The original lease was deJ)Osiled at their ndvocnles office and was to be transmitted to the purchaser upon payment of the p11rchm; c price in full.

The complninants after the lapse of the 90 tlays proceedet at their advocates office to know the status of the control since the time for completion of the samehad lapsed.

The complnintmts learnt that their advocate had transmitted the original certificate to the purchaser without their consent or ,vithout making or receiving the fuU payments of the purchase price.

The complainants demanded to know from the advocate the circumstances under the which the same wasgiven 10 purchaser without their knowledge and consent.

Through the finn of 1UNYITHIA, Mu·ruGJ, UMARA AND rvmZNA companyadvocates vide a letter dated 3/4/2024 acknowledges to have forwarded the said original certificate oflease Lo the purchaser's advocates.

The complainant's efforts towards getting the said original certificate of lease from their advocates have not been successful.

I have noted that the vendors advocate conspired ,vith the purchaser and breached his duty tohis clients byforwarding the said deed without full paymenlof the purchase price.

Further after the investigating officer invited the advocate and the purchaser to Makupa policestation to record the statements they have adamantly refused to do thus implying the intention to fraud the vendors.

It's now clear that the evidence points out to the offence of stealing contrary to section 268 (2) as readwithsection 275of the penal codeand concealing deeds ontrary to section 288 of the penal code.

I direct as follows,

Thaφ ne JOSEPH M. MUNYITHIA and FARIDMOHAMED AL1"1AARY to becharged with above charges.

You are so directed.

MARTIN KAR.IUKI

PROSECUTION COUNSEL

FOR DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC PROSECUTIONS.