

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE  
OYO STATE OF NIGERIA  
IN THE IBADAN JUDICIAL DIVISION  
HOLDEN AT IBADAN

BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE E. ESAN – JUDGE  
THIS THURSDAY THE 30<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF JANUARY, 2014

SUIT NO. I/5C/2010

BETWEEN:

THE STATE ..... COMPLAINANT

AND

CHUKWUDI ENWEAZU ..... ACCUSED

\*\*\*\*\*

The accused is present.

Orogbangba I.B. for the State (Miss).

K.O.O. Olaniyan for the accused person.

J U D G M E N T

The accused person is arraigned before this Court on a one count charge of stealing as follows:

That you Chukwudi Enweazu 'M' on or about the 14<sup>th</sup> day of June 2008 at United Bank for African PLC Dugbe Ibadan, in the Ibadan Judicial Division did steal the sum of Twenty Million Naira (₦20,000,000.00) property of United Bank for Africa PLC and thereby committed an offence contrary to and punishable under S. 390(9) of the

Criminal Code Cap. 38 Volume II Laws of Oyo State of Nigeria 2000.

The prosecution called five witnesses while the accused person testified in his own defence and called no other witness.

At the trial, the prosecution opened its case with the testimony of Ojo Oladimeji, an auditor at U.B.A head office Lagos. He stated that on the 14<sup>th</sup> June 2008, a fraud alert was received from the regional auditor in Ibadan. The report was of a cash theft of ₦20 Million by the accused person. His director directed that it should be referred to the State C.I.D, Ibadan. He testified that on 16<sup>th</sup> June, 2008, his director briefed the management and it was agreed that the case be transferred to Special Fraud Unit Lagos and a formal petition was written to the Commissioner of Police, Special Fraud Unit. He was invited to the Special Fraud Unit where he made a statement adopting the petition. The Statement he made to the Police on that day was tendered for identification and marked 'I.D'1.

Under cross-examination by the Learned Counsel for the accused person he said he is straight forward he was telling the Court and all that he saw. He said there was no coercion in respect of his statement to the

Police. He works as internal auditor at Head Office, Marina, Lagos.

This case happened at Dugbe I.D. business Office, Ibadan. The alert he received, came in form of an e-mail which was initiated by their Ibadan regional auditor. A preliminary report followed the alert. The Statement he made to the Police is from the preliminary report.

P.W.2 was Ekundayo Deborah Olabisi who works at U.B.A Dugbe II. Business Office Ibadan and is the head of Operation. She stated that on the 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2008, she was the relieving head of Cash Management Centre. In the evening of that day, Mr. Chukwudi (the accused) as the authorized officer from Dugbe I Business Office came to Cash the Management Centre and stated that they will need the sum of ₦20 Million on the 14<sup>th</sup> of June 2008 to pay some Politicians. On the 13<sup>th</sup> of June 2008, he came again to remind them. On the 14<sup>th</sup> of June 2008, a Saturday, herself and the 2<sup>nd</sup> custodian, Kemi Abiri the and head of C.F.C i.e, the one she was relieving named Femi Ologunde were in the Business Office to release the sum of ₦20 Million to the accused person. After receiving the money the accused person left with the ₦20 Million to the Business Office.

After they confirmed that the accused person had taken the money to the business office, they locked the box. When they called the accused to ask whether the Politicians had arrived, he said they had not come and that he was still expecting them. Later, she got a call from the head of C.F.C, Femi Ologunde, that the accused person had run away with the N20 Million. They, then went to the Police Station and made Statement. She tendered the Statement she made for identification and it was marked "ID2".

Under cross-examination by the learned Counsel for the accused person, she stated that she was initially charged in Court together with the accused. She was accused of stealing the N20 Million. She was also accused of conspiracy with the accused. She stated that the money was released to the accused person as an authorized person.

P.W.3 was Ologunde Ajibade Femi who works at U.B.A Dugbe I, Ibadan as a Senior Banking Officer. According to him on the 14<sup>th</sup> of June 2008, a Saturday, he called at the Dugbe II office where he met the accused person with Kemi Abiri and Deborah Ekundayo. The accused told him that he was there to collect money for members of the House of

Assembly who wanted to use the money that Saturday morning. Together with Deborah and Kemi, they went inside. The money was already stacked for the accused it was N20 Million cash. It was handed over to the accused person and he took it to his office. The Witness stated that on the 11<sup>th</sup> of June 2008, he was at the U.C.H Branch Office to relieve the branch manager. He said that he made a Statement to the Police which he tendered as 'ID3'.

Under cross examination by the learned counsel for the accused person the witness stated that he was initially charged along with the accused for conspiracy and stealing. The charge was amended. He now stated that he relieved the Manager of U.C.H Ibadan on Friday 13<sup>th</sup> and reported to his office on the 16<sup>th</sup>. The system of the bank was that he could work in any Ibadan office of his choice. On Saturday the 14<sup>th</sup> June 2008 he was not fully at work. He did not have any prior knowledge of what was to happen on the 14<sup>th</sup> of June 2008. He went to do some outstanding work. He had some reports on money laundering. It was banking work and he was fully on duty. But on that 14<sup>th</sup>, he was told of the withdrawal of N20 Million. The money was kept in the vault which

he does not usually entered. The money was given to the accused by the custodians. He was not part of the custodians and the key was not with him.

The custodians were P.W2 and one Kemi Abiri. They are his colleagues whom he was with when the money was taken away by the accused. It was a coincidence that he was there. When they met, he did not envisage any problem. The accused had worked with the bank for 3 years before he was posted out. He tendered his statement which was admitted in evidence and marked Exhibit A. It was not the normal practice to move such an amount of money without escort. It was around this time that the Inspector General of Police direct that money should be moved with armoured car. Thus, the Police refused to give the bank Police escort because they had not complied with the I.G.P's directive of using armoured vehicle. It was not the first time a staff would carry such an amount of money as a result of I.G.P's directive. He was not sure whether the bank security or Police were on ground. At the time the money was taken away, he believed the money was safe.

According to him, as at the time of the incident, he was 6 years old in the banking sector. People used to complain about cash shortage. His statement was in response to questions asked by the Police. After the accused ran away, many of them were arrested.

P.W.4 was Oluwakemi Abiri who works at U.B.A Zona Office, Dugbe as a clearing officer. On 13<sup>th</sup> June 2008, in the evening, her superior called her and told her that she would be holding forte for a colleague who had an engagement. She was to go to the office on Saturday 14<sup>th</sup> June 2008 to supply cash to an officer of the bank. P.W. 2 was her superior. The key was given to her on Friday night. On 14<sup>th</sup> June 2008, in the morning, herself Femi Ologunde (P.W.3) and Deborah Ekundayo entered the vault with the accused person. They were to supply cash of N20 Million to the accused. The cash was given to the accused and he left with the cash. She was called later in the day and told that the accused could not be found. She tendered for identification the Statement she made to the Police which was marked 'ID4'. The money involved was N20 Million.

Under cross examination by the learned counsel for the accused she stated that she was not arrested at all nor was she invited by the Police. The Statement was written after the accused was arrested. She was invited three years after. She cannot remember the date she made the statement. May be it was on 21/04/2009. The incident was on 14th June 2008. The money was released to the accused through normal process. She had the key to the vault. She had prior knowledge on Friday, 13<sup>th</sup> June that the money will be withdrawn. It was Deborah Ekundayo who gave her the directive. She participated in releasing the money and did not suspect any foul play. She did not know if it was the normal practice of releasing money of such amount to a staff.

The accused did not tell her anything before taking the money and she was not responsible for any request. After work on that 14<sup>th</sup>, she went home but she was called by her superior to ask whether the money had gotten to its destination and she said yes. According to her, we are spirit beings. Her spirit was very heavy when she got home and she did not feel okay.



P.W.5 was the Deputy Superintendent of Police James Sarki who used to work at Force C.I.D. Fraud Unit Yaba, Lagos. He knows the accused. On the 16<sup>th</sup> of June 2008, a letter of complaint from U.B.A was sent to the Commissioner of Police Special Fraud Unit of Force C.I.D, requesting for tracking down of a fleeing staff i.e. the accused person.

The petition was indorsed to his team for investigation. In the course of his investigation, he came to Ibadan armed with a letter requesting for the transfer of the case file and suspect. There, he met some of the staffs of the bank who were suspected of collaborating with the suspect. He met Ekundayo Deborah, Ologunde Ajibade Femi, Mrs Abiri Oluwakemi and one other. Having taken over the case file, they were re-arrested and cautioned before they made their statements. He tendered 3 of the statements which were admitted and marked Exhibits B, C1 and D1 respectively. He took them to Lagos. In the petition, the address of the suspect was stated and when he visited the place with other detectives, it was under lock and key.

They declared the suspected warranted in their gazettes and some newspapers and obtained a warrant of arrest and filed for CR05, sent it

to the criminal registry of Force C.I.D. Later, they got information that he was in Ghana. He was arrested with the cooperation of the Nigeria High Commission to Ghana by the Ghanaian Police and on the 4<sup>th</sup> of June 2009, he was deported back to Nigeria. He went to the airport and received him there. He took him back to his station, arrested and cautioned him in English. He volunteered a statement. He wrote the statement himself. He tenders it and it was admitted in evidence and marked Exhibit E.

Under cross-examination by the learned counsel for the accused, he said that the accused exonerated everybody in his office from the offence. The witness stated that he had investigated 419 cases, theft, fraud. This is a case of theft, fraud element is there. He was involved with this investigation from the beginning i.e. 16<sup>th</sup> June. He stated that the accused said 419 people took the money from him. The accused was not tortured to say this.

With this piece of evidence, the Prosecution closed its case.

The defence opened with the evidence of D.W.1, the accused, Chukwudi Enweazu. He testified that he is now (a wheel barrow

pusher). On the 14<sup>th</sup> of June, 2008, he went to work at U.B.A Dugbe I. He had been working with U.B.A for the past 23 years. On the 13<sup>th</sup> June 2008, he was approached by one Mr. Azeez and Mr. Alaba, their big time customers, for the release of N20 Million to be used for one of their political party activities. He was the rightful person to supply the money. It was not the first time they came for such transaction. He informed one or two people working with him. He was a Senior Banking Officer. His schedule of duty was supply of money to customers, receiving deposits from customers, receiving checks and payment of cheques to customers, evacuation of cash to their Zonal processing centre, overseeing the functions of tellers.

According to him, Alaba and Azeez are known to the bank as big customers who had huge accounts in the bank. He was in charge that day. He informed those in Zonal Processing Centre of the pending withdrawal of N20 Million. When Alaba and Azeez came back on the 13<sup>th</sup> of June, 2008, he informed his staff. He went to ZPC and the money was supplied to him from Z.P.C. They loaded the money into his car boot. He signed the voucher that he received the money. This was

not the first time that a huge amount of money was released to a bank official. A huge amount of money was previously released to him (N20 Million) to supply Ijebu Ode branch.

He left the office and went to Premier Hotel where Azeez was waiting for him to supply him with the money before returning to the office. When he got to Premier Hotel Azeez said he should follow him to Baba Alaba's house at Ibafo to supply the money. When they got to Baba's house, he supplied him with the money. He was grateful. Suddenly, he started speaking incantations. He became confused and unconscious. He understands a little Yoruba and knew he was speaking incantations. He became conscious when he got to Ketu with Azeez who insulted him and gave him money to travel to Ghana. They took his car and cash. When he got to Ghana, he gained control of himself. He went to Cotonou before Ghana.

There, he asked for Winners' Chapel. He was taken to Ghana by a friend of his in Cotonou where he located Winners' Chapel. He said he confessed everything to the Police. The Police in Ghana arrested him and took him to E.F.C.C in Ikoyi, Lagos where he was for 3 months.

There, the I.P.O said that he will go to Baba Alaba's house to go and investigate but did not. From there, he was brought to Ibadan for further investigation. He did not know the outcome of the investigation. He knows Ologunde Femi Ajibade, Olukoye Michael, Anakebe Azubuike, Deborah Ekundayo, Temitope Adeyinka, Olukemi Abiri and Salawu Modinat who were all his colleagues. He said all of them were charged initially but suddenly they were used as witnesses against him. D.S.P James is the I.P.O who investigated his case. He was not aware that he was declared wanted. It was not true what the I.P.O said that he initially arrested those who did 419 with him.

Under cross examination by the Learned Counsel for the prosecution, he stated that there was Dugbe 1 and 2 business offices for U.B.A. He was working in Dugbe business office I as an authorized officer. He used to collect money from Dugbe II where he was not doubted as an authorized officer. He started working with U.B.A since 1985 and knew the dos and don'ts. He used to work for few hours on Saturday unless they had a lot of customers. He signed for N20 Million. He knows Kemi Abiri and others. They were not junior to him. He

started working before them at U.B.A. When someone collects money from the bank, they need to debit the person's account. He knew Azeez as a customer. He stated that Bunmi did not introduce him to Azeez. That Azeez and Alaba had accounts in U.B.A. He knew Bunmi because of a problem that he had.

He read out page 2 of Exhibit E which is his statement that states 'that it was Bunmi who introduced him to Azeez'. He told his staff that the money was to be supplied to Politicians. He was living at 6, Ogedengbe Street Ketu, Lagos. He did not know what positions Azeez and Alaba were holding in their political party. They collected the money from him and he become unconscious. Alaba never helped him before the incident neither did he give him any soap to use. The soap did not turn into cowries. He read from page 3 of his Statements that "Alaba gave him soap which turned to cowries." The problem he had took him to Alaba before this incident. At that time, Alaba had an account with U.B.A and was having more than ₦3 Million.

He did not debit the account even though he collected N20 Million for him. He supplied the money to Alaba who wanted to give him a

cheque before he became unconscious. He had been supplying money to many customers before collecting their cheques.

With this piece of evidence, the accused person closed his case.

The learned counsel for the parties filed and exchanged their written addresses which they duly adopted.

In his own written address, the learned counsel for the accused person O.K. Olaniyan Esq. raised one issue for determination.

- Whether the prosecution has successfully proved beyond reasonable doubt the ingredients/elements of stealing under Section 390 of the Criminal Code Cap. 38 Vol. II Laws of Oyo State 2000.

On this sole issue, counsel made reference to Section 360 of the Criminal Code Laws of Oyo State, Sections 138 and 139 of the Evidence Act, and Section 390 of the Criminal Code, Cap 38 Law of Oyo State. He stated the ingredients of the offence of stealing.

He cited -

1. MAIYAKI V. THE STATE

(2008) 11 SCM 49 AT PG. 61 PER ADEREMI JSC

2. STATE VS. AZEEZ & ORS.

(2008) 8 SCM 175

He submitted that the guilty mind or the intention to fraudulently steal or convert is absent in this accused person in view of the facts and evidence before the Court. He submitted that since the prosecution had not been able to prove the case very essential element of intention to steal or defraud the issue formulated should be resolved in favour of the accused person. He submitted further that in taking all the testimonies of the prosecution witnesses together, one will not be wrong to say that what has been proved by the prosecution through these witnesses is simply to establish the lawful actions of the accused. The accused did not deny the facts in his own testimony, however, the prosecution had not been able to prove that there exist a guilty mind in performing the activities spelt out by the witnesses. He, therefore, submitted that in all material particulars, the accused person has not committed any offence going by the evidence of the prosecution before the Court.



He submitted further that the prosecution had not proved the elements of a crime. He stated that the accused would not have been charged for stealing if the said customer or the politician or Baba Alaba had not disappeared or absconded with money. He submitted that the prosecution has not raised any fact or evidence to prove that the accused intended to fraudulently deprive the bank of the money whether permanently or temporarily. He cited –

**BABALOLA V. STATE**

(1989) 7 SC (Part 1) 94 at 116 paragraph S

He submitted that there was evidence that the accused requested for and got the consent of the bank before taking the money and also the officials of the bank had enough notice and ample opportunity to cross check the facts relating to the request by the accused person. He cited –

**ENO & ANOR. V. C.O.P**

(1962) All NLR 92.

He submitted that it was the event which followed the taking of the money that made the accused person a suspect and to be on trial and not

the event of taking the money itself. He submitted that the prosecution has failed woefully to prove the guilt of the accused beyond reasonable doubt. He stated that the testimony of the accused person of his ordeal in the hands of the fraudster stands unchallenged by the prosecution and the culprit was never apprehended by the Police. He cited –

1. AIGUBAREGHAN & ANOR. V. THE STATE  
(2004) 2 SCM 24
2. MUKA V. THE STATE  
(1976) 9-16 SC 305

In conclusion, he submitted that in the absence of evidence proving that the accused had intention and had actually stolen fraudulently the accused person ought to be discharged and acquitted of the charge. He submitted that there was nothing implicating in the statement of the accused to the police. He appealed to the Court not to allow the accused person who is a victim of bad and fictitious people and circumstance suffer again when he should not. He cited –

1. SAIDU V. STATE

(1982) 1 NCR 49 PER, OBASEKI JSC

2. OLUSOLA OYELEYE & ANOR. V. STATE

Appeal No. CA/I/103A 2008 (unreported) page 8

In her own address, the Learned Counsel for the State, Demola Oyekunle formulated one issue for determination.

- Whether the prosecution has proved the charge of stealing preferred against the accused person beyond reasonable doubt.

On this issue, Counsel made reference to Section 135(1) of the Evidence Act 2011. He submitted that proof beyond reasonable doubt does not mean proof beyond all doubt or shadow of doubt. He cited –

JUA V. THE STATE

(2010) 1-2 S.C. 96 at 129-130

He also stated the three ingredients required in proving a charge of stealing. He submitted that the prosecution can prove these ingredient through direct evidence, circumstantial evidence and confessional evidence. He submitted that the accused person's statement, Exhibit E,

is confessional in nature. He made reference to Sections 28 and 29(1) and (4) of the Evidence Act, and cited -

MOHAMMED V. THE STATE

(2007) ALL FWLR (Part 383) 46 at 61 per Tobi JSC

He submitted that all the ingredients of stealing are encapsulated in Exhibit E i.e. the confessional statement of the accused person. He submitted that in the alternative there is enough circumstantial evidence on record to ground the conviction of the accused person. He cited -

UGWU AND ANOR. V. THE STATE

(1972) JSC 89 AT 91

He submitted that the fraudulent intention of the accused is inferable from the facts and circumstance of this case. He made reference to Section 383(2) of the Criminal Code, Cap. 38, Volume 2, Laws of Oyo State, 2000. He cited -

SUNDAY V. THE STATE

(2013) All FWLR (Part 682) 1812 at 1821

He urged the Court to convict the accused person as charged.

It is trite law that in a Criminal trial, the onus is on the prosecution to prove its case beyond reasonable doubt. The duty on the prosecution is not to prove the offence beyond any shadow of doubt but to adduce evidence direct or circumstantial that conclusively points to the accused person and no other person as the culprit for the offence committed.

See - Chukwu v. State

(2007) All FWLR 1224 at 1254

Obidike v. State

(2001) 17 NWLR (Part 743) 601

Ukane v. C.O.P

(1995) 8 NWLR (Part 416) 705

As stated earlier the accused person is charged with stealing. Stealing means to fraudulently take to ones use anything capable of being stolen or to fraudulently convert to his own use or to the use of any other person, anything capable of being stolen. See -

Chiawugo v. State

(2002) 2 NWLR (Part 750)325.

What the prosecution must prove in order to sustain a charge of stealing are:

- (a) That the thing stolen is capable of being stolen.
- (b) That the accused had the intention to permanently deprive the owner of the thing stolen.
- (c) That the accused person was dishonest.
- (d) That the accused had unlawfully appropriated the thing stolen to his own use.

See – Otti v. State

(1997) 1 NWLR (Part 207) 103 at 118

Mohammed v. State

(200) FWLR (Part 30) 2623 at 2626

It is necessary to state that any property is capable of being stolen except an immovable.

Yongo & anor. V. C.O.P

(1990) 5 NWLR (Part 148) 103

Furthermore the thing stolen must belong to some persons natural or juristic. See Clark & anor. Vs. The State

(1986) 4 NWLR (Part 35) 381

On the first ingredient, that the thing stolen is capable of being stolen, it is clear that the subject matter of this charge is money. Money is an inanimate thing or commodity which is capable of being stolen. The amount of money alleged to have been stolen is N20 Million. The prosecution witnesses as well as the accused person confirmed this fact.

As regards the 2<sup>nd</sup> -5<sup>th</sup> ingredients, there is no dispute between the parties that the accused person actually took the sum of N20 Million from U.B.A and there after disappeared for over a year before he was arrested in Ghana. P.W.2 Ekundayo Deborah Olabisi, head of operations U.B.A testified that the accused person who was also a staff of U.B.A requested for N20 Million for a Customer and the money was

released to the accused person on the belief that as the accused told them that he was collecting it for a customer.

P.W.3 and P.W.4 Ologunde Ajibade Femi both staff of U.B.A, all buttressed this. These witnesses told the Court that the accused could not be found after the transaction. The accused person himself did not deny this fact.

The accused person, in his Statement to the Police Exhibit E which was admitted as evidence without any objection and on oath confirmed that he lied to the bank officials that he was collecting the money for a Politician. He narrated in detail how he collected the money and how the money was used before he escaped to Ghana. The Statement clearly shows that the accused person dishonestly, deceitfully, cunningly and fraudulently carted away the sum of N20 Million belonging to U.B.A PLC and unlawfully appropriated same to his own use. Even though the accused person claimed in his statement that he had the intention to return the money, this is an afterthought and it is immaterial and of no consequence in this case. The purport of S.383(2) c.c. is that a person who takes money with an intent to use it at his will or converts it to his



own use even though he may intend afterwards to repay the amount to the owner he is deemed to take the money fraudulently or with a fraudulent intention.

see - Clark & anor. V. The State

(1986) 4 NWLR (Part 34) 381

Babalola & ors. V. The State

(1986) 4 NWLR (Part 115) 264

Alake & anor. V. The State

(1991) 7 NWLR (Part 205) 567

It is therefore clear that although a property lawfully comes into the possession of the accused person as in the instant case, once it is established that there is an intention on the part of the accused person to assert a right which is inconsistent with that of the owner and thereby permanently deprive the owner of the ownership of the property the offence of stealing is complete. See - Babalola & ors. V. State (1989) 4 NWLR (Part 115) 264.

As I said earlier the accused person deceived his co-workers and took away the bank's money which he converted to his own personal use by handling the money over to the people whom he had prior arrangements with.

It was the submission of the learned counsel for the accused that Exhibit E the statement of the accused is not confessional. I do not agree with him

Clearly, the statement of accused person to the Police Exhibit E is confessional. Therein the accused person gave an account of his culpability. Some excerpts from the statement are as follows:-

*"I was employed in December 1985 as a junior clerk and rose to Senior Bank Officer. On 14<sup>th</sup> June 2008, I went to Dugbe 2, bullion and tell them that I want to supply some of our Customer money for politician based in trust they have on me, they released the money to me ..... I lied to them that I want to supply the Politician the money....."*

In his additional statement the accused stated thus:

*"On our way back from Ibadan we drove straight to Baba Alaba house to inform him that we have brought the money ..... when I dropped from my car at Ketu he had earlier instructed me to leave the Country and he is going to drop my car in my house at Ketu 4 Alapara. .... I entered bus to Mile 2 from Mile 2 to Cotonou, there I stayed for one month in a Church from there I moved to Togo and cross to Ghana ..... where I stayed until I was arrested on 2/4/09."*

The position of the law is that a confessional statement is the best evidence. It is a statement of admission of guilt by an accused person and the trial Court can solely act on it to convict an accused person.

See - (1) Odu v. State

(1998) 1 NWLR (Part 532) 24 at 33

(2) Udediba v. State

(1976) 11 SC 133

(3) Mohammed v. State

(2007) All FWLR (Part 383) 46 at 61

However it is desirable to test the veracity of the confessional statement to determine whether the statement is corroborated. In other words whether there is anything outside the confession to show that it is true.

See -

Alarape & ors. V. The State

(2001) 5 NWLR (Part 705) 79

In the instant case, the evidence of the prosecution witnesses who gave accounts of how the accused person took away the sum of N20 Million from the coffers of U.B.A buttress, corroborate, confirm and give credence to the confession of the accused person.

Furthermore, the accused person in his testimony before the court corroborated his confessional statement when he admitted that he took the N20 million to some people and thereafter absconded to Ghana.

As a result, it is my finding that the prosecution has proved the case of stealing against the accused person beyond reasonable doubt and


I so hold.

The accused person is therefore found guilty as charged. He is accordingly convicted.

Allocutus:- The Learned Counsel for the accused pleads that the accused is a first offender. He is a family man and he has learnt his lesson. Counsel urges the Court to be lenient and temper justice with mercy.

Sentence:- The accused person was a bank official who betrayed the trust reposed on him by his employers when he carted away a huge amount of money. Unfortunately for him the long arms of the Law caught up with him where he was hiding in Ghana. The accused person should be given the maximum sentence and taught the lesson that crime does not pay. However I have taken into consideration the passionate plea of his learned counsel and the fact that the accused person who was on bail never absented himself from court and he showed much remorse. I will therefore be lenient with him.

The accused person is sentenced to 3 I.H.L.

  
E. ESAN  
JUDGE  
30/1/2014.