

CORAM: HER WORSHIP AMA ADOMAKO-KWAKYE (MS.), MAGISTRATE,
DISTRICT COURT '2', KANESHIE, SITTING AT THE FORMER STOOL LANDS
BOUNDARIES SETTLEMENT COMMISSION OFFICES NEAR WORKERS'
COLLEGE, ACCRA ON 17TH NOVEMBER, 2023.

SUIT NO. A8/91/22

SELINA LAWAL
RIDGE, ACCRA

::

PETITIONER

VRS.

PATRICK KOFI AWUNOR
NIMA, ACCRA

::

RESPONDENT

JUDGMENT

Introduction

The Petitioner instituted this Petition on 23rd February 2022 praying for a dissolution of the marriage between the parties, payment by the Respondent of monthly maintenance of GH¢ 1,500.00 for the children and payment by Respondent of alimony of GH¢ 30,000.00. The Respondent in his Answer and Cross Petition filed on 9th December 2022 also prayed for a dissolution of the parties' marriage, Petitioner to be ordered to be responsible for the medical and clothing needs of the children whereas the Respondent takes charge of their school fees and maintain them at GH¢ 1,000.00, reasonable access to the children and no order to be made as to cost.

The undisputed facts are that the parties married customarily on 13th August 2012 and same was subsequently converted to a marriage under Part III of the Marriages Act, 1884-1985. They cohabited at Pambros, Weija and have three children together; Jessica Awunor, Gerald Awunor and Debora Awunor who were 10 years, 7 years and 3 years respectively at the commencement of this suit. Both parties contend that their marriage has broken down beyond reconciliation due to the conduct of each other.

Petitioner's Case

According to the Petitioner, the Respondent often sleeps outside the matrimonial home, usually returns home drunk in the morning and subjects her and the children to assault when they complain. She alleged that the Respondent has been unfaithful during the pendency of the marriage and all efforts by family members to help them resolve their marital issues have proven futile. Petitioner further averred that the Respondent has stopped maintaining the children of the marriage since 2018. She therefore instituted this suit praying for the reliefs stated *supra*.

Respondent's Case

The Respondent denied all the allegations levelled against him by the Petitioner, stating that it was rather the Petitioner who had behaved unreasonably. He averred that the Petitioner was jealous anytime he was in the company of his female friends and colleagues. He added that the Petitioner often disrespected and insulted him unprovoked and extended the disrespect to his family.

According to Respondent, despite several attempts by him and his family to settle the marital differences between the parties, same was not achieved due to the Petitioner's adamant behaviour to change her ways. He therefore left the matrimonial home and took refuge in a prayer centre. Respondent stated that even though he had left the matrimonial

home, he has religiously been maintaining the children by paying their fees, rent as well as providing for their other needs. He however added that he cannot pay alimony because he does not have the resources to do that, that he was not the one who initiated the petition and that the Petitioner is well paid than him.

Issues

- a. Whether or not the marriage between the parties has broken down beyond reconciliation within the purview of the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1971 (Act 367).
- b. Whether or not the Petitioner is entitled to receive alimony GH¢ 30,000.00 from the Respondent.

Evaluation of evidence/Legal Analysis:

To prove that a marriage has broken down beyond reconciliation, the law requires a petitioner to plead and prove to the satisfaction of the court, one or more of the six facts set out under **Section 2(1) of the Matrimonial Causes Act (Act 367)**. Those facts in a loose list are; adultery, unreasonable behaviour, desertion, not living as man and wife for two years continuously with consent to divorce, not living as man and wife for five years continuously with no consent needed and irreconcilable differences. See **Danquah vs Danquah (1979) GLR 371**.

Pleading and proving any of the facts by themselves however, are not dispositive of the quest to dissolve. That is to say, the discharge of the burden by the Petitioner on any of the facts is not in itself sufficient to obtain the decree. The court must be satisfied on all the evidence that the marriage has indeed broken down beyond reconciliation. See the case of **Kotei v. Kotei [1974] 2 GLR 172**.

It is trite that in civil cases, the general rule is that the party who in his/her pleadings or writ raises issues essential to the success of his/her case assumes the onus of proof. See **Sections 11(1) & (2), 12(2) and 14 of the Evidence Act, 1975 (NRCD 323)** as well as the cases of **Takoradi Flour Mills vs. Samir Faris [2005-2006] SCGLR 882 @ 900; GIHOC Refrigeration & Household vs. Jean Hanna Assi (2005-2006) SCGLR 458.**

The Petitioner had the onus of discharging the burden of producing sufficient evidence in respect of her claims on a balance of probabilities and the Respondent also bore that same burden in respect of his claims as well. The Court must satisfy itself that both parties have satisfied the burden on them by proving their case on the balance of probabilities.

Section 1(1) of the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1971 (Act 367) allows either party to a marriage to present a petition to the court for divorce. **Section 1(2)** of the Act further emphasizes that, the sole ground for granting a petition for divorce shall be that the marriage has broken down beyond reconciliation. From the pleadings and evidence adduced in court, both parties seek to rely on **Sections 2(1)(b) and (f) of the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1971 (Act 367).**

On 28th April 2023 when trial was commenced, both parties were present and, in their presence, the suit was adjourned to 16th and 23rd June 2023 for continuation of trial. Neither the Respondent nor his lawyer appeared to either cross examine the Petitioner or for Respondent to open his defence, although a hearing notice was duly served for that purpose. Where a party fails to attend Court to defend a claim that has been brought against him, he cannot later assert that he was not given a hearing or that the audi alteram partem rule has been breached.

In **The Republic v High Court (Fast Track Division); Ex parte State Housing Co Ltd. (No. 2) (Koranten-Amoako Interested Party) (2009) SCGLR 185**, the Supreme Court held

at page 190 that a party who disables himself from being heard cannot later turn around and accuse the adjudicator of breaching the rules of natural justice. See also the case of **The Republic v. Court of Appeal, Accra; Ex parte East Dadekotopon Development Trust and Another [2015] DLSC 3207**.

The Respondent had a witness statement filed on 27th January 2023. It is trite law that merely filing a witness statement does not constitute evidence until the party who filed same mounts the witness box and relies on same as his or her evidence in chief. Thus, in the case of **John Dramani Mahama v Electoral Commission & Another [2021] GHASC 12 (4th March 2021)** His Lordship Anin Yeboah CJ (as he then was) succinctly held that;

“... the above rule also points to the fact that a witness statement filed and served does not constitute evidence in law till the author of the statement mounts the witness box, takes the oath and prays that the witness statement be adopted as evidence in chief pursuant to Order 38 r 3E(2), which provides thus: “(2) Where a witness is called to give oral evidence under subrule (1), the witness statement of that witness shall stand as the evidence in chief of that witness unless the Court otherwise orders.”

The Respondent’s witness statement which was not relied on by him for same to be adopted by the Court cannot therefore be considered by this Court in the determination of the suit, since it does not amount to evidence. The Petitioner is not entitled to automatic grant of her claims just because the Respondent did not attend court. Petitioner has to satisfy the burden of proof on her before the court will grant the reliefs she seeks.

Issue a. Whether or not the marriage between the parties has broken down beyond reconciliation within the purview of the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1971 (Act 367).

The Petitioner’s witness statement filed on 8th August, 2022 was adopted by the Court as her evidence-in-chief. Her evidence was that the parties married under the Ordinance on

13th August, 2012 at the Registrar General's Department. Exhibit 'A', which is the parties' marriage certificate however shows that the ordinance marriage was held on 9th August 2013 at the Principal Registrar of Marriages Office, Accra. I therefore find as a fact based on this documentary evidence that the ordinance marriage between the parties was contracted on 9th August 2013. The law is that documentary evidence ought to be preferred over oral evidence. See the cases of Adama Seidu & 4 ors v Catholic Graduates [2018] 125 G.M.J. 186 @ 201; Fosua Adu Poku v Dufie (deceased) and Adu Poku Mensah [2009] SCGLR 311 and Hayfron v Egyir (1984) 1 GLR 682.

She testified that the parties' marital issues started when she was pregnant with their youngest child. During this period, Petitioner testified, that Respondent spent nights out of the matrimonial home. She levelled allegations of infidelity against the Respondent which she stated that she witnessed.

It was the testimony of the Petitioner that the Respondent during the pendency of the marriage often returned home drunk and would not heed her advice to desist from such behaviour. She further testified that the Respondent subjected her and the children of the marriage to physical abuse such as slaps and kicking the children with his foot. According to her, Respondent has not maintained the children of marriage since 2018. She therefore reported same to the Social Welfare Department where the Respondent was ordered to pay GH¢ 300.00 monthly for each child but after making payments on two occasions, Respondent failed to continue making the payments. Concerned about the actions of the Respondent, the Petitioner wrote a letter to the Respondent's superior at work with hopes that such initiative might perhaps salvage the situation and help the parties settle their marital issues. Unfortunately, the expected outcome was not achieved. She tendered in evidence a copy of the said letter as Exhibit 'B'.

The Petitioner testified that due to Respondent's failure to cater for the needs of the children, she has been the one providing all the needs of the children and often struggles to get Respondent to pay their school fees. As such, the children are always on the verge of being sacked for owing school fees and are sometimes actually sacked. Petitioner further added that the Respondent has moved out of the matrimonial home since February 2019 and has refused to answer her calls. According to her, all the three children are asthmatic with at least one of them getting an attack every week. This, Petitioner says has put so much burden on her financially and has led to her being drained emotionally. Petitioner testified that she has made several efforts to reconcile their differences one of such is when she reported the matter to Respondent's parents however, Respondent failed to attend the meeting called for the purpose of reconciliation.

Unreasonable Behaviour

Whether or not the Respondent has behaved in a way that the Petitioner cannot reasonably be expected to live with the Respondent?

A Petitioner may satisfy the court that a marriage has broken down beyond reconciliation by adducing evidence that are in tandem with **Section 2(1)(b) of Act 367** which is to the effect that;

(1) For the purpose of showing that the marriage has broken down beyond reconciliation the petitioner shall satisfy the court of one or more of the following facts;

(b) that the respondent has behaved in such a way that the petitioner cannot reasonably be expected to live with the respondent.

The Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary (4th Edition) has defined behaviour generally as "the way that a person behaves in a particular situation or under particular

conditions. **Baker P in Katz v Katz [1972] 3 All ER 219** put it as follows: *“behaviour is something more than a mere state of affairs or state of mind, such as for example a repugnance to sexual intercourse, or a feeling that the wife is not reciprocating the husband’s love, or not being as demonstrative as he thinks she should be. Behaviour in this context is action or conduct by one which affects the other. Such conduct may either take the form of acts or omissions or may be a course of conduct, and, in my view, it must have some reference to the marriage.”*

Unreasonable behaviour in marriage can also take the form of cruelty, nagging, drunkenness, threats or violence. In dealing with behaviour, the question, is whether the Petitioner can reasonably be expected to live with the Respondent and it is for the court to, and not the Petitioner, to answer it as it is an objective test. The Court must have regard to the personalities of the individuals before it and it must assess the impact of the Respondent’s conduct on the particular Petitioner in the light of the whole history of the marriage and their relationship.

The test generally accepted is the one formulated by Dunn J in the case of **Livingstone-Stallard v Livingstone-Stallard** as follows:

“would any right-thinking person come to the conclusion that this husband has behaved in such a way that this wife cannot reasonably be expected to live with him, taking into account the whole of the circumstances and the characters and personalities of the parties?”

The test was even more fully spelt out in the case of **Ash v Ash [1972] 1 All ER 582**, where Bagnall J stated:

“I have to consider not only the behaviour of the respondent but the character disposition and behaviour of the petitioner, the general question may be expanded thus: can this petitioner, with his or her character and personality, with his or her faults and other

attributes, good and bad, and having regard to his or her behaviour during the marriage, reasonably be expected to live with this respondent?"

In **Mensah v Mensah [1972] 2 GLR 198**, the court further stated that:

In determining whether a husband has behaved in such a way as to make it unreasonable to expect a wife to live with him the court must consider all the circumstances constituting such behaviour including the history of the marriage. It is always a question of fact. The conduct complained of must be grave and weighty and mere trivialities will not suffice...

Since the Respondent did not appear to cross-examine the Petitioner, one would argue that he has conceded and indeed, the law is that he has conceded. The principle has been stated in a plethora of judicial authorities. See **Kwanko v. Lebanon Society [2014] 70 GMJ 118, at 141-142, per Dzamefe JA; Amoah VI v. Okine & 4 Ors. [2014] 77 G.M.J. 124 at 142, S.C; and GPHA v. Nova Complex Ltd. [2007-2008] SCGLR 806 at holding 3.**

It must be pointed out that the principle that unchallenged evidence amounts to an admission is not without exceptions. To start with, the Supreme Court held in **Dzaisu v. Ghana Breweries Ltd [2007-2008] SCGLR 539** that: *"The principle that when a party fails to cross examine on an issue, that issue would be ruled against him is not an inflexible rule."* Also, in the case of **In Re Johnson (Decd); Donkor v. Prempeh [1975] 2 GLR 182**, the Court of Appeal held: *"It is not always the law that the failure to cross examine on material issues amount to complete acceptance of the evidence offered by the adversary. Where the evidence is incredible or romancing in character, a court of law is not bound to accept same on the ground that it was acknowledged sub-solevitio by the adversary against whom it was offered."*

From the evidence adduced by the Petitioner, she testified that the Respondent has not maintained the children of marriage since 2018. This made her report the matter to the social welfare where the Respondent was ordered to pay an amount of Gh₵ 300.00 each

month for each child. However, Respondent failed to observe the orders. She further reported Respondent's actions to his boss at the Economic and Organised Crime Office (EOCO) through a letter she tendered in evidence as Exhibit 'B'.

From Exhibit 'B', a copy of the letter written to the Executive Director of EOCO dated 28th June, 2021, and same titled "*Request for assistance to resolve domestic issues involving Mr. Patrick Kofi Awonoo*" one can clearly tell merely by reading the said letter the frustration and burden the Petitioner has been made to bear as a result of Respondent's unreasonable behaviour. It is this letter which reveals the truth of Petitioner's claims and make certain her assertions.

It is clear from Exhibit 'B' that the Respondent has neglected his family including the Petitioner and the children of the marriage. Exhibit 'B' supports Petitioner's claims that the Respondent has refused to cater for the educational needs of the children of the marriage. As such, they are often sacked from school for non-payment of fees. Not only has he abandoned them and neglected to provide for their educational needs but also their medical needs. In Exhibit 'B', Petitioner narrated an occasion all the children were ill and admitted at the hospital for three days. During this period, even though Respondent was aware, he was unbothered about same. Respondent did not visit the children until the Petitioner reported him to the Deputy Director of his office. Even when they were discharged, he did not visit nor call to check up on them. It is also evident from this letter that the Petitioner and the children were asked to vacate their rented home because of Respondent's failure to pay for their rent as he has moved out of the matrimonial home.

For all this period, Petitioner has borne all the burden of the marriage by providing for the children's needs. As the husband and father of the children, the Respondent ought to have performed his duties and not shrug them off. In a society such as ours, it is the

husband who mostly provides and shoulders the burdens of the family with the wife supporting him when the need arises. Fathers who religiously perform their duties by providing and caring for their children and their family earn the respect of members of the society. They are the ones whose conduct and nurturing shape the future generation of our society. In fact, responsible fathers pride themselves in their contribution towards the development and growth of their children. They do not wait on others to inform them of their responsibility owed towards their wives and the children they have fathered.

As a man of his calibre, one would least expect that he will conduct himself in such a manner; neglecting his duties and being nonchalant about the wellbeing of his children and also abusing them physically. It is no fault of the children that the parties are experiencing challenges in their marriage as such, they should not be made to suffer unduly. It is appalling and disappointing to say the least, that the Respondent will conduct himself in such a manner. Respondent's conduct of neglecting his duties and putting all the burden on the Petitioner and meting out physical assault on the Petitioner and the innocent children, in the Court's opinion amount to unreasonable behaviour.

Petitioner again levelled allegations of infidelity against the Respondent which she stated that she witnessed same. Even though the Respondent did not appear in court to challenge these allegations, this Court is of the considered opinion that the Petitioner had to do more than merely repeating her averments on oath. She did not tender in evidence anything to support her allegations of infidelity against the Respondent. This Court is therefore not satisfied with the evidence led in respect of these allegations.

From the evidence, it does appear that the Respondent's allegation of unreasonable behaviour in his pleadings was a half-truth. The marriage's real waterloo is proved to be his unreasonable behaviour towards the Petitioner. It is important I believe, that, this fact is clearly put on record even if the marriage is to suffer dissolution. Unreasonable

behaviour is an objective test and this court is minded to conclude that Petitioner has proved to the satisfaction of this court that it is rather the Respondent who behaved unreasonably towards the Petitioner, a fact this Court has found. On this basis, the court is satisfied that unreasonable behaviour under section 2(1) (b) of Act 367 has been properly established.

Irreconcilable Differences:

Section 2(1) (f) of the Matrimonial Causes Act, Act 367 is to the effect that, one of the facts for establishing that a marriage has broken down beyond reconciliation is to establish that the parties to the marriage have, after diligent effort, been unable to reconcile their differences.

The Petitioner contended in this instant case that their marriage has broken down beyond reconciliation as a result of their irreconcilable differences despite attempts by families in settling their differences. Petitioner averred that they have not been able to settle their differences even though she has made efforts geared towards same. She added that the Respondent declined the invitation of his parents when the parties were invited for the purpose of settling their marital issues. From Exhibit 'B' it is clear that even after the Petitioner reported Respondent's conduct to his superiors at work, the parties were unable to settle their differences.

In his pleadings, Respondent also stated that the parties have not been able to settle their differences despite all the attempts made to reconcile same. The Petitioner again testified which was confirmed by Respondent in his pleadings that Respondent had already left their matrimonial house. This surmises an intention not to live together again as a married couple due to irreconcilable difference. Based on these findings, the Court is

satisfied that irreconcilable differences under section 2(1) (f) of Act 367 has been properly established.

Issue b. Whether or not the Petitioner is entitled to receive alimony GH¢ 30,000.00 from the Respondent

The Petitioner in her reliefs made a prayer for the award of alimony to her. Under **Section 20 of the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1971 (Act 367)** the Court may amongst others, order either party to the marriage to pay to the other party such sum of money as part of financial provision as the court thinks just and equitable. In her evidence in chief by way of Witness Statement the Petitioner prayed for alimony of Gh₨ 30,000.00.

Under **Section 20 of the Matrimonial Causes Act, 1971 (Act 367)** the Court may amongst others, order either party to the marriage to pay to the other party such sum of money as part of financial provision as the Court thinks just and equitable. In considering financial settlement, some of the factors taken into consideration include the financial needs and resources of both parties, the standard of living enjoyed during the marriage and the parties' current circumstances, the duration of the marriage, and the contributions made by each party to the welfare of the family, the parties' conduct, station in life, age and means of the parties, any agreement, if any, made between the parties regarding alimony, responsibilities of each party, amongst others. The award of lump sum or alimony is a discretionary function of the Court. The consideration of the award of lump sum payment should be made not in isolation from the earning capacity of a party; it should not cripple the other party's earning capacity. It is necessary to state that there is no cut and dried rule but the peculiarities of each case inform the Court in making any decision in respect of financial provision or alimony, having regards to the specific facts and evidence adduced.

In the case of **Isaac Kwame Amoah Ahinful v Anne Marie Ahinful (2016) JELR 107733 (HC)**, the Court made reference to the 6th Edition of the Black's Law Dictionary in defining alimony as: "...sustenance or support of the wife by her divorced husband and stems from the common law right of the wife to support by her husband. Allowances which the husband or wife by court order pays to the other spouse for maintenance while they are separated or after they are divorced (permanent alimony) ..." and the Court was unambiguous that the award of alimony or financial provision, does not automatically follow an order of dissolution of a marriage. Thus, it is dependent on the circumstances of each case and must be just and equitable.

In the case of **Aikins v. Aikins (1979) GLR 223**, the Court took into account factors such as the fact that the wife did not have any capital assets of her own, that for many years prior to the presentation of the Petition she had not worked, that she required some funds to rent a premises for herself and her children, and to set herself up in business, and accordingly awarded her lump sum payment. The Supreme Court also granted the Petitioner in the case of **Quartson v. Quartson [2012] 2 SCGLR 1077** a lump sum financial provision on the basis of need; the necessity for her to have some funds to survive on whiles she re-organized her life. In **Beatrice Oye Plokhaar v Sterian Plokhaar (2016) JELR 108100 (HC)**, the Court also emphasized that the Court in deciding whether to grant financial provision to a party or not was to examine the need of the parties.

From the evidence, Respondent is employed and works as a Senior officer with the Economic and Organised Crime Office, a government institution and the Petitioner is also a Nurse. He stated in his pleadings that he is in debt as such, he is not in a position to compensate the Petitioner. I must point out that this suit has come about as a result of the Respondent's unreasonable behaviour towards the Petitioner. The parties had been married for almost ten years when the Petition was instituted. The Respondent asserted

in his Answer that he had borrowed money and was repaying so he did not have the financial resources to compensate the Petitioner. No evidence was adduced on this. There is also no evidence on record that he has any other financial obligations or commitments hindering him from paying alimony. I am of the considered view that an award of a lump sum payment of GH¢ 15,000.00 to be paid by the Respondent to the Petitioner as alimony would be in order for the burden she was made to carry during the subsistence of the marriage and to assist her settle herself well in life after dissolution of the marriage.

Ancillary Issues on Children

Section 22 of Act 367 states:

- (1) In all proceedings under this Act, it shall be the duty of the court to inquire whether there are any children of the household.*
- (2) The court may, either on its own initiative or on application by a party to any proceedings under this Act, make any order concerning any child of the household which it thinks reasonable and for the benefit of the child.*
- (3) Without prejudice to the generality of subsection (2), an order under that section may—*
 - (a) award custody of the child to any person;*
 - (b) regulate the right of access of any person to the child;*
 - (c) provide for the education and maintenance of the child out of the property or income of either or both of the parties to the marriage.*

In issues concerning the child, it is the best interest of the child which is the paramount consideration as stipulated by **Section 2 of the Children’s Act, 1998 (Act 560)**. The Petitioner has prayed for the Respondent to maintain the children at GH¢ 1,500.00 monthly. The Respondent also in his Answer and Cross Petition prayed to maintain them

at GH¢ 1,000.00 monthly, to be given reasonable access to the children and for Petitioner to be responsible for the children's health and clothing needs whilst he pays their school fees.

There seems to be no issue of custody or concerns about the Petitioner still having custody of the children and in the absence of any evidence pointing to the fact that the children's stay with their mother has been detrimental to their proper growth and development, the Court awards custody to the Petitioner with the Respondent granted reasonable access to them.

I will at this stage consider the financial contribution of the parties towards the children and make orders for same. From the evidence adduced, this Court is inclined to believe that both parties are in a position to contribute financially to support the children having regard to their occupation. It is obvious that both of them are gainfully employed. I have also taken into account the peculiar health needs of the children. The responsibility of catering for the children ought not to be made the sole responsibility of one party.

The Court thus makes an order for the Respondent to bear the health expenses of the children and maintain them monthly at GH¢ 1,200.00 subject to yearly upward adjustments based on the prevailing economic situation in the country. Thus, an application can be brought for the amount to be varied when deemed necessary. The educational needs and expenses of the children should be equally borne by both the Respondent and the Petitioner. The Petitioner is also to support by providing the day-to-day clothing needs of the children while the Respondent provides them clothing and shoes on special occasions like Christmas and birthdays.

Conclusion

Having inquired into the facts as alleged by both parties and from the evidence adduced by the Petitioner, it is this Court's humble opinion that the marriage between the parties has broken down beyond reconciliation. It would serve no useful purpose to ask the parties who have been living apart for some years now to come together by a refusal of the relief for dissolution of their marriage.

In the light of the foregoing, I hold that:

1. The marriage celebrated between the parties on 9th August 2013 at the Principal Registrar of Marriages Office, Accra is hereby dissolved.
2. Custody of the three children is granted to the Petitioner with reasonable access granted to the Respondent.
3. An amount of GH¢ 15,000.00 is awarded in favour of Petitioner against Respondent as alimony.
4. The Respondent is to maintain the children monthly at GH¢ 1,200.00.
5. The Respondent is to be responsible for all the health needs of the children.
6. The educational needs and expenses of the children should be equally borne by both the Petitioner and the Respondent.
7. The Petitioner is to be responsible for the children's day-to-day clothing needs and the Respondent is to provide them clothing and shoes on special occasions.
8. Cost of GH¢ 2,000.00 is awarded for the Petitioner against Respondent.

[SGD]
AMA ADOMAKO-KWAKYE (MS.)
(MAGISTRATE)

Legal Representation

No legal representation for the Petitioner.

Kwesi Adu-Mante, Esq. for the Respondent.