

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE FEDERAL CAPITAL TERRITORY**  
**IN THE ABUJA JUDICIAL DIVISION**  
**HOLDEN AT COURT NO. 4, MAITAMA ON THE**

**28<sup>TH</sup> DAY OF SEPTEMBER, 2023**

**BEFORE HIS LORDSHIP: HON. JUSTICE U. P. KEKEMEKE**

**SUIT NO. FCT/HC/CV/2750/2016**

COURT CLERKS: *JOSEPH ISHAKU BALAMI & ORS.*

**BETWEEN:**

DAVID AIYEDOGBON ..... CLAIMANT

AND

EMEKA UGWUONYE ..... DEFENDANT

**JUDGMENT**

The Claimant's Writ of Summons and Statement of Claim is dated the 10<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2016. By the leave of Court granted on the 14<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2017, the Claimant filed an Amended Statement of Claim on 17/11/2017.

The Claimant prays for the following reliefs:

- (a) The sum of Ten Billion Naira as aggravated damages for the damage of his character, reputation and

bringing him down in the estimation of right thinking members of the society and exposing him to odium, opprobrium and ridicule.

(b) AN ORDER of perpetual injunction restraining the Defendant, his agents, privies, associates or howsoever called from making further defamatory publications against the Claimant and his family members.

(c) Cost of the suit.

The Writ of Summons and Statement of Claim was served on the Defendant on the 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> day of November 2016, 21<sup>st</sup> November 2016 and 24<sup>th</sup> day of November 2017. The Defendant failed, refused and or neglected to enter appearance or file a defence.

On the 8<sup>th</sup> day of March 2018, the Claimant opened his case. He called three (3) witnesses to prove same.

The first Claimant's witness is David Aiyedogbon, the Claimant himself. He said orally that he lives at House 3, Road 13, Gwarinpa, Abuja. He is a retired civil servant

but now in private business. He deposed to a Witness Statement on Oath on 17/11/2017. He identified and adopted same as his oral evidence.

In the said written Statement on Oath, he states that the Defendant is a private Legal Practitioner carrying on business under the name and style of Eculaw Group and the operator of a social media platform known as Due Process Advocates (DPA) with over 120,000 members and over 2 million followers resident at 25 Adeyemo Alakija Street, Victoria Island, Lagos State outside the jurisdiction of the High Court of the FCT.

That he is an accomplished civil servant who retired meritoriously before going into private business where he is doing well and have created a lot of goodwill and reputation among his business associates and in the society.

That as a result of his good conduct, he earned a lot of respect in his church and community consequent upon which his community gave him a merit award in

recognition of his contribution to the community and its development.

The Defendant published and caused to be published of and concerning him on the wall of the Due Process Advocates (DPA) on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2016 the following words:

“David has extraordinary ability to intimidate and he is apparently quite vicious a person.”

“David has been said to be able to hack into phone lines and such things.”

The above statements consists of imputations and actual statements that he had the motive to kill and actually killed his wife, thereby calling him a murderer hence lowered his reputation in the estimation of right thinking members of society generally and disparaged and exposed him to hatred, opprobrium, odium, contempt and ridicule.

That he did not have any motive to murder his wife and did not murder his wife or hired anybody to murder his wife for him or anybody.

That he did not see the offensive publications initially until friends and well-wishers drew his attention to the said publication.

The said publications are:

- (i) Publication of 19<sup>th</sup> June 2016 titled “Clarification: My Role in the Case of the Missing Abuja Based Woman” wherein the Defendant wrote of and concerning him of the following words: “But I think I have evidence that he killed her.”
- (ii) Publication of 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2016 titled “DPA’s Protest Against Police Corruption and Injustice has Commenced” wherein the Defendant wrote of and concerning him of the following words: “Some elements in the Nigeria Police have been bought over to cover up the murder of Mrs. Charity Aiyedogbon by her own husband.”
- (iii) Publication of 25<sup>th</sup> June 2016 titled, “The Case of Charity Aiyedogbon, I’m Concerned about my Life”,

which had 563563 Likes 383 Comments, 1500 Shares; wherein the Defendant wrote of and concerning him that “I now have overwhelming evidence that David Aiyedogbon killed his wife Chacha.”

- (iv) Publication of 26<sup>th</sup> June 2016 titled, “This is the Body” which had 294294 Likes, 807 Comments, 141 Shares, wherein the Defendant wrote of and concerning him, “This is the headless and dismembered body of Charity Aiyedogbon”.
- (v) Publication of 28<sup>th</sup> June 2016 titled, “David Aiyedogbon vs. Emeka Ugwuonye: The Needless Controversy over the Fate of Chacha”, which had 372372 Likes, 48 Shares and 206 Comments, wherein the Defendant wrote of and concerning him, “I will describe David as a lowlife and a cold blooded murderer of his own wife.”
- (vi) Publication of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2016 titled, “Breaking News on David Aiyedogbon: Another of his many lies” wherein the Defendant wrote concerning him, “Also note that David is not really an intelligent person.”

That when he became aware of the publications, he went home and used his computer downloaded video, printed the said defamatory publications against him. That the said computer was working properly as at the time of the downloading and printing. That the computer is normally used in browsing internet in the cause of business. That he eventually produced a certificate in line with the provision of the law.

That on being aware of the publications, he requested his lawyers to write a letter to the Defendant demanding a retraction and an apology for the offensive publications on the 24/06/2016. It was served on the Defendant via UPS Courier Service.

That on receipt, the Defendant instead of apologising caused to be published on 29<sup>th</sup> June 2016 on the wall of DPA an acknowledgment of the receipt of the said letter titled, “Breaking News on the Quest for Justice for Chacha. David Aiyedogbon has formally demanded an apology from me.”

That on the said post, Defendant continues to defame him without any restraint by calling him a wife abuser, stating he will be in prison in 14 days from the date of the publication for the murder of his wife and then there will be no need to give an apology.

The Defendant in spite of receiving the letter from his lawyer continued to publish defamatory materials concerning him in complete disregard of the letter.

His lawyers wrote a reminder on 12/07/2016 but Defendant refused to tender any apology but continued to make disparaging remarks concerning him. It is published thus:

(i) Publication of 1<sup>st</sup> July 2016 titled, “Getting an apology or finding your wife alive”, which had 298298 Likes, 124 Comments and 12 Shares, wherein the Defendant wrote of and concerning him, “If he had common sense he should know that the only thing he really needs is to find his wife alive.”



(ii) Publication of 1<sup>st</sup> day of July 2016 titled, “The nature of the evidence against David Aiyedogbon in the murder of Charity Aiyedogbon”, which had 158 Likes, 49 Comments and 38 Shares, wherein the Defendant wrote of and concerning him, “The person that mostly stood to benefit immensely from Charity’s death is David. He would benefit, in that his alleged crimes known to Charity would not be revealed and he would not go to jail.”

That the Defendant was not satisfied with writing defamatory publications concerning him but went on to make video and audio publications from the internet.

That as a result of the publications, his Church suspended his daughter’s wedding indefinitely. That his community has ostracized him also as a result of the publication. That his business partners have broken business ties with him.

The general public now look at him with hatred, contempt, odium, opprobrium and ridicule. That he has

been psychologically dislocated and has been visiting hospitals for therapies without getting better.

That he has been gravely injured in his reputation and social standing in the society as people now shun him and make faces and cynical remarks about him.

He has lost all his friends and associates particularly business associates, church and community. His community has withdrawn the Merit Award conferred on him. He is now treated as a social leper by right thinking members of the society.

That Defendant was actuated by monetary consideration in defaming him as Defendant used the opportunity to solicit for funds from members of the public under the guise that he was fighting for an oppressed woman that had lost her life.

The Claimant mentioned the following publications:

- (i) Publication of 3/07/2016 titled, “Update on my trip to Abuja and my meeting with Police Authority” which had 20202 Likes, 13 Shares and 55 Comments.

(ii) Publication of 5/07/2016 titled, “Below is the list of contributions... in response to our request for contribution from members.”

(iii) Publication of 7/07/2016 titled, “6<sup>th</sup> July 2016 Updated List of Contributions.”

(iv) Publication of 9/07/2016 titled, “8<sup>th</sup> July 2016 Update on Contributions.”

That no monetary compensation can restore his lost self-esteem, reputation and standing but he seeks monetary compensation for the defamation. He prays for ₦10 Billion Naira, a perpetual injunction and cost.

The witness tenders the following:

(1) Exhibit A - Ayegunde Gbede Community Certificate of Merit.

(2) Exhibit B - Publication of Defendant dated 21<sup>st</sup> June 2016 titled, “Search for Chacha or justice for Chacha: Update of the missing Abuja based lady.”

- (3) Exhibits C - C4:
  - (i) Defendant's publication dated June 19, 2016 titled, "Clarification: My Role in the Case of the Missing Abuja Based Woman."
  - (ii) Publication of Defendant dated 25<sup>th</sup> June 2016
  - (iii) The Defendant's publication dated 26<sup>th</sup> June 2016.
  - (iv) Defendant's publication dated 28/06/2016.
  - (v) Defendant's publication dated 30/06/2016.
  
- (4) Exhibit D - Claimant's Solicitor's letter demanding a retraction and an apology dated 24/06/2016.
  
- (5) Another publication dated 29<sup>th</sup> June, 2016 is Exhibit E.
  
- (6) Exhibit F is Solicitor's Final Reminder dated 12/07/2016.
  
- (7) Exhibits G and G1 are Defendant's alleged Further Defamatory Publications dated 30/06/2016 and 1/07/2016.

(8) Exhibit H is a letter from his Church suspending Daughter's wedding.

(9) Exhibit J is a letter from business associates disassociating itself from Claimant dated 27/09/2016.

(10) Exhibits K - K2 are further alleged defamatory Statements by the Defendant.

(11) Exhibit L is the video and audio publications of the Defendant.

I demand as per my Writ of Summons.

Under Cross-Examination, the witness answers as follows:  
That there is no lawsuit pending between him and his late wife. He later said only one suit was pending and he was served only two weeks before she was declared missing.

To another question he answered that the lawyer who filed the suit has been charged to Court by the FCT Police Command for forging the signature of his wife. That the case was decided in his favour in Lokoja.

One of the cases is for judicial separation. She withdrew that shortly before she disappeared. The second was for dissolution of Charvid Nig. Ltd. It was withdrawn. She filed another one at Lokoja. It was struck out.

To a question, he said the lawyer was Nsikak Udoh. He cannot remember the dates the suits were instituted. That he cannot estimate time or dates.

He answered that she wrote a Petition to ICPC. The subject of the Petition is Charvid Nig. Ltd that was under litigation. He was invited by ICPC and he made a Statement.

He is not aware that his wife accused him of committing a crime at ICPC. It is about Charvid Nig. Ltd. He further said the Court held that she is not a stakeholder of the company. That she had no locus standi.

That the Defendant was arraigned for his role in the disappearance of Charity. That Defendant was on Court bail at the time of this Cross-Examination.

That he filed this suit and also wrote a Petition to the Bar Association to complain about the Defendant's conduct. His lawyer also wrote a Petition to the Police about people instigating the public against him, telling people to come and protest against him thereby making his life unsafe.

Defendant also told law enforcement agents to arrest and prosecute him. That complicity is the reason why Defendant was arrested and charged to Court.

He does not have a property in London. In another breath he said he cannot dispute about a property in London. He did not know if his wife has a property in London in her name or in the name of the company. He does not have a case in London about property.

That on the 29<sup>th</sup> day of May 2014, his wife walked out of the marriage and she lived alone until 18<sup>th</sup> of May 2016 when his daughter called him to say that her attention has been drawn to some posts that her mother was missing. That she had been missing for nine days before she was informed.

That they were married for 26 years before she walked out of the marriage. That he had no contact with her for two years.

To a question he answered that as at that time they had cases in Court, he did not know where she was, but was only attending to the Court cases.

To a further question, he answered that on the 8<sup>th</sup> day of August 2014, after a lot of discussion between his family and his wife's family, he travelled with five members of his extended family to her hometown in Mbaukwu in Anambra State to tell them the situation of things and that they have cases in Court.



They promised to come to Abuja and requested for transport money. He gave them ₦100,000 to come down on Saturday, 2/08/2014. On Monday, 4/08/2014, they paid the money back into his account stating that his wife refused to be involved in a meeting.

He further told them that she left the matrimonial home and that she did not tell him where she was. They confirmed they are aware of her whereabouts.

To another question, he answered that Kelvin was her staff and later a business partner. He denied filing a report at the Police Station, which led to the arrest of Kelvin and Charity.

That she locked up her shops on her own because she was owing the staff two months salary. That the properties where the shops were belong to Charvid.

That Charvid did not own an hotel in Kogi. He denied having any investment in Kogi State. That Charvid is the

name of the family company. That he, the wife and children are shareholders of the family company. The above was the reason for the dissolution of the company.

To a question, he answered that he never accused Kelvin of a romantic relationship with his wife. That it was the Defendant that mentioned it in several posts.

That when his daughter reported about his wife being missing, he was in Turkey. He told his daughter to report at the Gwarinpa Police Station.

That he followed up when he returned. He wrote a Statement. His efforts led to the recovery of her cars in the Defendant's home State.

The Police through him also carried out DNA test on the body that Defendant showed on the Facebook purported to be the body of Charity. That all his children were invited to write Statements.

To another question, he answered that the quest to look for Charity is the reason for this suit. That the Defendant said he has overwhelming evidence that he killed her.

He initiated this suit to enable him show the overwhelming evidence. The Police also charged the Defendant to Court to show the overwhelming evidence. That he sued him for defamation to know whether the defence of justification can avail him. Defendant collected money from the public to do so but has not done anything.

To another question, he answered that he was not looking for Charity, Claimant's wife but merely defamed him. That Defendant should explain how he found the body.

That the Police carried out DNA test. That on the day of the DNA test, the Defendant was not present. That some of the exhibits were posted in Defendant's Facebook while others were posted in Due Process Advocate Facebook.

That in Exhibit B, Defendant's name is there. It was published on the platform of Due Process Advocate, which he founded.

He had no Facebook account but his attention was drawn to the post by those who have Facebook account. Many people called his attention all over the world. He also saw the things personally.

That Facebook pages are on the internet. It is on computer. That he saw the posts by the Defendant. That he was sending the posts daily. That the dates of the relevant posts are in his Statement of Claim. That Defendant has not responded to his claim.

He was defamed on the platform of DPA. The Defendant is the founder of DPA. He does not know the status of DPA. The Defendant's name and picture is on the posts.

Refers to Exhibits K1 & K2. They are list of people contributing money for Charity.

Refers to Exhibit G. That on 14/06/2018, after this case was adjourned, in several television channels, the Commissioner of Police paraded Paul Chukwujekwu Ezeigbo and Emmanuel Adoga as people who murdered Charity. That prior to that he had no evidence to believe she was murdered.

That as at 2016, Police said they cannot declare her dead. That she was only missing. That the claim of Defendant was not verifiable in the absence of credible evidence.

Refers to Exhibit C2, which says he was responsible for the murder.

To another question, he answered that on 25/06/2016, Defendant said he had overwhelming evidence that he killed his wife. He also described him as a lowlife and a cold blooded murderer.

That Defendant defamed him by saying he killed his wife. He is not aware that Charity was pregnant for a lover. He

does not know if ICPC has a case against him. The case was not charged to Court. It was at the level of investigation. He did not see the contents of the Petition.

There was no dispute about property. She made demands for money. They had disagreement. One Nsikak filed cases on behalf of Charity but was not coming to Court. One was discovered to be forged.

He never said his wife was found in Brazil, South Africa or Lagos. The dismembered body was shown on Defendant's Facebook page. He does not know who took the pictures. That they did not identify the body. He does not have the technical expertise to know that it was Charity's body.

The Defendant has Facebook account. He has about 20,000 followers. He does not know their addresses. He read their names on Defendant's Facebook account. That the publications were made by Defendant on his Facebook account.

To a question, he answered that it was published to the whole world and people commented. That the names of people who commented are clearly stated therein. Numerous people saw it including his son and Secretary.

That he could not go to church for about 6 months because of comments. He could not go to his village for about 1½ years.

That Police arrested suspects. Some charged to Court. He is not a suspect. He has not been arrested or charged to Court. The Defendant is facing four criminal cases. He has presently been arrested for murder.

The PW2 is Bankole Akinjemi Owolabi of House 6, 14 Road, Gwarinpa Estate. He described himself as an Architect with Federal Housing Authority, Abuja.

He was served with a subpoena to appear before this Court to give evidence. He remembered writing letters to the Claimant in this suit. One in June 2016 and another on 1/07/2016. The letters are Exhibit H.

The PW3 is one Moses Ibiteye. He is also a subpoenaed witness. He said orally that he lives at No. 2, Christo Street, Mararaba. He is an IT expert. He deals in communication networking.

He said he wrote Exhibit J. That the name and signature are his. He wrote the said exhibit based on the information he got on the internet that David Aiyedogbon killed his wife. There was also a video and press release by the Defendant through Due Process Advocacy group.

The Claimant did not reply the letter. He also put a call to the Defendant. He did not respond. He used to do business with the Claimant and his wife. That he was doing the technical aspect of any contract they got.

The Claimant is still owing him ₦645,000. He does not have any business relationship with the Claimant any more.



The Claimant closed his case on 31/10/2019 and the case was adjourned to 4/12/2019 for Defence. The Defendant failed, refused and neglected to file his defence since 2016 till date. On 10/11/2022, the Defendant's right to defend the suit was foreclosed.

The Claimant's Final Written Address is dated 4/04/2023.

The Claimant posited two (2) issues for determination:

- (1) Whether Claimant has on preponderance of evidence proved that the words published by the Defendant concerning the Claimant really defamed the Claimant.
- (2) Whether the Claimant is entitled to damages as a result of the defamatory publications made of and concerning the Claimant by the Defendant.

Learned Counsel argued on Issue 1 that the words published by the Defendant of and concerning the Claimant in Exhibits B, C1, C2, C3 & C4, E, G1, G2, K1, K2 and L contained materials defamatory of the Claimant.

The Defendant, he argued has no justification for the above publications concerning the Claimant. That Defendant specifically called the name of the Claimant in the publications. That the Claimant was disparaged.

Learned Counsel urges the Court to hold that the Defendant did actually made the publications under reference and that the publications are defamatory of the Claimant.

On Issue 2, whether the Claimant is entitled to damages, Learned Counsel refer to Exhibits D & F written to the Defendant. The Defendant received and ignored them.

He further canvassed that the evidence of the Claimant is uncontroverted and should be relied upon. That Claimant has through credible and reliable evidence proved that the Defendant made publications of and concerning the Claimant which lowered his reputation in the eyes of reasonable members of the society. Claimant suffered disgrace in the church and community.

He finally urges the Court to grant the claim as per the Writ of Summons and Statement of Claim.

I have read the evidence and considered the Written Address of Claimant's Counsel. The case before this Court is defamation.

A defamatory word when spoken is slander but when the word is put in writing, it is called libel as in this case.

Libel is a statement reduced into writing by one person about the other, which statement has been published to a third party and has effect or the tendency to lowering the addressee in the estimation of right thinking members of the society generally, particularly when the statement causes its victim to be regarded with ill-feelings or ridicule, fear, disdain, hatred or contempt.

The Claimant relied on Exhibits B, C1, C2, C3 & C4, E, G1, G2, K1, K2 and L as the defamatory publications made by Defendant against the Claimant.

To succeed in an action for libel, the Claimant must prove upon balance of probability that the material

- (1) was in writing
- (2) was published
- (3) referred to Claimant
- (4) was published to some person other than himself
- (5) was defamatory
- (6) false
- (7) there was no justification for the publication of the words.

See **ALAWIYE vs. OGUNSANYA (2004) 4 NWLR (PT. 864) 486**

**AYENI vs. ADESINA (2007) All FWLR (PT. 370) 1451**

**NITEL vs. TUGBIYELE (2005) 3 NWLR (PT. 912) 334.**

The law is that in an action for libel, a Claimant must set out in his Statement of Claim the exact words which he alleges to be defamatory of him to enable the Court determine whether the words constitute a ground of action.

See **NINGI vs. FBN PLC (1996) 3 NWLR (PT. 435) 220 at 225.**

In paragraph 8 of the Amended Statement of Claim, the Claimant set out graphically the various publications and the exact words which he alleges to be defamatory.

(1) In Exhibit C dated 19<sup>th</sup> June 2016, the Defendant wrote, “People are not well informed in law, do not understand that there is a difference between killing a person and murdering that person. So I make clear now that if Chacha is dead, I have no evidence that her husband murdered her. But I think I have evidence that he killed her.”

(2) The publication of 25<sup>th</sup> June 2016 is Exhibit C1. It states, “The case of Charity Aiyedogbon I’m concerned about my life. I now have overwhelming evidence that Mr. David Aiyedogbon killed his wife.”

“David has an idea the kind of evidence at my disposal. He has sworn to stop me at all cost. And this is a man who had the heart to kill his wife.”

(3) The publication of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2016 is Exhibit C4.  
“David is not really an intelligent person.”

There are 109 Comments in this publication. Some of the comments are produced hereunder:

- (1) Amali Sandy: *He cannot lie for ever, the truth must surely prevail.*
  - (2) Kemi Adewale: *No intelligent person will kill his or her spouse rather than take a walk...”*
  - (3) Juliana Adeyemi: *He believes in his money. He has laundered over ₦10B from government when he was working with them.*
  - (4) Amstrong Chijindu Godwin: *This David A. is truly a pathetic liar and an unrepentant cunning man.*
  - (5) Priscillia Onoji: *David is fantastically brainless.*
  - (6) Nkem Angel Obineche: *David is an amateur liar. God will make a public show of his kind of person.*
- etc.

In a tort of defamation, the rule is that each publication is a fresh and separate tort. There is a publication for which the authors and or the publishers are jointly and severally liable.

See **OGBONNAYA vs. MBALEWE (2005) 1 NWLR (PT. 907) 282.**

From the publications tendered, Exhibits B, C, C1, C2, C3 and C4, it is clear that the publications are in writing. Exhibit H is a letter dated 1/07/2016 written by PW2, Pastor Bankole Owolabi and Pastor Simon Egbelo while Exhibit J is made by Moses Ibiteye.

From the content of Exhibit J, they read the various publications and video broadcast by the Defendant alleging that he killed his wife, consequent upon which they put his daughter's wedding on hold.

Exhibit J is dated 27/09/2016 tendered by PW3, Moses Ibiteye. He said in the said exhibit that he read the trending publications on social media by the Defendant. Exhibits B, C, C1, C2, C3 & C4 are the said publications which PW2 and PW3 read.

Several other persons read the publication and made comments, some of which were earlier reproduced in this judgment. There is no doubt therefore that the libellous materials were published. The name of the Claimant was variously mentioned in the publication and the publication was to the whole world.

Defamation is concerned with injury to reputation resulting from words written or spoken by others. It is a statement that tends to lower the Claimant in the estimation of right thinking members of society generally or to expose him to hatred, contempt or ridicule or cause other persons to show or avoid him or to discredit him.

The comments made after the publication, the evidence of PW2 and PW3 and Exhibits J & H tendered clearly show the contempt, ridicule and hatred the Claimant was exposed to as a result of the publications.

In my humble view, the reckless and unguarded publications lowered the reputation of the Claimant in the eyes of reasonable members of the society.

See **GUARDIAN NEWSPAPER LTD vs. AJEH (2005) 12 NWLR (PT. 938) 205.**

The words complained of render the Claimant to odium, shame and disgrace.



From evidence, the matter was reported to the Police. The Claimant was not indicted or charged because there was no evidence to do so rather the Defendant was arrested and have been charged in respect of the matters connected with the killing of the wife of the Claimant.

The Defendant was served with this suit. He failed to file a Statement of Defence or give evidence in rebuttal of the claim. He failed to put evidence on his side of the imaginary scale.

The statements published are false and there are no justifiable grounds for the publications of the words complained of. Publication is a lifewire of an action such as this. It is proved in this case.

See **UKACHUKWU vs. UZODINMA (2007) 9 NWLR (PT. 1038) 167.**

The publications made are defamatory, reckless and infantile. Hiding under the social media or a civil society organization to attack, humiliate, debase, harass, castigate, blackmail innocent citizens need to be

discouraged in a sane society. The Courts owe it a duty to ensure sanity reigns in our society.

In totality, it is my view and I so hold that the Claimant's action succeeds. The law is that libel is actionable per se. It is actionable without proof of damages because it is in a written or permanent form.

If a Claimant proves libel as in this case, his cause of action is complete. He does not need to prove that he has suffered any resulting actual damage or injury to his reputation for such damage is presumed.

**See CRSN CORP vs. ONI (1995) 1 NWLR (PT. 371) 270.**

Judgment is entered in favour of the Claimant against the Defendant as follows:

1. The Defendant shall pay to the Claimant ₦100,000,000 (One Hundred Million Naira) as aggravated damages for the libellous publications made of and concerning the Claimant.

2. An Order of perpetual injunction is hereby issued restraining the Defendant, his agents, privies, associates or however called from making further defamatory publications against the Claimant and his family members.
  
3. ₦500,000 (Five Hundred Thousand Naira) as cost of action.

---

**HON. JUSTICE U. P. KEKEMEKE**  
**(HON. JUDGE)**  
**28/09/2023**

Parties absent.

Tony Ogbulafor, Esq. for the Claimant.

Defendant absent and is unrepresented.

**COURT:** Judgment delivered.

(Signed)  
**HON. JUDGE**  
28/09/2023