**GODWIN OKPEH**

**V.**

**THE STATE**

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF NIGERIA

THE 8TH DAY OF MARCH, 2017

CA/J/217C/2009

**LEX (2017) - CA/J/217C/2009**

OTHER CITATIONS

2PLR/2017/143 (CA)

(2017) LPELR-42487(CA)

**BEFORE THEIR LORDSHIPS**

JUMMAI HANNATU SANKEY, J.C.A

ONYEKACHI AJA OTISI, J.C.A

JOSEPH EYO EKANEM, J.C.A

**BETWEEN**

GODWIN OKPEH - Appellant(s)

AND

THE STATE Respondent(s)

**ORIGINATING COURT**

HIGH COURT OF BENUE STATE, MAKURDI DIVISION (S.A. Olugbemi J., Presiding)

**REPRESENTATION/LAWYERS**

A.A. MALIK, Esq. with M.O. OZUEH, Esq. - For Appellant

AND

E.G. ANYANGEBEE, Esq (Principal State Counsel, Ministry of Justice, Benue State) - For Respondent

**ISSUES FROM THE CAUSE(S) OF ACTION**

CRIMINAL LAW – ARMED ROBBERY:- Prosecution for the charge of armed robbery – Failure of prosecution to timeously object to address of counsel of accused person filed and adopted out of time – Subsequent application to discountenance same in consideration of the case – Where upheld by the court – Legal effect – Whether renders the whole trial a nullity
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**PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE ISSUES**

ACTION - ADDRESS OF COUNSEL:- Importance of address of counsel - Effect of denying a counsel/party of the opportunity of addressing the Court

ACTION - IRREGULAR PROCEDURE/PROCEDURAL IRREGULARITY:- Proper time to raise/bring an objection to a procedural irregularity – Effect of failure thereto
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JUDGMENT AND ORDER - ORDER OF RETRIAL/TRIAL DE NOVO:- Criminal case - Principles that guides the court in making an order of retrial.

JUDGMENT AND ORDER - SUBSTANTIAL JUSTICE:- Duty of court to ensure that substantial justice is done – Basis of

**CASE SUMMARY**

ORIGINATING FACTS AND CLAIMS

The appellant (as 1st accused person) was charged along with two other persons for the offences of conspiracy to commit robbery and armed robbery contrary to Sections 5 (b) and 1(2) (a) of the Robbery and Firearms (Special Provisions) Act Cap. 398, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria, 1990. Before the commencement of the trial, the 2nd accused person was said to have died and his name was struck out of the information. In the course of the trial, the 3rd accused person was said to have escaped from custody and his name was also struck out of the information leaving the appellant to face his trial alone.

The case of the respondent against the appellant is that the appellant and five others accosted and robbed one Supol Aloysius Atighir and Inspector Ahmed Musa of the sum of N500:00 and a Nokia 1110 handset (mobile phone) respectively, while armed with a gun and other dangerous weapons. Inspector Ahmed Musa shot and wounded the appellant in his leg with his gun. The other persons took to their heels while the appellant fell down and was arrested by the police.

The appellant denied the charge and led evidence to the effect that there was a fight involving students of a secondary school which led to the disruption of the free flow of traffic on a road. He was near the scene and the police arrived the scene, fired tear gas and, as he was in the process of crossing the road, he was shot in his leg.  
  
The trial Court believed the evidence of the prosecution, and disbelieved the appellant who was found guilty as charged and sentenced to death in a manner to be determined by the Governor.

**DECISION(S) APPEALED AGAINST**

The trial Court entered judgment, finding the appellant guilty of the offences of conspiracy to commit robbery and armed robbery contrary to Sections 5(b) and 1(2) (a) respectively, of the Robbery and Firearms (Special Provisions) Act Cap 398 Laws of the Federation of Nigeria 1990. He was accordingly sentenced to death for both offences. Dissatisfied, the Appellant appealed to the Court of Appeal.

**ISSUE(S) FOR DETERMINATION ON APPEAL**

*BY APPELLANT:*

"a. Whether the learned Trial Judge was right to have held that Exhibit 1 was voluntarily made by the appellant, thereby admitting and relying on same and indeed did the prosecution prove its case as required by law to warrant conviction of the Appellant.

b. Whether the learned Trial Judge was right to discountenance the final address of the Appellant at the lower (sic) and whether that amounted to a breach of the appellant's right to fair hearing.

*BY RESPONDENT:*

[The Respondent adopted the issues formulated by the Appellant].

*AS ADOPTED BY COURT*

[The Court adopted the issues formulated by the Appellant].

**MAIN ISSUES**

JOSEPH EYO EKANEM, J.C.A. (DELIVERING THE LEADING JUDGMENT):

This appeal is against the judgment of the High Court of Benue State, sitting in Makurdi (the trial Court) delivered on 18/3/2009 in charge No. MHC/43C/05 in which the trial Court found the appellant guilty of the offences of conspiracy to commit robbery and armed robbery contrary to Sections 5(b) and 1(2) (a) respectively, of the Robbery and Firearms (Special Provisions) Act Cap 398 Laws of the Federation of Nigeria 1990. He was accordingly sentenced to death for both offences.

Aggrieved by the conviction and sentence, the appellant appealed to this Court by way of a notice of appeal which was, by the order of this Court, amended on 4/12/2014 but was deemed filed on 3/12/215.

The summary of the facts of the case leading to this appeal is that the appellant (as 1st accused person) was charged along with two other persons for the offences of conspiracy to commit robbery and armed robbery contrary to Sections 5 (b) and 1(2) (a) of the Robbery and Firearms (Special Provisions) Act Cap. 398, Laws of the Federation of Nigeria, 1990. Before the commencement of the trial, the 2nd accused person was said to have died and his name was struck out of the information. In the course of the trial, the 3rd accused person was said to have escaped from custody and his name was also struck out of the information leaving the appellant to face his trial alone.

The case of the respondent against the appellant is that on 3/4/2005, at about 10:20 p.m, the appellant and five others accosted and robbed one Supol Aloysius Atighir and Inspector Ahmed Musa of the sum of N500:00 and a Nokia 1110 handset (mobile phone) respectively, while armed with a gun and other dangerous weapons. Inspector Ahmed Musa shot and wounded the appellant in his leg with his gun. The other persons took to their heels while the appellant fell down and was arrested by the police.

The appellant denied the charge and led evidence to the effect that there was a fight involving students of a secondary school which led to the disruption of the free flow of traffic on a road. He was near the scene and the police arrived the scene, fired tear gas and, as he was in the process of crossing the road, he was shot in his leg.

The trial Court believed the evidence of the prosecution, and disbelieved the appellant who was found guilty as charged and sentenced to death in a manner to be determined by the Governor.

The judgment of the trial Court, as earlier stated, is the subject of this appeal.

Pursuant to the rules of this Court, appellant filed a brief of argument while the respondent filed a respondent's brief of argument.

At the hearing of the appeal on 16/1/2017, appellant’s counsel adopted the appellant's brief and urged the Court to allow the appeal, set aside the judgment of the trial Court and discharge and acquit the appellant.

Respondent's counsel adopted his brief of argument and urged the Court to dismiss the appeal and affirm the judgment of the trial Court.

Out of the ten grounds of appeal in the amended notice of appeal, appellant's counsel, A.A. Malik, Esq; in his brief of argument filed on 5/10/2015 but which was deemed properly filed and served on 23/11/16, distilled two issues for the determination of the appeal, viz;

"a. Whether the learned Trial Judge was right to have held that Exhibit 1 was voluntarily made by the appellant, thereby admitting and relying on same and indeed did the prosecution prove its case as required by law to warrant conviction of the Appellant. Distilled from grounds 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 of the notice and grounds of appeal.

b. Whether the learned Trial Judge was right to discountenance the final address of the Appellant at the lower (sic) and whether that amounted to a breach of the appellant's right to fair hearing. Distilled from grounds 2 and 3 of the notice and grounds of appeal."

In the respondent's brief of argument settled by E. G. Ayangebee, Esq, Principal State Counsel, Ministry of Justice, Benue State, which was filed on 13/6/2016 but was deemed properly filed and served on 23/11/2016, the issues formulated by the appellant's counsel are adopted. I shall therefore be guided by the issues in the determination of the appeal. Since issue B raises the issue of fair hearing, I propose to start my consideration of the appeal with it.

**ISSUE B**

Appellant's counsel noted that the trial Court gave both sides 14 days each within which to file their written addresses and 3 days for reply by the appellant. He admitted that the appellant filed his address out of time and without the leave of Court. He stated that respondent's counsel urged the trial Court to discountenance the address and the trial Court granted the prayer, and so it did not consider the same in writing its judgment.

It was his submission that the right of an accused person to address the Court is a constitutional right and that since appellant’s address was already before the trial Court, it ought not to have completely shut out the appellant considering the nature of the offences for which he was charged. He stated that the failure to file the address was the fault of appellant's counsel and further submitted that the law is that the sins of counsel cannot be visited on the litigant.

Referring to the case of SALAMI v. ODOGUN (1991) 2 NWLR (pt. 13) 291 and other cases contained in his list of additional authorities, he contended that the appellant was denied the right to fair hearing. This, he said, vitiated the proceedings of the trial Court and renders the same liable to be set aside and the conviction of the appellant quashed. He urged the Court to discharge and acquit the appellant.

In response counsel for the respondent contended that the trial Court was right to discountenance the address of the appellant as it was filed out of time and without leave of the trial Court. It was his further contention that judgments of Courts are determined based on the evidence adduced before the Court and not on the addresses of counsel. He submitted that the appellant did not utilize the opportunity given to him to file his written address and so he could not complain of a denial of fair hearing.

In determining this issue, it is to be stated that addresses of counsel form part of a case. The importance of addresses is recognized by the Constitution of Federal Republic of Nigeria, 1999, as amended by providing in Section 294 (1) as follows:

"Every Court established under this Constitution shall deliver its decision in writing not later than 90 days after the conclusion of evidence and final addresses and furnish all parties to the cause or matter determined with duly authenticated copies of the decision within seven days of the delivery thereof."

Sections 192 and 194 of the Criminal Procedure Code make provisions for the right of address.

Those provisions are a part of the guarantee of the right to fair hearing entrenched in Section 36 (1) of the Constitution.

In the case of OBODU V. OLOMU (1987) 3 NWLR (PT.59) 111, 121, BELGORE, JSC, as he then was, stated that,

"Addresses form part of the case and failure to hear the address of one party, however overwhelming the evidence seems to be on one side, vitiates the trial; because in many cases it is after the addresses that one finds the law on the issues fought in favour of the evidence adduced."

Nnamani, JSC, at page 124 of the same report stated that, "In the normal course of things the proceedings cannot be said to be complete until both parties have addressed the Court."

In SIGBENU v. IMAFIDON (2009) 13 NWLR (Pt. 1158) 231, 25,it was held that the right of address is a fundamental requirement of fair trial.

It must however be stated that a party entitled to address the Court cannot be compelled to address the Court. He may choose not to address the Court or he may fail to address the Court. In OBODO V. OLOMU supra 121BELGORE, JSC, as he then was, stated that,

"Just as a party is not compellable to give evidence to prove his case so is a party not compellable to address the Court when he has the right to do so."

His Lordship added still at page 121 that,

"A party entitled to address the Court may waive his right but it must be shown that he has so waived his right."

In this instance, the trial Court at the end of the hearing of evidence ordered for the delivery of written addresses by both sides, giving the defence counsel 14 days to file his written address. The respondent was also given 14 days from the date of service of appellant's address to file its address. Appellant's counsel was given 3 days from the date of service of respondent's address to file a reply, if he so wished. It is not in doubt that appellant's counsel filed his address out of time. Respondent's counsel however filed his written address.

On 25/2/2009 when the case came up at the trial Court for adoption of written addresses, G.L. Usongo, Esq; for the appellant adopted his written address and urged the Court to discharge and acquit the appellant. Ayangabee, Esq; for the respondent thereafter stated that he had filed his written address but before adopting it, he urged the Court to discountenance the address filed by the appellant for being filed out of time without leave. He thereafter adopted his address and urged the Court to convict the appellant.

At page 94 of the record of appeal, the reaction of appellant’s counsel to the application to discountenance his address and the response of the Court are recorded as follows:

"Usongo: We apologise. I leave it to the discretion of the Court.

Court: The defence counsel knew that he was out of time. He knows what to do but choose not to do it. Orders of Court are meant to be obeyed and the Court cannot award a party for a willful disobedience of its orders. The address of the defence counsel filed out of time without leave of Court is hereby discountenanced. The case is adjourned to 18.3.2009 for judgment.

It is pertinent to re-state that appellant's written address was filed at the trial Court but out of time without leave of Court. So it was already before the Court but irregularly so. The address was already served on the respondent's counsel also. This can be inferred from the fact that he did not complain about not being served it but rather asked for it to be discountenanced. Furthermore, counsel for the appellant adopted the address before the respondent's counsel applied for it to be discountenanced. Having allowed counsel to adopt his address without objection, respondent's counsel waived his right to object to it and so the trial Court should not have entertained his application for the same address to be discountenanced.

Waiver as a concept was described by ESO, JSC, in ARIORI v. ELEMO (1983) NSCC (VoL.14) 1, 8 as,

"... one that presupposes that the person who is to enjoy a benefit or who has the choice of two benefits is fully aware of his rights to the benefits, but he either neglects to exercise his right to the benefit or where he has a choice of two, he decides to take one but not both...

A man who is not under any legal disability should be the best judge of his own interest. If therefore having a full knowledge of the rights, interests, profits or benefits conferred upon or accruing to him by and under the law, but he intentionally decided to give up all these, or some of them, he cannot be heard to complain afterwards that he has not been permitted the exercise of his right, or that he has suffered by his not exercising his rights. He should be held to have waived those rights. He is to put it another way, estopped from raising the issue."

Having failed to exercise his right to object to the irregular written address by not raising the issue before the address was adopted, respondent's counsel waived the right to object to it and was therefore estopped from raising it thereafter.

The law is that an objection to a procedural irregularity must be taken timeously, id est, at the commencement of the proceedings or at the time the irregularity arises except where it is shown that the objector has suffered a miscarriage of justice as a result of the irregularity. See BAJOGA v. THE GOVERNMENT OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA (2008) 1 NWLR (PT. 1067) 85, 115 and UCHENDU V. OGBONI (1999) 68 LRCN 925,951.This was not done in this case.

As earlier stated, the address was already before the trial Court even though irregularly so. In the interest of justice, the trial Court should not have ignored it or discountenanced it. It should have looked at it to see if it contained submissions that could tilt its mind in favour of the appellant who was facing the jeopardy of a death sentence. In the case of Mobil Producing (Nig) Unlimited v Monokpo (2003) 18 NWIR (Pt 852) 346, 410, for example, the Supreme Court held that where a statement of defence is filed late or irregularly, the Court should not shut its eyes to it but should look at it to see if it discloses a defence which might be considered in the interest of justice. See also Dangote General Textiles Products Ltd V. Hascon Associates (Nig) Ltd (2013) 16 NWLR (Pt 1379) 60.

Even though the above cases relate to statement of defence and notice of intention to defend filed out of time, the underlying principle, which applies with equal force to the instance case, is that Courts are to do substantial justice and not technical justice.

The filing of the address out of time was the fault of appellant’s counsel. Counsel surprisingly failed to ask for extension of time to file the address and a deeming order. This again was the fault of counsel and not that of the appellant who was, in a manner of speaking, poised between life and death. It is the law that errors of counsel should not be visited on his client. This is especially so in this instance where the error did not render the process incompetent and so did not go to its roots. In Shell Petroleum Development (Nig) Ltd V Agbara (2016) 2 NWLR (Pt 1496) 353, 411, I.T. Muhammad, JSC, opined thus,

"Now, counsel may mess-up; they may be under misapprehension of a nature, they may goof. They are human beings subject to err. It is a well laid down principle of law that a Court of law, because of the counsel's error of judgment, carelessness, misapprehension, commission or omission, will not punish a litigant or visit the innocent litigant with the sin committed by his counsel unless it can be shown that the litigant himself was a party to the commission of that sin."

That is in keeping with the position of the law expounded long ago by Bowen, I.J., in Cropper v Smith (1884) 26 Ch: D 700, 711 that

"... it is well established principle that the object of Court is to decide the rights of the parties, and not to punish them for mistakes which they make in the conduct of their cases by deciding otherwise than in accordance with their rights.

I agree with respondent's counsel that a party who neglects to utilise the opportunity given to him to be heard cannot turn round to blame the Court for his failure to utilise the opportunity. However in the instant case, appellant's counsel showed intention and efforts, albeit irregularly, to utilise the opportunity given to him to file an address.

This should have moved the hand of the trial Court to indulge him.

It is therefore my view that the trial Court should not have discountenanced the written address of the appellant's counsel. The trial Court erred in doing so.

What then is the effect of this error? Appellant's counsel stated, in essence, that it was fatal. Respondent's counsel took a contrary stance, submitting that judgments are based on the evidence adduced before the Court and not on addresses of counsel which, he stated, could not be a substitute for evidence. I shall at this stage return to the case of Obodo v Olomu supra Page 121 where Belgore, JSC, as he then was, stated that

"Addresses form part of the case and failure to hear the address of one party, however overwhelming the evidence seems to be on one side, vitiates the trial; because in many cases, it is after the addresses that one finds the law on the issues fought in favour of the evidence adduced."

It is speculative to think that the ignored address would not have had any effect on the mind of the Judge. As was stated by Obaseki, JSC inObodu V Olomu Supra 123-124.

"Its beneficial effect and impact on the mind of the Judge is enormous and unquantifiable. The value is immense and its assistance to the Judge in arriving at a just and proper decision, though dependent on the quality of the address can not be denied. The absence of an address can tilt the balance of the learned Judge’s judgment as much as the delivery of an address after conclusion of evidence can.

It is not for the Court to speculate on what the effect of plaintiff's counsel’s address could have been on the learned trial Judge’s judgment ... Until the learned Trial Judge's mind is exposed to an address, no one can say what effect it will have on his mind.

See also Salami v Odogun (1991) 2 NWLR (pt 173) 291, Ani V Effiok (2011) LPELR-CA/C/5/2009 and Akabogu v Akabogu (2003) 9 NWLR (pt 826) 435.

The appellant was therefore denied his right to fair hearing, the effect of which is that it vitiates the trial.

The next point I must consider is as to what order I should make in view of the above conclusion. Should I discharge and acquit the appellant or should I order a re-trial?

The power of the Court of Appeal in that regard is derived from Section 19 (2) of the Court of Appeal Act, 2004 which provides that

"Subject to the provisions of this Act, the Court of Appeal shall, if it allows an appeal against conviction, quash the conviction and direct a judgment and verdict of acquittal to be entered or order the appellant to be re-tried by a Court of competent jurisdiction.

In the locus classicus of Abodundu V The Queen (1959) NSCC (Vol. 1) 55, the Supreme Court set out the factors to be considered in determining whether or not to order trial de novo as follows:

a. that there had been an error in law (including the observance of the law of evidence) or irregularity in procedure of such a character that on the one hand the trial was not rendered a nullity and on the other hand the Court of Appeal is unable to say that there had been no miscarriage of justice;

b. that, leaving aside the error or irregularity, the evidence taken as a whole discloses a substantial case against the appellant;

c. that there are no such special circumstances as would render it oppressive to put the appellant on trial a second time;

d. that the offence/s for which the appellant was convicted, or the consequences to the appellant or any other person of the conviction or acquittal of the appellant are not merely trivial; and

e. that to refuse to order a re-trial would occasion a greater miscarriage of justice than to grant it.

See also Bude v State (2016) 12 NWLR (pt 1528) 154,169.I have already dealt with the first factor in this judgment. I do not need to go over it again.

In respect of the second factor, the case of the prosecution has already been set out in this judgment; so also the case of the appellant.

Following a trial-within-a trial, the prosecution tendered as an exhibit the extra-judicial statement of the appellant wherein he is recorded to have confessed to the crime. The prosecution also led evidence through PW1 and PW2. The PW1 was a victim of the said armed robbery and he testified that the appellant and other boys armed with offensive weapons robbed him and one inspector Ahmed Musa of money and a cell phone.

The appellant testified by himself and called two other witnesses. His case was that he was an innocent by-stander who was shot by the police in the course of the latter bringing to an end a chaotic situation caused by students who were engaged in a fight that disrupted traffic on a highway.

I am satisfied that the facts disclose a substantial case against the appellant.

In respect of the third factor, I note that the appellant has been in custody since 2005, id est, for 12 years now. This ordinarily should render it oppressive to put him on trial a second time. However, a consideration of the fourth factor would drown out the voice of the third factor, Viz; the offences for which the appellant stood trial are conspiracy to rob and armed robbery contrary to Sections 5 (b) and 1 (2) (a), respectively of the Robbery and Firearms (Special Provisions) Act Cap 398 Laws of the Federation of Nigeria which carry the death penalty. The punishment prescribed for the offences shows their gravity and how seriously the society views the same. The offence of armed robbery is not something to be winked at. Thus the length of time the appellant has spent in custody pales into nothingness in the light of the gravity of the offence. See Bude V State Supra.

The fifth factor therefore naturally falls in place, Viz; that it would occasion a greater miscarriage of justice to refuse to order a retrial than otherwise. The law will fail to protect the society if a person that is alleged to have committed a capital offence is allowed to walk home free without trial simply because the trial Court took a wrong step at the first trial in which there was a substantial case demonstrated against him.

Issue B is therefore resolved in favour of the appellant. The appeal therefore succeeds in part. The judgment and in deed the proceedings of the trial Court amounted to a nullity on account of the trial Court discountenancing the written address of the appellant. I decline to consider Issue (A).

I hereby direct that the case be remitted to the High Court of Benue State for retrial before a Judge of that High Court other than the trial Judge (Kpojime, J.). The case shall be given accelerated hearing.

**JUMMAI HANNATU SANKEY, J.C.A.:**

I have had a preview of the Judgment of my learned brother, Ekanem, JCA, with which I agree.

I agree that, in line with numerous decisions of the Supreme Court, chief amongst which is Obodo V Olumo (1987) 3 NWLR (Pt. 59) 111 at 121, address of Counsel forms a crucial part of a case, and the failure to consider the address of one party, especially in a case such as this which carries the death penalty, vitiates the trial. As was stated very aptly by Belgore, JSC (later CJN),

"... it is after the addresses that one finds the law on the issues fought in favour of the evidence adduced."

See also Sigbenu V Imafidion (2009) 13 NWLR (Pt.1158) 231.

Much as Counsel for the Appellant did not exhibit due diligence in failing to make the appropriate application to regularise his final address already filed before the trial Court, this is one of the typical instances where the sin of Counsel should definitely not have been visited on the Appellant. He had no role to play in the filing of the process, and the carelessness (on dual levels) of failing to file the address within time and yet not taking the opportunity offered to regularise the process when his attention was called to it, was wholly attributable to his Counsel.

This was a case where the trial Court should have exercised its discretion to countenance the address of Counsel, given the facts and circumstances of the case. In ignoring and discountenancing the final address of Counsel for the Appellant therefore, the Appellant was denied his right to fair hearing, thereby voiding the entire trial.

Furthermore, the failure of the Respondent's Counsel to object to the said irregular process until after it had been adopted by Counsel for the Appellant, also pointed to the fact that he had waived his right to complain. The failure to file the address within the time prescribed by the Rules of Court was a mere irregularity which did not go to the root of the case and so was capable of being waived. SeeAriori V Elemo (1983) NSCC (Vol. 14) 1 at 8 per Eso, JSC; & Bajoga V Govt., FRN (2008) 1 NWLR (Pt.1067) 85 at 115.

It is therefore for these reasons and for those adumbrated in the lead Judgment that I also allow the Appeal in part.

I endorse the consequential orders therein, including the order for re-trial.

**ONYEKACHI AJA OTISI, J.C.A.:**

My learned Brother, Joseph E. Ekanem, JCA, made available to me in draft form, an advance copy of the Judgment just delivered in which this appeal was allowed, in part. The issues raised in this appeal have been characteristically comprehensively resolved. I am in agreement with the resolution of the issues and have nothing further to add. I abide by the orders made in the lead Judgment, including the order for retrial.