

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF THE UNITED REPUBLIC OF
TANZANIA**

(IN THE DISTRICT REGISTRY)

AT MBEYA

CRIMINAL JURISDICTION

SESSION CASE NO. 24 OF 2016

REPUBLIC

VERSUS

JUMA S/O NDELE

RULING

Date: 28. 02. 2020

Dr. A. J. Mambi, J.

This Ruling emanates from the accused admission on the charge of manslaughter. The accused Person (**JUMA S/O NDELE**) was earlier charged with murder but in HIS plea, he admitted to have caused the death of the deceased without malice. The prosecution had no objection on the accused admission for an offence of manslaughter. The prosecution read the facts on charge of Manslaughter and all the accused admitted the facts. The prosecution facts briefly show that the accused did murder the deceased one NAEM S/O KIBONA on the 6TH of AUGUST in 2015

at Kapunga Village within the District of Mbarali and Mbeya region.

Since the accused had pleaded guilty on the charge of manslaughter and basing on the charge and flanking facts from the prosecution, the accused was convicted of an offence of **manslaughter c/s 195 of the Penal Code Cap 16 [R.E. 2002]**. Section 195 of the *Penal Code Cap 16 [R.E. 2002]* provides that:

*“(1) Any person who by an unlawful act or omission causes the death of another person is guilty of **manslaughter**.*

(2) An unlawful omission is an omission amounting to culpable negligence to discharge a duty tending to the preservation of life or health, whether the omission is or is not accompanied by an intention to cause death or bodily harm”.

Before sentencing the accused, the prosecution submitted that they have no any previous criminal records for the accused. The State Attorney Ms. Rhoda Ngole thus prayed this court to consider the punishment for the accused. The Defence through the defence Counsel Mr. Maumba prayed mitigation to this court basing on the various reasons. Having convicted the accused with an offence of manslaughter, I will now consider the appropriate sentence.

I have carefully and respectively considered the submissions from both parties including mitigation from the defence. I have also read the facts and the circumstance of the death of the deceased to enable me to decide the appropriate sentence.

The offence of manslaughter under which the accused persons stand charged is punishable for maximum of life sentence under

section 198 of the Penal Code Cap 16 [R.E. 2002]. Indeed section 198 provides that

*“Any person who commits manslaughter **is liable** to imprisonment for life”.*

Reading between the lines on the above provision of the Penal Code uses the words “**liable**” that means life imprisonment is the maximum sentence but the court has discretion to impose lesser offence depending on the circumstance of the case. In our case, given the fact that the death resulted from the quarrel and it was the first offence for the accused as admitted by the prosecution under the trial records, the court find it appropriate to consider lesser sentence.


It is on the records that the accused person had conflict, quarrel and fight with the deceased but unfortunately such quarrel led to his death. This show the accused persons had no malice. It has been held in various decisions that where it is proved that the death resulted from fight or quarrel, the court should consider opting for an offence of manslaughter.

I have also taken into account the time spent by the accused at remand prison (eight years). Basing on those factors and the circumstance of the deceased death, I find it proper for the accused person to undergo the following sentence.

SENTENCE

In terms of **section 198** of the **Penal Code Cap 16 [R.E. 2002]** I the accused is sentenced to serve one year imprisonment.





Dr. A. J. MAMBI

JUDGE

11. 02. 2020

Ruling delivered this day of 11th February 2020 before all
parties.


Dr. A. J. MAMBI

JUDGE

11. 02. 2020