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**Answer**

According to the question, the legal issue is whether the act of the government is unconstitutional.

Now the according to **section 1** **of the Land Law Act 1978**, it say that from the commencement of this act, all land comprised in the territory of each state in the federation are vested in the governor of the state.

So basically the governor of a state signature has to be put down b4 any one can own any land in a state, because all lands of a state are vested on the governor.

Now in this case this is a revocation of rights of occupancy, which means to take back or cancel the right or certificate given to a person over rights according to **section 21, 22 and 23 Land Use Act 1978** which makes the prior consent of the governor of a state mandatory for the validity of every subsequent transaction relating to a right of occupancy granted in the territory and the penalty of non-compliance includes rendering the transaction void pursuant to **section 34(8) and 36(6) of the Land Use Act** .

Chief Ajah’s right was taken away due to the fact that he broke rules which was made by the governor of his state in other to keep the people safe from the Covid 19. We can see this in the case of **Obi v Minister of FCT 2015** where it was said that in his judgment said Governor Obi failed to provide the court with evidences to show that relevant sections of the Land Use Act was not complied with in the action of Malam Nasir el-Rufai, the then FCT minister.

Chief Ajah lost his rights after breaking the rules which was vested on the people by the governor to keep them safe. So then the governor of the state choose to punish him for his wrong doing. So in this case whatever was done to chief Ajah’s building was the decision of the state/governor.