

IN THE FEDERAL HIGH COURT OF NIGERIA
IN THE ILORIN JUDICIAL DIVISION
HOLDEN AT ILORIN
ON FRIDAY, THE 13TH DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015
BEFORE THE HONOURABLE JUSTICE A.O. FAJI
JUDGE

SUIT NO: FHC/IL/CS/63/2015

BETWEEN

AYOOLA AYODELE SUNDAY.....APPLICANT

AND

1. INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE
2. COMMISSIONER OF POLICE,
KWARA STATE COMMAND
3. FIRST BANK OF NIGERIA LTD

}.....RESPONDENTS

JUDGMENT

By this application for enforcement of Fundamental Rights filed on 5/10/15, the Applicant seeks the following reliefs:

1. **A DECLARATION** that the unlawful arrest and detention of the Applicant at a Police Station in Ibadan and subsequently at 'A' Division Police Station, Ilorin by agents of the

1st and 2nd Respondents on the instruction of the agents of the 3rd Respondent when he went to withdraw some money from his account operated with the 3rd Respondent at her Molete/Challenge Branch, Ibadan, Oyo State constitutes a flagrant violation of the Applicant's right to personal liberty.

2.A DECLARATION that the gross assault, mental and psychological torture, harassment and intimidation meted out to the Applicant by the Officers of the 1st and 2nd Respondents during his unlawful arrest and detention at 'A' Division Police Station, Ilorin, constitutes a grave violation of the Applicant's right to dignity of human person.

3.A DECLARATION that the action of the agents/officers of the 1st and 2nd Respondents

compelling the Applicant to undertake to pay or refund the alleged sum defrauded the 3rd Respondent to her through the agents/officers of the 1st and 2nd Respondents constitutes a gross violation of the Applicant's constitutional right.

4.A DECLARATION that the unjustified seizure of the ATM, Passbook and Account holder's I.D. card (issued to the Applicant by the 3rd Respondent) by the agents/officers of the 1st and 2nd Respondents constitutes a violation of the Applicant's right to own property.

5.A DECLARATION that the unjustified and continuous freezing of the Applicant's Savings Account Number: 3009385516 by the 3rd Respondent operated with her

Molete/Challenge Branch Office, Ibadan, Oyo State, thus, denying him access to his funds therein constitutes a violation of the Applicant's right to own property.

6. AN ORDER of mandatory injunction compelling the Respondents to return all the items (including the ATM, Passbook and Account holder's I.D. Card belonging to the Applicant) which are unlawfully seized and remain in the custody of the Respondents.

7. AN ORDER of mandatory injunction compelling the Respondents, particularly, the 3rd Respondent to defreeze the Applicant's Savings Account Number: 3009385516 operated with her Molete/Challenge Branch Office, Ibadan, Oyo State and allow him access to his funds therein.

8. AN ORDER of mandatory injunction compelling the Respondents to refund to the Applicant the sum of N100,000.00 (One hundred thousand naira) paid by the Applicant to the agents/officers of the 1st and 2nd Respondents for onward transmission to the 3rd Respondent as part of the money allegedly defrauded the 3rd Respondent, under the compulsion and undue pressure of the agents/officers of the 1st and 2nd Respondents.

9. AN ORDER of perpetual injunction restraining the Respondents by themselves, agents, privies or whosoever acting through them or for them from further arresting, detaining, intimidating or harassing the Applicant herein in connection with the alleged fraud without just cause.

10. AN ORDER of mandatory injunction compelling the Respondents, jointly and severally to write an unalloyed and unmitigated letter of apology to the Applicant as required under the 1999 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria as amended for violation of his fundamental rights.

11. A SUM OF FIVE MILLION NAIRA only, jointly and severally against the Respondents as general, exemplary and aggravated damages to assuage the feelings of the Applicant for denying him access to his money in his account with the 3rd Respondent and to his other seized items; and for the physical, mental and psychological damage done to his person by the Respondents.

The grounds for the application are:

The gross assault, mental and psychological torture, harassment, intimidation, arrest, detention, freezing of bank account, seizure of some items of the Applicant herein as well as his compulsion by the Respondents to refund some money allegedly defrauded the 3rd Respondent which he knows nothing about is unlawful and amounts to a violation of the Applicant's fundamental rights to personal liberty, dignity of human person and the right to own property.

There is also an affidavit in support sworn to by the Applicant. Applicant contends that he was arrested and detained in Ibadan and transferred to Ilorin when he went to withdraw money from his account with First Bank Ibadan. The arrest was on the instruction of 3rd Respondent.

The applicants' rights to personal liberty and dignity of human person were violated as he was arrested twice – when he went to withdraw money from the bank and in his Office. There was no reasonable suspicion in violation of **Section 35(1) of the 1999 Constitution and Article 6 of the African Charter on Human and Peoples' Rights Cap A9 LFN 2004.** Applicant was arrested without proper investigation carried out by Respondents.

The detention in the first instance in Ilorin for more than 6 consecutive days and another 11 consecutive days in the second instance without lawful excuse are unlawful. The detention was more than the prescribed 24 hours if detention is in a place within 40 kilometers radius of a Court of competent jurisdiction. The length of time is immaterial as 3 hours was considered enough in **ISENALUMHE-**

V-JOYCE AMADIN & ORS (2001) 1 CHR 458

@ 466. Applicant is therefore entitled to an award of damages.

Applicant was also physically tortured and emotionally traumatized in the course of his detention in Ilorin. Counsel referred to paragraphs 13 and 18 of the affidavit in support which depicts degrading treatment in contravention of **Section 34(1) (a) of the 1999 Constitution and Article 5 of the African Charter.**

Applicant was also compelled to undertake to pay a sum of N159,000 being the alleged sum involved in a fraud for which he is not culpable. That amounts to compulsory acquisition or taking of his money contrary to **Section 44(1) of the 1999 Constitution and outside the exceptions in Section 44 (2) (b).**

Applicant was compelled to undertake to refund some money to 3rd Respondent. He was arrested a second time in order to enforce this undertaking when he refused to pay. He was thus forced to pay N50,000 through his surety to Officers of 1st and 2nd Respondents on two occasions for onward transmission to 3rd Respondent. Counsel relied on paragraph 19 of the affidavit and exhibits A1 and A2. Counsel urged the Court to order Respondents to return the money to the applicant as well as the items seized from him to wit: ATM Card, Passbook and account holder's I.D Card. There was no reasonable suspicion to ground the arrest and no conviction by a Court of law to justify the forfeiture or seizure of Applicants' property.

On the reliefs, Counsel urged the Court to grant all the declarations sought.

Damages follow automatically for breach of any right. Counsel referred to JIM-JAJA-V-COP RIVERS STATE (2013) ALL FWLR (part 665) 203 @ 225 where the Court held that damages avail once unlawful detention has been established. The compensation is automatic by the operation of the law pursuant to Section 35(6) of the Constitution. Applicant is also entitled to an apology. Damages avail no matter how great or minute the trespass. Counsel referred to OKONKWO-V-OGBOGU (1996) 4SCNJ 190 @ 207.

Counsel urged the Court to consider the following in assessing damages:

- The impact of the degrading treatment meted to Applicant.
- The Applicant is CEO of a business outfit.

- The Applicant is the son of a deceased High Court Judge.

Counsel therefore urged the Court to award exemplary damages more so in view of the unrepentant posture and brazen disregard for the Rule of Law by 1st and 2nd Respondents. Their conduct was also unprofessional and arbitrary. Counsel referred also to **ODOGU-V-A.G. OF FEDERATION (1996) 7 SCNJ 132 at 139, MISOR-V-ADELEKE (2005) ALL FWLR (part 287) 882 @ 896-897.**

The Applicants account was also frozen by the 3rd Respondent in breach of contract as well as breach of Applicant's Constitutional Rights.

1st and 2nd Respondents' reaction was by counter-affidavit sworn to by Mallam Abdulwahab Aliu, Litigation Clerk in the

Chambers of the Honourable Attorney-General of Kwara State.

In urging the Court to dismiss the application, Counsel submitted that Applicant has not established the violation of his Fundamental Rights. He was arrested on the strength of complaint of fraud and or allegation of crime against him and some others in lawful custody. The right to personal liberty can be rightly curtailed within a reasonable time and on reasonable suspicion of commission of a crime. Counsel urged the Court not to fetter the powers of the Police under Sections 214 and 216 of the Constitution and Sections 4 and 24 of the Police Act, relying on LUNA-V-COP RIVERS STATE POLICE COMMAND (2010) LPELR 8642 (CA).

3rd Respondent reacted vide a counter affidavit sworn to by Nana Hauwa Isa, its employee, on 19th October 2015.

Counsel stated that Applicant is a customer of 3rd Respondent at its Molete/Challenge Branch in Ibadan. 3rd Respondent through its auditors discovered a fraud perpetrated by one of its employees in collaboration with some customers (Applicant inclusive) to the tune of N9,860,000.

Counsel submitted that 3rd Respondent did not instruct 1st and 2nd Respondents but merely made a report of fraud leaving 1st and 2nd Respondents to investigate same using their discretion. Counsel submitted that no liability enures against 3rd Respondent and relied on: **EZEADUKWA-V-MADUKA (1997) 8**

NWLR (part 518) 635; NWANGWU-V-DURU (2002) 2 NWLR (part 751) 265 @ 282 and FIRST BANK OF NIGERIA PLC-V-ATTORNEY-GENERAL OF THE FEDERATION (2013) LPELR 2015.

Upon discovery of the fraud, a report was made to the Police. In the course of investigations, the proceeds of the fraud were traced to 3 accounts one of which belongs to the Applicant leading to arrest of Applicant and other individuals, 3rd Respondent's employees inclusive.

3rd Respondent is not liable for any actions taken pursuant to the report. Counsel relied on **FAJEMIROKUN-V-COMMERCIAL BANK (NIG) LTD (2009) ALL FWLR (part 487) 1 at 6 G-H.** The arrests were done by the Police

without the involvement or knowledge of 3rd Respondent. The Applicant did not also mention any involvement of 3rd Respondent at any occasion of his alleged torture, trauma humiliation and harassment. The only allegation was as to the report made by 3rd Respondent to the Police who thereafter placed a restriction on Applicants account as one involved in the fraud. Even though it was alleged that Applicant was detained inside 3rd Respondent's Ibadan Branch's banking hall on the instruction of the Branch Manager (which is denied) it is not logical to aver that 3rd Respondent's agents instructed the Police to arrest Applicant. The Police was left to exercise its discretion and 3rd Respondent is therefore not liable. Counsel

relied on ONYEDINMA-V-NWITE (1997) 3 NWLR (part 493) 333 at 345.

3rd Respondent merely carried out its civic duty to make a report to the Police without more and thus incurred no liability. Counsel relied on: NWADINOBI-V-BOTU (2000) 9 NWLR (part 672) 220 @ 228.

Counsel urged the Court to dismiss the application.

A further affidavit was deposed to on Applicant's behalf by Counsel, G.A. Faleye (Mrs.) on 23rd October 2015.

Counsel submitted in the reply address that 1st and 2nd Respondents did not deny the allegations of arrest and detention beyond the prescribed period at the instruction of 3rd Respondent's agent. Neither did they deny the

allegation of seizure of Applicant's property.

There is no justification or reasonable suspicion shown for the arrest and have thus not discharged the burden of proving the legality of the arrest and detention. Counsel relied on **COP ONDO STATE-V-OBOLO (1989) 5 NWLR (part 120) 130; ABIOLA-V-FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA (1995) 7 NWLR (part 405)1.**

Even though Applicant contends that he was coerced to make Exhibit MOJ1, the document shows no justification for Applicant's detention by 1st and 2nd Respondent on 3rd Respondent's instructions. On MOJ2, the document presupposes that being a computer printout it is logical to conclude that it had been prepared and only given to Applicant to sign since at that time

he was already in detention. Even if MOJ2 was meant to grant Applicant bail, it was signed on 14/11/14, days after Applicant was arrested and detained on 10th November 2014. It was made outside the prescribed 'reasonable time'. There is also nothing in 1st and 2nd Respondents' counter-affidavit showing reasonable suspicion a term which must be based on a particularized and objective, not subjective basis, premised on specific and articulable facts. Counsel relied on AGUNDI-V-COP (2013) ALL FWLR (part 660) 1247 at 1297 B-C.

Exhibit A3 also shows that all the transactions carried out by Applicant on his account were done as prescribed by 3rd Respondent. It does not show any reasonable suspicion. Counsel submitted that the cases of

GAMBARI-V-BUHARI and LUNA-V-COP

cited by 1st and 2nd Respondents do not apply.

The failure of 1st and 2nd Respondents to produce the 2 undertakings to pay made under coercion by the Applicant (despite a notice to produce them) calls for the invocation of **Section 167(d) of the Evidence Act.**

On 3rd Respondents submissions, Counsel submitted that 3rd Respondent did not deny Applicant's arrest and detention but only pleaded that she was exercising her civic right. Counsel however submitted that 3rd Respondent went beyond this by pointing out, identifying and instigating the arrest and detention of the Applicant. That Applicant was arrested in 3rd Respondent's banking hall was not denied and that on the instruction of 3rd Respondent. By

denying knowledge of when, where and how Applicant was arrested and detained by 1st and 2nd Respondents, the Court was urged to hold that Applicant must have been arrested based on the instruction and identification of the 3rd Respondent. It was also not contended that the name and identity of the Applicant was given to 3rd Respondent by any person arrested in connection with alleged fraud. Applicant's version of where and how he was arrested should therefore be accepted. There is also nothing in 3rd Respondent's counter-affidavit to justify reasonable suspicion that Applicant committed the fraud. 3Rd Respondent did not only report the alleged fraud, she also listed out the names of the suspects. Exhibits FBN1, FBN2 and FBN3 do not also show any

abnormality or fraud as 3rd Respondent did not relate them to the facts of the case. 3rd Respondent did not also call Applicant to explain the abnormality in his account as it did to others before turning him over to the Police. There is no justification for freezing the account of Applicant by the 3rd Respondent without a Court order to do so. To freeze the account and collect N100, 000 from the Applicant through 1st and 2nd respondents for being proceeds of the alleged fraud amounts to a punishment which can be imposed only by a competent Court which 3rd Respondent is not. That can only be done on a finding of guilt by the Court.

The suspicion, if any, was after the arrest.

1st and 2nd Respondent detained first before looking for evidence. The bail bond can only

justify detention after the date of the bond. The failure to produce the undertakings is also prejudicial to the Respondents.

1st and 2nd Respondents' Counsel in his oral address submitted that the detention was justifiable because of the nature of the offence. Applicant was re-arrested because he used professional sureties. Torture has also not been proved. Applicant's statement **Exhibit MOJ1** also shows there was no torture as he admitted some facts and denied others. The endorsement on the bail Bond- **Exhibit MOJ2** – by the Applicant also shows a stable mind.

On damages, Counsel submitted that having acted in a questionable manner, Applicant does not deserve damages. A refund is not justifiable since Applicant never admitted that he is the

lawful owner of the money. He did not also prove its source. The money was recovered in the course of investigation.

3rd Respondent in his oral arguments submitted that merely acting as a pointer cannot amount to an instruction. 3rd Respondent can only be liable if the report was false or without foundation. Paragraph 18 of counter-affidavit and **Exhibits FBN1-3** show a basis for the allegations.

The freezing of the account was in accordance with banking practice and was done so as not to jeopardize investigations. Counsel could however not cite any law in support of the Banking practice. Counsel also submitted that 3rd Respondent was not aware that the Police

was removing anything and relied on paragraphs 28-30.

In his oral reply Applicant's Counsel submitted that 1st and 2nd Respondents' paragraph 3ee was denied in his paragraph 4 (XIV) paragraph 3aa was denied in paragraph 4 (Xii) There is no law or order of Court that allows 3rd Respondent to freeze Applicant's account in violation of Applicant's rights.

On 3rd Respondent's paragraph 18, Counsel submitted that there is nothing linking the 3 accounts therein.

The addresses were adopted on 2nd November, 2015.

Those were the submissions of Counsel.

The Applicant is complaining about his arrest and detention by 1st and 2nd Respondents

on two occasions. On the first occasion, he was detained for 6 days. On the second occasion for 11 days. On both occasions, he was arrested in Ibadan and taken to Ilorin and was detained there. The arrests and detentions, according to Applicant, were on the instructions of the 3rd Respondent.

Applicant contends in paragraphs 9-10 of his supporting affidavit that he was accosted by the Branch Manager of 3rd Respondent's Molete Branch and told that his account had been used in committing fraud in the Bank. The account was thus put on red alert and frozen. He was subsequently arrested by the Police on the instructions of 3rd Respondent's Manager aforesaid. What form the instruction took was not revealed. 3rd Respondent contends that it

only carried out its civic duty of reporting fraud to the Police after which the Police exercised its discretion. 1st and 2nd Respondent did not however deny the fact that the first arrest was on the instruction of 3rd Defendant's Molete/Challenge Branch. Neither was it denied that the arrest took place in the said Banking Hall.

To my mind however, these facts do not show instigation or conduct by 3rd respondent which hampered 1st and 2nd Defendants from freely exercising their discretion to arrest. Even if there was an instruction, it has not been shown that it was such as to make the Police arrest against its better judgment. The evidence shows that the 3 Respondents had been working together to unravel the fraud. The day of the

arrest was thus not their first day of interface on the issue of fraud. Indeed, 1st and 2nd Defendants had given instructions to 3rd Defendant to freeze Applicants account and place same on red alert. The Police had clearly taken the initiative in the matter. It cannot therefore be correct to say that at the time of Applicant's arrest, the arrest was at the 3rd Respondent's instigation. I believe that at that point in time the Police had enough information to enable them exercise their discretion to arrest. The arrest, in the circumstances could not have been done by the Police under pressure from 3rd Defendant. The Police to my mind exercised its discretion freely. That a citizen reported a crime or acted as a pointer in identifying a suspect is not beyond the exercise of his civic duty. It was

not contended that Applicant was lured into going to the Molete Branch on the day in issue by 3rd Respondent. At worst, what happened is akin to a citizen assisting the Police in exercising its power of arrest by providing information to the Police.

Indeed, Applicant's position is that his arrest was on the 'instruction' of the 3rd Respondent. One wonders if 3rd Respondent was in a position to give instructions to the Police and even if so, whether the Police was bound to follow such instructions. I think in order to be liable, 3rd Respondent must have done something more than report to the Police. It must have instigated ie. made the Police act against its better judgment.

The 3rd Respondent cannot therefore be liable for the arrest of Applicant by 1st and 2nd Respondents.

It would seem from the reliefs claimed that they relate only to the arrest done when Applicant went to withdraw money from his account at 3rd Respondent's Molete/Challenge Branch, Ibadan. There is no relief that relates to Applicants' re-arrest. The arguments and depositions relating to the second arrest therefore go to no issue. The only arrest and detention that will be considered is the arrest and detention which took place when Applicant went to the Bank to collect money.

If 3rd Respondent is not liable for Applicant's arrest, it cannot therefore be liable

for his detention. Relief 1 therefore fails as regards 3rd Respondent.

As regards 1st and 2nd Respondents was there a reasonable suspicion to justify Applicant's arrest?

Reasonable suspicion must exist at the time of the arrest. I think it is the bundle of facts which if true can lead to a belief that the Applicant was probably involved in the offence or that there are questions which the Applicant ought to answer to shed more light on his role in the circumstances.

The evidence in 1st and 2nd Respondents' counter-affidavit shows that investigations were carried out by the Police upon a discovery of fraud by 3rd Respondent. Part of the proceeds of the fraud were traced to Applicant's account

with 3rd Respondent. It has been argued that since 3rd Respondent invited some people to explain how part of the proceeds got into their account, that same opportunity should have been availed Applicant. The opposite to this is why did Applicant not report an unexpected credit in his account to his Bank? After all an honest Nigerian did so in respect of N3, 000,000. The account statement does not also indicate the name of the depositor of N159, 000 into Applicant's account on 9th October 2014. With these facts at their disposal, I think 1st and 2nd Respondents were right in proceeding to arrest Applicant as these facts seem to be material upon which reasonable suspicion can be based.

Even though there are no details as to dates in relief 1, the description of the circumstances

justify a conclusion that the arrest referred to therein is that of 10th November, 2014. Indeed, the lapse of time between the date of deposit i.e 9/10/14 and the date of arrest i.e. 10/11/14 lends credence to paragraph 3(s) of 1st and 2nd

Respondents counter-affidavit to the effect that it took some time to effect Applicants' arrest.

I therefore find that the arrest of the Applicant by 1st and 2nd Respondents on 10th November 2014 was based upon a reasonable suspicion that he committed a crime.

It is note-worthy that the detention sequel to this arrest ended on 14/11/14 – it was for 5 days. The Applicant was not charged before a Court of competent jurisdiction within 24 hours. The 1st and 2nd Respondents sought to justify this period of detention by saying that the nature of the

alleged offence was reason for it. Another reason given was that investigation was still on. I do not think either of these suffices. The 1st and 2nd Respondents obviously arrested first before investigating. It should in my view be the other way round. The liberty of a citizen should not be curtailed without recourse to due process. That was not done.

1st and 2nd Respondents also contend that Applicant was offered bail upon his arrest. However, Exhibit MOJ2 was issued on 14/11/14 – the very day Applicant was released. I think 1st and 2nd Respondents are liable for the detention of Applicant for the period starting 24 hours after his arrest and detention.

In the course of his arrest on 10/11/14 Applicant contends that he was physically

tortured and emotionally traumatized by 1st and 2nd Respondents' Officers. In the further affidavit in addition to reiterating the allegation of torture, Applicant contended that he was coerced into making Exhibit MOJ1. 1st and 2nd Respondents posit that that is not so as Exhibit MOJ1 admitted some facts and denied others.

I do not agree with 1st and 2nd Respondents. If Applicant was arrested on 10/11/14, why were Exhibits MOJ1 – his statement and MOJ2 – bail bond executed on the same day? i.e. 14/11/14. This in my view lends credence to the assertion that Applicant was tortured and compelled to undertake to pay money. If it was otherwise, why was Applicant kept since 10/11/14 and only allowed to make a statement on 14/11/14. It was contended that Applicant

was offered bail before then. If that is true, why did he not make his statement before then?

Why did 1st and 2nd Respondents not produce the undertakings but state that he undertook to refund the money when he realized his errors and became sober. That is not consistent with making Exhibits MOJ1 and MOJ2 on the same day, days after his arrest and detention. I do not also agree with paragraph 3(x) that Applicant surrendered his ATM card, Passbook and Account holder's Identity Card. That would have made some sense had Applicant been released within 24 hours of his arrest and not kept up till 14/11/14 before he made his statement and was offered bail.

As regards the freezing of Applicant's account, 3rd Respondent contends that Banking

practice permits it. 1st and 2nd Respondents' position is that, it was done for purposes of investigation. Neither of them cited any Legal justification for freezing Applicant's account without resort to due process.

Since relief 8 seems premised on the second arrest in respect of which there is no claim it is hereby struck out.

Accordingly, reliefs 1-4 succeed against 1st and 2nd Respondents. They fail as regards 3rd Respondents. Reliefs 5-7 succeed against all the Respondents. Relief 9 and 10 succeed against 1st and 2nd Respondents.

Relief 11 relates to damages. The complaints to be remedied are:

- denial of access to Applicant's account and the seized items.

- physical, mental and psychological damage to Applicant's person.

I do not think that exemplary damages or aggravated damages avail in the circumstances.

The Applicant has not brought himself within the purview of either specie of damages. I however agree that regardless of the length, any detention that is unlawful attracts an award of damages.


The circumstances of the detention are material. Applicant was taken from Ibadan to Ilorin. He was kept in detention in Ilorin from 11th to 14th November 2014. It would appear that 1st and 2nd Respondents just kept him in detention because they neither took his statement nor offered him bail. Indeed his statement was taken on the same day he was

offered bail. Even if the alleged fraud took place in Ilorin, Applicant at best took advantage of it in Ibadan. I do not really see why he had to be taken to Ilorin and then kept till 14/11/14 before his statement was taken. I think that could have been done in Ibadan. He was in my view taken to Ilorin just to make it more difficult for him to get help from friends and family. I think this should not be encouraged. He was also tortured in detention. He clearly suffered physical, mental and psychological damage. He was denied access to his account and his personal everyday items causing grave inconvenience in the course of his trade. I do not think this loss can be quantified.

In the circumstances, I award the sum of N500, 000 in favour of the Applicant against the Respondents in the following proportions:

- N200, 000 against 3rd Respondent for unlawfully freezing Applicant's account.
- N300, 000 against 1st and 2nd Respondents for unlawfully directing 3rd Respondent to freeze Applicant's account and put it under red alert.

The said figure also represents damages for breach of Applicant's fundamental rights, as prayed.


A.O. FAJI
JUDGE
13/11/15

Counsel:

Y.A. Alajo Esq for Applicant.
Ayoola Idowu Akande Esq

for 1st & 2nd Respondents;
S.M.H. Kosemani Esq with him
Y.L. Akanbi with U. Omotosho Esq
and A.S. Ibrahim-Gambari Esq for
3rd Respondent.