Applicant cannot challenge the takeover of his shares by the present action.

27. The Respondent further states that when the Applicant's complaint was received by the NHRC in March 2014, the Commission followed its established complaint procedure and conducted a preliminary investigation, particularly concerning the alleged violation of the right to property. During this process, the Commission found that the matter did not relate to breach of fundamental human rights but rather an attempt to reclaim an equity interest belonging to Oak (Engineering) Ltd, the Applicant's company, which held shares in the defunct New Nigeria Salt Company Ltd that was taken over by the military government in 1978.

28. The Respondent admits that under the NHRC Act, only the Commission's Governing Council has the authority to hear and determine complaints. That during its preliminary investigation, the

NHRC visited the site of the company. However, the investigation could not be completed due to the dissolution of all Federal Government boards in 2015, including the NHRC Governing Council which alone had the legal power to make a final determination. Consequently, the Commission was unable to issue a final decision to the Applicant or his lawyers.

29. Nevertheless, the Respondent contends that after the Governing Council was dissolved, the Applicant had the option of seeking redress in court but failed to do so.

30. Regarding the Applicant's attempt to obtain the Oputa Panel report from the Federal Ministry of Justice, and his claim that the Ministry refused his request, the Respondent states that this allegation is false. The Ministry did not refuse his request; rather, it forwarded it to the Office of the Secretary to the Government of the Federation, which it considered the appropriate authority to handle the matter. The Applicant, however, failed to follow up with that office. The Respondent therefore states that the actions of its Ministry of Justice were consistent with the law and due process, as provided under the Freedom of Information Act, 2011.

31. The Respondent further states that when the Applicant's counsel later wrote to the Commission requesting that investigations into his complaint be concluded, there was still no Governing Council in place. The Council, which had been dissolved in 2015, was only

reconstituted in August 2021 after the Applicant had already filed this case before the Court.

32. The Respondent, therefore, contends that there was no denial of fair hearing or access to justice. A preliminary investigation was conducted in accordance with fair hearing principles, even though the Applicant's complaint had no legal foundation from the outset given the circumstances of the 1978 government takeover. Accordingly, the Respondent maintains that its National Human Rights Commission did not violate any of the Applicant's rights and that the National Human Rights Commission Act, 1995 (as amended) does not apply retrospectively.

b. Pleas in Law

33. By way of pleas in law, the Respondent submits:

(i) That the Application is statute barred given that it was not filed within three years from the date the cause of action arose.

(ii) That the National Human Rights Council did not breach the Applicant's right to fair hearing under Article 7 of the African Charter in any way whatsoever.

c. Reliefs Sought

34. The Respondent requests the Court for the following reliefs:

(i) A declaration that the Applicant's complaint is not that of [a] breach of fundamental right but rather an issue of reclaiming equitable interest belonging to Oak (Engineering) Ltd, as the Applicant's complaint has to do with the interest of a company that owns shares in the New Nigeria Salt Company Ltd which [is] defunct having been taking over by the Federal Military Government in 1978.

(ii) A declaration that the National Human Rights Commission did not fail or refuse to conclude the hearing and determination of the complaint submitted on behalf of the Applicant and that the Commission's inability to conclude and determine the said complaint was due to circumstance beyond [its] control, i.e., the dissolution of the Commission's Governing Board (which is the only body that can conclude and determine complaint submitted before the Commission).

(iii) A declaration that there was no infringement on the Applicant's right to fair hearing or any other fundamental right of the Applicant by the Respondent.

(iv) An order dismissing the Applicant's action in its entirety.

(v) An order awarding cost of ₦4,000,000.00 against the Applicant on behalf of the Respondent.

VII. PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE COURT

35. The Respondent filed a preliminary objection to the Application arguing that it was statute barred given that it was not filed within three years from the date the cause of action accrued. After hearing the parties during its session on 11 March 2025, the Court dismissed the objection relying on its jurisprudence which has clarified that the statute of limitation in Article 9(3) of the Court's Protocol applies only to cases involving the extra-contractual liability of the Community, rather than to applications alleging human rights violations.

VIII. JURISDICTION OF THE COURT

36. Article 9(4) of the Protocol of the Court vests the Court with "jurisdiction to determine cases of violation of human rights that occur in any Member State." To invoke this jurisdiction, it is sufficient if the Application alleges that violations of human rights have taken place in the territory of the Respondent state and that the Respondent is responsible for those violations, but without prejudice to the determination of the claims on the merits after hearing both parties. (See *Registered Trustees of Gan Allah Fulani Development Association v Federal Republic of Nigeria* [ECW/CCJ/JUD/06/23], para 38).

37. In this case, the Applicant alleges that he submitted a complaint to the National Human Rights Commission of Nigeria regarding the unjustified seizure, without compensation, of his 46% shares in a company known as the New Nigeria Salt Company Ltd by the Government of Nigeria in 1978. Since the complaint was submitted [in 2010], the Human Rights Commission has failed or refused to complete investigations into the matter and issue a report. Because this allegation implicates the Respondent's human rights obligation to guarantee to the Applicant a right to fair hearing under Article 7 of the African Charter, the Court concludes that it has jurisdiction consistent with Article 9(4) of the Protocol of the Court.

IX. ADMISSIBILITY OF THE APPLICATION

38. Article 10(d) of the Court's Protocol requires three main admissibility conditions for human rights cases. These are (a) the applicant's victim status or standing, (b) the non-anonymity of the application; and (c) the non-pendency of the matter before another international court or tribunal. See *Aziagbede Kokou & Others v Republic of Togo* [2013] CCJELR 167 (para 18).

39. In this case, the Court observes that the Applicant has demonstrated his victim status by pleading sufficient facts that show, *prima facie*, that the conduct of the Respondent's National Human Rights Commission has infringed his right to a fair hearing. Secondly, the case has not been presented anonymously, nor is there evidence that the claims are pending before another international court, contrary to

the admissibility requirements of Article 10(d) of the Protocol of the Court. For these reasons, the Court concludes that the Application is admissible.

X. MERITS

40. Having regard to the pleadings in the Application including the reliefs sought, the Court considers that there is only one main issue for determination: *Whether the failure of the Respondent's National Human Rights Commission to complete the investigation and determination of the complaint lodged by the Applicant violates the Applicant's right to a fair hearing under Article 7(1) of the African Charter.*

i) Alleged violation of the Applicant's right to a fair hearing

a) Submissions of the Applicant

41. The Applicant submits that despite commencing investigations, the Respondent's National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) has failed or refused, since 2015, to conclude the hearing and determination of his complaint concerning the unlawful and unjustifiable expropriation of his property by the Nigerian Government under the New Nigeria Salt Company Limited (Takeover) Act 1978. The Applicant contends that this conduct of the

NHRC violates his right to a fair hearing under Article 7(1) of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights.

b) Submissions of the Respondent

42. The Respondent submits that the NHRC received the Applicant's complaint and began preliminary investigations in March 2014. However, the process was halted when the Federal Government dissolved all boards, including the NHRC Governing Council in 2015. Given that the NHRC Governing Council is the only body empowered under the NHRC Act 1995 to hear and determine complaints, the process could not move forward.

43. The Respondent also contends that, in any event, the NHRC's preliminary investigations revealed that the Applicant's complaint was not a human rights issue. Rather, it concerned the recovery of equity interests belonging to the Applicant's company in the New Nigeria Salt Company Ltd, which the Federal Military Government seized in 1978.

44. The Respondent further argues that after the NHRC Council's dissolution, the Applicant could have sought redress in court but failed to do so. Accordingly, it maintains that there was no denial of fair hearing to the Applicant as the NHRC conducted preliminary investigations into the Applicant's complaint.

c) Analysis of the Court

45. The Court begins by addressing the Respondent's contention that the Applicant's complaint before the NHRC was not a human rights matter, but rather the recovery of equity interests belonging to the Applicant in the New Nigeria Salt Company Ltd, which is statute barred by virtue of its seizure under the New Nigeria Salt Company Limited (Takeover) Act 1978.

46. The Court considers that by virtue of the Applicant's second or further Amended Initiating Application dated 16 July 2024, the matter presented before this Court is the alleged violation of the Applicant's right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time arising from the failure or refusal of the NHRC to conclude the investigation and determination of the complaint submitted to it. The underlying merit of the complaint before the NHRC or its justiciability under the Respondent's Constitution or other laws, is a separate question from the issue before this Court. This Court has been invited only to decide whether the Applicant's complaint received a fair hearing within a reasonable time before the NHRC, not whether the substance of his complaint before the NHRC had merit.

47. Having clarified the issue in contention, the Court recalls Article 7(1) of the African Charter which states:

> Every individual shall have the right to have his cause heard. This comprises: (a) the right to an appeal to competent national organs against acts of violating his fundamental rights as recognized and guaranteed by conventions, laws, regulations and customs in force; (b) the right to be presumed innocent until proved guilty by a competent court or tribunal; (c) the right to defense, including the

right to be defended by counsel of his choice; (d) the right to be tried within a reasonable time by an impartial court or tribunal.

48. In *Al-Hassan Fadia v Togolese Republic* [ECW/CCJ/JUD/17/24] (para 79) the Court noted that the text of Article 7 of the African Charter shows that "the right to a fair trial is a compendium of rights consisting of various substantive and procedural guarantees aimed at ensuring that the life, liberty, property, or other fundamental rights of the individual are not curtailed without a lawful, fair, and impartial legal process." And further, that these "protections apply not only in criminal proceedings, but also in other proceedings involving the determination of a person's rights and obligations". (*Ibid*; see also *Kessei Menveinoyou v Togolese Republic* [ECW/CCJ/JUD/34/24], para 40).

49. It follows, that at the national level, the bodies to which Article 7 of the African Charter apply are not just the regular courts exercising criminal or civil jurisdiction, but any other state institution, whether permanent or *ad hoc*, charged with the determination of the rights or obligations of individuals. Thus, in *Justice Thomas Masuku v The Kingdom of Swaziland* (ACHPR, Comm No. 444/13), where the complainant, a judge, invoked Article 7 of the African Charter to challenge the disciplinary proceedings instituted against him by the Judicial Service Commission of Swaziland, the African Commission held that the right to a fair hearing applied in all proceedings whether administrative, civil, criminal or military involving the determination of the rights or obligation of an individual. Similarly, this Court held

in the *Al-Hassan Fadia* case that Article 7 of the African Charter applies to disciplinary proceedings of aeronautic personnel before the civil aviation authority of the Respondent State.

50. In this case, the Court observes that the National Human Rights Commission (NHRC) of the Respondent is a quasi-judicial body established by law and vested with the authority to promote and protect human rights through investigation of human rights violations and the making of appropriate recommendations. Indeed, under Section 6(e) of the NHRC Act 1995 (as amended), the NHRC has the power to "[m]ake determination as to damages or compensation payable in relation to any violation of human rights where it deems this necessary in the circumstances of the case."

51. There is no doubt, therefore, that as a quasi-judicial organ of the Respondent state, the NHRC is a body within the contemplation of Article 7(1) of the African Charter as far as the right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time is concerned.

52. On whether the failure of the NHRC to complete the investigation and determination of the Applicant's complaint since 2015 violates his right to a fair hearing, the Court takes note of the Respondent's submission that this was due to the dissolution of the Governing Council of the NHRC in 2015. The Respondent states that the Governing Council, the sole authority empowered to adjudicate human rights complaints before the Commission, remained dissolved

until its reconstitution in 2021, the same year the Applicant brought his case before this Court.

53. The Court notes, however, that as far as the right of the individual to a fair hearing within a reasonable time is concerned, "it is the responsibilities of State Parties to the African Charter to organize their judiciary in such a way that the right guaranteed in Article 7(1)(d) of the Charter can be effectively enjoyed." (*Haregewoin Gabre-Selassie and IHRDA (on behalf of former Dergue Officials) v Ethiopia*, [ACHPR, Comm No. 301/05], para 235).

54. In light of the above, the Court considers that it is the responsibility of the Respondent to ensure that its entire judicial system is functional and able to deliver on its mandate effectively and efficiently. This includes not only the regular courts but also tribunals and quasi-judicial bodies such as the NHRC charged with determining the rights or obligations of individuals, in accordance with Article 7(1)(d) of the African Charter.

55. However, based on the Respondent's own submission, it can be inferred that for about six years, from 2015 to 2021, when the governing council of the NHRC was dissolved and not reconstituted, no action was taken on the Applicant's complaint before the NHRC. The dissolution of the governing council and the failure to reconstitute it for six years was an act of the Respondent state, not that of any external party. Therefore, the Court considers that the Respondent

cannot extricate itself from its own conduct which was responsible for the failure or inability of the NHRC to conclude the investigations into the Applicant's complaint.

56. Accordingly, the Court finds that the Respondent's failure, for six years, to reconstitute the governing council of the NHRC to enable it to conclude the investigation and determination of the Applicant's complaint, as well as those of similarly situated persons, is inexcusable and amounts to a violation of the Applicant's right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time under Article 7(1)(d) of the African Charter.

XI. REPARATIONS

57. Given the Court's conclusion that the Respondent has violated the Applicant's rights under Article 7(1)(d) of the African Charter, the Court must consider the appropriate reparations the Respondent must make.

58. Reparations may take the form of restitution, compensation, satisfaction, or a combination of these. In this case, the Applicant, in addition to a declaration of a violation of his rights, has requested 5 billion naira as general damages.

59. The Court notes that in the award of general damages, it is not possible to place a monetary value on the suffering, distress, embarrassment, and other psychological harms a victim of a human

rights violation would have suffered. The Court may take account of factors such as the gravity or egregiousness of the violation and the conduct of the State in the aftermath of the violation. However, ultimately, it is up to the Court to exercise its discretion in equity to determine what amounts to a fair compensation to be paid, as there are, generally, no decisive criteria for such determinations. In the circumstances of this case, the Court considers 5 million naira to be just compensation by way of general damages for the violation of the Applicant's right to a fair hearing under Article 7(1)(d) of the African Charter.

60. The Court grants other reliefs sought by the Applicant only to the extent indicated in the operative clause of this judgment.

XII. COSTS

61. Pursuant to Article 66(11) of the Rules of the Court, the Court decides that each party shall bear their own costs.

XIII. OPERATIVE CLAUSE

62. For the foregoing reasons, the Court sitting in public and after hearing the parties:

On jurisdiction

i. *Declares* that the Court has jurisdiction over the Application.

On Admissibility

ii. *Finds* that the Application is admissible.

On the Merits

iii. *Declares* that the Respondent has violated the Applicant's right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time contrary to Article 7(1)(d) of the African Charter.

On reparations

iv. *Orders* the Respondent to pay to the Applicant the sum of 5 million naira as compensation for the violation of his right to a fair hearing within a reasonable time contrary to Article 7(1)(d) of the African Charter.

v. *Orders* the Respondent to take all necessary measures to ensure the hearing and determination of the complaint the Applicant lodged with the National Human Rights Commission without further delay

On cost

vi. *Decides* that each party shall bear their own costs.

Done at Abuja this 17th day of November 2025 in English and translated into French and Portuguese.

Hon. Justice Sengu Mohamed **KOROMA**
Presiding .....

Hon. Justice Dupe **ATOKI**
Member .....

Hon. Justice Edward Amoako **ASANTE**
Judge Rapporteur .....

ASSISTED BY:
Mr. Gaye **SOWE** (Ag. Deputy Chief Registrar) .....