NR & CO. QUARTERLY

ISSUE #01 /2025

The Editorial [Pg.2]

Legal Briefs

The Firm

Welcoming New Talent to the Firm [Pg.3]

Legislative Updates

The Virtual Assets Service Providers Bill, 2025 [Pg.5]

Contributors

The Supreme Court's Judgement on Bicameralism [pg.12]

NJOROGE REGERU AND COMPANY
ADVOCATES, COMMISSIONERS FOR OATHS AND NOTARIES PUBLIC
www.njorogeregeru.com

Editorial Team

Grishon Thuo
Ruth Regero
Chrispine Sande
Magdaline Muhiu
Mark Gathagu

Contributors
Mark Gathagu
Magdaline Muhiu

Design & Layout
Mansion Arts Limited

Publisher
Njoroge Regeru & Company Advocates

Disclaimer

This Newsletter is for informative purposes only and it is not to be relied upon as legal advice. None of the information contained in the Newsletter is intended to create, and receipt of it does not constitute, an advocate-client relationship. Nothing in this Newsletter is intended to guarantee, warranty or predict the outcome of any particular case and should not be construed as such a guarantee, warranty or prediction. The authors are not responsible or liable in damages or otherwise howsoever for any actions (or lack thereof) taken as a result of relying on or in any way using any of the information contained in this Newsletter and shall in no event be liable for any damages resulting from reliance on or use of any of the information herein contained. Nothing contained in this Newsletter should be construed as constituting any legal advice on any subject to any person. It is recommended that readers facing specific situations should take specific advice from suitably qualified professionals.

EDITOR'S NOTE

Dear Reader,

Welcome to the first quarter's edition of our newsletter for the year 2025 where we delve into key developments and insights shaping the regulatory and legal landscape. In this edition, we shine a spotlight on critical aspects affecting the financial sector and noteworthy legal precedents.

We begin with celebrating the Firm's achievements in the last quarter, that is, participating in the Gertrudes Hospital Family Cancer Walk and the recognition of our senior partner, Mr. Njoroge Regeru in Band 1 of the 2025 Chambers Global rankings. These moments highlight our commitment to community, sustainability and teamwork.

In Legislative Updates, we cover the Virtual Assets Service Providers Bill 2025 and the Anti Money Laundering and Combating of Terrorism Financing Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2025. VASP's reforms focus on consumer protection, and compliance with international standards, while balancing innovation with security in the digital asset market while the Anti-Money Laundering and Combating of Terrorism Financing Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2025 seeks to strengthen financial oversight and compliance across various sectors, increasing penalties and introducing stricter reporting requirements to combat money laundering and terrorism financing.

The Case Highlights section shares key legal stories, including the Kwanza Estates Limited v Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology case on the enforcement of contractual obligations and the doctrine of frustration in land transactions and the Gogni Rajope Construction Limited & another v Omondi judgment on unfair termination and the due process required in employment dismissals under Kenyan labor laws.

Our Contributors' Platform offers insightful analyses, including reflections on the constitutional intricacies of Kenya's bicameral legislative structure and the implications of recent Supreme Court rulings, as well as the sobering reality of international law and sovereignty illustrated by the case of a Kenyan facing the death penalty in Vietnam. Through these articles, we delve into the balance of power within Kenya's governance system and highlight the crucial lessons for travelers navigating foreign legal landscapes.

As we navigate the dynamic landscape of regulations, policy developments and legal precedent, we remain committed to providing valuable perspectives to our readers. We hope this edition of our newsletter serves as a valuable resource and sparks meaningful dialogue on the issues shaping various industries.

Chrispine Sande
sande@njorogeregeru.com

The Firm

As we step into the new year, we are delighted to share some exciting developments and milestones that reflect our continued growth and commitment to excellence. The first quarter of 2025 has been nothing short of remarkable, with notable additions to our team, meaningful contributions to our community, and recognition of outstanding professional achievements. Here's a glimpse into our journey so far:

Welcoming New Talent to the Firm

We are thrilled to welcome four exceptional individuals who recently joined our Firm, each bringing their unique skills, perspectives, and energy to our team. Please join us in extending a warm welcome to **Muthoni Kihia, Edward Maina** and **Wanjiru Gikungu,** our newest Trainee Advocates, as well as our intern, **Fr. Paul Kariuki.**

We look forward to their continued growth and success with us!

Making Strides for a Good Cause: Gertrude's Hospital Family Cancer Walk

In a continued effort to contribute meaningfully to the communities we serve, our Firm proudly participated in the **Gertrude's Hospital Family Cancer Walk**. This event is close to our hearts as it raises critical awareness and funds for cancer treatment and research, benefiting many children and families in need.

Our team showed up in full force, joining hundreds of others in this inspiring walk, highlighting the Firm's commitment to social responsibility and health advocacy. Through our participation, we aim to not only give back to society but also to foster a culture of care and compassion within our Firm.

Recognition of Excellence:

Senior Partner Njoroge Regeru Ranked in Band 1 by Chambers Global

We are incredibly proud to announce that our Senior Partner, Mr. Njoroge Regeru, has been recognized once again in the 2025 Chambers Global Rankings, securing a well-deserved Band 1 ranking in the Dispute Resolution and Arbitration category. This prestigious recognition affirms his exceptional expertise, leadership, and dedication to delivering outstanding legal services to our clients.

Mr. Regeru's ranking is a testament to his hard work, unparalleled experience, and reputation in the field of dispute resolution. His strategic insights and ability to navigate complex legal challenges has earned him this esteemed acknowledgment from Chambers, and we could not be more thrilled for him. This accomplishment speaks volumes about the caliber of legal talent within our Firm and strengthens our position as one of the leading Law Firms in the region.

As we continue to build on these exciting developments, we remain committed to upholding the values of professionalism, integrity, and excellence in everything we do. We look forward to an even more successful and impactful 2025, with many more milestones to celebrate as a team.

Stay tuned for more updates in the coming months. Thank you for your continued trust and support!

ARBOR HOUSE
ARBITRATION CENTRE
Meet | Resolve | Advance

IDEAL FOR:

Arbitrations
Mediations
Meetings
Workshops
Trainings

ABOUT AHAC

AHAC functions as a discreet, quiet and pleasant environment where lawyers, other professionals and their clients meet to resolve disputes. Your first and only choice for all exclusive and private meetings.

Accessible

Digital Conference Facilities

Affordable

Serene Environment

Ample Secure Parking

Support Services

www.ahbc.co.ke

Arbor House Business Centre, Arboretum Drive • P.O. Box 45169 - 00100, Nairobi, Kenya.
(254) 706 808 080, 0795 338 179, 0780 006 969 • info@ahbc.co.ke

Legislative UPDATES

In this segment, we provide updates on various Bills introduced in Parliament focusing on consumer protection and financial oversight and compliance across various sectors.

THE VIRTUAL ASSETS SERVICE PROVIDERS BILL, 2025

Introduction

Virtual Assets, hereinafter referred to as VAs, are digital representations of value that can be digitally traded, or transferred, and can be used for payment or investment purposes or for other purposes as could arise. They include but are not limited to Cryptocurrencies, Non-Fungible Tokens (NFTs), Utility Tokens and Gaming Assets. Virtual assets (VAs) have rapidly evolved over the past decade, offering transformative opportunities in financial transactions and investments. However, their decentralized nature introduces risks such as money laundering (ML), terrorism financing (TF), proliferation financing (PF) and fraud.

The Cabinet Secretary for National Treasury and Economic Planning announced the Virtual Assets Service Provider's Bill 2024 on 9th January 2025. The Bill is currently under parliamentary review, following completion of the Public Participation Stage on 29th January 2025. It aims to address the risks associated with virtual asset transactions, ensure consumer protection and align the sector with international standards on anti-money laundering (AML), countering the financing of terrorism (CFT), and countering proliferation financing (CPF). Additionally, it seeks to promote financial innovation while safeguarding market integrity and protecting the economy from potential risks posed by unregulated digital assets.

Salient Provisions of the Bill

1. Regulatory Oversight

The Bill designates the Capital Markets Authority and the Central Bank of Kenya as the principal regulatory authorities responsible for licensing, supervision, and enforcement of compliance within the virtual asset sector. The Cabinet Secretary for the National Treasury retains the power to designate additional regulatory bodies as necessary. These authorities will be empowered to issue guidelines, regulations, and directives to ensure that VASPs adhere to the highest standards of financial integrity and security. The Bill also outlines the principles that will guide regulatory authorities in their oversight, including fostering innovation while ensuring financial stability and protecting the interests of consumers and investors.

2. Licensing and Compliance Requirements

Under the Bill, any person or entity intending to provide virtual asset services must obtain a license from the relevant regulatory authority. The application process includes an assessment of the applicant's financial stability, governance structures, cybersecurity measures, and AML/CFT/CPF compliance. The regulatory authorities have the discretion to impose conditions on the license, ensuring that only entities with robust operational frameworks and risk management practices are permitted to operate. Furthermore, licensees are required to conduct their business in a prudent manner, maintain solvency, and protect client assets from mismanagement or fraudulent activities.

3. Consumer Protection and Market Integrity

The Bill establishes stringent requirements to ensure that VASPs conduct their business with integrity, transparency, and financial prudence. This includes capital adequacy requirements, cybersecurity standards, and obligations to protect customer assets. Further, VASPs must maintain detailed transaction records and comply with disclosure requirements. Transparency and fair dealing are emphasized, requiring VASPs to provide clear and accurate information to clients regarding their services, risks, and obligations. The Bill also mandates VASPs to implement mechanisms for handling customer complaints and dispute resolution, ensuring that consumer grievances are addressed efficiently and fairly.

4. AML/CFT/CPF Regulations

The Bill introduces robust mechanisms to combat financial crimes, including requiring VASPs to undertake due diligence on customers, report suspicious transactions, and implement internal controls to mitigate money laundering and terrorist financing risks. Regulatory authorities are also empowered to impose penalties for non-compliance. VASPs will be required to maintain detailed records of transactions for a specified period and ensure that such records are accessible to regulatory authorities when required. The Bill further obligates VASPs to conduct regular risk assessments to identify and mitigate potential financial crime risks associated with their operations.

5. Initial Virtual Asset Offerings (IVAOs)

The Bill mandates that any entity issuing an Initial Virtual Asset Offering (IVAO) must first obtain approval from the relevant regulatory authority. The issuance must comply with disclosure obligations to protect investors and prevent fraudulent schemes. Promoters of IVAOs will also be subject to regulatory scrutiny to ensure that they meet fit-and-proper requirements, possess adequate financial resources, and maintain transparency in their operations. The Bill aims to create a structured and transparent framework for token offerings, thereby reducing the risk of fraudulent schemes and speculative bubbles that could harm investors.

6. Investigations and Enforcement

Regulatory authorities are granted extensive powers to conduct compliance inspections, investigations, and audits of VASPs. They may impose administrative penalties, suspend or revoke licenses, and take enforcement actions against non-compliant entities. Authorities will have the power to compel the production of documents, interview key personnel, and, if necessary, take corrective measures to prevent harm to consumers and the financial system. The Bill also outlines penalties for offenses, ensuring that breaches of regulatory obligations attract significant fines and, in some cases, criminal liability.

7. Cybersecurity and Data Protection

Given the digital nature of virtual assets, the Bill places a strong emphasis on cybersecurity and data protection. VASPs are required to implement robust cybersecurity frameworks to prevent hacking, data breaches, and other cyber threats. They must also comply with existing data protection laws to safeguard customer information. This includes adopting industry best practices such as encryption, multi-factor authentication, and regular security audits to prevent unauthorized access and fraud. Failure to comply with these cybersecurity requirements may result in penalties, suspension of operations, or revocation of licenses.

8. Implications for Stakeholders

The passage of this Bill will significantly impact various stakeholders, including existing virtual asset service providers, financial institutions, and consumers. For VASPs, compliance with the new licensing and AML/CFT/CPF requirements will be mandatory. Financial institutions may need to revise their risk management frameworks to accommodate virtual asset-related transactions. Consumers are expected to benefit from enhanced protection against fraud and financial crimes. Additionally, the government and regulatory bodies will need to invest in capacity-building initiatives to effectively oversee the sector and enforce compliance.

Potential Challenges of the Bill

a) Regulatory and Compliance Burden

The Bill imposes strict licensing requirements and obligations that could significantly increase compliance costs for VASPs. Smaller startups may struggle to meet these requirements, leading to market concentration where only well-financed entities survive, affecting competition and innovation.

b) Uncertainty on Stablecoins

The Bill does not provide a defined regulatory framework, determining whether a stablecoin qualifies as a financial product, security, derivative, or non-cash payment facility. The absence of a specific licensing category for stablecoins could lead to regulatory gaps or misclassification under existing licensing categories.

c) Broad Discretionary Powers of Regulators

The Bill grants broad discretionary power to regulators (Central Bank of Kenya, Capital Markets Authority etc.) This has the potential to create bottlenecks, potentially stifling the freedom of virtual asset service providers to innovate. Startups and small businesses, in particular, are likely to face challenges in navigating the complex regulatory terrain, raising concerns about whether the bill inadvertently favors larger, more established entities.

Conclusion

The Virtual Asset Service Providers Bill, 2025 represents a significant step towards regulating Kenya's virtual asset industry. If implemented effectively, the Bill has the potential to establish Kenya as a leader in digital asset regulation, promoting financial inclusion and economic growth while ensuring that virtual asset activities remain secure and accountable.

THE ANTI-MONEY LAUNDERING AND COMBATING OF TERRORISM FINANCING LAWS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 2025

On 11th February 2025, the National Assembly introduced the Anti-Money Laundering and Combating of Terrorism Financing Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2025, aimed at strengthening financial oversight, enhancing compliance, and aligning Kenya's regulatory framework with international standards. The Bill introduces key changes that expand regulatory authority, increase penalties for non-compliance, and impose stricter reporting obligations across multiple sectors.

Expanded Regulatory Oversight and Compliance Obligations

The Bill enhances the mandate of the Financial Reporting Centre (FRC) and renames its head from "Agency Director" to "Agency Director-General" to clarify leadership roles. It also introduces the Public Benefit Organizations Regulatory Authority as an oversight body, extending compliance obligations to non-financial sectors such as real estate, betting, and dealers in precious metals and stones. These industries must now adhere to strict anti-money laundering (AML) and counter-terrorism financing (CTF) measures, including risk assessments and enhanced due diligence for high-value transactions.

Stricter Penalties for Non-Compliance

To deter violations, the Bill significantly increases penalties. Institutions failing to meet reporting requirements may face fines of up to KES 20 million or imprisonment for up to seven years. Continued non-compliance attracts additional daily penalties, reinforcing accountability among financial institutions and businesses handling large cash transactions.

Risk-Based Monitoring and Sector-Specific Reforms

The Bill introduces a risk-based supervision framework, compelling financial institutions and designated businesses to actively assess and mitigate risks associated with money laundering and terrorism financing. It grants expanded powers to regulatory authorities across various industries, including banking, real estate, mining, Sacco societies, and betting, to ensure compliance through inspections, sanctions, and enhanced reporting requirements.

Implementation Challenges and Regulatory Risks

While the Bill strengthens Kenya's financial regulatory framework, several challenges may hinder its implementation. The heightened compliance burden could strain small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), which may lack the resources to meet stringent reporting requirements. Overlapping regulatory mandates could create enforcement conflicts, leading to inefficiencies. Additionally, concerns over bureaucratic delays, regulatory overreach, and the potential for selective enforcement may discourage investment and financial inclusion. Notably, the Bill does not explicitly address cryptocurrency transactions, leaving a critical gap in AML enforcement.

Conclusion

The Anti-Money Laundering and Combating of Terrorism Financing Laws (Amendment) Bill, 2025 represents a significant step toward enhancing financial transparency and accountability in Kenya. However, its success will depend on clear enforcement mechanisms, improved inter-agency coordination, and support for affected businesses to ensure smooth compliance without stifling economic growth.

Case Highlights

In this segment, we highlight various decided cases, looking into the jurisprudence set by the apex courts on various legal issues.

Kwanza Estates Limited v Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology

On December 6, 2024, the Supreme Court of Kenya delivered its judgment in **Kwanza Estates Limited v Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology (JKUAT),** setting a precedent on contractual enforcement and the doctrine of frustration in lease agreements involving public institutions.

Kwanza Estates Limited leased premises to JKUAT for six years from May 2010, with a renewal in 2016 for another six-year term ending April 2022. However, in July 2020, JKUAT issued a three-month termination notice, citing financial difficulties due to a change in law and the Covid-19 pandemic, which disrupted educational institutions. Kwanza Estates argued that the lease lacked a termination clause, making the notice invalid and obligating JKUAT to pay rent until the lease expired.

The Environment and Land Court (ELC) ruled in favor of Kwanza Estates, affirming that the lease remained binding in the absence of a termination clause. On appeal, the Court of Appeal reversed the decision, holding that the Covid-19 pandemic was a force majeure event, justifying termination. Dissatisfied, Kwanza Estates moved to the Supreme Court.

Issues

1. Whether JKUAT had properly pleaded force majeure or frustration to be discharged from its contractual obligations.
2. Whether the Covid-19 pandemic constituted valid grounds for terminating the lease.
3. Whether Kwanza Estates was entitled to the reliefs sought.

The Supreme Court held that force majeure could not be invoked since the lease agreement lacked such a clause. The proper doctrine for consideration was frustration, which occurs when an unforeseen event makes contract performance impossible or radically different from what was agreed. However, the court found that the lease was still capable of performance, as financial hardship alone does not constitute frustration.

Additionally, the lease's lack of a termination clause meant that JKUAT's unilateral termination and subsequent vacating of the premises in January 2021 amounted to a breach of contract. The court upheld Kwanza Estates' claim and awarded Kshs. 2,453,699 in damages.

Conclusion & Implications

The Judgment reinforces the principle that parties must honor contractual obligations as written and that courts will not rewrite contracts. It highlights the importance of clear contractual drafting, particularly in anticipating risks such as economic downturns or pandemics. This decision sets a precedent for strict enforcement of lease agreements and limits reliance on external events to escape contractual duties

Gogni Rajope Construction Company Limited, Cebaud Engineering Services Limited v Cornel Otieno Omondi (Civil Appeal No. 321 of 2019)

On the 7th February 2025, the Court of Appeal delivered a compelling judgment in the case of Gogni Rajope Construction Limited & another v Omondi. In this case, the Appellants, Gogni Construction Limited and Cebaud Engineering Services Limited appealed a judgment against them from the Employment and Labor Relations Court , which ordered them to pay the Respondent a sum of Kshs. 1,222,146.

Facts

The Respondent, Omondi was employed as an Assistant Projects Engineer on a contract which was renewable after two years, earning a gross salary of Kshs. 200,000 paid to him by the 2nd Appellant, Cebaud Limited, a sister company to the first Appellant, Gogni Construction Limited. The

Respondent was sent on compulsory leave by the first Appellant to allow investigations however he contended that no investigations were conducted nor was he accorded a hearing before his services were terminated. The appellants however contended that he was dismissed for lawful reasons including serious failures, incompetence, negligence and fraudulent acts or omissions which constituted gross misconduct. The appellants further contended that they delivered a notice to show cause to the respondent asking him to respond to the charges against him but the respondent failed to do so, and hence he was dismissed.

The trial court found that even If the Appellant had valid and justifiable reasons for terminating the respondent's contract, the process of termination was flawed, leading to the conclusion that the termination was unfair and unlawful. The appellants, aggrieved by the judgment filed an appeal in the Court of Appeal.

Issues

The Court of Appeal considered the following issues for determination;

Whether the termination of the respondent by the 1st Appellant was unfair and unlawful, whether section 45(3) of the Employment Act which states that an employee who has been continuously employed by his employer for a period not less than thirteen months immediately before the date of termination shall have the right to complain that he has been unfairly terminated, and if the affirmative is true, what award should be given to the respondent.

Analysis

Whether the termination of the respondent by the 1st Appellant was unfair and unlawful

The Court ruled that despite the steps that the 1st Appellant took such as sending out a letter to show cause and giving a deadline to receive a response, they still fell short of the requirements of section 41 and section 45(2)(c) of the Employment Act, even though the reasons for termination were valid. The court ruled that the respondent ought to have been given a notice of one month or payment in lieu, informed of the alleged misconduct and allowed to defend himself or make representation.

Whether section 45(3) of the Employment Act which states that an employee who has been continuously employed by his employer for a period not less than thirteen months immediately before the date of termination shall have the right to complain that he has been unfairly terminated

The Court relied on the judgment of Justice Lenaola J. which declared section 45(3) of the Employment Act unconstitutional as it did not give effect to the right to fair labor practices and was not in accordance with the constitution. The Court of Appeal therefore ruled that the Appellants could not find recourse in section 45(3) of the Employment Act and therefore dismissed the appeal

iNTERLUDE

"Maybe, but I think we should hire a lawyer anyway."

"Your Honor, my client respectfully asks that you reconsider your decision."

"Sometimes I wear this in court. It's my frivolous law suit."

CONTRIBUTORS' PLATFORM

A Constitutional Ballet: The Supreme Court's Judgement on Bicameralism and the Delimitation of Legislative Power

By Mark Gathagu
lawyers@njorogeregeru.com

In the intricate architecture of constitutional governance, the balance of power between institutions is neither arbitrary nor fluid. It is carefully delineated by the supreme law of the land. The recent Supreme Court decision in Senate & Others v. Speaker of the National Assembly & Others is a reaffirmation of this principle and is a jurisprudential pronouncement that seeks to restore order to the legislative process and reinforce the sanctity of procedural compliance.

For years, Kenya's bicameral Parliament has been mired in a jurisdictional struggle, with the National Assembly asserting primacy over legislative affairs and the Senate striving to uphold its constitutional mandate as the guardian of devolved interests. At the heart of this dispute lies a fundamental question: What is the extent of each House's legislative authority and how should it be exercised within the framework of the Constitution of Kenya 2010?

The Constitutional Question: Legislative Procedure and Institutional Restraint.

The case before the Supreme Court revolved around two pivotal constitutional provisions:

1. Article 110(3), which mandates that before either House of Parliament considers a Bill, the Speakers of both the National Assembly and the Senate must jointly resolve whether it concerns the County Governments.
2. Article 114, which governs Money Bills, stipulating that such legislation originates exclusively in the National Assembly.

Despite the unequivocal language of Article 110(3), the National Assembly had persistently enacted legislation without seeking concurrence from the Senate. This unilateral approach led to the passage of numerous statutes, many with direct implications for county governments, without adherence to the prescribed bicameral procedure.

The Supreme Court's Judgment was definitive:

"The concurrence process under Article 110(3) is not an optional step to be dispensed with at the discretion of one House. It is a mandatory procedural safeguard designed to ensure that legislative authority is exercised within the bounds of constitutional fidelity."

By asserting that no Speaker can unilaterally determine the nature of a Bill, the Court reaffirmed that parliamentary procedure is not a matter of convenience but a constitutional imperative. This Judgment, therefore, not only corrects procedural anomalies, but also restores the institutional equilibrium envisioned in the 2010 Constitution.

The Senate's Role in Financial Legislation: Limited but Not Excluded.

The Judgment also addressed the longstanding debate over the Senate's role in financial legislation. Article 114 assigns the initiation of money Bills exclusively to the National Assembly, a provision that the lower House has frequently interpreted as an absolute exclusion of Senate participation.
The Court, while upholding the National Assembly's primary jurisdiction over financial matters, provided a nuanced clarification:

"While the introduction and primary deliberation of money Bills remain the prerogative of the National Assembly, the Senate's oversight role in county finances must not be rendered illusory."

This interpretation ensures that fiscal legislation affecting devolved units is not enacted in a vacuum but remains subject to scrutiny within the broader framework of cooperative governance.

A Judicial Pronouncement with Lasting Implications
The Supreme Court's Judgment carries profound constitutional and institutional implications:

- For the National Assembly, it serves as a legal constraint against unilateralism, reinforcing the necessity of inter-house cooperation in legislative processes.
- For the Senate, it reaffirms its place as a coequal legislative body with a substantive, if not expansive, role in shaping laws that affect counties.
- For the broader constitutional order, the Judgment underscores the principle that procedural compliance is not a mere technicality but an indispensable pillar of the rule of law.

However, while the decision strengthens bicameralism, it stops short of reconfiguring the power asymmetry between the two Houses. The Senate remains a House of review rather than origination, particularly in financial matters, a structural limitation that, while constitutionally sound, continues to raise questions about the extent to which devolution is truly safeguarded in legislative affairs.

Conclusion
The Restoration of Legislative Order

In rendering this Judgment, the Supreme Court has not merely adjudicated a legal dispute; it has reaffirmed the foundational principles of constitutional democracy. Legislative power must be exercised within the confines of the Constitution, and no institution, however powerful, may deviate from its prescribed role.

The Judgement stands as a jurisprudential milestone, an assertion that in the delicate ballet of governance, each institution must perform its role with precision, lest the entire constitutional order fall into disarray. As Parliament moves forward, it must do so with renewed commitment to constitutional fidelity, ensuring that legislative processes remain anchored in the principles of accountability, cooperation, and the rule of law.

Vietnam, the Law, and the Kenyan Dilemma: A Wake-Up Call for Every Traveler

Magdaline Muhiu
lawyers@njorogeregeru.com

Over the years, more and more people have The case of Margaret Nduta, a Kenyan woman facing the death penalty in Vietnam for drug trafficking, has shocked Kenya and raised some tough questions for travelers everywhere. Arrested in 2023 with two kilos of cocaine at Ho Chi Minh City Airport, Nduta's story isn't just a headline, it's a glaring reminder that ignorance of foreign laws can cost you everything.

The Case That Gripped a Nation

Here's the story: Margaret Nduta, seemingly caught in the wrong place at the wrong time, is now facing Vietnam's harshest penalty. Despite claiming she had no idea what was inside the suitcase she was transporting, the court convicted her of drug trafficking, and she was sentenced to death.

Now, this isn't just a random "tough luck" moment. Vietnam's drug laws are strict to the point of unforgiving, they carry the death penalty for possessing over 600 grams of heroin or cocaine or 2.5 kilos of meth. In Nduta's case, it was two kilos of cocaine. It's a chilling reminder that when you step into another country, you're stepping into their legal system. Not yours, not Kenya's.

Sovereignty: Why the Government Can't Just "Fix" It

The hard truth here is that sovereignty, the right of countries to govern themselves, means that no amount of diplomatic pressure can force Vietnam to change its laws. The Kenyan government can petition, rally and even beg, but the Vietnamese government's legal system remains untouched. That's the reality of international law.

At the heart of the issue is the fact that Vietnam's sovereignty means they control their own legal processes. As harsh as it seems, their courts are governed by Vietnamese law, and those laws apply to everyone, regardless of where you come from. Kenya's government can't simply intervene because, under international law, each country has the final say in its own legal matters.

Consular Support: What Can Actually Be Done?

Now, if you're arrested abroad, your first thought might be: "But wait, I'm a citizen of a different country. My government can save me, right?" Well, sort of. Under the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (1963), foreign nationals do have the right to consular support. This can include making sure you get a fair trial and giving you access to a lawyer.

Here's the key part, consular support doesn't mean a magical fix. It can't change the outcome of a case if the local laws are harsh. No matter how much the Kenyan government pushes, they cannot force Vietnam to reduce or overturn Nduta's sentence. It's the harsh reality of living under someone else's legal system.

What Does This Mean for You? Travel Smart.

So, what does this mean for anyone planning to travel abroad? Let's break it down:

1. Know the Laws Before You Go: This may sound obvious, but when you're heading to another country, especially one with strict laws, make sure you understand what's legal and what's not. In countries like Vietnam, even the smallest mistake—like carrying someone's suitcase—can land you in serious trouble.
2. Sovereignty Is Real: When you're in another country, their laws are the final word. No amount of diplomatic pleading will change that. You're responsible for following the rules of the country you're visiting, no matter how harsh they might seem.
3. Consular Support: Know It, Don't Rely on It: Yes, your country's embassy or consulate can help ensure you're treated fairly and can provide legal support. But that doesn't mean they can get you off the hook if you've violated the law. It's not a free pass.

4. Be Careful What You Carry: Don't transport goods for others, especially when you don't know what's inside. Nduta's tragic situation shows how quickly things can go sideways. Even if you're unaware of the contents of your luggage, the court might still hold you responsible.
5. Death Penalty in the Real World: In some countries, like Vietnam, the death penalty is still a reality for severe crimes like drug trafficking. Know what you're up against. It's not something you can negotiate your way out of with a few calls home.

Conclusion: Knowledge Is Your Best Defense

Margaret Nduta's case is a heart-wrenching reminder of why it's so important to understand the laws of the country you're visiting. Sovereignty means countries have the final say over their legal systems, and no amount of diplomatic pressure can change that.

So, the next time you travel, remember: Know before you go. Do your research on the country's laws, be cautious about what you're carrying, and understand the limits of consular support. It's not just about avoiding trouble, it's about ensuring your safety and peace of mind when you're far from home. Travel smart, stay informed and remember: when you're abroad, you're living by someone else's rules. Play it safe.

Acknowledgements

The Editorial team would like to express its sincere gratitude to all those members of the Firm who, in one way or another, contributed to the conception, preparation and eventual production of this Newsletter. The dedication and input of the writers and contributors is appreciated and we look forward to continued support in the issues to follow.

Njoroge Regeru & Co. Advocates
Arbor House, Arboretum Drive
PO Box 46971-00100 GPO Nairobi
Tel: +254-020-2612531/2613646 | 020-3586592/2319224,
Cell: 0722 206 884, 0733 608 141, 0752 431 961
www.njorogeregeru.com