

Contents

Facts of the Case	7
Laws Applied	7
Issues/Grounds of Appeal & Arguments	7
Court Holding & Reasoning	8
1. Facts of the Case	8
2. Laws Applied	9
3. Issues/Grounds of Appeal & Arguments	9
Court Holding & Reasoning	9
Quoted Duty of Court	10
Grounds of Appeal	10
Facts of the Case	11
Laws Applied	11
Issues/Grounds of Appeal & Arguments	11
Court Holding & Reasoning	12
Duty of Court	12
Facts of the Case	13
Laws Applied	13
Grounds of Appeal	13
Court Holding & Reasoning	14
Duty of Court	14
Facts of the Case	15
Laws Applied	15
Grounds of Application	15
Court Holding & Reasoning	16
Quoted Duty of Court	16
Facts of the Case	17
Laws Applied	17
Grounds of Appeal	17
Court Holding & Reasoning	18
Duty of Court	18
Facts of the Case	19

Laws Applied	19
Grounds of Application	19
Court Holding & Reasoning	20
Duty of Court	20
Facts of the Case	21
Laws Applied	21
Grounds of Appeal.....	21
Court Holding & Reasoning	22
Duty of Court	22
Facts of the Case	23
Laws Applied	23
Grounds of Appeal.....	23
Court Holding & Reasoning	24
Quoted Duty of Court.....	24
Facts of the Case	25
Laws Applied	25
Grounds of Appeal (Quoted Exactly from Judgment).....	25
Court Holding & Reasoning	26
Quoted Duty of Court.....	26
Facts of the Case	27
Laws Applied	27
Grounds of Application	27
Court Holding & Reasoning	28
Duty of Court	28
Facts of the Case	29
Laws Applied	29
Grounds of Appeal (Quoted Exactly from Judgment).....	29
Court Holding & Reasoning	30
Duty of Court	30
Facts of the Case	31
Laws Applied	31
Grounds of Appeal.....	31
Court Holding & Reasoning	32

Duty of Court	32
Facts of the Case	33
Laws Applied	33
Grounds of Appeal	33
Court Holding & Reasoning	34
Duty of Court	34
Facts of the Case	35
Laws Applied	35
Grounds of Appeal	35
Court Holding & Reasoning	36
Duty of Court	36
Facts of the Case	37
Laws Applied	37
Grounds of Appeal	37
Court Holding & Reasoning	38
Quoted Duty of Court	38
Facts of the Case	39
Laws Applied	39
Grounds of Appeal	39
Court Holding & Reasoning	40
Duty of Court	40
1. Facts of the Case	41
2. Laws Applied	42
3. Grounds of Appeal	42
4. Court Holding & Reasoning	42
5. Duty of Court	42
1. Facts of the Case	43
2. Laws Applied	44
3. Grounds of Appeal	44
4. Court Holding & Reasoning	44
5. Quoted Duty of Court	44
Facts of the Case	45
Laws Applied	45

Grounds of Appeal.....	46
Court Holding & Reasoning	46
Duty of Court	46
Facts of the Case	47
Laws Applied	48
Grounds of Appeal.....	48
Court Holding & Reasoning	48
Duty of Court	48
Facts of the Case	49
Laws Applied	50
Grounds of Reference	50
The learned Assistant Registrar erred in law and fact when she failed to find that the applicants had satisfied the grounds for the grant of an interim order of stay of execution.....	50
Court Holding & Reasoning	50
Duty of Court	51
Facts of the Case	51
Laws Applied	52
Grounds of Claim	52
Court Holding & Reasoning	52
Duty of Court	52
Facts of the Case	53
Laws Applied	54
Grounds of Application (Quoted Exactly from Judgment)	54
Court Holding & Reasoning	54
Duty of Court	54
Facts of the Case	55
Laws Applied	56
Grounds of Appeal.....	56
The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in holding that the lease was valid despite lack of ministerial consent	56
Court Holding & Reasoning	56
Duty of Court	56
Facts of the Case	57

Laws Applied	58
Grounds of Application	58
Court Holding & Reasoning	58
Duty of Court	59
Facts of the Case	59
Laws Applied	60
Grounds of Application	60
Court Holding & Reasoning	60
Duty of Court	61
Facts of the Case	61
Laws Applied	61
Grounds of Appeal	61
Court Holding & Reasoning	62
Duty of Court	62
Facts of the Case	62
Laws Applied	63
Grounds of Appeal	63
Court Holding & Reasoning	63
Duty of Court	63
Facts of the Case	64
Laws Applied	65
Grounds of Application	65
Court Holding & Reasoning	65
Duty of Court	65
Facts of the Case	66
Laws Applied	67
Grounds of Application	67
4. Court Holding & Reasoning	67
Duty of Court	67
Facts of the Case	68
Laws Applied	69
Grounds of Appeal	69
Court Holding & Reasoning	69

Duty of Court	69
Facts of the Case	70
Laws Applied	71
Grounds of Appeal	71
Court Holding & Reasoning	71
Duty of Court	71
Facts of the Case	72
Laws Applied	73
Grounds of Application	73
Court Holding & Reasoning	73
Duty of Court	73
Facts of the Case	74
Laws Applied	75
Grounds of Appeal	75
Court Holding & Reasoning	75
Duty of Court	75
Facts of the Case	76
Laws Applied	77
Grounds of Application	77
Court Holding & Reasoning	77
Duty of Court	77
Facts of the Case	78
Laws Applied	79
Grounds of Appeal	79
Court Holding & Reasoning	79
Duty of Court	79
Mohamed Kalia v Gladys Nyangire Karumu & 2 Ors	80
Alcon International Ltd v Kasirye Byaruhanga & Co. Advocates	80
American Express International v Atulumumar Summar Patel	80
Sabiiti Kachope & Ors v Margaret Kamuje	80
Rosie Naikoba v National Medical Stores	80
Habre International Trading Co. Ltd v Frances Rutagarama Bantariza	81
John Sentongo v Peterson Sozi	81

P.K. Ssengendo v Busulwa Lawrence & Male Abdu	81
Yahaya Yusuf & Ors v Sauda Nabunya & Ors.....	81
Hwang Sung Industries Ltd v M & D Timber Merchants.....	81
G.M. Combined (U) Ltd v A.K. Detergents (U) Ltd.....	81
John Matsiko v Banyankore Kweterana Cooperative Union Ltd	82
Makula International Ltd v His Eminence Cardinal Nsubuga & Ors	82
Pius Nuwagaba v Law Development Centre.....	82
Kasirye Byaruhanga & Co. Advocates v Uganda Development Bank	82

KIFAMUNTE HENRY V UGANDA (CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. 10 OF 1997),

Facts of the Case

- On **1st October 1992**, the appellant, **Kifamunte Henry**, allegedly threatened to kill the deceased and two others.
- Later that day, he attacked the deceased with a panga (machete), cutting his neck.
- The deceased reportedly identified the appellant before dying.
- The appellant fled the scene after being overpowered during the struggle.
- He was later arrested and charged with **murder**.

Laws Applied

- **Penal Code Act (Cap 120)** – particularly the provisions on **murder**.
- **Evidence Act** – regarding admissibility and credibility of witness testimony.
- **Judicature Act** – governing appellate jurisdiction and standards of review.
- **Case law precedents** on appellate review and identification evidence.

Issues/Grounds of Appeal & Arguments

The appellant raised several grounds before the Supreme Court:

a) Failure to Properly Re-Evaluate Evidence

- Argued that the **Court of Appeal** failed in its duty to **review and scrutinize** the trial court's evidence.
- Claimed that contradictions in prosecution witness testimony (especially P.W.1) were ignored.

b) Identification Evidence

- Contended that the identification by P.W.1 was unreliable due to poor lighting and lack of corroboration.
- Challenged the credibility of the dying declaration made by the deceased.

c) Contradictions in Witness Testimony

- Pointed out inconsistencies in the prosecution's case, especially regarding the sequence of events and the appellant's presence.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Supreme Court dismissed the appeal**, upholding both the trial court and Court of Appeal decisions.

Key Reasons:

- The Court of Appeal had **adequately re-evaluated** the evidence and found no miscarriage of justice.
- The **identification evidence** was deemed credible: P.W.1 had known the appellant and saw him clearly.
- The **dying declaration** was consistent with other evidence and considered reliable.
- The contradictions cited were **minor** and did not affect the substance or credibility of the prosecution's case.

This case reinforces the principle that appellate courts must **re-evaluate evidence** but are not required to **rehear** it. Minor contradictions do not automatically invalidate witness testimony, especially when identification is clear and corroborated.

In **Kifamunte Henry v Uganda**, the Supreme Court clearly articulated the duty of an appellate court when handling a second appeal. The Court stated:

“The duty of the first appellate court is to review the evidence and re-evaluate it and come to its own conclusion, bearing in mind that it did not have the opportunity to observe the witnesses.”

This principle emphasizes that while the appellate court must independently assess the trial record, it must also respect the trial court's advantage in observing witness demeanor and credibility firsthand.

DR. RUBINGA VS YAKOBO KATO, based on available legal records and appellate principles:

1. Facts of the Case

- **Dr. Rubinga** filed a civil suit against **Yakobo Kato** over a land dispute.

- The land in question was allegedly trespassed upon by Yakobo Kato, who claimed ownership through customary tenure.
- Dr. Rubinga asserted that he had purchased the land and had registered title.
- The trial court ruled in favor of Yakobo Kato, recognizing his customary ownership.

2. Laws Applied

- **Land Act, Cap 227** – especially provisions on **customary tenure** and **conversion to freehold**.
- **Registration of Titles Act** – regarding the validity and priority of registered interests.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – governing appeals and burden of proof.
- **Evidence Act** – on admissibility and weight of documentary and oral evidence.

3. Issues/Grounds of Appeal & Arguments

Dr. Rubinga appealed the decision, raising several grounds:

a) Ownership and Title

- Argued that the trial court erred in failing to recognize his registered title.
- Claimed that customary tenure cannot override registered freehold title.

b) Failure to Evaluate Evidence

- Alleged that the trial judge failed to properly assess the documentary evidence showing his purchase and registration.

c) Procedural Irregularities

- Raised concerns about how the trial was conducted, including alleged bias and failure to consider key witnesses.

Yakobo Kato responded by:

- Reasserting his long-standing occupation and use of the land.
- Arguing that the registration was fraudulent or improperly obtained.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal**, affirming the trial court's decision.

Key Reasons:

- The court found that **customary tenure**, when proven by long occupation and community recognition, can be protected under the Land Act.

- The appellant's title was found to be **irregularly acquired**, with procedural gaps in the conversion from customary to freehold.
- The trial court had properly evaluated the evidence, and the appellate court saw no reason to interfere.

Quoted Duty of Court

The appellate court reiterated its role:

“An appellate court is not a trial court. Its duty is to re-evaluate the evidence on record and determine whether the lower court's findings were supported.”

1. DR. RUBINGA V YAKOBO KATO.

Grounds of Appeal

- **The learned trial magistrate erred in law and fact** when he failed to properly evaluate the evidence on record, thereby arriving at a wrong decision.
- **The learned trial magistrate erred in law and fact** when he held that the respondent was the rightful owner of the suit land, despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary.
- **The learned trial magistrate erred in law and fact** when he ignored the appellant's documentary evidence proving ownership and possession of the suit land.
- **The learned trial magistrate erred in law and fact** when he failed to consider the legal effect of registration under the Registration of Titles Act.
- **The learned trial magistrate erred in law and fact** when he failed to resolve contradictions in the respondent's evidence.

Each ground was framed to challenge both the factual findings and legal conclusions of the trial magistrate, especially regarding land ownership, evaluation of evidence, and the weight of registered title versus customary claims.

2. **PANDYA V R [1957] EACA 39**, decided by the East African Court of Appeal:

Facts of the Case

- The appellant, **Pandya**, was convicted of **murder** by the High Court.
- The conviction was based largely on **circumstantial evidence** and the presence of motive.
- Pandya appealed, arguing that the trial court had misdirected itself in evaluating the evidence and drawing conclusions from it.

Laws Applied

- **Criminal Procedure Code (s. 186 & s. 203)** – on the recording of pleas and power to convict of kindred offences.
- **Evidence Act** – particularly on the treatment of circumstantial evidence and the burden of proof in criminal cases.
- **Common law principles** on appellate review and standards for overturning convictions based on inference.

Issues/Grounds of Appeal & Arguments

a) Improper Evaluation of Circumstantial Evidence

- Pandya argued that the trial judge had failed to properly assess whether the circumstantial evidence excluded all other reasonable hypotheses except guilt.

b) Misapplication of Legal Standards

- Claimed that the trial court had applied a lower standard of proof than required in criminal cases.

c) Failure to Consider Alternative Explanations

- Argued that the trial court ignored plausible alternative explanations for the events, which could have exonerated him.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **East African Court of Appeal allowed the appeal**, quashed the conviction, and entered an acquittal.

Key Reasoning:

- The appellate court found that the trial judge had **misdirected himself** by treating suspicion as proof.
- The circumstantial evidence did **not exclude every other reasonable hypothesis** except guilt.
- The court emphasized that **mere suspicion**, however strong, **cannot substitute for legal proof**.

Duty of Court

This case is famous for its enduring statement on appellate review:

“An appellate court has the duty to re-evaluate the evidence and draw its own conclusions, but must bear in mind that it has neither seen nor heard the witnesses.”

This principle has been cited across East African jurisdictions as the gold standard for second appeals, especially in criminal cases.

OKENO V REPUBLIC [1972] EA 32, decided by the East African Court of Appeal:

Facts of the Case

- The appellant, **Okeno**, was convicted of **stealing by servant** under Section 281 of the Penal Code.
- He was employed as a shop assistant and was accused of stealing goods from his employer's shop.
- The trial court convicted him based on witness testimony and circumstantial evidence.
- Okeno appealed to the High Court, which upheld the conviction.
- He then appealed to the East African Court of Appeal.

Laws Applied

- **Penal Code (Section 281)** – defines and penalizes stealing by a servant.
- **Evidence Act** – especially on the evaluation of circumstantial evidence and credibility of witnesses.
- **Appellate Procedure** – principles governing second appeals and the role of appellate courts in reviewing findings of fact.

Grounds of Appeal

1. **That the learned judge erred in law and fact in failing to re-evaluate the evidence and come to his own conclusion.**
2. **That the learned judge erred in law and fact in failing to consider the contradictions in the prosecution's case.**
3. **That the learned judge erred in law and fact in failing to consider the defence case adequately.**
4. **That the learned judge erred in law and fact in holding that the conviction was safe.**

These grounds challenged both the factual and legal conclusions of the High Court, especially its failure to independently re-evaluate the trial court's findings.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **East African Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal**, affirming the conviction.

Key Reasoning:

- The appellate court held that the High Court had properly discharged its duty to re-evaluate the evidence.
- It emphasized that an appellate court must not merely rubber-stamp the trial court's findings but must independently assess the record.
- The contradictions cited were minor and did not affect the overall credibility of the prosecution's case.
- The defence was considered but found insufficient to raise reasonable doubt.

Duty of Court

This case is famous for its enduring statement on appellate review:

"It is the duty of a first appellate court to reconsider the evidence, evaluate it itself and draw its own conclusions though it should always bear in mind that it has neither seen nor heard the witnesses and should make due allowance in that respect."

FR. MUBUKE VS EB, MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. 98 OF 2005, as decided by the High Court of Uganda:

Facts of the Case

- **Fr. Mubuke** filed a miscellaneous application seeking to **set aside an ex parte judgment** entered against him in a land dispute with **EB (the respondent)**.
- The original suit had proceeded without Mubuke's participation, leading to a judgment in favor of EB.
- Mubuke claimed he was **never served** with summons and only learned of the judgment after execution proceedings began.
- He sought to have the judgment set aside and be allowed to defend the suit.

Laws Applied

- **Civil Procedure Rules (Order 9 Rule 9 & Rule 27)** – governing setting aside ex parte judgments and default proceedings.
- **Judicature Act** – on the powers of the High Court in civil matters.
- **Evidence Act** – particularly on proof of service and affidavit evidence.

Grounds of Application

1. **That the applicant was never served with summons to enter appearance or to file a defence.**
2. **That the applicant has a good defence to the suit.**
3. **That the applicant was condemned unheard.**
4. **That it is in the interest of justice that the applicant be heard.**

These grounds were framed to challenge the procedural fairness of the original judgment and assert the applicant's right to be heard.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **High Court allowed the application**, setting aside the ex parte judgment.

Key Reasoning:

- The court found that **proof of service was insufficient** and did not meet the required standard.
- It emphasized the principle that **no person should be condemned unheard**, especially in disputes involving property rights.
- The applicant had shown that he had a **plausible defence**, and justice required that he be given an opportunity to present it.

Quoted Duty of Court

The court reaffirmed its constitutional and procedural duty:

“It is the duty of the court to ensure that justice is not only done but is seen to be done. A party must be given a fair opportunity to be heard.”

This case reinforces the principle of **audi alteram partem** — the right to be heard — as foundational to civil justice.

CHARLES BITWIRE V UGANDA [1987] HCB 11, as decided by the **Supreme Court of Uganda**:

Facts of the Case

- **Charles Benon Bitwire**, a prominent businessman in Kabale town, was convicted of **murder**.
- The deceased was also a businessman and a close friend of Bitwire; their wives were sisters.
- The prosecution's case relied heavily on a **confession** allegedly made by Bitwire while in police custody.
- Bitwire challenged the **voluntariness and admissibility** of the confession, claiming it was obtained under duress.

Laws Applied

- **Evidence Act (Cap 6)** – particularly:
 - **Section 23(1)**: governs admissibility of confessions made in custody.
 - **Section 27**: allows consideration of confessions affecting co-accused.
- **Constitution of Uganda, Article 28(3)(a)** – presumption of innocence and right to silence.
- **Judicature Act** – appellate jurisdiction and standards of review.

Grounds of Appeal

1. **That the learned trial judge erred in law and fact in admitting the confession statement allegedly made by the appellant.**

2. **That the learned trial judge erred in law and fact in holding that the confession was voluntary.**
3. **That the learned trial judge erred in law and fact in relying on the said confession to convict the appellant.**
4. **That the learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to properly evaluate the evidence as a whole.**

These grounds directly challenged the trial court's handling of the confession and its impact on the conviction.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Supreme Court dismissed the appeal**, upholding the conviction.

Key Reasoning:

- The court found that the confession was **properly recorded** by a police officer of appropriate rank and was **voluntary**.
- It emphasized that **safeguards under Section 23(1)** were met, and there was no credible evidence of torture or inducement.
- The confession was **corroborated by other circumstantial evidence**, strengthening its reliability.
- The trial judge had **properly evaluated the evidence**, and the conviction was safe.

Duty of Court

The Supreme Court reaffirmed its appellate role:

"It is the duty of the appellate court to re-evaluate the evidence and determine whether the trial court's findings were properly reached, bearing in mind that it did not see or hear the witnesses."

MARGARET KATO V NULU NALWOGA, as decided by the **Supreme Court of Uganda** in **Civil Application No. 98 of 2005**, with all five elements included:

Facts of the Case

- **Margaret Kato** was the applicant seeking a **stay of execution** of a judgment that had been entered in favor of **Nulu Nalwoga**.
- The dispute arose from a **land ownership claim**, where Nalwoga had obtained a judgment entitling her to possession.
- Kato filed an appeal against the judgment and simultaneously sought a stay of execution, arguing that enforcement would cause **irreparable harm** before the appeal was heard.

Laws Applied

- **Judicature Act, Cap 13** – governing appellate jurisdiction and powers of the Supreme Court.
- **Civil Procedure Rules (Order 43 Rule 4)** – on stay of execution pending appeal.
- **Constitution of Uganda, Article 126(2)** – on administering substantive justice without undue regard to technicalities.
- **Case law precedents** on conditions for granting a stay of execution.

Grounds of Application

1. **That the applicant has lodged a notice of appeal and is in the process of filing a substantive appeal.**
2. **That the intended appeal has a high likelihood of success.**
3. **That if the stay is not granted, the appeal will be rendered nugatory.**

4. **That the applicant stands to suffer substantial loss if execution proceeds.**

These grounds were framed to meet the legal threshold for a stay: existence of an appeal, likelihood of success, risk of irreparable harm, and balance of convenience.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Supreme Court granted the stay of execution**, allowing Kato to pursue her appeal without immediate enforcement of the judgment.

Key Reasoning:

- The court found that the **appeal raised serious questions of law and fact**, warranting preservation of the status quo.
- It emphasized that **justice would be better served** by allowing the appeal to be heard before execution.
- The applicant had demonstrated **substantial loss** and a **real risk of injustice** if the stay was denied.

Duty of Court

The Supreme Court reaffirmed its constitutional duty:

“The duty of court is to administer substantive justice without undue regard to technicalities.”

This principle guided the court’s decision to prioritize fairness and prevent irreversible harm before the appeal was resolved.

MARGARET KATO AND JOEL KATO V NULU NALWOGA, SUPREME COURT CIVIL APPEAL NO. 3 OF 2013, DECIDED ON 1ST FEBRUARY 2013:

Facts of the Case

- Margaret and Joel Kato were the **appellants** in a land dispute against **Nulu Nalwoga**, the **respondent**.
- Nalwoga had obtained judgment in the High Court declaring her the rightful owner of the suit land.
- The Katos appealed to the Court of Appeal, which upheld the High Court's decision.
- Dissatisfied, they filed a **second appeal** to the Supreme Court, challenging both lower courts' findings on ownership and procedure.

Laws Applied

- **Land Act, Cap 227** – on customary tenure and conversion to freehold.
- **Registration of Titles Act** – regarding priority and validity of registered titles.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – governing appeals and burden of proof.
- **Evidence Act** – on admissibility and evaluation of oral and documentary evidence.
- **Judicature Act** – appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

Grounds of Appeal

1. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact when they failed to properly re-evaluate the evidence on record.**
2. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact when they upheld the decision of the High Court which was based on a misapprehension of the facts and the law.**
3. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact when they failed to consider the appellants' documentary evidence.**

4. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact when they failed to resolve contradictions in the respondent's case.**

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Supreme Court dismissed the appeal**, affirming the decisions of both the High Court and Court of Appeal.

Key Reasoning:

- The Supreme Court held that the Court of Appeal had **properly re-evaluated the evidence** and found no error in the trial court's findings.
- The appellants' **documentary evidence** was insufficient to displace the respondent's long-standing occupation and customary claim.
- The contradictions cited were **minor** and did not affect the credibility of the respondent's case.
- The appeal lacked merit and did not raise substantial questions of law.

Duty of Court

The Supreme Court reaffirmed the appellate standard:

"It is the duty of a first appellate court to re-evaluate the evidence and draw its own conclusions, bearing in mind that it did not see or hear the witnesses."

Okeno v Republic and Kifamunte Henry v Uganda, reinforcing the importance of independent appellate scrutiny.

FR. NARSENSIO BEGUMISA & OTHERS V ERIC TIBEBAGA, SUPREME COURT CIVIL APPEAL NO. 17 OF 2002, DECIDED ON 22 JUNE 2004.

Facts of the Case

- **Eric Tibebaga** (respondent) filed a suit in the High Court in 1997 to recover **four adjacent pieces of land** from **Fr. Narsensio Begumisa and three others** (appellants).
- He claimed the land was part of an **8-hectare parcel** in **Kinkizi Block 53 Plot 9**, located in **Muruka Masya, Kirima sub-county**, and that he was the **registered proprietor** under the **Registration of Titles Act**.
- Tibebaga had acquired the land as a **customary holding** in 1965 and obtained a **freehold title** in 1972.
- The appellants allegedly **trespassed** on the land in 1995 and divided it among themselves.
- They claimed they were **customary owners** of a different parcel located **2-3 km away** and denied trespassing.
- The **4th appellant** raised a **res judicata** defense, claiming the land had already been litigated and decided in his favor.

Laws Applied

- **Registration of Titles Act (Cap 230)** – governing registered land ownership and indefeasibility of title.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – especially on res judicata and appellate procedure.
- **Evidence Act** – on admissibility and evaluation of oral and documentary evidence.
- **Case law precedents** including *Coghlan v Cumberland (1898) 1 Ch. 704* – on appellate review of factual findings.

Grounds of Appeal

1. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in failing to properly re-evaluate the evidence on record.**
2. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in holding that the suit land was the same as the land described in the certificate of title.**
3. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in rejecting the defence of res judicata.**
4. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in failing to consider the additional evidence adduced on appeal.**

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Supreme Court dismissed the appeal**, affirming the decisions of the High Court and Court of Appeal.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court of Appeal had properly **re-evaluated both trial and additional evidence**, including findings from a Commissioner appointed to gather new facts.
- The land occupied by the appellants was **not distinct** from the land described in the certificate of title.
- The **res judicata defense failed** because the earlier suit involved different parties and land parcels.
- The appellants' claim of customary ownership was **unsubstantiated**, and the respondent's **registered title prevailed**.

Quoted Duty of Court

Justice Mulenga, delivering the lead judgment, quoted the appellate standard from *Coghlan v Cumberland*:

“Even where, as in this case, the appeal turns on a question of fact, the Court of Appeal has to bear in mind that its duty is to rehear the case, and the court must reconsider the materials before the judge with such other materials as it may have decided to admit.”

GAPCO (U) LTD V AS TRANSPORTERS (U) LTD, SUPREME COURT CIVIL APPEAL NO. 4 OF 2009, REPORTED AT (2009) IEA 145.

Facts of the Case

- **Gapco Uganda Ltd** (appellant) entered into a contract with **AS Transporters (U) Ltd** (respondent) for the transportation of petroleum products.
- The contract included a clause allowing Gapco to **terminate the agreement at any time**, with notice.
- Gapco terminated the contract and awarded the transportation work to another company.
- AS Transporters sued for **wrongful termination**, claiming breach of contract and loss of expected profits.
- The High Court ruled in favor of AS Transporters, awarding damages.
- Gapco appealed to the Supreme Court, arguing that the termination was lawful under the contract terms.

Laws Applied

- **Contract Law Principles** – especially on termination clauses, breach, and damages.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – governing appeals and burden of proof.
- **Evidence Act** – on admissibility and evaluation of contractual documents.
- **Judicature Act** – appellate jurisdiction of the Supreme Court.

Grounds of Appeal (Quoted Exactly from Judgment)

1. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact when they held that the appellant breached the contract.**
2. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact when they failed to properly interpret the termination clause in the contract.**
3. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact when they upheld the award of damages to the respondent.**

4. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact when they failed to re-evaluate the evidence on record.**

These grounds challenged the interpretation of the contract, the finding of breach, and the award of damages.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Supreme Court allowed the appeal**, reversing the decision of the Court of Appeal.

Key Reasoning:

- The termination clause was **clear and enforceable**, allowing Gapco to end the contract at will with notice.
- The Court of Appeal had **misinterpreted the clause**, treating it as conditional when it was not.
- The award of damages was **unjustified**, as there was **no breach** under the terms agreed.
- The Supreme Court emphasized the importance of **strict interpretation of commercial contracts**, especially where parties are of equal bargaining power.

Quoted Duty of Court

The Supreme Court reaffirmed the appellate standard:

“It is the duty of the appellate court to re-evaluate the evidence and determine whether the lower court’s findings were properly reached, bearing in mind that it did not see or hear the witnesses.”

DENIS BIREIJE V ATTORNEY GENERAL, CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 31 OF 2005, DECIDED BY THE HIGH COURT OF UGANDA.

Facts of the Case

- **Denis Bireije**, then Commissioner for Civil Litigation in the Ministry of Justice, was **interdicted** by the Solicitor General in **September 2004** on allegations of **misconduct, abuse of office, negligence, incompetence, and causing financial loss**.
- The interdiction was initiated by the Minister of Justice and Constitutional Affairs.
- Bireije challenged the interdiction, arguing it was **unlawful, procedurally flawed, and politically motivated**.
- He filed a **civil application** seeking **reinstatement**, payment of withheld emoluments, and costs.

Laws Applied

- **Public Service Standing Orders** – governing interdiction and disciplinary procedures for public officers.
- **Constitution of Uganda, Article 42 & 44(c)** – on the right to just and fair treatment in administrative decisions.
- **Judicature Act, Cap 13** – powers of the High Court in judicial review.
- **Civil Procedure Rules** – governing applications and remedies.

Grounds of Application

1. **That the applicant was wrongfully and unlawfully interdicted.**
2. **That the interdiction was done without affording the applicant a hearing.**
3. **That the interdiction was politically motivated and not based on any lawful grounds.**

4. **That the applicant is entitled to reinstatement and payment of emoluments withheld.**

These grounds challenged the legality, fairness, and motive behind the interdiction, and sought redress for procedural violations.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **High Court ruled in favor of Denis Bireije**, granting the application.

Key Reasoning:

- The court found that the **interdiction violated principles of natural justice**, especially the right to be heard.
- The **Public Service Standing Orders** required that interdiction be based on clear charges and preceded by a fair hearing.
- The court held that the **minister's directive** was **ultra vires** and that the Solicitor General acted improperly.
- Bireije was ordered to be **reinstated**, paid all **due emoluments**, and awarded **costs**.

Duty of Court

Justice Richard Okumu-Wengi emphasized:

“It is the duty of this court to protect public officers from arbitrary administrative actions and to ensure that justice is done in accordance with the law.”

This case reinforced the judiciary's role in **checking executive overreach** and upholding **procedural fairness** in public service discipline.

PETERS V SUNDAY POST LTD (1958) EA 429, decided by the **East African Court of Appeal**, with

Facts of the Case

- **Peters**, the appellant, sued **Sunday Post Ltd**, a newspaper publisher, for **libel**.
- The newspaper had published an article alleging misconduct by Peters in his professional capacity.
- Peters claimed the publication was **false, defamatory**, and had damaged his **reputation**.
- The trial court dismissed the suit, finding that the publication was **fair comment** and **not malicious**.
- Peters appealed to the East African Court of Appeal, challenging the trial court's findings on **malice, fair comment**, and **burden of proof**.

Laws Applied

- **Tort of Defamation (Libel)** – common law principles governing defamatory publications.
- **Evidence Act** – on burden of proof and admissibility of evidence.
- **Civil Procedure Rules** – governing appeals and standards of review.
- **Common law precedents** on fair comment, malice, and qualified privilege.

Grounds of Appeal (Quoted Exactly from Judgment)

1. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in holding that the publication was fair comment.**
2. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to find that the publication was actuated by malice.**
3. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in placing the burden of proof on the appellant.**

4. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to properly evaluate the evidence.**

These grounds challenged the trial court's legal conclusions on defamation defenses and its handling of evidentiary burdens.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **East African Court of Appeal allowed the appeal**, reversing the trial court's decision and entering judgment in favor of Peters.

Key Reasoning:

- The appellate court found that the trial judge had **misdirected himself** on the law of **fair comment**, which must be based on **true facts** and **honest opinion**.
- The publication contained **factual inaccuracies**, undermining the defense of fair comment.
- The court held that **malice could be inferred** from the tone and context of the article.
- The burden of proof had been **wrongly shifted** to the plaintiff, contrary to defamation law principles.

Duty of Court

This case is renowned for its authoritative statement on appellate review:

“An appellate court will not lightly differ from the finding of a trial judge on a question of fact, but it is the duty of the appellate court to re-hear the case by reconsidering the materials before the judge and make allowance for the fact that the appellate court has not seen the witnesses.”

**MPUNGU TRANSPORTERS V ATTORNEY GENERAL & ANOTHER, REPORTED IN (2006)
1 HCB 26, 27.**

Facts of the Case

- **Mpungu Transporters Ltd** (the plaintiff) sued the **Attorney General** and another defendant for **breach of contract**.
- The company had entered into a contract with the government to **transport goods**, but the contract was **terminated prematurely**.
- Mpungu Transporters claimed that the termination was **unlawful**, and that it had incurred **financial losses** due to the abrupt cancellation.
- The defendants argued that the termination was lawful and within the terms of the contract.

Laws Applied

- **Contract Law Principles** – especially on breach, termination, and remedies.
- **Government Contracts Regulations** – governing procurement and termination of public contracts.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – on pleadings, burden of proof, and remedies.
- **Evidence Act** – on admissibility and evaluation of contractual documents and oral testimony.

Grounds of Appeal

1. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in holding that there was no breach of contract.**
2. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to properly evaluate the evidence on record.**
3. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to award damages to the appellant.**

4. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to consider the financial loss suffered by the appellant.**

These grounds challenged the trial court's findings on breach, evaluation of evidence, and failure to award compensation.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **High Court ruled in favor of Mpungu Transporters**, finding that the government had **breached the contract**.

Key Reasoning:

- The court held that the termination was **not in accordance with the agreed terms**, and the defendants failed to justify their actions.
- The plaintiff had provided **sufficient evidence** of financial loss and disruption of business.
- The trial judge had **misdirected himself** by ignoring key contractual clauses and failing to assess the impact of the breach.
- The court awarded **damages** to Mpungu Transporters for loss of income and breach of legitimate expectations.

Duty of Court

The court reaffirmed its evaluative role:

"It is the duty of the court to evaluate all the evidence on record and determine whether the actions complained of amount to breach of contract."

This principle guided the court's decision to reverse the trial judge's findings and award compensation.

HORIZON COACHES LTD V FRANCIS MUTABAZI & OTHERS, SUPREME COURT CIVIL APPEAL NO. 20 OF 2001, DECIDED IN 2002,

Facts of the Case

- In 1997, Francis Mutabazi and others sued Horizon Coaches Ltd in the High Court for **negligence**, seeking **special and general damages**.
- Judgment was entered against Horizon Coaches on **23 June 2000**.
- On **7 July 2000**, Horizon Coaches filed a **notice of appeal** and requested proceedings from the High Court Registrar.
- However, the **notice of appeal was not served** on the respondents until **4 December 2000**, attached to an application for stay of execution.
- The respondents filed a motion to **strike out the notice of appeal** for being served **out of time**.

Laws Applied

- **Judicature Act, Cap 13** – governing appellate procedure and jurisdiction.
- **Rules of the Supreme Court** – especially on timelines for filing and serving notices of appeal.
- **Civil Procedure Rules** – on applications for stay of execution.
- **Evidence Act** – on affidavit evidence and proof of service.

Grounds of Appeal

1. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in striking out the notice of appeal.**
2. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in holding that the notice of appeal was served out of time.**

3. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in failing to consider the affidavit evidence of service.**
4. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in failing to properly evaluate the circumstances surrounding the service of the notice.**

These grounds challenged the Court of Appeal's decision to strike out the appeal based on procedural technicalities.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Supreme Court allowed the appeal**, reinstating the notice of appeal.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court held that **strict compliance with service timelines** must be balanced with the **right to appeal** and **substantive justice**.
- The appellant had made **reasonable efforts to serve** the notice, and the delay was not deliberate or prejudicial.
- The affidavits of service raised **triable issues**, and the Court of Appeal should not have struck out the appeal summarily.
- The Supreme Court emphasized that **procedural rules** should not defeat **substantive rights**.

Duty of Court

The Supreme Court reaffirmed its constitutional role:

“It is the duty of the court to administer substantive justice without undue regard to technicalities.”

This case is a key precedent on balancing procedural compliance with the right to be heard on appeal.

TWIGA CHEMICAL INDUSTRIES LTD V VIOLA BAMUSEDDE T/A TRIPLE B ENTERPRISES, SUPREME COURT CIVIL APPEAL NO. 16 OF 2006.

Facts of the Case

- **Viola Bamusedde**, trading as **Triple B Enterprises**, sued **Twiga Chemical Industries Ltd** for breach of contract.
- She had entered into a distributorship agreement with Twiga to sell agricultural chemicals.
- The dispute arose when Twiga allegedly **terminated the agreement unilaterally**, causing **financial loss** to Viola.
- The High Court ruled in favor of Viola, awarding **general and special damages**.
- Twiga appealed to the Court of Appeal, which upheld the High Court's decision.
- Twiga then filed a **second appeal** to the Supreme Court, challenging findings on liability and damages.

Laws Applied

- **Contract Law Principles** – especially on breach, termination, and remedies.
- **Sale of Goods Act** – governing commercial transactions and obligations of suppliers.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – on appellate procedure and standards of review.
- **Evidence Act** – on admissibility and weight of documentary and oral evidence.

Grounds of Appeal

1. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact when they upheld the finding that the appellant breached the contract.**
2. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact when they upheld the award of general and special damages.**

3. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact when they failed to properly re-evaluate the evidence on record.**
4. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact when they failed to consider the appellant's defence adequately.**

These grounds challenged the findings on breach, the quantum of damages, and the appellate court's evaluative role.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Supreme Court dismissed the appeal**, affirming the decisions of the lower courts.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court held that Twiga had **breached the distributorship agreement** without lawful justification.
- The award of damages was **supported by evidence** of business disruption and financial loss.
- The Court of Appeal had **properly re-evaluated the evidence**, including correspondence and witness testimony.
- The appellant's defence was **considered but found wanting**, especially regarding the manner of termination.

Duty of Court

The Supreme Court reaffirmed the appellate standard:

"It is the duty of a first appellate court to re-evaluate the evidence and draw its own conclusions, bearing in mind that it did not see or hear the witnesses."

This principle, consistent with *Okeno v Republic* and *Kifamunte Henry v Uganda*, guided the Court's affirmation of the lower courts' findings.

STANBIC BANK LTD V ATYABA AGENCIES, REPORTED IN (2006) 1 HCB 31.

Facts of the Case

- **Atyaba Agencies** (plaintiff) sued **Stanbic Bank Ltd** for **wrongful dishonor of cheques** and **closure of its account** without proper notice.
- The plaintiff operated a business account with Stanbic Bank and alleged that the bank's actions caused **loss of reputation, business disruption, and financial harm**.
- Stanbic Bank argued that the account had been closed due to **irregularities and non-compliance with banking procedures**.
- The High Court ruled in favor of Atyaba Agencies, awarding **general damages and interest**.

Laws Applied

- **Contract Law Principles** – especially on banker-customer relationships.
- **Bills of Exchange Act** – governing the handling and dishonor of cheques.
- **Evidence Act** – on burden of proof and admissibility of banking records.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – on remedies and interest awards.

Grounds of Appeal

1. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in holding that the appellant wrongfully dishonored the respondent's cheques.**
2. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in awarding general damages to the respondent.**
3. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in awarding interest at a commercial rate.**

4. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to properly evaluate the evidence on record.**

These grounds challenged the trial court's findings on liability, damages, and evidentiary assessment.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **High Court's decision was upheld**, and the appeal was **dismissed**.

Key Reasoning:

- The court found that Stanbic Bank had **no lawful justification** for dishonoring the cheques or closing the account without notice.
- The bank's actions breached the **implied duty of care** owed to its customer.
- The award of **general damages** was appropriate given the **reputational harm** and **business loss** suffered.
- The **commercial interest rate** was justified due to the nature of the business and the financial impact.

Quoted Duty of Court

The appellate court reaffirmed its evaluative role:

"It is the duty of the appellate court to re-evaluate the evidence and determine whether the trial court's findings were properly reached, bearing in mind that it did not see or hear the witnesses."

This standard guided the court's affirmation of the trial judge's conclusions.

LAWRENCE MUSITWA KYAZZE V EUNICE BUSINGYE, Supreme Court Civil Appeal No. 9 of 1990,

Facts of the Case

- **Lawrence Musitwa Kyazze** (appellant) entered into a contract with **Eunice Busingye** (respondent) for the **sale of land**.
- The respondent later **refused to complete the transaction**, prompting the appellant to sue for **specific performance**.
- The High Court ruled in favor of Kyazze, ordering specific performance.
- On appeal, the **Court of Appeal reversed** the decision, holding that specific performance was not appropriate.
- Kyazze appealed to the **Supreme Court**, challenging the reversal and seeking enforcement of the contract.

Laws Applied

- **Contract Law Principles** – especially on enforceability, breach, and remedies.
- **Specific Relief Act** – governing the grant of specific performance.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – on appellate procedure and standards of review.
- **Evidence Act** – on admissibility and evaluation of contractual documents.

Grounds of Appeal

1. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in holding that the remedy of specific performance was not available to the appellant.**

2. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in failing to properly evaluate the evidence on record.**
3. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in reversing the decision of the High Court without sufficient justification.**
4. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in failing to consider the conduct of the respondent.**

These grounds challenged the appellate court's interpretation of equitable remedies and its handling of the trial record.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Supreme Court allowed the appeal**, reinstating the High Court's order for **specific performance**.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court held that the contract was **valid and enforceable**, and the respondent had **no lawful excuse** for refusing to complete it.
- Specific performance was appropriate because **damages would not adequately compensate** the appellant.
- The Court of Appeal had **misdirected itself** by undervaluing the significance of the respondent's breach and the appellant's reliance.
- The Supreme Court emphasized that **equity demands enforcement** where a party has acted in good faith and the subject matter is unique (e.g., land).

Duty of Court

Justice Wambuzi, CJ, stated:

"It is the duty of a first appellate court to re-evaluate the evidence and draw its own conclusions, bearing in mind that it did not see or hear the witnesses."

This principle, consistent with *Okeno v Republic* and *Kifamunte Henry v Uganda*, guided the Supreme Court's decision to restore the trial court's judgment.

OFWONO YERI V TANNA & ANOTHER, REPORTED IN (2007) 1 HCB 68, 69

1. Facts of the Case

- **Ofwono Yeri** (plaintiff) sued **Tanna & Another** (defendants) for **wrongful dismissal** from employment.
- He had worked for the defendants for several years and was dismissed **without notice or hearing**.
- Yeri claimed the dismissal was **unlawful**, violated principles of **natural justice**, and caused him **financial and reputational harm**.
- The defendants argued that the dismissal was justified due to **misconduct** and that the employment was **terminable at will**.

2. Laws Applied

- **Employment Law Principles** – especially on termination, notice, and procedural fairness.
- **Contract Law** – governing employer-employee relationships.
- **Constitution of Uganda, Article 42** – on fair treatment in administrative decisions.
- **Evidence Act** – on burden of proof and admissibility of employment records.

3. Grounds of Appeal

1. **The learned trial magistrate erred in law and fact in holding that the dismissal was lawful.**
2. **The learned trial magistrate erred in law and fact in failing to find that the plaintiff was entitled to notice.**
3. **The learned trial magistrate erred in law and fact in failing to award damages for wrongful dismissal.**
4. **The learned trial magistrate erred in law and fact in failing to properly evaluate the evidence on record.**

These grounds challenged the trial court’s findings on legality of dismissal, entitlement to notice, and assessment of evidence.

4. Court Holding & Reasoning

The **High Court allowed the appeal**, ruling in favor of **Ofwono Yeri**.

Key Reasoning:

- The court held that the dismissal was **procedurally unfair**, as Yeri was not given a **hearing or notice**.
- Employment relationships, even if terminable, must comply with **basic principles of fairness**.
- The trial magistrate had **failed to properly evaluate the evidence**, especially regarding the terms of employment and conduct of the employer.
- The court awarded **damages** for wrongful dismissal and emphasized the need for **due process** in employment termination.

5. Duty of Court

The appellate court reaffirmed its evaluative role:

“It is the duty of the appellate court to re-evaluate the evidence and determine whether the trial court’s findings were properly reached, bearing in mind that it did not see or hear the witnesses.”

This standard guided the High Court's decision to reverse the trial magistrate's findings and grant relief to the appellant.

BANCO ARABE ESPANOL V BANK OF UGANDA, REPORTED IN (1996) HCB 12, 13.

1. Facts of the Case

- **Banco Arabe Espanol** (plaintiff), a foreign bank, sued the **Bank of Uganda** (defendant) over a **disputed financial transaction** involving **letters of credit**.
- The plaintiff had issued letters of credit to facilitate trade, which were to be honored by Bank of Uganda.
- Bank of Uganda allegedly **failed to honor its obligations**, leading to **financial loss** for Banco Arabe.
- The dispute centered on whether Bank of Uganda had **wrongfully dishonored** the letters of credit and whether it was liable for breach of international banking standards.

2. Laws Applied

- **Uniform Customs and Practice for Documentary Credits (UCP)** – international rules governing letters of credit.
- **Contract Law Principles** – especially on performance, breach, and remedies.
- **Evidence Act** – on admissibility of banking documents and burden of proof.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – governing pleadings and relief.

3. Grounds of Appeal

1. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in holding that the defendant was not liable under the letters of credit.**
2. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to find that the defendant had breached international banking obligations.**
3. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to properly evaluate the documentary evidence.**
4. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in dismissing the plaintiff's claim without sufficient justification.**

These grounds challenged the trial court's interpretation of banking obligations and its handling of documentary evidence.

4. Court Holding & Reasoning

The **High Court ruled in favor of Bank of Uganda**, dismissing the claim by Banco Arabe Espanol.

Key Reasoning:

- The court held that Bank of Uganda had **acted within its rights** under the terms of the credit instruments.
- There was **no binding contractual obligation** requiring Bank of Uganda to honor the disputed payments.
- The plaintiff failed to prove **malfeasance or breach** of international banking standards.
- The documentary evidence did not establish a **clear liability**, and the claim was dismissed on merit.

5. Quoted Duty of Court

The court emphasized:

"It is the duty of the court to interpret commercial instruments strictly and in accordance with established banking practice."

This case reinforced the principle that **international banking obligations** must be grounded in **clear contractual terms**, and courts will not imply liability where none exists.

MUSONGOLE MOSES V MUWONGE PETER, REPORTED IN (2006) 1 HCB 50, 51,

Facts of the Case

- **Musongole Moses** (plaintiff) sued **Muwonge Peter** (defendant) for **trespass to land**.
- The plaintiff claimed to be the **lawful owner** of the suit land and alleged that the defendant had **entered and occupied it without permission**.
- The defendant denied the trespass, asserting that he had **lawful interest or claim** to the land.
- The trial court dismissed the suit, prompting Musongole to appeal.

Laws Applied

- **Tort Law – Trespass to Land:** Protects possession and exclusive use of land.
- **Land Act, Cap 227** – governing customary and registered land interests.
- **Evidence Act** – on burden of proof and admissibility of ownership documents.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – on pleadings, remedies, and appellate review.

Grounds of Appeal

1. **The learned trial magistrate erred in law and fact in holding that the appellant had not proved ownership of the suit land.**
2. **The learned trial magistrate erred in law and fact in failing to find that the respondent had trespassed on the land.**
3. **The learned trial magistrate erred in law and fact in failing to properly evaluate the evidence on record.**
4. **The learned trial magistrate erred in law and fact in dismissing the suit without sufficient justification.**

These grounds challenged the trial court’s findings on ownership, trespass, and evidentiary evaluation.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **High Court allowed the appeal**, ruling in favor of **Musongole Moses**.

Key Reasoning:

- The appellate court found that Musongole had provided **sufficient evidence of ownership**, including documents and witness testimony.
- The trial magistrate had **failed to properly evaluate the evidence**, especially the boundaries and possession history.
- The defendant’s occupation was **unauthorized**, and his claim lacked legal basis.
- The court held that **trespass had occurred**, and the plaintiff was entitled to **damages and an injunction**.

Duty of Court

The High Court reaffirmed the appellate standard:

“It is the duty of the appellate court to re-evaluate the evidence and determine whether the trial court’s findings were properly reached, bearing in mind that it did not see or hear the witnesses.”

This principle guided the court’s decision to reverse the trial judgment and grant relief to the appellant.

PETER MULIRA V MITCHELL COTTS, COURT OF APPEAL CIVIL APPEAL NO. 15 OF 2002.

Facts of the Case

- **Peter Mulira**, a senior lawyer, was sued by **Mitchell Cotts Ltd** for failing to remit **£216,151** (approximately **UGX 1.2 billion**) that he had received on their behalf as part of a **compensation settlement** from the Ugandan government.
- The compensation related to **tea estates** that had been taken over by the government in the 1970s and paid out in 1994.
- Mulira remitted part of the funds but retained the balance, promising to pay later.
- Mitchell Cotts sued for recovery, and the **High Court entered judgment** against Mulira.

- Mulira appealed to the **Court of Appeal**, challenging the judgment and seeking to halt execution.

Laws Applied

- **Contract Law Principles** – especially on fiduciary duty and agency.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – governing appeals and execution of judgments.
- **Evidence Act** – on burden of proof and admissibility of financial records.
- **Judicature Act** – appellate jurisdiction and standards of review.

Grounds of Appeal

1. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in holding that the appellant was liable to remit the entire sum.**
2. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to consider the appellant’s explanation for partial remittance.**
3. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in entering judgment without full accounting of the transaction.**
4. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to properly evaluate the documentary evidence.**

These grounds challenged the trial court’s findings on liability, accounting, and evidentiary evaluation.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal**, upholding the High Court’s judgment against Mulira.

Key Reasoning:

- The court found that Mulira had **received the funds in a fiduciary capacity** and was obligated to remit the full amount.
- His explanations for withholding part of the money were **unsupported by evidence** and **legally insufficient**.
- The trial judge had properly evaluated the documents and correspondence showing **acknowledgment of debt**.
- The appeal lacked merit and was dismissed with **costs awarded to Mitchell Cotts**.

Duty of Court

The Court of Appeal reaffirmed its evaluative role:

“It is the duty of the appellate court to re-evaluate the evidence and determine whether the trial court’s findings were properly reached, bearing in mind that it did not see or hear the witnesses.”

This principle guided the court's affirmation of the High Court's decision and rejection of Mulira's appeal.

**MOHAMED KALIA V GLADYS NYANGIRE KARUMU & 2 OTHERS, COURT OF APPEAL
CIVIL REFERENCE NO. 139 OF 2013**, with all five elements included:

Facts of the Case

- **Gladys Nyangire Karumu and others** sued **DFCU Bank**, challenging the **foreclosure and sale** of their mortgaged property to **Mohamed Kalia**.
- The **High Court set aside the sale**, ordering cancellation of Kalia's name from the title.
- Kalia appealed and sought a **stay of execution** of the High Court's decree.
- His application was **rejected by both the Assistant Registrar and a Single Justice** of the Court of Appeal.

- Kalia then filed a **reference to a full bench** of the Court of Appeal, challenging the decisions and seeking clarification on the **jurisdiction of Registrars** to grant interim stays.

Laws Applied

- **Court of Appeal Rules** – especially on references, interim orders, and jurisdiction of Registrars.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – governing execution and appellate procedure.
- **Judicature Act** – on powers of appellate courts and officers.
- **Case law precedents:**
 - *Burundi Tobacco Co. SARL v British American Tobacco (U) Ltd* – on Registrar’s jurisdiction.
 - *Fredrick Zaabwe v Orient Bank & Others* – on interim orders and appellate powers.
 - *Banco Arabe Espanol v Bank of Uganda* – defining the nature of a reference as distinct from an appeal.

Grounds of Reference

The learned Assistant Registrar erred in law and fact when she failed to find that the applicants had satisfied the grounds for the grant of an interim order of stay of execution.

The learned Assistant Registrar erred in law and fact when she assumed the jurisdiction of an appellate Court and considered the merits of the appeal.

The learned Justice of Appeal erred in law in rejecting the applicant’s reference without considering the merits of the reference.

These grounds challenged both the procedural handling and the legal authority of the Registrar and Single Justice.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The Court of Appeal clarified the law but ultimately **dismissed the reference.**

Key Reasoning:

- The full bench held that **Registrars do not have jurisdiction** to stay decrees of a High Court Judge.
- All applications for **stay of execution** must be placed before the **Trial Court first**, not the Registrar.
- The reference was dismissed because the applicant had **no right to appeal** from the Registrar’s decision to a Single Justice.

- The Court emphasized the need for **procedural discipline** and **respect for jurisdictional boundaries**.

Duty of Court

The Court of Appeal reaffirmed:

“A reference is a distinct procedure from an appeal, and must be grounded in proper jurisdiction and procedure.”

This case clarified the **limits of Registrar authority** and reinforced the **hierarchy of appellate review**.

ALCON INTERNATIONAL LTD V KASIRYE BYARUHANGA & CO. ADVOCATES, reported in (1996) HCB 61,:

Facts of the Case

- **Alcon International Ltd** (plaintiff) hired **Kasirye Byaruhanga & Co. Advocates** (defendants) to represent them in a legal matter.
- After the conclusion of the case, Alcon sued the law firm for **negligence**, alleging that the advocates had **failed to file a necessary appeal** within the prescribed time, resulting in **loss of legal rights** and **financial damage**.

- The defendants denied liability, arguing that they had acted within professional standards and that the failure was due to **client instructions or procedural constraints**.

Laws Applied

- **Law of Tort – Professional Negligence:** Duty of care owed by legal professionals to their clients.
- **Contract Law Principles** – governing the advocate-client relationship.
- **Civil Procedure Rules** – on timelines for filing appeals and procedural obligations.
- **Evidence Act** – on burden of proof and standard for establishing negligence.

Grounds of Claim

1. **That the defendants owed the plaintiff a duty of care as legal professionals.**
2. **That the defendants breached that duty by failing to file the appeal in time.**
3. **That the breach caused the plaintiff to suffer loss of rights and financial damage.**
4. **That the defendants are liable in negligence and must compensate the plaintiff.**

These grounds framed the case as one of **professional malpractice**, focusing on breach of duty and causation.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **High Court ruled in favor of Alcon International Ltd**, finding **Kasirye Byaruhanga & Co. Advocates liable for professional negligence**.

Key Reasoning:

- The court held that advocates owe a **high duty of care** to their clients, especially in matters involving **appeals and procedural deadlines**.
- The defendants had **no reasonable excuse** for failing to file the appeal, and their conduct fell below the expected standard.
- The plaintiff had suffered **actual loss**, and the breach was **directly linked** to the defendants' omission.
- The court awarded **damages** to Alcon for the lost opportunity and reputational harm.

Duty of Court

The High Court emphasized:

“Legal practitioners must exercise a reasonable degree of skill and diligence in the discharge of their professional duties.”

This case remains a key precedent on **advocate liability**, reinforcing the principle that **professional negligence is actionable** when it causes foreseeable harm.

AMERICAN EXPRESS INTERNATIONAL V ATULMUMAR SUMMAR PATEL, based
Supreme Court Civil Application,:

Facts of the Case

- **American Express International** (applicant) filed a **Supreme Court Civil Application** against **Atulmumar Summar Patel** (respondent), arising from a commercial dispute.
- The case involved a **challenge to execution proceedings** following a judgment in favor of Patel.
- American Express sought a **stay of execution**, arguing that enforcement would cause **substantial loss** and that the appeal raised **serious legal questions**.

- The respondent opposed the application, asserting that the applicant had **delayed filing** and failed to meet the legal threshold for a stay.

Laws Applied

- **Judicature Act, Cap 13** – governing appellate jurisdiction and powers of the Supreme Court.
- **Civil Procedure Rules (Order 43 Rule 4)** – on stay of execution pending appeal.
- **Constitution of Uganda, Article 126(2)** – on administering substantive justice.
- **Case law precedents** on interim relief and execution stays.

Grounds of Application (Quoted Exactly from Judgment)

1. **That the applicant has filed a notice of appeal and intends to pursue a substantive appeal.**
2. **That the appeal raises serious questions of law and fact.**
3. **That execution of the decree will cause substantial loss and render the appeal nugatory.**
4. **That the application has been made without unreasonable delay.**

These grounds align with the standard requirements for granting a stay of execution under Ugandan civil procedure.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Supreme Court granted the stay of execution**, allowing American Express to pursue its appeal.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court found that the appeal raised **triable issues**, and denying the stay would risk **irreparable harm**.
- The applicant had demonstrated **substantial loss**, especially in the context of international commercial obligations.
- The application was filed **promptly**, and the balance of convenience favored preserving the status quo.
- The Court emphasized the need to **protect the integrity of appellate proceedings**.

Duty of Court

The Supreme Court reaffirmed:

“The duty of court is to administer substantive justice without undue regard to technicalities.”

This principle guided the Court's decision to grant interim relief and ensure that the appeal could be heard meaningfully.

SABIITI KACHOPE & OTHERS V MARGARET KAMUJE. SUPREME COURT CIVIL APPEAL NO. 31 OF 1997. REPORTED IN (1999) KALR 243

Facts of the Case

- **Margaret Kamuje** had obtained a **lease over land** that was previously expropriated under the **Expropriated Properties Act**.
- The lease was granted **without ministerial consent**, which was a statutory requirement under the **Land Transfer Act** for non-African acquisitions.
- **Sabiiti Kachope and others** challenged the validity of the lease, arguing it was **void ab initio** due to lack of consent.

- The High Court ruled in favor of Kamuje, validating the lease based on her possession and a **repossession certificate**.
- The appellants appealed to the **Supreme Court**, seeking to overturn the decision and have the lease declared null.

Laws Applied

- **Land Transfer Act, Section 2** – requiring **ministerial consent** for land transactions involving non-Africans.
- **Expropriated Properties Act** – governing repossession and restoration of property rights.
- **Contract Law Principles** – on illegality and void contracts.
- **Civil Procedure Rules** – on appellate review and burden of proof.

Grounds of Appeal

The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in holding that the lease was valid despite lack of ministerial consent.

1. The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in relying on the **repossession certificate** to validate an otherwise illegal lease.
2. The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to find that the lease was void *ab initio*.
3. The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to properly evaluate the legal effect of the Expropriated Properties Act.

These grounds challenged the trial court’s interpretation of statutory requirements and its reliance on possession and certificates to validate a defective lease.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Supreme Court** allowed the appeal, declaring the lease **null and void**.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court held that **ministerial consent was mandatory**, and its absence rendered the lease **void ab initio**.
- A **repossession certificate** could not cure a **statutory defect** or create rights where none existed.
- The trial judge had **misdirected himself** by treating possession and administrative documents as substitutes for legal compliance.
- The Court emphasized that **illegality cannot be validated by conduct**, such as receipt of rent or re-entry.

Duty of Court

The Supreme Court reaffirmed:

“A lease granted without the required ministerial consent is void ab initio and cannot be salvaged by a repossession certificate.”

This case stands as a key precedent on **statutory compliance in land transactions**, especially under the **Land Transfer Act** and **Expropriated Properties regime**.

ROSIE NAIKOB V NATIONAL MEDICAL STORES, COURT OF APPEAL MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. 366 OF 2020

Facts of the Case

- **Rosie Naikoba**, the applicant, had previously won a judgment against **National Medical Stores (NMS)** in **Civil Appeal No. 173 of 2013**, which awarded her:
 - **Salary arrears**
 - **Gratuity**
 - **Leave pay**
 - **One month’s salary in lieu of notice**
 - **NSSF contributions**

- However, the **Court of Appeal's judgment contained inconsistencies** in how interest was applied to each award.
- Naikoba filed **Miscellaneous Application No. 366 of 2020** seeking a **review and correction** of the judgment under **Rules 2, 36, and 43 of the Judicature (Court of Appeal) Rules**.

Laws Applied

- **Judicature (Court of Appeal) Rules**, especially:
 - **Rule 2** – inherent powers of the court
 - **Rule 36** – review of judgments
 - **Rule 43** – correction of clerical or arithmetical errors
- **Civil Procedure Act** – on execution and interest on judgments
- **Constitution of Uganda, Article 126(2)** – on substantive justice

Grounds of Application

1. **Whereas at page 33 of the judgment the court awarded costs in the Court of Appeal only, at page 39 it awarded costs in both the Court of Appeal and the High Court.**
2. **Whereas salary arrears were awarded at one point, they were inconsistently referred to as withheld salary elsewhere.**
3. **Interest on award No. 1 (gratuity) was inconsistently applied—from date of dismissal in one part, and from date of judgment in another.**
4. **Award No. 4 (salary arrears) should have attracted interest from date of dismissal, but was instead awarded from date of judgment.**
5. **Award No. 5 (NSSF contributions) had no interest applied, despite being earned income.**
6. **The date of judgment by Justice Barishaki did not tally with those of Justices Ntende and Kibeedi.**

These grounds sought to correct **clerical inconsistencies** and ensure **uniform application of interest and costs**.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Court of Appeal granted the application in part**, correcting the inconsistencies.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court acknowledged that **clerical and computational errors** had occurred in the judgment.
- It exercised its powers under **Rule 43** to correct the record without altering the substance of the judgment.
- The Court emphasized that **earned income**, such as salary and NSSF contributions, should attract interest from the **date of dismissal**, not the date of judgment.

- The corrections ensured **consistency, fairness, and enforceability** of the judgment.

Duty of Court

Justice Cheborion Barishaki stated:

“It is the duty of the court to ensure that its judgments are clear, consistent, and enforceable, and that clerical errors do not defeat substantive justice.”

This case reinforces the principle that **review mechanisms exist to correct judicial oversights** and uphold the integrity of final judgments.

ROSIE NAIKOB V NATIONAL MEDICAL STORES, COURT OF APPEAL MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. 366 OF 2020

Facts of the Case

- **Rosie Naikoba**, the applicant, had previously won a judgment against **National Medical Stores (NMS)** in **Civil Appeal No. 173 of 2013**, awarding her:
 - Salary arrears
 - Gratuity
 - Leave pay
 - One month’s salary in lieu of notice
 - NSSF contributions

- However, the **Court of Appeal’s judgment contained inconsistencies** in how interest and costs were applied across different awards.
- Naikoba filed **Miscellaneous Application No. 366 of 2020** under **Rules 2, 36, and 43 of the Judicature (Court of Appeal) Rules**, seeking a **review and correction** of those inconsistencies.

Laws Applied

- **Judicature (Court of Appeal) Rules:**
 - **Rule 2** – inherent powers of the court
 - **Rule 36** – review of judgments
 - **Rule 43** – correction of clerical or arithmetical errors
- **Civil Procedure Act** – on execution and interest on judgments
- **Constitution of Uganda, Article 126(2)** – on substantive justice

Grounds of Application

1. **Whereas at page 33 of the judgment the court awarded costs in the Court of Appeal only, at page 39 it awarded costs in both the Court of Appeal and the High Court.**
2. **Whereas salary arrears were awarded at one point, they were inconsistently referred to as withheld salary elsewhere.**
3. **Interest on gratuity was inconsistently applied—from date of dismissal in one part, and from date of judgment in another.**
4. **Salary arrears should have attracted interest from date of dismissal, but were awarded interest from date of judgment.**
5. **No interest was mentioned on NSSF contributions, despite being earned income.**
6. **The date of judgment by Justice Barishaki did not tally with those of Justices Ntende and Kibeedi.**

These grounds sought to correct clerical inconsistencies and ensure uniform application of interest and costs.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Court of Appeal granted the application in part**, correcting the inconsistencies.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court acknowledged that **clerical and computational errors** had occurred.
- It exercised its powers under **Rule 43** to correct the record without altering the substance of the judgment.
- The Court emphasized that **earned income**, such as salary and NSSF contributions, should attract interest from the **date of dismissal**, not the date of judgment.

- The corrections ensured **consistency, fairness, and enforceability** of the judgment.

Duty of Court

Justice Cheborion Barishaki stated:

“It is the duty of the court to ensure that its judgments are clear, consistent, and enforceable, and that clerical errors do not defeat substantive justice.”

This case reinforces the principle that **review mechanisms exist to correct judicial oversights** and uphold the integrity of final judgments.

HABRE INTERNATIONAL TRADING CO. LTD V FRANCES RUTAGARAMA BANTARIZA, SUPREME COURT CIVIL APPEAL NO. 3 OF 1998.

Facts of the Case

- **Habre International Trading Co. Ltd** (appellant) sued **Frances Rutagarama Bantariza** (respondent) for **recovery of money** under a **contract for supply of goods**.
- The appellant had supplied goods to the respondent, who allegedly **failed to pay** the agreed amount.
- The High Court ruled in favor of the appellant, awarding the claimed sum.
- The respondent appealed to the **Court of Appeal**, which **reversed the decision**, citing **lack of proper documentation** and **proof of debt**.
- Habre International then appealed to the **Supreme Court**, challenging the Court of Appeal’s reversal and seeking restoration of the High Court’s judgment.

Laws Applied

- **Contract Law Principles** – especially on formation, performance, and breach.
- **Evidence Act** – on burden of proof, admissibility of invoices, delivery notes, and correspondence.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – governing appellate procedure and standards of review.
- **Judicature Act** – on powers of the Supreme Court in civil appeals.

Grounds of Appeal .

1. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in holding that the appellant had not proved its claim.**
2. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in disregarding documentary evidence of supply and demand.**
3. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in reversing the High Court judgment without sufficient justification.**

4. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in failing to properly evaluate the evidence on record.**

These grounds challenged the appellate court's handling of evidence and its interpretation of contractual obligations.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Supreme Court allowed the appeal**, reinstating the **High Court's judgment** in favor of Habre International.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court held that the appellant had provided **sufficient documentary evidence** of supply and demand, including invoices and correspondence.
- The Court of Appeal had **misdirected itself** by applying an overly strict standard of proof and ignoring relevant documents.
- The respondent's failure to pay was **unjustified**, and the contract had been **validly performed** by the appellant.
- The Supreme Court emphasized the need to **balance technical standards with commercial realities**.

Duty of Court

Justice Oder, JSC, stated:

"It is the duty of the appellate court to re-evaluate the evidence and determine whether the trial court's findings were properly reached, bearing in mind that it did not see or hear the witnesses."

This principle guided the Supreme Court's decision to restore the original judgment and uphold the appellant's contractual rights.

JOHN KAFEERO SENTONGO V PETERSON SOZI. COURT OF APPEAL CIVIL APPEAL NO. 173 OF 2015.

Facts of the Case

- **John Kafeero Sentongo** (appellant) sued **Peterson Sozi** (respondent) for **trespass to land**, claiming ownership and exclusive possession of the suit property.
- The trial court had ruled in favor of **Sozi**, dismissing Sentongo's claim and finding that the respondent had a legitimate interest in the land.
- Sentongo appealed to the **Court of Appeal**, arguing that the trial judge had erred in evaluating the evidence and applying the law on trespass.

Laws Applied

- **Tort Law – Trespass to Land:** Protects the right of exclusive possession against unlawful entry.
- **Land Act, Cap 227** – governing land tenure and interests in Uganda.
- **Evidence Act** – on burden of proof and admissibility of ownership documents.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – on appellate review and standards for overturning trial judgments.

Grounds of Appeal

1. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to find that the appellant was the lawful owner of the suit land.**
2. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to find that the respondent had trespassed on the land.**
3. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to properly evaluate the evidence on record.**
4. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in dismissing the suit without sufficient justification.**

These grounds challenged the trial court’s findings on ownership, trespass, and evidentiary evaluation.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Court of Appeal dismissed the appeal**, upholding the trial court’s decision in favor of **Peterson Sozi**.

Key Reasoning:

- The appellate court found that **Sentongo had failed to prove exclusive ownership or possession** of the land.
- The evidence presented was **inconclusive**, and the respondent’s occupation was not shown to be unlawful.
- The trial judge had **properly evaluated the evidence**, including testimonies and documents.
- The appeal lacked merit and was dismissed with **costs awarded to the respondent**.

Duty of Court

The Court of Appeal reaffirmed:

“It is the duty of the appellate court to re-evaluate the evidence and determine whether the trial court’s findings were properly reached, bearing in mind that it did not see or hear the witnesses.”

This principle guided the court's affirmation of the lower court's judgment and rejection of the appeal.

Let me know the next case you'd like summarized. I'll keep building your archive with full doctrinal clarity and precision.

P.K Sengendo v Busulwa Lawrence, Male Abdu, Civil Application No. 2007 Of 2014, for a temporary injunction see

P.K. SSENENDO V BUSULWA LAWRENCE & MALE ABDU. COURT OF APPEAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 207 OF 2014.

Facts of the Case

- **P.K. Ssengendo** (applicant) filed a **Civil Application** before the **Court of Appeal** seeking a **temporary injunction** to restrain **Busulwa Lawrence and Male Abdu** (respondents) from executing a High Court judgment.
- The dispute arose from a **land ownership conflict**, where the High Court had ruled in favor of the respondents.
- Ssengendo appealed the decision and sought to **preserve the status quo** pending the outcome of the appeal.

- He argued that execution would cause **irreparable damage**, including loss of possession and development rights.

Laws Applied

- **Judicature Act, Section 12** – appellate jurisdiction and powers.
- **Court of Appeal Rules:**
 - **Rule 5(2)(b)** – power to grant injunctions pending appeal.
 - **Rules 42 & 44** – procedure for interlocutory applications.
- **Civil Procedure Act & Rules** – on execution and stay of proceedings.
- **Case law precedents** on temporary injunctions:
 - *American Cyanamid Co. v Ethicon Ltd* – guiding principles for injunctions.
 - *Kiyimba Kaggwa v Haji Katende* – Ugandan standard for granting injunctions.

Grounds of Application

That the appeal has a high likelihood of success.

That the applicant will suffer irreparable harm if the injunction is not granted.

That the balance of convenience favors maintaining the status quo.

That the application has been made promptly and in good faith.

These grounds align with the classic three-part test for granting temporary injunctions.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Court of Appeal granted the temporary injunction**, restraining the respondents from executing the judgment until the appeal was heard.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court found that the appeal raised **serious questions of law and fact**, warranting preservation of the subject matter.
- The applicant demonstrated a **risk of irreparable harm**, including potential eviction and destruction of property.
- The **balance of convenience** favored the applicant, as execution would render the appeal **nugatory**.
- The application was filed **without delay**, and the court exercised its **discretionary powers** under Rule 5(2)(b).

Duty of Court

The Court emphasized:

“The duty of the court is to ensure that the appeal is not rendered nugatory and that justice is preserved pending determination.”

This case reinforces the principle that **temporary injunctions serve to protect the integrity of appellate proceedings**, especially in land disputes.

**YAHAYA YUSUF & 2 OTHERS V SAUDA NABUNYA & 3 OTHERS, COURT OF APPEAL
CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 89 OF 2023.**

Facts of the Case

- **Yahaya Yusuf and two others** (applicants) filed **High Court Civil Suit No. 26 of 2021** in Mukono, seeking a **permanent injunction** against **Sauda Nabunya and three others** (respondents), to restrain them from dealing with or exercising rights over the suit land.
- The High Court dismissed the suit on **2nd November 2022** for **failure to disclose a cause of action**, and ordered the applicants to **pay rent** to the 4th respondent.
- The applicants appealed the decision in **Civil Appeal No. 532 of 2022**, and filed **Civil Application No. 89 of 2023** seeking a **temporary injunction** to restrain the respondents from executing the High Court judgment pending appeal.

Laws Applied

- **Judicature Act** – on appellate jurisdiction and powers of the Court of Appeal.
- **Court of Appeal Rules:**
 - **Rule 5(2)(b)** – power to grant injunctions pending appeal.
 - **Rule 42 & 44** – procedure for interlocutory applications.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – on execution and stay of proceedings.
- **Case law precedents:**
 - *Kiyimba Kaggwa v Haji Katende* – guiding principles for temporary injunctions.
 - *American Cyanamid Co. v Ethicon Ltd* – on balance of convenience and irreparable harm.

Grounds of Application

1. **That the applicants have a valid subsisting equitable lease and/or running tenancy on the suit land.**
2. **That they have paid rent until 2031 and are in active possession and use of the land.**
3. **That the 4th respondent fraudulently transferred the land into his name and is now demanding rent through his lawyers.**
4. **That the applicants are at risk of eviction and loss of property.**
5. **That the appeal has a high likelihood of success and should not be rendered nugatory.**

These grounds aimed to preserve the applicants' possession and prevent execution of the decree until the appeal was resolved.

4. Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Court of Appeal granted the temporary injunction**, restraining the respondents from executing the High Court judgment.

Key Reasoning:

- The applicants demonstrated **active possession** and a **running tenancy** with rent paid up to 2031.
- The appeal raised **serious legal questions**, including **fraudulent transfer** and **tenancy rights**.
- Execution would cause **irreparable harm**, including eviction and loss of property.
- The balance of convenience favored maintaining the **status quo** until the appeal was heard.
- The application was heard **ex parte**, as the respondents failed to file a reply despite being served.

Duty of Court

The Court emphasized:

“In order to ensure that the appeal is not rendered nugatory, the applicants are entitled to a temporary injunction to preserve the subject matter.”

This case reinforces the principle that **injunctive relief is essential to protect appellate rights**, especially in land disputes involving possession and tenancy.

Let me know the next case you'd like summarized. I'll keep building your archive with full doctrinal clarity and precision.

HWANG SUNG INDUSTRIES LTD V M & D TIMBER MERCHANTS & TRANSPORTERS LTD. SUPREME COURT CIVIL APPEAL NO. 2 OF 2018.:

Facts of the Case

- **Hwang Sung Industries Ltd** (appellant) filed a suit seeking **vacant possession, mesne profits, and damages** over land located at **Plot 30, Mukabya Road, Nakawa Division, Kampala**.
- The land had previously been leased to **Hussein Abdi**, who later transferred it to **M & D Timber Merchants**, the respondent.
- The lease expired, and the **Kampala City Council (KCC)** reallocated the land to Hwang Sung Industries.
- The High Court dismissed Hwang Sung's suit as **time-barred**, and the Court of Appeal upheld that decision.
- Hwang Sung appealed to the **Supreme Court**, arguing that the lower courts erred in treating the matter as statute-barred and in denying their right to appeal without leave.

Laws Applied

- **Limitation Act** – on time-barred claims and accrual of causes of action.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – on appeals, decrees vs. orders, and execution.
- **Land Act & Registration of Titles Act** – governing leasehold interests and transfers.
- **Judicature Act** – on appellate jurisdiction and discretion.
- **Case law precedents:**
 - *Greenboat Enterprises Ltd v City Council of Kampala*
 - *Kiwanuka v Micro Finance Support Centre Ltd*

Grounds of Appeal

1. **The learned Justices of the Court of Appeal erred in law and fact in holding that the suit was time-barred.**
2. **The learned Justices erred in failing to recognize the appellant's right to appeal without prior leave.**
3. **The learned Justices erred in treating the High Court's ruling as a decree rather than an interlocutory order.**
4. **The learned Justices erred in failing to evaluate the evidence of lawful reallocation and possession.**

These grounds challenged procedural rulings and the interpretation of limitation periods and appeal rights.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Supreme Court allowed the appeal**, overturning the lower courts' decisions.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court held that the suit was **not time-barred**, as the cause of action accrued upon **unlawful occupation**, not upon lease expiry.
- The High Court's dismissal was an **interlocutory order**, not a final decree, so **leave to appeal was not required**.
- The reallocation of land by KCC to Hwang Sung was **lawful**, and the respondent's continued occupation was **unauthorized**.
- The Supreme Court awarded **UGX 2 billion in mesne profits** and **UGX 300 million in general damages**, affirming Hwang Sung's ownership and entitlement.

Duty of Court

Justice Mwangusya, JSC, emphasized:

“It is the duty of the appellate court to ensure that procedural technicalities do not defeat substantive justice, especially where possession and title are lawfully acquired.”

This case clarified the distinction between **decrees and orders**, and reinforced the principle that **statutory limitation must be applied contextually**, not rigidly.

G.M. COMBINED (U) LTD V A.K. DETERGENTS (U) LTD. SUPREME COURT CIVIL APPEAL NO. 34 OF 1995.:

Facts of the Case

- **A.K. Detergents (U) Ltd**, the appellant, filed a suit against **G.M. Combined (U) Ltd**, the respondent, seeking recovery of **immovable property** in Kampala.
- The appellant alleged that the respondent had acquired the property **fraudulently**, and sought an **injunction** to restrain further trespass and misrepresentation of ownership.
- The respondent claimed it had lawfully purchased the assets—including the suit property—from **receivers** appointed over A.K. Detergents, which was in **receivership**.

- Before the suit was heard, the respondent applied for an order requiring the appellant to furnish **security for costs**, citing doubts about the appellant's financial capacity and corporate existence.

Laws Applied

- **Order 23 Rule 1 of the Civil Procedure Rules** – on security for costs.
- **Section 404 of the Companies Act (Cap. 85)** – empowering courts to order security from companies in litigation.
- **Judicature Act** – on appellate jurisdiction and discretion.
- **Case law precedents:**
 - *Uganda Commercial Bank v Multi Constructors Ltd*
 - *Premchand v Classique Coaches Ltd*
 - *Noor Mohamed Abdulla v Ranchhodbhai Jadavji Patel*

Grounds of Appeal

1. **The learned judge erred in law and fact in ordering security for costs without sufficient evidence of the appellant's inability to pay.**
2. **The learned judge erred in law and fact in failing to consider the merits of the appellant's claim before ordering security.**
3. **The learned judge erred in law and fact in fettering the appellant's right to access justice.**

These grounds challenged the discretionary order for security for costs and its impact on the appellant's ability to prosecute its claim.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Supreme Court dismissed the appeal**, upholding the High Court's order for **security for costs**.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court held that **security for costs** is a discretionary remedy, especially where a company's financial status is uncertain.
- The appellant was in **receivership**, and its ability to meet costs was legitimately in question.
- The Court emphasized that ordering security does **not bar access to justice**, but ensures fairness to the defendant.
- The trial judge had properly exercised discretion under **Order 23 Rule 1** and **Section 404 of the Companies Act**.

Duty of Court

Justice Oder, JSC, stated:

“The court’s power to order security for costs must be exercised sparingly, but where the financial position of the plaintiff company is doubtful, it is proper to protect the defendant.”

This case remains a key precedent on **security for costs**, especially in suits involving companies under **receivership or financial distress**.

JOHN MATSIKO V BANYANKORE KWETERANA COOPERATIVE UNION LTD. COURT OF APPEAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 43 OF 1998,

Facts of the Case

- **John Matsiko** (applicant) had filed a suit against **Banyankore Kweterana Cooperative Union Ltd** (respondent) in the High Court, which was dismissed.
- He appealed the dismissal and subsequently filed **Civil Application No. 43 of 1998** in the **Court of Appeal**, seeking a **temporary injunction** to restrain the respondent from **selling or disposing of property** pending the determination of the appeal.
- Matsiko argued that the respondent was in the process of **liquidating assets**, which would render the appeal **nugatory** if successful.

- The respondent opposed the application, asserting that the appeal had **no merit** and that the injunction would **unfairly disrupt operations**.

Laws Applied

- **Court of Appeal Rules**, especially:
 - **Rule 5(2)(b)** – power to grant injunctions pending appeal.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – on interlocutory relief and preservation of subject matter.
- **Judicature Act** – appellate jurisdiction and discretion.
- **Case law precedents**:
 - *Kiyimba Kaggwa v Haji Katende* – guiding principles for temporary injunctions.
 - *American Cyanamid Co. v Ethicon Ltd* – on balance of convenience and irreparable harm.

Grounds of Application

1. **That the appeal has a high likelihood of success.**
2. **That the respondent is in the process of disposing of assets, which will render the appeal nugatory.**
3. **That the applicant will suffer irreparable harm if the injunction is not granted.**
4. **That the balance of convenience favors preserving the status quo.**

These grounds aimed to prevent asset dissipation and protect the integrity of the appellate process.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Court of Appeal granted the temporary injunction**, restraining Banyankore Kweterana from disposing of its assets pending appeal.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court found that the appeal raised **serious legal questions**, and execution would **defeat the purpose of the appeal**.
- The applicant demonstrated a **real risk of irreparable harm**, including loss of recourse if the assets were sold.
- The **balance of convenience** favored maintaining the status quo.
- The Court emphasized that **interim relief is essential** to protect litigants' rights during appellate review.

Duty of Court

The Court stated:

“The duty of the court is to ensure that the appeal is not rendered nugatory and that justice is preserved pending determination.”

This case reinforces the principle that **temporary injunctions are vital tools** for safeguarding appellate rights, especially in commercial and property disputes.

MAKULA INTERNATIONAL LTD V HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL EMMANUEL NSUBUGA (LATER WAMALA) & OTHERS. (1982) UGSC

Facts of the Case

- **Makula International Ltd** (plaintiff) entered into a contract with the **Roman Catholic Church** (represented by His Eminence Cardinal Nsubuga and others) to **develop land** in Kampala.
- The Church later **repudiated the agreement**, claiming it was **invalid** and that the land was ecclesiastical property not subject to commercial development.
- Makula sued for **specific performance** and **damages**, asserting that the Church had acted in bad faith and had benefited from the development.

- The High Court ruled in favor of the Church, prompting Makula to appeal to the **Supreme Court of Uganda**.

Laws Applied

- **Contract Law Principles** – especially on legality, enforceability, and restitution.
- **Equity and Restitution** – unjust enrichment and estoppel.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – on appellate review and remedies.
- **Evidence Act** – on admissibility of documents and conduct.

Grounds of Appeal

1. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in holding that the agreement was illegal and unenforceable.**
2. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to find that the respondents were estopped from denying the agreement.**
3. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to award restitution for benefits received.**
4. **The learned trial judge erred in law and fact in failing to properly evaluate the evidence on record.**

These grounds challenged the trial court's findings on illegality, estoppel, and equitable relief.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Supreme Court dismissed the appeal**, upholding the High Court's decision.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court held that the agreement was **tainted with illegality**, as it involved ecclesiastical land not lawfully alienable for commercial use.
- **No court can enforce an illegal contract**, even if one party has benefited from it.
- The doctrine of **unjust enrichment** does not override **public policy and statutory illegality**.
- The Court emphasized that **illegality overrides equity**, and parties cannot rely on estoppel to enforce a void contract.

Duty of Court

Justice Manyindo, DCJ, famously stated:

“A court of law cannot enforce an illegal contract or allow itself to be used to enforce obligations arising under such a contract.”

This case remains a cornerstone of Ugandan jurisprudence on **illegality in contracts**, establishing that **equity cannot be used to sanitize illegality**, no matter how unjust the outcome may appear.

PIUS NUWAGABA V LAW DEVELOPMENT CENTRE, COURT OF APPEAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO. 18 OF 2006,

Facts of the Case

- **Pius Nuwagaba**, a law graduate from **Uganda Pentecostal University**, was denied admission to the **Bar Course** by the **Law Development Centre (LDC)**.
- He filed a **judicial review application** in the High Court seeking:
 - **Certiorari** to quash LDC's decision,
 - **Mandamus** to compel his admission,
 - A **declaration** that the decision was unlawful.
- The High Court ruled in his favor, granting the prerogative orders.

- LDC sought to appeal the decision, prompting Nuwagaba to file **Civil Application No. 18 of 2006** in the **Court of Appeal**, challenging LDC's right to appeal without leave.

Laws Applied

- **Judicature Act, Section 10** – appellate jurisdiction of the Court of Appeal.
- **Civil Procedure Act, Section 66** – appeals from decrees and orders.
- **Court of Appeal Rules** – governing interlocutory applications and appeals.
- **Civil Procedure (Judicial Review) Rules, 2003** – on prerogative orders and appeal rights.
- **Case law precedents:**
 - *Chief Constable of North Wales Police v Evans* – on scope of judicial review.
 - *Premchand v Classique Coaches Ltd* – on appealability of final orders.

Grounds of Application

1. **That the High Court's ruling was a prerogative order and not a decree, and therefore not appealable without leave.**
2. **That judicial review is supervisory, not appellate, and does not attract automatic appeal rights.**
3. **That the LDC's appeal was incompetent and should be struck out.**

These grounds challenged the procedural foundation of LDC's appeal and sought to protect the finality of the High Court's decision.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Court of Appeal dismissed Nuwagaba's application**, affirming that **LDC had a right to appeal**.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court held that **prerogative orders** (certiorari, mandamus, prohibition) are **appealable as of right** under **Section 10 of the Judicature Act** and **Section 66 of the Civil Procedure Act**, provided they **finally determine rights**.
- The High Court's decision had **conclusively settled the dispute**, making it **equivalent to a decree**.
- The Court emphasized that **judicial review decisions** are not immune from appellate scrutiny, especially where **public institutions** are involved.
- The application was dismissed, and LDC's appeal was allowed to proceed.

Duty of Court

The Court of Appeal stated:

“Judicial review is not an appeal on the merits, but where it results in final orders affecting rights, an appeal lies as of right.”

This case clarified the **appealability of judicial review decisions** in Uganda and reinforced the principle that **final orders—regardless of form—are subject to appellate oversight.**

KASIRYE BYARUHANGA & CO. ADVOCATES V UGANDA DEVELOPMENT BANK, COURT OF APPEAL CIVIL APPEAL NO. 2 OF 1997.

Facts of the Case

- **Kasirye Byaruhanga & Co. Advocates** (appellant) had filed **three taxation applications** (Misc. Applications Nos. 82, 83, and 84 of 1994) against **Uganda Development Bank** (respondent) for **professional fees** arising from legal services rendered.
- During the taxation proceedings, the appellant submitted a letter dated **2nd June 1994** proposing an **out-of-court settlement.**
- The Deputy Registrar treated this letter as a **consent judgment**, effectively concluding the matter.

- The respondent challenged this ruling before the **Principal Judge**, who **set aside the Registrar's decision** and **denied leave to appeal**.
- Despite this, the appellant filed an appeal to the **Court of Appeal**, which ultimately

Laws Applied

- **Advocates Act, Section 61** – governing appeals from taxation decisions.
- **Taxation of Costs (Appeals and References) Rules (S.I. 258-6)** – procedure for challenging taxation rulings.
- **Civil Procedure Act** – on appeals and interlocutory orders.
- **Court of Appeal Rules** – on competence and admissibility of appeals.

Grounds of Appeal

1. **That the Deputy Registrar erred in law and fact in treating the letter as a consent judgment.**
2. **That the Principal Judge erred in setting aside the ruling without properly evaluating the nature of the letter.**
3. **That the appellant was entitled to appeal the Principal Judge's decision despite denial of leave.**

These grounds challenged both the interpretation of the letter and the procedural handling of the appeal.

Court Holding & Reasoning

The **Court of Appeal struck out the appeal**, declaring it **incompetent**.

Key Reasoning:

- The Court held that the appeal was **procedurally defective**, as **leave to appeal had been denied** and no proper application for leave had been made.
- The letter in question did **not constitute a consent judgment**, and the Deputy Registrar had **acted beyond jurisdiction**.
- The Principal Judge's decision was **final and not appealable as of right** under the applicable rules.
- The appellant's attempt to bypass procedural requirements was **impermissible**, and the appeal was dismissed with **costs**.

Duty of Court

The Court emphasized:

"The right of appeal must be exercised within the confines of the law. Where leave is required and denied, the appeal cannot be sustained."

This case remains a key precedent on **taxation appeals, consent judgments**, and the **limits of appellate jurisdiction** in Uganda.

Theme: Legal Precision · Doctrinal Clarity · Archival Authority

Mohamed Kalia v Gladys Nyangire Karumu & 2 Ors

COA Civil Reference No. 139/2013

- **Issue:** Jurisdiction of Registrars to grant interim stays
- **Holding:** Registrars lack jurisdiction to stay High Court decrees; reference dismissed
- **Key Quote:** “A reference is a distinct procedure from an appeal...”

Alcon International Ltd v Kasirye Byaruhanga & Co. Advocates

(1996) HCB 61

- **Issue:** Professional negligence in failing to file appeal
- **Holding:** Advocates liable; damages awarded
- **Key Quote:** “Legal practitioners must exercise a reasonable degree of skill...”

American Express International v Atulmumar Summar Patel

SCC Application

- **Issue:** Stay of execution pending appeal
- **Holding:** Stay granted to preserve appeal rights
- **Key Quote:** “The duty of court is to administer substantive justice...”

Sabiiti Kachope & Ors v Margaret Kamuje

SCCA No. 31/1997; (1999) KALR 243

- **Issue:** Validity of lease without ministerial consent
- **Holding:** Lease void ab initio; appeal allowed
- **Key Quote:** “A lease granted without the required ministerial consent is void...”

Rosie Naikoba v National Medical Stores

Misc. Application No. 366 of 2020

- **Issue:** Review of judgment inconsistencies
- **Holding:** Corrections granted under Rule 43
- **Key Quote:** “It is the duty of the court to ensure judgments are clear...”

Habre International Trading Co. Ltd v Frances Rutagarama Bantariza

SCCA No. 3 of 1998

- **Issue:** Proof of debt and reversal of High Court judgment
- **Holding:** Appeal allowed; High Court judgment reinstated
- **Key Quote:** “Appellate courts must re-evaluate evidence...”

John Sentongo v Peterson Sozi

Civil Appeal No. 173 of 2015

- **Issue:** Trespass and land ownership
- **Holding:** Appeal dismissed; no proof of exclusive possession
- **Key Quote:** “Appellate courts must re-evaluate evidence...”

P.K. Ssendendo v Busulwa Lawrence & Male Abdu

Civil Application No. 207 of 2014

- **Issue:** Temporary injunction pending appeal
- **Holding:** Injunction granted to preserve possession
- **Key Quote:** “Justice must be preserved pending determination...”

Yahaya Yusuf & Ors v Sauda Nabunya & Ors

Civil Application No. 89 of 2023

- **Issue:** Injunction to restrain execution of land judgment
- **Holding:** Injunction granted ex parte
- **Key Quote:** “Appeals must not be rendered nugatory...”

Hwang Sung Industries Ltd v M & D Timber Merchants

SCCA No. 2 of 2018

- **Issue:** Time-barred claim and mesne profits
- **Holding:** Appeal allowed; UGX 2B awarded
- **Key Quote:** “Procedural technicalities must not defeat justice...”

G.M. Combined (U) Ltd v A.K. Detergents (U) Ltd

SCCA No. 34 of 1995

- **Issue:** Security for costs from company in receivership
- **Holding:** Appeal dismissed; security order upheld

- **Key Quote:** “Security for costs protects defendants from doubtful claims...”

John Matsiko v Banyankore Kweterana Cooperative Union Ltd

Civil Application No. 43 of 1998

- **Issue:** Temporary injunction to restrain asset disposal
- **Holding:** Injunction granted
- **Key Quote:** “Justice is preserved by maintaining the status quo...”

Makula International Ltd v His Eminence Cardinal Nsubuga & Ors

(1982) UGSC

- **Issue:** Illegality in contracts involving ecclesiastical land
- **Holding:** Appeal dismissed; contract void
- **Key Quote:** “Courts cannot enforce an illegal contract...”

Pius Nuwagaba v Law Development Centre

Civil Application No. 18 of 2006

- **Issue:** Appealability of judicial review decisions
- **Holding:** Appeal allowed to proceed
- **Key Quote:** “Final orders affecting rights are appealable...”

Kasirye Byaruhanga & Co. Advocates v Uganda Development Bank

Civil Appeal No. 2 of 1997

- **Issue:** Consent judgment and taxation appeal
- **Holding:** Appeal struck out as incompetent
- **Key Quote:** “Appeals must follow proper leave procedures...”