

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE OF SOKOTO STATE

IN THE SOKOTO JUDICIAL DIVISION

HOLDEN AT SOKOTO

ON THE 24TH DAY OF JUNE, 2021

BEFORE HIS LORDSHIP

HON. JUSTICE MOHAMMED MOHAMMED (JUDGE)

SUIT NO: SS/FHR/04/2020

BETWEEN:

JUNAIDU UMAR-----APPLICANT

VS

- 1. BELLO SHEHU GWADABAWA**
- 2. DPO UNGUWAR ROGO POLICE DIVISIONAL OFFICE-- RESPONDENTS**
- 3. COMMISSIONER OF POLICE SOKOTO**

Court resumed today 24/6/2021

Judgment

Court: The applicant by a motion on notice dated 23/2/2021 and filed on the 24/2/2021, with suit No. SS/FHR/04/2021 commenced this application through his counsel Mr. M.A. Mustapha Esq of A. Umar & CO No. 58, Ahmadu Bello Way,

Sokoto for the enforcement of his fundamental rights wherein he prays this Court for the following orders:-

1. An order enforcing the applicant's fundamental rights as guaranteed, enshrined and protected by sections 36 (1), 35 (4), 35 (5), (a) and 46 (1) of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 as amended and articles 3, 4, 6 and 7 (a) of the African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights 1979, for being breached or likely to be breached by the Respondents, their agents, privies or assigns.
2. Declaration that the detention of the applicant by the 2nd respondent at the Unguwar Rogo police division, Sokoto office since the 5th day of December, 2020 to 7th day of December, 2020 in lieu of his younger brother without any justification, found guilty of any offence nor commit any offence or allege offence no reliable complaint of committing or about to commit any offence, is unconstitutional null and void and of no effect whatsoever and violation of section 35 (4) and 35 (5) (a) of the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 (as amended) and Article 3, 4, 6 and 7 (a) of the African charter on Human and People's Rights 1979.
3. An order of this Honourable Court mandating the respondents to public apology publish in at least 3 circulations National Newspaper.
4. An order of award of the sums of N1,000,000:00k as general and N30, 000:00 as a registration fees for registration of automatic spillover of which the detention of applicant by the 2nd respondent at the instance of the 1st respondent jointly or severally on the person of the applicant against the respondents and on his arrest and

subsequent detention by the 2nd respondent on the behest act of the 1st respondent from 5th day of December, 2020 to 7th day December 2020

5. Such further order or orders as this Honourable Court may deem fit to make in the circumstances.

The motion was supported by a statement setting out the name and description of the applicant, the reliefs sought by the applicant and the grounds upon which the reliefs were predicated. Also in support of the motion, is a 31 paragraphs supporting affidavit deposed to by the applicant himself.

In opposing the grant of the reliefs sought by the applicant, the 1st respondent filed a 27 paragraphs counter affidavit deposed to by the 1st respondent himself. Annexed to the counter affidavit, are 6 annextures marked as exhibits "A" - "F"

Exhibit "A" are patients reference personal cards of Specialist Hospital Sokoto of same of the alleged victims of crime in persons of Aliyu Farida, Moh'd Hadiza, Bello Muazu and Moh'd Asmau.

Exhibit "B" are Medical reports of Farida Aliyu, Hadiza Moh'd, Bello Muazu and Asmau Moh'd issued by Specialist Hospital Sokoto evidencing that the above mentioned persons were presented at the hospital facility for treatment as a result of various injuries sustained by them and treated.

Exhibit "C" are statements of complaints made by the above mentioned persons at Unguwar Rogo Police Division.

Exhibit "D" is the First Information Report Mentioned in Chief Magistrate Court II, Sokoto in respect of offence of screening of offender against the applicant.

Exhibit "E" is another First Information Report No. SK/413/2020 Mentioned in Chief Magistrate Court II, Sokoto for the offence of criminal conspiracy, house trespass, assault and causing hurt against one Abdulazeez Abdullahi & Anor.

Both the two {2} First Information Reports were dated 7/12/2020.

Exhibit "F" is a direct criminal complaint No. SK/DC/29/2021 lodged by the applicant & 1 Anor against the 1st respondent & 1 Anor for the offences of criminal conspiracy, criminal intimidation, house trespass, mischief and causing grievous hurt.

The 2nd and 3rd respondents after being served with the applicant's application also filed a 15 paragraphs counter affidavit in opposition to the grant of the applicant's application.

The counter affidavit of the 2nd and 3rd respondents was accompanied with four {4} annextures marked as Exhibits "A", "B", "C" and "D" respectively.

Exhibit "A" is the statement of the Divisional Police investigation officer in person of Insp. Bala Bello.

Exhibit "B" is the First Information Report mentioned in Chief Magistrate Court II, Sokoto dated 7/12/2020 in respect of the offence of screening of offender against the applicant.

Exhibit "C" is another First Information Report No. SK/413^C/2020 dated 7/12/2020 mentioned in Chief Magistrate Court II Sokoto against one Abdulazeez Abdullahi & 1 Anor for the offences of criminal conspiracy, house trespass, assault and causing hurt.

Exhibit "D" is the statement of complaint made by the 1st respondent at Unguwar Rogo Police Division.

After the applicant was served with the respondents' counter affidavit the applicant's counsel by a Motion on Notice No. SS/M.206/2021 dated 24/3/2021 filed on the 25/3/2021 and granted on the 31/3/2021 sequel to no objection response of all the respondents' counsel, the applicant filed a further and better affidavit of 14 paragraphs as a reply to the 1st respondent's counter affidavit, and 28 paragraphs as a reply to the 2nd and 3rd respondents' joint counter affidavit.

After the filling of all the foregoing processes by counsel, the counsel on 31/3/2021 adopted their respective written addresses as their legal argument in respect of the application before the court after relying on the affidavit evidence and annextures annexed thereunder.

Finally, the applicant's counsel urge the court to grant the application as prayed, while the respondents' counsel urge the court to dismiss the application as it lacks merit with substantial cost against the applicant and the matter was thereafter adjourned for judgment.

In summary, the applicant's case is anchored on the fact that the 1st respondent influenced the 2nd respondent who is the agent of the 3rd respondent to arrest the applicant on the 5th

of December, 2020 and subsequently detain him until 7th December, 2020 in lieu of the applicant's younger brother without any justification and in violation of his constitutionally guarantee rights under sections 35 (4) and 35(5) (a) of the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 as amended and Articles 3, 4, 6 and 7 (a) of African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights 1979.

In arguing the application the applicant's counsel formulated one {1} issue for determination and is hereby reproduced as follows:-

"Whether or not the applicant is entitled to the grant of the reliefs sought for in this application.

The 1st respondent counsel did not formulated any issue but decide to adopt the sole issue as formulated by the applicant's counsel.

The 2nd and 3rd respondents' counsel formulated three {3} issues for determination in arguing their opposition to the grant of this application and are hereby reproduced as follows:-

(i) *Whether the applicant's complaint or claim against the investigation by the respondents in to the complaint of crime reported to the 2nd respondent could be brought by an application under Order 2 Rule 1 and 2 of the Fundamental Rights {Enforcement Procedure} Rules 2009 wherein the violation of sections 36(1), 35(4) and 46(1) of the 1999 constitution as amended*

and Articles 3, 4, 5 and 7(a) of the African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights 1979

- (ii) Whether in view of the facts and circumstances of the case including available evidence, any of the applicant's rights could be said to have been infringed by the respondents.*
- (iii) Whether the applicant had proved his case as to entitled him to any of the reliefs sought.*

Upon consideration of the processes filed and the issues formulated by the parties in this application, this court for the purpose of this judgment formulated one {1} issue for determination which is a hybrid of the sole issue formulated by the applicant's counsel and issue No. 2 as formulated by 2nd and 3rd respondents' counsel and is as follows:-

"Whether in view of the facts and surrounding circumstances of the case including the available evidence as presented by parties before this court the applicant is entitled to the grant of the reliefs sought in this application.

The application of the applicant is brought pursuant to Order 2 Rules 1 and 2 of Fundamental Rights {Enforcement Procedure} Rules 2009 and section 46 (1) of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 as amended.

By the provisions of Order 2 Rules 1 and 2 of the Fundamental Rights {Enforcement Procedure} Rules, 2009 and section 46 (1) of the CFRN 1999 as amended pursuant to which this application is brought, any person who alleges that any of his rights under chapter 4 of the Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria 1999 as amended has been or is being, or

is likely to be breached, may apply to the High Court for redress.

- Hassan V. EFCC {2014} 1 NWLR pt 1389 p 607
- Ransome Kuti V. AGF {1985} NWLR pt 6 p 211
- Fajemirokun V. Commercial Bank {Nig} Ltd {2009} 5 NWLR 588

By paragraph 3:8 of the applicant's adopted address, the applicant submitted that from the affidavit evidence, the grounds upon which the application is brought which were tied to the reliefs sought, the applicant has placed all the vital and reliable evidence showing that the applicant's fundamental rights as guaranteed under sections 36(1), 35(4), 35(5) (a), 42(1) (a) of the CFRN 1999 as amended and Articles 3, 4, 5 and 7 (a) of the African Charter on Human and Peoples Rights 1979, have been breached.

In paragraph 3:9 the applicant's counsel further submitted that by the depositions in the supporting affidavit, the applicant was detained in the custody of the 2nd respondent from 6th and 7th day of December, 2020 in lieu of his younger brother without any lawful justification or cause.

It was also the contention of the applicant's counsel that the 1st respondent did not lodge any complaint whatsoever against the applicant before the 2nd respondent on which the 1st respondent can arrest and detain the applicant.

- Ogu V. State {1996} 9 NWLR pt 366 p 1
- Nemi V. State {1994} SCNJ 1106
- Controller General of Nigeria Prison Service V. Dr. Feme Adekany {2002} 15 NWLR pt 90 p 362

- Director State Security Service v. Olisa Ogbakoba {1998} NWLR pt 595 p 425

In his submission, the 1st respondent's counsel argued in paragraph 3:2 of their adopted written address that in an allegation of in this case, the burden of proving the alleged violation, is on the applicant and the applicant in this application, did not prove his allegations against the respondents as required by law as the contents of the affidavit evidence before the court, did supply sufficient materials upon which the court can rely in granting his application.

He submitted that every person who has reason to complaint against any person in connection with the commission of crime as did by the 1st respondent, is guaranteed by law to do so before the police or any law enforcement agency.

- Gbajor V. Ogunburegui {1961} 1 ANLR 853 at
- Gusau V. Umeurike {2012} 28 WRN III
- Osil V. Balogun {2012} 38 WRN 143
- FCMB V. Ette {2008} 22 WRN 63

He submitted further that the 1st respondent by his counter affidavit, reported the commission of crime when his family members were attacked to the 2nd respondent for the 2nd respondent's necessary legal action.

He concluded by submitting that the 1st respondent having performed what is required of him by law, cannot be said to have violated or infringed upon the rights of the applicant.

- Fajemirokun V. C.B (C.I) Nig. Ltd {2002} 10 NWLR pt 774 p 95

Counsel to the 2nd and 3rd respondents in opposing the grant of the grant of the applicant's application, also submitted in paragraph 4:04 of their adopted written address that by the contents of their counter affidavit and the annexures annexed thereunder, it was the occurrence of the breach of peace in the area of the applicant leading to the commission of the offence's of criminal conspiracy, house trespass, assault and causing hurt reported to the 2nd respondent for investigation that called for the action taken by the 2nd respondent.

It was their further submission that by the provisions of sections 214 (2) (b) of the CFRN 1999 as amended and 4 of the police Act Cap. P 19 LFN 2004, the police including 2nd and 3rd respondents, have been empowered to protect life and properties, prevent and detect crime, apprehend offenders and maintain law and order among others.

- Fawehinmi V. LGP {2002} 7 NWLR pt 747 p 606 at 670

2nd and 3rd respondents' counsel submitted that the 2nd respondent having received a complaint of the commission of crimes, owed a statutory duty to discharge his obligation by exercising his discretionary power of invitation, arrest or detention of the alleged offenders within the contemplation of the law, as abdicating its responsibility may influence the aggrieved to resort to self-help which may lead to breakdown of law and order in the society.

- Okochi V. Amankwi {2008} 18 NWLR pt 851 p 28

He finally submitted that its trite law that a court order which capable of preventing law enforcement agency from conducting criminal investigation against a suspect reasonably suspected to have committed crime, is a creeping order like a weapon of mass destruction and a clear intention of preventing the law enforcement agency from discharging its statutory functions.

- Uzor Kalu V. FRN {2016} LPELR 40 108

By the applicant's averments in paragraphs 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 19 of the applicant's supporting affidavit and re-echoed in paragraphs 14, 22 and 24 of the applicant's further affidavit in response to the 2nd and 3rd respondents' counter affidavit the applicant alleged that the 1st respondent influenced the 2nd respondent to arrest him on the 5/12/2020 and subsequently detain him until 7/12/2020 in lieu of his younger brother without any justification violation of his constitutional rights.

In controverting the claim of the applicant, the 1st respondent by paragraphs 6, 7, 9, and 11 of his counter affidavit, averred that he reported a case of criminal conspiracy, assault and causing hurt to the 2nd respondent against some of the applicant's family members because they injured some members of his household namely Asma'u Mohammed, Hadiza Mohammed, Muazu Bello and Farida Aliyu as well as damaged his gate and glass of his windows, having armed themselves with saw and sticks.

It was his averment that the injuries sustained by the members of his household, necessitated him to take them to specialist Hospital, Sokoto for treatment, and in proof,

annexed their patient Reference Personal Cards, their respective medical reports and their respective statements made at Unguwar Rogo Police Division as Exhibits A, B and C respectively.

By paragraphs 5 (a), (b), (c), (d) and (e) of the 2nd and 3rd respondents' counter affidavit, the 2nd and 3rd respondents averred that on 5/12/2020, the 1st respondent lodged a formal complaint before the 2nd respondent against the brother of the applicant {Fahad Umar} and another for the offences of criminal conspiracy, house trespass, assault and causing hurt.

It was part of their averment that when one inspector Bala Bello was shown the said Fahad Umar by the 1st respondent as among the offenders for the purpose of inviting him to the station, the applicant obstructed the said inspector in his efforts to aid the escape of Fahad Umar from police arrest by closing the gate of the house where Fahad Umar had entered making it impossible to effect his arrest, and that as a result of the applicant's obstruction, the applicant was arrested for obstructing police office while executing his lawful duty and screening of an offender.

To further substantiate the averment, the statement of arresting police officer Inspector Bala Bello was annexed to the 2nd and 3rd respondents' counter affidavit and marked as Exhibit POL. A".

The facts were averred in paragraph 5 © and (d) Of the 2nd and 3rd respondents' counter affidavit and are hereby reproduced below:-

" 5. That the true facts which came to my personal knowledge that led to arrest of the applicant, are as follow:-

c. that arrival of the police, the nominal complainant identified the two suspects that broke into their house to attack and injured people, the inspector invited them but Fahad Umar a brother to the applicant took to his heels.

d. The applicant and other family members obstructed the police from arresting him and closed the door thereby making it impossible to effect the arrest. The statement of the arresting officer narrating what transpired at the scene, is hereby annexed as Exhibit POL. A"

Part of Exhibit "POL.A" annexed to the 2nd and 3rd respondents counter affidavit reads as follows:-

"The girls identifies Fahad as the suspect who attacked them. I tried to effect arrest but Fahad escaped----- with assistance of Junaidu and other family members....."

Corroborating the evidence of the 2nd and 3rd respondents as presented in their Joint Counter affidavit the 1st respondent also averred in paragraph 10 of his counter affidavit as follows:-

"10. That in my present and indeed other on lookers, Inspector Bala Bello attempted to arrest the said Fahad Umar, but the applicant interrupted the arrest and with

his (applicant) help, Fahad Umar run and entered their house and therefore cannot be arrested at that point."

It is trite law that in cases that are being fought on the basis of affidavits as in this case, the evidence is what is averred in the affidavit on oath.

- NIC v. Aminu {2012} 8 NWLR pt 1302 p 330
- Onujabe V. Idris {2012} 2 NWLR pt 1284 p 285

It is also trite law that evasive denials in a counter affidavit, are often taken or counted as admissions because evasive denial alone without more cannot amount to controverting the evidence earlier averred.

- Danladi V. Dangiri {2015} 2 NWLR pt 1442 p 124
- Ugwuanyi V. NICON Insurance plc {2013} 11 NWLR pt 1366 p 546

Similarly, a general denial or traverse in a counter affidavit of many paragraphs in an opponent's main affidavit without more, is in Law ineffectual as against specific allegations of fact in the main affidavit

- UBN PLC V. Awmar Properties Ltd {2018} 10 NWLR pt 1626 p 64
- Ugwuanyi V. NICON Insurance plc {supra}.

The law is also trite that where the contents of a counter affidavit specifically attack or challenge the specific allegations of fact made in the adversary's affidavit as in this case, then the court is duty bound to give the affidavit evidence in the counter affidavit, a worthy consideration.

- Jukok Intl Ltd V. Diamond Bank Plc {2016} 6 NWLR pt 1507 p 55
- Chairman, EFCC V. Little Child {2016} 3 NWLR pt 1498 p 72

Our superior courts have also decide that where evidence is adduced by way of affidavit evidence supported by documentary exhibits, both the affidavit and the documentary exhibits should be employed in resolving and determining the matter before it.

- Dagazau V. Bokir International Ltd {2011} 14 NWLR p 261
- Nwosu V. Imo state Environmental Sanitation Authority {1990} 2 NWLR pt 235 p 688
- Akila V. Director SSS {2014} 2 NWLR pt 1392 p 443

The law is also trite that uncontroverted facts contained in an affidavit, are taken as true.

- Malari V. Leigh {2019} 3 NWLR pt 1659 p 332
- Panya V. President FRN {2018} 15n NWLR pt 1643 p 395
- Oloyede V. State {2018} 8 NWR pt 1621 p 311
- Wari V. EFCC {2018} 14 NWLR pt 1639 p 195

Furthermore, where documentary evidence support depositions in an affidavit or counter affidavit, as in this case}, such depositions, are taken as the correct position of what it seeks to established

- Oloyede V. State {supra}

This is because, the documents once attached as required by law, are legally speaking taken as having been tendered in evidence.

- Regd Trustees of Tipping Trailer Owners Union V. N. U. M. W. {2012} ALL FWLR pt 627 p 773

From the affidavit of parties and exhibits annexed thereunder, paragraphs 10 of the 1st respondent's counter affidavit and paragraph 5 (c) and (d) of the 2nd and 3rd respondents' counter affidavit read together with exhibits "POL.A and B" annexed thereunder to the counter affidavit of the 2nd and 3rd respondents, are specific attacks controverting or disputing the allegations of facts made by the applicant that he was arrested and detained by 2nd and 3rd respondents upon the influence of the 1 respondent in lieu of his brother Fahad Umar who was alleged to have committed some crimes.

The response of the applicant in his further and better affidavit particularly paragraph 12 of his response to the 1st respondent's counter affidavit, and paragraphs 12 and 13 of his response to the 2nd and 3rd respondents' counter affidavit, are apparently evasive and did not appeared to specifically dispute the claim of the respondents as to why the applicant was arrested and detained.

Paragraph 12 of the applicant's further and better affidavit in response to the averment contained in paragraph 10 of the 1st respondent's counter affidavit, is hereby reproduced below as follows:-

"12. That with reference to paragraph 10 of the 1st respondent's counter affidavit is not true. And in furtherance to this, it is irrelevant because the applicant is fighting for his Fundamental Human Rights infringed by the 2nd and 3rd respondents on the behest act of 1st respondent."

As earlier reproduced in this judgment and at the risk of repeating myself, paragraph 10 of the 1st respondent's counter affidavit reads:-

"10. That in my present and indeed other on lookers, inspector Bala Bello attempted to arrest the said Fahad Umar, but the applicant interrupted the arrest and with his (applicant) help, Fahad Umar run and entered their house and therefore cannot be arrested at that point."

The foregoing paragraph 12 of the applicant's further and better affidavit in response to the 1st respondent's counter affidavit, is substantially the same with paragraph 13 of the applicant's further and better affidavit in response to the 2nd and 3rd respondents' counter affidavit.

Furthermore, paragraphs 10 and 12 of the applicant's further and better affidavit which are responses to the averments contained in paragraph 5 (c) and (d) of the 2nd and 3rd respondents' counter affidavit, are also evasive because they did not specifically controverted or disputed the claim of the 2nd and 3rd respondents as to why the applicant was arrested and detained before the First Information Report was prepared against the applicant for the offence of screening of offender as shown by exhibit "POL.B" annexed to the 2nd and 3rd respondents' counter affidavit.

By the provisions of section 4 of the Police Act read together with the provisions of section 214 (2) (b) of the CFRN 1999 as amended the 2nd and 3rd respondents have been empowered to detect and generally investigate crimes, apprehension of offenders, prevent commission of crimes, as well as maintain law and order among others.

- Fawehinmi V. IGP {2002} 7 NWLR pt 747 P 606 at 670
- Okochi V. Amankwi {2008} 18 NWLR pt 851 p 28
- Fajemirokun V. C.B {Nig} Ltd {2002} 10 NWLR pt 774 p 95

It is trite law that every citizen of this country has the right to report every criminal conduct of another to the police or any other law enforcement agency for necessary investigation, and in the course of investigating a reported case of the commission of a crime, the police are entitled to use their discretion or initiative in performing the duty.

- Africbank Plc V. Oyima {2004} 2 NWLR pt 855 p 659
- Fajemirokun V. C.B {Nig} Ltd {supra}
- Gusau V. Umeurike {2012} 28 WRN III
- OSIL V. Balogun {2012} 38 WRN 143

In the case of FCMB V. Ette {2008} 22 WRN 63, the Court of Appeal held:-

" It is the duty as well as the right of every citizen to bring to the notice of the police either a report or a specific complaint against persons who are suspected or alleged to have committed offences. It is a matter for the police to decide what action they should take on the

report or complaint. If the police decide on an action on their own initiative which is ultimately proved to have been detrimental to the person against whom the complaint or report is made, the citizen cannot be held responsible where he has not taken the law into his own hands, then the duty of investigating and detecting crimes by the police would not only be extremely difficult, but efforts of the police would be abortive”.

It is trite law that the right to personal liberty of citizens in this country can be deprived temporarily where that citizen is reasonably suspected of having committed a criminal offence.

- Section 35 (1) (c) CFRN 1999 as amended
- Ekwenugo V. FRN {2007} 3 NWLR pt 1021 p 209
- Sambo V. Nig. Army Council {2017} 7 NWLR pt 1565 p 400
- DSS Zamfara State Command V. Mohammed {2018} LPELR 43869
- Achebe V. Nwosu {2003} 7 NWLR pt 818 p 103 at 131
- Dakubo Asari V. FRN {2007} 12 NWLR pt 1048 p 320
- Onyiriola V. IGP {2009} 3 NWLR pt 1128 p 324
- Hassan V. EFCC {2007} 16 NWLR pt 1061 p 483

In *AG Anambra State V. UBA* {2005} 3 WRN 191, it was held that it is an interference of the powers given by the constitution to law enforcement officers in the control of criminal investigation for a person accused of committing a crime to rush to court with a view to be shielded against criminal investigation and prosecution. A person who is accused of committing a crime cannot expect a judicial fiat to

prevent law officers from exercising their constitutional powers.

- Kalu V. FRN {2017} LPELR 40108
- Oguejiofor V. Ibeabuchi {2017} LPELR 43590

In view of all that has been said in this judgment as inspired by the available evidence as contained in the averments and annexures annexed thereunder of both parties it is the finding of this court that the applicant was not arrested and detained in lieu of his brother who was accused of committing some crimes, but because the applicant obstructed the police from discharging their lawful duty of arresting his brother against whom a formal complaint was lodged before the 2nd respondent and thereby screened his said brother who eventually escaped from police arrest.

I therefore humbly agreed with the respondents' counsel that the respondents did not in any way violated any of the applicant's rights. I so hold.

The applicant having failed to prove his case the case has no merit and the applicant is not entitled to any of the reliefs sought.

Consequently, this suit is hereby dismissed for lack of merit.
Make no order as to cost.

Application dismissed.

Signed

Hon. Justice Mohammed Mohammed
Judge
24/06/2021

Appearances:

Mustapha Na Abu Esq for the applicant.

M. U. Uwais Esq for the 1st respondent.

Ismail Lawal Esq with Shehu Musa Esq for the 2nd and 3rd respondents

Certify True Copy

FATIMA SAIDU MOH'D
Ag DIRETOR LITIGATION
HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE
SOKOTO