Interested Party Affidavit Supporting Review of Unlawful Picketing Restrictions

Educational sample 149 | Nairobi

Educational reconstruction from a reported Kenyan judgment. This is newly drafted text, not an original court filing and not a matter handled by our team. Identifying details are replaced with bracketed fields. Verify the facts, current law, jurisdiction and court directions before signing, swearing or filing.

Reconstructed formal document

REPUBLIC OF KENYA

IN THE HIGH COURT AT NAIROBI JUDICIAL REVIEW DIVISION

PETITION OR APPLICATION NO [reference]

REPUBLIC v [RESPONDENT AUTHORITY] EX PARTE [APPLICANTS]

INTERESTED PARTIES [as admitted in the actual file]

AFFIDAVIT

1. I am [authorised officer] of [professional body], an interested party admitted by order dated [date]. I identify the body’s mandate and my authority at I1.

2. The body supports lawful peaceful assembly and enforcement of constitutional limits on public power. Its position concerns the challenged directive rather than a request to immunise every form of protest conduct.

3. I2 contains the body’s contemporaneous observations and correspondence about the directive. I distinguish its institutional records from facts directly witnessed by me.

4. The injury allegation is supported only by the specific admissible records identified at I3. I do not purport to give a medical opinion or attribute personal conduct to an officer without evidence.

5. The body asks the Court to determine the directive’s legality under the constitutional framework. Admission as an interested party does not authorise introduction of an entirely new damages or criminal prosecution claim.

SWORN by [deponent] at [place] on [date]. Signature [ ]. BEFORE ME [Commissioner for Oaths]. This sample has not been sworn.

Use and evidence notes

Admission as an interested party and permission for the affidavit must be supported by the actual court directions. Identify authority and institutional records. Do not enlarge the litigation into a new claim. Separate witnessed facts, authenticated documents and legal argument. Complete a valid jurat and redact irrelevant private and medical information.

Exhibit schedule: [label]; [document date]; [description]; [existing record pages or basis of admission]. Do not append invented or missing records.

Source and procedural limits

Rights organisations challenged a police directive issued during medical workers' industrial action. They relied on an earlier Nairobi picket at which a union officer was injured and sought review relief concerning peaceful assembly. The respondent did not answer the application; an interested professional body supported it.

The High Court granted prohibition, certiorari, declarations on personal responsibility and costs payable personally by the respondent. It declined the other requested relief. It did not award the requested personal compensation, supervisory investigation order or apology, and did not convict anyone of a criminal offence.

Constitution Articles 24, 36, 37, 41 and 47; Fair Administrative Action Act; Law Reform Act and Civil Procedure Rules Order 53 for the source route; National Police Service Act sections 10 and 66. A current applicant must verify leave, time, service and the competent respondent, and distinguish public law relief from a criminal conviction.

[2024] KEHC 16607 (KLR) — 31 December 2024. Original judgment: https://katibainstitute.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Kenya-Human-Rights-Commission-8-others-v-Nchebere-Law-Society-of-Kenya-2-others-Interested-Parties-Application-E082of2024-2024KEHC16607KLR-Judicial-Review-31December2024-Judgment.pdf

The original decision may identify participants. The specimen replaces their identifying details. A source decision is not proof that a draft was filed, that an allegation succeeded, or that the same result will follow in another case.