

UGANDA / JUDGMENT

New Vision Printing & Publishing Co. Ltd v Atek Lillian and Ojok Cosmos Otukene (Miscellaneous Application No. 013/2024) [2025] UGHC 312 (21 May 2025) [2025] UGHC 312

COURT

High Court of Uganda

BEFORE

Mwaka, J

CASE / FILE NUMBER

Miscellaneous Application No. 013/2024

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

THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA

IN THE HIGH COURT OF UGANDA HOLDEN AT KITGUM

MISCELLANEOUS APPLICATION No. 013/2024

(Formerly HIGH COURT GULU - MISC. APPLICATION No. 023/2023)

5 (Arising from HIGH COURT KITGUM - CIVIL APPEAL No. 051/2024)

(Formerly HIGH COURT GULU - CIVIL APPEAL No. 088/2022)

(ARISING FROM CIVIL SUIT No. 018/2019: MAGISTRATE PADER)

NEW VISION PRINTING & PUBLISHING CO. LTD APPLICANT

Versus

10 1. ATEK LILLIAN

2. OJOK COSMOS OTUKENE RESPONDENTS

BEFORE: HON. MR. JUSTICE PHILIP W. MWAKA.

RULING.

Introduction and Background.

- 15 [1]. The Applicant, stipulated herein, filed this Application seeking Orders from this Court - firstly, that the time within which to seek leave of this Court to Appeal be extended; secondly, that a Notice of Appeal and a Memorandum of Appeal lodged in this Court on the 20th October, 2022 be validated; thirdly and lastly, an Order making provision for Costs of this Application.
- [2]. The Motion instituting the Application was filed on the 10 20 th March, 2023. The Ruling of the Lower (Trial) Court sought to be Appealed was delivered on the 7th October, 2022 by His Worship Ongwee Stanislaus Okello, Magistrate Grade 1, Pader overruling a preliminary objection on a point of Law raised by the 1st, 4th, 5th and 6th Defendants with costs in regard to their contention 25 that the Plaint instituting the suit in Libel did not disclose a cause of action.

1 | Page

Pleadings and Procedural Status.

- [3]. The Application is instituted by way of Notice of Motion under **Section 98 of the Civil Procedure Act, Cap. 71 (now Cap. 282); Order 44 Rules 2, 3 & 4 and Order 52 Rules 1 & 3 of the Civil Procedure Rules, SI 71 – 1. 30** These citations were revised by the **Law Revision Act, Cap. 3 and Statutory Instrument No. 049/2024: The Law Revision (Commencement of the 7 th Revised Edition) (Principal Laws) Instrument, 2024.**
- [4]. The Application is supported by an Affidavit of Mr. Ochola Felix, the 6th Defendant. Apparently, the Affidavit omits the customary last paragraph and 35 thereby does not state whether it's contents and averments are based on knowledge, information and, or belief. See: **Order 19 Rule 3(1) & (2) of the Civil Procedure Rules.** This defect, however, in the circumstances of this case does not render his Affidavit incurably defective and the Affidavit shall be retained on the Record of this Court and relied on in the interests of 40 substantive Justice. See: **Sugga Vs. Roadmaster Cycles (U) Ltd [2002] 1 EA 255 & Article 126(2)(e) of the Constitution.** Moreso, since upon due consideration, the averments are simply a mundane recital of the Trial proceedings in the Lower (Trial) Court leading to the instant Application which in any event can be ascertained from the Lower (Trial) Court's Record. 45 [5].

Similarly attached to the Application is an Affidavit of a Mr. Ntende Kenneth cited as Counsel for the Applicant which the Court observes is neither signed by nor duly attested to by a Commissioner for Oaths - thus comprising a bare statement not on oath. See: **Oaths Act, Cap. 21** and **Commissioner for Oaths (Advocates) Act, Cap. 6**. In consequence, the Court finds the 50 document supposedly an Affidavit incurably defective and not properly filed on its Record. It is irredeemable and cannot be saved under the considerations outlined in the foregoing paragraph. It is accordingly struck out.

- [6]. The Respondents opposed the Application and filed an Affidavit in Reply of Ms. Atek Lillian, the 1 st Respondent/1 st Plaintiff, on the 20th December, 2023.

55 [7]. This Court considers it pertinent and instructive, in the consideration of this Application, to establish the status of the Trial proceedings (procedural posture) in the Lower (Trial) Court as far as can be discerned from its Record of Proceedings which are provided. The Court observes that - (1). The Main Suit was filed on the 24th October, 2019 with the Plaintiffs (Respondents herein) alleging defamation by way of Libel. (2). The 1st and 5 60 th Defendants filed their Written Statement of Defence on the 15th November, 2019 while the 4th and 6th Defendants filed their Defence on the 25th November, 2019. (3). No Defence was filed for or by the 2nd and 3rd Defendants in respect of which the matter is proceeding **Ex Parte**. (4). The matter was referred to Mediation which was on the 20th 65 January, 2021 reported as unsuccessful. (5). Significantly, on the 28th September, 2022 the suit was Scheduled followed by the 1st Plaintiff, now the 1st Respondent herein, commencing her testimony as PW1 and culminated in a preliminary objection raised by the Defendants in the course of the 1st Plaintiff's testimony - now subject of this Application. [8]. In his Ruling on the 7 70 th October, 2022 the Learned Trial Magistrate overruled the preliminary objection raised by the Defendants who had contended that the Plaintiff did not disclose a cause of action as required by **Order 7 Rule 1(e) of the Civil Procedure Rules** by virtue of the failure of the Plaintiffs to plead the facts constituting the cause of action and when it arose and more 75 importantly in as far as the claim for defamation by way of Libel is concerned failing to specify or to stipulate in the Plaintiff by way of pleading the offensive tortious words and, or language used. The Learned Trial Magistrate determined that the "**actual words**" complained of and in "**substance**" were contained in paragraph 9 of the Plaintiff and therein referenced an Annexure 80 of a voice recording and its translation which were said to have been served on the Defendants following the Scheduling Conference and prior to the hearing and therefore the Defendants would not be prejudiced or disadvantaged at the hearing since they could present witness testimony.

- [9]. The Learned Trial Magistrate further determined that the Defendants are in 85 possession of the Recording and therefore dismissing the case would be tantamount to an injustice to the Plaintiffs being "**lay innocent people**" whose Counsel ought to have ensured that the voice recording and translation were attached and the mistakes of Counsel cannot be visited on the litigants. Therefore, the initial error of not attaching the voice recording was not fatal. 90 Moreover, at the Scheduling the parties had agreed that the voice recording is translated and served. Hence, the preliminary point was overruled with costs.

- [10]. In subsequent appearances, it transpired that the proceedings became acrimonious. At the next proceeding after the Ruling on the preliminary objection which was on the 27th October, 2022 neither the Defendants nor 95 their Counsel appeared before the Trial Court and the Trial could not proceed. The inertia continued on the 1st November, 2022, the 15th November, 2022, the 12th December, 2022 and the 24th January, 2023.
- [11]. Following the Ruling on the 7th October, 2022, a Notice of Appeal and a Memorandum of Appeal raising three (3) grounds of Appeal designated **Civil Appeal No. 088/2022** with the Applicant as the 1 100 st Appellant was lodged in the High Court on the 20th October, 2022. The Court observes that on its Record is a Notice of Appeal filed by the Applicant herein and the 6th Defendant dated 14th October, 2022 Lodged in the High Court on the 20th October, 2022 and a Memorandum of Appeal dated 20th October, 2022 and Lodged on 20 105 th October, 2022 raising three (3) grounds of Appeal all in one way or the other in respect of whether the Plaint disclosed a cause of action.
- [12]. Crucially, in respect of the instant Application and the Appeal filed *vide* **Civil Appeal No. 088/2022** there is much doubt amongst the parties in the Main Suit as to whether the Lower (Trial) Court through the Learned Trial 110 Magistrate did in fact grant the Defendants leave to Appeal his Ruling - since it was not a Ruling which by its nature could be Appealed to the High Court as of right under **Order 44 Rule 1 of the Civil Procedure Rules**.
- [13]. The Record of Proceedings of the Lower (Trial) Court of the 27th October, 2022 reflects that the Learned Trial Magistrate stated at page 23, referring to 115 the Defendants at the Trial, that - **"... from the record: it is true, Counsel sought leave to Appeal. The same was not granted. Counsel did not give reasons for Appealing and no Order to Appeal was granted"**.
- [14]. Following this, on the Lower (Trial) Court's Record at the Proceedings of the 1 st November, 2022 at page 24 the Learned Trial Magistrate further observed 120 that - **"The Appeal on a preliminary point of Law needs an Order for Leave to Appeal. This Order has not been granted"**.
- [15]. It is therefore the finding of this Court after considering the Record of Proceedings of the Lower (Trial) Court *in extenso* that the Defendants had in fact orally sought leave to Appeal whilst before the Learned Trial Magistrate 125 immediately after he had delivered the Ruling on the preliminary objection on the 7th October, 2022 - in which their objection was overruled and denied and their oral Application for leave to Appeal the Ruling was apparently not granted for the reasons given by the Learned Trial Magistrate. Any initial confusion arising in respect of whether leave to Appeal was granted to the 130 Defendants, or not, was clarified as highlighted in the preceding paragraphs. The Trial Court did not issue any Order granting leave to Appeal the Ruling on the preliminary objection and neither has one been presented in this Court. This Court accepts the Learned Trial Magistrate's clarification on his Record.

Order 44 Rule 1(3) of the Civil Procedure Rules provides -

135 "Applications for leave to Appeal shall in the first instance be made to the Court making the Order sought to be Appealed from."

[16]. In the circumstances, therefore, the Defendants stipulated in the Main Suit having sought and been denied leave to Appeal by the Learned Trial Magistrate in the Lower (Trial) Court would - as a condition precedent - be 140 required to apply to the High Court for leave to Appeal the Ruling of the Learned Trial Magistrate, should they be interested in pursuing an Appeal.

The Applicant's Case and Submissions.

- [17]. The Applicant's grounds in the Motion for extension of time within which to seek leave to Appeal and for validation of the Notice of Appeal and 145 Memorandum of Appeal and as seen in the remaining Affidavit of Mr. Ochola Felix are that it had raised a preliminary point of Law in regards to the suit not disclosing a cause of action due to the failure of the Plaintiffs to reflect the actual offensive tortious words and language used in the Plaint *verbatim* on which the cause of action was grounded which the Learned Trial Magistrate 150 overruled on the basis that an audio recording that first appeared at the Scheduling was sufficient to cure the irregularity. Its case is that in so doing the Learned Trial Magistrate tried to cure an irregularity that is incurable in Law. The Applicant next avers that being dissatisfied with the Ruling it sought leave to Appeal and which it contends that the Learned Trial Magistrate granted and then adjourned the matter *sine die*. A letter dated 10 155 th October, 2022 from the Plaintiff's Counsel was addressed to the Court to the effect that there had been no Appeal lodged and therefore sought hearing notices to continue with the hearing. The Applicant shortly after filed a Notice of Appeal and Memorandum of Appeal which it brought to the attention of the 160 Trial Court and Plaintiffs. The Applicant then proceeds to assail the Learned Trial Magistrate averring that it believed that he had "altered" the Record of the Trial Court which was submitted to the High Court thereby causing a "grave" miscarriage of Justice by his "behaviour" and that he demonstrated "bias" and "bad faith". Its case is also that the Appeal has a high probability 165 of success and in the interests of Justice the Application should be allowed.
- [18]. In its Submissions filed on the 10th July, 2024 the Applicant submitted citing **Section 98 of the Civil Procedure Act** that this Court has inherent powers to make Orders for the ends of Justice and, or to prevent an abuse of the process of the Court. Referring to its Affidavits, the Applicant submits that it 170 has demonstrated good cause for grant of the Application.

6 | Page

- [19]. In respect of extension of time to seek leave to Appeal, the Applicant prays the Court extends time since there had not been an unexplained inordinate delay and it would be wrong to shut it out of and deny it the right to Appeal. The Applicant then reiterates its averments alleging distortion of the Record 175 of the Trial Court by the Learned Trial Magistrate and insisting that it was "altered" and "doctored" to falsely indicate that it had

been denied leave to Appeal the Ruling. The Applicant, however, later concedes that it was caught up by time in seeking leave to Appeal and in sum on the matter submits that it has provided a reasonable explanation for its failure to first seek leave from 180 the High Court before filing its Appeal moreso within the time prescribed.

- [20]. In respect of leave to Appeal under **Order 44 Rule 1(2) of the Civil Procedure Rules**, the Applicant submits that since there was no automatic right of Appeal from the Ruling, it was required in the first instance to seek leave from the Court which made the Order Appealed from. It is its 185 contention that leave was sought on the ground that it was dissatisfied with the Ruling and which it insists was granted. The Applicant complains about a hearing notice issued and difficulty in obtaining the Record of Proceedings from the Trial Court and yet again reiterates its complaint regarding alleged alterations. It submits that the foregoing sufficiently explains its delay in 190 seeking leave to Appeal the Ruling of the Learned Trial Magistrate.
- [21]. Here, this Court observes the vacillating positions and stance of the Applicant - on the one hand blaming the Learned Trial Magistrate for supposedly altering the Trial Court's Record from initially indicating that leave to Appeal had been granted to later indicating that it had not been granted; and on the 195 other hand conceding that difficulties encountered in receiving the Trial Court's Record caused the delay in their seeking leave to Appeal the Trial Court's Ruling and in turn Appealing within the time prescribed by Law.
- [22]. In respect of an Appeal's likelihood of success, the Applicant submits that an Appeal has a high likelihood of success reiterating its points of objection.

200 [23]. In concluding on the matter, the Applicant prays that the Application is granted and the Notice of Appeal and the Memorandum of Appeal documents already filed *vide* **Civil Appeal No. 088/2022** are validated.

The Respondents' Case and Submissions.

- 205 [24]. In opposing the Application, as already observed, the Respondents filed an Affidavit of the 1 st Respondent, Ms. Atek Lillian on the 20th December, 2023 in which she avers that the Application is without merit or sufficient grounds, frivolous and contains falsehood. The Court observes that the Affidavit predominantly comprises technical objections based on the advice of her 210 Attorneys without much substance in terms of factual information.
- [25]. The Respondents did not file Written Submissions todate inspite of the Schedule provided by the Court.
- [26]. There were no Rejoinders filed on the Record of the Court.

215 Representation.

- [27]. Counsel, Mr. Ntende Kenneth, who on the Trial Court's Record had indicated that he variously represented the 1st Defendant - The Manager, Uganda Radio Network; the 4th Defendant - The Editor in Chief of Radio Rupiny and the 6th Defendant - (Mr. Ochola Felix) in the Lower (Trial) Court now 220 represented the Applicant - New Vision Printing and Publishing Company Ltd - being the sole Applicant. This was improper since he had also presented an Affidavit in evidence and professionally Counsel is well aware that he cannot at the same time present evidence as a witness and simultaneously purport to be heard in Representation. Mr. Felix Ochola, the 6th Defendant, 225 was present in Court - much as he is not a party to this instant Application.
- [28]. Counsel, Mr. Okun Innocent, holding brief for Counsel, Mr. Egaru Emmanuel, represented the Respondents. The Respondents were absent.

Considerations and Determination of the Court.

- [29]. As a preliminary consideration on a point of Law, **Sua Sponte**, this Court 230 observes that the Main Suit was in fact not instituted against the Applicant herein, the New Vision Printing and Publishing Company Limited. The Applicant, itself being a body corporate, did not feature in any of the Lower (Trial) Court's Trial proceedings whatsoever since the suit's filing in 2019. The Applicant's first emergence as a protagonist in respect of this litigation under 235 the Main Suit was in filing the Notice of Appeal and Memorandum of Appeal in 2022 in its own names as a supposed Appellant instituting an Appeal from the Ruling of the Learned Trial Magistrate then in this Application similarly purporting to further the Appeal by seeking extension of time and validation of the Notice and the Memorandum of Appeal - as the sole Applicant.
- 240 [30]. The Court is conscious that the parties against whom the Main Suit was filed were: the 1st Defendant - The Manager, Uganda Radio Network; the 2nd Defendant - The Editor in Chief of the Red Pepper Newspaper; the 3rd Defendant - The Pepper Publications Ltd; the 4th Defendant - The Editor in Chief of Radio Rupiny; the 5th Defendant - Mr. Dan Michael Komakech; and, the 6th Defendant - Mr. Ochola Felix. The Court has already observed that the 2nd and 3rd Defendants did not file Written Statements of Defence. The Written Statements of Defence observed on the Record were filed by the 1st, 4th, 5th and 6th Defendants. The 4th Defendant, described as a local Radio Station based in Northern Uganda, and the 6th Defendant, described as an employee of the 4th Defendant, give their address of service in the suit as the Legal Department, the New Vision Printing and Publishing Company Ltd. Meanwhile, the 1st and 5th Defendants' address is through their designated Attorney representing them in the Main Suit. The 1st Defendant is described as an Online Media Outlet publication while the 5th Defendant is said to be a Journalist in the employment of the 1st Defendant. These are the designated Defendants party to the Main Suit. The Applicant itself does not feature.

9 | Page

- [31]. The Applicant herein, the New Vision Printing and Publishing Company Limited, is an established well known limited liability corporate entity with its core business being publication of News items and information through its 260 different Media fora. Curiously, in this Application and throughout these proceedings including in the Written Submissions it filed, the Applicant herein does not make any reference to its **Locus Standi** in filing this Application - seemingly oblivious to its abrupt emergence which this Court has already observed that it only surfaced to supposedly file a Notice of Appeal and a 265 Memorandum of Appeal and alternately pursue extension of time within which to Appeal and validation as this Court has previously belaboured.
- [32]. Much as a nexus may exist between the Applicant and some of the designated Defendants in the Main Suit, this has not been established by the Applicant. While the Court may consider and take Judicial Notice of material in the 270 Public Domain to ascertain the nature and character of and relationships between entities in suits it is presiding over, this constitutes an essential element an Applicant would be required to address in discharging their burden of proof in establishing their **Locus Standi** in an Application such as this where an entity abruptly emerges in an Appeal having had no previous 275 participation in Trial Proceedings.
- [33]. As far as the Court can discern from the public domain, the 4th Defendant Radio Rupiny - loosely describes and presents itself as a "**subsidiary**" of the Applicant with the implication that the Applicant is its parent Company or for that matter holding Corporation thereby implicitly suggesting a principal 280 - agent relationship. The Uganda Registration Services Bureau (URSB) indicates that Radio Rupiny is in fact simply registered as a business name. The Uganda Communications Commission (UCC) indicates that it is registered to the Applicant as its operator styled simply as "**Radio Rupiny**". As a very basic minimum, the Applicant and its subsidiaries are clearly 285 separate Legal entities and their separate existence is one of their convenience.

10 | Page

- [34]. The Court has found it necessary to belabour these considerations since from its own observations, though not raised as an objection, the Applicant as the Corporate entity it is not a designated party to the Main Suit as ascertainable from the pleadings. It is trite that one may elect to file a suit against either a 290 principal or its agent or both, as the case may be, but once the suit is filed the entity stipulated is and remains the subject of the suit. It is therefore untenable for an entity subject of a pending suit and, or any of its associated entities including its principals, agents, parent corporations, holding corporations and subsidiaries not explicitly designated as a party to the pending suit to simply 295 interchangeably, randomly or whimsically switch, alter or otherwise change their participation in the suit pending before the Court without first obtaining leave of the presiding Court to either be added, joined or substituted as a party or even removed and

struck out as may be appropriate. This is the very essence of the entirety of the provisions of **Order 1 of the Civil Procedure**

- **300 Rules, SI 71-1.** The rationale is simply that there must be predictability to litigation and any demurrers as to the **Locus Standi** of any litigant cited as a party to a suit must be formally addressed and resolved by the presiding Court. In the event that a Court left the parties to their own devices, the litigation process would be rendered chaotic, especially by entities seeking to remain 305 cloaked behind the corporate veil and anonymity preferring not to feature.
- [35]. In suits filed in defamation, precedent indicates the Courts have been permissive in allowing suits against unincorporated entities and personas on the one hand including Editors or Editors in Chief or Editorial Boards (**virtute officii**) of News and Media entities including Newspapers, Television, Radio 310 and other Media - as well as individuals; and on the other hand, suits against the principal entities or parent entities themselves often Corporations. One is at liberty to institute a targeted suit against any specific identified entity or alternatively in omnibus against all perceived offending entities. The peril faced is that an inappropriately joined entity may be struck out at cost.
- **315 See: Felix Onama Vs. Uganda Argus Ltd [1968] EACA 10; CACA No. 170/2022: The Monitor Publications Ltd, The Managing Director - The Monitor Publications Ltd, The Managing Editor/Executive Editor - The Monitor Publications Ltd, The Editor Sunday Monitor - Monitor Publications Ltd and Andrew Bagala Vs. Pius Bigirimana; CACA No. 320 128/2017: The Red Pepper Publications Ltd & The Editor in Chief of the Red Pepper Publications Ltd Vs. Rtd. Chief Justice Samuel William Wako Wambuzi; High Court Civil Suit No. 611/1993: Rhoda Kalema Vs. William Pike; High Court Civil Suit No. 113/2003: Rtd. Justice Jeremiah Herbert Ntabgoba Vs. The Editor in Chief of the New Vision 325 Newspaper & Another, etc.**
- [36]. In the context of this Application, the question of the **Locus Standi** of the Applicant herein to institute an Appeal is exacerbated by the fact that it was well aware of the proceedings in the Trial Court and apparently seemingly continued to enjoy anonymity as an undisclosed principal, albeit through its 330 Attorney(s). The Applicant did not seek leave of the Trial Court to be joined or added or substituted as a designated party to the litigation or for that matter seek to have the 4th Defendant struck out - as appropriate - which it had every opportunity to do during the Trial Proceedings and which had it done the question of its **Locus Standi** raised herein would not arise. It is the entities that 335 are party to the Main Suit under Trial that would be considered **"an aggrieved party"**. As a consequence, this Application is filed by the Applicant in a vacuum and is entirely without foundation in Law.
- [37]. This Court is, however, conscious that in only the most exceptional of circumstances and for the most compelling cause would an Appeal instituted 340 by an entity not party to previous litigation - including the Trial and even a first Appeal - be allowed and entertained. This does not arise here.

See: Supreme Court Civil Appeal No. 021/2010: Komakech Geoffrey & Another Vs. Rose Akol Okullo & 2 Others, Etc.

- [38]. Bearing the foregoing in mind, this Court hereby finds that the Applicant 345 herein not being an original party to the litigation does not have **Locus Standi** to institute and, or pursue this Application and, or otherwise purportedly intervene as an Appellant. In sum, with the Applicant having no **Locus Standi** to file this Application, the Application is incompetent, misconceived and bad in Law. The Application is accordingly struck out with costs.
- 350 [39]. In regards to the Notice of Appeal and the Memorandum of Appeal filed by the Applicant herein together with the 6th Defendant without leave of this Court as required by **Order 44 Rule 1(2) of the Civil Procedure Rules**, this Court inevitably finds that both were prematurely filed and both the cited Notice of Appeal and the Memorandum of Appeal **vide** **Civil Appeal No. 355 088/2022** are hereby struck out. **See: CACA No. 379/2017: AllMuss Properties (Uganda) Ltd Et Al Vs. CTM (Uganda) Ltd Et Al.**
- [40]. Having carefully given due consideration to the Application with its supporting Affidavit, the responsive Affidavit, the Written Submissions of the Applicant filed on Court Record, the Law Applicable and taking into account 360 all relevant factors; this Court finds that the Applicant stipulated herein does not have **Locus Standi** to file this Application and the Application is hereby struck out with costs. Similarly, the Notice of Appeal and the Memorandum of Appeal **vide** **Civil Appeal No. 088/2022** are both struck out.

365 Orders of the Court.

- [41]. Accordingly, the Court makes the following Orders:
- 1. **Miscellaneous Application No. 013/2024** is hereby struck out.
- 2. The Notice of Appeal and the Memorandum of Appeal **vide** **Civil Appeal No. 088/2022 (now 051/2024)** are both hereby struck out.
- 370 3. The Applicant shall meet the costs of this Application.
- 4. The file shall be returned to the Lower Court to conclude the Trial.
- It is so Ordered.

Signed and Dated on the 21st day of May, 2025 at High Court, Kitgum Circuit.

Philip W. Mwaka 375

Acting Judge of the High Court.

Delivery and Attendance.

This signed and dated Ruling has on the directions of the Presiding Judge been delivered to the Parties electronically on Wednesday, 21st day of May, 2025 at 380 10:00am by the Deputy Registrar, High Court, Kitgum Circuit. Certified copies shall be retained on the Court's file to be availed to the Parties.

- 1. Deputy Registrar, High Court Kitgum Circuit: H/W Suzanne Aisia Musooli.
- 2. Counsel for the Applicant: Mr. Ntende Kenneth.
- 3. Counsel for the Respondent: Messrs. Egaru & Co. Advocates.
- 4. The Applicant: The New Vision Printing & Publishing Co. Ltd.
- 5. The 1st Respondent: Ms. Lillian Atek.
- 6. The 2nd Respondent: Mr. Ojok Cosmas Otukene
- 7. Court Clerk and Interpreter: Mr. Atube Michael.
- 8. Interested and Affected Persons and Entities. 390

Philip W. Mwaka

Acting Judge of the High Court.

High Court Kitgum Circuit. 395

\$21st day of May, 2025.

385

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/ughc/2025/312/eng@2025-05-21
CASE PAGE	https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/uganda/new-vision-printing--publishing-co-ltd-v-atek-lillian-and-ojok-cosmos-otukene-miscellaneous-application-no-0132024-2025-ughc-312-21-may-2025-unknown-t--6a3ea4da3b1caa91297e6d19

Prepared on 13 October 2026 · Esheria