

IN THE FEDERAL HIGH COURT OF NIGERIA
IN THE CALABAR JUDICIAL DIVISION
HOLDEN AT CALABAR
ON MONDAY, THE 15th DAY OF APRIL, 2019
BEFORE HIS LORDSHIP, HON. JUSTICE S. A. AMOBEDA
JUDGE

SUIT NO: FHC/CA/25^C/2019

BETWEEN:

FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA }

COMPLAINANT

AND

CHIKEZIE BRIGHT (AKA ABDUL ESTHER) }

DEFENDANT

JUDGMENT




On the 15th day of April, 2019, the Defendant was arraigned before this court on a one (1) count charge dated 9/4/2019 and filed on the 11/04/2019 for fraudulent impersonation with intent to obtain property and gain advantage for himself and thereby committed an offence contrary to section 22 (3)(a) & (b) and punishable under section 22 (4) of the Cyber Crimes (Prohibition, Prevention Etc) Act 2015 and punishable under section 22 (4) of the same Act.

The Defendant having understood the charge read to him in English Language, pleaded guilty to the charge.

The Prosecution thereafter urged this court to convict the Defendant in view of his plea of guilty. He continued by stating that parties had also entered into a plea bargain agreement dated 9/4/2019 and filed on 11/4/2019. The said agreement was executed by the Prosecution on one hand and the Defence counsel on the other. Counsel on both sides then adopted same as their agreement.

On the Plea Bargain Agreement, it is agreed that:-



1. The Defendant shall plead guilty to the offence with which he is charged.
2. A term of six (6) months imprisonment with an option of fine fixed at the discretion of the court.
3. The Defendant shall forfeit to the Federal Government of Nigeria his HP Laptop, four (4) Internet modem, fifty eight (58) Airtel sim cards, fifty nine (59) MTN sim cards, three (3) Etisalat sim cards, two (2) Glo sim cards and one (1) Turkey sim card being the instruments used in the commission of the offence recovered by the complainant in the course of investigation.

Accordingly, upon plea of guilty of the Defendant, the Defendant is hereby convicted as charged.

After the presentation by the Prosecution and pursuant to **section 270 (4) of ACJA 2015**, an inquiry from the Defendant whether his plea of guilty is as to the fact stated by the Prosecution. The Defendant answered in the affirmative that he fully understood the fact and the ingredient of the offences and stood by his plea of guilty. I also inquired again from the Defendant further to the same provision of **section 270 (4) of ACJA, 2015**, whether he entered into the plea bargain agreement voluntarily and without undue influence, and he answered in the affirmative that he entered into the plea bargain agreement freely, voluntarily and was not unduly influenced by the Prosecution (EFCC) or indeed anybody.


Learned counsel to the Convict similarly affirmed that his client understood the charge and that he was part of the plea bargain which he duly signed.

By way of allocutus, Counsel to the Convict stated that the Convict is very remorseful and prayed this Court to temper justice with mercy.

I am in no doubt therefore that the Defendant fully understood the charge, the terms of the plea bargaining agreement, he freely entered into with the Prosecution and his plea of guilty was unequivocal.



2/8/2023



In the circumstances, the duty of the court is circumscribed by the clear provision of **Section 356 (2) of ACJA, 2015.**

I hereby accordingly find and pronounce the Defendant guilty on the one (1) count charge and convict him as charged.

The Court cannot therefore impose a higher punishment than that prescribed for the offence neither can a Court impose a sentence which the statute creating the offence has not provided for. See the case of **Ekpo v. State (1982) 1 NCR 137.**

The attitude of Courts when it comes to sentencing is basically that it must be a rational exercise with certain specific objective. It could be retribution, deterrence, reformation etc in the hope that the type of sanction chosen will but the particular objection chosen however roughly, unto effect. The sentencing objective to be applied and therefore the type of punishment may vary depending on the need of a particular case.

In discharging this no doubt difficult exercise, the Court has to decide first on which from the above principle or objective applied better to the fact of a caused and their the quantum of punishment that it will accord with it.


In this case, if the objective is for the deterrent and the reformation of the convict, then the maximum punishment for the Convict as provided for in the Act appeared to me particularly excessive in the light of the facts of this case alluded to by counsel on both sides of the aisle.

In the same vein, it is a notorious fact that crimes of this nature appeared now to be prevalent in our clime and the Court as preventive tools in the criminal justice system must not be seen to encourage crime of this nature by giving light sentences. The court therefore here, must engage in some tight balancing act.

(1) To be considerate and fair in enforcing clear provisions of the law.

(2) To be fair to the Convict where though pertinent as in this case is displayed.

I have considered all these factors particularly the fact that the Convict is a first offender and who has exhibited sincere penitence in the circumstances rather than insist on his inalienable right to a trial, he pleaded guilty




thereby saving tax payer's resources and time of court. This attitude must have played a part obviously in the Prosecution agreeing to the plea bargain agreement dated 11/4/2019.

Having considered all these parts, I am inclined to the view that a lighter sentence appears to me desirable and appropriate in this case and will fully achieve noble goals of deterrence and reforming the Convict towards a precinct part of a moral rectitude.

The charge before this Court is brought pursuant to **Section 22 of Cyber Crimes (Prohibition, Prevention Etc) Act, 2015**; which the convict was charged and convicted; provides punishment to a term of imprisonment of 5 years or to a fine not more than ₦7,000,000.00 (Seven Million Naira) or both. In the extant situation, since the plea bargain agreement in place provides that the convict is sentenced to a six months imprisonment and option of fine of the amount to be fixed at the discretion of the Court and which can probably and legal be situated within the range of punishment under Section 22 of the Act. I do not consider that the offence require a heavy sentence.

I do hereby sentence the convict to Six months imprisonment with an option of fine of ₦100,000.00 (One hundred thousand Naira). That the defendant shall forfeit to the Federal Republic of Nigeria the HP Laptop and all the Sim cards being the instrument used in the commission of the offence which was recovered from the said investigation.


.....
Hon. S.A. Amobeda
Presiding Judge


CERTIFIED TRUE COPY
FEDERAL HIGH COURT, CALABAR
JOYLYNE COLE, ESQ.
SENIOR REGISTRAR

2/23/2023

Appearances:

- 1. **Usman Shehu, Esq.** with **J.O Abolarin, Esq.** ----- for the Prosecution
- 2. **C.C. Okafor, Esq.** ----- for the Defendant

Cell of Const Judgment - ₦200,000


1/23/2023

FEDERAL HIGH COURT
CASHERS OFFICE
DATE 2-3-2023
CALABAR
Comptroller