

IN THE DISTRICT MAGISTRATE COURT, HELD AT HARBOR AREA,
TAKORADI, WESTERN REGION ON TUESDAY THE 1st DAY OF AUGUST, 2023,
BEFORE HIS WORSHIP, BERNARD D.BINEY, ESQ... MAGISTRATE

SUIT NO. A1/7/2021

Full Gospel Word & Worship Center
International Church
TAKORADI

}

PLAINTIF

VRS:

Abubakar Ahmed
PLOT NO.S 68/68
APREMDO,
TAKORADI

}

DEFENDANT

J U D G M E N T

By the endorsement on the writ of summons issued from the registry of this court on 2 July, 2021, the plaintiff claims against the defendant the following:

- a) Trespass to Plot No.C67 situate at Apramdo
- b) Damages for destruction caused to Plaintiff's billboard, flag,pole and discoloring Plaintiff's painting.

- c) Recovery of possession.
- d) Perpetual injunction restraining the defendant either by himself, his agents, privies and assigns etc from interfering with the land, attacking Plaintiffs workers or members of the Plaintiff's church or in anyway having anything to do with PlotNo. C67, Apramdo the subject matter of this suit.

From the records, the defendant participated in the trial from the beginning of the case and filed his witness statement though no written statement of defence was filed but he suddenly failed and/or refused to participate further in the court proceedings for whatever reason best known to him despite the service of hearing notices on him requesting him to appear before the court to defend the suit. The court therefore had no option than to proceed with the trial to its conclusion resulting in the instant judgment.

It is trite learning that a party to a case may refuse to participate in the proceedings altogether or fail to lead evidence. The rule therefore is that when a party is given opportunity to participate in the court proceedings and/or lead evidence in support of his stand or in defence of allegations against him but deliberately declines to avail himself of that opportunity, the court will be entitled to proceed with the trial to conclusion and make deductions or findings on the basis of the evidence adduced at the trial. See: In re West Coast Dyeing Industry Ltd; Adams v. Tandoh [1984-86] 2 GLR 561, CA and also Watalah v. Ghana Primewood Products Ltd. [1973] 2 GLR 126.

Moreover, in the case of In Re Ashalley Botwe Lands; Adjetey Agbosu & Ors v. Kotey & Ors [2003-2004] SCGLR 420 at 465, it was held thus:

“A litigant who is a defendant in a civil case does not need to prove anything; the plaintiff who took the defendant to court has to prove what he claims he is entitled to from the defendant. At the same time, if the court has to make a determination of a fact or of an issue, and that determination depends on evaluation of facts and

evidence, the defendant must realize that the determination cannot be made on nothing. If the defendant desires the determination to be made in his favour, then he has the duty to help his own cause or case by adducing before the court such facts or evidence that will induce the determination to be made in his favour. The logical sequel to this is that if he leads no such facts or evidence, the court will be left with no choice but to evaluate the entire case on the basis of the evidence before the court, which may turn out to be only the evidence of the plaintiff. If the court chooses to believe the only evidence on record, the plaintiff may win and the defendant may lose. Such loss may be brought about by default on the part of the defendant."

It is in the light of the afore-stated authoritative decisions that I proceed to decide the instant suit. But the plaintiff must understand that the default of the defendant herein does not imply an automatic victory for him. His case must first of all be believed by the court and must be legally tenable before he can have victory. After all, "success in litigation is not achieved by chivalry or bravado but by the outlay of credible and reliable evidence." See: Alec Grant Sam & Others v. Unilever Ghana Ltd & Others (Civil Appeal No. J4/48/2014 dated 6th June 2016), per Akamba, JSC.

In the case of Dr R.S.D Tei & Anor v. Messr Ceiba Intercontinental [2018] DLSC 3301, Pwamang JSC had the following to say:

"It must be remembered that the fact that a defendant does not appear to contest a case does not mean that the plaintiff would be granted all that he asks for by the court. The rule in civil cases is that he who alleges must prove on the balance of probabilities and the burden is not lightened by the absence of the defendant at the trial. The absence of the defendant will aid the plaintiff only where he introduces sufficient evidence to establish a prima facie case of entitlement to his claim."

The evidence on record depicts the following facts as recounted by the plaintiff on 13th July, 2023.

THE CASE OF THE PLAINTIFF

According to Apostle Prince George Cobbinah, he is the head pastor and Trustee of Plaintiff's church which is a religious body engaged in the propagation of the word of God located at Apramdo. He knows the defendant as a neighbor who lives close to the land in dispute. Thus occupying a building plot Nos. 68 and 69, Apramdo Layout. The Plaintiff church is the owner of Plot Nos. C66 and C67 situate at Apramdo Layout by a Deed of Assignment from one Thomas Brew Ward and the owner per His Lawful Attorney Nana Abakah on one part and Plaintiff Church on the other part dated 4th October, 2019. Deed of Assignment and search report tendered as Exhibit "A" and "A1". The plaintiff got onto the land in 1998 when it began the negotiation for the purchase of the land and gradually got the documentations finalized and executed in 2019 after a long protracted legal battle with the estate of one Cecelia Addison the wife of the said Thomas Ward Brew. The Plaintiff church developed Plot No. C66 and has been carrying out its church services on the land since 1998 with Plot No. C67 reserved for the main church building. That the Plaintiff church acquired a building permit for the construction of a fence wall around the around plots c66/c67 and tendered exhibit "B1" and "B2". The Plaintiff erected billboard on the land with its name inscribed on it. That the Plaintiff also erected a flag pole on which it hoist its flag and the flag of partners in the USA. That the Plaintiff has also planted teak trees on the Plot No. C67 used presently as a car park. That there is a lane lying between the Plaintiff's property being plot No. C67 the land in dispute, and that of the Defendant being plots C68 AND C69. The defendant has been in the habit of disturbing the Plaintiff's church over its use and possession of Plot No. C67. That the defendant is refusing to appreciate the layout of the area and is also refusing to accept the lane between his property C68 and C69 and the property of the plaintiff C67. That the defendant has been attacking plaintiff's

representative, my goodself and some members of the church with threats whenever we organize to carry out any project on the land. I wish to tender photographs of the defendant and his wife on one of the attacks amidst insults and abuses marked Exhibit C and C1. That the defendant in an outraged mood went about the land discoloring the white painting on the teak trees into black. That I wish to tender a copy of photograph of Defendant with container of black paint and brush carrying out the discoloring marked Exhibit C2. That again the defendant has caused damage to Plaintiff's BillBoard and the flag poles, copies of photograph of bill board marked Exhibit D1 showing the damaged poles on the ground. The Defendant has also been attacking the workers of the Plaintiff whenever he sees them working on the land. The Plaintiff church caused its lawyers to write to warn the Defendant on his actions towards the church and copy of the said letter tendered in evidence as Exhibit D2. That we reported the matter to Kwesimintsim Police and the Effia- Kwesimintsim Municipal Assembly (EKMA) whereby the Municipal Chief Executive invited the parties to submit their site plans. At the meeting with the Physical Planning Officer the Chief Executive made it point blank to the defendant that his land was separated by the lane from the Plaintiff's land Plot C67 and his plot C68 and c69 and advised him to stop the attacks and threats against the Plaintiff and its members all to no avail, copy of the letter to EKMA and its Reply marked Exhibit E and E1 tendered in evidence. That the cost of damage occasioned by the defendant to Plaintiff is GHC 9,580.00 which is made up of the following (1) billboard Ghc 4,800.00 (2) flag poles 19- Ghc 2,850 (3) 19 National Flags destroyed Ghc 760 (4) Bags of cement Ghc 280. (4) 2 white oil paint Ghc 170, golden brown oil paint Ghc 170, workmanship Ghc 550. Copy of the bill attached and marked as Exhibit F. that EKMA went to inspect the land and advised the Defendant to leave our land to allow peace in the area but he is still disturbing us on the land. That we are seeking the relief reliefs sought contained in the writ of summons accordingly.

I recall that the plaintiff tendered in evidence some documents (particularly exhibits A, A1, B, B1 and B21) which are from official legal sources to assist in resolution of such issues when disputes arise in ownerships and boundaries of land and I will give attention to them as when it becomes necessary.

Apart from Exhibit A which is a registered Deed of Assignment executed between Thomas Brew Ward AND Full Gospel Word And Worship Center Inc. with Reg. No. WR 2762/1699/19 dated 4/10/2019, Exhibit "A1" is a Certificate of Search No. SDI. 455/2021 dated March, 2021 from Lands Commission covering Plot Nos. C67 & C66 situate at APREMDO. The operative part of Exhibit "A1" states as follows:

"Your letter dated 4th March, 2021, in respect of the above-mentioned plots refers:

1. The plots are not state land.
2. The plots form part of a lease dated 30th April, 1991 and made between Nana Nyankeh Brem II, Chief of Apremdo and Cecelia Addison for a term of 99 years from the date of the lease vide Document No. WR 260/91 with File No. WR 2762/1823.
3. Assignment dated 11th February, 2008 and made between Kweku Addison (Administrator of the Estate of Cecelia Addison) and Irene Dwomoh for the unexpired term of the head lease vide Document No. WR 135/09
 4. Court Judgment dated 27th May, 2019 and granted by the District Court, Harbor Area, Takoradi vide suit No. A9/47/16 with Job No. PVLMDWRAR 135/09.
 5. Assignment dated 4th October, 2019 and made between Thomas Brew Ward and Full Gospel Worship Centre Inc. for the unexpired term of the head lease vide Job No. PVLMDWRAR 393462019

Signed

Regional Lands Officer

I will evaluate Exhibit "A" in the course of this delivery.

But in the meanwhile, it is my considered view that on the basis of this plaint highlighted supra, the plaintiff has a cause of action to pursue against the defendant. As to whether or not his cause of action ought to be upheld and/or endorsed by this court notwithstanding the absence of the defendant at the trial is another issue altogether.

Legal issues for determination:

At the end of the plaintiff's case the court set the following issues for determination.

1. Whether or not Plot No. C67 is owned by the Plaintiff.
2. Whether or not Plaintiff is entitled to his reliefs.

Burden of Proof

Having set down issues for determination in this trial, it is relevant to point out the burden of proof in this matter. It is settled law that a party who asserts assumes the burden of proving same. The burden of producing evidence as well as the burden of persuasion is cast on such a party and the standard of proof required to discharge the burden of persuasion in civil matters is one of "preponderance of probabilities". See sections 12(1) and (2) and 11(4) of the Evidence Act, 1975[NRCD 323].

These statutory provisions have been subject of discussion in plethora of decisions in our Courts. Some of the cases are **Takoradi Flour Mills v. Samir Faris**[2005-2006]SCGLR 882, where the Supreme Court per Ansah JSC exhaustively dealt with the burden of proof at pages 896-898 of the report and **In re Ashale Botwe Lands; Adjetey Agbosu & Ors. V. Kotey & Ors.** [2004-2005] SCGLR 420, among others.

Section 14 of NRCD 323 also provides that:

“Except otherwise provided by law, unless and until it is shifted a party has the burden of persuasion as to each fact the existence or non-existence of which is essential to the claim or defence he is asserting”.

It is also the duty of the court to assess all the evidence on record in order to determine in whose favor the balance of probabilities should lie. In the case of **In re Presidential Election Petition (No.4) Akuffo – Addo & Ors v. Mahama & Ors [2013] SCGLR (Special Edition) 73**, the Supreme Court held at page 322 as follows;

“Our understanding of the rules in the Evidence Decree, 1975 on the burden of proof is that assessing the balance of probabilities, all the evidence, be it that of the plaintiff, or the defendant, must be considered and the party in whose favor the balance tilts is the person whose case is more probable of the rival versions and is deserving of a favorable verdict”

In **Okudzeto Ablakwa (No.2) v. Attorney General & Obetsebi-Lamprey (No.2) [2012] 2 SCGLR 845**, the Supreme Court in dealing with the burden of proof held at page 867 and stated as follows;

“..what this rule literally means is that if a person goes to court to make an allegation, the onus is on him to lead evidence to prove that allegation, unless the allegation is admitted. If he fails to do that, the ruling on that allegation will go against him. Stated more explicitly, a party cannot win a case in court, if the case is based on allegation which he fails to prove or establish”

See also **Faibi v. State Hotels Corporation [1968] GLR** and **Ackah v. Pergah Transport [2010] SCGLR 728**

Evidence Adduced in Court (Plaintiff's Case)

According to his evidence-in-chief in court, the representative of the Plaintiff's church stated as follows; I am known as Apostle Prince George Cobbinah, I am the head pastor and Trustee of Plaintiff's church which is a religious body engaged in the propagation of the word of God located at Apramdo. I know the defendant as a neighbor who lives close to the land in dispute. Thus occupying a building plot Nos. 68 and 69, Apramdo Layout. The Plaintiff church is the owner of Plot Nos. C66 and C67 situate at Apramdo Layout by a Deed of Assignment from one Thomas Brew Ward and the owner per His Lawful Attorney Nana Abakah on one part and Plaintiff Church on the other part dated 4th October, 2019. Deed of Assignment and search report tendered as Exhibit "A" and "A1". The plaintiff got unto the land in 1998 when it began the negotiation for the purchase of the land and gradually got the documentations finalized and executed in 2019 after a long protracted legal battle with the estate of one Cecelia Addison the wife of the said Thomas Ward Brew. The Plaintiff church developed Plot No. C66 and has been carrying out its church services on the land since 1998 with Plot No. C67 reserved for the main church building. That the Plaintiff church acquired a building permit for the construction of a fence wall around the around plots c66/c67 and tendered exhibit "B1" and "B2". The Plaintiff erected billboard on the land with its name inscribed on it. That the Plaintiff also erected a flag pole on which it hoist its flag and the flag of partners in the USA. That the Plaintiff has also planted teak trees on the Plot No. C67 used presently as a car park. That there is a lane lying between the Plaintiff's properties being Plot Nos. C66 & C67 and the land in dispute, and that of the Defendant being plots C68 AND C69. The defendant has been in the habit of disturbing the Plaintiff's church over its use and possession of Plot No. C67. That the defendant is refusing to appreciate the layout of the area and is also refusing to accept the lane between his property C68 and C69 and the property of the plaintiff C67. That the defendant has been attacking plaintiff's representative, my goodself and some members of the church with threats whenever we organize to carry out any project on the land. I wish to tender photographs of the defendant and his wife on one of the attacks amidst insults and abuses

marked Exhibit C and C1. That the defendant in an outraged mood went about the land discoloring the white painting on the teak trees into black. That I wish to tender a copy of photograph of Defendant with container of black paint and brush carrying out the discoloring marked Exhibit C2. That again the defendant has caused damage to Plaintiff's BillBoard and the flag poles, copies of photograph of bill board marked Exhibit D1 showing the damaged poles on the ground. The Defendant has also been attacking the workers of the Plaintiff whenever he sees them working on the land. The Plaintiff church caused its lawyers to write to warn the Defendant on his actions towards the church and copy of the said letter tendered in evidence as Exhibit D2. That we reported the matter to Kwesimintsim Police and the Effia-Kwesemintsim Municipal Assembly (EKMA) whereby the Municipal Chief Executive invited the parties to submit their site plans. At the meeting with the Physical Planning Officer the Chief Executive made it point blank to the defendant that his land was separated by the lane from the Plaintiff's land Plot C67 and his plot C68 and C69 and advised him to stop the attacks and threats against the Plaintiff and its members all to no avail, copy of the letter to EKMA and its Reply marked Exhibit E and E1 tendered in evidence. That the cost of damage occasioned by the defendant to Plaintiff is GHC 9,580.00 which is made up of the following (1) billboard Ghc 4,800.00 (2) flag poles 19- Ghc 2,850 (3) 19 National Flags destroyed Ghc 760 (4) Bags of cement Ghc 280. (4) 2 white oil paint Ghc 170, golden brown oil paint Ghc 170, workmanship Ghc 550. Copy of the bill attached and marked as Exhibit F. that EKMA went to inspect the land and advised the Defendant to leave our land to allow peace in the area but he is still disturbing us on the land. That we are seeking the relief reliefs sought contained in the writ of summons accordingly

Finding of Facts.

The court found as a fact that the Plaintiff obtained an assignment of Plot Nos. C66 & C67 from Thomas Brew Ward (Thomas Ward Brew) Acting By His Lawful Attorney, Nana Abakah which assignment was registered at Lands Commission as Document No. WR 2762/1699/19 plots are situated at Aprembo. That the Lands Commission acknowledges the

Plaintiff as the owner of Plots Nos. C66&67 and Plaintiff's church has been in possession of the land in dispute since 1998.

Analysis of Issues and Application of Relevant laws.

The Defendant participated in this trial up to a point where he even filed his witness statement indicating that he was ready to contest this action, but for whatever reason the defendant suddenly and abruptly ceased coming to court despite numerous adjournments at his instance, still Defendant failed/ refused to appear. The court will therefore take it that after the Court afforded defendant the opportunity to be heard, she failed to respond to the Plaintiff's claim or attend court. The law is that where a party fails to appear in Court after due service on him, he is said to have deliberately failed to take advantage of the opportunity given him to be heard. The audi alteram partem rule cannot be said to have been breached.

See the case of **Ankumah v. City Investment Co. Ltd. [2007-2008]1 SCGLR 1068**. See also the case of **Republic v. High Court(Fast Track Division); Ex parte State Housing Co. Ltd (No.2) Koranten- Amoako Interested Party, [2009]SCGLR 185** where Wood JSC (as she then was) stated authoritatively at page 190 as follows:

“A party who disables himself or herself from being heard in any proceedings cannot later turn round and accuse an adjudicator of having breached the rules of natural justice”

Accordingly, the court, in the instant matter and being mindful of the position of the law as espoused in the above case, and in conformity with Order 25 rule 2 (a) of District Court Rules (C.I. 59) proceeded to hear the matter of the Plaintiff without the Defendant.

The Plaintiff in discharge of the burden cast on him to prove his assertion of being owner of the said plot No.C67 testified by tracing his root of title, in other words, his source of acquisition of the land in dispute from head lease between Nana Nyankey Brem II, Chief

of Apremo and Cecillia Addison for a term of 99 years from the date of lease, upon whose death Kweku Addison (Administrator of the Estate of Cecilia Addison) assigned the unexpired term to Irene Dwomoh dated 11th February, 2008 and then later through yet another assignment dated 4th October, 2019 Thomas Ward Brew assigned his unexpired term to the Plaintiff church. In further proof of that Plaintiff tendered the Deed of Assignment executed between Thomas Ward Brew and True Word Gospel International Inc which has been registered at Lands Commission as Document No. WR 2762/99/2019 same of which was admitted into evidence and marked as Exhibit A. The Plaintiff in further proof of ownership of this plot also testified that he has been in possession of this land by planting teak trees and erected fence wall around same since 1998 but due to some protracted litigation about the land he finally got the documentations ready in 2019.

In land suits such as the instant case, the plaintiff is required to prove his root of title, the mode of acquisition and the identity of his land among others. The Supreme Court speaking through Adinyira JSC in the case of **Yehans International Ltd v. Martey Tsuru Family and 1 or.** [2018] DLSC 2488 held **“it is settled that a person claiming title has to prove: 1) his root of title, ii) mode of acquisition, and iii) various acts of possession exercised over the land.. This can be proved either by traditional evidence or by overt acts of ownership in respect of the land in dispute. A party who relies on derivative title must prove the title of his grantor. Awuku v Tetteh [2011] 1 SCGLR”**

This position as espoused by the Supreme Court in the above case has been complied with by the plaintiff in the instant case. In confirmation of his possession and ownership of the land in dispute, this is what Plaintiff said in his evidence-in-chief before the court.

“The Plaintiff church developed Plot No. C66 and has been carrying out its church services on the land since 1998 with Plot No. C67 reserved for the main church building. That the Plaintiff church acquired a building permit for the construction of a fence wall around the around plots c66/c67 and tendered exhibit “B1” and “B2”. The Plaintiff

erected billboard on the land with its name inscribed on it. That the Plaintiff also erected a flag pole on which it hoists its flag and the flag of partners in the USA. That the Plaintiff has also planted teak trees on the Plot No.C67 used presently as a carpark”

Accordingly, applying the reasoning in the above authorities, it is the view of the court that plaintiff has discharged the burden of proof imposed on him and I hold that Plaintiff has been in undisturbed possession and ownership of the disputed since 1998.

Section 48 (2) of the Evidence Act (NRC323) provides;

“(2) A person who exercises acts of ownership over property is presumed to be the owner of it.”

There has been several judicial pronouncement on the above provision of the Evidence Decree and one of such cases is **Sas George v Johnson Hilodjie & or Civil Appeal No.J4/13A/2004** where Supreme Court stated that;

“the clearly discernible principle is that, in cases of this nature, the most satisfactory contemporary facts that a court should look out for are undisturbed overt act of ownership or possession exercised over the subject matter. That is not to say that other concrete do or may not qualify as acts in living or recent memory. Indeed, what may constitute a fact or event in recent memory in one case, may not pass the same test in another. Each must therefore be dealt with on its own peculiar facts. Therefore, findings and decisions of courts of competent jurisdiction, may, appropriately qualify as evidence of facts in living or recent memory. But, evidently, in land litigation, proven uninterrupted and unchallenged acts of possession, in the absence of some cogent evidence on record to the contrary, as for example an unreserved acceptance of crucial parts of the other side’s oral history cannot be ignored or denied the deserved weight, given that in the first place, by the clear provisions of S.48 of The Evidence Decree NRCD323, such acts raise presumption of ownership.”

In the instant case, aside the abundance of clear records showing ownership of the plot in

dispute to be vested in the Plaintiff, he has exercised control and possession over the land coupled with other acts of ownership such as planting teak trees and parking cars on the plot on the land for a considerable period of time now.

Besides, by parties own agreement, Regional Survey Department was engaged to draw a composite plan based on the survey instructions filed by the parties. The Regional Surveyor of Lands Commission Survey and Mapping Division filed his submission of composite plan dated 14/04/22 in the registry of this court on 20/04/22. In this composite plan Plot Nos. C66 and C67 with boundary line as shown by plaintiff on the ground edged firm yellow line fell in line with boundary line as shown per Plaintiff's site plan edged broken yellow line are separated by a lane from Defendant's Plot Nos, C68 and C69 boundary line as shown by the Defendant on ground edged red firm line. Looking at the composite plan as filed, the various plots of the parties both of which are joined to each other, and both separated by a lane, should ordinarily not admit of no controversy.

Analyzing the whole evidence before the court, it is difficult to appreciate the concerns of the Defendant, but unfortunately, he chose to abstain from continuous participation of the suit to make known his concerns to the court.

Therefore, considering the totality of evidence before the court, especially, Exhibits "A" "A1" "B" "B1" and "B2" the court is satisfied and convinced that Plaintiff has discharged the burden of proof imposed on him, and has been able to prove his case against the Defendant on balance of probabilities.

Accordingly, I hereby enter judgment in favor of the Plaintiff and grant the reliefs he seeks against Defendant and order as follows:

1. Declaration of title to Plot No. C67 situate at Aprembo and find defendant liable for trespass to same.
2. Special Damages Ghc 9,580.00 for the destruction caused to Plaintiff's bill board, flag pole, and discoloring of Plaintiff's paintings.

- 3 . General damages of Ghc5, 000.00 for trespass.
- 4 . Recovery of Possession.
- 5 . Perpetual injunction restraining the Defendant either by himself, his agents' privies and assigns etc from interfering with the land, attacking Plaintiffs workers or members of thePlaintiff Church or in anyway having anything to do with PlotNo. C67, Apremndo the subject matter of this suit.

I think that the justice of this case warrants that the plaintiffbe given some costs to offset the expenses he incurred in initiatingthe instant suit. Consequently, I will, and hereby award cost of GH¢3,000.00 against the defendant and in favour of the plaintiff.

(SGD)

BERNARD D. BINEY ESQ.

(DISTRICT MAGISTRATE)

01.08.2023

COUNSEL:

J.E.K. Abakah for Plaintiff

REFERENCES;

- 1 . In re West Coast Dyeing Industry Ltd; Adams v. Tandoh [1984-86] 2 GLR 561, CA.
- 2 . Watalah v. Ghana Primewood Products Ltd. [1973] 2 GLR 126.
- 3 . Moreover, in the case of In Re Ashalley Botwe Lands; AdjeteAgbosu & Ors v. Kotey & Ors [2003-2004] SCGLR 420.
- 4 . Alec Grant Sam & Others v. Unilever Ghana Ltd & Others (CivilAppeal No. J4/48/2014 dated 6th June 2016).

- 5 . Dr R.S.D Tei & Anor v. Messr Ceiba Intercontinental [2018] DLSC3301.
- 6 . In re Presidential Election Petition (No.4) Akuffo – Addo & Ors v. Mahama & Ors [2013] SCGLR (Special Edition) 73,
- 7 . Faibi v. State Hotels Corporation [1968] GLR and Ackah v. Pergah Transport [2010] SCGLR 728.
- 8 . Ankumah v. City Investment Co. Ltd. [2007-2008]1 SCGLR 1068.
- 9 . Republic v. High Court (Fast Track Division); Ex parte State Housing Co. Ltd (No.2) Koranten- Amoako Interested Party, [2009] SCGLR 185.
- 10 . Yehans International Ltd v. Martey Tsuru Family & 1or [2018] DLSC2488.
- 11 . Section 48 of Evidence Decree (NRCD 323)
- 12 . George v Johnson Hilodjie & or Civil Appeal No. J4/13A/2004