

INTERPRETATION

INTERPRETATION OF STATUTES – Clear, unambiguous words in statute – Need to give them their ordinary meaning when construing – NIGER PROGRESS LTD N.E.I. CORP 1989 3 NWLR Pt. 107 68; GARBA V FED CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION 1988 I NWLR Pt. 71 449; BAMAIYI V A.G. OF FED 2001 90 LRCN 2738; AINABEHOLO V E.S.U.W.F.M.P.C.S. LTD. 2007 2 NWLR Pt.1017, p.33 at p.37

INTERPRETATION OF WORDS – SHALL – In its ordinary meaning, when the word “shall” is used, it connotes a command, and that which must be given a compulsory meaning – ACHINEKU V ISHAGBA 1988 4 NWLR Pt. 89 411; BAMAIYI V A.G. OF FED supra.

INTERPRETATION OF STATUTES – REASONABLENESS OF AN ACT OF PARLIAMENT – No reasonable tribunal will imply in a statute consequences that will lead to absurdity and injustice – A.G. ONDO STATE V A.G. EKITI STATE 2001 91 LRCN 3065.

INTERPRETATION OF STATUTES – The courts should take cognizance of the preamble of the statute and the objects and purpose of the provisions sought to be interpreted – OGUN STATE V FEDERATION 1982 1 – 2 SC 13; BRONIK MOTORS V WEMA BANK 1983 I SCNLR 296; BENDEL STATE V THE FEDERATION 1981 10 S.C. 1; AG ONDO V A.G EKITI supra.

INTERPRETATION OF STATUTES – LITERAL RULE – AMBIGUOUS
EXPRESSION IN STATUTE – MISCHIEF RULE – ADEWUMI V A.G.
EKITI STATE 2002 93 LRCN 43;
TEXACO PANAMA V SHELL PETROLEUM 2002 94 LRCN 152.

INTERPRETATION OF STATUTES – CONFLICT B/W FEDERAL AND
STATE LAWS – By virtue of section 4 of the 1999 Constitution, the Federal
Law prevails – A.G. ONDO STATE V A.G FED 2002 99 LRCN 1329.