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The legal quagmire for the determination of this poser is whether the act of the governor is unconstitutional and contravenes the procedures under the constitution and land use act.

From the above question and in applying the legal issue, the act of the governor In demolishing the property of Chief ajah (Tarzan hotels) is wrong. Section 28 of the land use act should be taking into consideration . The case of LTD vs IBAFON CO. LTD the Supreme Court emphazied that publication in the gazette does not constitute sufficient notice that there must be personal service to the person, and from the above scenario there was no personal service to Chief ajah. And from the above scenario it can also be deduced that the governors executive order is inconsistent with the quarantine law , the executive order is supposed to be in accordance with the law. Section28(6) should also be consider when considering the requirements of service of notice for revocation. The case of S.O. Adole .v. Boniface B. Gwar is also an important case to be considered to when discussing the above scenario of Chief ajah and the governor. Note: Valid notice should also be direct it doesn’t matter if it’s to the general public , the case of Ononnuju v AG Anambra State exaplains better the need for valid notice. Chief ajah should however be duly compensated by the governor in accordance with section 44 of the constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria and section 30 of the land use act.