

**THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA  
IN THE HIGH COURT OF UGANDA AT KAMPALA  
(LAND DIVISION)**

**CIVIL APPEAL NO. 39 OF 2021**

**(ARISING FROM THE RULING OF THE DEPUTY REGISTRAR**

**VIDE M.A NO. 1378 OF 2021)**

**(ALL ARISING FROM CIVIL SUIT NO. 675 OF 2021)**

**TWED PROPERTY DEVELOPMENT LIMITED::::::::::::: APPELLANT**

**VERSUS**

**1. UGANDA INVESTMENT AUTHORITY**

**2. VICTORIA NILE PLASTICS LIMITED::::::::::::: RESPONDENTS**

**3. JERRYFA LIMITED**


**BEFORE: HON. JUSTICE JOHN EUDES KEITIRIMA**

**RULING:**

This is an application brought by way of Notice of Motion under **Section 98 & 79(1) of the Civil Procedure Act and Order 50 Rule 8 of the Civil Procedure Rules**. The appellant is seeking for orders that:-

1. The Deputy Registrar's order declining to grant the temporary injunction vide **M.A No. 1378 of 2021** was contrary to the facts and the law governing temporary injunctions.

2. The Deputy Registrar's order declining the application for a temporary injunction be set aside.

  
27/05/2022

3. **Miscellaneous Application 1378 of 2021** be allowed and the orders sought in terms;


(i) That a temporary injunction issues restraining the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> respondents from dispossessing the applicant of occupation on the suit land and proceeding to carry on any developments on the land formerly comprised in **Kyaggwe Block 113 Plot 572** and presently subdivided into **Plots 1638 and 1639** until the disposal of the main suit.

(ii) A further temporary injunction be issued prohibiting the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent from issuing full term leases to the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> respondents in respect of the said land till the disposal of the main suit.

The application is supported by the affidavit of the Appellant's Managing Director Dr. Dan Twebaze who deposes inter alia:-

(i) That the appellant is dissatisfied with the ruling vide **M.A No. 1378 of 2021** delivered on the 1<sup>st</sup> November, 2021 by the Deputy Registrar of this court that declined the appellant's application for a temporary injunction.

(ii) That the Deputy Registrar erred in law and fact when she held that the appellant will not suffer irreparable damage.

  
27/05/2022

50 (iii) That the Deputy Registrar erred in law and fact when she ruled in favour  
of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> respondents on the ground of balance of convenience  
at the detriment of the appellant.


(iv) That the Deputy Registrar erred in law and fact when she ignored the  
55 fact that the appellant was not at all material times in possession of the  
suit land even before the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> respondents were issued with titles  
of the suit land.

(v) That the Deputy Registrar erred in law and fact when she failed to  
60 resolve the ground that the appellant must show a prima facie case with  
a probability of success.

(vi) That it is in the interest of justice that the subject matter of the main  
suit be preserved to meet the ends of justice and the appeal be allowed  
65 and a temporary injunction granted in the terms proposed in the  
application.

In his affidavit in reply Hamza Galisonga, the Director Industrial Parks  
Development of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent deposes inter alia:-

70 (i) That he is advised by his Attorney's Chambers that the Deputy Registrar  
properly guided herself on the law regarding to the issuance of a  
temporary injunction and arrived at the right conclusion.

  
27/05/2022



(ii) That he is advised by his said lawyers that there are several  
75 considerations that a court considers when evaluating an application  
for a temporary injunction.

(iii) That he is informed by his said lawyers that the appellant has no legal  
or equitable claim over the suit land on account of the fact that they no  
80 longer have a valid lease and therefore the appellant has no legal  
position of standing to bring an application to obtain/recover land.


(iv) That he knows that the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent was well within its rights to  
refuse to renew the lease held by the appellant.

85 (v) That the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent did not unlawfully deprive the appellant of land  
but rather the appellant's lease expired and land reverted by operation  
of law to the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent.

90 (vi) That he knows that the appellant will not suffer any damage which is  
incapable of compensation in monetary terms if this application is not  
granted and that the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is capable of satisfying any adverse  
court award.

95 (vii) That he knows that the balance of convince is in favour of the  
respondents.

(viii) That he is reliably informed by the attorneys in the Attorney General's  
chambers that:-

100  
  
27/05/2022

(a) Granting temporary injunctions is an exercise of judicial discretion and the purpose of granting it is to preserve the status quo until the question to be investigated in the main suit can finally be disposed of.

105

(b) The imminent threat in this case is not against the appellants but against the respondent's investment revenue which if this application is granted will be unreasonably halted.

110

(c) That the legal factual balance of convenience in this case is in favour of the respondents.

(d) That the status quo in this case is that the appellant's lease automatically abated, and they have no legal or equitable interest in the suit land.

115


(e) That if orders prayed for in this application are granted, they will effectively be changing the status quo and placing the appellant onto the land without any colour of right and contrary to the purpose of temporary injunctions.

120

(f) That the appellant has failed to demonstrate to court on a balance of probabilities that they shall suffer any irreparable loss or damage which cannot be atoned for by an award of damages.

125

(g) That the main suit filed by the appellant is not based on any legally recognizable instrument of ownership of land and lacks merit.

  
27/05/2022

- (ix) That in the interest of justice this application should be rejected and dismissed with costs to the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent.

130

The appellant and the first respondent filed written submissions the details of which are on record and which I have considered in determining this appeal.

135

**The issue to determine now is whether the Deputy Registrar's order declining to grant the temporary injunction vide Miscellaneous Application No. 1378 of 2021 was contrary to the facts and law governing temporary injunctions.**


140

**Order 41 Rule 1 of the Civil Procedure Rules provides that "*where in any suit it is proved by affidavit or otherwise –***

145

- (a) *that any property in dispute in a suit is in danger of being wasted, damaged, or alienated by any party to the suit, or wrongly sold in execution of a decree; or***
- (b) *that the defendant threatens or intends to remove or dispose of his or her property with a view to defraud his or her creditors, the court may by order grant a temporary injunction to restrain such act or make such other order for the purpose of staying and preventing the wasting, damaging, alienating, sale, removal or disposition of the property as the court thinks fit until the disposal of the suit or until further orders".***

150

  
27/05/2022




It was held in the case of **Kiyimba Kaggwa versus A.N Katende [1985] H.C.B 43** that the granting of a temporary injunction is an exercise of judicial discretion and the purpose of granting it is to preserve the status quo until the question to be investigated in the suit is finally disposed of. It was also held in the said case that the conditions for the grant of a temporary injunction are first that an applicant must show a prima facie case with a probability of success. Secondly, such injunction will not normally be granted unless the applicant might suffer irreparable injury which would not adequately be compensated or atoned for by an award of damages, thirdly if the court is in doubt, it will decide the application on the balance of convenience.

The appellant filed **H.C.C.S No. 675 of 2021** against the respondents claiming its equitable interest in the suit land comprised in **Kyaggwe Block 113 Plot 572** and presently sub divided into **plots 1638 and 1639**.

The appellant claimed it is in possession of the said suit land and the respondents have jointly and severally tried to defeat their interests and are riddled with fraud and misrepresentation. The appellants are seeking in the main suit for the recovery of the suit land, cancellation of the title, special damages and costs of the suit.

The appellant subsequently filed **Miscellaneous Applications No. 1378 and 1379 of 2021** and the said applications were seeking for injunctions which the Deputy Registrar declined to grant hence this appeal.

  
27/05/2022

The 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> respondents never contested this appeal as they never filed affidavits in reply.

180 It is apparent that it is the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> respondents who have the titles to the suit land. Whether they were validly obtained or not is a matter that is yet to be decided by this court. They did not contest this appeal, in fact the 3<sup>rd</sup> respondent conceded to the appeal. The 1<sup>st</sup> respondent is not in physical possession of the suit land and will therefore not be affected in anyway by  
185 the outcome of this application. It was held in the cases of ***H.B Gandesha and another versus G.J. Lutaaya – S.C.C.A No. 14 of 1989 and Prof. Oloka Onyango and Others versus Attorney General – Constitutional Petition No. 6 of 2014*** that uncontested evidence should be taken as the truth.

190 Since the 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> respondents who have titles to the contested suit land have not contested this appeal, I take it that they conceded to it.

In my view the concerns of the 1<sup>st</sup> respondent will properly be addressed  
195 when the main suit is determined.

It is therefore basing on the above reasons that I will allow this appeal and will set aside the ruling of the Deputy Registrar vide **Miscellaneous Application No. 1378 of 2021** involving the parties herein.

The said application will be granted until the determination of the main suit.

200 Costs of the said application and this appeal will abide the outcome of the said suit.

  
27/05/2022



205



**HON. JUSTICE JOHN EUDES KEITIRIMA**  
**27/05/2022**