IN THE HIGH COURT OF TANZANIA

AT ITELYA

APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRITINAL APPEAL NO. 6 OF 1980

(ORIGINAL CATHURAL CAUE I.A. 230 OF 1978

OF THE DISTRICT COURT OF SUMBAWANGA DISTRICT

AT LUMBRHANGA)

BEFORE: J.B. HILAGALA 139. - DISTRICT MAGISTRATE

Versus

Versus

RESPONDENT

JUDGLIT

SAMATTA, J.

i di seri i L

This is an appeal from a decision of the district court of Sumbawanga district whereby the appellant was convicted of corrupt transaction, contrary to s. 3(2) and 3(3) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1971, and was sentenced to a term of three years imprisonment.

The impugned decision cannot, for reasons I shall hereinafter endeavour to give, be allowed to stand. The prime witness for the prosecution was one P.C. Jairce. His evidence was to this effect. On July 2, 1978, he agreeted the appellent and two other persons on a charge of being in possession of goods suspected to have been stolen or unlawfully obtained. As he lad the trio to the police station the appellant asked to have a tate - a - tate with him.

The secret conversation took place in the house of one Sigara (FW2).

The appellant handed over the BOO/= to him (the hound of justice) and asked for forgiveness. According to the policeman, who denied having searched the appellant, the money was handed over to him in the presence of Sigara. The appellant followed him into Signra's

house on his own iniative. He did not, directly or indirectly, summon the appellant into Signra's house. The evidence of Sigara tended however to support the appellant's version of the story. According to the appellant, the hound of justice, after the arrest, searched him and recovered als. 300/= from his person. At Sigara's house the policeman counted the money in the presence of Sigara and alleged that he had given it to him as a bribe. According to his testimony, Sigara did not without the appellant hand over any money to the guardian of law. His evidence on the crucial point, to use his own words, was as follows: "The policemen told me to keep an eye on the loads ... P.C. Jairos told no to call the accused in the room. I called him and they started discussing things which I did not hear ... Later on the policeman called me inside the room and told me to count [some/money he had in his hands. [Tr/was three hundred shillings ... The policeman did not tell me who had given the money to him." In her judgment the learned trial magistrate made no reference to the glaring inconsistency between P.C. Jairo's testimony and that of Sigara. This omission was a serious error. Is it possible that the guardian of law was falsely crediting himself with a reputation of being a hater of corruption? Having not heard the opportunity to watch the demeanour of the witnesses - a subject on which the learned trial magistrate made no express comment - I cannot see how I can confidently answer. that question in the negative. Judging from Sigara's evidence, the conduct of P.C. Jaires towards the appellant seems suspicious. The policeman gave no convincing explanation why he visited Sigara's house. On the whole, I am inclined to agree with Mr Kapinga, counsel for the Republic, that the appellant's guilt was not demonstrated beyond a rational controversy. iccordingly, I allow the appeal, quash the conviction and set aside the sentence imposed thereon. The order

for forfeiture is also set aside. The three is also set aside.

The three hundred shillings should be refunded to the appellant. I make no order for the appellant's release as he has already finished serving the sentence I have just set aside.

- Amuella

D. A. SAMATIA

JUDGE.

Delivered at Mbeya this 10th day of September, 1982, in the presence of Mr Kapinga, counsel for the Republic.

B. A. SAMATTA

JUDGE.