

16/law01/122

Introduction.

The land use panel of 1977 which one headed by the Supreme Court held that the system of land holding according to section 1 states that all the land belongs to the government of each state except the land is owned before the land was enacted.

The right of occupancy can be terminated by either surrender or revocation. The right of Revocation is vesting in the governor. According to section 28 the governor may revoke right of occupancy for overriding public interest. In section 5(1) the governor has the power and right to revoke. This power is exercised only in respect of statutory occupancy or customary.

In the scenario above the main legal issue is if the government has the right to revoke the statutory occupancy of Ajah. According to section 28(6) it states that the governor must give a personal notice before revoking land occupancy. Before the governor demolished ajah's property he didn't give him a personal notice before his punishment. The general public order states that punishment for breaking quarantine rules is fine and maybe imprisonment not destruction of property.

The governor in this case is wrong. As seen in *Ononuju v A.G Anambra State* there was valid notice before actions were taken. Before destruction of property he could have given the Ajah heads up days before not revoking occupancy without notice. The purpose of giving notice is to duly inform the holder of the steps about to be taken on his occupancy rights. The absence of a valid notice is unconstitutional as seen in *Goldmark Ltd v ibafon co. Ltd*.

All though there was an executive order there was no due notice so the governor is wrong and his actions can't be backed up by law.

The second legal issue implies if the governor's claim will be successful in court. His claim would have been successful in court if he was backed up by the law and the law states his actions were right but the executive order given by the government states fines not demolition. The executive order cannot be sufficient notice. The notice is to be directly addressed to the person in question. An executive order is notice to the agencies and public if the new cause of action the government is taking. The executive order isn't sufficient enough to revoke the land in this case.

In conclusion Ajah can sue the governor due to lack of valid and personal notice. And the claim of the governor would not be successful because it isn't constitutionally approved.