

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

**MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION NO. 1933 OF 2021**  
**(ARISING FROM TAX APPEAL REF. NO.008 OF 2018)**  
**(ARISING FROM MISC. APPLICATION NO. 111 OF 2017)**  
**(ARISING FROM CIVIL SUIT NO. 590 OF 2013)**

**KARAMIRA AMOS ::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::: PLAINTIFF**

**VERSUS**

**KAMPALA CAPITAL CITY AUTHORITY ::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::: DEFENDANT**

**BEFORE: LADY JUSTICE ALEXANDRA NKONGE RUGADYA**

**RULING:**

**Background to the application:**

The applicant, Mr. Karamira Amos was the successful party in **Civil Suit No. 590/2013**, wherein court ordered KCCA to pay him **385,000/-** at an interest rate of 23% per annum, from 20<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2012 until full payment, being the outstanding amount in accordance with the partial consent judgment dated **5<sup>th</sup> April 2012**.

The respondent, **M/s Tumwebaze, Atugonza Kobusingye Advocates** who represented him in the main suit filed **MA No. 111/2017** where they sought the amount of **Ug x.141, 952,000/=** to be taxed, as the Advocate – client Bill of costs.

The amount was taxed at **Ug.x 5,979,000/=** which the applicant was required to pay for the application; and **Ug.x 47,303,900/=** for having represented him under the main suit.

He however appealed against that decision to this court, vide **TA No. 008/2018**. This court upheld the decision to award the **Ug.x 5,979,000/-** for but allowed the appeal as regards the taxation of the main bill of costs, and referred the said matter back to the Registrar for re-assessment, which however has never been done.

Dissatisfied with the decision of this court, the applicant who is currently unrepresented filed, filed this application, **MA No. 1933/2021**, seeking enlargement of time within which to appeal against its decision, claiming among other things that the appeal has prospects of success.

5 As per the affidavit of service filed 29<sup>th</sup> November, 2021 the respondent firm was served on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2021, with the summons, order and written submissions in respect of this application. They acknowledged receipt of the court documents on that same day.

They however filed a reply on **16<sup>th</sup> December 2021**, outside the time as court had on 12<sup>th</sup> November 2021 directed, without seeking prior leave of court to file their reply out of time.

In effect, this application is therefore unopposed.

10 **Decision of Court:**

By his letter to court, dated **7th February 2022** in which the application explains the circumstances under which he had filed the application, two key issues emerge:

First, that he was advised that he had to seek leave of this court before bringing an appeal, against the decision of this court passed vide: **TA No. 008/2018**.

15 Secondly, that he still awaits the decision of the Registrar to re-assess the awards as this court had directed.

The application before this court is therefore premature as it awaits the final decision of the Registrar, as earlier directed.

20 The tax master must therefore comply with the order of this court, vide **TA No. 008/2018**, within 30 days.

No orders to costs.

  
**Alexandra Nkonge Rugadya**

**JUDGE**

*Delivered  
via bail  
23/2/2022*

25 **23<sup>rd</sup> February, 2022**