

kept at home, But the infringement of the village regulation is not enough to have found the- cthnvictjbn. That the 1st appellant had the authority,? lawfully is very clear. Ee-brok stat, 1. av/ in having Ijetn. The story give' b'yt he 2 eliant lik:ewis.e rkes hi iident of , hVing been inps'ession of the roudso finuriiti.on cohtrary t'b the :lāw uner4lich he hadben charguc]. 7.; IncCncluS1l)n therefore, both appellants were found guilty cnci convicted oufnces on evidence that at nfOst- : created supicioii agbinst %hem. This is not enbughL . . . YAHYP. RUBJ;1A,, 1 JUE., 30/12/01. . . :
~, , . . . , VJ V' . . . ;f. . . '

- . . . , .
- . . . , ry.. - . . . , . . . , . . . ' . . . ,
--

Source & reproduction note

Judgment wording, source notices and original paragraph numbers are retained. Esheria supplies the layout and this PDF's page numbers; these are not the source pagination. This is a research copy, not an official or certified court document. Check quotations, citations and publication restrictions against the original source before relying on it.

ORIGINAL SOURCE	https://media.tanzlii.org/media/judgment/351321/ source_file/64ee5ea66b3bd5f3/19811230_TZHC_Tabora1.pdf
CASE PAGE	https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/tanzania/tembele-so-yacha-v-the-republic-shopbreaking- tzhc-1981

Prepared on 14 October 2026 · Esheria