

Okumu v Attorney General
(Misc. Cause No.163 of 2013)
[2014] UGHCCD 89 (3 July 2014)
[2014] UGHCCD 89

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

1 / 2

derives its jurisdiction from S. 197 (ii) and S. 119 (i), (h), (g) of the UPDF Act. If a civilian brings himself/ herself under the jurisdiction of the General Court Martial, he/she can be tried even if he/she is a civilian. This can occur when they use or are found in possession of weapons, the monopoly of the Defence Forces. (**Hadijah Namugerwa** case refers)

It should be noted that a right of habeas corpus is not automatic and that whoever applies for it is given the order. The applicants have to prove the purpose for the application i.e production of a person in an unlawful detention to courts of law. Habeas corpus is not meant to challenge the proceedings from which the applications originate. Constitutionality of such proceedings can only be determined on reference to the Constitutional Court since S 119 (i) (g) and (h) of the UPDF Act has never been declared unconstitutional.

Whether the weapons are a monopoly of the defence forces is a matter of evidence which cannot be determined by this court in these proceedings. It is a triable issue. Whereas S. 119 (i) (g) and (h) does not create an offence, it is an unusual section which brings civilians under the ambit of the General Court Martial if found in possession of not only fire arms but ammunitions the monopoly of the defence forces. That law has never been repealed and is still effective and in force regardless of the misgivings of the Human Rights advocates. All the applicants listed above in the above applications are in lawful custody and are not entitled to the prayers sought respectively. Those still entitled may apply for bail before the court. Therefore the applications as listed have no merit and they will be dismissed respectively.

Stephen Musota

J U D G E

03.07.2014

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/ughccd/2014/89/eng@2014-07-03>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/uganda/okumu-v-attorney-general-misc-cause-no163-of-2013-2014-ughccd-89-3-july-2014-unknown-topic-unknown-court-2014--6a3ea4d93b1caa91297e60b4>

Prepared on 12 October 2026 · Esheria