

Court Observation Form

Court Observer: Date & Time of Monitoring Exercise: 15/3/2018 10am

Case Title: Federal Republic Nigeria v Mohammed K. Sanusi Case No.: KOH/KAD/19/EFCC/14

Courtroom Information

State: KADUNA Judicial Division/District: KADUNA Courtroom No.: 6

Name of Judge: Hon Justice Aliyu Name & Agency of Prosecutor: EFCC H.M. Mohammed Esq.

Defence Counsel Chief C.A. Ekhozemomhe Esq.

When did the court sit? For how long did you witness court proceedings?

Case Information (Tick correct answers: Y= Yes; N = No)	
1.	a. Cause list sighted? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y Nb. Case on cause list? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y N c. Scheduled start time: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y N c. Was it easy to identify the case? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y N d. Was it easy identify/locate the courtroom? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y N
2.	What type of hearing was it? <u>Criminal, stage - Examination of witness</u> * Briefly mention the subject matter of the case and what stage of hearing it is at
3.	Were you allowed to get or peruse a copy of the court record? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y N Was bail granted? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y N When (date), and what were the conditions of bail (use back of page if necessary)
4.	On the back of the page, please provide a very brief comment on the case history, including law under which the case is tried, previous adjournment and the next adjourned date (4-5 Lines)
Court Website and IT (tick or underline the correct response)	
5.	a. Does the court have a website? Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N b. Does the website feature a webpage for the courtroom/judge you are monitoring? Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N
6.	Did you find a web-copy of the cause list with the case listed? Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N
7.	a. Is the website current? Current Quite Current Out of Date Very Obsolete b. Regularity of updates Regular Quite Regular Irregular Very Irregular c. Accuracy of information Accurate A bit accurate Inaccurate Misleading d. Did you find information about your case on the court website?
8.	How useful did you find the website? Was the site easy to read and navigate? Does the site have a search function?
9.	If the court lacks a website, are there plans to have one? At what stage of development is it? <u>Plans are underway, however due to financial restraint, the website is not available yet</u>
10.	Does the court have an e-filing and e-messaging system? How is it being deployed in this case/in anti-corruption cases generally? (Please keep your response to 3 lines on the back of the page). <u>NO</u>
The Hearing (Pls tick or provide the correct answer)	
11.	a. The court sat <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y N b. The case you are monitoring proceeded on schedule <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y N c. Complainant was in court <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N d. Prosecution was in court <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y N e. The defendant was in court <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y N f. Defence Counsel in Court <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y N g. If hearing was delayed, at whose instance was the delay? <u>At the instance of the prosecution</u> h. What reasons were given for the delay? <u>the witness was running late</u> f. What consequential orders followed? <u>The case was stood down</u>
12.	a. Defendant was in custody Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N b. Subsisting order to produce defendant complied with <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Y N

	c. What reasons were given for non-compliance?				
13	a. Witnesses were in Court? <input checked="" type="radio"/> Y <input type="radio"/> N b. If not, what reasons were given? c. What consequential directive if any, did the court give? (you may make additional brief comments on back page)				
14.	Case Prioritization: Did the matter proceed as set (mention, motion, <u>hearing</u> , ruling, address, or judgment)? How many hours or days were allocated to the matter? <u>one day</u> How many interlocutory applications were taken? <u>3</u> For what? <u>Motions</u> If the case was adjourned, at whose instance and for what reasons? <u>It was adjourned for the Trial within Trial</u> What was the length of adjournment? <u>1 month</u> If it was a long adjournment, what reasons were given? Overall, how frequent are adjournments in the case? <u>Adjournments are frequent in the case</u> What indicated that the court was giving the case expedited hearing? <u>The adjournments are usually short</u>				
15.	<i>General Courtroom Conduct and Efficiency</i>	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
	Courtroom was orderly	1	2	3	<u>4</u>
	The Judge was courteous and respectful	1	2	3	<u>4</u>
	The Judge was in control* of the proceedings	1	2	3	<u>4</u>
	Judge was ready/prepared** for court	1	2	3	<u>4</u>
	The Prosecution was ready/prepared*** for court	1	2	3	<u>4</u>
	The defence was ready/prepared**** for court	1	2	3	<u>4</u>
	Cases were handled in a timely manner	1	2	3	<u>4</u>
	The judge was impartial	1	2	3	<u>4</u>
	Individuals were treated equally by Court staff	1	2	3	<u>4</u>
	<i>Transparency and Accountability</i>	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
	Judge was demonstrably neutral	1	2	3	<u>4</u>
	Parties were given equal opportunities to present their cases	1	2	3	<u>4</u>
	Judge made effort to understand the concerns of the parties	1	2	3	<u>4</u>
	Prosecution held accountable***** for actions that delayed proceedings	<u>1</u>	2	3	<u>4</u>
	Defence held accountable for actions that delayed proceedings	<u>1</u>	2	3	4
	The interest of the public was adequately represented	1	2	3	<u>4</u>
	<i>Communicating Courtroom Proceedings</i>	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
	Court announced every stage of proceedings	1	2	3	<u>4</u>
	Court explained every stage of proceedings	1	2	3	<u>4</u>
	Defendant understood procedures and rulings	1	2	3	<u>4</u>

You may if necessary provide brief comments of the hearing:

Documenting the Observer's experience

I gained better understanding of the court's role in anti-corruption cases:

Very Much Quite So Not sure Not at all
Court process was fair: Very fair Quite Fair Not sure Unfair

Courts reaction to observer's presence: Receptive Cooperative Hostile indifferent

Did your confidence in the court ability to dispense justice increase because you witnessed proceedings? Very Much Quite So Not sure Not at all

What did you find most interesting about your experience? The Judge was in absolute control of the proceeding. It was good to see Justice being done.

Notes on certain terms

* A judge is in control when he maintains general courtroom decorum, holds counsel to the highest levels of compliance with the rules, grants adjournments only for valid reasons and not more times than is permitted by the rules.

**You can tell that a judge is unprepared if for instance s/he comes to court without having read the case file and relevant law, or easily grants adjournments for flimsy reasons.

*** A prosecutor betrays his or her unpreparedness when he/she betrays a firm grasp of the case/facts and applicable law, a charge or information sheet is found to be defective or the prosecution fails to ensure that processes have been properly filed, court directives have been complied with and that prosecution witnesses are in court if the case was set down for the prosecution's case.

**** Indications that the defence attorney is unprepared could include gimmicks that are intended to prevent the court from proceeding with the hearing as scheduled, unscheduled interlocutory applications, failure to produce defence witnesses, etc.

***** A judge holds legal counsels accountable when s/he does not accommodate flimsy excuses for adjournments, ensures that timelines are kept and a tight lead is kept on adjournments by upholding the provisions of ACJA and practice directions relating to court room delays and adjournments. His or her ability to enforce the rules show that s/he retains control of the proceedings and would were necessary, remonstrate parties and counsel for holding up proceedings. The judge may also issue consequential orders, order costs where justified, and ensure that his/her orders are complied with.

③ Bail was granted to the accused on the 24th day of September 2014, The approved bail was ₦500,000

The case deals with alleged case of conspiracy, forgery and obtaining the sum of ₦5,000,000.00 (Five million Naira) under false pretences reported by one Barr. Friday Oduma on behalf of Hajia Zainab Bello. The case was investigated by the Land and Property Fraud Unit,

Law under which case is tried
- Section 1(1)(g) of the Advance Fee Fraud and other related offences Act, 2004

- Section 363 of the Penal code CAP 532 LFN, 1990
- Section 366 of the

~~Previous~~

Previous adjournment - 18/1/2018

Next adjournment - 16/4/2018