

UGANDA / JUDGMENT

Galandi v Attorney General (Constitutional Petition 4 of 2021) [2025] UGCC 2 (18 February 2025) [2025] UGCC 2

COURT

Constitutional Court of Uganda

BEFORE

Mulyagonja, JCC, Kihika, JA /JCC, Tibulya, JA/JCC,
Kazibwe, JCC, Asa Mugenyi, JA/ JCC

CASE / FILE NUMBER

Constitutional Petition 4 of 2021

Source: ulii.org · Research copy typeset by Esheria. Not court-issued or certified.

I

**⁵ THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA IN THE CONSTITUTIONAT COURT OF
UGANDA AT KAMPALA**

[Cora m ; M u lyagonja, Ki h i i ka,Ti bu !ya, M ugenyi, Ka zi bwe Kawu m i,JJ CC]

CONSTITUTIONAL PETITION NO. 04 OF 202L

BETWEEN

GALANDI PAUL EMMY LUZIGE GABONJ. A PETITIONER

AND

ATTORNEY GENERAL RESPONDENT

JUDGMENT OF MOSES KAZI BWE KAWUMI. JCC

20

Introduction

This petition was brought under Article 137 (3) of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda 1995 and the Constitutional Court (Petitions and References) Rules S.1.91 of 2005. The Petitioner contends that the failure

by the Court of Appeal to expeditiously determine Election Petition Appeal No.53 of 2016 was inconsistent with and contravened Articles L (41,2 (1) & (2), 1,3 (4) (a), L26(2)(b) and L40 (1) & (2) of the Constitution. 25

Background

In the Parliamentary Elections held on 18th February 2016, the Electoral Commission returned, declared and gazetted a one Herbert Tom Kinobere as the duly elected Member of Parliament for Kibuuku County Constituency in Kibuuku District. A one Wairagala Godfrey Kamba challenged the election in Mbale Court in his capacity as a registered voter in the constituency and was successful. 30 35

Page 1 of 15

UI

⁵ Herbert Tom Kinobere filed Election Petition Appeal No.53 of 2016. The Appeal was first called for hearing on 28th March 2017 before Stephen Kavuma (DCJ as he then was), Owiny Dollo (JA, as he then was) and Hellen Obura, JA. Judgment was reserved to be delivered on notice. In September 2017, Justice Kavuma retired before judgment was delivered.

A re-constituted panel comprised of Owiny Dollo (DCJ then), Kakuru JA(RIP) and Obura JA, heard the appeal afresh on 4th October 2018 and judgment was reserved to be delivered on notice. On 20th August 2020, Justice Owiny Dollo was elevated to the position of Chief Justice before the judgment could be delivered.

The Appeal was dismissed on 4th December 2020 for the reason that it had abated and each party was ordered to bear its costs. The basis for the decision was that the 2016-2020 election period was closing. Nomination of aspirants for elective positions including aspirants for Parliamentary seats had ended and campaigns were underway. 20

The Court noted that reconstitution of another panel to hear the Appeal would be an exercise in futility and the whole exercise in as far as it related to the 2016 elections would be moot. The Court regretted the inconvenience, injustice and the delay caused to the parties. 25

The Petitioner contends that he is a public spirited Ugandan and an ardent believer in the Rule of Law and Constitutionalism who was aggrieved by the failure by the Court of Appeal to expeditiously determine Election Petition Appeal No.53 of 2016. It is contended that the failure to determine the Petition expeditiously was inconsistent with and in contravention of Articles 1(4), 2(1) & (2), 3(4) (a), 26(2) (b) and 140(1) & (2) of the Constitution. ,

Page 2 of LG

It is further contended that the omission by the Respondent to supervise and require Justice Stephen Kavuma (DCJ as he then was) to clear all pending matters on his desk including the impugned Election Petition Appeal in the extra three months spent before finally vacating his office, was inconsistent with and contravened Article 44(1)(C) of the Constitution.

The Petitioner also contends that the Respondent undermined the supremacy of the Constitution and defiled the rule of law. He seeks the following Declarations: -

- i. That the delay to expeditiously determine Election Petition Appeal No.53 of 2016 as constitutionally provided for was inconsistent with and contravened Articles 1(4), 2(1) & (2), 3(4)(a), 26(2)(b) and 140 of the Constitution.
- ii. That the neglect by the Respondent to supervise and require Justice Kavuma to clear all pending matters including Election Petition Appeal No.53 of 2016 before vacating office was inconsistent with and contravened Article 44(1)(C) of the Constitution.
- iii. That to the extent that the Court of Appeal in its judgment determined that the Election Petition Appeal had abated meant, that the people of Kibuku Constituency would continue to be represented in Parliament from the date of the judgment to the expiry of the 10th Parliament, by a person who is not qualified to be a Member of Parliament which was unconstitutional and contravened Articles 44 and 26(2)(b) of the Constitution and

Page 3 of 16

1,0

⁵ Sections 66 & 67 of the Parliamentary Elections Act, 2005 as amended.

The Petitioner seeks orders that: -

- a) All Election Petition Appeals pending hearing be expeditiously heard and determined within six months from the date of delivery of the judgment in this Petition.
- b) All future Election Petition Appeals must be heard and determined expeditiously as stipulated in the Constitution of Uganda and in any case not later than six months from the respective filing dates.
- c) Costs of the Petition be provided for.

Respondent's answer to the Petition

- The Respondent contends that the Petition discloses no issues or questions for Constitutional interpretation. It is denied that the alleged failure by the Court of Appeal to expeditiously determine Election Petition Appeal No.53 of 2016 was inconsistent with and/or in contravention of Articles 1 (4), 2 (1) & (2), 3 (4) (a), 26 (2) (b) and 40 (1), (2) of the Constitution. 25

It is averred by the Respondent that the alleged omission to supervise and require the then Deputy Chief Justice to clear all pending matters before retirement did not contravene and was not inconsistent with Article 44 (1) (C) of the Constitution. The Respondent further contends that neither was the supremacy of the Constitution undermined nor the rule of law defied as alleged by the Petitioner.

The Respondent filed an affidavit sworn by Ebila Hilary Nathan, State Attorney, in support of the Answer to the Petition. It is contended in the 35

Page 4 of 15

5 Affidavit that the reasons for the delay to determine Election Petition Appeal No.53 of 2016 were laid out in the Judgment and that the Petition discloses no grounds requiring Constitutional interpretation.

It is further contended that the complaints by the Petitioner can be successfully challenged and addressed in the High Court by way of Judicial Review for being ultra vires and contrary to the Parliamentary Elections Act. This aspect of the Reply to the Petition however appears to have been abandoned since it was not canvassed in the submissions. 10

Re-joinder by the Petitioner 15

The Petitioner asserted in re-joinder that the delay in disposing of the Election Petition Appeal No.53 of 2016 within the prescribed time was inexcusable and violated the Constitution. It is further averred, that the High Court cannot review a decision of a higher court and the Petition was properly filed since the Court may be petitioned for declarations as well as for redress where appropriate.

Representation

Mr. Akenda Solomon represented the Petitioner while Mr. Richard Adrole, the Assistant Commissioner in charge of Litigation in the Respondent's chambers, jointly with Senior State Attorney Mark Muwonge represented the Respondent. 25

Issues raised by the Petitioner.

- Counsel for the Petitioner raised the following issues for resolution by the Court:- 30

- L. Whether the Petition raises a cause of action and the Petitioner has locus standi.

Page 5 of 16

U-

- ⁵ 2. Whether failure by the Court of Appeal to expeditiously determine Election Petition No.53 of 2016 or in any case not later than six months from the date of filing the said Election Petition Appeal was in contravention of and inconsistent with Articles 41, 2 (1) & (2), 3 (4) (a), 26 (2), (b) and 140 (1) & (2) of the Constitution.
- 3. Whether the failure by the Respondent to supervise and cause its servant Stephen Kavuma, (DCJ as he then was) to clear all pending matters on his desk including the impugned Election Petition Appeal, before vacating office was inconsistent with and in contravention of Articles 1 (3) & (4), 44 (1) (C) of the Constitution?
- 4. Whether the Respondent's agent's finding that the Election petition Appeal No.53 of 2016 had abated was in contravention of and inconsistent with Articles 1 (3) & (4) and 40 of the Constitution.
- 5. Whether the Petitioner is entitled to the remedies prayed for.

Submissions for the Petitioner on the 1st issue

As to whether the Petition discloses a cause of action and the Petitioner's locus standi to bring the Petition, it was submitted that the Petition was properly brought under Article 137 of the Constitution since it challenges the constitutionality of the Respondent's actions, which were in contravention of the cited Constitutional provisions. 25

Counsel for the Petitioner cited Attorney General V Major General David Tinyefuza; Constitutional Court Appeal No.1 of 1997 for the proposition that in as much as the Petitioner alleges the acts or omissions complained of, and cites the provisions of the Constitution which have been contravened, a cause of action is disclosed. 30

⁵ Submissions for the Respondent

For the Respondent, it was argued that the Petitioner is aggrieved by the decision of the Court of Appeal in Election Petition Appeal No.53 of 2016 but no issues requiring Constitutional interpretation were raised. It was submitted that in the case of Mbabali Jude V Edward Kiwanuka Sekandi.

Constitutional Petition No.0028 of 2012 the court while relying on the Supreme Court decision in Ismail Serugo V Kampala City Council & Attorney General. Constitutional Appeal No.2 of 1998 held: 10

> "That for the Constitutional court to be clothed with jurisdiction at all, the court must be petitioned to determine the meaning of any part of the Constitution in addition to whatever remedies are sought from it in the same petition."

It was submitted that since no questions requiring interpretation of the Constitution are evident in the Petition, it ought to be dismissed.

20

Determination

The jurisdiction of the Constitutional court to determine Constitutional Petitions and References from other courts is derived from Article 137 of the Constitution. Article 137 (3) (b) of the Constitution is relevant for the determination of the first issue.

Article 137 (3) (b) of the Constitution provides as follows:-

"3. A person who alleges that---

(a)

(b) Any act or omission by any person or authority is inconsistent with or in controvention of a provision of this Constitution, may petition the constitutional court for ^a decloration to that effect and for redress where appropriate."

Page 7 of L6

(d)

- The subject matter jurisdiction of the Constitutional court has been S canvassed in a number of authorities and guiding precedents are abundant. In Mbabali Jude V Edward Kiwanuka Sekandi. Constitutional Petition No.0028 of 2012 Kasule JA, observed that: -
- "A constitutional question that has to be interpreted by the Constitutional court arises when there is an issue, legal or otherwise, requiring an interpretation of the Constitution for the resolution of the cause out of which that issue arises of the constitution the *from..... Interpretation* is ascertaining of the meaning of specific constitutional provisions and how they should be applied in a particular *context.*"

The Court of Appeal dismissed Election Petition Appeal No.53 of 2016 for the reason that it had abated given the near expiry of the election cycle it related to. The justification for not concluding the Appeal was the departure from office of two members from the two successive panels constituted to hear and determine the Appeal.

The Court stated in its 4th December 2020 judgment that :-

"The appeal therefore would ordinarily have to be placed before a reconstituted Coram for fresh hearing. However, we have considered the fact that the election period 2016-2021 is closing. Nomination of aspirants for parliamentary seats already ended and campaigns are has underway..... Proceeding to reconstitute a new Coram and rehearing this Petition would be an exercise in futility. It would entail a fresh hearing. Judgment writing would then follow. All this would take time.

\$20\$

\$25\$

5 In view of the above we consider that this appeal in as far as it relates to the 2016 elections is moot. We are alive to the fact that the question of the appellant's qualifications may be alive. That is a matter that can be dealt with in the next election or whenever it comes again.

We highly regret the inconvenience and injustice this delay has caused to the parties. The appeal stands dismissed having abated. We order each party bears his own costs here and at the High Court."

Interpretation of the constitution is the ascertaining of the meaning of specific constitutional provisions and how those provisions should be applied in a particular context. The context was that the Court did not determine the Appeal in time leading to its abatement. This has to be analysed against the Constitutional provisions requiring expeditious hearing of electoral matters.

The Petition therefore raises questions for the interpretation of Articles 141, 126 (2) (b) and 140 (2) of the Constitution. I find merit in the first issue.

Issue No.2

Whether failure by the Court of Appeal to expeditiously determine Election Petition No.53 of 2016 or in any case not later than six months from the date of filing the said Election Petition Appeal was in contravention of and inconsistent with Articles 141, 2 (1) & (2), 3 (4) (a), 126 (2) (b) and 140 (1) & (2) of the Constitution.

Submissions for the Petitioner.

Page 9 of 15 (/

It was submitted for the Petitioner that the will and consent of the people on who should govern them is expressed through regular, free and fair elections of their representatives or through referenda as provided for by Article 1 (4) of the Constitution. Counsel submitted that Article 2 (1) provides for the supremacy of the Constitution the provisions of which are also binding on the Court of Appeal and that any act inconsistent with it shall be void as laid out in Article 2(1) of the same Constitution. Counsel cited Paul K. Semogerere & another V AG. Constitutional Appeal No.1 of 2000 and Okello-Okello John Livingstone & Others V AG & Another. Constitution Petition No.4

of 2005 in support

1s ef the submissions.

Article L26 (21(b) of the Constitution was referenced as the basis for the principle that justice shall not be delayed by the courts. Counsel emphasized the requirement for the Court of Appeal to have determined Election Petition Appeal No.53 of 20L6 expeditiously citing Article 140 zo (1) and (2) of the Constitution to support the submission.

25 30 It was argued that the expeditious hearing of Election Petition Appeals is construed to be within six months from the date such Appeals are filed as dictated by Section 66 l2l of the Election Petitions Act, which operationatizes Article L40 of the Constitution. Counsel for the Petitioner relied on the case of Kubeketerya V Waira Kyewalabye & EC. EPA No. 97 of ? :OLG for the proposition that elections are periodically held after every five years. Where the outcome is challenged in courts of law, the leaders and the electorate must know their fate expeditiously to remove any uncertainty on both sides.

The Court was urged to declare that the delay or failure by the Court of Appeal to determine Election Petition Appeal No.53 of ZOLG was in

⁵ contravention of and inconsistent with the listed Articles of the Constitution.

Submissions for the Respondent

For the Respondent, it was submitted that Article 76 ol the Constitution empowers Parliament to enact laws on the conduct of elections and pursuant to it; the Parliamentary Elections Act was enacted. Section 55(2) of the Parliamentary Elections Act provides for hearing and determination of Election Petition Appeals within six months and further

provides that the Court may suspend any other matter pending before it for that purpose.

Counsel argued that Section 93 of the Parliamentary Elections Act further provides for the making of Rules to regulate the hearing of Electoral disputes pursuant to which the Parliamentary Elections (Election Petitions) Rules S.l. 141-2 were made. Rule 33 thereof provides for the expeditious hearing of Appeals and Rule 34 provides for extension of time for hearing of appeals where exceptional grounds exist, counsel argued.

It was submitted that the delivering of Judgments in Election Petition Appeals after six months is not unconstitutional since section 65 (2) of the Parliamentary Elections Act as amended is not mandatory. Counsel cited Ayena Odongo Krispas Charles V Attorney General Constitutional Petition 38 of 2OL7 to support the argument. 25

Counsel for the Respondent further argued that Article 135(1) of the Constitution provides for the composition of the Court of Appeal. The Court of Appeal is only constituted at any sitting, if it consists of an uneven number, not being less than three members of the Court, it was so Pointed out' 30

Page 11 of 16

it was submitted that with the retirement of Kavuma (DCJ) and the elevation of Owiny Dollo (CJ), the available members after the two incidents could not form the Coram to hear and determine the Appeal within six months. Time was therefore on account of those exceptional circumstances extended but the failure to deliver the judgment within six months was not inconsistent with or in contravention of Articles 1 (4), 10

2 (L1,,3 (4) (a), L26 (2) (b) and Article 1,40 of the Constitution.

Determination

The second issue relates to the court's failure to expeditiously determine the Petition and in any case, within six months from the date it was filed.

The six months' period is derived from Section 66(2) of the Election Petitions Act which provides as follows;- L5

"The Court of Appeal shall proceed to hear and determine on appeal under this section within six months from the date of filing the appeal and for that purpose may suspend any other matter pending before it."

It is worth noting that the Petitioner does not seek the interpretation of Section 66(2) of the Parliamentary Elections Act but seeks ^a pronouncement on the application of Article 140(1)&(2) of the Constitution to the context within which Election Petition Appeal No.53 of 2016 was dismissed by the court.

Article 140(1) of the Constitution provides as follows :-

"1.40. Hearing of election cases.

- (1) Where any question arises before the High Court for determination under article 86(1) of this Constitution, the High Court shall proceed to hear and determine the question expeditiously and for that purpose, suspend any other matter pending before it.
- (2) This article shall apply in a similar manner to the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court when hearing and determining appeals on questions referred to in clause (1) of this article."
- 10 Article 85 (1) of the Constitution that is referred to in Article 140(1) cited above, mandates the High Court to determine matters concerning the eligibility of members of Parliament. Article 140(1) provides for expeditious hearing of such matters by the Courts.

- 15 20 The Oxford Learners Dictionary defines the term "expeditiously" to mean, "doing something with speed and efficiency." The Court of Appeal failed to handle the election petition appeal in over four years from the date it was filed. The court was aware that election cycles in this jurisdiction last for a period of five years. The appeal concerned a sitting member of Parliament whose qualifications to represent the people of Kibuku County Constituency had been declared inadequate by the High Court.

The justification given by the court was the collapse of two panels that heard but did not determine the Appeal. The first hearing was on 28th March 2017 and one of the members of that panel left the court in September 2017, which translates, to six months from the date the appeal was heard. Another panel was reconstituted and heard the appeal on 4th October 2018, which was 19 months from the date of the first hearing.

a

On 20th August 2020, a member of the Panel was promoted before judgment was delivered. The appeal was dismissed on 4th December 2020 after 26 months from the date it was heard by the reconstituted panel. It was nowhere stated that the Court of Appeal at any time from

Page 13 of 16

(

when the appeal was filed lacked at least three Judges which was the required number of Justices to hear and determine the appeal.

Article 140 (2) of the Constitution mandates the court to set aside all other business, which points to the importance and necessity to expeditiously determine election petition appeals. This provision was not invoked by the court given the delayed delivery of judgments by each of the two panels and the long periods between the collapse and reconstitution of fresh panels.

I would find that the omission by the Court of Appeal to hear and determine Election Petition Appeal No. 53 of 2016 within the 2016 election cycle was inconsistent with and contravened Articles 146(2) and 140(2) of the Constitution. 15

Article 1 (4) of the Constitution provides; 20

- "7. Sovereignty of the People
- H) The people shall express their will and consent on who shall govern them and how they should be governed in accordance with this Constitution."
- 25

The people of Kibuuku County expressed their will on the person to represent them in Parliament by electing Hon. Tom Kinobere. This was invalidated by the High Court, which declared him unqualified, and the matter was presented to this court on Appeal. It was incumbent on the court to expeditiously determine the question about his eligibility to represent the people, which did not happen until the expiry of the electoral period.

\

- ⁵ The omission to determine the Appeal within the election cycle it related to implied, that the people of Kibuuku County were for that period, represented by a member of Parliament whose qualifications had been declared to be inadequate to hold such a position.
- ^I further find it imperative to note that the right to a fair hearing provided for under Article 28 (L) of the Constitution entails a speedy trial. Article 28 (1) provides: 10
- "28. Right to a fair hearing.
- (1) In the determination of civil rights and obligations or any criminal charge, a person shall be entitled to a fair, speedy and public hearing before an independent and impartial court or tribunal established by law."

The right to a fair hearing, which entails a speedy hearing among other attributes, is also emphasized in Article L26 (2) (b) of the Constitution which provides for speedy delivery of justice. It is a non-derogable right under Article 28 of the Constitution and the Court of Appeal should have taken that into account in the management of Election Petition Appeal No.53 of 2016. 20

I would thus find that by failing to determine Election Petition Appeal No.53 of 2016 expeditiously, the Court of Appeal contravened Articles L (4)(i), L26 (2) (b) and 140 (2) of the Constitution.

The Petition succeeds on the second issue. I do not find it necessary to delve into the merits of the third and fourth issues raised by the Petitioner. I also find the orders sought by the Petitioner to be speculative and not meriting discussion by the court. I make the following declarations; 30

(1

I

Page 15 of 16

a

t

1. The omission by the Court of Appeal to hear and determine Election Petition Appeal No.53 of 2016 within the 2016-2021 election cycle was inconsistent with and contravened Articles L26(2) and 140(2) of the Constitution.

a

2. The omission to determine the Appeal within the 20L6-202L election cycle implied, that the people of Kibuuku County were for that period, represented in Parliament by a person whose qualifications had been declared to be inadequate to hold such ^a position.

15

Remedies

The Petition raised matters of great public importance relating to the will of the people to determine who to govern them. The Petition further highlighted the failure by the court to deliver on its mandate yet it was the apex forum to resolve the electoral dispute. The Petitioner was however, not a party to the appeal and would not qualify for costs. Each

- party will bear its costs.
- ²⁵ Dated and delivered at Kampala this 1.may of 2025.

Moses Kazibwe Kawumi ³⁰ Justice of the Constitutional Court

THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA IN THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT OF UGANDA AT KAMPALA

CONSTITUTIONAL PETITION NO. 04 OF 2021

BETWEEN

\$AND\$

GALANDI PAUL EMMY LUZIGE

ATTORNEY GENERAL 15

OSCAR JOHN KIHIIKA.

Justice of the Constitutional Court

RESPONDENT

PETITIONER

HON. JUSTICE IRENE MULYAGONJA, JCC CORAM: HON. JUSTICE OSCAR JOHN KIHIIKA, JCC
HON. JUSTICE MARGARET TIBULYA, JCC HON. JUSTICE MOSES KAZIBWE KAWUMI, JCC HON.
JUSTICE DR. ASA MUGENYI, JCC

JUDGMENT OF OSCAR JOHN KIHKA, JCC

\$25\$

\$20\$

I have had the benefit of reading in draft the Judgment of my learned brother Justice Moses Kazibwe Kawumi, JCC.

I agree that this petition succeeds. I have nothing useful to add.

Dated and delivered at Kampala this

\$\mathsf{S}\$

\$10\$

THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA IN THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT OF UGANDA AT KAMPALA

[Coram: Mulyagonja, Kihika, Tibulya, Kazibwe Kawumi & Mugenyi, JJ. CCI

CONSTITUTIONAL PETITION NO. 04 OF 2021**BETWEEN**

GALANDI PAUL EMMY LUZIGE GABONJA PETITIONER

AND

ATTORNEY GENERAL o.....o....o..... RESPONDENT

JUDGMENT OF MARGARET TIBULYA. JCC

I have had the benefit of reading in draft the judgment of my learned brother Kazibwe Kawumi, JC. I agree with the analysis and conclusion.

I also agree with the proposed orders as embodied in his judgment. I have nothing useful to add.

Dated at Kampala this I day of 2025

7r ooaaaaaaaaa

Tibulya Justice of the Constitutional Court.

THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA**IN THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT OF UGANDA AT KAMPALA**

(coram: Mutyaogonja, Kihika, Tibulya, Kazibwe Kawumir & Mugenyi JJCC) CONSTITUTIONAL
PETITION NO. 4 OF 2021

BETWEEN

GALANDI PAUL EMMY LVZIGE GABONJA AIID PETITIONER

ATTORNEY GENERAL RESPONDENT

JUDGMENT OF JUSTICE DR. ASA MUGENYI. JCC

I have had the advantage of reading in draft the judgment prepared by my Learned Brother, Hon. Justice Moses Kazibwe Kawumi, JCC. I agree with the reasoning and orders Proposed.

Dated at Kampala this ... (..*To^, ... A.+ * 1 2025

\ I

JUSTICE OF CONSTITUTIONAL COURT

THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA**IN THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT Or. UGANDA AT KAMPALA**

Coram: Mulgagonja, Kihika, Tibulya, Kazibwe Kawumi & Mugenyi, JJCC

CONSTITUTIONAL PETITION NO 04 OF 2021**BETWEEN**

GALANDI PAUL EMMY

LVZIGE GABONJA 3 PETITIONER

AND

ATTORNEY GENERAL RTSPONDENT

JUDGMENT OF IRENE MULYAGONJA, JCC

I have had the benefit of reading in draft the judgment of my learned brother, Kazibwe Kawumi, JCC.

I agree with the reasons, the decision and the declarations that he proposed.

As Kihika, Tibulya and Mugenyi, JJCC also agree, the petition succeeds with the following declarations and orders:

- 1. The omission by the Court of Appeal to hear and determine Election Petition Appeal No. 53 of 2016 within the 2016-2021 election cycle was inconsistent with and contravened Articles 126 (2) and LaO Q1 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda.
- 2. The omission to determine the appeal within the 2016-2021 election cycle implied that the people of Kibuku County were for that period represented in Parliament by a person whose qualifications had been declared inadequate to hold such an office.
- 3. Each party shall bear its costs for the petition

Dated at Kampala this 11th day of February, 2025. I

^ ⁵ Irene Mulyagonja

JUSTICE OF THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT

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://ulii.org/akn/ug/judgment/ugcc/2025/2/eng@2025-02-18>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/uganda/galandi-v-attorney-general-constitutional-petition-4-of-2021-2025-ugcc-2-18-february-2025-unknown-topic-unknown-court-2025--6a3ea4d83b1caa91297e4f40>

Prepared on 12 October 2026 · Esheria