Purchaser by Purchaser Plot and Payment Evidence Schedule

Educational sample 462 | Machakos

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 ENVIRONMENT AND LAND COURT AT MACHAKOS

ENVIRONMENT AND LAND CASE NO [reference]

[CLAIMANT] v [RESPONDENT]

EVIDENCE OR COMPUTATION SCHEDULE

1. This schedule identifies each purchaser separately: [anonymous claimant code], [plot identifier and extent], [seller], [agreement date], [price], [paid amount], [outstanding amount] and [bundle pages]. Names in the actual filing must match the parties and authority documents.

2. For each transfer through the co-operative, record the fresh allotment letter, transfer receipt, beacon fee, survey fee and title-processing fee by date, issuer and amount. Mark missing records as missing; do not allocate one claimant receipt to the entire group.

3. Link each plot to the registered mother parcel using [approved scheme, survey record and authenticating witness]. A letter alone does not resolve the competing parcel description or establish the precise physical extent.

4. Record possession and interference separately: [entry date], [observed obstruction], [photograph author] and [direct witness]. Distinguish a purchaser personal observation from events reported by the representative claimant.

5. Record the co-operative acknowledgement, any unfulfilled transaction condition, related litigation and the competitor root-of-title material. Representation authority and common issues are [identified]; individual transaction proof remains necessary.

6. The totals are [transparent sums and formulae], reconciled to the genuine ledger. This schedule supports the pleaded transfer and possession remedies; it is neither a title instrument nor proof of unspecified general damages.

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

This is an evidential or accounting aid, not an originating process or independent proof. Give dates, authors or custodians, admissibility status, actual document pages and transparent calculations. Label missing and disputed items. Obtain the applicable leave or directions for supplementary evidence, serve it and prevent duplicate credits or recovery.

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

Fifty-seven plot purchasers relied on agreements, fresh allotment letters and payment receipts issued through the registered co-operative proprietor. A competing occupier claimed a different parcel subdivision, developed the land and counterclaimed. A survey officer could find no records for the asserted subdivision. The co-operative supported the buyers; the competitor called no evidence.

The Court ordered permanent protection, vacation by the competitor within 90 days and transfer by the co-operative within 30 days, with authorised execution of documents on default. The non-existent-title cancellation prayer and unexplained general damages were refused. The competitor counterclaim was dismissed and it bore costs; the registrar and Attorney General claims were dismissed without costs.

Each purchaser must connect a genuine transaction to an identified plot. An allotment or title copy cannot replace proof of lawful acquisition. Co-operative jurisdiction had been determined on the particular dispute; no blanket rule bypassing section 76 follows. Police assistance and enforcement periods require the actual order.

[2025] KEELC 195 (KLR) - 22 January 2025. Source decision: https://new.kenyalaw.org/akn/ke/judgment/keelc/2025/195/eng@2025-01-22

Reproduced primary text checked: https://sheriahub.com/cases/ke/caselaw/mungaru-56-others-v-kamulu-housing-cooperative-society-3-others-2025-keelc-195-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.