

UGANDA / JUDGMENT

Yonasani B.Kanyomozi v Motor Mart(U) Ltd [2000] UGSC 14 (14 June 2000)

[2000] UGSC 14

COURT

Supreme Court of Uganda

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

{\rtf1\ansi\ansicpg1252\uc1\deff0\stshfdbch0\stshfloch0\stshfhich0\stshfbi0\deflang2057\deflangfe2057{\fonttbl{\f0\froman\fcharset0\prq2{*\panose 02020603050405020304}Times New Roman;}{\f36\froman\fcharset238\prq2 Times New Roman CE;}

{\f37\froman\fcharset204\prq2 Times New Roman Cyr;}{\f39\froman\fcharset161\prq2 Times New Roman Greek;}{\f40\froman\fcharset162\prq2 Times New Roman Tur;}{\f41\froman\fcharset177\prq2 Times New Roman (Hebrew);}

{\f42\froman\fcharset178\prq2 Times New Roman (Arabic);}{\f43\froman\fcharset186\prq2 Times New Roman Baltic;}{\f44\froman\fcharset163\prq2 Times New Roman (Vietnamese);}{\colortbl;\red0\green0\blue0;\red0\green0\blue255;\red0\green255\blue255;

\red0\green255\blue0;\red255\green0\blue255;\red255\green0\blue0;\red255\green255\blue0;\red255\green255\blue255;\red0\green0\blue128;\red0\green128\blue128;\red0\green128\blue0;\red128\green0\blue128;\red128\green0\blue0;\red128\green128\blue0;

\red128\green128\blue128;\red192\green192\blue192;}{\stylesheet{\ql\li0\ri0\widctlpar\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\adjustright\rin0\lin0\itap0\fs24\lang2057\langfe2057\cgrid\langnp2057\langfenp2057\snext0 Normal;}{*\cs10 \additive\ssemihidden

Default Paragraph Font;}{*\ts11\tsrowd\trftsWidthB3\trpaddl108\trpaddr108\trpaddfl3\trpaddft3\trpaddfb3\trpaddfr3\trcbpat1\trcfpat1\tsellwidthfts0\tsvertalt\tsbrdrt\tsbrdrl\tsbrdrb\tsbrdr\tsbrdrdgl\tsbrdrdgr\tsbrdrh\tsbrdrv

\ql \li0\ri0\widctlpar\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\adjustright\rin0\lin0\itap0\fs20\lang1024\langfe1024\cgrid\langnp1024\langfenp1024\snext11 \ssemihidden Normal Table;}{

\s15\ql \li0\ri0\sb100\sa100\sbauto1\saauto1\widctlpar\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\adjustright\rin0\lin0\itap0 \fs24\lang2057\langfe2057\cgrid\langnp2057\langfenp2057 \sbasedon0 \snext15 \styrsid6970562 Normal (Web);}{\s16\ql \li0\ri0\widctlpar

\tc\tx4153\tqr\tx8306\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\adjustright\rin0\lin0\itap0
\fs24\lang2057\langfe2057\cgrid\langnp2057\langfenp2057\sbasedon0\snext16\styrsid13203663
footer;}{\cs17\sbasedon10\styrsid13203663 page number;}

{\latentstyles\lsdstimax156\lsdlockeddef0}{\listtable{\list\listtemplateid1153884270\listhybrid{\listlevel\levelnfc4\levelnfcn4\leveljc0\leveljcn0\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid-1939276300

\03(\00);}{\levelnumbers\02;}{fbias0\fi-360\li720\jclisttab\tx720\lin720}{\listlevel\levelnfc4\levelnfcn4\leveljc0\leveljcn0\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807577\02\01;}{\levelnumbers\01;}

\fi-360\li1440\jclisttab\tx1440\lin1440}{\listlevel\levelnfc2\levelnfcn2\leveljc2\leveljcn2\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807579\02\02;}{\levelnumbers\01;}{\fi-180\li2160\jclisttab\tx2160\lin2160}

{\listlevel\levelnfc0\levelnfcn0\leveljc0\leveljcn0\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807567\02\03;}{\levelnumbers\01;}{\fi-360\li2880\jclisttab\tx2880\lin2880}{\listlevel\levelnfc4\levelnfcn4\leveljc0\leveljcn0\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807577\02\04;}{\levelnumbers\01;}{\fi-360\li3600\jclisttab\tx3600\lin3600}{\listlevel\levelnfc2\levelnfcn2\leveljc2\leveljcn2\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807579\02\05;}{\levelnumbers\01;}{\fi-180\li4320\jclisttab\tx4320\lin4320}{\listlevel\levelnfc0\levelnfcn0\leveljc0\leveljcn0\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807567\02\06;}{\levelnumbers\01;}{\fi-360\li5040\jclisttab\tx5040\lin5040}{\listlevel\levelnfc4\levelnfcn4\leveljc0\leveljcn0\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807577\02\07;}{\levelnumbers\01;}{\fi-360\li5760\jclisttab\tx5760\lin5760}{\listlevel\levelnfc2\levelnfcn2\leveljc2\leveljcn2\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807579\02\08;}{\levelnumbers\01;}

\fi-180\li6480\jclisttab\tx6480\lin6480}{\listname ;}{\listid1348679204}{\list\listtemplateid534787676\listhybrid{\listlevel\levelnfc0\levelnfcn0\leveljc0\leveljcn0\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid-1242393994

\03(\00);}{\levelnumbers\02;}{fbias0\fi-360\li420\jclisttab\tx420\lin420}{\listlevel\levelnfc4\levelnfcn4\leveljc0\leveljcn0\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807577\02\01;}{\levelnumbers\01;}

\fi-360\li1140\jclisttab\tx1140\lin1140}{\listlevel\levelnfc2\levelnfcn2\leveljc2\leveljcn2\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807579\02\02;}{\levelnumbers\01;}{\fi-180\li1860\jclisttab\tx1860\lin1860}

{\listlevel\levelnfc0\levelnfcn0\leveljcn0\leveljcn0\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807567\02\03.;}
{\levelnumbers\01;}{\fi-360\li2580\jclisttab\tx2580\lin2580 }{\listlevel\levelnfc4\levelnfcn4\leveljcn0\leveljcn0\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807577\02\04.;}{\levelnumbers\01;}{\fi-360\li3300\jclisttab\tx3300\lin3300 }
{\listlevel\levelnfc2\levelnfcn2\leveljcn2\leveljcn2\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807579\02\05.;}
{\levelnumbers\01;}{\fi-180\li4020\jclisttab\tx4020\lin4020 }{\listlevel\levelnfc0\levelnfcn0\leveljcn0\leveljcn0\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807567\02\06.;}{\levelnumbers\01;}{\fi-360\li4740\jclisttab\tx4740\lin4740 }{\listlevel\levelnfc4\levelnfcn4\leveljcn0\leveljcn0\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807577\02\07.;}{\levelnumbers\01;}{\fi-360\li5460\jclisttab\tx5460\lin5460 }{\listlevel\levelnfc2\levelnfcn2\leveljcn2\leveljcn2\levelfollow0\levelstartat1\levelspace0\levelindent0{\leveltext\leveltemplateid134807579\02\08.;}{\levelnumbers\01;}
{\fi-180\li6180\jclisttab\tx6180\lin6180 }{\listname ;}{\listid1816750708}}
{*\listoverrideable{\listoverride\listid1348679204\listoverridecount0\ls1}
{\listoverride\listid1816750708\listoverridecount0\ls2}}{*\pgptbl
{\pgp\ipgp0\itap0\li0\ri0\sb0\sa0}}
{*\rsidtbl \rsid6638\rsid1731914\rsid1974642\rsid3614676\rsid4811922\rsid5983884\rsid6970562\rsid7368535\rsid7762874\rsid9848880\rsid13123112\rsid13203663\rsid14830933\rsid14947745\rsid15078456\rsid15410386\rsid16145625\rsid16525304}}{*\generator Microso
ft Word 11.0.5604;}{\info{\title THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA }{\author jchemeri}{\operator skivumbi}{\creatim\yr2009\mo12\dy2\hr13\min27}{\revtim\yr2009\mo12\dy2\hr13\min27}
{\version2}{\edmins0}{\nofpages19}{\nofwords6040}{\nofchars34429}{*\company JSI}
{\nofcharsws40389}{\vern24689}}{\paperw11906\paperh16838 \widowctrl\ftnbj\abenddoc\noxlatoyn\nexpshrt\noultrlspec\dntblnsbdb\nospaceforul\hyphcaps0\formshade\horzdoc\dgmargin\dghspace180\dgvspace180\dghorigin1800\dgvorigin1440\dghshow1\dgvshow1
\jexpand\viewkind1\viewscale100\pgbrdrhead\pgbrdrfoot\splytwnine\ftnlytwnine\htmautsp\nolnhtadjtbl\useltbaln\alntblind\lytcalctblwd\lyttblrtgr\lnbrkrule\nobrkwrtbl\snaptogridincell\allowfieldndsel\wrppunct
\asianbrkrule\rsidroot6970562\newtblstyruls\nogrowautofit \fet0{*\ftnsep \pard\plain \ql
\li0\ri0\widctlpar\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\adjustright\rin0\lin0\itap0
\fs24\lang2057\langfe2057\cgrid\langnp2057\langfenp2057 {\insrsid13203663 \chftnsep

\par }}{*\ftnsepc \pard\plain \ql
\li0\ri0\widctlpar\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\adjustright\rin0\lin0\itap0
\fs24\lang2057\langfe2057\cgrid\langnp2057\langfenp2057 {\insrsid13203663 \chftnsepc

\par }}{*\aftnsep \pard\plain \ql
\li0\ri0\widctlpar\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\adjustright\rin0\lin0\itap0
\fs24\lang2057\langfe2057\cgrid\langnp2057\langfenp2057 {\insrsid13203663 \chftnsep

\par }}{*\aftnsepc \pard\plain \ql
\li0\ri0\widctlpar\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\adjustright\rin0\lin0\itap0
\fs24\lang2057\langfe2057\cgrid\langnp2057\langfenp2057 {\insrsid13203663 \chftnsepc

\par }}\sectd \linex0\headery708\footery708\colsx708\endnhere\sectlinegrid360\sectdefaultcl\sectr
sid14947745\sftnbj {\footer \pard\plain \s16\ql \li0\ri0\widctlpar

\tqc\tx4153\tqr\tx8306\pvpara\phmrg\posxr\posy0\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\adjustright\rin0\lin0\i
tap0\pararsid3614676 \fs24\lang2057\langfe2057\cgrid\langnp2057\langfenp2057 {\field{*\fldinst
{\cs17\insrsid13203663 PAGE }}{\fldrslt {

\cs17\lang1024\langfe1024\noproof\insrsid9848880 1}}{\cs17\insrsid13203663

\par }\pard \s16\ql \li0\ri360\widctlpar\tqc\tx4153\tqr\tx8306\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\adjustright\
rin360\lin0\itap0\pararsid13203663 {\insrsid13203663

\par }}{*\pnseclvl1\pnucrm\pnstart1\pnindent720\pnhang {\pntxta .}}
{*\pnseclvl2\pnucrltr\pnstart1\pnindent720\pnhang {\pntxta .}}
{*\pnseclvl3\pndec\pnstart1\pnindent720\pnhang {\pntxta .}}
{*\pnseclvl4\pnlcltr\pnstart1\pnindent720\pnhang {\pntxta }}

{*\pnseclvl5\pndec\pnstart1\pnindent720\pnhang {\pntxtb ({\pntxta })}}
{*\pnseclvl6\pnlcltr\pnstart1\pnindent720\pnhang {\pntxtb ({\pntxta })}}
{*\pnseclvl7\pnlcrm\pnstart1\pnindent720\pnhang {\pntxtb ({\pntxta })}}{*\pnseclvl8

\pnlcltr\pnstart1\pnindent720\pnhang {\pntxtb ({\pntxta })}}
{*\pnseclvl9\pnlcrm\pnstart1\pnindent720\pnhang {\pntxtb ({\pntxta })}}\pard\plain \s15\ql
\li0\ri0\sb100\sa240\sbauto1\sl360\slmult1

\widctlpar\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\adjustright\rin0\lin0\itap0\ipgp1\pararsid13203663
\fs24\lang2057\langfe2057\cgrid\langnp2057\langfenp2057
{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15078456\charrsid15078456 }}

\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid15078456 THE REPUBLIC OF
UGANDA }{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15078456

\par }{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid15078456 IN THE SUPREME
COURT OF UGANDA }{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15078456

\par }{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid15078456 HOLDEN AT MENG
\line (CORAM: ODER MULENGA AND KANYEIHAMBA JJ. S. C.) \line }
{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15078456 }{

\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid15078456 CIVIL APPEAL NO.15 OF
1995}{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15078456

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid15078456 \line }
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15078456 }
{\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15078456\charrsid15078456 }{

\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid15078456 BETWEEN}
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid15078456 }
{\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \line }{

\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid7762874 YONASANI }
{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15078456 B. KANYOMOZI::::::::::::::::::::::::::}
{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 APPELLANT \line }{

\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874 }
{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874\charrsid7762874 }
{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid7762874 AND}{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid7762874 }
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \line }
{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 MOTOR MART (U)
LIMITED}{

\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874 ::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::}
{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid7762874 RESPONDENT}
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \line }{

\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 (Appeal arising from
judgmen}{\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874 t and Decree of the High Court }
{\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

(Mr. Justice J. B. Katusi) at Kampala in Civil Suit No.}
{\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874 37}
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 }
{\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874 of }{

\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 1993 dated 1 January
1995). }{\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874

\par }{\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \line }
{\b\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 JUDGMENT OF
MULENGA JSC. }{\b\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 This is an appeal against a decision of the High Court dismissing a suit for breach of contract. The appeal was}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874

instituted in this Court on 23}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\super\langnp1033\insrsid7762874\charrsid7762874 rd}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874 }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

May 1995, before the Court of Appeal was established by the Constitution in October 1995. The appeal, however, had a chequered history of being dismissed for want of prosecution a

nd subsequently being re-instated. It is unnecessary to detail that history here. Suffice to say that because of that history the appeal was not heard until 10th April, 2000, almost five years after it was instituted. The facts, which give rise to the sui

t, however date back to the late 1980\quote s. I should first give a brief account of how the suit came about.}{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 In 1987, the appellant, Yonasani B. Kanyomozi, whom I shall refer to as '93Kanyomozi'\94, owned a Bedford tipper lorry, to which I shall herein refer as }

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 '93the vehicle }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 '93

. At the material time, the vehicle was not functional, apparently as a result of its being used and mishandled by the army during the war. In or about April 1987, Kanyomozi, who was out of the country at the time, instructed his wife to take th

e vehicle to the garage for necessary repairs. The vehicle was inspected and an initial estimate of repair costs was made in June 1987. Subsequent estimates were made in July and August, 1987. Payment for the repairs, however, was staggered and most of it

was made in 1990. In or about December of that year the vehicle was returned to Kanyomozi in the belief that repairs were duly completed. However, upon being taken on road test immediately, the vehicle broke down. It was taken back to the garage.}{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

It was alleged in the pleadings, but not repeated in evidence, that subsequently another road test was carried out with similar results. Whether the allegation was true or false however does not appear to affect the issues in this appeal and I shall not r

efere to it any more. At some stage subsequent to the vehicle breaking down while on road test, Motor Mart (U) Limited, to which I will herein refer as '93Motor Mart'\94

, undertook to bear the cost of the engine overhaul to be carried out by Leyland Daf (U) Ltd. The overhaul, however, was never carried out, and Kanyomozi finally decided to sue for breach of contract. He filed suit in January, 1993. }

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 It is apparent that Kanyomozi and/or his legal advisers were unsure as to who was liable for the alleged breach of c

ontract. initially the suit was brought against Motor Mart as sole defendant. However, in an amended plaint dated 12th March 1993, A. R. Mackenzie, General Mana}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874 ger of Motor Mart and Leyland D}{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 af (U) Ltd., at whose garage the engine overhaul was to be carried

out, were added as co-defendants. In his judgment, the learned trial judge held that the evidence before him showed that the contract for the repairs of the vehicle was between Kanyomozi and Motor Mart. There was no appeal or cross-appeal against that hol

ding, and so this appeal proceeded, and my judgment is}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874 based, on that premise. On a fin}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

al analysis in his judgment, the trial judge concluded, in effect: }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874

\par {\listtext\pard\plain\s15 \lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

\hich\af0\dbch\af0\loch\f0 (a)\tab}}\pard \s15\ql

\fi-360\li720\ri0\sb100\sa240\sbauto1\sl360\slmult1\widctlpar

\jclisttab\tx720\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\ls1\adjustright\rin0\lin720\itap0\ipgp1\pararsid7762874

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

That Motor Mart had breached the contract in failing to satisfactorily complete the repairs between 1987 and 1990; }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874

\par {\listtext\pard\plain\s15 \lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

\hich\af0\dbch\af0\loch\f0 (b)\tab}}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

That Kanyomozi had waived the rights that had accrued to him under the contract up to 1990, and he was stopped from suing in respect of any breach prior to 21 September 1992; and}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 }
 {\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 12. The plaintiff states that the Defendants have failed, neglected and/or refused to repair the }
 {\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874\charrsid13203663 plaintiff\quote s}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 vehicle for which they are in breach of contract and th}{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874 at the plaintiff}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 f is entitled to damages therefore.\94}{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 Paragraphs 8,9 and 11 narrate allegations (in form of evidence) of two incidents when the vehicle broke down while it was on test run after repairs,

and of the eventual undertaking by Motor Mart to meet the cost of overhauling the engine. Paragraph 10 contains the }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874\charrsid13203663 plaintiff\quote s}{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 contention that the said break down resulted from failure to repair the vehicle sufficiently, or at all, during the period since 1987.}{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 In the joint written statement of defence, apart from general denials, it was pleaded in answer to the said paragraphs of the p}{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874

laint, first that the plaint }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 disclosed no cause to action; and in the alternative, that the suit was time barred. These

two pleadings, however, were not pursued, on trial. In the further alternative, several allegations, }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 (}
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

in form of evidence),were made, from which it is not easy to discern Motor }
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874 Mart\quote s precise defence. The }
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

following sub-paragraphs in paragraph 6 of the defence, however, appear to represent its defence:}{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \93}
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874 (a) }
 {\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874 The plaintiff contracted with M/s Bruce (U)
 Ltd to }

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 repair motor vehicle No. UXL. 225 in 1987.}\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 (b) }

{\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874 M/}

{\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

s Bruce (U) Ltd. finished the repairs and handed in the vehicle to the plainti}

{\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7762874 ff}

{\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 (c) }

{\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid7762874 That while}

{\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

the motor vehicle No. (JXL 225 was in the custody }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

of the plaintiff it developed new mechanical problems for which the l defendant was contacted to handle but it refused and referred to the garage of the 3rd defendant. \line (d) \line (e) \line }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676 (f) }}

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 The plaintiff insisted that }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid3614676 the }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676\charrsid3614676 1}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\super\langnp1033\insrsid3614676\charrsid3614676 st}

{\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676\charrsid3614676 }

{\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid3614676 }}

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676 defendant who does not in anyw}

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 ay deal in motor vehicles

and mechanical repairs of motor vehicles does repair the vehicle. \line

(g) The first defendant shall aver that it indicated to the plaintiff that it had engaged the 3\rqoute defendant to do repairs but that the repairs were on condition that the 3\rqoute defendant obtains spare parts from the United Kingdom. \line }}

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 (h) }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 The }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676\charrsid3614676 1}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\super\langnp1033\insrsid3614676\charrsid3614676 st}

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676\charrsid3614676 }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid3614676 and 3}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676\charrsid3614676 rd}

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676 }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

defendants shall aver that the said spare parts are not yet available and the }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676\charrsid13203663 plaintiff}

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676 \rquote }}

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676\charrsid13203663 s}

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 car cannot therefore be repaired until they will be available.\94 }}

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 (emphasis added).}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \line I think this pleading can be paraphrased into the following three contentions, namely: \line a) That the contract to repair the vehicle in 1987 was between Kanyomozi and Bruce

(U) Ltd., and when the repairs were completed, the vehicle was du}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676 ly delivered to Kanyomozi.

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 b) That subsequently the vehicle developed }{\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676 new mechanical p}

{\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

roblems. }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 and Kanyomozi insisted that Motor Mart undertakes the repairs, where upon the latter instructed

Leyland Daf (U) Ltd., to carry out the repairs, but only on condition that Leyland Daf first obtains the required spare parts from the United Kingdom.}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 c) That the spare parts were unavailable, and the vehicle could not yet be repaired.}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 It was from the foregoing pleadings that three issues were framed at the commencement of the trial. The issues, as framed, were: \line }}

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \931. Whether there was a contract between the parties. \line 2. Whether there was a}

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676 breach of the contract by the }}

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 defendants. \line 3. If so, what remedies are open to the plaintiff\94 }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 The learned trial judge answered the first issue in the affirmative, in relation to Motor Mart, the 1 defendant. He said:

\line }

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \93From the entire evidence on record, PW2 (}{i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676\charrsid13203663 Kanyomozi\lquote s}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 }
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676\charrsid13203663 wife}
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663) visited the premises of BRUCE (L LTD., whe}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676 re she met a gentleman called KIMERI}
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 A. This Kimeria introduced her to a workshop manager who according to the e}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676 vidence on record is called WAL}
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 USJMB}
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676 I}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 . First defendant recognised both Kimeria and Walusimbi as its agents and that they acted on its behalf It is pertinent here to produce the letter of 21.6.90, exhibit P3 written on beha}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676 l}
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 f of the first defendant to the Plaint'94}{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 }
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 After reproducing the letter, the learned trial judge went o}{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

n, in his judgment, to say: \line }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 }
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \93In light of the contents of this letter the arg

ument by Mr. Matovu (counsel for Motor Mart) that there was no contract between plaintiff and first defendant is not, with respect, tenable. There was a contract between plaintiff and first defendant evidenced by the document styled estimates exhibit P.3

dated 22.4.87 and referred to in the above letter.'94 }
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

In my view this holding is well founded as it is supported by evidence which the learned trial judge properly refers to. No evidence was adduced to prove the allegation in the written statement of defence

, of a separate completed contract between Bruce (U) Ltd. and Kanyomozi. Besides, as I have noted earlier in this judgment there is no appeal against the holding. I therefore need not discuss it any further.}}

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 The answer to the second framed issue appears to be in three parts. The learned trial judge held:}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par {\listtext\pard\plain\s15 \lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663
\hich\af0\dbch\af0\loch\f0 (1)\tab}}\pard \s15\ql
\fi-360\li420\ri0\sb100\sa240\sbauto1\sl360\slmult1\widctlpar

\jclisttab\tx420\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\ls2\adjustright\rin0\lin420\itap0\ipgp1\pararsid3614676
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 That Motor Mart was in breach of }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

contract up to 1990;

\par {\listtext\pard\plain\s15 \lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663
\hich\af0\dbch\af0\loch\f0 (2)\tab}}
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

That by his conduct Kanyomozi waived all his rights under the contract arising prior to 1990, and therefore, was estopped from suing on basis thereof\rqoute ; and }
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par {\listtext\pard\plain\s15 \lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663
\hich\af0\dbch\af0\loch\f0 (3)\tab}}
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

That when Kanyomozi gave Motor Mart another chance to complete the repairs, time was not made of the essence of the contract, and consequently Motor Mart was not in breach after 21.9.92 so that the suit was premature. }}

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par }\pard \s15\ql \li60\ri0\sb100\sa240\sbauto1\sl360\slmult1\widctlpar\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\adjustright\rin0\lin60\itap0\ipgp1\pararsid3614676
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 It is this answe

r to the second issue, to which I shall now turn, that is the bone of contention in this appeal. I shall revert to the answer to the third issue later in this judgment.}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 Four grounds were raised in the memorandum of appeal. At the hearing of the appeal, ho

wever, Mr. Mulira who represented Kanyomozi abandoned grounds 3 and 4 for lack of merit. The remaining two grounds, which were argued together, read: \line }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \lquote

(1) The learned Judge erred in fact and misdirected himself on the law when he held that appellant by hi

s conduct had waived ALL of his legal rights under the contract that would have been due to him up to 1990 when the suit vehicle was delivered to him in unsatisfactory state of repairs.}

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 2. The learned trial judge failed to evaluate the evidence on record

and erred in fact when he made the finding that from the entire evidence on record it appeared that this was a contract without any stipulation with regard to time, and that the appellant was estopped from raising any breach that was committed before 21st

August 1992.\'94}{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 Basically Mr. Mulira\rquote

s argument on these grounds was that the holdings complained of were not based on any pleading or evidence. He submitted that neither waiver nor estopped was pleaded by the defence, and that there was no evidence on eith

er issue since Motor Mart and the co-defendants opted to adduce no evidence at all. The holdings, according to counsel, were a departure from the issues framed for determination by the court. Counsel further submitted that the learned trial judge had fail

ed to properly evaluate the evidence as a whole and in particular Kanyomozi\rquote s explanation for not towing the vehicle away from the garage, and allowing Motor Mart another chance to complete the repairs. }{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid3614676

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 In reply, Mr. Tumusingize, Counsel for Motor Mart, su

ported the holdings by the trial judge based on what he called two significant dates in the case, namely December 1990, when the vehicle was delivered to Kanyomozi in the belief that it was completely repaired; and 21 September 1992, when Motor Mart intim

ated that the engine of the vehicle was to be overhauled at its expense. According to counsel the finding of the court that the suit was premature was premised on Motor Mart's

s said intimation. He reiterated the reasoning of the learned trial judge that after

waiting from 1987, during which period he was made aware of the difficulty in procuring spare parts, and then giving Motor Mart another chance to repair the vehicle, it was incumbent on Kanyomozi, before filing suit, to give notice that time had become

of essence of the contract; and that in absence of such notice Kanyomozi was estopped from filing suit only four months after Motor Mart's undertaking to meet the cost of the engine overhaul.

In coming to the conclusions that he did, the learned trial judge ju

st said this in his judgment:

On the second issue there is evidence to show that plaintiff delivered his vehicle to the first defendant as far back as 1987. In 1990 there

was an attempt by the first defendant to deliver the vehicle. It was found to be in state of unsatisfactory repairs. The first defendant undertook to correct the situation. See Exhibit P.5. As a general rule, the law does not regard a promissory as discha

arged unless he had completely and precisely

performed the exact thing that he agreed to do. Clearly at this stage the first defendant was in breach of contract. From the entire evidence on record it appears to me that this was a contract without any stipula

tion in regard to time. The only reasonable inference to be drawn therefore is that time was to be reasonable. In my judgment it could not be said with any stretch of imagination that a vehicle delivered in 1987 for repairs and delivered in 1990 still in

unsatisfactory state of repair, the work was carried out in reasonable time. \line That: \line
\quote Your vehicl}{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 e is of a type which was
never }}

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 imported into Uganda in any
quan}{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 tity and has }
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 been out of}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 production for many years, and }
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 therefore lacki}
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 ng spares for its satisfactory }}

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 repairs would }
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 not avail any defense to the }
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 defendant }}

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \93 }
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 The learned trial judge
observed in effect, rightly in my}{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 }
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

view, that Motor Mart should not have undertaken the contract if it could not do it. Having said
all that, however, the learned trial judge went on to say: }
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \93But it seems to me
that by his conduct }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112\charrsid13203663 plaint
waived}}

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 all of his legal rights under
the contract that would have been available to him up to 1990 when the vehicle was delivered in
unsatisfactory state of repairs. In his evidence he said: }}

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \quote I abandoned
th}{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 e idea of towing it as earlier }
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 suggested b}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 y my advocates and agreed that }
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 they should go on with the
repairs. The basis of my aband}}

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 oning the towing is to be }
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 found in Exhibit P.5.
\rquote }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 Exhibit P. S is the
letter written on 21st September, 1992. This suit was filed on 19th January, 1993. This is a period
of about four months after Exhibit P.5 was received.\'94 }{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 After quoting a passage
from the judgment of Denning L. J., in }
{\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 CHARLES RI CKARDS v.
OPPENHEIM }{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 (1950) ALL ER 420, the trial
judge went on to hold:}{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112

\par \'93}{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112\charrsid13123112 In}
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 }
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 this case I would hold that}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 the }
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112\charrsid13203663 plaintiff}
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 is estopped from }{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 raising any breach that was
committed before 22\'94\rquote

September, 1992. As I said before, this suit was filed on 19th January, 1993. There is no evidence
that before this and between this date }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 and
21st September, 1992 plaint}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 iff had given any notice to
the first defendant demanding that he had to have his vehicle within a fixed period of time thus
making time of essence.\'94 }{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 Finally, after another
quotation from the said judgment of Denning L. J., the learned trial judge concluded thus:}
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112

\par \'93}{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112\charrsid13123112 In }
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 the case before me, I am of
the view that }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112\charrsid13203663

plaintiff}{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 }
 {\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

having decided to give the first defendant another chance to try on the vehicle he should have protected himself by notice making time of essence... In the abse

nce of this notice I am constrained to agree with counsel for the defendants that the suit was premature. I regret to have to come to this conclusion.\94 }
 {\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 It appears to me from the foregoing excerpts in his judgment, that the learned trial judge formed the view that Kanyomozi\rqoute

s rights under the contract had undergone change at some point in time between December 1990 and 21 September, 1992, and that the change came about as a result of Kanyomozi\rqoute s conduct which amounted to a waiver of his rights. Although in

the judgment that conduct is not expressly described, it is obvious that what is referred to, is the fact that Kanyomozi allowed Motor Mart to have another chance to carry out and complete the repairs on the vehicle, after the \line }{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 }
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112\charrsid13203663 Initial}
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

failure. Before considering whether that amounted to waiver, I think it is necessary to evaluate the evidence in order to put that fact in its proper context. \line

Kanyomozi testified that at the time he decided to take the vehicle for repairs the engine had

collapsed and the vehicle was in a bad state. He asserted repeatedly, both in examination-in-chief and in cross-examination that it was mutually agreed, that the repairs were to put the vehicle in a road worthy condition and that for purpose of ascertaini

ng that, a road test would be carried out upon completion of the repairs. On that understanding, estimates of repair costs were made after examination of the vehicle in June 1987 and were revised in subsequent months. Ultimately an invoice for work do}{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 ne was raised in the sum of 1.}
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 6m/= which he paid to Motor Mart. In 1990 when the vehicle was released to him, it was taken by Motor Mart

s technicians for a road test. The vehicle broke down in the process. }

When he contacted the General Manager of Motor Mart w

as told to return the vehicle to the garage. Eventually Motor Mart undertook to meet the cost of overhauling the engine of the vehicle. It is not clear from Kanyomozi's evidence when this undertaking was first made, but it was confirmed in a letter

written to him on 21 September

, 1992. Earlier, Leyland Daf, at whose garage the vehicle was, has written to Kanyomozi a letter dated October 25, }

1991, Exh. D2, to say:}

RE: YOUR VEHICLE
BEDFORD TK UXL 225 }

The above vehicle
was presented in our workshop
to repai

ultly braking system and engine }
overheating. On i}
the fa}

nspection, the breaking system }
needs completely o}
verhauling and the overheating }

problem as that water is
leaking from the engine
between the cylind}
er head and the crank case and }

needs extensive repairs.}
}

Unfortunately spare }
parts for this type of vehicle }
}

are not available in Uganda}{{i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 and I wish to inform }{{i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 you that we are not able to }{{i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112

carry out any repairs to }{{i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 this vehicle in our workshops.\94 }{{i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112

\par }{{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 To the extent that Leyland Daf wrote this letter, not as the party who contracted with Kanyomozi, but for all intents }{{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112

and purposes, on behalf of }{{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

Motor Mart, I do not accept the submission by Mr. Tumusingize, that if matters had rested with that letter, Motor Mart would have had no more responsibility for the vehicle rep

air. That may well have been the case, if this letter had been written in 1987 when the vehicle was first inspected. However, it was written in 1991 after repairs had been attempted and had been paid for. The vehicle was in Leyland Daf\rqoute

s garage on Motor Mart\rqoute s instructions for the purpose of making good the deficiency in the repairs carried out earlier. This is borne out in two subsequent letters. T}{{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 he first is the letter dated 2}{{

\lang1033\langfe2057\super\langnp1033\insrsid13123112\charrsid13123112 nd}{{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 }{{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 March 1992 written to Kanyomozi \lquote

s advocates by Motor Mart. It reads:}{{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112

\par }{{i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \93RE; }{{i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 MOTOR VEHICLE UXL 225 }{{i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \line

Thank you for your letter of 18th February 1992. The purpose of our request to Mr. Kanyomozi was that Leyland Daf should }

{{b\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13123112

establish whether the overheating problems experience related to earlier repairs carried out by Bruce }{{b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13123112 (Uganda) }{{b\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13123112 L

td.}{{i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 }{{i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \line

We regret we cannot accept responsibility for repairs, unless we have a proper technical evaluation by a competent engineer approved by ourselves.\94 }
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 (emphasis is added). }{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 Although the request that had been made to Kanyomozi, and the advocates\quote letter of }
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 18}{

\lang1033\langfe2057\super\langnp1033\insrsid13123112\charrsid13123112 th}
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112 }
 {\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 }{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 February 1992, to which it was a reply, were not brought out in evidence, it is reasonable to infer from the second letter, which is dated }{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112\charrsid13123112 21}
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\super\langnp1033\insrsid13123112\charrsid13123112 st}
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112\charrsid13123112 }{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 September 1992, that Motor Mart was eventually satisfied that the }
 {\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \93problems experienced related to earlier repairs\94 }{

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 and for that reasons accepted responsibility for them. The second letter is Exh. P5 which was addressed to Kanyomozi by the General Manager of Motor Mart. It reads; \line }{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 \93Thank you for your letter of 4, September, which came as a considerable surprise to me. I have given }
 {\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

clear instructions }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 to Mr. Risk Pronk of Leyland Daf that they should carry out an engine overhaul at our expense.}
 {\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid13123112

\par }{\pard \s15\ql \li0\ri0\sb100\sa240\sbauto1\sl360\slmult1\widctlpar\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\adjustright\rin0\lin0\itap0\ipgp1\pararsid7368535
 {\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 }{

\b\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid7368535 When last I checked they were working on obtaining spares}
 {\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663 }{

and they did say they were experiencing difficulties

. Your vehicle is of a type, which was never
imported into Uganda in any quantity; and has been out of

production for many years.

By copy of this letter I would request Leyland Daf to advise you and myself on
current position.

(emphasis added).

Again it is unfortunate that the contents of Kanyomozi's

letter of 4, September 1992, which considerably surprised the General Manager, were not disclosed in evidence. Nonetheless in my view, the irresistible inference to draw from this letter is that the said

clear
instructions

to Leyland Daf were given, not on the day, but earlier than the date when the letter was written; hence the intimation:

When last I checked they were working on obtaining spares.
The expression
last checked

coupled with the request that Leyland Daf advises on
current position

clearly indicates not only that there had been at least one other check before, but also that the instructions to Leyland Daf to overhaul the engine at Motor Mart's

se, had been given earlier still. So, although the undertaking to meet the expense is referred to in the letter, Exh. P5, it must have been made earlier than 21 September 1992.}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 This tends to tally with Kanyomozi's testimony that when he took the vehicle b

ack to the garage at Luzira, after it broke down during the road test, Mackenzie, the General Manager of Motor Mart, undertook to repair it on his account. Furthermore, although Kanyomozi testified that the basis of abandoning the idea of towing away the

vehicle from the garage was }

{\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 \93to be found in Ex. P5\94 }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

it does not necessarily mean that he first became aware of the undertaking from reading the letter; nor that this was the only reason why he allowed the engine overhaul to be undertaken after the initial fa

ilure. He gave his full explanation during cross-examination After acknowledging that he had received the letter of 2 March 1992, Exh D1, he said: }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 \93My understanding of the letter was that they were going to repair the vehicle at their expense I abandoned

the idea of towing it as earlier suggested by my advocates and agreed that they go on with repairs. The basis of my abandoning the towing is to be found in exhibit P5. I was not informed of the problem of spare parts when I}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914 }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 first took my vehicle to them.}{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914 My vehicle was not a unique model}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 \94 \line }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 Again after acknowledging that he had received the letter of October }{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 25, }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 1999, Exh. D2, he said:}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914

\par \93After }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 that I went t}

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914 o them and they indicated they }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 would get the sp

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914 ares. One cannot wait for ternity }
 {\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 (sic) I have not }
 {\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914 found out whether spares came. }{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 I inquired about whether the
 v{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914 ehicle was finished. }
 {\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

Mackenzie said the vehicle would be repaired I \line did not find it reasonable to withdraw the
 vehicle from the defendants and take it {\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914
 elsewhere. Defendants were }{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 agents of importing these
 vehicles. Waiting has limit. \line I was told it could}
 {\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914 take 2-3 months to repair the }{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 vehicle.\'94}
 {\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 }
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 As I have said earlier in this
 judgment, the two letters from Motor Mart tend to corroborate Kanyomozi\rqoute

s testimony. The defense did not offer any evidence to contradict or otherwise modify that
 testimony. The learned trial judge did not find the testimony, or any part of it, unreliable, and I
 find no reason to differ}{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914 from that. The position as I fin}
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 d it, therefore, is, in a
 nutshell, as follows:}{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 In 1987
 Kanyomozi\rqoute

s vehicle was in a bad state, its engine, inter alia, having collapsed. Motor Mart agreed to repair
 the vehicle and put it in a roadworthy condition. For that work Motor Mart charged, and was paid
 about Shs. 1.6 million. When in 1990 the

vehicle was returned to Kanyomozi it was discovered that Motor Mart had not performed its part
 of the contract because the vehicle broke down upon being put on a road test. Motor Mart
 accepted to take the vehicle back into the garage and to have the engin

e

overhauled at its expense. Kanyomozi found that proposition reasonable, and accepted that
 Motor Mart should make good its performance. Motor Mart never made good its performance.
 Hence the suit. The learned trial judge found as a fact, and I agree with h

im, that according to the evidence there was no stipulation, at any stage, as to the time within which to complete the repairs. He then drew inference that }

{\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 \'93time was to be reasonable

\'94 }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 Again I respectfully agree because in those circumstances the law imputes

a term in the contract, that work would be performed within a reasonable time. The learned trial judge then held that the period from 1987 to 1990 was unreasonable, in the circumstances, and that lack of spare parts was no defence to Motor Mart. Again I

agree. What I find difficult to understand, however, is how and why the learn}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914 ed trial judge came to the \line }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

conclusion that thereafter the position changed. He did not indicate in what way Kanyomozi, or for that matter the law, discharged Motor Mart }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 from }{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 its obligation to repair the vehicle within reasonable time. Nor did the he indicate how, if at all, lack of spares became available as a defence, to Motor Mart after 21 September, 1992.

\line It seems to me, with due respect to the learned trial judge, that he erroneously placed reliance on the decision in }

{\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 RICKARDS v. OPPENHEIM }{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 (supra) from which he quoted extensively. I should hasten to point out that while the passages he quoted from the judgment of Denning L. J. (as he then was) are quite sound, and the facts in t

hat case are similar to those in the instant case, the two cases differ in material particulars. In the }{\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 RICKARD }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

\quote s }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 case, unlike in the instant case, there was an express stipulation in the contract, making time for delivery, of the essence of the contract.

When the stipulated time lapsed, the innocent party waived the stipulation by indicating that he would accept delivery on subsequent dates. After a couple of disappointments, however, the innocent party gave to the defaulting party, express notice that h

e

would not accept delivery after four weeks. Delivery was offered long after the four weeks had expired and it was refused. In that case, unlike in the instant case, it was not in dispute that the innocent party had waived the initial stipulation as to time

for

delivery. The central issues for determination were whether after the waiver, the innocent party was entitled to give notice making time of the essence again; and if he was, whether the notice he gave was reasonable. It was held that he was entitled

and that in the circumstances of the case the four week notice was reasonable. In the instant case there was no stipulation of time, and so, there was no stipulated time to be waived. Secondly in the instant case the question was not as to be reasonable

the

of any notice given by Kanyomozi, the innocent party, but rather the question was as to the reasonableness or unreasonableness of the time taken by Motor Mart without completing its obligation. The holding by the trial judge, that Kanyomozi ought to have

protected himself by giving a fresh notice after 21 September 1992, making time of the essence, implies, in effect, that Kanyomozi had waived the term imputed by the

law that the

Motor Mart was to complete its contractual obligation within reasonable time. In the

I shall revert to the issue of waiver shortly. First, I should briefly dispose of the judge's

proposition that Kanyomozi needed to protect himself by giving notice that time had become of essence. With due respect, I think that proposition has no sound basis or justification. In the

RICARD S

case the holding was that the innocent party was entitled to

to give the express notice that

that it did, not that the

notice was a necessity. If no such notice had been given, the law would still have imputed a term that completion was to be within reasonable time. In the instant case that implied term was applicable and I would therefore hold that there was no legal necessity

for Kanyomozi, after 21 September, 1992 or at any other time, to give notice that time was to be of the essence of the contract. In the

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 \line Next I have to consider whether Kanyomozi waived any legal right due to him as held by the trial court. As I have pointe

d out earlier in this judgment, what appears to have been held to constitute the }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914\charrsid5983884 waiver}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 was Kanyomozi\quote

s decision to allow Motor Mart to make good the deficiency in repairs, instead of withdrawing the vehicle and file suit immediately after the initial fail

ure. To my understanding, for an act, statement, or other conduct, to be construed in law as a waiver, it must be shown that there was }

{\b\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid1731914 mutual agreement}{

\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 to alter or otherwise affect the legal relationship of the parties. }{

\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 BIRD v. HILDAGE }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 (1947) 2 All ER 7 wa

s a suit between landlord and tenant, whose lease agreement stipulated dates on which the quarterly rent was payable. The landlord was in the habit, however, of accepting rent paid well after the due date. Subsequently, when, as usual, the tenant failed t

o

pay on the due date, the landlord filed a suit for possession and refused to accept payment tendered on the date the suit was filed. In his defense the tenant paid the rent into Court. The English trial Court dismissed the suit. On appeal, the Court of A

ppeal held that where an act had to be done periodically, the fact that it had been done }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914\charrsid5983884 irregularly}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

in the past, does not justify an assumption that the irregularity would be waived in the future.

With reference to the facts of that case, the Court observed:}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 \93Indeed, it would be

most unfortunate }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914\charrsid5983884 if}

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

in such a case, mere forbearance by a landlord to exercise h}

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid1731914 is rights of distress or re-entr}

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

y on one or more occasions was held to bind him for the future, since landlords would then tend to be more harsh in the

enforcement of their legal rights. There may, no doubt, be cases where the court can properly infer from the conduct of the parties a variation of the original agreement... We can find here no evidence of any such variation of the contract}}

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15410386 ..\94

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 }
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 I think sim

ilar observations may be made in respect of the instant case. Mere forbearance by Kanyomozi to exercise his right to sue in 1990, 1991 and 1992 did not justify an assumption that continu}
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15410386

ed failure to complete the }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 repairs would not be acted upon. It did not

amount to a variation of the original contract, and consequently did not bind Kanyomozi in future in regard to his rights under the contract. With due respect to the learned trial judge, I am constrained to say that he did not direct his mind sufficientl

y

or at all to the necessary elements required for the application of the principle of waiver and the doctrine of estoppel. In a nutshell, his decision in this regard was that Kanyomozi was estopped from suing because he had waived his legal rights under t

h

e original contract. This however is erroneous. The two are distinct concepts independent of each other. Waiver arises from express or implied agreement between the parties. Estopped arises from a representation of one party to another on which that other

acts.}{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15410386

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 This difference between waiver and estopped was highlighted by the Court of Appeal for Eastern Africa in }
{\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

NURDIN RANDALL v. LOMBANK LTD }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 (1963) EA 304, where Newbold J. A. (as he then was) said at p.3 14: }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15410386

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 \93....the distinction between waiver and estopp

el should be clearly appreciated. Waiver is based on a contract, express or implied, between the parties. Thus it arises from a term, express or implied, of a contract, and before any such term can exist a valid contract must be established. It is found t

hat a contract is established and that it contains such term, then that term, like any other term in a contract, may found a cause of action.\94 }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 (and, I would add, a defence). }
{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 \93Estoppel, on the other hand, is primarily a rule of evidence whereby a party to li

tigation is, in certain circumstances, prevented from denying something, which he had previously asserted to be true. Estoppel... can never found a cause of action, though it may enable a cause of action, which would otherwise fail, to succeed.\94 }{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15410386

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 The learned Justice of Appeal cited, with approval the description of that difference as set out in the judgment of the Privy Council in }{

\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15410386 DA WSONS\rqquote }

{\i\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 BANK LTD. v. JAPAN C077\rqquote ON TRADING CO. LTD. }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15410386

(1935) A. I. R. PC 79 }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 at p.82 part of which I find useful to reproduce here for emphasis. It reads as follows; }
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15410386

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 \93These words, which are the true foundation of the }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15410386\charrsid5983884 judgment,}{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 disclose, in their Lordships\rqquote opinion, a confusion of thoughts upon the subjects of estoppel and waiver. Estoppel is a rule of evidence which comes into operat

ion if (a) a statement of the existence of a fact has been made by the defendant of an authorised agent of his on his behalf (b) with the intention that the plaintiff should act upon the faith of the statement, and (c) the plaintiff does act on the faith

of the statement. On the other hand}{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15410386 , waiver is contractual, and ma}{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

y constitute a cause of action; it is an agreement to release or not to assert a right. If an agent with authority to make such agreement on behalf of his principal agrees to waive his pri
{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15410386 ncipal\rqoute

s rights then the principa}{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 l
will be bound, but he will be bound by contract not by estoppel. There is no such thing as
estopped by waiver.\'94 }{

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15410386

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 I agree with that
description of waiver and estoppel. Upon applying the same}
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15410386 to the instant case, I again fin}{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

d no difficulty in holding that Kanyomozi did not waive any of his legal rights because at no time
was there any agreement between Kanyomozi and Motor Mart that the former would not assert
his right or that the latter was released from its obligations in

accordance with the terms of the contract. Secondly, going by the said description it is quiet it is
evident that in the instant case, the issue of estoppel did not arise. Kanyomozi pleaded and
adduced evidence, which proved that Motor Mart had failed to

perform its part of the contract within reasonable time. It was not suggested in evidence at the
trial, or in the }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15410386\charrsid5983884 judgment,}
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

that Kanyomozi had made any representation which he should be prevented from denying
because Motor Mart had acted on the faith of the

representation. In short there is no representation Kanyomozi was estopped from denying. In the
circumstances, I think grounds 1 and 2 of appeal must succeed.}
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid15410386

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 Before I take leave of the
appeal, however, I have to consider if this Court should make any co

nsequential orders. In the Memorandum of Appeal it was prayed that the decision of the High
Court be set aside and that judgment be entered as prayed in the lower Court. The prayers in the
amended plaint dated }{

\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 12th }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 March 1993 were for, inter
alia, special

and general damages with costs and interest both on the damages and on the cost. There was an alternative prayer for '\93a }\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 road worthy lorry in good repair similar to the one in }{'

\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 issue.\'94 }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 Unfortunately counsel did not address this Court on the question of remedies. Or}{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638 dinarily the appropriate order }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

would have been to remit the case to the High Court for determination of the reliefs the plaintiff should be granted. Two reasons, however, convince me that in the interests of justice this litigation ought to be concl

uded here. The first is that the litigation has been protracted. I am aware that it is not uncommon for a civil suit in Uganda to last in the courts for as long as seven years and more. However, every opportunity }{'

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638\charrsid5983884 possible}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 should be utilised to expedite disposal of cases, recalling the time old maxim that }{'

\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 '\93justice }

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 delayed is justice }

{\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 denied.\'94 }{'

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 Secondly, the trial court did consider what remedy would have been awarded if the suit had succeeded. Although the trial court did not go the full length to determine th

e quantum of damages, sufficient findings of fact to base an assessment on, were made. By virtue of s.4(2) of the Judicature Act, 1967 as amended by Statute No. 12 of 1987, (which was the law applicable to this case) this Court has }{'

\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 '\93the power, authority and jurisdiction vested in the }{'\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 court from }{'

\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 which the appeal is brought. '\94 }{'\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

In my opinion this is a proper case in which to invoke those provisions and assess the damages.}{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 For special damages the plaintiff claimed Shs. }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638 75,515,650/}{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 =. }{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 In the }
 {\b\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 \93particulars of special damages\94 }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

six heads of claim were listed. The first five, totaling shs. 3,515,650/=, comprised amounts allegedly paid for spare parts and repair costs. The learned trial judge found that some of the heads were not proved while others were not claimable.

I have no reason to interfere with that finding. The si}
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638 xth head of claim for Shs. 72m/}
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

= was for loss of income from January 1991. The learned trial judge found that it had been proved that the vehicle was a commercial vehicle and that Motor Mart ought to h

ave known that fact. He also found that it was also proved that Kanyomozi had previously earned income from hiring out}{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638 the vehicle at the rate of s}
 {

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 50,000/= per trip, and that the vehicle used to make two trips per day. He did not compute the amount he wou

ld have awarded on this head, but observed that the total amount would have been subject to income tax.}{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638

\par However, there are }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 other consideration that should affect}{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638 the final award. The sum of }{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 72/= appears to be equivalent of gross earnings at the aforesaid

rate for 720 days or approximately 2 years. In my view, another legitimate deduction would have to be costs of operating the vehicle. Although no evidence was adduced on }
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638\charrsid5983884 these aspects}{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 , it is imperative to take into account the inevitable, that Kanyomozi w

ould have spent on fuel, general maintenance of the vehicle, and even on wages since he testified that he did not drive the vehicle himself. Then there are such impond}
 {\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638 erables as the likelihood: \line }{

(a) That the vehicle, being old, would occasionally require repairs, on which occasions it would be off duty; and

(b) That the vehicle would not have been hired on every day even when it was available, for it used to be hired casually

rather than on permanent contract.

Taking all those factors (including income

tax) into consideration, I think that 20% of the sum claimed would be close to the net income lost and I would award that as special damages. The learned trial judge made no comment on the claim for general damages. I think he was right as no basis was la

i

d either in evidence or argument for that claim, which, in any event, is not usual in a suit for breach of contract. I would disallow it. I would also reject the alternative prayer, which is in effect for specific performance. In my view the wronged party

in the instant case, can be appropriately enforce his contractual right through suit, to take his vehicle for repair elsewhere, or to choose to write it off in view of its age. }

In the result, I would allow this appeal. I would set aside the judgment of the High Court and substitute therefor

, judgment for the appellant Yonasani B. Kanyomozi against the respondent, Motor Mart (U) Limited, in the sum of

14,400,000/= special damages, with interest at 6% p.a. from the date of filing suit till payment in full. I would also award to the appellant costs of this appeal and in the High Court.

DATED }

at Mengo this 85.

14

th

85day of 85 June. . .2000

J. N. MULENGA

{

\b\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 JUSTICE OF}

{\b\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid6638 THE}

{\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 }{

\b\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 SUPREME COURT. }

{\b\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638

\par }{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 I CERTIFY THAT THIS
A \line TRUE COPY OF THE ORIGINAL \line W. }

{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid6638 MASALU}{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 }

{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 MUSENE \line }

{\b\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638\charrsid6638 REGISTRAR OF}{

\b\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid6638 }

{\b\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 THE SUPREME COURT. }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638

\par }{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 \line }

{\b\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid6638 JUDGMENT OF ODER JSC}

{\i\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 \line }{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid6638 I have had the benefit of reading
in draft the judgment of Mulenga, JSC, with which I agree. The appeal should be allowed. }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid6638 As Kanyeihamba, JSC, also
agrees, the order of the Court shall be as proposed by Mulenga, J. S. C. \line Dated at}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638 Mengo this 14}{

\lang1033\langfe2057\super\langnp1033\insrsid6638 th }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638 day of}

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid6638 ... June...2000 }

{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638

\par }{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid6638 A. H. O. ODER}

{\b\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid6638 }

{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid6638 \line JUSTICE OF THE
SUPREME COURT\line

\par }{\b\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid6638 JUDGMENT}

{\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 }

{\b\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 OF KANYEIHAMBA. J. S.
C. }

\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 \line }
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

I have had the benefit of reading in the draft the judgment of my learned brother, Mulenga, J. S. C., and I agree with him that this appeal ought to succeed. I also agree with the orders he has proposed. I would award costs in this appeal and in the High Co

urt to the appellant.}{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638

\par }{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 DATED at MENO this }
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638 14}
{\lang1033\langfe2057\super\langnp1033\insrsid6638\charrsid6638 th}
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6638 }{

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 Day of . . . June..2000 \line }
{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 G. W. KANYEIHAMBA \line }
{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid6638

JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT}

{\b\ul\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 }
{\b\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884 \line \line }
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid6638

\par }\pard\plain \ql \li0\ri0\sl360\slmult1\widctlpar\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\adjustright\rin0\lin0
\itap0\ipgp1\pararsid7368535 \fs24\lang2057\langfe2057\cgrid\langnp2057\langfenp2057
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid7368535\charrsid5983884

\par }\pard\plain \s15\ql \li0\ri0\sb100\sa240\sbauto1\sl360\slmult1\widctlpar\aspalpha\aspnum\fa
auto\adjustright\rin0\lin0\itap0\ipgp1\pararsid13203663
\fs24\lang2057\langfe2057\cgrid\langnp2057\langfenp2057 {

\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid6970562\charrsid13203663

\par }\pard\plain \ql \li0\ri0\sl360\slmult1\widctlpar\aspalpha\aspnum\faauto\adjustright\rin0\lin0
\itap0\pararsid13203663 \fs24\lang2057\langfe2057\cgrid\langnp2057\langfenp2057
{\lang1033\langfe2057\langnp1033\insrsid14830933\charrsid13203663

\par }}

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/ugsc/2000/14/eng@2000-06-14>

CASE PAGE <https://chat.esheria.ai/case-law/uganda/yonasani-bkanyomozi-v-motor-martu-ltd-2000-ugsc-14-14-june-2000-unknown-topic-unknown-court-2000--6a3ea4da3b1caa91297e6cba>

Prepared on 13 October 2026 · Esheria