

LAND CASE NO: ..7/91.....

DATE: 6/4/92

Name of Land in dispute..... MAEASI

Name of Plaintiff:..... CONLIUS KWASITE'E OF NAONAU LI VILLAGE

V.

Name of Defendant:..... SIRU ABA'ABA OF FEEFATA KIBOFISI VILLAGE

D E C R E E

JUDGMENT

COURT FINDINGS

(1) This land case was not done properly by the chiefs settlement.

(2) The plaintiff statement of claim was based mainly at SINORO outside of disputed land call MAEASI and Court find that Plaintiff's generation also at SINORO. Plaintiff himself was of SINORO and first discovered AUBO'O. Claim covering Maeasi land. This Court not interest of Sinoro but only Maeasi disputed land. Court notice that ULASI discovered AUBO'O. From Ulasi to your son Kwasitee (2) 7 generation while you have 13 generation for Sinoro. You plaintiff (1) C. Kwasitee said in your statement that Aubo'o is your principal sacrifice site.

During our survey you show to Court party one group of stone. No any ETEA, or BIBI was noticed as you answered C Question 6 find not custom signs as said. Even at Luluga.

(3) You denied Dfd (1) Siruabaaba not seen his offer sacrifice at Luluga or Maeasi disputed land.

Your witnesss (4) Mark during survey eried and confess to confirm that Siruabaaba Dfd (1) also bring taro and pigs to sacrifice or REE at FATABAIA tabu site. But denied your C. Kwasitee Plaintiff.

(4) You Plaintiff said Galisu'u born of a woman name TETEFIU of your tribe but GEGEO DW 5 who was descendants of GALISUU denied that plaintiff (1) not related to TETEFIU (f). She is of FUNILOFO tribe. There Funilofe award Luluga parcel of his ancestor GALISU'U. *for*

(5) Defendant (1) Siruaba have 17 generation for FUNILOFO. While Ptf have 7 generation for Auboo. Court belief that Dfd 1 + 2 first discovered of Funilofe covering Maeasi land. Defendants gave (4) parcels of land to his female side.

(6) Both Conlius Kwasitee and Olosua mentioned in Court gave some parcels of land to your female tribe, but during survey Court did not see any principal custom signs at Auboo H.Q to qualify your gifts. So Court doubt your claim, your principal

Issued to P + D 6/5/92 ...12..

[Signature]

sacrifice sites. Therefore Court disqualified your boundaries
of spearline claim in this case.

(7) Court belief that your PTF (2) OLOSUA descendants of
GALISUU female line to have right at Luluga under existing male
tribes of GALISUU authority.

(8) Court belief that C. Kwasitee not have any connection to
related to any female of Luluga (Maeasi). Not even own any parcel
of land. Therefore not perform any sacrifice. Custom feast at
Luluga (Maeasi).

(9) Court belief that you Cornelius Kwasitee TEU only stay with
LOFOLANGA male descendants of SINORO who married woman of GALISUU
tribe who settled at Maeasi Luluga till his son C. Kwasite (Ptf)
today. Since your father stay under custom permission of LOFOLANGA.
Court agreed but SHOULD NOT claim ownership of any parcel of land
within Maeasi. Luluga (parcel). Court resume to pass decision
at 2 p.m. 13/4/92.

DECISION:

Court disqualifed the claim/boundariea of plaintiffs claim in this.
Both plaintiffs 1 and 2 not qualified to claim ownership of and
parcel of land within Maeasi. (Luluga).

Court agreed they can use Luluga parcel of land under the existing
male tribes of GALISUU authority as laid in the 1985 Court case
decision. Court certified Siruabaaba for FUNILOFO and MAEASI.
Any new development Plaintiff 1 and 2 want to make seek permission
from Defendant Siru.

Right explain. Appeal within 90 days as from today 13/4/92
exp. 12/7/92.

Court

officials:

- Maekiria
- Osifela
- John Gen'imia
- Philip Silas

- Vice resident
- Court Member
- Court member
- Court Clerk (M)

