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The legal issue for determination are:

* Whether the governor had the power to revoke the statutory right of occupancy of Mr Ajah
* Whether Mr Ajah’s claim would be successful in court.

Revocation of rights of occupancy is the right of the governor to with draw the right of occupancy from a person. A right of occupancy can only be revoked when it fulfils the following criteria.

1. There must be purpose: the purpose is for overriding public interest of statutory right of occupancy. **Section 28(2) land use act.**
2. Notice of consent: notice is essential before there can be a valid revocation. **Section 28(6) Land use Act** provides that the revocation of a right of occupancy shall be signified under the hand of a public official duly authorized on that behalf by the governor and notice there of shall be given to the holder. In the case **of ONONIYU V ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ANAMBRA STATE.** It was held that a publication in the gazette of a notice of revocation without personal service of same to the holder does not make the revocation valid.
3. Compensation: section 29(1) Land Use Act provides that a right of occupancy is revoked for the cases set out in **section 28 land use act or section 29(3)(a) or (c) land use act** the holder or the occupier shall be entitled to compensation for the value at the date of the revocation. In **Harn v Sunderland Corporation**, it was held that compensation implies that the loss to the seller must be completely made up to him and unless he received a price that fully equalled his pecuniary loss the compensation would not be equivalent to the compulsory sacrifice.

According to the factual matrix presented above, the governor has the right to revoke the statutory right of occupancy of any citizen of Nigeria in the state. According to **section 28(2) land use** act the governor had a purpose for the demolishing of the hotel of m rajah because due to the outbreak of the resent pandemic, public gatherings was the greatest chance of exposing the citizens to the pandemic.

Also, the governor of the state is meant to issue out a notice to an officer duly authorized for this purpose who would in turn hand the notice over to the occupier. However according to the factual matrix, the governor didn’t issue a notice to the occupier personally but however made a public announcement. In the case **of S.O** **ADOLE V BONIFACE**. It was held that where the title to a piece of land is being revoked it is important to give the title owner a notice about the revocation.

Furthermore, the governor of the state didn’t give compensation to the m rajah for his loss rather the hotel building was demolished.

In conclusion, this writer seeks to advice Mr Ajah that regardless of the fact that he was in defiance of the quarantine law by opening his hotel and going on with normal activities, the land use act makes a provision for a notice to be issued to him personally by an authorised authority and also, he is entitled to some form of compensation. If he pleads all this before the state high court that has the original jurisdiction to try cases like this, his action would be successful.