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ANSWER

The Legal Issue is whether or not the govonor right to revoke the land is constitutional . I will answer is affrimative by the producure of the qurantine law section 5 and section 28 of the Land Use Act,

The right of a governor to revoke the land there can be valid three condition :purpose, valid notice ,compensation if adequate.

According section 28(5) of Land Use Act ,it is stated the purposes of revoking a right can also be on the ground of

\*Breach of implied provisions in the closure while section 5 of Quarantine law

\* Breach of any term in the c/0 or any special contract section 8 o f LUA.

\*Refusal or neglect to pay for c/o,according to the scenario above the governor has right demolished as provided in the executive order.  S. 5 of the Quarantine Law cause there was already a punishment laid down. Also under section 28(5) there is penal revocation of the to acquire the land without compensation.

There was valid notice by the governor under section 28(6) and 28(7) of the LUA , shall be signified and in the scenario , executive order and warning served as an actual notice to chief Ajah .

In line with the circumstances , the governor has the right to demolish the tarzan hotel reason being that it is in line with the public notice or public purposes see the case of AMULE V LOCAL STATE GOVERNMENT.

IN CONCLUSION, the right of the governor to demolish and revoke is constitutional and chief Ajah is not entitled to any compensation cause he didn’t follow the executive order of the land and the section 5 of quarantine law .