

THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA
IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF UGANDA AT KAMPALA
(Coram: Elizabeth Musoke, Muzamiru M. Kibeedi and Monica K. Mugenyi, JJA)
ELECTION PETITION APPLICATION No. 16 & 17 OF 2021

5 **WAIRA JAMES KYEWALABYE MAJEGERE SITINGO ::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::: APPLICANT**
VERSUS

KUBEKETERYA JAMES :: RESPONDENT
AND

ELECTION PETITION APPLICATION No. 38 OF 2022

10 **WAIRA JAMES KYEWALABYE MAJEGERE SITINGO ::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::: APPLICANT**
VERSUS

1. KUBEKETERYA JAMES]
2. ELECTORAL COMMISSION] ::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::: RESPONDENTS

15 **RULING OF THE COURT**

Background: -

Hon. Waira James Kyewalabye Majegere Sitingo (applicant) and Hon. Kubeketerya James (1st respondent) contested for the seat of Member of Parliament for Bunya East Constituency in the national General Elections held on the 14th of January 2021. The Electoral Commission
20 (2nd Respondent) declared and gazetted the 1st respondent as the validly elected Member of Parliament for the constituency. The applicant was dissatisfied with the results and filed a Petition in the High Court of Uganda at Jinja challenging the outcome of the election.

On the 8th of November, 2021, the High Court (Hon. Mr. Justice Isah Sserunkuuma) dismissed the Petition and declared the 1st respondent as the validly elected Member of
25 Parliament for Bunya County East, Mayuge District.

On the 9th November, 2021, the applicant filed a Notice of Appeal and a letter requesting for a certified copy of the trial court proceedings in the Registry of the High Court of Uganda at Jinja. The applicant was able to serve the Notice of Appeal and the Letter applying for proceedings on the 2nd respondent only. The applicant failed to serve the 1st respondent the Notice of Appeal and the Letter applying for proceedings.

On the 16th of November 2021, the applicant filed the Memorandum of Appeal in the Registry of the Court of Appeal. As was the case with the Notice of Appeal, the applicant succeeded in serving the Memorandum of Appeal on only the 2nd respondent but not the 1st respondent.

On the 15th of December 2021, the Deputy Registrar of the Jinja High Court electronically served the applicant's Counsel a draft of the typed proceedings of the trial court. But the said proceedings were incomplete as they omitted the proceedings for the 18th day of August 2021. Further, they contained several typing errors which the applicant's Counsel pointed out to the Registrar by their letter dated the 22nd December 2021 and requested for rectification of the same.

In the meantime, on the 18th of November 2021, the applicant filed in the Registry of this Court Election Petition Application No. 16 of 2021 against the 1st respondent seeking extension of the time within which to serve the Respondent with a Notice of Appeal. In the same application, the applicant sought an order of substituted service to be issued against the 1st Respondent so that he can be served with the Notice of Appeal and Memorandum of Appeal through *The New Vision* or *The Monitor* newspapers. The major grounds for the application were that the 1st respondent had gone into hiding and could not be traced in order for the applicant's advocates to serve him personally. Further, the advocates who represented the 1st respondent before the High Court declined service.

On the 24th of November, 2021, the applicant filed a second Election Petition Application (EPA) against the 1st Respondent seeking to extend the time within which to serve the Memorandum of Appeal upon the 1st Respondent, vide: EPA No.17 of 2021. In the same application, the applicant once again sought an order of substituted service to be issued

against the 1st Respondent so that he could be served with the Memorandum of Appeal
55 through *The New Vision* or *The Monitor* newspapers. The major grounds for the said
application were that the efforts to effect personal service upon the 1st respondent had failed
as he could not be located at his known residence at Kyaliwajala, Mbalwa Road in Kira
Municipality and his Parliamentary office located on Kingdom Mall, Kampala - Room No.
E534. Further, that even the efforts to effect service on the 1st respondent through the
60 Speaker of Parliament and the advocates who represented the 1st respondent during the High
Court proceedings, Ms Muzuusa & Co. Advocates and Ms Wagabaza and Co. Advocates
were futile as each one of them declined service.

On the 15th day of February 2022, the Deputy Registrar of Jinja High Court supplied the
applicant's advocates the complete Record of proceedings and judgment of the trial court
65 duly certified by him. The applicant's counsel, in turn, filed in the Registry of this court the
Record of appeal on 21st February 2022.

Further, on 21st February 2022, the applicant filed in this court the 3rd Election Petition
Application arising from the same election namely, EPA No.38 of 2022, seeking to validate
the Record of Appeal lodged in this Court outside the prescribed time. The applicant also
70 sought validation of the service of the Record of Appeal upon the 1st and 2nd respondents
which was done out of time. The major ground upon which the application is based is that
despite the vigilance on the part of the applicant's advocates to follow up the typing and
certification of the proceedings of the trial court, they were availed the same after the period
prescribed for filing the Record of Appeal had lapsed.

75 Each one of the three applications was supported by an Affidavit deponed by the applicant
elaborating the grounds which prompted the filing of each respective application. The
respondents did not file any Affidavit in Reply in any of the three applications.

Representations: -

At the hearing of the three applications, the applicant was represented by Mr. Kalali Steven
80 and Mr. Lule Kennedy Ben; while the 1st Respondent was jointly represented by Mr. Asuman

Nyonyintono, Ms. Lydia Ntono and Mr. Daniel Mudhumbusi. The 2nd Respondent was represented by Mr. Eric Ssabiti holding brief for Mr. Lugolobi Hamid. The appellant and the 1st respondent were both present in court.

85 Counsel invited this court to consider their respective written submissions which they had already filed before the hearing date.

Applicant's submissions: -

90 In their Written submissions in respect of EPA No. 16/2021 and EPA No. 17/2021, Counsel for the applicant argued that the Applicant, through his lawyers and the process server, took all essential steps to ensure service of the Notice of Appeal and the Memorandum of Appeal on the 1st respondent within the prescribed time but he evaded service of the same in a bid to frustrate the progress of the appeal. That this is what created the need to file the instant applications seeking extension of time to effect service on the 1st respondent by way of substituted service.

95 Counsel further submitted that even the 1st respondent's advocates, M/s Wagabaza & Co. Advocates together with M/s Muzuusa & Co. Advocates, declined service of court process as they claimed to have no instructions from the 1st respondent to accept the court documents.

100 In the premises, so submitted Counsel, it is just and equitable that the time of serving the Notice of Appeal and Memorandum of Appeal be extended and that service be effected by way of substituted service as there is sufficient cause warranting the same. Counsel further submitted that the Applicant was diligent in exercising his right of appeal by filing the Notice of Appeal, the Letter requesting for Proceedings and the Memorandum of Appeal in time and he duly served the same on the 2nd Respondent. That evasion of service by the 1st Respondent constituted a good reason for grant of the prayers set out in EPA Nos. 16 & 17 of 2021.

105 As regards EPA No. 38 of 2022, Counsel submitted that the failure to file the Record of Appeal in time arose due to circumstances beyond his control as it is the trial court itself, through its Officials, who failed to execute their mandate to expeditiously avail him with

Certified Record of Proceedings in time as required by Rule 2 of the Parliamentary Elections (Elections Petitions) (Production of Record of Appeal) Directions SI 141-1. Counsel prayed to this Court to find the delay on Court's part as reason enough or exceptional cause warranting validating the Record of Appeal filed out of time so that the Appeal is heard and disposed of on its merits.

Respondent's submissions: -

In their oral submissions which they made when the three applications were called for hearing, Counsel for the 1st respondent stated that their objections to the applications were on matters of law in two aspects namely: the applicant did not effect service of the Notice of Appeal, letter requesting for the Record of proceedings and the Memorandum of Appeal as required by law.

Second, that the Record of Appeal was availed to the applicant in time, but they filed it out of time. Counsel stated that their detailed arguments on the above points of law were part of the Conferencing Notes which they invited us to consider as their submissions.

We have looked at the arguments of Counsel for the 1st respondent as set out in their written Conferencing Notes/Submissions. Counsel simply stated a truism namely, that the Notice of Appeal and Memorandum of Appeal were not served upon the 1st respondent within the time prescribed by the Rules of this court. Further, that the Record of Appeal was likewise filed out of time. But these are not the real issues arising from any of the three applications before us. The applicant, in his each one of the Affidavits in Support of the three applications, admitted that he did not take the required actions within the prescribed time. However, he craves to be granted leave to rectify or otherwise validate the errors and omissions on account of the reasons he has advanced which he believes constitute "sufficient reason". To that extent, the arguments of the 1st respondent are not helpful. They are irrelevant in the resolution of the real issue raised by the three applications for consideration by this court namely, whether the reasons advanced by the applicant to account for his failure to serve the Notice of Appeal and Memorandum of Appeal on the 1st respondent plus the delay to file the Record of Appeal

135 amounts to sufficient reason to grant extension of time within the terms of Rule 5 of the Rules
of this court under which the three applications were brought.

Resolution

We have considered the pleadings and the evidence on record, as well as the submissions of
counsel for either party in support of and/or in opposition to the respective Applications. The
issues and evidence in the three applications are closely interconnected. As such, court on its
140 own motion decided to consolidate the three applications and resolve the issues in one go.

The issues raised by the pleadings and submissions in the three applications can be broken
down into three categories namely:

- 145 **1. Whether there was sufficient reason for the failure of the applicant to effect service
of the Notice of Appeal and Memorandum of Appeal upon the 1st Respondent as
prescribed by law.**
- 2. Whether there was sufficient reason for the delay of the applicant to file the Record
of Appeal.**
- 3. Whether the applicant is entitled to the remedies sought.**

We shall resolve the three issues in the order set out above.

Non-service of the Notice of Appeal and Memorandum of Appeal

The issue of the failure of the applicant to serve the Notice of Appeal upon the 1st Respondent
arises from EPA No. 16 of 2021, while the issue of the failure of the applicant to serve the
Memorandum of Appeal upon the 1st Respondent arises from EPA. No. 17 of 2021. By the
said applications, the applicant sought orders of this court to extend the time within which to
155 serve respectively the Notice of Appeal and the Memorandum of Appeal upon the 1st
Respondent.

From the Affidavit Evidence in the said applications, the judgment against which the applicant
desires to appeal was delivered by the High Court (Hon. Mr. Justice Isah Sserunkuuma) on

the 8th of November 2021. The applicant filed the Notice of Appeal in Jinja High Court
160 Registry on 09th November 2021; while the Memorandum of Appeal was filed in the Registry
of this court on 16th November 2021 within the prescribed time. The challenge faced by the
applicant relates only to the non-service of the Notice of Appeal and the Memorandum of
Appeal upon the 1st respondent after the said documents were duly filed in the Registries of
the High Court and Court of Appeal respectively.

165 Under Rule 78 of the Judicature (Court of Appeal) Rules, service of the Notice of Appeal on
the 1st respondent was supposed to be done before or within seven days after the lodging of
the notice of appeal, that is to say, by 16th of November 2021.

The above Rule 78, in particular, and the Judicature (Court of Appeal) Rules in general, are
applicable to applications which arise from an election appeal by virtue of Rule 36 of the
170 Parliamentary Elections (Election Petitions) Rules, S.I. No. 141-2, which provides as follows:

“36. Procedure generally.

*Subject to such modifications as the court may direct in the interests of justice and
expedition of the proceedings, any rules regulating the procedure and practice on
appeal from decisions of the High Court to the Court of Appeal in civil matters shall
175 apply to appeals under this Part of these Rules.”*

On the other hand, Rule 88(1) of the Judicature (Court of Appeal) Rules, imposed an
obligation on the applicant to effect service of the Memorandum of Appeal upon the 1st
Respondent before or within seven days after lodging the Memorandum of Appeal. The
Memorandum of Appeal in the instant matter having been filed in court on 16th of November
180 2021, it follows that the last day for its service upon the 1st respondent fell on the 23rd of
November 2021. By the time the applicant filed EPA No. 17 of 2021 on 24th of November
2021, the time prescribed for serving the Memorandum of Appeal had just expired.

By the two applications, EPA No. 16 of 2021 and EPA No. 17 of 2021 the applicant seeks
extension of time within which to serve the two court documents upon the 1st respondent.

185 For this Court to grant an application for extension of time Rule 5 of the Judicature (Court of
Appeal) Rules requires that there must be “sufficient reason”. Rule 5 is couched as follows:

“5. Extension of time.

190 The court may, for **sufficient reason**, extend the time limited by these Rules or by any decision of the court or of the High Court for the doing of any act authorised or required by these Rules, whether before or after the expiration of that time and whether before or after the doing of the act; and any reference in these Rules to any such time shall be construed as a reference to the time as extended.” [Emphasis added]

195 The term “**Sufficient reason**” has been held by this Court and the Supreme Court to refer to any good reason that prevented an applicant from taking an essential step within the time prescribed by the law, or other reasons why an intended appeal should be allowed to proceed though filed out of time. See The Electoral Commission Vs Mwasuko Jacob, Election Petition Application No. 42 of 2022 (Unreported); Bakiite Leonard & 2 Others Vs Ampaire Kizito Nseko & 2 Others, Election Petition Application No. 27 of 2022 (Unreported); James Bwogi vs. Kampala City Council and Another, Supreme Court Civil Application No. 09 of 2017 (unreported); and Boney M. Katatumba Vs. Waheed Karim, Supreme Court Civil Application No. 27 of 2007 (unreported).

205 The reason given by the Applicant in his Affidavits to account for his failure to effect personal service upon the 1st respondent was that despite the concerted efforts on the part of the applicant’s advocates with the assistance of the applicant, they failed to locate the 1st respondent as he “*blatantly went into hiding to have [the applicant’s appeal] dismissed on a technicality for failure to take [the] essential step of effective service on the [1st] respondent personally and/or frustrate its progress*”.

210 The Applicant’s Affidavits filed in support of the applications and the Affidavits of service filed in the two applications went to great length to explain the efforts the applicant made to serve the 1st respondent with the two court documents. The following efforts standout:

215 The applicant using a one Ali Kyambadde, a court process server with the High Court of Uganda attached to the Court of Appeal, delivered the documents to the chambers of Muzuusa & Co. Advocates in Jinja but the receptionist rejected the documents following a phone call conversation she had with one of the advocates practicing in the firm in the

hearing of the Court Process Server. The details of how the service was done are set out in Ali Kyambadde's Affidavits of Service. Ms. Muzuusa & Co. Advocates were part of the firm of advocates which represented the 1st respondent in the High Court and before this court.

220 The same Court Process Server on diverse dates delivered the court documents to the Chambers of the 1st respondent's advocates in Kampala, Ms Wagabaza & Co. Advocates. The receptionist in the law firm, in consultation with some advocate of the same law firm, rejected service claiming they had no instructions. But the said law firm was likewise part of the team that represented the 1st respondent during the High Court proceedings and before this court. Indeed, the chambers of Ms. Muzuusa & Co. Advocates and Ms Wagabaza & 225 Co. Advocates were both indicated in the 1st respondent's Answer to the Petition as his addresses for purposes of service of the court process in connection with the High Court proceedings.

The Court Process Server on diverse days searched for the 1st respondent at his residence and Parliamentary offices on Kingdom Mall in Kampala to no avail. The photographs and 230 other particulars of the location of the 1st respondent's residence and offices, the dates and times of visits, the persons he found at the respective places and the reaction of those people are all set out in detail in the Affidavits.

The Court Process Server went ahead and obtained the Cell Phone numbers of the 1st respondent, rung him and when he did not answer the calls, the Court Clerk sent the court 235 papers to the 1st respondent via WhatsApp. The WhatsApp message showed a "blue tick" which the Process Server stated was indicative that the 1st appellant had seen the WhatsApp message. The details of the phone number to which the Court Papers were sent, the dates and time sent, and the printout of the messages are all contained in the Affidavit of service.

240 When the applicant's advocates got the reports from the Court Process Server to the effect that he had failed to serve the 1st respondent in person and that the advocates who represented the 1st respondent in the High Court had rejected service of the court

documents, they took up the matter with the 1st respondent and his advocates. Kalali Steven, one of the applicant's advocates working in Ms Nagawa & Co. Advocates, on
245 diverse dates rung Asuman Nyonyintono with the objective of getting them to agree on the modalities of service of the court papers upon them. He refused to be served claiming he had no instructions. The details of the dates and times of the voice calls, the phone numbers and the print out of the WhatsApp chats between Kalali Steven and Asuman Nyonyintono are part of the Affidavits filed.

250 As we have already stated hereinabove, the 1st respondent did not file any Affidavits to rebut the applicant's evidence. The applicant's evidence in support of his claim that personal service of the Notice of Appeal and the Memorandum of Appeal upon the 1st respondent was frustrated by the 1st respondent himself remained uncontroverted. We find that the deliberate actions on the part of the 1st respondent to fail or frustrate personal service of court
255 documents on himself and/or rejection of service of his Counsel constitutes sufficient reason for extension of time under Rule 5 of the Rules of this court.

Delay of the applicant to file the Record of Appeal.

Rule 31 of the Parliamentary Elections (Election Petition) Rules, requires the appellant to lodge with the registrar of this court the Record of Appeal within thirty days after filing by him
260 or her of the Memorandum of Appeal. In the instant case, whereas the evidence on record shows that the Memorandum of Appeal was filed in court on the 16th day of November 2021, the appellant's advocates filed the Record of Appeal on 21st February 2022. The applicant's explanation for the delay was that it was caused by the trial court which availed him the certified record of proceedings of the trial court on 15th February 2022 and the Registrar's
265 Certificate on the 17th February 2022. That soon thereafter, the applicant filed the Record on 21st February 2022.

Delay attributable entirely to courts has been held to constitute "sufficient reason" for extension of time under Rule 5 of the Rules of this Court. See Wakayima Musoke Nsereko Vs Hon. Kasule Robert Ssebunya, EPA No. 10 of 2016 (Court of Appeal); Electoral Commission

270 *Vs Badogi Waguma, EPA No. 06 of 2016 (Court of Appeal); and Mansulkalal Ramji Karia Vs Attorney General, Supreme Court Civil Application No. 1 of 2003.*

The evidence on record shows that one day after the trial court delivered its judgment, the applicant's advocates applied to be availed a Certified Copy of the proceedings of the trial court. The applicant and his Counsel thereafter diligently followed up on the typing and certification of the trial court proceedings. But the fact that the judge who presided over the trial was from another Duty Station added onto the delay of court to finalize the preparation of the proceedings as it took some time to get the court file from the trial judge (at his usual duty station) back to Jinja High Court where the proceedings were typed. Eventually on the 15th day of December 2021 the Deputy Registrar of Jinja High Court sent a draft copy of the proceedings to the applicant's advocates for their perusal and confirmation as to whether they were complete. The advocates noted that the draft proceedings were incomplete and had several typing errors which they communicated to the Deputy Registrar by their letter dated 22nd December 2021.

Further delay arose when the copy of the proceedings got missing from the court file after certification of the same by the Deputy Registrar but before being delivered to the applicant. It was not until the 15th of February 2022 that the certified proceedings were availed to the applicant. The applicant filed the Record of Proceedings on 21st February 2022.

From the aforesaid, we find that the delay to file the Record of Proceedings was caused by the failure of the trial court to avail the applicant the proceedings in time. Under Rule 87 of the Rules of this Court, the trial court proceedings are a critical component of the Record of Appeal and, accordingly the applicant could not file the Record of Appeal without them.

We accordingly find that the applicant has adduced sufficient evidence to prove that he was prevented by sufficient reason to file the record of appeal within the prescribed period.

295

Decision of Court

1. The application for extension of the time for service of the Notice of Appeal upon the 1st respondent is hereby granted.
2. The application for extension of the time for service of the Memorandum of Appeal is
300 likewise hereby granted.
3. The filing and service of the Record of Appeal out of time is hereby validated.
4. The applicant is granted the taxed costs in EPA Nos. 16 of 2021 and EPA No.17 of 2021 only which shall be paid by the 1st respondent as the applications would not have been necessary but for his conduct.
- 305 5. As for EPA No. 38 of 2022, each party shall bear its own cost as the failure to file the Record of Appeal was through no fault on the part of the parties to the application or their lawyers.

At the time of this Ruling, the respondents had already been served the Record of Appeal and filed their written submissions in the substantive appeal, EPP No. 78 of 2021. The Notice of
310 Appeal and Memorandum of Appeal were part of the Record of Appeal which was served upon the respondents – albeit irregularly. The practical effect of the validation of the filing and service of the Record of Appeal is that there will be no need for the applicant to serve, once again, any of the respondents with the Notice of Appeal, the Memorandum of Appeal and the Record of Appeal.

315 On our part, we shall proceed to consider the Written Submissions of the parties in the substantive alongside the Record of Appeal and deliver our judgment on notice as earlier promised.

Per Curiam

320 We have noted that the challenge of service of the court documents in the instant matter was aggravated by the refusal of the advocates who represented the 1st respondent in the High Court and their staff to accept service of the Notice of Appeal and the Memorandum of appeal

allegedly because they “had no instructions from the client to accept service”. Curiously, the advocates who claimed to have no instructions to receive service of the court documents are the same advocates who represented the 1st respondent during the hearing of these three applications and the appeal itself.

Service of the Notice of Appeal is governed by Rules 78 and 18 of the Rules of this court. Rule 78 is couched in the terms below:

“78. Service of notice of appeal on persons affected

(1) An intended appellant shall, before or within seven days after lodging notice of appeal, serve copies of it on all persons directly affected by the appeal; but the court may, on application, which may be made ex parte, direct that service need not be effected on any person who took no part in the proceedings in the High Court.

(2) Where any person required to be served with a copy of a notice of appeal gave any address for service in or in connection with the proceedings in the High Court, and has not subsequently given any other address for service, the copy of the notice of Appeal may be served on him or her at that address, notwithstanding that it may be that of an advocate who has not been retained for the purpose of an appeal. [Emphasis Added]

On the other hand, as far as is relevant to the point under discussion, Rule 18 of the Rules of this court is couched as follows:

“18 Service and transmission of documents

(1) Where any document is required by these Rules to be served on any person, service may be effected in a way directed in each case by the court, which shall normally be a way in which a comparable process of the High Court could be served; and in the absence of any special direction, it shall be made personally on the person to be served or any person entitled under rule 23 of these Rules to appear on his or her behalf.

(2) ... (Not applicable)

(3) For the purpose of this rule, service on a partner or a clerk of an advocate at the office of the advocate shall be taken to be service on the advocate.

(4) Proof of service may be given where necessary, by affidavit, unless in any case, the court requires proof by oral evidence.” [Emphasis added]

The combined effect of the above two Rules is that:

- 355 1. Where an intended respondent was represented by an advocate in the High Court, service of a Notice of appeal upon that advocate or a partner of the advocate or a clerk of the advocate at the office of the advocate is good service unless and until the intended respondent furnishes this court with a different address of service.
- 360 2. No specific instructions are needed to be given to the advocate, the advocate's partner and clerk by the intended respondent before they are legally competent to receive service of the Notice of Appeal on his/her behalf.
3. Refusal of the advocate or his partner or clerk to accept service on behalf of the intended respondent is inconsequential and cannot stall the wheels of the appellate process for as long as no other address of service has been filed in this court.


365 Rule 80 of the Rules of this Court requires every person upon whom the Notice of Appeal has been served with the Notice of Appeal to serve on the intended appellant a Notice of address of service within 14 days of being served the Notice of Appeal. Our understanding of the Rule is that, among other things, it gives an opportunity to the advocate who received service of the Notice of Appeal "without the client's specific instructions" to look up his/her (former) client
370 and agree on the course of his/her future representation without stalling the wheels of the appellate process. And if no Notice of Address of Service is filed in court at that stage and served upon the intending appellant, then the future service of the Court documents upon the address for service used by the intended respondent during the proceedings in the High Court is proper service in connection with the appeal proceedings. To permit advocates to
375 refuse service of court documents under the guise of "I have received no instructions" is bound to frustrate the operations of this court. It is bound to contribute to the increase of the case workload currently being experienced by this court through the filing of unwarranted or otherwise avoidable applications related to service of documents of the appellate process. The fact that we have had to first deal with two applications about this subject of service of
380 court documents before proceeding to deal with the substantive appeal is clear testimony of this. Court's workload would have been reduced and the justice dispensed more


expeditiously if it were not for some of these glaring misconceptions on the part of Counsel and failure to advise their clients appropriately. In future, the advocates who disregard the Rules as to service of documents of this court should be held personal to account for the consequences of their decisions and actions by, inter alia, being ordered to personally pay the costs of such applications in accordance with the law. Accordingly, we direct the Registrar of this Court to serve copies of this Ruling onto the Attorney General of Uganda, the Director of the Law Development Centre, the President of the Uganda Law Society and the Secretary of the Law Council so that they can in-turn disseminate it to their respective constituents.

390 The Registrar should also post a copy of this Ruling onto the WhatsApp Groups of the advocates of this Court and the High Court.

It is so ordered.

Signed, dated and delivered at Kampala this ^{22nd} day of ^{April} 2022.


ELIZABETH MUSOKE
Justice of Appeal


MUZAMIRU MUTANGULA KIBEEDI
Justice of Appeal


MONICA K. MUGENYI
Justice of Appeal

Handwritten scribbles and faint markings, possibly including the number '4'.