

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR ZAMBIA
AT THE COMMERCIAL REGISTRY
HOLDEN AT LUSAKA
(Civil Jurisdiction)



BETWEEN:

STARKWOOD GENERAL TRADING LLC LIMITED PLAINTIFF

AND

UMOYO NATURAL HEALTH LIMITED

FIRST DEFENDANT

OLLE OTTEBY

SECOND DEFENDANT

KIM OTTEBY

THIRD DEFENDANT

Before the Honourable Mr Justice K. Chenda on 27th January 2026

For the Plaintiff : Mr W. Chirwa of Willa Mutofwe & Associates
For the Defendants : Ms. W.N. Chirwa of Kate Weston Legal Practitioners

JUDGMENT

Rules of Court

- (1) The High Court Rules, under Cap. 27

Case Law

- (1) *Cavmont Capital Holdings Plc. v Lewis Nathan Advocates* - SCZ Judgment No. 6 of 2016 at p. J35-36
- (2) *Richwell Siamunene v Sialubalo Gift* - Vol. 3 (2017) ZR 335 at 354
- (3) *Zambia Oxygen Limited & ZPA v Paul Chisakula & Ors* (2000) ZR27 at p.30
- (4) *Afrope Zambia Limited v Anthony Chate & Ors* - Appeal No. 160/2013 at p.J16

1 INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1.1 The Plaintiff is a company incorporated in the United Arab Emirates, while the First Defendant is a Zambian incorporated company, with the Second and Third Defendants as directors - shareholders.

1.2 Following differences over fulfilment of an agreement for sale of the shareholding of the Second and Third Defendants in the First Defendant, the Plaintiff took out this action on 16th May 2025 by writ of summons and statement of claim seeking:

- (i) payment of a refund in the sum of USD150,000 or Kwacha Equivalent;
- (ii) damages for loss of use of money;
- (iii) interest;
- (iv) costs; and
- (v) any other relief the Court may deem fit.

1.3 The Defendants contested the action by defence and counterclaim filed 11th June 2025 in which it was disputed that the First Defendant was party to the agreement.

1.4 It was also contended that an entity known as 'Stark Wood General Trading LLC' was the buyer that contracted with the Second and Third Defendants as sellers.

1.5 The Second and Third Defendants alleged that the agreement had been breached by the buyer and counterclaimed for:

- (i) a declaration that the agreement for the sale of shares dated 23rd August 2017 is repudiated;
- (ii) retention of the sum of USD 150,000 deposit;
- (iii) damages for breach of contract;
- (iv) damages for loss of future profits and earnings;
- (v) damages for inconvenience caused;
- (vi) damages for mental anguish and stress;
- (vii) interest on all sums found due;
- (viii) costs; and
- (ix) and any other relief the Court may deem fit.

1.6 Pleadings closed with the Plaintiff's reply and defence to counterclaim on 26th June 2025, in which it refuted the Defendants' allegations and reiterated its own.

2 CASE MANAGEMENT AND ISSUES

2.1 Following the close of pleadings, scheduling conference was held on 14th July 2025 at which the characteristic Par-Bench consultation took place to foster a problem solving environment.

2.2 It bore fruit in form of streamlining the case into five key contentions embodied in an Order for Directions dated 14th July 2025 as:

- (i) who were the parties to the agreement of 2017, pleaded in paragraph 4 of statement of claim (the "**Agreement**");

- (ii) who received the part payment of USD150,000 made by the Plaintiff in furtherance of the Agreement and when;
- (iii) is the Plaintiff and/or any of the Defendants to blame for non-fulfilment of the Agreement;
- (iv) has the Plaintiff and and/or any of the Defendants suffered resultant injury for which the Defendants (or any of them) or the Plaintiff ought to atone; and
- (v) ultimately, is the Plaintiff entitled to any relief against the Defendants (or any of them) and/or are the Second and Third Defendants (or either of them) entitled to relief against the Plaintiff.

2.3 Thereafter the parties attended to all pre-trial preparations and at final status conference held on 18th September 2025, the matter was set down for trial.

3 TRIAL AND EVIDENCE

3.1 Trial took place on 28th and 29th October 2025 as scheduled, and the evidential catalogue was as follows -

- (i) Mr Amos Chanda (PW) as sole witness for the Plaintiff;
- (ii) the Second Defendant (DW1) as witness for the First Defendant and for himself; and
- (iii) the Third Defendant (DW2) as witness for the First Defendant and for herself.

- 3.2 Mr Amos Chanda's testimony in chief, for the Plaintiff, was embodied in his witness statement dated 25th August 2025, supported by the Plaintiff's bundle of documents filed 7th August 2025.
- 3.3 Mr Chanda stated that he was a Director in the Plaintiff company and that on August 23, 2017, the Plaintiff and the Defendants entered into an agreement for the purchase and sale of shares in the First Defendant Company. The Defendants, represented by the Second and Third Defendants as shareholders and directors of the First Defendant, and the Plaintiff, represented by him, agreed that the Plaintiff would purchase up to 100% of the shares for a total consideration of USD 3,500,000.
- 3.4 It was his testimony that, as a condition precedent under clause five of the Agreement, the sellers were to assist the buyer with advice and assistance in managing the company for up to 12 months from the signing date. In consideration of the Agreement, the Plaintiff paid the Defendants USD150,000 in cash, which was received by all three Defendants in their respective capacities.

- 3.5 It was further stated that misunderstandings arose due to an insufficiently detailed Agreement, frustrating its performance. The Plaintiff expected, based on clause 5 of the Agreement, that the sellers would introduce the Plaintiff to company management upon signing and before full payment.
- 3.6 Mr Chanda testified that the Plaintiff made several attempts to claim a refund of the USD 150,000, as performance of the Agreement became impossible, but the Defendants ignored the requests.
- 3.7 When cross examined by Ms Chirwa, Mr Chanda testified as follows. The name of the purchaser in the Agreement is Stark Wood General Trading LLC while the name of the Plaintiff herein is Starkwood General Trading LLC Limited but he disagreed that they are different entities. His demeanour when answering to that was not convincing as he looked away from the Court and had a slight quaver in his voice. He testified that the purchaser is said to be incorporated in Dubai but admitted that he has not brought any incorporation certificate to establish its exact name.
- 3.8 He testified that the First Defendant's directors (Second and Third Defendants) are indicated as parties in the Agreement.

3.9 According to page 2 of the Agreement at page 2 of the Plaintiff's bundle, the purchase price of USD3,500,000 was to be paid firstly with a deposit of USD350,000 or 10% on signing of the Agreement but the purchaser did not pay it. It only paid USD150,000 in 3 installments between 2017 and 2021. He however denied that it amounted to a breach of the Agreement.

3.10 He testified that the sellers were supposed to honour obligations in clauses 5 and 6 of the Agreement before any further payment by the purchaser. He however conceded that there was no such clause in the Agreement.

3.11 Mr. Chanda also admitted that the purchaser did not make any other payment after the USD150,000.

3.12 He also conceded that there was no email or other communication from the purchaser to the sellers informing them of breach of clauses 5 and 6.

3.13 Mr. Chanda testified that the purchaser wanted to complete the transaction but that because of breach of clauses 5 and 6 by the sellers, the purchaser now wants a refund. He however conceded that there is no proof before Court of the purchaser notifying the sellers of failure to perform clauses 5 and 6.

3.14 Mr. Chanda agreed that the documents at page 18-22 of the Defendants' bundle showed that the Third Defendant was giving regular updates to Mrs. Mabel Chanda over the First Defendant company. He put Mrs. Chanda and the Third Defendant in touch with each other over the transaction as per page 27 of the Defendants' bundle.

3.15 In re-examination, it was Mr Chanda's testimony that he is the sole proprietor of Starkwood, a sister company of Stark Wood General Trading LLC of Dubai.

3.16 On that note, the Plaintiff closed its case.

3.17 The Defendants opened their case with the testimony of Mr Otteby (Second Defendant). His testimony in chief was embodied in a witness statement of 26th August 2025, supported by the Defendants' bundle of documents filed 7th August 2025.

3.18 Mr Otteby stated that in or about August 2017, both him and the Third Defendant were introduced to Mr Chanda. Mr. Chanda expressed interest in purchasing the entirety of their shareholding in the First Defendant. It was for his wife, who had an interest in natural health services.

- 3.19 An agreement was subsequently drawn up and signed on 23rd August 2017, naming the sellers as him and Kim Otteby (Third Defendant), and the purchaser as Stark Wood General Trading L.L.C. Key terms of the Agreement included that Stark Wood General Trading L.L.C would purchase 100% of the shares for USD3,500,000; the company was a going concern; the sellers were responsible for the accuracy of the attached balance sheet; the sellers would assist the buyer in managing the company for 12 months; and the sellers would not engage in a competing business for five years.
- 3.20 The payment schedule was outlined as: USD350,000 upon signing, USD1,150,000 by 30th September 2017, USD500,000 by 30th October 2017, USD 500,000 by 30th November 2017, and USD 1,000,000 by 30th December 2017.
- 3.21 It was his testimony that the purchaser delayed the initial deposit despite follow-ups. Nevertheless, the company continued its operations as a going concern, and he and the Third Defendant remained committed to ensuring the accuracy of the balance sheet. The Third Defendant maintained close communication with the purchaser, frequently visiting stores under construction and providing updates.

3.22 At some point in 2017, Mr Chanda delivered USD 100,000 in cash, followed by another USD 50,000 in cash after several months. Mr Otteby was unable to recall the exact dates of these payments due to the passage of time. He however asserted that the purchaser was therefore in breach of the Agreement.

3.23 Despite this breach, Mr Otteby was willing to continue with the sale, citing assurances from Mr. Chanda that the full purchase price would be settled. However, no further payments were made by the purchaser.

3.24 Mr Otteby was surprised to receive a demand letter on 14th December 2021, addressed to the First Defendant company from the purchaser's lawyers, Iven Mulenga & Company. The letter alleged a breach of the Agreement by the sellers, specifically a failure to provide the balance sheet as at 31st July 2017.

3.25 Mr Otteby refuted this, stating that the balance sheet was attached to the Agreement, as confirmed by clause 2.

- 3.26 Subsequently, on 31st August 2022, an action was commenced against the same Defendants by Musonda Mulenga, who claimed to act as attorney for Mr Chanda, trading as Stalkwood General Trading. The matter was dismissed because the proponent lacked legal capacity to bring or sustain the action.
- 3.27 Mr Otteby did not hear from the purchaser until 31st October 2023, when another demand letter was issued to the First Defendant from Mr Chanda T/A Starkwood Innovation.
- 3.28 The First Defendant's lawyers responded, seeking inter *alia* clarity on the identity of Starkwood Innovation and copy of the alleged agreement upon which the demand was founded. No response was received, and no further communication occurred until 10th July 2024, when another action was commenced under a new case number.
- 3.29 The proponent of the new case alleged that the Agreement was frustrated and that the sellers failed to transfer any or part of the shares. Mr Otteby described this as a new allegation, not previously raised in any correspondence.

- 3.30 He emphasized that the agreement was for the sale of 100% shareholding, to be transferred upon receipt of the full purchase price, and insisted that the Agreement was not frustrated but breached by the purchaser's failure to pay.
- 3.31 According to Mr Otteby the value of 50% shareholding in 2017 was USD1,750,000, but has since changed over the years.
- 3.32 He complained of having lost the opportunity to invest the expected purchase price, which could have yielded approximately 6% interest per annum.
- 3.33 He asserted that neither he nor the Third Defendant breached the agreement, and expressed distress over the matter and the false allegations made by the Plaintiff.
- 3.34 When cross examined by Mr Chirwa, Mr Otteby testified that he was a director – shareholder of the First Defendant company along with the Third Defendant. They signed the Agreement on 23rd August 2017, appearing at page 1-2 of the Defendants' bundle as sellers. Mr. Chanda signed for the purchaser.

3.35 He and the Third Defendant received USD150,000 from Stark Wood General Trading LLC, there is no record before Court to show when exactly though. They used the money for personal consumption not expansion or running expenses of the First Defendant.

3.36 Management of the First Defendant company was not handed over to the purchaser. The sellers received late payment of the deposit and it was not paid in full. There is no record of them pursuing the balance or even issuing a notice to complete or seeking redress for breach of Agreement.

3.37 The Agreement has not been fulfilled, the shares have not been transferred but he asserted that the USD150,000 was non-refundable.

3.38 Mr. Otteby however conceded that the Agreement did not say it was non-refundable.

3.39 He testified that he and the Third Defendant ran the company for the purchaser's benefit from 2017 to 2019 but conceded that there was no monetary benefit shared with the purchaser as nothing was due.

- 3.40 Mr. Otteby maintained that him and the Third Defendant suffered loss and damage from the purchaser's breach as they needed the unpaid money to invest in other ventures for better returns.
- 3.41 He conceded that the issue of breach of contract and potential loss and damage was not notified to the Plaintiff before the case began.
- 3.42 In re-examination, Mr Otteby clarified that the First Defendant was not a party to the transaction, only him and the Third Defendant selling their shares.
- 3.43 The entire management of the First Defendant could not be handed over to the purchaser in the transition stage; clause 5 of the Agreement had a process of handover; payment was to be made by the purchaser over 4 months but it was not, thus there could be no handover of management.
- 3.44 After September 2019 there was no further communication from Mr. Chanda. Mr. Otteby and the Third Defendant did not want to terminate the Agreement and thus did not raise any issue of breach.
- 3.45 Then in 2021 Mr. Chanda sought a refund.

3.46 Mr. Otteby and the Third Defendant wanted to sell their shares and re-invest the proceeds in a venture that would have generated income, hence the loss suffered..

3.47 Ms Otteby (Third Defendant or DW2) testified as the second witness for the Defendants, based on her witness statement of 26th August 2025, supported by the Defendants' bundle of documents dated 7th August 2025.

3.48 She indicated that she was the managing director of the First Defendant company. However, a good part of her statement echoed that of Mr Otteby and need not be restated. In addition to that, she stated that the Agreement was signed with Stark Wood General Trading L.L.C, not the Plaintiff.

3.49 At the time, she was actively working to expand the First Defendant company by opening new shops, introducing new products, and improving internal systems and procedures to increase profitability.

3.50 She discussed with the Second Defendant that the purchaser was in breach of the Agreement because payments were not being made on time, as stipulated.

3.51 Since plans had already been made based on the expected purchase price, she and the Second Defendant agreed to give the purchaser more time to complete the payment, after the purchaser's representative, Mr. Chanda, indicated that the full purchase price would be secured soon. However, the purchaser failed to make further payments, and communication between the parties ceased.

3.52 According to Ms Otteby, the payment of USD 150,000 made by Stark Wood General Trading LLC was only a partial payment towards a non-refundable 10% deposit of USD 350,000.

3.53 Even then, the purchaser failed or refused to make the full initial non-refundable deposit as agreed, thereby breaching the terms of the Agreement. The purchaser also failed or refused to acknowledge this breach. Instead, Mr. Chanda allegedly used various entities, including the Plaintiff company, Amos Chanda T/A Starkwood Innovation, and Amos Chanda T/A Starkwood General Trading, to make false allegations against Ms Otteby and the Second Defendant.

3.54 Ms Otteby refuted the allegation that the sellers did not assist the Plaintiff or purchaser in managing the First Defendant company after the Agreement was signed. She asserted that she repeatedly engaged with the purchaser's representatives, especially Mable Chanda. The purchaser was informed about new store openings, provided with company emails, and given contracts for third-party service providers. Pictorial updates of the new stores were also sent to the purchaser.

3.55 The sellers had provided the necessary assistance to the purchaser to enable it run the First Defendant company. Ms Otteby characterized the transaction as a straightforward sale of shares agreement, which the purchaser breached, and accused the purchaser of attempting to falsely blame the sellers for the breach.

3.56 It was her testimony that she and the Second Defendant acted in good faith, with every intention to transfer shares upon receipt of the full purchase price, but the purchaser did not adhere to the agreement.

- 3.57 Ms Otteby further stated that, as per the Agreement, they were to continue assisting the purchaser with running the First Defendant company for 12 months after the sale, demonstrating their dedication. The First Defendant company continued to open more shops and expand its product range.
- 3.58 After the purchaser breached the Agreement and remained silent for years, she assumed the purchaser had forfeited the partial non-refundable deposit and did not wish to complete the Agreement. The company, being her main source of income, continued operations, obtained a loan, and expanded into manufacturing. The company's state had changed significantly over the seven years since the Agreement.
- 3.59 She had planned to invest in a new business venture but was left uncertain due to the purchaser's failure to fulfill the Agreement. The non-refundable deposit of USD 75,000 was used for personal plans. The purchaser's failure to adhere to the Agreement caused her to lose investment opportunities and suffer financial harm.

- 3.60 When cross examined by Mr Chirwa, Ms Otteby testified that she signed the Agreement on 23rd August 2017 with Stark Wood General Trading LLC, represented by Mr. Chanda who later introduced his wife Mrs. Mabel Chanda as a representative too.
- 3.61 Ms. Otteby knew Mrs. Chanda from previous dealings. The documents at page 18-32 of the Defendants' bundle are her discussions with Mrs. Chanda over the transaction for sale of shares in the First Defendant.
- 3.62 She however conceded that the correspondence does not specifically mention the Agreement.
- 3.63 She also admitted that there was nothing before Court to show that the purchaser authorised her to discuss the transaction with Mrs. Chanda.
- 3.64 Ms. Otteby conceded that the correspondence at page 18 and page 23-27 of the Defendants' bundle pre-dated the Agreement of 23rd August 2017.
- 3.65 When it occurred that the purchaser did not pay as agreed she queried Mrs. Chanda in WhatsApp messages.

- 3.66 The deposit partially paid was used for personal consumption not expansion of the First Defendant.
- 3.67 She maintained that she suffered damage from non-fulfillment of the payment obligation in the Agreement.
- 3.68 When re-examined, Ms. Otteby clarified that for the transaction, Mrs. Chanda was introduced to her by Mr. Chanda and she had WhatsApp messages to prove it.
- 3.69 Even though the Agreement was signed with Mr. Chanda, it was her understanding that the First Defendant was being acquired for Mrs. Chanda's benefit.
- 3.70 She suffered damage not from the USD150,000 paid but from breach of the payment obligation in the Agreement.
- 3.71 On that note, the Defendants closed their case.

4 CLOSING SUBMISSIONS

- 4.1 After conclusion of trial, the Plaintiff tendered its final submissions on 10th November 2025 which were met with the Defendants' final submission of 24th November 2025.
- 4.2 For reasons that will become apparent, I will not embark on a copious reproduction of the arguments.

5 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

5.1 I wish to thank Counsel for rising to the occasion to prepare and tender such well researched, coherent and useful submissions.

5.2 That said, I have closely studied the material on record, evidence and submissions. After a careful consideration my decision is as follows.

The contention of who the parties were to the Agreement.

5.3 PW1 stipulated in para. 1 of his witness statement that he relied on the Plaintiff's bundle of documents and in para. 2 asserted that the Plaintiff and Defendants entered into the Agreement.

5.4 DW1 and DW2 for their part have stated in paras. 5 and 6, respectively of their witness statements that the Agreement was entered into between themselves and an entity called Stark Wood General Trading LLC. They have asserted that a copy thereof is produced at p.1-3 of the Defendants' bundle.

- 5.5 In resolving this issue, I have studied *inter alia* the Plaintiff's bundle and Defendant's bundle of documents. I note that the document at p.1-2 of both bundles is identical and identically executed.
- 5.6 I am thus satisfied that the Agreement is indeed the document appearing at p.1-2 of the Plaintiff's bundle and on the equivalent pages of the Defendants' bundle.
- 5.7 I will for convenience refer to it from the Plaintiff's bundle. The Agreement is titled as follows in typeset print (at p.1 of the Plaintiff's bundle):

"AGREEMENT BETWEEN KIM OTTEBY AND OLLE OTTEBY, HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS THE SELLERS AND HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS THE BUYER."
(Emphasis added)

- 5.8 The words 'Stark Wood General Trading LLC' are inserted by hand in between the phrase 'AS THE SELLERS AND ----- HEREINAFTER REFERRED TO AS THE BUYER'.
- 5.9 The signature page of the Agreement (at p.2 of the Plaintiff's bundle) shows the typeset word 'Sellers' and below it the names of the Second and Third Defendant.

5.10 It also shows the typeset word 'Buyer' and below it the words 'Stark Wood General Trading LLC' inserted by hand. The Agreement is also signed and dated (23rd August 2017).

5.11 In ***Cavmont Capital Holdings Plc. v Lewis Nathan Advocates***¹⁾ the Supreme Court guided that a court is duty bound to interpret a written contract within its four corners instead of in light of or in conjunction with extrinsic evidence.

5.12 I have studied the Agreement over and over and not found any provision or wording that stipulates that the Plaintiff (Starkwood General Trading LLC **Limited**) and not '**Stark Wood** General Trading LLC' is the buyer. I also have not found anything to suggest that the First Defendant is also a party to the Agreement.

5.13 Thus, I cannot accept the extrinsic evidence of PW1 (in the bare averment in his witness statement) to effectively read words into and vary the Agreement.

5.14 It would have been different if there was documentation produced by the Plaintiff from the authority responsible for company registration in Dubai, to show that the Plaintiff is indeed the same entity as 'Stark Wood General Trading LLC'.

5.15 Suffice to say that it is not the province of this Court to speculate and fill in the blanks through assumptions where the evidence is deficient. I am fortified in that regard by the decision of the Constitutional Court in ***Richwell Siamunene v Sialubalo Gift***⁽²⁾.

5.16 Consequently, I am duty bound to find as I hereby do that the parties to the Agreement are as follows -

5.16.1 'Stark Wood General Trading LLC' as buyer; and

5.16.2 the Second and Third Defendants as sellers.

5.17 In ***Zambia Oxygen Limited and ZPA v Paul Chisakula and Others***⁽³⁾, the Supreme Court endorsed the doctrine of privity of contract that only parties to a contract can sue or be sued on it.

5.18 Put differently, the benefits and burdens under a contract are a preserve of the parties under the contract.

5.19 This obviously has some grave legal implications for the claim and counterclaim as they are predicated on the Agreement.

The contention of who received the part payment of USD150,000 made by the Plaintiff in furtherance of the Agreement and when;

The contention of whether the Plaintiff and/or any of the Defendants is to blame for non-fulfilment of the Agreement;

The contention of whether the Plaintiff and and/or any of the Defendants has suffered resultant injury for which the Defendants (or any of them) or the Plaintiff ought to atone; and

The contention of whether ultimately, the Plaintiff is entitled to any relief against the Defendants (or any of them) and/or are the Second and Third Defendants (or either of them) entitled to relief against the Plaintiff.

5.20 All of these contentions have been pleaded and evidence led to try and show breach of contract (the Agreement) on the part of each side, to found a case for Plaintiff's claims and Second and Third Defendant's counterclaims.

5.21 Therefore, given the finding of this Court on the parties to the Agreement, the Plaintiff (as an outsider) cannot seek contractual relief against the Second and Third Defendants, nor can it seek contractual relief against the First Defendant which is a stranger to the Agreement. Such are the implications of the doctrine of privity of contract.

5.22 Further, as a double edged sword, the Second and Third Defendants cannot also seek contractual relief against the Plaintiff (an outsider) including a pronouncement to retain the deposit under the Agreement.

5.23 It becomes otiose to delve into the evidence and arguments relating to these contentions, which are now moot.

6 CONCLUSION AND ORDERS

Plaintiff's claim i to iii, and v in writ and statement of claim

6.1 There is no basis for the Plaintiff as a stranger to the Agreement to claim any of the said reliefs which are hereby dismissed.

Second and Third Defendant's counterclaims i to vii, and ix

6.2 There is no basis for the Second and Third Defendants to counterclaim against the Plaintiff which is not the entity that they contracted with under the Agreement.

Plaintiff's claim iv and Defendant's counterclaim viii

6.3 This claim relates to costs of this litigation, which are a matter of discretion for the Court in terms of Order 40 Rule 6 of the **High Court Rules**⁽¹⁾.

6.4 As for the guidance in the exercise of that discretion, I heed the authority of ***Afropo Zambia Limited v Anthony Chate & Ors***⁽⁴⁾.


6.5 In the said case, Wood, JS aptly guided that a successful party will not normally be deprived of his costs unless there is something in the nature of the claim or in the conduct of the party which makes it improper for him to be granted costs.

6.6 In the case at hand, the Plaintiff and Defendant have been unsuccessful in their claim and counterclaim, respectively.

6.7 Therefore it is fair and just to order that each of them bears their own costs of and occasioned by this action. So it shall be.

6.8 It is hoped that this will also pave the way for genuine dialogue to bring amicable closure to the grievances between the two camps before Court.

Dated at Lusaka this 27th day of January 2026



K. CHENDA
Judge of the High Court