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 Legal issue –

* Whether an executive order in a state of emergency will be viewed as sufficient notice under to land use act
* Whether chief Ajah is entitled to compensation?
* Whether the governor act of demolition was lawful?

The requirement of revocation is valid notice, purpose and adequate compensation, so the purpose of revocation is given by **section 28 (2) of the Land Use Act** this basically talked about if the governor can revoke your interest on the land if they want to use the land for public interest he can revoke your right.

 In the above factual Scenario, An executive order during a state of emergency such as the covid-19 pandemic would be viewed as sufficient notice being that a law enacted during such times are for the public interest and welfare. It would be viewed as notice to the general public. **Section to 305 of the 1999 Constitution** provides the president may publish an official gazette in this case an executive order for the proclamation of a state of emergency. An executive order is an order made by the executive, it could a president or the governor depending on each situation. **Section 8 of the Quarantine Act has** the right to make state order and declaration in regards to area infected local area such as bars, places of worship etc., there the executive order in a state of emergency would be sufficient notice

As regards to whether the governor act of demolition was lawful, I resolved in the negative , section 28 (2)(b) land use act provides Overriding public interest in the case of a statutory right of occupancy means the requirement of the land by the Government of the State or by a Local Government in the State, in either case for public purposes within the State, or the requirement of the land by the Government of the Federation for public purposes of the Federation; section 51 (c) of the land use act defines what "public purposes" includes; **for or in connection with sanitary improvements of any kind; for obtaining control over land contiguous to any part or over land the value of which will be enhanced by the construction of any railway, road or other public work or convenience about to be undertaken or provided by the Government,** the simply implies that the governor was acting in expressive whilst he has righto issue out fines and such the demolition of a building was unlawful.

 Whether Ajah is entitled to compensation, I resolve in the positive. He is entitled to compensation as provided by section 29 (1)land Use Act If a right of occupancy is revoked for the cause such as public purposes the holder and the occupier shall be entitled to compensation for the value at the date of revocation of their unexhausted improvements. Notwithstanding the act of demolition by the government would be viewed as exccesive.

Therefore, he can seek compensation according to the land use act for revocation of land for overriding public interest and is entitled to so because the Governor acted beyond the stipulated punishment for offender.