



NIGERIAN LAW AND PRACTICE JOURNAL

VOL. 5, NO. 1 MARCH, 2001

COUNCIL OF LEGAL EDUCATION
NIGERIAN LAW SCHOOL

Contents

	Page
Advisory Board/Members of the Editorial Board	vii
Editorial Note	viii
ARTICLES	
1. The Relevance of Meetings and the Committee System <i>Paul Obo Idornigie</i>	1
2. Appointment of Arbitrators: Law and Practice <i>Muhammed Mustapha Akanbi</i>	22
3. Analysis of Legislative Power under the Constitution <i>Landre Ade-Ojo</i>	40
NOTES	
4. Euthanasia under Nigerian Law — A Call for Change <i>S. Babatunde Odunsi</i>	61
5. Setting Aside a Null Judgement — A Call for Review <i>N. I. Nwokeocha</i>	71
6. Alibi as a Defence in Criminal Liability <i>N. A. O. Ijaiya</i>	82
7. The Law of Contempt of Court — An Appraisal <i>Mrs. Oluremi A. Adegoke</i>	87
8. Eligibility for Patent Protection in Nigeria <i>Robert E. Osamor</i>	98
9. Examining the Constitutionality of Funding the Judiciary from Federation Account against the Background of Financial Independence of the Judiciary <i>P. Chibueze Okorie</i>	107
10. Benefits of the Internet to Legal Research <i>Yemisi Dina</i>	115
11. To Succeed as a Lawyer <i>Alhaji Abdullahi Ibrahim, OFR, SAN</i>	131



Alibi as a Defence in Criminal Liability

N. O. A. Ijaiya, Esq.

N. A. O. Ijaiya, LL.B. (Hons), LL.M. (Ife), Barrister-at-Law is a Lecturer in the Faculty of Law, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria.

Alibi simply means elsewhere. It is a defence of having been at a place other than the scene of the crime. It may equally connote that I was not present at the place where the offence was committed.

For a plea of alibi to succeed, an accused is expected to raise the plea immediately after his arrest by the police, that is, he must tell or inform the investigating police officer at the first contact, that he was not present at the scene of the crime or that he was at a particular place different from the place where the crime was committed. That is, when a person is charged with an offence he is entitled to say that he was in some particular place or places other than the scene of the crime at the time of the commission of the crime. The accused must give the particulars of his alibi at the earliest opportunity.

By virtue of section 11 of the English Criminal Justice Act 1967, a defendant charged with an indictable offence must give seven days notice of the particulars of alibi if he wants to adduce evidence of it at his trial. If the accused did not properly set up his defence of alibi during the trial, he will not be allowed to do so on appeal except if the appeal court is satisfied that the trial was rushed or that the defendant had no fair chance of putting his defence of alibi across during his trial.¹

The investigating police officer in order to rebut the plea of alibi, must carry out the investigation to ascertain the claim of the accused, that is, the investigating police officer must endeavour to visit the place which the accused claimed he was at the particular time the offence was committed. The officer must equally find out the particulars of whoever the accused must have mentioned in his statement as the person or persons with whom he was staying or stayed at that particular time. The police officer must find out from those people whether it was true the accused or suspect was with the person or persons at that material time.

Failure on the part of the investigating police officer to carry out this duty is fatal to the success of the case against the accused. Once alibi is raised, the onus shifts on the prosecution to disprove it, it is not for the accused to prove it.

It should be noted that the standard of defence regarded to establish an

alibi is much lower than the proof beyond reasonable doubt expected of the prosecution. The burden of establishing the defence of alibi which lies on the accused is like that which lies on a defendant in civil case, it is discharged by the balance of probability and not by proof beyond reasonable doubt.

If an accused fails or neglects to inform the investigating police officer during the course of investigation and now raises the issue or makes the plea for the first time in court, the accused will not succeed because the opportunity for the police or investigating officer or prosecutor to investigate the defence might have been foreclosed. Although the prosecution can anticipate the defence of alibi and forestall it but if it cannot reasonably be foreseen and it is set up for the first time after the close of prosecution case, then the prosecution must be allowed to call rebutting evidence if they so wish.² This article or paper seeks to examine some fundamental issues.

If an accused who really participated in a crime but denied same during investigation by raising the plea of alibi but for reason which was beyond the control of the investigating officer, he could not conduct the required investigation to find out the authenticity of the accused claim, what would then be the stand or the position of the court? Will the court rely on circumstantial evidence to convict the accused or the court will because of this technical defect, acquit the accused?

This proposition could be examined by considering the following cases:

- (a) In the case of *Onuoha v. The State*³ the Supreme Court in holding⁴ had this to say "the setting up of the defence of alibi is not a sufficient reason for a trial judge to call witnesses *proprio motu* as there is nothing *ex-improviso* about the defence. It is the commonest of defences and it does not require any particular ingenuity but ordinary common sense on the part of the prosecution to conceive that a person accused may come to court and say that he did not do it, he was not at the scene of the crime."
- (b) In *Hausa v. The State*⁴ Where the Supreme court while dismissing the appeal by a majority decision held that "although there are occasions in which failure to check or investigate alibi may cast doubt on the reliability of the case of the prosecution, where there is positive evidence which cancels the alibi or where the prosecution adduces sufficient and accepted evidence which fixed the accused person at the scene of crime at the material time, the alibi raised is logically demolished or fizzles into thin air and thus doomed."

The facts of the case are as follows:

The appellant in that case was charged at the Bendel State High Court holden at Orerokpe with the murder of Samuel Ariokoko contrary to section 319 (1) of the Criminal Code cap 49 vol. 4 Law of Bendel State of

prosecution to investigate and rebut such plea in order to prove the case against the accused beyond reasonable doubt. Failure by the prosecution to investigate the plea of alibi which has been promptly and properly raised, may cast doubt on the probability of the prosecution's case.

The courts are advised to ensure that mere technicalities are not allowed to over ride the course of justice. The court should endeavour to weigh other evidence proffered in the case especially by the prosecution so as to arrive at a just and convincing decision such as the evidence of identification of the accused person with the crime (even by one prosecution witness), if it is a very clear and strong evidence. If there are discrepancies in the story of prosecution witnesses about the identity of the accused, the court must resolve such discrepancies before rejecting or accepting the defence of alibi.⁷

Conclusion, the plea of alibi should not be allowed to be turned to a shield by the accused person in order to get away from the desired punishment for the offence committed. Mere technicalities should not be allowed to defeat the doing of substantial justice as held by the Supreme Court in the case of *State v. Gwonto*.⁸ It is submitted that in rejecting the defence of alibi the court must carefully weigh the evidence of the prosecution especially identification with regard to the following matters: Time of day, Weather, Locus, Distance of view, Means of identification, Duration and Familiarity.

NOTES

1. Hon. Justice E. O. Fakayode, *The Nigerian Criminal Code Companion*, Ethiope Publishing Corp., Benin City Nig. 1977 p. 232
2. *Ibid* – Justice E. O. Fakayode (Rtd), Pg. 232.
3. (1989) 1 NSCC 411
4. (1994) 6 NWLR Part 350
5. (1965) All NLR, 193
6. (1995) 2 NWLR 193, Part 328.
7. Justice E. O. Fakayode Op. cit. Pg. 233
8. (1983) 1 SCNLR 142