**1. Opening and Framing the Issue**

**Move:**  
The judgment opens by clearly stating the nature of the case – a constitutional challenge brought by former employees of the Ghana Cocoa Board. The plaintiffs challenge sections 5 and 6 of PNDCL 125 on the ground that they oust judicial review and deny access to the courts.

**Function:**  
This move sets the stage by outlining both the factual background (employment termination and non-payment of terminal benefits) and the constitutional issue at stake: whether statutory provisions can deprive individuals of their right to access the courts.

**2. Contextual and Statutory Background**

**Move:**  
The Court reviews the specific statutory provisions (sections 5 and 6 of PNDCL 125) that are at issue. The text of these provisions is quoted and explained to clarify that they effectively bar judicial intervention in disputes arising from the re-organisation of the Board or termination of employment.

**Function:**  
By detailing the statutory language, the Court situates the case within the broader legal framework and provides the factual basis for its subsequent constitutional analysis. This move is essential for understanding the conflict between the statute and the constitutional guarantees of access to justice.

**3. Articulation of Constitutional Principles**

**Move:**  
A substantial portion of the judgment is devoted to articulating core constitutional principles – particularly those related to the supremacy of the Constitution, the right of access to the courts, and the role of judicial review as a watchdog function. The Court cites several constitutional provisions (e.g., articles 125(5), 140(1), and the doctrine of constitutional supremacy) and refers to established jurisprudence on these matters.

**Function:**  
This move establishes the normative framework. It highlights that any legislative attempt to oust judicial oversight, especially in matters affecting fundamental rights, is contrary to the core values and spirit of the Constitution. The discussion also underscores the unique role of the judiciary as an impartial interpreter of the law.

**4. Comparative Analysis with Precedent**

**Move:**  
The judgment systematically references earlier cases—such as Sam (No 2) v Attorney-General and Labone Weavers Enterprises Ltd v Bank of Ghana—to illustrate similar issues of access to courts and statutory ouster clauses. It draws analogies between the present case and prior rulings, reinforcing the reasoning that any limitation on court access is incompatible with constitutional guarantees.

**Function:**  
By comparing the present facts with those in binding precedents, the Court strengthens its argument. This move not only provides authority for its conclusions but also signals consistency in constitutional interpretation, ensuring that the rule of law is maintained over time.

**5. Integration of Normative and Policy Arguments**

**Move:**  
In addition to legal reasoning, the Court weaves in broader normative arguments—emphasizing public accountability, the separation of powers, and the inherent need for judicial independence. The analysis discusses the societal and democratic implications of denying access to justice, highlighting that such denial undermines both individual rights and institutional checks on power.

**Function:**  
This move situates the case within a wider context of democratic governance and the rule of law. It reassures readers (and the legal community) that the decision is not merely a technical ruling but a safeguard for democratic principles and accountability.

**6. Narrowing of the Issues and Focus on the Core Question**

**Move:**  
The Court notes that, following procedural developments and mutual agreement between counsel, the issues were narrowed to focus on the constitutionality of section 5 of PNDCL 125—i.e., its function in barring access to the courts. By sidelining peripheral employment disputes and other claims, the judgment concentrates on the central constitutional question.

**Function:**  
This move is crucial for maintaining clarity and focus in the judicial analysis. It prevents dilution of the argument and ensures that the decision addresses the fundamental constitutional matter at hand without unnecessary digressions.

**7. Conclusion and Holding**

**Move:**  
The judgment culminates with a clear declaration that section 5 of PNDCL 125 is unconstitutional and void. While the Court expressly rules on section 5, it refrains from pronouncing definitively on section 6—although it indicates that similar reasoning could apply. The decision is thus rendered as a judgment for the plaintiffs.

**Function:**  
This final move provides closure by directly answering the constitutional challenge. It reinforces the Court’s commitment to uphold the supremacy of the Constitution and the vital principle of unimpeded access to the judicial system.

**Summary**

In summary, the move structure analysis reveals that the Court’s opinion is methodically organized to:

1. **Set the stage** by outlining the issue and factual background.
2. **Detail the statutory provisions** and their implications.
3. **Frame the constitutional context** by invoking fundamental rights and judicial roles.
4. **Support the argument with precedents** and comparative analysis.
5. **Incorporate normative considerations** that extend beyond technical legalities.
6. **Narrow the issues** to focus on the core constitutional challenge.
7. **Deliver a decisive ruling** that affirms the importance of judicial access as a constitutional right.

This structured approach not only guides the reader through the complex reasoning of the decision but also emphasizes the interplay between statutory interpretation and constitutional mandates—a hallmark of judicial review in constitutional democracies.