Appellant Submissions Separating Adult Property Claims from Child Welfare

Educational sample 372 | Mombasa

Educational reconstruction from a reported Kenyan decision. Newly drafted wording, not an original court filing or a matter handled by our team. Specimen identities are bracketed. Adapt to genuine facts, current law, jurisdiction and court directions before signing, swearing or filing.

Reconstructed formal document

REPUBLIC OF KENYA

IN THE HIGH COURT AT MOMBASA

APPEAL NO [reference]

[APPELLANT] v [RESPONDENT]

WRITTEN SUBMISSIONS

1. These submissions concern the adult resettlement and belongings orders in the judgment under appeal. The appellant relies on the certified pleadings and trial record at [pages]. Submissions supply argument on that record and do not introduce new evidence of relocation, furniture or parental income.

2. The finding that relocation was induced without dispute cannot stand if the recorded testimony contains a denial. Identify the actual evidence on each side and the reasoning used below. A disputed assertion must not become an admitted fact merely because it was repeated in submissions.

3. The Children Act protects the child. A controversy about an adult ownership interest in household items requires the proper pleaded cause and competent forum. The distinction does not prevent a lawful child housing assessment supported by evidence.

4. Article 53 and sections 8 and 32 require the child best interests and equal parental responsibility to guide the decision. They do not authorise an unpleaded private-property remedy or remove the parties opportunity to meet a defined case.

5. The appellant accepts KES 50,000 monthly maintenance in this reconstruction. Parental education contributions must be assessed against actual means and non-monetary care, rather than an assumed automatic equal division. Preserve existing child obligations unless specifically and lawfully varied.

6. The appellant asks for the unsupported adult orders to be set aside while child maintenance, education and custody remain governed by the lawful orders. Costs should reflect the nature of this child matter and the Court discretion, rather than punish the child through unnecessary financial conflict.

DATED at [place] on [date]. Signed [party or advocate]. DRAWN AND FILED BY [name and address for service]. TO BE SERVED UPON [each affected person and address].

Use and evidence notes

Identify pleaded issues, admitted evidence and genuine record pages. Follow directions on length, authorities, filing and service. Submissions do not introduce exhibits or cure missing substantive prayers. Distinguish what a party sought from what the Court ordered, and an unsuccessful historical position from the actual holding.

Supporting material: [date]; [author or custodian]; [description]; [bundle page]; [authenticating witness]; [admission or permission]. Attach genuine records only. This public specimen contains no exhibits, signatures, personal identifiers or sworn declaration.

Source and procedural limits

A parent appealed a children-case judgment requiring monthly upkeep, education, resettlement, rent arrears and household items. The parties disputed relocation and ownership of the adult belongings. The father accepted KES 50,000 monthly child upkeep but sought equal sharing of education expenses. The mother relied on the child welfare and the parents differing financial means.

The High Court set aside KES 35,000 monthly resettlement for one year, adult rent arrears and household-item orders. It retained KES 50,000 monthly maintenance, ordered outstanding maintenance paid forthwith, and upheld education and custody orders. Each party bore their own costs. Equal parental responsibility did not require identical monetary contributions.

Apply Constitution article 53 and Children Act 2022 sections 8 and 32. Distinguish child welfare from adult property claims, pleaded relief from an omnibus prayer, and parental means from automatic fifty-fifty contribution. Paragraph 1 describes shelter ambiguously; the operative paragraph 55 specifies the resettlement amount per month. Check the certified order. No new child identity or financial evidence is invented.

[2025] KEHC 13064 (KLR) - 19 September 2025. Source decision: https://sheriahub.com/cases/ke/caselaw/hdws-v-can-2025-kehc-13064-klr

Reproduced primary text checked: https://sheriahub.com/cases/ke/caselaw/hdws-v-can-2025-kehc-13064-klr

The original decision may identify participants. The specimen brackets identifying details. A source judgment does not prove this reconstruction was filed, an allegation succeeded, a later order remains unchanged or the same result will follow in another case.