

INJUNCTIONS, DISCRETION
AND THE RULE OF LAW

PREPARED AND PRESENTED BY:

**HON. JUSTICE SYLVANUS CHINEDU ORIJI,
HIGH COURT OF THE FEDERAL
CAPITAL TERRITORY, ABUJA**

**BEING A PAPER PRESENTED AT THE HYBRID
REFRESHER COURSE ORGANISED BY THE
NATIONAL JUDICIAL INSTITUTE [NJI] FOR:**

**HON. JUDGES OF THE SUPERIOR COURTS OF RECORD
[HON. JUDGES OF THE FEDERAL HIGH COURT,
NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL COURT, HIGH COURT OF THE
FEDERAL CAPITAL TERRITORY, ABUJA, STATE HIGH
COURTS, HON. KADIS OF SHARIA COURTS OF APPEAL
AND HON. JUDGES OF CUSTOMARY COURTS OF
APPEAL]**

**HELD AT THE ANDREWS OTUTU
OBASEKI AUDITORIUM**

ON TUESDAY, 11TH FEBRUARY, 2025.

INTRODUCTION

I thank the Management of the National Judicial Institute [NJI] under the leadership of My Lord, *Hon. Justice Salisu Garba Abdullahi*, the Administrator of NJI [former Hon. Chief Judge of the High Court of the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Abuja], for the privilege to participate at this Hybrid Refresher Course organized for Hon. Judges of the Superior Courts of Record in Nigeria.

The theme of this Refresher Course/Workshop is: “*Strengthening Public Trust and Confidence in the Judiciary*”. The title of my Paper - *Injunctions, Discretion and The Rule of Law* - is apt. This is because proper exercise of the Court’s discretion in the grant or refusal of orders of injunction and the observance of the principles of the rule of law will invariably strengthen public trust and confidence in the Judiciary. Conversely, improper exercise of the discretion of the Court in the grant or refusal of orders of injunction and the non-observance of the principles of the rule of law will whittle down or erode public trust and confidence in the Judiciary.

Injunctions, Discretions and the Rule of Law are aspects of our jurisprudence and legal practice, which feature regularly in adjudication by the Courts and are well-known to Your Lordships. This Workshop provides an opportunity to remind ourselves of what we know and to discuss ways of improving our law and practice in these areas. By the Guidelines of the NJI for this Paper, the page limit is 15 pages, the font type is Times New Roman, the font size is 14 and 1.5 line-spacing. Therefore, the Paper will be a synopsis or outline of the subject matter.

The paper will consider the following: [a] Concept of Injunctions; [b] Classification or types of Injunctions; [c] Concept of Discretion and exercise of same by Judges in the grant or refusal of orders of Injunction; [d] The Rule of Law and the role of Judges in the observance of the Rule of Law.

A. Concept of Injunctions

Injunction is a discretionary order of an equitable nature issued by the Court directing a person to do, or to refrain from doing, a specified act. In **Aboseldehyde Laboratories Plc. v. Union Merchant Bank Ltd. & Anor. [2013] LPELR-201980 [SC]**, the Supreme Court defined injunction as “... *a judicial process or mandate operating in personam by which upon certain established principles of equity, a party is required to do or refrain from doing a particular act.*”

The purpose of an order of injunction pending the determination of the case is to preserve the *res* of the litigation for the benefit of the winning party as may be decided by the Court. A claim for injunction is ancillary to the main claim. Thus, where a Court has no jurisdiction over the subject matter of the suit, it ought not to grant an order of interim or interlocutory injunction in the matter.

B. Classification or Types of Injunctions

The types of injunctions include: [i] Mandatory Injunction; [ii] Interim Injunction; [iii] Interlocutory Injunction; [iv] Perpetual Injunction; [v] Mareva Injunction; [vi] Anton Pillar Injunction; and [vii] Injunction pending appeal. In the light of the focus and objective of this Paper as spelt out by NJI, I will make brief remarks on [i]-[iv].

[i] Mandatory Injunction

An order of mandatory injunction is a positive order of Court requiring a party to do a specific act or action. See the case of **Elias & Anor. v. Ecobank [Nig] Plc. [2015] LPELR-41003 [CA]**. The order is directed against a completed act with the aim of restoring the condition of things in the matter to the situation before the application for injunction.

In **Abubakar & Ors. v. Jos Metropolitan Development Board & Anor. [1997] LPELR-5301 [CA]**, the Court outlined some of the circumstances in which mandatory injunction may be granted. One of the circumstances that may warrant the grant of an order of mandatory injunction is where the defendant attempts to

steal a match on the claimant such as where, on receipt of notice that an injunction is about to be applied for, the defendant hurries on the work in respect of which complaint is made so that when he receives notice of an injunction, it is completed.

In deserving cases, the Court may also grant an order of mandatory injunction in order to maintain, restore and preserve its dignity. In the case of **Abbi v. Chief [PRO] J. J. T. Princewill & Ors. [2011 LPELR-3952 [CA]]** His Lordship, Ejembi Eko, JCA as he then was] held **at pages 14-15, paras E-E:**

"Restorative or mandatory injunction by its very nature is designed to judicially instill discipline on an erring party in order for the Court to maintain, restore and preserve its dignity and respect. ... The Court exercises this, inter alia, to undo what has been done by the erring party irrespective of what the Court will decide on the merits ... when the matter is heard."

[ii] Interim Injunction

An order of interim injunction is granted to prevent a person from taking certain action[s] or to maintain the *status quo* of the *res* or subject matter of the suit until a definite date or until further order is made or pending the hearing and determination of a motion on notice. It is usually granted in cases of real urgency and imminent irreparable damage to the *res* or subject matter of the suit. The urgency must be real and not self-inflicted. See **Kotoye v. CBN [1989] 1 NWLR [Pt. 98] 419** and **Ochoma & Ors. v. Ideozu & Ors. [2001] LPELR-12831 [CA]**.

[iii] Interlocutory Injunction

The purpose of an order of interlocutory injunction is the preservation of the *status quo* of the *res* of the litigation pending the determination of the substantive suit. In determining whether or not to grant an order of interlocutory injunction, the applicant must satisfy the Court of some conditions as set out in **Kotoye v. CBN [supra] 419** and **Ahamadu v. A. G., Rivers State & Ors. [1996] LPELR-14004**.

The applicant must satisfy the Court that: [i] he has a legal right in respect of the subject matter of the suit; [ii] there are substantial or serious issues to be determined in the main suit; [iii] the balance of convenience is in his favour, that is whether more justice will result in granting the injunction than in refusing it; [iv] monetary damages will not be adequate compensation for the injury from the violation of his right if he succeeds in the action; [v] he is not guilty of any reprehensible conduct, such as delay in bringing the application; and [vi] he has given undertaking to pay damages to the respondent if it turns out that the order of interlocutory injunction ought not to have been made.

Please note that in order to determine the balance of convenience, the Judge is expected to pose these questions: “*who will suffer more inconvenience if the application is granted?*” and “*who will suffer more inconvenience if the application is not granted?*” See **Edosomwan v. Erebor [2001] 13 NWLR [Pt. 730] 265.**

In some cases, it may be difficult - from the affidavit evidence of the parties and the nature of the subject matter of the suit - to determine where the scale of balance of convenience tilts. My respectful advice is that in such circumstance, it is proper for the Judge to order the parties to maintain the *status quo* of the *res* or subject matter of the litigation until the determination of the suit. The *status quo* to be maintained may be *ante bellum* or as at the date of the order [depending on the facts of the case]. This is more so as the main purpose of an order of interlocutory injunction is to maintain the *status quo* of the *res* of the litigation until the determination of the suit. See the case of **Ezebilo v. Chinwuba [1997] 7 NWLR [Pt. 511] 108.**

Finally, in determining an application for interlocutory injunction, the Judge must refrain from pre-judging or deciding live issues that would arise in the main suit. See **C.G.C. Nig. Ltd. v. Baba [2004] 10 NWLR [Pt. 882] 658.** Thus, where the grant of the order of interlocutory injunction is likely to pre-judge live issues in the substantive suit, prudence dictates that the application should be refused. In deserving cases, the Judge may make an order for accelerated hearing of the suit.

[iv] Perpetual Injunction

An order of perpetual injunction is granted after a final hearing of the case on the merits. It will only be granted to an applicant after he has satisfied the Court that he has a legal right to be protected because the order is usually made to preserve an established legal right. See *Ojo v. Akinsanoye* [2014] LPELR-22736 [CA].

C. Concept of Discretion and Exercise of Same by Judges in the Grant or Refusal of Orders of Injunction

Simply put, “*Discretion*” is the freedom or power to decide what should be done in a particular situation. See *EFCC v. Akingbola* [2014] LPELR-24257 [CA] @ page 30, paras A-E [Per Amina Adamu Augie, JSC] and *Ajuwa c. SPDC* [Nig.] Ltd. [2011] 18 NWLR [Pt. 1279] 797.

At page 479 of the Seventh Edition of Black’s Law Dictionary by Bryan A. Garner, “*Discretion*” is defined as: “*A public official’s power or right to act in certain circumstances according to personal judgment and conscience.*”

At the same page, “*Judicial Discretion*” is defined as: “*The exercise of judgment by a judge or court based on what is fair under the circumstances and guided by the rules and principle of law; a court’s power to act or not act when a litigant is not entitled to demand the act as a matter of right.*” In *Onovo & Ors. v. Mba & Ors* [2014] LPELR-23035 [SC] @ page 66, paras. C-E, His Lordship, Nwali Sylvester Ngwuta, JSC had this to say on the concept of discretion of a Court:

“Discretion, when applied to a Court of justice, means sound discretion guided by law. ... Discretion means equitable decision of what is just and proper under the circumstances or a liberty or privilege to decide and act in accordance with what is fair and equitable under the peculiar case guided by the principles of law.”

A common factor in all types of orders of injunction is that the grant or refusal is at the discretion of the Court as the remedy is equitable. The discretion must be exercised judicially and judiciously based on the facts of each case. The exercise of discretion by a Judge may be taxing in some cases especially in the grant or refusal of an *ex parte* order of interim injunction where urgency has been disclosed by the applicant and the act, harm or danger sought to be restrained is imminent.

As I said before, an order of injunction is not granted as a matter of course. In the case of an *ex parte* order of interim injunction, since the other party has not stated his side of the case, a Judge must be wary or circumspect in granting the order except where the facts and the law support a favourable exercise of discretion.

I humbly recommend that in exercising discretion on whether to grant or refuse an order of interim injunction, a Judge must be guided by these additional factors: [i] the need to preserve the dignity of the Judge and the Court; [ii] the exercise of the discretion must be reasonable and based on the facts and the law; and [iii] in some cases, the need to preserve law, order and the overall interest of the society.

In the NJI Guidelines for this Paper, one of the key points is: “*Case studies highlighting successful and controversial uses of injunction.*” One of the objectives in the Guidelines is that: “*At the conclusion of this session, participants should be able to: ... Analyze case studies to draw lessons from the appropriate and inappropriate exercise of judicial discretion.*”

In compliance with the Guidelines, let me reflect on a case where I had the onerous task to exercise discretion in an *ex parte* application for interim orders of injunction in relation to the *End Bad Governance Protest* which took place from 1/8/2024 to 10/8/2024.

On Wednesday, 31/7/2024, while I was serving as the Head of the Vacation Court of the High Court of the FCT, Abuja, a case file was forwarded to me from the

Registry of the Court with Suit No. FCT/HC/CV/3472/2024: Honourable Minister of FCT v. Omoyele Sowere & 11 Ors. An *ex parte* motion for interim injunction and a motion for interlocutory injunction were filed along with the writ of summons.

The 1st & 2nd defendants [Omoyele Sowere and Damilare Adenola] were sued as the founders and promoters of *TAKE IT BACK MOVEMENT*. The 3rd & 4th defendants [Adama Ukpabi and Tosin Harsogba] were sued as the founders and promoters of *ACTIVE CITIZENS GROUP*. The 5th defendant was “*Persons Unknown*”. The 6th to 12th defendants were the security agencies [i.e. Inspector General of Police, Director General, Department of State Security Services, Chief of Army Staff, etc.].

The claimant/applicant prayed the Court for:

1. *An order of interim injunction restraining the 1st-5th defendants from gathering or parading themselves along any roadway, street, office, and/or public premises/property within the FCT between 1st-10th August, 2024 or any other day thereafter pending the hearing and determination of the Motion on Notice.*
2. *An order of interim injunction mandating the 6th-12th defendants to restrain and or prevent the 1st-5th defendants from gathering or parading themselves along any roadway, office, and/or public premises/property within the FCT between 1st-10th August, 2024 or any other day thereafter pending the hearing and determination of the Motion on Notice.*

Some of the depositions in the affidavit in support of the motion were that:

- a) *The claimant is the chief security officer of the FCT. Ordinarily, the claimant and the Federal Government of Nigeria are not averse to peaceful protest but unfortunately, intelligence/security report reaching him has it that some elements within the 1st-5th defendants intend to capitalize on the planned protest to cause havoc, and irreparable damage may be done by not just*

converging themselves to protest, but to destroy public facilities, blocking roadways to prevent movement of persons and vehicles, disturb public peace and order, among other things.

b) The best way to forestall any likely crisis or criminality being intended by some elements within the organizers of the planned protest is to prevent or restrain them from converging themselves in any major public facilities or offices/premises or parading themselves along any major roadways/streets within the FCT.

In the said affidavit, the letter dated Friday, 26/7/2024, from *TAKE IT BACK MOVEMENT, FCT* signed by the 2nd defendant [Damilare Adenola] addressed to the claimant was attached as Exhibit A. The affidavit disclosed that the letter was received by the claimant on Monday, 29/7/2024. The letter - a copy of which is attached at the last page of this Paper - reads in part:

“As one of the groups organizing the forthcoming #EndBadGovernance protest, #DaysOfRage starting from August 1st to 10th, 2024: we at the Take it Back Movement [TIB] write to your esteemed office, to notify you of our decision to use the Eagle Square as a point of convergence for patriotic Nigerians to demand for better governance. ...

In short, we ask that the protesters are accorded the courtesy accorded to foreign and local official dignitaries who have frequently used the space. In addition, we request that the outer wire mesh barrier facing the Aso Rock Villa be removed in the meantime, as protesters may decide to visit the Presidential Villa during the protest. ...”

I must confess that the exercise of discretion to grant or refuse the *ex parte* application was a difficult task, bearing in mind that the planned protest, subject matter of the application, was to begin the next day [1/8/2024].

Upon considering the prayers sought; the affidavit evidence; the need to preserve law, order and the overall interest of the society; and the need to avert casualties that may possibly occur if the protesters enter [or visit] the Presidential Villa [as stated in the said letter, Exhibit A] and are confronted by security agents guarding the Presidential Villa, I held the view that the prayer sought by the claimant/applicant for an order of interim injunction:

“... is akin to restraining the 1st-5th defendants/respondents from embarking on protest. The Court recognizes the constitutional right of every citizen of Nigeria to embark on a peaceful protest. That right, in my view, cannot be violated by a restraining order of interim injunction as prayed.

The point must however be made that in the exercise of the right to protest, every citizen has an obligation to ensure that properties of other citizens and of the government and other public facilities are not destroyed. In the affidavit in support of the motion, the claimant/applicant has stated facts to the effect that the proposed protest is likely to lead to destruction of public facilities and prevent movement of persons and vehicles, in addition to disturbance of public peace and order.

In the light of the above, the Court considers it appropriate and expedient to grant an order under the omnibus or general prayer to ensure that the rights of the protesters are guaranteed and that the protest does not negatively or adversely affect the rights of other citizens to move about and to ensure that properties and other public facilities are not destroyed.”

I made the following orders:

- 1. The 1st-5th defendants/respondents, while embarking on the planned protest from 1/8/2024 to 10/8/2024 in exercise of their constitutional rights are to use the Moshood Abiola Stadium in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja only and are restrained by an Order of Interim Injunction from gathering in any other place pending the hearing and determination of the Motion on Notice.*

2. *The 1st-5th defendants/respondents, while embarking on the planned protest from 1/8/2024 to 10/8/2024 are restrained by an Order of Interim Injunction from preventing residents in the FCT, Abuja from exercising their constitutional right to freedom of movement and from destroying or vandalizing properties or public facilities pending the hearing and determination of the Motion on Notice.*
3. *The 6th-12th defendants/respondents are directed to give the 1st-5th defendants/respondents adequate protection within the Moshood Abiola Stadium in the Federal Capital Territory, Abuja throughout the period of the planned protest from 1/8/2024 to 10/8/2024 pending the hearing and determination of the Motion on Notice.*

Now, as I said before, the exercise of discretion by a Judge is “*based on what is fair under the circumstances and guided by the rules and principle of law*”. This means that given the same facts, two Judges may arrive at different decisions. The settled position of the law is that no case can be authority for another in matters of discretion. Thus, where a trial Judge has exercised his discretion over a matter, an appellate Court is not likely to interfere on the ground that it might have exercised the discretion differently if it were in a position to do so. See **Chandria & Ors. v. Balogun & Ors. [2024] LPELR-61836 [CA]**.

However, the appellate Court will interfere where the trial Judge exercised his discretion under a wrong principle or mistake of law or under a misapprehension of the facts. The position of the law was aptly stated by My Lord, *Ugochukwu Anthony Ogakwu*, JCA in **Leadership Group Ltd. & Anor. v. Infinity Security Services Ltd. [2023] LPELR-61364 [CA] @ 21-22, paras. D-F** thus:

"It is now aphoristic and apothegmatic to state that a discretion properly exercised will not be lightly interfered with by an appellate Court, even where the appellate Court is of the view that it might have exercised the discretion differently. It is only where a Court exercised discretion under a wrong

principle or mistake of law or under a misapprehension of the facts ... In other words, and to put it more pungently, the exercise of discretion will only be reversed where the Court exercised its discretion wrongly by failing to give due weight to relevant considerations on which the exercise of judicial discretion is based. Also, it is where the manner of exercise of discretion has been reckless, arbitrary, or capricious that an appellate Court can interfere”.

From the nature of exercise of discretion, there can be no doubt that another Judge faced with the same facts in the Protest Case may have arrived at a different decision such as refusing the orders sought or granting the orders. I am glad that I made the above orders in view of the wanton destruction and looting of properties by hoodlums and opportunists amongst the protesters in some parts of the Country and even in parts of the FCT, Abuja during the “*End Bad Governance Protest*”.

In line with the NJI Guidelines for this Paper, I will refer to one case where the Court of Appeal interfered with the exercise of discretion by a Judge in the grant of an order of interlocutory injunction. The case is **Okey Wali Esq. & Ors. v. Seth O. Amaefule Esq. & Ors. [2014] LPELR-22435 [CA]**. In that case, the learned trial Judge granted an order of interlocutory injunction restraining the defendants/appellants from implementing/enforcing the increased practicing fees payable by legal practitioners.

The legality or otherwise of the increment in the Bar practicing fees was the bone of contention in the suit filed at the Federal High Court. The Court of Appeal held that the exercise of discretion by the learned trial Judge was arbitrary. The Court of Appeal set aside the ruling of the Federal High Court and dismissed the application.

As I conclude my thoughts on exercise of discretion by a Judge, let me remark that whenever a Judge is called upon to exercise discretion in a matter especially in an *ex parte* motion for interim injunction, he must be courageous to grant the order where, from the facts and the law, it is expedient, just and proper to do so. A Judge

must also be courageous to refuse the order where, from the facts of the case and the law, it is not expedient, just or proper to do so.

D: The Rule of Law and the Role of Judges
in the observance of the Rule of Law

Simply put, the rule of law means that everything must be done according to the law. The rule of law is critical for the advancement of democracy, rooted in equal rights to all citizens. By strengthening the rule of law, we protect the rights of all people, advance inclusiveness and limit the arbitrary exercise of power, which are the inherent features of democracy.

The principles of the rule of law include: [i] supremacy of the law and equality of all before the law [the law of the land is supreme, everyone must be treated equally under the law, and no one is above the law; [ii] separation of powers [the government is subject to the law, and the powers of different branches of government are separated]; [iii] independent judiciary [courts are independent and impartial]; [iv] legal certainty [laws are clear, predictable and accessible]; and [v] human rights [human rights are protected and the law is consistent with international human rights standards; and [vi] absence of corruption.

The benefits of the observance of the rule of law include: [i] the rule of law promotes justice, equity, opportunity and peace; [ii] it ensures that the law is applied fairly and consistently; [iii] it ensures that everyone is held accountable to the same laws; and [iv] it ensures that the government is accountable to the law.

Now, what is the role of Judges in the observance of the rule of law? The starting point is to refer to the decision of His Lordship, *Andrews Otutu Obaseki, JSC* in the case of **Military Governor of Lagos State & Ors. v. Ojukwu [1986] LPELR-3186 [SC] @ pages 21-22, paras. D-A**, thus:

"The Nigerian Constitution is founded on the rule of law, the primary meaning of which is that everything must be done according to law. It means also that government should be conducted within the framework of recognized rules and principles which restrict discretionary power ...

More relevant to the case in hand, the rule of law means that disputes as to the legality of acts of government are to be decided by judges who are wholly independent of the executive. ... The judiciary cannot shirk its sacred responsibility to the nation to maintain the rule of law. ... "

The above pronouncement emphasizes the fact that it is the role of Judges [the judiciary] to ensure that the principles of the rule of law are upheld. My Lords, let us, as Judges, uphold the dictates of our oaths of office and be purposive in upholding the rule of law. Judges should also ensure that judgment and court orders are obeyed by persons affected. Where contempt proceedings are initiated before the Court for disobedience of its judgment or order, every Judge is urged to be courageous to punish those who disobey Court judgment and order when the alleged disobedience is established.

My Lords, distinguished participants, at this juncture, permit me to raise an issue for discussion arising from the independence of the judiciary, which is one of the principles of the rule of law. Part of the decision in the *Ojukwu's case [supra]* is that *"the rule of law means that disputes as to the legality of acts of government are to be decided by judges who are wholly independent of the executive."*

The critical question or issue is whether the constitutional provisions on appointment of Justices, Judges and Heads of Court guarantee a Judiciary or *"judges who are wholly independent of the executive."* In other words, can Justices [and Judges] effectively perform their duties of upholding the rule of law in the light of the provisions of the 1999 Constitution [as amended] relating to the appointment of Justices and Judges especially the Heads of the various Courts?

By sections 231[2], 238[2], 250[2], 254B[2], 256[2], 261[2] and 266[2] of the 1999 Constitution [as amended], the appointments of the Justices, Judges and Kadis in these provisions are by the President of the Federal Republic of Nigeria on the recommendation of the National Judicial Council [NJC]. Under section 231[2], the appointment of a Justice of the Supreme Court is subject to confirmation by the Senate. Sections 270[2], 276[2] and 281[2] thereof give the power of appointment of Judges of the High Court, Kadis of the Sharia Courts of Appeal and Judges of the Customary Courts of Appeal in the States to the Governors of the States.

Now, subject to better view, the Judiciary does not play any role in the appointments made by the Executive and the Legislature. I reason that the appointment of judicial officers should be by the NJC if judicial officers [and the judiciary] are to be truly independent in the performance of their duties and exercise their judicial discretions in accordance with the principles of the rule of law.

More worrisome are the provisions of the 1999 Constitution [as amended] relating to the appointments of various Heads of Court. For appointments of Acting Heads of Court, the most senior Justice or Judge of the Court where vacancy occurs shall be appointed in an acting capacity. See for example section 231[4] thereof on the appointment of Acting Chief Justice of Nigeria and section 271[4] on the appointment of Acting Chief Judge of a State.

Curiously, the constitutional provisions on the appointments of Heads of various Court are so uncertain. For example, section 231[3] provides: *“A person shall not be qualified to hold the office of Chief Justice of Nigeria or a Justice of the Supreme Court, unless he is qualified to practice as a legal practitioner in Nigeria and has been so qualified for a period of not less than fifteen years.”* Experience over the years has shown that appointments of Heads of Courts especially in the States are riddled with executive discretion and external influence. Regrettably, the subtle institutionalization of this practice is greatly undermining the fundamental principle of judicial independence.

Due to the power of appointment of Heads of Courts in the States, some Governors have attempted to remove Chief Judges of their States; such as the attempt by the Governor of Kogi State in conjunction with the State House of Assembly to remove *Hon. Justice Umaru Ali Eri* as Chief Judge of Kogi State in 2008. Another attempt was made in 2019 by the Governor of Kogi State in conjunction with the State House of Assembly to remove *Hon. Justice Nasir Ajanah* as Chief Judge of Kogi State. These attempts were struck down and set aside by My Lord, *Hon. Justice A. O. Ajileye* in his judgments delivered on 16/5/2008 in *Suit No. HC/KK/002CV/2008* and on 18/6/2019 in *Suit No. HC/11CV/2019* respectively.

Another issue arising from the uncertainty of the provisions on the appointment of Heads of Court is the desire [or attempt] in the past by some legal practitioners to be appointed as Justices of the Supreme Court. It is hoped that someday, a private legal practitioner will not be appointed as the Chief Justice of Nigeria or Head of any other Court. It seems that these provisions are to ensure that the Executive continues to have control over the Judiciary.

The Legislature has initiated the process of amending the Constitution. If the Judiciary is not satisfied with these provisions, there is opportunity to make proposals to the Legislature that will guarantee the independence of the Judiciary especially in relation to appointment of Heads of Court and other judicial officers.

Conclusion

It will not be proper to exceed the prescribed limit of 15 pages. Let me again thank the NJI for the privilege and thank Your Lordships for listening. I respectfully invite My Lords to the questions, comments and discussion session.



TAKE IT BACK MOVEMENT, FCT

WWW.TAKEITBACKGLOBAL.COM

Mr. Nyesom Wike,
Minister of the Federal Capital
Territory,
Abuja.

26 July, 2024

Dear Minister,

REQUEST FOR USE OF EAGLES SQUARE ABUJA FOR #ENDBADGOVERNANCE PROTEST

As one of the groups organizing the forthcoming #EndBadGovernance protest, #DaysOfRage starting from August 1st to 10th, 2024; we at the Take it Back Movement (TIB), write to your esteemed office, to notify you of our decision to use the Eagles Square as a point of convergence for patriotic Nigerians to demand for better governance.

This request entails using this national asset-day and night for the duration of the historic protest. Also, note that the protest may be prolonged beyond ten days as we embark on resolving the protracted national crisis occasioned by the ruling party.

Further, your office must also ensure the provision of a 24-hour power supply, toilet facilities, water, and security for the convenience of Nigerian citizens who will be camped out at Eagle Square.

In short, we ask that the protesters are accorded the courtesy accorded to foreign and local official dignitaries who have frequently used the space. In addition, we request that the outer wire mesh barrier facing the Aso Rock Villa be removed in the meantime, as protesters may decide to visit the Presidential Villa during the protest.

It is our sincere hope that this request will be granted expeditiously.

Revolutionary regards,


Damilare Adenola
Director of Mobilization

Phone
09037506418

Email
info@takeitbackglobal.com