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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Since 2000, UNODC has promoted the development and dissemination of international standards as well as tools for their effective implementation at the domestic level. At the international level, it has facilitated the development of a range of policy guidance documents1, including an outline for assessing justice sector integrity and capacity,2 the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct3, a code of conduct for court employees4, a Commentary on the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct, as well as a training manual on judicial ethics. Other forthcoming tools include an e-learning tool on judicial ethics and a technical guide for the strengthening of judicial integrity and capacity.5

Technical assistance focuses on improving access to justice, enhancing the quality and timeliness of justice delivery, strengthening public trust in the judiciary, establishing safeguards for professional ethics, and facilitating coordination across justice sector institutions.6 In this context, UNODC has been cooperating with the Nigerian Judiciary since 2001 through two projects aimed at strengthening judicial integrity and capacity (Phase 1 2001-2003 and Phase 2 2006 – 2010). While the first project phase was supported by the Governments of The Netherlands and Norway, the second phase was funded primarily by the European Union with smaller contributions provided by the Governments of the United Kingdom and Norway.

Since its beginning, the project has been supporting the Nigerian Judiciary and other stakeholders in the process of strategic planning of judicial reform, implementation and monitoring, both at the national level and within pilot states; initially Borno, Delta and Lagos states and then joined by Anambra, Benue, Enugu, Kaduna, Katsina, Rivers states, and FCT during the second phase of the project.

As a first step, in 2002 UNODC supported the conduct of a comprehensive assessment of justice-sector integrity and capacity in the country. This study aims to produce a comprehensive and detailed picture of the status quo of the country’s justice sector, adopting a variety of approaches including desk research, surveys and focus groups.7 As such it served both as the basis for the design of action plans for strengthening judicial integrity and capacity, as well as a baseline against which the impact of reforms can be measured. During the second phase of the project, the assessment was repeated in 2007 and extended to the additional pilot states.

---

5 For further information on the work of the judicial group on strengthening judicial integrity and capacity, http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption_judiciary.html
6 For further information on technical assistance provided by UNODC in the area of judicial integrity and capacity, see http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/corruption.html
The current report provides a detailed overview of the findings of this second assessment. The survey instruments were administered to a large set of stakeholders both inside and outside the justice sector, including judges, prosecutors, police court staff, lawyers, business people, court users (e.g. litigants, accused, witnesses and experts) and prisoners awaiting trial. All were asked questions about:

- Access to justice
- Timeliness of justice delivery
- Quality of justice delivery
- Independence, impartiality and fairness of the courts
- Integrity, accountability and oversight
- Coordination and cooperation across the justice sector institutions
- Public trust in the justice system

A key element of the assessment methodology is the strong reliance on local ownership, fostered through the participatory review and adaptation of the survey instruments as well as through participatory data analysis conducted by focus groups.

In 2002, 5,766 stakeholders were interviewed across three states, Lagos, Delta and Borno. When the assessment was repeated in 2007 a total of 10,000 stakeholders were interviewed across 10 states.

As far as access to justice is concerned, the assessment explored the coverage of the territory by the courts; the affordability of court and lawyer fees; the ease of access to information on basic rights, the functioning of the justice process and the statutes affecting one's own case as well as the access of prisoners awaiting trial to legal services, their knowledge about the possibility to apply for bail, and the average number of months they spent in remand.

Access to justice was a major problem but it was found that access to information was far more problematic than physical or economic access to the courts. Affordability turned out to be more closely related to the number of times a court adjourned a case, than to lawyers’ fees. In 2007 access to justice had improved significantly, with the average time prisoners had to spend in remand reduced from 30 months in 2002 to less than 12 months in 2007. There were also improvements in the general awareness of prisoners with regard to bail with 68% of the respondents being aware of their right to apply for bail in 2007, as opposed to only 43% in 2002. Prisoners, moreover, had better access to legal assistance, with 56% being represented by a lawyer as opposed to only 38% in 2002.

Similar improvements could be registered with regard to timeliness and quality of justice delivery. More specifically, the number of months that it had taken courts users on average to resolve their legal matters had reduced from 27 months in 2002 to a little over 12 months in 2007. Court users had also been asked to indicate how many times they had been required to come to court to deal with their case by the time of the interview. In general, court users’ perceptions as concerns the timeliness of the courts had improved significantly with only 30% of the courts users in 2007 still believing that the courts were never or seldom quick, as opposed to 67% in 2002. Progress was also confirmed with regard to the working conditions of judicial officers, with 87% of judicial officers finding the record-keeping in their respective court efficient or very efficient, as opposed to only 44% sharing this opinion in 2002. At the same time, basic IT infrastructure in the courts had been upgraded, with almost a third of the judicial officers having access to a personal computer, as opposed to only 9% in 2002. One of the main problems which continues to hamper the computerization of courts, is
the lack of coherent ICT policies for the judiciary, including pre-established standard requirements of hard and software to be purchased as well as the availability of reliable electricity. This has led in some cases to the purchasing of the wrong or incompatible equipment. Moreover, the lack of thorough needs assessments and maintenance plans lead often to a situation where equipment is not being utilized effectively or malfunctioning equipment cannot be repaired as no budgetary provisions have been made for that purpose.

Another focus of the assessments was the frequency, nature, cost and causes of corruption in the courts. The intention was to explore where and how corruption occurs with a view to identifying counter-measures. For that reason experience and perception of corruption were both explored. In 2002 a large portion of respondents had experienced bribery. The main reason for paying bribes was to expedite the court process or to be granted bail. Other court-related procedures identified as related to corruption included: delays in the execution of court orders; prisoners not being brought to court; lack of public access to copies of court orders and decisions; disappearance of files; unusual variations in sentencing; delays in the delivery of judgments; high rates of decisions in favor of the executive; and appointments resulting from political patronage. In 2002, 77% of lawyers and 43% of court users claimed that within the last 12 months prior to the interview they had been approached for the payment of a bribe in the context of a court case. When these stakeholders were asked the same question in 2007, only 16% of the lawyers and only 2% of the court users admitted that they had been approached for the payment of a bribe. Judicial officers largely confirmed this trend with only 3% of the respondents claiming to be aware of an incident in which a court user had paid a bribe to a court staff, as opposed to 17% in 2002. At the same time, the overall accountability and governance has improved: e.g. the percentage of judicial officers who were evaluated at least once a year has increased from 61% in 2002 to more than 90% in 2007. At the same time, those judicial officers who never had been evaluated during their entire career reduced from 32% in 2002 to 3% in 2007.

With regard to the independence, impartiality and fairness of the courts, in 2002, users and operators were skeptical, with half of the judges agreeing that government controlled the judiciary and more than half of the lawyers regarded courts' decisions as influenced by politics. More specifically, 19% of the judges felt that judicial appointments were politically influenced and not based on merit, while 50% of the lawyers claimed to know of judicial decisions that had been inspired by politics. However, in 2007 findings seemed to suggest that judicial independence had been strengthened significantly. Only 24% of lawyers stated that they were aware of a judicial decision during the last 12 months which in their opinion had been influenced by politics, and only 8% of judicial officers claimed to be aware of a judicial appointment having been influenced by political considerations rather than merit. Thus, contrary to the concerns voiced by some judges at the outset of the project, it was possible to enhance accountability without jeopardizing judicial independence. As a matter of fact, it turned out that, if carefully designed, measures aimed to increase accountability of judges can at the same time strengthen judicial independence.

All of these improvements have helped to enhance public confidence in the justice system. More specifically, the percentage of court users who stated that they had not used the courts during the last two years despite a need to do so reduced from 42% in 2002 to 36% in 2007. At the same time, those court users who indicated that they would use the courts again based on their experience increased from 58% in 2002 to 69% in 2007.
However, despite all the progress, data also shows that further advancements remain a must. Still, the percentage of prisoners awaiting trial in remand remains very high, witnesses do not receive adequate compensation for their inconveniences in most states, adjournments (even if far less frequent) unnecessarily prolong disputes, political interference with judicial appointments and judicial decision-making remain an issue, both in the eyes of judicial officers and the bar, coordination among the various justice sector institutions pose continuous challenges. While the judiciary was able to significantly reduce the vulnerability of courts to corrupt practices, there are still a high number of alleged incidents of members of the Nigerian Prison Service as well as the Nigerian Police Service extorting petty bribes from prisoners in remand and court users. Gains in terms of increased integrity and accountability of the courts risk are short-lived in view of the low salaries of court staff and poor working conditions of the lower bench. Moreover, with rapid economic growth and social changes, the demands on the justice system by citizens and businesses are growing rapidly. Thus, improvements might turn out to be insufficient and unsustainable. The need for a functioning court system capable of supporting a rapidly growing economy, guaranteeing basic human and political rights of individuals and providing security and justice to all, makes continuing reforms an imperative.
INTRODUCTION

The assessment followed a similar study of integrity and capacity in the justice sector which was conducted by UNODC in cooperation with the Nigerian Institute for Advanced Legal Studies in 2002 in Bornu, Delta and Lagos states.

This is the report of the second phase of the assessment of the capacity and integrity of the justice system and institutions in 9 states and the FCT. The field survey was conducted in 2007 and preliminary findings of the survey were introduced and analyzed by a large group of justice sector stakeholders at State Judicial Integrity meetings between late 2007 and early 2008.

This second phase assessment comprised of two broad components namely:

a. **Baseline Assessment** of the integrity and capacity of the justice sector in the Federal Capital Territory (FCT), Anambra, Benue, Enugu, Kaduna, Katsina and Rivers States. The baseline assessment produced descriptive data on the current conditions of the justice sector in the states.

b. **Progress assessment** of the integrity and capacity of the justice sector in Borno, Delta and Lagos States. The progress assessment produced information on the current state of the justice system in these states and a comparison of the results with the findings of the previous assessment in those states by UNODC in 2002, and published in 2006.
METHODOLOGY

Survey sample size

A total of 10,000 interviews were conducted in the 9 states and the FCT among the survey target groups (judicial officers, lawyers, prosecutors, courts staff, police, court users and prisoners awaiting trial). Each sub-group was allocated a sample according to its estimated universal population within the state\(^8\) (See table below). The sample size distribution is determined by the size of the target population in each state calculated on Confidence Level of 95\% and Confidence Interval of 5\%, with a set minimum sample size per state of 384\(^9\).

Out of 10,000 questionnaires administered in the survey, 9,818 (98.2\%) were properly completed, while 182 or 1.8\% were invalid and discarded\(^10\). Table I-A (Appendix) shows the number of questionnaires administered in each pilot states per category of the respondents, the total number of returned samples found valid, and those invalid.

Categories of respondents/stakeholders interviewed

The researchers interviewed 7 categories of stakeholders. Those interviewed were randomly selected at the locations of interview, usually in the court, police or prison premises.

1. Judicial Officers (J) - comprising judges of the state and federal high courts, magistrates, area court, customary court and Sharia court judges, customary court of appeal and Sharia court of appeal judges.
2. Lawyers (L) – comprising those in private practice or in legal departments of companies or corporations.
3. Prosecutors (P) - including law officers in the department of public prosecutions in the ministries of justice, and police prosecutors at the magistrates, Sharia, area and customary courts.

\(^8\) The target sub groups are the key stakeholders to whom the field researchers interviewed, namely, judicial officers (judges, magistrates, areas/Sharia/customary court presiding officers), lawyers, prosecutors, police, prisoners awaiting trial, court staff and court users.

\(^9\) Using the Sample Size Calculator of The Survey System by Creative Research Systems (www.surveysystems.com). The population of each state is estimated from the 1991 Census figures at 2.9\% annual growth rate.

\(^10\) The main reasons for invalidating the samples included multiple answers to questions where one answer was required, answers that showed lack of understanding of the question, or sample in which over 85\% of the questions were not answered. See in appendix: Table II-A: Returned sample sizes per state and categories of stakeholders interviewed.
4. Court staff (CS) – including courtroom staff such as court clerks, secretaries, and non-courtroom staff working in the registry, administration, accounts, bailiffs, and security sections of the judiciary.

5. Court users (CU) – including litigants (plaintiffs, defendants, and accused persons), witnesses, and other persons using the courts at dates of the interview, but not those visiting the court premises for non-courtroom related transactions.

6. Police staff (POL) – comprising senior, mid-level and junior rank police personnel.

7. Prisoners awaiting trial (PAT) – persons who are on remand waiting to commence their trial or whose trials have commenced.

The tables and graphs contained in this document are numbered in accordance with the following system. The initial letter refers to the stakeholder group to which the respective question was posed (e.g. J indicating questions to Judicial officers, L to Lawyers, P to Prosecutors, CS to Court staff, CU to Court users, POL to police, and PAT to Prisoners awaiting trial) and the number refers to the position of the question in the respective questionnaire.

There were a total of 487 questions across the 7 categories of respondents, covering descriptive, experiential or evaluative information on each of the 7 general themes of the assessment, namely

- i. Access to justice
- ii. Timeliness of justice delivery
- iii. Quality of justice delivery
- iv. Independence, impartiality and fairness of the courts
- v. Integrity, accountability and oversight
- vi. Coordination and cooperation across the justice sector institutions
- vii. Public trust in the justice system

The questions were framed in diverse data-gathering formats, (closed ended, multiple choice, numeric open-ended and test open-ended). Those questions which required the respondents to give a rating or grading usually allotted values of 1-5, with the most negative value being 1 and the most positive being 5.

**Administration of questionnaires**

A total of 138 field researchers and their supervisors conducted the field survey\(^\text{11}\). All completed questionnaires were collected by field supervisors and returned weekly to the consultant’s office in Lagos. The data were entered into Excel sheets, and analyzed for the key findings into spreadsheets, table and charts.

The distribution of the samples in each state among each category was spread to ensure balance in geography, gender, age groups, income levels and other forms of diversity within the groups or category. In each state, all the local government areas, and judicial divisions were covered by the field researchers.

\(^{11}\) See the distribution of Table IV-A: Field researchers per state in appendix.
Mostly field researchers asked questions to the interviewees and recorded their responses on the questionnaires. However, in a few cases, especially as concerns judges, questionnaires were left with the respondents for completion and collected after two days.

**Challenges**

The research teams encountered several challenges, including:

i. Most of the senior judicial officers refused to be orally interviewed and insisted that the researchers dropped the questionnaires and collected them later, which added to the waiting time, travel costs, and possibility of invalid entries as the researchers did not have the opportunity of explaining the questions where explanation is required. Many cases of invalid questionnaires in that category of respondents were a result of apparent lack of understanding of the questions or multiple answers, and usually occurred where the questionnaires were dropped off for the respondents and collected later.

ii. Some court users were reluctant to respond to questions, and sometimes were shielded by their lawyers. In few cases, court users demanded payment before they would be interviewed. Particularly, questions on corruption and bribe-seeking conducts of officers were avoided more than other questions.

iii. Some court staff were also reluctant to be interviewed, and when they agreed, many were reluctant to answer questions relating to corruption and personnel management for fear that their answers may be reported to the authorities and they may face possible reprisal.

**How the challenges were managed**

Some of the challenges were envisaged or identified during the pilot testing of the questionnaires. Thus, measures to manage them were put in place, including:

i. The interviews were completely confidential. The respondents did not disclose their personal identities in the questionnaire or to the researchers, and this encouraged many court staff and court users to answer the questions without fear of reprisal.

ii. Pre-survey training of the field researchers and pilot testing of the questionnaires prepared the researchers for the challenges.

iii. A research manual was developed to assist researchers in their field work and in ensuring the researchers understood the questions, linkages between the questions across the themes, and were able to handle possible challenges in the field work.
CHAPTER 1. BACKGROUND

The 9 pilot states Anambra, Benue, Borno, Delta, Enugu, Kaduna, Katsina, Lagos and Rivers states and the Federal Capital Territory comprise a total of 47.3 million inhabitants (2006 Census) and roughly one third of the total territory.

Basic data collection included a number of judicial officers and court staff as well as cases received and disposed of by the various state courts. It also included information concerning the budget allocated and released to the judiciary. However, information provided by the registries of the state high courts in some cases turned out to lack accuracy and is therefore not included in the following description. Estimating the actual financial resources available to the judiciary remains difficult as many projects that support the judiciary are directly financed and carried out by the state governments (e.g. transportation and housing for judicial officers, court buildings etc.).

1.1. Description of the pilot states

Map of population density in Nigeria

12 http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nigeria
1.1.1. Anambra

Anambra state is located in the South east region, with a population of 4,182,032\(^{13}\). The state is popular for trade, small scale industries and other commercial activities. The predominant religion is Christianity and the major ethnic group is the Ibo. The state was created in 1991 out of the then Anambra state, which comprised the present Anambra and Enugu States. Anambra state has since 1999 suffered long political instability as a result of several post-election governorship disputes.

The state has 26 High Courts judges across its 7 judicial divisions, 36 Magistrates, and 118 Customary Court judges sitting in 34 courts, and 4 Customary Court of Appeal judges sitting in 1 court\(^{14}\). By December 2007, the state’s judiciary employed 1,524 court staff comprising 260 courtroom staff and 1,264 non-courtroom administrative staff. 1,066 of them were junior staff and 458 senior staff\(^{15}\). The State Judicial Service Commission, headed by the Chief Judge, manages the judicial system.

In 2007, a total of 1,435 cases were filed at the High Court, and 1,158 (80.6%) were disposed of, a 44% decline from the 3,243 cases filed in 2002 in the High Court and 2,251 (69.4%) disposed of that year. At the magistrate courts, 1,686 cases were filed in 2007 and 1,576 (93.4%) were disposed of, while at the customary courts, 1,723 cases were filed and 1,468 (85.2%) disposed of.

1.1.2. Benue

Described as the “food basket” of the nation, Benue state in north central Nigeria has predominantly a farming population, mainly comprising Tiv, Idoma and Igala ethnic groups. The 2006 population size of the state was 4,219,244. The main religions are Christianity and traditionalists.

The state has 13 high court judges, 41 magistrates, 83 area court judges and 5 customary court of appeal judges. The judiciary employs 740 junior and 621 senior staff, a total of 1,361 comprising 925 non-courtroom staff and 436 courtroom staff.

In 2007, 325 cases were filed at the high court and 450 cases (138%) were disposed of. In 2002, 380 cases were filed and 312 were disposed of that year. A total of 2,819 cases were filed at the magistrate courts in 2007 and 917 cases (32.5%) finally disposed of. In 2002, 1,994 cases were filed and 498 (24.9%) were disposed of. In 2007, the judiciary in the state received 2.28 cases per non-judicial staff and 57.6 cases per judicial staff, and disposed of 1.04 cases per non-judicial staff and 25.3 cases per judicial staff.

\(^{13}\) For the details of the 2006 national population census, see [www.population.gov.ng/pop_figure.pdf]
\(^{14}\) A customary court comprises a panel of 3 lay judges. The customary court of appeal also has a panel of 3 judges who rank equivalent to the High court judge of the state.
\(^{15}\) Junior staff are employees within the Nigeria’s civil service levels 1 to 6. Employees between levels 6 and 17 are senior staff. Those above that level are the executive or management staff.
1.1.3. Borno

Borno state is situated in the extreme north east of Nigeria. It has a population of 4,151,193, most of whom are Muslims. The main ethnic groups are Fulani, Bo, and Shuwa-Arabs. Trans-Sahara trade, cattle rearing, leather craftsmanship and farming are the major economic activities of the people of the state. The crime rate in the state is low and complex civil litigations are very rare.

There are 10 high court judges, 20 magistrates, 78 Sharia court judges, and 2 Sharia Courts of appeal in the state. The state has 510 non-judiciary court staff comprising 261 staff at the registry and administration, and 249 serving in the courtrooms.

In 2007, 253 cases were filed at the high court and 69 (or 27%) were concluded, and in 2006, 231 cases were filed and 77 (or 33%) concluded. At the magistrate court, 343 criminal cases were filed in 2007 and 62 (or 18%) were concluded, and in 2006, 484 criminal cases were filed and 201 (or 41.5%) were concluded.

With the introduction of Sharia in 2001, the bulk of simple civil and criminal cases are now heard by the Sharia courts. In 2007, 8,240 cases were filed at the Sharia courts and 7,312 (or 88.7%) concluded. 7,361 cases were filed in 2006 and 6168 (83.7%) were concluded. Like in other states that have Sharia court system, the rate of appeals against the decisions of the Sharia courts was very low. In 2007, 7,312 cases were concluded by the Sharia courts, but only 183 appeals were filed at the Sharia court of appeal, representing 2.5% of Sharia court decisions. In 2006, 6,168 cases were concluded at the Sharia courts and 225 appeals were filed, representing 3.6%. Between 2002 and 2007, an annual average of 2.1% of decided cases at the Sharia courts were contested on appeal.

1.1.4. Delta

Delta State in the Niger Delta has a population of 4,008,391, comprising mainly the Urhobo, Ibo, Isoko and Itsekiri ethnic groups. The predominant religion is Christianity. The main economic activities of the people are farming and fishing. There are oil extraction and related services carried out by mostly foreign companies. Like in other parts of Niger Delta, the rate of crime is high due to activities of militant groups in the region.

The state has 28 high courts judges, 76 magistrates, 57 customary court judges, and 2 customary court of appeal panels. It has total of 3,292 non-judicial court staff out of which

---

16 There is no information from the judiciary on the number of civil cases filed at the magistrate court. In fact, most of the simple civil cases are mostly handled at the Sharia courts.
17 Between 2002 and 2007, the Sharia courts in the state received 55,683 cases and disposed of 50,126 cases (92.8%), as against 1,237 cases received at the high courts within the same 6-year period, out of which 415 or 33.8% were concluded, or 2,281 cases received at the magistrate courts within the same period out of which 32.8% were concluded.
18 Between 2002 and 2007, an annual average of 2.1% of decided cases at the Sharia courts were appealed against to the Sharia court of appeal, indicating high public trust in the Sharia courts. Other factors that contribute to the very low rate of appeals against decisions of the Sharia courts include poverty or lack of funds to prosecute appeals, religious beliefs that encourage Sharia court users to accept Sharia court decisions without challenge, and the fact that most of the cases are simple claims for which the cost of prosecuting appeals makes no economic sense.
2,412 work in the courtroom as court registrars, secretaries and clerks, and 880 are on administrative and registry duties.

At the high court in 2007, 8,729 cases were filed and 7,458 (85.4%) were concluded, representing clearance rate of 266 cases per judge. In 2006, 7,445 cases were filed and 6,629 (89.03%) were concluded, representing 236.75 cases per judge. At the magistrate courts, similar high return of concluded cases was reported. In 2007, 7,113 cases were filed out of which 6,844 or 96.2% were concluded, representing 90.5 cases per magistrate. In 2006, 6,858 cases were filed and 6,314 or 92.06% were concluded, representing 83.2 cases per magistrate.

1.1.5. Enugu

Located in the south east region, Enugu was the headquarters of the old Eastern region, and has a long tradition of legal practice. It has a population of 3,257,398 and the predominant ethnic group is Ibo. The main religion is Christianity.

The state has 25 high courts judges, 51 magistrates sharing 34 courtrooms, and 325 customary court judges sitting in 108 customary courts. It has 1,785 judicial staff, comprising 878 junior and 907 senior staff.

In 2007, the high court registry received 569 cases and 407 (71.5%) were concluded. In 2006 the high courts received 2,317 cases and concluded 1,741 (74%). In 2002, the same court received 1,589 cases and concluded 1,219 (76.8%). At the magistrate court, a total of 1,468 cases were received in 2007, and 1,117 (76%) were disposed of. At the customary courts in 2006, 1,572 cases were received and 969 cases (61%) were concluded. There is also the Rent Tribunal that received fewer than 100 cases in 2007, dealing mainly with small tenement related claims.

1.1.6. Federal Capital Territory

In 1991, Nigeria’s capital was moved from Lagos to Abuja FCT. With a population of 1,405,201, according to the 2006 census, and annual population growth of over 11%, the FCT has the fastest growing population in the country, with an estimated 2.85 million inhabitants by 2015 and more than 4 million by 2020. The political administration of the FCT resides in the minister of the Federal Capital Territory, who exercises executive functions, while the House of Representative of the National Assembly serves as the legislative body of the territory.

The judiciary is under the Chief Judge of the FCT. In 2007, there were 30 high court judges, 47 magistrates, and 38 areas courts judges. The FCT judiciary employs a total of 2,627 staff, comprising 732 staff serving the courtrooms, and 1,895 staff working on administrative and related duties. 1,680 (64%) are junior staff and 947 (36%) are senior staff.

A total of 4,224 cases were filed at the high court registry in 2007 and 3,839 or 90.8% were concluded during the same period. At the magistrate court, a total of 11,614 cases were filed and 14,314 cases or 123% were disposed. At the area courts, 8,322 cases were filed while 7,890 or 94.8% were disposed of. Compared with the case docket in the Territory in 2002, there was over 69% increase in cases filed in the courts between 2002 and 2007. In 2002,
2,806 cases were filed at the high court, and 2,369 disposed of that year. At the magistrate and area courts, 7,892 and 6,269 cases were filed respectively in 2002, and 6,480 or 82%, and 5,670 or 90.4% were disposed of respectively in those courts.

1.1.7. Kaduna

Kaduna state has over 28 ethnic groups, and nearly equal Christian and Muslim populations. Its capital, Kaduna was the political headquarter of the old northern region, and its branch of the Nigeria bar association is the oldest in the north. It has a population of 6,066,562.

The state has 18 high court judges and 19 high court rooms, and 35 magistrates sharing 16 courtrooms. The state also has 48 customary court judges, 5 customary court of appeal judges sitting in 3 customary courtrooms, 94 Sharia court judges, and 4 judges of the Sharia courts of appeal sitting in 2 courtrooms. In 2007, the judiciary had 1,978 non-judicial staff, with 1,729 (87%) serving the courtrooms, and 249 (13%) working on administrative and related duties.

At the high court, 4,931 cases were filed in 2007 out of which 2,824 cases (or 57.2%) were concluded. At the magistrate courts in 2007, 3,001 cases were filed and 4,980 cases were concluded. Compared with the number of cases filed in the high court and magistrate court in 2002, there was considerable decline. In 2002, 2,895 cases were filed at the high court and 3,014 were concluded, while at the magistrate court 27,171 cases were filed and 14,597 were concluded. The decline was due to the introduction of Sharia courts. These courts hear now most of the simple civil cases. In 2007, a total of 35,952 cases were filed at the Sharia courts and 35,400 or 98.4% were disposed of. At the customary courts in 2006, 6,355 cases were filed and 6,453 or 101% were concluded.

1.1.8. Katsina

Located in the northwest of Nigeria, Katsina state was carved out of Kaduna state in 1987. In 2006, it had a population of 5,792,538. The State population is mostly Muslim, and the Hausa-Fulani represent the largest ethnic groups. Because of its rich arable land, the main economic activity is farming. Katsina state is one of the few states in Nigeria where crops are grown all year round: cotton, groundnuts, millet, guinea corn, maize, rice, and vegetable. There are also sizable leather craftsmanship and cattle rearing.

There are 9 high court judges, 12 magistrates, 96 Sharia court judges, 198 Sharia court assistants, and 7 Sharia court of appeal judges. The total non-judicial court staff is 1,664, out of which 570 (34%) work in the Sharia courts.

With the introduction of Sharia courts in 2000, most cases are filed at the Sharia courts. In 2007, 93,216 cases were filed at the Sharia courts, and 65,108 (69.8%) concluded, while at the high court the same year, 2,624 cases were filed and 224 cases (8.5%) concluded. At the magistrate courts the same year, 12,502 cases were filed and 3,257 or 26% were concluded. In 2007, 139 appeals against decisions of the Sharia courts were filed at the Sharia Court of Appeal and 111 or 78.9% concluded. The number of appeals represents 0.2% of Sharia court judgments.
1.1.9. Lagos

Lagos state is the commercial capital of Nigeria, with a population of 9,013,534, according to the 2006 federal census, though the state government disputed the figure and claimed the state had more than 12 million inhabitants. The state has a land mass of about 1,800km², making it the most densely populated state in the country. The main religions are Christian and Muslim, with few traditionalists. The indigenous tribes are Aworis, Egun, Ijebu and Egbas, all of whom are sub-ethnic groups of the Yorubas.

Lagos judiciary is the oldest in Nigeria. Its existence dates back to the period of the cession of Lagos Island to the British Government when it was established as the Colony Province Judiciary. In 1967, Lagos state was created as one of the 12 states in the country, and the state judiciary was established.

By 2008, there were 53 high courts judges, 111 magistrates and 1,480 non-judicial court staff comprising 575 junior staff and 805 senior staff. 875 of the non-judicial staff assist judges and magistrates in courtrooms and 605 perform administrative and accounting duties.

In 2007, 6,005 cases were filed at the high court, and 3,325 (55.7%) were concluded. In 2006, 6,746 cases were filed and 2,347 or 34.7% disposed of, representing 44.2 cases per judge. At the magistrates’ court in 2007, 4,962 cases were filed and 1,952 or 39.3% concluded, representing 44.7 cases per magistrate. In 2006, 5,672 cases were filed and 1,160 or 20.45% concluded, representing 51 cases per magistrate.

In April 2001, the high court was divided into specialized divisions, namely the Criminal, Land, Probate and Family, Commercial and General Civil Divisions.19 In 2004, the judiciary introduced the new civil procedure rules for the high court20, and set up the multi-door court house in order to integrate alternative dispute resolution in judicial proceedings. In 2007, the state government started to computerize the high court registry.

1.1.10. Rivers

Rivers state, in the Niger Delta region, had a population of 5,185,400 in 2006. The state is composed of over 18 tribes, including Kalabari, Ikwere, Ndoni, Okrika, Ibani, Ogbu, Etche, among others21. Being mainly riverside communities, the major occupation of the people are fishing and farming. In the last 10 or so years, Rivers state has witnessed high crime rate as a result of the activities of large bands of militants kidnapping people for ransom and attacking the oil and gas extraction industries in the region.

The state had 30 high courts judges, 35 magistrates and 73 customary court judges. There were 1,546 non-judicial court staff comprising 904 junior and 642 senior staff.

In 2007, 2,507 cases were filed at the high court and 2,829 (or 113%) were concluded. By the end of 2007, 7,799 cases were still outstanding as backlog.22 In 2006, 4,087 cases were filed

19 See Practice Directions No PD/II/C.1/LS No 1 of 2001 issued by the then Chief Judge Christopher Segun.
21 See the Rivers State government’s website http://www.riverstatenigeria.net
and 4,500 (110%) disposed of. At the magistrate court in 2007, 5,658 cases were filed and 4,700 (or 83%) were disposed of, while in 2006 in the same court, 7,098 cases were filed and 4,136 (or 58%) were disposed of. At the customary courts, 499 cases were filed in 2007 and 580 (or 116%) disposed of, while in 2006, 495 cases were filed and 462 or 93.3% were disposed of.

In 2006, the judiciary introduced a new civil procedure rules for the high courts, and in 2007, a new civil procedure rules of the magistrate courts, aimed at improving court proceedings in the state. The state has introduced mediation centers in the ministry of justice, which has diverted many small claims or minor civil disputes from the mainstream courts to alternative dispute resolution methods. The state’s judiciary has provided computers to all high court judges, and in 2007 introduced pilot automation of court proceedings in selected high court rooms, which would improve administration of justice in the state and reduce delays in proceedings when it is eventually extended to all the courts.

### 1.2. Comparison between states

The significant differences between pilot States become more obvious when directly comparing the number of judicial officers, court staff, caseloads and budgetary allocations. These differences are key for the further analysis of the varying degree of efficiency of different state judiciaries and provide the basis for the introduction of results-based management of budgeting.

#### 1.2.1 Distribution of judicial officers, court staff and caseloads across pilot states

The distribution of judicial officers and court staff varies significantly across pilot states (for 2007) and neither appears linked to the number of inhabitants, nor the size of the territory, nor the caseload.

---

Table I: Cases filed and disposed of per high court judge in 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No of judges</th>
<th>Cases filed per judge</th>
<th>Cases concluded per judge</th>
<th>Cases filed at the high court</th>
<th>Cases disposed of at the high court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>1158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>8729</td>
<td>7458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.C.T</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4224</td>
<td>3839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6005</td>
<td>3325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2507</td>
<td>2829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>24</strong></td>
<td><strong>110</strong></td>
<td><strong>76</strong></td>
<td><strong>2880</strong></td>
<td><strong>2205</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of cases filed at the high court, by judge, varies a lot from state to state with a maximum of 312 cases filed per judge in Delta state and a minimum of 21 cases filed in Borno state. Great differences can be found also in terms of productivity of individual judges, with an average individual clearance rate of more than 100 cases per year in Delta, FCT, Katsina and Lagos, while in Borno and Enugu state judges on average seem to dispose of less than 20 cases per year.

The information on the numbers of staff, cases filed and cases concluded were provided by the registry of the respective jurisdiction. Though information requested was on only substantive cases filed and disposed of, some states such as Delta State provided data that included interlocutory applications filed in substantive cases within the year (2007). Therefore, the data may not in such instance, represent the appropriate number of substantive cases filed and concluded, and ratio with staff.
Table II: Cases filed and disposed of per magistrate in 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No of Magistrates</th>
<th>Cases filed per magistrate</th>
<th>Cases disposed of per magistrate</th>
<th>No of cases filed at the magistrate court</th>
<th>Cases disposed of at the magistrate court</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2819</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>7113</td>
<td>6844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.C.T</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>11614</td>
<td>14314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>11451</td>
<td>8007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4962</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>5658</td>
<td>4700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>5235</td>
<td>4388</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cases filed per magistrate also vary strongly from state to state. Borno, Enugu, Lagos, Anambra and Benue states have the lowest individual caseloads, while the highest individual caseloads are to be found in the FCT and Katsina state. Similarly, the results for the individual case clearance rates vary, with magistrates in Katsina, Rivers and FCT clearing between 134 to a 667 cases per annum, while magistrates in Benue, Borno, Enugu and Lagos hardly clear more than 20 cases per annum.26.

Table III: Average individual caseloads and clearance rates of judicial officers (judges and magistrates) during the time period 2002 to 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2002-2007 State</th>
<th>Cases filed per judge</th>
<th>Cases concluded per judge</th>
<th>Cases filed per magistrate</th>
<th>Cases disposed of per magistrate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.C.T</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When reviewing caseloads and clearance rates over a more extended time period, differences in productivity across states become even more obvious. Most preoccupying appear to be the situations in Borno, Katsina and Lagos states, where individual clearance rates appear to not exceed a third of the caseloads received during the five year period from 2002 to 2007.

25 Larger number of cases was treated at the Sharia courts in Borno state in 2007 than at the magistrate courts. Both courts have concurrent jurisdiction on most civil and personal matters. In 2007, 8240 cases were filed at the Sharia court in the state, and 7312 cases were concluded. The state had 78 Sharia court judges. This translated, on ratio of cases per judge, to 105.6 cases filed, and 93.7 cases concluded per Sharia court judge.

26 See in appendix Figure 1-A: Distribution of numbers and types of staff, Figure 2-A: Distribution of the Categories of staff (junior/senior) & Table V-A: Cases filed and disposed of per court staff 2007.
1.2.2 Distribution of budget across pilot states

The following tables show the budgetary resources provided to the state judiciaries in the ten pilot states. However, as mentioned before, these figures were provided by the high court registries and there are doubts concerning their accuracy. Therefore it was not possible to utilize these figures for the purpose of further analyzing the efficiency of budget implementation – a necessary precondition for results based budgeting.

Table IV: Budget allocation and releases to state judiciaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Budget to State Judiciaries</th>
<th>2005 Allocation '000,000</th>
<th>2005 Released '000,000</th>
<th>2006 Allocation '000,000</th>
<th>2006 Released '000,000</th>
<th>2007 Allocation '000,000</th>
<th>2007 Released '000,000</th>
<th>2008 Allocation '000,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>390.4</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>1,083.1</td>
<td>965.0</td>
<td>799.6</td>
<td>1,078.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1,206.7</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>287.4</td>
<td>490.9</td>
<td>250.1</td>
<td>655.1</td>
<td>256.6</td>
<td>778.1</td>
<td>855.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>803.1</td>
<td>1,057.3</td>
<td>1,102.6</td>
<td>1,306.3</td>
<td>1,250.6</td>
<td>1,460.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>1,017.3</td>
<td>1,116.6</td>
<td>1,116.6</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>855.9</td>
<td>642.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>523.2</td>
<td>515.2</td>
<td>479.3</td>
<td>551.2</td>
<td>535.5</td>
<td>768.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>558.8</td>
<td>402.8</td>
<td>402.8</td>
<td>419.2</td>
<td>419.2</td>
<td>642.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>258.7</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>218.8</td>
<td>522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers27</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table V: Total annual budget of the entire state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Total Annual Budget '000,000,000 (billion)</th>
<th>2005 '000,000,000 (billion)</th>
<th>2006 '000,000,000 (billion)</th>
<th>2007 '000,000,000 (billion)</th>
<th>2008 '000,000,000 (billion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>35.782</td>
<td>55.891</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>28.670</td>
<td>38.512</td>
<td>47.414</td>
<td>64.656</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>38.737</td>
<td>49.505</td>
<td>60.316</td>
<td>53.771</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>115.999</td>
<td>149.999</td>
<td>189.999</td>
<td>150.574</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>48.272</td>
<td>69.272</td>
<td>97.053</td>
<td>94.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>31.711</td>
<td>41.304</td>
<td>55.776</td>
<td>50.781</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>341.881</td>
<td>490.344</td>
<td>504.549</td>
<td>983.194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers27</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Based on the figures available, it would appear that the budget allocated and released to the judiciaries in the ten pilot states on average amounts to roughly 0.5% of the total state budget.

27 The data from FCT and Rivers were not available. The researchers unsuccessfully sought for the desk information by letter of 4 March 2008 to Rivers State and FCT judiciaries and reminder visits to their Chief Registrars.

28 The data from FCT and Rivers were not available. The researchers unsuccessfully sought for the desk information by letter of 4 March 2008 to Rivers State and FCT judiciaries and reminder visits to their Chief Registrars.
## 1.2.3 Overview

Table VI: Background overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2007</th>
<th>Population 2006 million</th>
<th>Total Annual State Budget 2007 N$Million</th>
<th>Budget releases to state judiciaries 2007 N$Million</th>
<th>% Budget releases to state judiciaries T.A.B.</th>
<th>Cases filed at the high court</th>
<th>Cases disposed at the high court</th>
<th>N of judges</th>
<th>Cases filed per judge</th>
<th>Cases concluded per judge</th>
<th>N of cases filed at the magistrate court</th>
<th>Cases disposed of at the magistrate court</th>
<th>N of magistrates</th>
<th>Cases filed per magistrate</th>
<th>Cases disposed of per magistrate</th>
<th>N of court staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>55 891</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>1435</td>
<td>1158</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1686</td>
<td>1576</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>47 414</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2819</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>60 316</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>189 999</td>
<td>1 251</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>8729</td>
<td>7458</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>7113</td>
<td>6844</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1468</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4224</td>
<td>3839</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>11614</td>
<td>14314</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>2627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>97 053</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>55 776</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1912</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11451</td>
<td>8007</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>1664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>9.0 (12.0)</td>
<td>504 549</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>6005</td>
<td>3325</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4962</td>
<td>1952</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>2507</td>
<td>2829</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>5658</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>1546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>144428.3</td>
<td>376.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2880</td>
<td>2205</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>5235</td>
<td>4388</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>1777</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 2. ACCESS TO JUSTICE

In order to determine the accessibility of the justice system, the survey asked in particular court users, prisoners awaiting trial and lawyers about their experiences and perceptions when using any of the justice sector institutions. More specifically, the survey instruments included questions concerning the cost of accessing the justice system, the ease with which information can be obtained, the access to legal services, the specific challenges facing prisoners awaiting trial and the availability and use of mechanisms of alternative dispute resolution.

2.1. Access of the public to the police

In order to assess the ease with which the public has access to the police, court users were interviewed about their experiences when dealing with the police. More specifically, they were asked whether they had been the victim of a crime during the last 12 months prior to the interview, and if so, whether they had reported the incident to the police. It turned out that 15% of the court users indicated that they had been the victim of a crime, out of which 78% had reported the incident to the police, with the reporting rate being the highest in Rivers (100%) and Anambra states (88%), and the lowest in Borno (67%), Katsina (67%) and Benue (68%) states.

Figure 2: (CU22-23) Have you been the victim of a crime during the last 12 months? If yes, did you report the incident to the police?

Court users were also asked to rate their level of satisfaction with the attention the police had given to the matter. The finding showed that on national average, 44% were not satisfied or very unsatisfied with the response of the police, while only 34% indicated to be satisfied or very satisfied. The highest levels of user-satisfaction could be recorded in Kaduna state with 52% of the respondents indicating that they had been satisfied or very satisfied with the services provided by the police. In Delta, Rivers, Lagos and Borno states on the other hand the lowest levels of user-satisfaction were found, with more than 50% of the respondents
indicating, that they had not been satisfied or even very unsatisfied with the attention given by the police to the matter.

Figure 3: (CU26) To what extent were you satisfied with the overall attention given to the matter by the police?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>very unsatisfied</strong></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>unsatisfied</strong></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>somewhat unsatisfied</strong></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>satisfied</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>very satisfied</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2. Affordability of the justice system

In order to assess the affordability of the justice system, court users were asked, among others, to rate the affordability of the courts during the last 12 months. On the national average, the majority of respondents (47%) felt that the courts had only been *sometimes* affordable, while 30% were of the opinion that the courts were *never or seldom* affordable. Only 23% stated that the courts had *always* or *usually* been affordable. Particularly negative were the perception of court users in Rivers and Delta states with 56% and 44% respectively indicating that they considered the courts to be *never or seldom* affordable. At the same time, more court users in Katsina state (37%) and FCT (46%) were of the opinion that courts had *usually or always* been affordable.
This finding was confirmed by the lawyers, who were also asked whether, based on their experience during the last 12 months, they would consider the cost of litigation to be generally affordable to their clients. The majority of the lawyers (53%) said that the cost of litigation had been affordable only *sometimes*. Like the court users, also lawyers in Delta and Rivers states, were particularly negative about the affordability of the courts, with 26% and 27% respectively saying the courts were seldom or never affordable.
Court users were also asked to compare the affordability of the courts with the situation of two years prior to the interview. On average 39% of the court users agreed that affordability was better or much better than two years prior to the interview, while only 14% felt that the affordability of the courts had deteriorated during the last two years.

The most significant improvements could be registered in Lagos, Katsina, Borno states and FCT with 62%, 60%, 46% and 57% respectively saying they considered the courts more affordable than two years ago, while in Anambra and Rivers states more court users felt that affordability had deteriorated during the last two years.

Figure 6: (CU17) From your experience, how would you rate the affordability of the courts for you compared to two years ago?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No experience with the courts before now</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much better</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The same</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worse</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Much worse</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again these findings were confirmed by the lawyers, with the majority of respondents (52%) agreeing that the courts had become more or much more affordable than two years ago. The biggest improvements were registered in Katsina, Lagos and Kaduna states, with 92%, 73% and 61% of lawyers indicating that courts had become more or much more affordable. At the same time, lawyers in Rivers, Enugu and Anambra states considered courts to be less affordable than two years prior to the interview.
In order to assess the affordability of the court system, stakeholders were further asked a number of questions relating to the direct and indirect costs of using the courts, including court filing and lawyer fees, the cost and time it took court users to travel to and from the court, and the number of times court users had to return to court to conclude their case.

Court users were asked to indicate how much they had paid in court fees in respect of the case for which they were in court on the day of interview. The responses received showed that on the national average, the sum of ₦5000 was spent by court users for a contested case, with very significant differences across the various states.

Moreover, the lawyers interviewed were asked to indicate the exact amount their clients spent in court fees. On the national average, they indicated that their clients had paid ₦33,625 on court fees. This ranged from an average of ₦3,817 in Benue state to ₦98,203 in Rivers state.

In order to assess the cost of hiring lawyers, court users were asked to indicate the amount they had paid their lawyers in the last contested case. On average, court users paid ₦70,000 for lawyers’ fees.

When lawyers were asked the same question, their responses were not consistent with those of the court users. The sum of ₦130,692 was found to constitute the national average, with fees ranging from ₦32,257 in Benue state to ₦209,656 in Rivers state.
Court and lawyer fees are not the only determinants of the cost of using the courts. Other indicators include the time and cost of traveling to court. Accordingly, court users were also asked about the time and cost of transportation as well as the number of times they had to come to court for their cases. The responses varied widely from state to state. On national average, the majority of respondents (74%) indicated that it had taken them little more than an hour to arrive at the court and that they paid average of ₦5,900 for transportation. The court users whose cases were concluded on the date of the interview stated the average number of time they had to travel to court from the filing to conclusion of the case was 5.7 times. The shortest travel period to courts, as well as the fewest number of times the court users had to travel to court, were recorded in Kaduna and Borno states, while Rivers and Anambra states recorded the highest number of times court users had to travel to court.

### 2.3. Access to legal services

As concerns access to legal services, prisoners awaiting trial were asked whether they had retained a lawyer, and if so, who was paying for the lawyer fees. On national average, 56% responded that they were represented by a lawyer, mostly paid for by *family or friends*. 11% of the prisoners awaiting trial received *pro bono* or free legal services, while only 7% were benefiting from the services of a *government-financed lawyer*. 
Also the availability of *pro bono* legal services differs across states, with remand prisoners in particular in Borno (43%) and Enugu states (24%) receiving such services, while such services are less available in FCT and Anambra state.
2.4. Access to information

Another indicator of access to justice is the ease with which the users of the courts can access information relevant to their cases. Court users, lawyers and prisoners awaiting trial were all asked to rate access to information from the courts.

The majority of court users (62%) found it easy or very easy to obtain information from the courts concerning their current case. Court users in FCT, Kaduna and Katsina states found it most easy to obtain information from the courts, while 32% of court users in Borno state found it difficult or very difficult, (as opposed to 13% on national average).

Figure 11: (CU18) Was it easy/difficult to obtain information from the court regarding your case?

Prisoners awaiting trial face greater difficulties accessing information about their cases. Only 49% found it easy or very easy obtaining information, while 41% found it difficult or very difficult. Prisoners awaiting trial in FCT, Katsina and Lagos state found it easier to access information than their peers in Anambra, Borno and Enugu states.
As concerns lawyers, 76% found it easy or very easy to obtain information from the courts, with courts in Katsina and Delta states being considered most accessible, while courts in Borno state were considered the least accessible in this context.
Another indicator of access to information is the level of awareness among prisoners awaiting trial of the possibility and conditions of obtaining bail. When asked whether they were aware of the possibility of applying for bail, 68% responded affirmatively, with the highest levels of awareness being recorded in FCT (100%), Rivers (88%) and Anambra (80%) states, while the lowest levels of awareness were to be found in Delta (40%) and Katsina (51%) states.

Figure 14: (PAT9) Are you aware of the possibility of applying for bail?

Moreover, when prisoners awaiting trial were asked whether they were aware of the general conditions under which bail could be granted, 52% indicated that they were aware of such conditions, with the highest levels of awareness in FCT, Anambra, Lagos and Borno states and the lowest levels of knowledge in Delta, Kaduna and Enugu states.

The main source of information for prisoners awaiting trial as concerns bail were lawyers, followed by judges and magistrates, while court staff, prison staff, police and prosecutors played a less important role in providing such information. In particular, judicial officers in Enugu, Borno and Kaduna states played a very pro-active role in educating prisoners awaiting trial about the possibilities and conditions of applying for bail, while in some other jurisdictions, judicial officers did not appear to provide such essential information to prisoners awaiting trial (e.g. in Anambra, FCT, Katsina and Lagos states)29.

29 See in Appendix Table X-A: If yes, from whom did you receive such information?
2.5. Access to justice by prisoners awaiting trial

Prisoners awaiting trial typically face greater difficulties in accessing the justice system than other court users. The survey instrument for prisoners awaiting trial therefore included a number of additional questions aimed to assess their current levels of access to justice. As a key indicator of access to justice, prisoners awaiting trial were asked about the time they had already spent in remand by the time of the interview. From their responses, the average period time spent in remand was 12.66 months. Of particular concern in this context are Benue and Enugu states where the average time spent in remand exceeded 20 months by the time of the interview.
Of the prisoners awaiting trial interviewed, 68% indicated that a date of their trial had already been fixed. Particularly, remand prisoners in FCT and Borno states indicated they had speedier access to justice, with 100% and 93% respectively stating that trial dates had been fixed, while in Delta and Enugu states more than half of the respondents indicated no trial date had yet been fixed.

**Figure 17: (PAT4) Has a date been fixed for your trial?**

![Bar chart showing percentage of prisoners with fixed trial dates by state.]

2.6. Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) and Restorative Justice

One of the innovations introduced by many state judiciaries in Nigeria with a view to enhancing access to justice is the creation of specific institutions to provide for alternative avenues for dispute resolution. Such Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) mechanisms include the creation of the Multi-Door Court House in Lagos state, the ADR Center in the FCT, as well as the Amicable Settlement Corridor in Borno state.

Judicial officers were therefore interviewed on their use of different forms of ADR in their courts. On national average, 67% indicated that they used ADR or other less formal justice delivery mechanisms in the cases they handled, with the highest percentage being recorded in Rivers, Lagos and FCT\(^{30}\), while in particular, in Borno state, ADR methods were much less being utilized\(^{31}\).

---

\(^{30}\) FCT and Lagos state already have established and operate the court-connected multi-door court house.

\(^{31}\) This situation might have significantly changed as in 2008, the Borno high court introduced the amicable settlement corridor, to integrate ADR directly into the justice delivery process. The Borno model provides an innovative solution, as the ADR mechanism is made available within the premises of the high court. The usefulness of this close integration of the formal and informal justice delivery mechanisms is to be monitored closely.
While the legal framework provides little flexibility for the use of restorative justice methods, nevertheless almost half of all prosecutors indicated that they had made use of such methods, with the highest percentages being registered in Borno, Rivers and Enugu states, while prosecutors in Kaduna state appeared to hardly make use of such method.
When asked about the type of ADR methods being used, it became evident that there were significant differences across the ten pilot states. While *settlement through traditional and community leaders* was most popular in Rivers, Anambra and Kaduna states, the *certification that lawyers discussed settlement* was most frequently used in Delta state, *settlement conference with judicial officer* most used in Lagos, and *mediation* most commonly used in Enugu, Kaduna and Katsina states.

Table VII: (J26) If yes, Please indicate which mechanism was used the last time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechnism</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other/ specify</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement through traditional/ community leaders</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restorative justice</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certification that lawyers discussed settlement</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settlement conference with judicial officer</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early neutral evaluation</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediation</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arbitration</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3. TIMELINESS OF JUSTICE DELIVERY

In order to assess the timeliness of justice delivery, various stakeholders were asked questions about their experiences and perceptions of the speed with which different justice sector institutions responded to complaints and resolved disputes. More specifically, questions covered issues relating to the swiftness with which the police dealt with complaints, the speed with which courts disposed of cases, as well as the frequency and duration of delays.

3.1. Timeliness of the Police

Stakeholders were asked to rank the speed with which the police carried out its responsibilities. The majority of police officers interviewed (56%) stated that the police was usually or always quick in dealing with cases and responding to complaints. Only 8% of the respondents held the opposite view. Police officers in Rivers, Kaduna and Katsina states held the most positive views, while those in Lagos and Anambra states were comparatively more critical as concerns the responsiveness and preparedness of the police.

![Figure 20: (POL11) During the last 12 months, from your experience, do you consider the police have been quick in dealing with cases/ complaints?](image)

When they were asked to compare the timeliness of the police with the situation of two years prior to the interview, 75% of the police officers felt that things had improved, with officers in FCT and Kaduna state evaluating the improvements in terms of speed more positively than their colleagues in the other pilot states.
3.2. Perceptions of the timeliness of the courts

In assessing timeliness of justice delivery, court users were asked whether from their experiences during the last 12 months, they would consider the courts having been quick in handling cases. The majority of them (50%) said the courts had been sometimes quick, while 20% said the courts were always or usually quick, and 30% said the courts were seldom or never quick. Most negative were the opinions of court users in Rivers, Benue and Borno states with 60%, 38% and 36% indicating that they considered the courts to be seldom or never quick.
The perception of courts’ timeliness by judicial officers, lawyers and prosecutors differed somewhat from those of court users. The majority of the judicial officers (52%) felt that the courts were usually or always quick and 44% said the courts were sometimes quick, while only 4% said the courts were seldom or never quick.

As concerns lawyers and prosecutors, they mostly felt that courts were only sometimes quick. Lawyers in Katsina and Kaduna states held the most positive views with 48% and 33% of the respondents sharing the opinion that the courts were usually or always quick.

Similarly, 37% of the prosecutors believed that the courts had been quick or even very quick during the last 12 months prior to the interview. The most significant discrepancies were observed as concerns the perceptions of timeliness in Benue state, where 64% of the prosecutors ranked the courts as being usually or always quick, while only 14% of the lawyers shared that view.

32 See in appendix Table XI-A: From your experience, in the last 12 months do you consider the courts have been quick in concluding cases

33 See in appendix Figure 3-A: In the last 12 months, from your experience, do you consider the court has been quick in handling cases?
Figure 23: (L27) From your experience, during the last 12 months do you feel that the courts have been quick?

In order to assess any changes in the timeliness of the justice delivery, court users were also asked to rate the timeliness of the courts compared to two years prior to the interview. It turned out that 43% of those courts users who have had experience with the courts stated that the timeliness of the courts had improved, with court users in Lagos state (68%), FCT (60%) and Katsina state (57%) holding particularly positive views in this context.

Figure 24: (CU21) From your experience, how would you rate the timeliness of the courts for you compared to two years ago?
These findings were confirmed by 87% of the judicial officers, 79% of prosecutors\textsuperscript{34} and 73% of lawyers, who all agreed that the courts’ timelines was better or much better than two years prior to the interview.

Lawyers in FCT (94%), Katsina (94%) and Lagos states (89%) were particularly impressed with improvements on court timeliness, while those in Benue state were least impressed.

Figure 25: (L28) From your experience, how would you rate the timeliness of the courts compared to two years ago?

3.3. Experiences of timeliness of the courts

Stakeholders were also asked about their experiences concerning the timeliness of the courts. For that purpose, court users were asked to indicate how long ago they had filed the case for which they were in court on the day of interview. On average, 43% of the court users responded that they had filed their case less than 6 months ago and only 16% had filed it more than 24 months ago. It also turned out that the courts in Katsina and Borno states were the quickest with 73% and 65% of court users having filed their cases less than 6 months ago, while courts in Rivers and Lagos states appeared to have the greatest challenges in quickly disposing of their respective case load.

\textsuperscript{34} See in appendix Figure 4-A: (J24) From your experience, how would you rate the timeliness of the courts compared to two years ago? & Figure 5-A: (P16) From your experience, how would you rate the timeliness of the courts compared to two years ago?
Figure 26: (CU8) How long ago was the case filed?

Judges and lawyers were asked how long it usually took the courts to conclude different types of contested cases.

As concerns criminal cases, 31% of judicial officers indicated that it took them less than 12 months to conclude such cases, while another 38% said that it took them up to 24 months to conclude such cases. Protracted criminal proceedings were most frequently recorded in Enugu and Lagos states, while 59% of the judicial officers in Kaduna, 38% in Anambra and 33% in Katsina state indicated that it took them less than 12 months to conclude a contested criminal case.

Lawyers had slightly different experiences with only 19% indicating that it took the courts less than 12 months to conclude contested criminal cases, while most of them (31%) stated that it took them between 1 and 2 years. Still 40% of the lawyers reported that on average it took the courts more than 2 years to conclude a criminal case. In particular in Delta, Lagos, Enugu and Rivers states, more than half of the lawyers reported that it took the courts more than 2 years on average to conclude a criminal case.

35 See in appendix Table XII-A: (J14) From your experience, on the average how long do contested criminal cases last in your court?
Figure 27: (L21) From your experience, on average, how long do contested criminal cases last in the court?

With respect to commercial cases, majority of judicial officers (36%) said it took less than 1 year to conclude such cases, while 25% said commercial cases took on average 1 to 2 years.\(^{36}\)

Again the experiences of lawyers were slightly less positive, with 37% saying that it took the courts on average more than two years to conclude a commercial cases, while 49% indicated that usually courts were able to resolve commercial cases within two years.

According to lawyers, the slowest courts in handling commercial cases are to be found in Delta and Rivers states.

\(^{36}\) See in appendix Table XIII-A: (J15) From your experience, on the average how long do contested commercial cases last in your court?
Contested civil cases were most time consuming, with 30% of the lawyers claiming that it took the courts 2 to 4 years to conclude such cases, while 32% indicated that on average courts took more than 4 years to resolve civil cases. Again lawyers in Delta and Rivers felt that the courts in their states faced the greatest challenges in the timely dispensation of justice.
3.4. Delays and their causes

Still on timeliness, stakeholders were asked whether in recent times they had experienced excessive delays in handling court cases and if so what had caused such delays.

The majority of stakeholders interviewed said that they had experienced excessive delays at some stage of the court proceedings during the last 12 months prior to the interview. More specifically, 51% of the judicial officers, 60% of the lawyers and 47% of prosecutors confirmed that they had experienced excessive delays during the last 12 months (in particular in Delta and Rivers –vis- à -vis Katsina- states).

37 The research questionnaires did not provide any definition of “excessive delay” and so it was left to the interpretation of the respondents.

38 See in appendix Figure 6-A: (J11) Have you experienced what you consider in your personal opinion excessive delay at any of the stages of court proceedings in the past 12 months?
On national average, the majority of judicial officers (61%) said that they had experienced excessive delays mainly during trial proceedings, followed by service of processes (7%) and commencement of trial (6%). Among the lawyers, 43% came across excessive delay at the trial proceedings, followed by commencement of trial (11%) and service of processes (8%). The prosecutors also confirmed these findings, with 33% indicating that they had encountered excessive delays during trial proceedings followed by service of processes (15%) and commencement or institution of charge or information (7%).

In conclusion, stakeholders were asked to identify the causes of such delays. Most of the judicial officers (43%) said that the main cause of excessive delays in court proceedings was ploy by parties, the request for unnecessary adjournments and interlocutory applications to protract the proceedings. Other causes of delays included the frequent absence of witnesses (25%) and cumbersome procedures (17%). At the same time weak management, unmotivated staff, lack of human resources as well as corruption were no significant factors in causing delays, according to the judicial officers, with the exception of Enugu and Katsina states where weak management was considered relevant, and Benue and Katsina states where judicial officers said the lack of human resources also contributed to delays.
Lawyers largely confirmed the causes of delays indicated by judicial officers. Also in their assessment the causes of delays were primarily linked to ploy by parties, cumbersome procedures and the absence of witnesses; 14% also emphasized weak management as one of the key factors causing delays. In the opinion of the prosecutors, weak management was the second most significant factor (after cumbersome procedures) causing excessive delays in the court process.
Furthermore, the study sought to assess the causes of frequent adjournments; more specifically whether they were caused by the absence of the parties, their legal representation, the prosecutor or the judicial officer. The majority of all stakeholder groups confirmed that they had experienced at least one adjournment caused by such absence during their last court case.39

Stakeholders mostly confirmed that adjournments were caused by the absence of the accused, the defendant, their lawyers or of a witness.40

Figure 33: (J10) If yes, which party in particular, the last it happened?41

Court users, prosecutors and lawyers were further asked whether in the course of the proceedings they had requested for an adjournment as a tactic for delay. While all of them categorically denied the use of such tactics, 49% of judicial officers felt that some requests for adjournments during their last case had been motivated by the desire to delay the proceedings.

39 See in appendix Figure 7-A: (J9) Concerning this last contested case, during the entire trial, was this case ever adjourned because of the absence of one party in the trial? & Figure 8-A: (P6) Concerning this last contested case, during the entire trial, was this case ever adjourned because of the absence of one party in the trial? & Figure 9-A: (L8) Concerning the last contested case, during the entire trial, was the case ever adjourned because of the absence of one party in the trial?

40 See in appendix Figure 10-A: (L9) If yes, which party in particular, the last time it happened? & Figure 11-A: (P7) If yes, which party in particular, the last time it happened?

41 See in appendix Figure 7-A: (J9) Concerning this last contested case, during the entire trial, was this case ever adjourned because of the absence of one party in the trial?
Figure 34: (CU13) During the course of this case, did you (or your lawyer) request an adjournment as a “tactic” for delay?

Figure 35: (J8) Concerning this last contested case, during the entire trial, did any of the parties ask for an adjournment, which in your opinion was a tactic for delay?
Finally, the study assessed the extent to which the court system is capable of handling its caseload, and if not how quickly the backlog of cases is increasing. For that purpose, judicial officers were asked how many cases they had been assigned during the past 12 months prior to the interview, and how many they had disposed of during the same period. On national average judicial officers were assigned a total of 74 cases per year, while they managed to dispose of 41 contested and 43 non contested cases. Overall, courts appear able to handle their individual case load\textsuperscript{42}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Figure36.png}
\caption{(J20-22) Back log}
\end{figure}

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & National Average & Anambra & Benue & Bornu & Delta & Enugu & FCT & Kaduna & Katsina & Lagos & Rivers \\
\hline
J22 - How many cases were assigned to you in the last 12 months? & 74 & 53 & 30 & 43 & 83 & 57 & 64 & 87 & 87 & 120 & 85 \\
J20 - How many contested cases did you conclude in the last 12 months? & 41 & 31 & 16 & 23 & 40 & 31 & 29 & 40 & 71 & 82 & 41 \\
J21 - How many non-contested cases did you conclude in the last 12 months? & 43 & 31 & 18 & 28 & 62 & 33 & 33 & 45 & 49 & 77 & 47 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{42} However, it would seem that the above responses provided by judicial officers do not correspond with the information provided by the high court registries of the 10 pilot states – see Table III: Average individual caseloads and clearance rates of judicial officers (judges and magistrates) during the time period 2002 to 2007.
CHAPTER 4. QUALITY OF JUSTICE DELIVERY

With a view to determining the quality of justice delivery the study sought to assess the consistency, coherence and predictability of judicial decision making as well as the technical capacities of courts and the professional preparedness of judicial officers to carry out their functions efficiently, effectively and in full compliance with the laws of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

4.1. Consistency and coherence of judicial decision-making

An important indicator of quality justice delivery is the degree to which decisions of the courts are consistent and coherent with previous judgments and existing legal jurisprudence. It is necessary that legal principles and decisions are predictable, so that citizens can rely on them in all their daily actions which may have legal implications as well as when using the courts to seek redress. Therefore, judicial officers, lawyers and prosecutors were asked to indicate the degree to which they considered judgments of courts during the last 12 months consistent with the laws of the land and relevant precedent. All stakeholders confirmed that judicial decision-making was usually in line with laws and jurisprudence, with stakeholders in Anambra state being the least confident in the consistency of judicial decision-making.

Figure 37: (L10) Do you consider the sentencing of the courts to be consistent with the law and jurisprudence during the last 12 months?
Figure 38: (P19) Do you consider the sentencing of the courts to be consistent with the law and jurisprudence during the last 12 months?

Anambra Benue Borno Delta Enugu FCT Kaduna Katsina Lagos Rivers

4.2. Access to working tools and materials

4.2.1. Access to legal resources and materials

A justice system can only produce quality outputs when the personnel have access to necessary working tools and materials. Therefore, judicial officers were asked whether, while preparing for the last case they had handled prior to the interview, they had made use of judicial resources, such as law reports, jurisprudence of higher courts, legal literature, sentencing guidelines, etc.

The majority of them (92%)\textsuperscript{43} said that they had made use of such resources, but it also turned out that 60% of those who used such materials had to rely on their personal libraries and sources, with the exception of judicial officers in Borno, Katsina and Kaduna states where a significant portion of the courts had been equipped with libraries.

\textsuperscript{43} See in appendix Figure 12-A: (J27) While preparing your last case, did you make used of judicial resources such as laws, jurisprudence of higher courts, legal literature sentencing guide lines?
Figure 39: (J28) How is/are these material(s) made available to you?

The same was true for the prosecutors, with 81% of them indicating that they had made use of judicial resources half of whom had to rely on their personal libraries.

Figure 40: (P21) How is/are these material(s) made available to you?

44 See in appendix Figure 13-A: (P20) While preparing your last case, did you make used of judicial resources such as laws, jurisprudence of higher courts, legal literature sentencing guidelines?
4.2.2. Availability and access to computers

The study assessed the access of judicial officers to information technology (IT) in particular Personal Computers (PCs). It turned out that only 28% of the respondents had a PC in their office of which a third had procured the equipment using their own means.

Figure 41: (J34) Do you have a computer in your office?

Figure 42: (J35) Who provided the computer?
4.3. Recordkeeping

Another indicator of quality for the institutions forming the justice system is their ability to establish, maintain and access case records.

4.3.1. Efficiency of record keeping

When asked to evaluate the efficiency of record keeping in the courts and in prosecutors’ offices, the majority of judicial officers (86%) and prosecutors (77%) indicated that the record keeping systems in their respective workplaces were efficient or very efficient. In particular, judicial officers and prosecutors in Lagos state commended the efficiency of record keeping in their workplaces.

Figure 43: (J57) In general how efficient is record keeping at your jurisdiction?

4.3.2. Ready access to case records

Moreover, when judicial officers and prosecutors were asked whether they had easy and ready access to court records, 92% of judicial officers45 and 87% of prosecutors responded affirmatively. Only in Benue and Delta states, more than 20% of the prosecutors claimed to have difficulties in accessing records in their respective offices.

---

45 Between 88% and 97%. See in appendix Figure 14-A: (J58) Do you have ready access to record of your court for the last 5 years?
Finally, as concerns the quality of record keeping, judicial officers, prosecutors and police were also asked whether during the last 12 months they had experienced any incident of a lost or misplaced court file. Roughly 10% of the respondents in all three stakeholder groups reported such an incident. In particular, for judicial officers in Anambra (27%) \(^{46}\), prosecutors in Borno state (25%) and police officers in Lagos state\(^ {47}\) felt that the record management systems in their respective workplaces faced challenges.

---

\(^{46}\) See in appendix Figure 15-A: (J59) Did you have any problem of lost/misplaced records in the last 12 months?

\(^{47}\) 42% of them indicated a problem of lost or misplaced case files in their station or division in the last 12 months.
4.4. Court and Human Resources Management

With a view to measuring the quality of internal management systems, judicial officers were also asked to what extent policies, guidelines and regulations in personnel and budget management were formalized in writing in their state judiciaries.

4.4.1. Policies, guidelines and regulations in personnel and budget management

The majority of the judicial officers interviewed (64%) said policies and guidelines on personnel management were usually or always communicated in writing, while only 26% claimed that this was seldom or never the case. In particular in Kaduna and Borno states the publication of policies, guidelines and regulations appeared to be less frequent.

![Figure 46: (J36) In your organization to what extent are guidelines/policies/regulations concerning personnel management formalized in writing?](image)

Similar findings were recorded among prosecutors, with half of the respondents confirming that policies, guidelines and regulations concerning personnel management were usually or always formalized in writing.

On national average, more than half of the judicial officers (54%) and 46% of the prosecutors said that policies and guidelines on budget management were usually or always formalized in writing. This was most frequently the case in Lagos and Katsina states, while in Delta, Kaduna, Benue and Borno states such policies seem less likely to be formalized in writing.

---

48 See in appendix Figure 16-A: (P29) In your organisation to what extent are guidelines/policies/regulations in personnel and budget management formalized in writing personnel management?
Figure 47: (J37) In your organization to what extent are guidelines/policies/regulations on budget management formalized in writing?

Figure 48: (P30) In your organization to what extent are guidelines/policies/regulations on budget management formalized in writing?
4.4.2. Training

Another key element of the quality of justice delivery is the level of continuing professional training vested on justice sector personnel with a view to promoting knowledge and skills as well as professional ethics and attitude.

Justice sector operators, therefore, were asked whether they had received any professional training during the last 12 months prior to the interview.

The findings differed significantly from state to state. While in some states (Anambra, Delta, Enugu and Kaduna) more than half of the judicial officers had not received any professional training in the course of the last 12 months prior to the interview, in other states like Borno and Lagos more than 90% of the respondents confirmed that they had received at least one training during the last 12 months.

Figure 49: (J85) Have you received any professional training during the last 12 months?

Most of the trained judicial officers (85%) were either satisfied or very satisfied with the training received, while only 4% were to some extent dissatisfied.
Figure 50: (J86) If you did, are you satisfied with the last training you received?

The responses received by prosecutors were similar, with more than 70% of the respondents in Lagos and Borno states having profited from some form of training during the last 12 months prior to the interview, while in Benue and Enugu states less, than a quarter of the prosecutors had received any training during the last 12 months prior to the interview.

Figure 51: (P79) Have you received any professional training during the last 12 months?

However, more than one third of those prosecutors who had participated in a training expressed some level of discontent concerning the quality and usefulness of such training (as opposed to the judicial officers).
4.4.3. Job satisfaction

Another factor contributing to the overall quality of justice delivery is the level of job satisfaction of the justice sector personnel. Judicial officers, prosecutors and police were therefore asked whether they were satisfied with the general working conditions, and whether they would accept another employment outside the justice sector if it would be offering better working conditions.

The findings generally showed that most justice sector personnel were not satisfied with their conditions of service at the time of interview. The majority of judicial officers (50%) said they were unsatisfied or very unsatisfied while only 27% said they were satisfied or very satisfied. 15% stated they were only somewhat satisfied. However, the findings differed significantly across the states; e.g. in Katsina, Borno and Lagos states the study found comparatively high levels of job satisfaction among judicial officers, with more than half of the respondents confirming that in general, they were satisfied or very satisfied with the working conditions. At the same time, the least satisfied judicial officers were to be found in Benue and Anambra states with roughly 90% stating their dissatisfaction with the working conditions.

Despite the low level of satisfaction with working conditions, most of the judicial officers (63%) said that they would not take another job outside the judiciary even if it would offer better working conditions; with the exception of Anambra and Enugu states where 77% and 51% of the respondents indicated that they would do so.
Figure 53: (J87) Are you satisfied with your general working conditions?

Figure 54: (J88) If you are offered a job outside the judiciary with better working conditions, would you accept the offer?

Also among prosecutors, the majority (65%) expressed their dissatisfaction with the working conditions, but unlike judicial officers, most of them (61%) indicated that they would take another job, if it would offer better working conditions.
Police showed much lower levels of job satisfaction than judicial officers or prosecutors, with 74% of police officers indicating that they were \textit{unsatisfied} or \textit{very unsatisfied} with their working conditions. However, stark differences could be found among police in the ten pilot states; e.g. police in Borno and Lagos states appeared to be more satisfied with their jobs than...
their colleagues elsewhere, with roughly a quarter of the respondents in those two states confirming that they were satisfied with their working conditions. Not surprisingly, the majority of police officers stated that they would accept another job, if it would offer better working conditions.

**Figure 57: (POL.52) Are you satisfied with your general working conditions?**

![Figure 57](image)

**Figure 58: (POL.53) If you had better working conditions outside the police, would you like to change your job?**

![Figure 58](image)
CHAPTER 5. INDEPENDENCE, IMPARTIALITY AND FAIRNESS OF THE COURTS

The level of independence of the judiciary from the executive and other political or extraneous influences is an important indicator of fairness and credibility within the justice system, including its preparedness to uphold basic human and civil rights.

5.1. Independence

In order to assess the independence of the judiciary in the surveyed states, different stakeholders were asked questions about their opinions as concerns the independence of the courts.

Judicial officers were asked whether, based on their experiences during the last 12 months prior to the interview, they would consider the courts as independent from the executive and political influence. The majority (47%) responded that this had been usually or always the case, while only 15% indicated that in their opinion the courts had never or seldom been independent during the past 12 months prior to the interview.

Figure 59: (J83) In these last twelve months, from your experience, do you consider the courts have been independent of the executive and other political influences?

However, lawyers and prosecutors were not as positive as their colleagues on the bench. Only 33% and 30% respectively believed that the courts had been independent during the past 12 months, while 50% of the lawyers and 45% of the prosecutors felt that the courts had been only sometimes independent. The most significant differences in perception can be observed in Benue state, where 60% of the judicial officers considered the courts as independent, while only 41% of the prosecutors and 28% of the lawyers shared their views.
Justice sector professionals were also asked to compare the independence of the courts with the situation of two years prior to the interview.

A very large majority of judicial officers (86%) said that the courts’ independence was better or even much better than in the past. Particularly positive were the judicial officers in the
FCT, Kaduna, Katsina and Rivers states with more than 90% of respondents sharing that view\(^{49}\).

This finding was also confirmed by lawyers and prosecutors with the respondents in both professions agreeing that the courts’ independence was better or much better than two years prior to the interview. Again lawyers in the FCT, Kaduna, Katsina and Rivers states were particularly positive concerning the overall improvements of judicial independence.

Figure 62: (P44) From your experience, how would you rate the independence of the court compared to two years ago?

\(^{49}\) See in appendix Figure 17-A. (J84) From your experience, how would you rate the independence of the court compared to two years ago?
Figure 63: (L39) From your experience, how would you rate the independence of the courts compared to two years ago?

Furthermore, justice sector operators were also asked about their opinions concerning judicial appointments, in particular whether they were aware of any such appointments during the last 12 months prior to the interview which had been politically inspired or otherwise been influenced by non-merit based considerations.

The majority of judicial officers interviewed (55%) said they were not aware of any such appointments, while only 8% claimed that indeed they were aware of judicial appointments having been influenced by politics. Only the respondents in Enugu state represented to some extent an exception, with more than 20% of the judicial officers indicating that they were aware of appointments during the last 12 months prior to the interview which had been politically inspired.

The prosecutors largely confirmed the opinions expressed by the judges with 53% of the respondents stating that they were not aware of any judicial appointments or promotions being influenced by politics, while 16% claimed to know about an appointment or a promotion which had been influenced by political considerations.
Figure 64: (J43) Are you aware of any judicial appointment/promotions that have occurred in the last 12 months in your jurisdiction, which have been politically inspired or influenced?

Figure 65: (P36) Are you aware of any judicial appointment/promotions that have occurred in the last 12 months in your jurisdiction, which have been politically inspired or influenced?
Among the lawyers 21% claimed that they were aware of judicial appointments or promotions during the last 12 months which in their view had been influenced by political considerations. In particular, lawyers in Anambra (38%), Benue (33%) and Delta (35%) expressed quite strong concerns about politically influenced appointments. On the other hand, lawyers in the FCT, Kaduna, Katsina and Lagos states held particularly positive views, with less than 10% of the respondents claiming that they were aware of judicial appointments which had been determined by non-merit based considerations.

Figure 66: (L40) Are you aware of any judicial appointment/promotions that have occurred in the last 12 months in your jurisdiction, which have been politically inspired or influenced?

5.2. Fairness and Impartiality

Stakeholders were interviewed about their perceptions of the fairness of the justice system. In particular, the study sought to assess the extent to which court users as well as other stakeholders felt that the courts are able to dispense justice and treat those who seek justice without regard to social and economic status, gender, religion and ethnicity.

For that purpose court users were asked whether, and to what extent, they agreed with the statement that the justice system worked only for the rich and powerful. Most of the respondents (42%) disagreed or completely disagreed with this statement, while only 22% agreed or completely agreed with the statement.

 Particularly critical concerning the fairness of the justice system were court users in Anambra and Rivers states, while those in Delta and Kaduna states held predominantly positive views.
Prisoners awaiting trial were more negative in their assessment. When asked whether they felt that they had been treated fairly during their time in remand, most of them (68%) said that this had not been the case. Particularly negative were the views expressed by prisoners awaiting trial in FCT, Enugu and Rivers states with more than 80% of the respondents complaining about having been treated unfairly, while those in Benue and Borno states seemed to feel treated fairly most of the times.

Figure 68: (PAT3) Do you feel that you have been treated fairly during your period in remand?
With a view to further assessing the impartiality of the courts, judicial officers were asked whether they were aware of any judgment of a court in their state during the last 12 months that had been influenced by non-merit based factors, such as politics, gender, ethnicity, religion, family or social ties or corruption. Most of the judicial officers said they were not aware of such judgments or decisions. The few (less than 3%) who held the opposite view, claimed to be aware of judgments having been influenced primarily by politics, family and social ties and corruption, while other factors, such as gender, ethnicity or religion had been of negligible relevance in their views. In particular, in Anambra and Enugu states, a comparatively larger group of judicial officers felt that politics and to a lesser extent family and social ties as well as corruption posed a threat to the impartiality of judicial decision-making.

Lawyers and prosecutors held more negative views yet confirmed that politics, family and social ties as well as corruption had been more relevant than other factors in influencing judicial decision-making. More specifically, 21% of the lawyers and 15% of the prosecutors claimed to have knowledge of a judgment during the last 12 months that had been influenced by politics or corruption, while 13% of the lawyers and 15% of the prosecutors confirmed the same being the case for family and social ties.

Figure 69: (L41–46) Are you aware of any judgment of the courts in your jurisdiction during the last 12 months that has been influenced by ...?

---

50 See in appendix Figure 18-A: (J44–49) Are you aware of any judgment of the courts in your jurisdiction in the last 12 months which have been influenced by ...?
Police officers were also asked whether they were aware of an investigation or decision during the last 12 months that had been influenced by any of the above mentioned factors. Again, they confirmed that politics, corruption and family and social ties were the most relevant factors influencing the impartiality also of the investigative process.

**Figure 71: (POL13-18) Are you aware of any judgment of the courts in your jurisdiction in the last 12 months which have been influenced by ...?**
CHAPTER 6. INTEGRITY, ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT

Corruption and other forms of misconduct within the judiciary threaten its independence, impartiality and fairness and undermine the rule of law—a key prerequisite for economic growth and the eradication of poverty. Corruption in the justice system does not only stifle efficiency and effectiveness, but also undermines the commitment of the personnel, and reduces public trust and confidence in the system. Effective protection of human rights and human security require a well-functioning judiciary, with integrity, that is capable of enforcing the law and administering justice in an equitable, efficient and predictable manner.

The survey, therefore, sought to assess the vulnerability of the justice system to corrupt practices as well as the effectiveness of the existing integrity safeguards and oversight mechanisms. In order to assess the nature of corruption in the justice sector, various stakeholders were asked questions about their perceptions and experiences with respect to the level, location, frequency and cost of corruption in the courts, the police and prosecution.

6.1. Perception of corruption in justice system

6.1.1. Perception of corruption in the courts

As concerns the general perception of corruption in the justice system, court users were asked to rate the level of corruption of the Nigeria’s justice system during the last 12 months prior to the interview. On national average, 30% of the respondents felt that the country’s justice system was *seldom* or *never* corrupt, while 19% were convinced that the justice system was *usually* or *always* corrupt. The majority of court users were undecided and stated that in their assessment the justice system was *sometimes* corrupt.

Particularly negative were the perception of court users in Rivers, Anambra and Benue states with 31% and 28% of respondents stating that they considered the country’s justice system to be *usually* or *always* corrupt. At the same time, court users in FCT were rather positive about the integrity of the justice system with the majority of respondents (53%) stating that the justice system was *seldom* or *never* corrupt.

Not so surprisingly, lawyers, prosecutors, police and judicial officers were more positive in their perception of the prevalence of corruption in the justice system. Only between 8 and 10% of the respondents in all four stakeholder groups felt that the justice system was *usually* or *always* corrupt, while 33% of the lawyers, 40% of the prosecutors, 43% of the police and 49% of the judicial officers stated that in their opinion the justice system had *never* or only *seldom* been corrupt during the last 12 months prior to the interview.
When comparing the results across states and stakeholder groups, it became evident that the views expressed were rather consistent. E.g. in FCT, 54% of the lawyers, 71% of the prosecutors, 72% of the police and 81% of judicial officers felt that the justice system had been either never or seldom corrupt.

Figure 73: (L51 In the last twelve months, do you believe that the justice system has been corrupt?
Figure 74: (P77) In the last twelve months, do you believe that the justice system has been corrupt?

Figure 75: (POL49) In the last twelve months, do you believe that the justice system has been corrupt?
Figure 76: (J81) In the last twelve months, do you believe that the justice system has been corrupt?

Stakeholders were further asked to compare the prevalence of corruption in the justice system at the time of the interview with the situation of two years prior to the interview.

All respondents concurred that the integrity of the justice system had improved significantly over the past two years. More specifically, 47% of the court users, 69% of the police, 81% of the prosecutors and an impressive 86% of the judicial officers felt that the level of corruption within the courts was better or much better than 2 years before. Across all stakeholder groups the most significant improvements occurred in the FCT as well as in Kaduna, Katsina, Lagos and Rivers states.

While stakeholders agreed that overall, the integrity in the courts and the justice system at large had improved, in some states the views expressed were slightly less positive. In particular in Anambra state where 13% of the lawyers, 27% of the court users, and 32% of the police officers felt that the prevalence of corruption had become worse or much worse in the course of the past two years. As concerns judicial officers, their views were even more positive than those of other stakeholders, with only 4% indicating that the corruption situation had deteriorated. A slight exception in this regard was Delta state, where 13% of the judicial officers interviewed felt that corruption had increased over the last two years.

51 See in appendix Figure 19-A: (POL50) From your experience, how would you rate the level of corruption of the courts compared to two years ago?
52 See in appendix Figure 20-A: (P78) From your experience, how would you rate the level of corruption of the courts compared to two years ago?
53 See in appendix Figure 21-A: (J82) From your experience, how would you rate the level of corruption of the courts compared to two years ago?
Figure 77: (CU34) From your experience, how would you rate the level of corruption in the courts compared to two years ago?

Figure 78: (L52) From your experience, how would you rate the level of corruption in the courts compared to two years ago?
6.1.2. Perception of corruption in the police

What applies to the courts seems also to be true for the police. Overall 68% of the police officers felt that the corruption situation had improved over the last two years prior to the interview, as compared to only 12% who indicated that in their opinion the prevalence of corrupt practices within the police had worsened.

Figure 79: From your experience, how would you consider the level of corruption in the police compared to two years ago?

6.2. Frequency of corruption

6.2.1. Frequency of bribe seeking behaviour

In order to ascertain the frequency of bribe-seeking behaviour of justice sector personnel, court users were asked whether during the last 12 months prior to the interview they had been approached for the payment of a bribe in order to expedite the court proceedings. A significant 81% said that no such request had been made, while only 2% claimed that they had been approached for the payment of a bribe when getting into contact with the courts. In particular, in the FCT and Benue state none of the court users admitted that they had been approached for the payment of a bribe during the last 12 months prior to the interview, while in Anambra state 7% admitted that they had encountered bribe-seeking behaviour\(^{54}\).

This finding was confirmed by prisoners awaiting trial, with a majority (80%) stating they had not been asked to pay a bribe during the last 12 months prior to the interview, while 12%

---

\(^{54}\) See in appendix Figure 22-A: In the last twelve months, have you been asked to give bribe or favour in order to expedite the court proceedings?
claimed that they had been approached with such requests. In particular, a significant number of prisoners awaiting trial in Borno (25%) and Anambra (15%) states claimed that they had been approached with a request for the payment of a bribe, while the lowest levels of such experiences were recorded among prisoners awaiting trial in the FCT (5%).

Figure 80: (PAT21) Have you been asked to pay a bribe in order to expedite the court proceedings in the last twelve months?

Courts users and prisoners awaiting trial who claimed that they had been approached for the payment of a bribe were also asked to indicate on how many occasions such requests had been made to them.

The assessment further explored the experiences of prosecutors. Again the majority of respondents indicated that they were not aware of any court user during the last 12 months who had been solicited for the payment of a bribe. Only 8% claimed that they were aware of such incidents55.

Quite different were the responses of judicial officers, with 23% of the respondents admitting that they were aware of cases of bribe-seeking behavior by justice sector professionals.

55 See in appendix Figure 23-A: (P59) Are you aware of court users being asked to pay a bribe in order to influence or expedite the court proceedings in the last twelve months?
Figure 81: (J63) Are you aware of court users (or their lawyers) being asked to pay a bribe in order to influence or expedite the court proceedings in the last twelve months?

The above finding was confirmed by 16% of the lawyers, who admitted to being aware of incidents during the last 12 months prior to the interview when their clients had been requested to pay a bribe in order to influence or expedite the court proceedings.

Figure 82: (L53) Are you aware of one of your clients (or you in his/her behalf) being asked to pay a bribe in order to influence or expedite the court proceedings in the last twelve months?
The highest prevalence of bribe seeking behaviors in the courts was reported by lawyers in Anambra, Delta and Rivers states (26-27%), while only 1% of the lawyers in Katsina state admitted to be aware of such an incident occurring during the last twelve months prior to the interview.

### 6.2.2. Frequency of court users offering bribes

In order to assess the supply side of bribery in the court system, court staff were interviewed about the frequency of bribes being offered to them. Only 5% of the court staff admitted that they had received such offers, with the highest frequency being registered in Enugu (15%) and in Borno states (10%).

Figure 83: (CS3) In the last twelve months, have you or any of your colleagues been offered a bribe in relation to a court proceeding?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Don't Know (%)</th>
<th>Don't Want to Answer (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National average</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.2.3. Frequency of bribery

In order to further assess the prevalence of bribery in the justice system, court users who had been approached for the payment of a bribe were asked to indicate whether they had accepted such requests. On national average, 7% said they had accepted *sometimes* to pay the bribe, while 5% said they *usually* or *always* had accepted to pay. However, the absolute majority of those who had been approached for the payment of a bribe, had refused to pay.

The percentage of those who had refused to pay a bribe differed significantly from state to state. In particular, in Katsina state, 33% of the respondents claimed that they had never given in to a request for a bribe, while 13% in Enugu state indicated that they had paid.
This finding was largely confirmed by lawyers, with 53% claiming that their clients did not pay bribes even when asked to do so. Again, according to lawyers, court users in Katsina state were most likely to turn down a request for a bribe, while those in Enugu state would most likely pay.
Similar was the response of prosecutors, with 80% confirming that, as far as they were aware, in most cases court users tend to refuse to pay bribes.\textsuperscript{56}

\section*{6.3. Context of bribe-seeking behaviour}

The study further attempted to assess at which stage of the court proceedings incidents of bribe-seeking behaviour were most likely to occur. Stakeholders were therefore asked to indicate which procedural stage in their experience was most vulnerable to bribery.

Judicial officers and lawyers\textsuperscript{57} concurred largely in their responses indicating that the last incidence of bribery they were aware of, had occurred either at the stage of the \textit{implementation of the bail order} or at the \textit{institution of the proceedings}.

Figure 86: (J64) If yes, at what stage the last time?

The experiences of justice sector professionals were essentially matched by those of prisoners awaiting trial – the majority of whom identified \textit{institution of proceedings} followed by \textit{implementation of bail order} as the procedural stages most vulnerable to corrupt practices\textsuperscript{58}.

\textsuperscript{56} See in appendix Figure 24-A: (P76) Are you aware whether these persons accepted to pay bribe?

\textsuperscript{57} See in appendix Table IX-A: (L54) If yes, at what stage the last time?

\textsuperscript{58} See in appendix Table X-A: (PAT 13) If yes, at what stage the last time?
6.4. Vulnerability of justice sector professionals to corrupt practices

The study sought to identify the actors participating in the corrupt transactions. For that purpose, stakeholders were asked in greater detail about the last case of bribery they either knew about or had been directly involved in.

6.4.1. Judicial officers

More specifically, court users and prisoners awaiting trial were asked by whom they had been approached for the payment of a bribe. Only 1.7% of the court users and 1% of the prisoners awaiting trial claimed that they had been asked to pay a bribe by/to a judicial officer. The highest prevalence of bribe-seeking behaviour by judicial officers was reported by court users (6.5%) and prisoners awaiting trial (5%) in Anambra state.

Figure 87: (CU37) In relation to this current case have you been asked to pay a bribe to a judge?

Judicial officers and lawyers largely confirmed these findings. When asked whether they were aware of a concrete case during the last 12 months prior to the interview of bribe-seeking behaviour of a judicial officer, only 2% of the judicial officers and 4% of the lawyers

59 See in appendix Figure 25-A: (PAT14) In relation with this current case have you (or your lawyer on your behalf) been asked to pay a bribe to a judge or magistrate?
responded affirmatively\textsuperscript{60}. Most affected, according to the respondents of both professions, were the judicial officers in Borno state, as well as in Enugu and Anambra states. It was also remarkable that 29\% of the lawyers in Benue state \– compared to only 7\% on national average \– refused to respond to this specific question.

Figure 88: (L55) In relation to the current cases you are dealing with, has your client been asked to pay a bribe to a judge?

\begin{figure}
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\end{figure}

6.4.2. Prosecutors

As concerns the prosecutors, 4.4\% of the court users\textsuperscript{61} and 8\% of the prisoners awaiting trial claimed that in relation to the current case for which they had come to court, they had been approached by a prosecutor for the payment of a bribe. A comparatively high prevalence of alleged bribe-seeking behaviour of prosecutors could be registered in Benue and Borno states, as well as in Anambra, Enugu and Delta states.

\textsuperscript{60} See in appendix Figure 26-A: (PAT14) Are you aware of any concrete case during the last twelve months in which the court user gave bribe to a judge?

\textsuperscript{61} See in appendix Figure 27-A: (CU40) In relation to this current case, have you been asked to pay a bribe to a prosecutor?
Figure 89: (PAT) In relation with this current case, have you (or your lawyer on your behalf) been asked to pay a bribe to a prosecutor?

These findings were mostly confirmed by lawyers. On national average, 13% of the lawyers claimed that they were aware of a recent case of bribe-seeking behaviour by a prosecutor. When comparing results across the states, it turned out that lawyers in Enugu, Anambra, Borno and Rivers states were most forthcoming in claiming to be aware of prosecutors soliciting bribes from court users.

Figure 90: (L58) In relation to the current cases you are dealing with, has your client been asked to pay a bribe to a prosecutor?
As concerns judicial officers, only 3% of the respondents admitted to being aware of bribe-seeking behavior of a prosecutor in the context of a current case, with judicial officers in FCT (6%) and in Delta (8%) state being most likely to report such incidents.\(^{62}\)

### 6.4.3. Police

Furthermore, court users and prisoners awaiting trial were asked to indicate whether in the context of the current case, they had been asked to pay a bribe to a police officer. It turned out that 13% of the court users and 20% of the prisoner awaiting trial claimed that they had been approached by a police officer for the payment of a bribe.

On average, the highest prevalence of corruption among police could be registered in Benue state with 67% of the prisoners awaiting trial and 22% of the court users claiming that they had been approached for the payment of a bribe. Also relatively high was the alleged court related police corruption in Delta, Anambra and Rivers states. The police in FCT, Katsina and Lagos, on the other hand, appeared to be considerably less affected by corrupt practices.

Figure 91: (CU43) In relation to this current case have you been asked to pay a bribe to a police officer?

\(^{62}\) See in appendix Figure 28-A: (J68) Are you aware of any concrete case during the last twelve months in which the court user gave bribe to a prosecutor?
Again, the findings were largely confirmed by lawyers and, to a lesser degree, by judicial officers. More specifically, 25% of the lawyers claimed to be aware of an incident of bribe-seeking behavior by a police officer in the context of a current case. In comparison, only 4% of the judicial officers\(^63\) were able to confirm such allegations.

Also 10% of police officers, who were asked whether they were aware of any situation during the last 12 months in which a court user, suspect or accused person gave a bribe to one of their colleagues, admitted that they knew of such incidents.

---

\(^63\) See in appendix **Figure 29-A:** Are you aware of any concrete case during the last twelve months in which a court user gave a bribe to a police officer?
6.4.4. Lawyers

By the nature of their work representing people in dispute or litigants in conflict with the law, lawyers are more susceptible to bribe-giving than to bribe-seeking behaviour. When court users were asked if they had been asked to pay a bribe to a lawyer in relation to the case for which they were in court on the date of the interview, the majority (82%) responded negatively, while only a marginal 2% said they had been asked to do so.

This was also the trend of the responses by other stakeholders to a similar question; e.g. only 1% of judicial officers, 2% of prosecutors (but 17% in Borno and 9% in Anambra states), 2% of prisoners awaiting trial, and 5% of police officers stated they had paid bribe to a lawyer or knew of a situation in which a court user had been asked to pay a bribe to a lawyer.64

---

64 See in appendix Figure 30-A: (PAT23) In relation with this current case, have you (or your lawyer on your behalf) been asked to pay a bribe to a lawyer? & Figure 31-A: (J74) Are you aware of any concrete case during the last twelve months in which a court user gave a bribe to a lawyer? & Figure 32-A: (L64) In relation to the current cases you are dealing with, has your client been asked to pay a bribe to a lawyer? & Figure 33-A: (POL47) Are you aware of any concrete case during the last twelve months in which a court user or suspect or accused person gave a bribe to a lawyer?
Figure 95: (CU46) In relation to this current case have you been asked to pay a bribe to a lawyer?

Figure 96: (P70) Are you aware of any concrete case during the last twelve months in which a court user paid a bribe to a lawyer?
6.4.5. Court staff

Concerning bribe-seeking behaviour of court staff, 13% of lawyers, 8% of court users and 6% of prosecutors claimed that court staff had requested the payment of a bribe from them in respect of the cases for which they were in court on the day of the interview, while only 3% of judicial officers\textsuperscript{65}, police and prisoners awaiting trial\textsuperscript{66} responded that they were aware of such incidents.

According to 28% of the lawyers and 23% of the court users, court staff in Rivers state were most susceptible to receiving bribes, while those in Katsina state appeared least likely to take bribes.

While prosecutors confirmed the low susceptibility of court staff in Katsina state to corrupt practices, they were most negative as concerns court staff in Borno state, with 42% indicating that they knew of a concrete case during the 12 months prior to the interview in which a court staff had accepted a bribe.

Figure 97: (CU49) In relation to this current case have you been asked to pay a bribe to a court staff?

\textsuperscript{65} See in appendix Figure 34-A: (J77) Are you aware of any concrete case during the last twelve months in which the court user gave bribe to a court staff?

\textsuperscript{66} See in appendix Figure 35-A: (PAT26) In relation with this current case, have you (or your lawyer on your behalf) been asked to pay a bribe to a court staff?
Figure 98: (L67) In relation to the current cases you are dealing with, has your client been asked to pay a bribe to a court staff?

Figure 99: (P73) Are you aware of any concrete case during the last twelve months in which a court user paid a bribe to a court staff?
6.4.6. Prison Staff

Finally, the study sought to assess the likelihood of prison staff engaging in bribe-seeking behaviour.

It turned out that 20% of prisoners awaiting trial claimed that they had been asked by a prison staff for the payment of a bribe. There were some significant differences across the states, with none of the prisoners awaiting trial in FCT admitting that they had been approached by a prison staff for the payment of a bribe, while 67% of those in Benue state claimed that this had been the case.

Figure 100: (PAT29) In relation with this current case, have you (or your lawyer on your behalf) been asked to pay a bribe to a prison staff?

![Bar graph showing the percentage of prisoners awaiting trial who were asked to pay a bribe in different states.]

Mostly prisoners awaiting trial had been requested to pay a bribe in order to receive better treatment in custody, while bribery was less frequent for the purpose of obtaining information concerning their court case or in the context of applying for bail.

6.5. Readiness of court users to engage in corruption

Court users were also asked whether they had actually paid a bribe when being asked to do so. Only 8% said that they had usually or always paid the bribe when requested, while 11% stated that they had paid sometimes and 15% said that they had seldom or never accepted to pay.
6.6. Accountability, integrity and oversight of the courts

In order to ascertain the highest levels of integrity and professionalism and to prevent, detect and respond effectively to all forms of misconduct, justice systems are normally equipped with a range of mechanisms aimed to enhance accountability, promote transparency, ensure quality service delivery and safeguard the integrity of its staff.

In order to assess the existing mechanisms, stakeholders were asked questions concerning the effectiveness of existing codes of conduct and the performance appraisal systems as well as the availability of mechanisms for receiving and dealing with complaints and the willingness of stakeholders to report corrupt practices.

6.6.1. Awareness of the code of conduct

Codes of conducts and similar tools for promoting integrity, independence, fairness, impartiality, professionalism and other values in the justice sector will only be effective if they are properly disseminated, the officers concerned are aware and understand their content, and they are being held accountable for their compliance with these codes.

In order to assess the efficacy and relevance of the codes, stakeholders were asked whether they were aware of the existence of such codes, they were available to them as well as to other stakeholders and whether they felt professionals within the justice sector were held accountable for their compliance with these codes.
The level of awareness of the code of judicial conduct was rather high among all justice sector professionals. More specifically, 93% of judicial officers, 89% of the lawyers and 80% of the prosecutors were aware of the existence of the code of judicial conduct.

Figure 102: (J60) Are you aware of the existence of a code of judicial conduct?

![Bar chart showing awareness of the code of judicial conduct by state.]

The same was true for lawyers, as concerns the professional standards for legal practitioners, with 93% of the respondents indicating that they were aware of these rules.

Figure 103: (L31) Are you aware of the existence of a code of conduct for lawyers?

![Bar chart showing awareness of the code of conduct for lawyers by state.]

See in appendix Figure 36-A: (L32) Are you aware of the existence of a code of conduct for judicial officers?
Police officers were also mostly aware of the existence of a code of conduct applicable to them. Particularly high was the level of awareness among police officers in Anambra, Benue, Borno and Rivers states, while those in the FCT and Kaduna appeared comparatively unaware of the existence of a code of conduct applicable to them.

Figure 104: (POL30) Are you aware of the existence of a code of conduct for the police?

6.6.2. Availability of the code of conduct

Though 93% of judicial officers knew about the code of judicial conduct, not everybody seemed to have obtained a copy of the code. On national average, 11% of the judicial officers claimed that they had not received a copy of the code. In particular, in Enugu and Delta states as well as in the FCT the code of conduct does not appear available to many judicial officers, while in Lagos, Kaduna and Benue states almost all judicial officers seemed to have obtained a copy of the code.
However, in order to be effectively held accountable to the code of conduct, the code must not only be available to the judicial officers but also the users of the courts.

Lawyers and prosecutors were therefore asked whether the code of judicial conduct had been made available to court users in the courts where they usually practiced. Mostly this was not the case, with 72% of the lawyers and 81% of the prosecutors indicating that court users did not have access to the code of judicial conduct.

Figure 106: (L33) In the court where you mainly practice, is the code of conduct for judicial officers made available to court users?
The study further explored the availability and practical relevance of the code of conduct for police officers. Most police officers (83%) stated that they had received a copy of the code. Moreover, when police officers were asked if citizens had access to the code at the police stations, 33% responded affirmatively.

Figure 107: (POL31) If yes, in the police or post where you usually work now, is the code of conduct made available to the police personnel?

Figure 108: (POL33) In the police or post where you usually work now, is the code of conduct made available to the public?
6.6.2. Complaints mechanisms and their use

6.6.2.1. Court users, Prisoners awaiting trial, lawyers

The assessment further sought to explore the effectiveness and credibility of complaints mechanisms in the eyes of courts users, prisoners awaiting trial and lawyers.

For that purpose, the court users, who had admitted that they had been approached for the payment of a bribe, were asked whether they had filed a complaint. The majority – 84% of those who had received requests for bribes during the last 12 months - stated that they had *seldom* or *never* complained, while only 2% of the court users stated that they had filed a complaint *usually* or *always*.

Figure 109: (CU54) Did you complain about the request to give bribe to the competent authorities?

These findings were largely confirmed by lawyers, with only 4% indicating that they were aware of an incident in which one of their clients had chosen to report the bribe seeking behaviour.
Figure 110: (L71) Did your client report the request of bribe to the competent authorities?

Mostly such reports were made to the police or the judiciary, with quite a number of court users taking advantage of the anonymous complaints boxes where they existed. Only a small portion of those who filed a complaint, addressed these to the EFCC or the Media.

Table VIII (L72) If you reported, how did he complain?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Report to the judicial authorities</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to police</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to prosecutor</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to EFCC</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used the anonymous complain box in the court</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report to the press</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/specify</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked why they did not file a complaint, 42% indicated that they did not do so because of their fear of violent retaliation, or because they doubted that the authorities would do anything about the complaint (19%). Another 14% also said that they feared to lose the case if they should chose to complain. Only 8% indicated that they had refrained from complaining because they believed the competent authorities were corrupt themselves.

Court users in Lagos (74%) and Delta (71%) states were particularly concerned about violent retaliation, while court users in FCT (40%) feared most that they might be losing the case as a consequence of filing a complaint. In Borno (44%) and Rivers (58%) states, the majority of the court users were concerned that the authorities would not take any action even if they would file a complaint. In Katsina state, 31% of the court users claimed that they felt discouraged from complaining because they perceived the authorities themselves were corrupt.

Figure 111: (CU56) When you did not report the request of the bribe, why did you not?

The reasons given by prisoners awaiting trial corresponded mostly to those given by court users, with 42% indicating that they did not do so because of their fear of violent retaliation and 20% being concerned that they might lose their case as a consequence of filing a complaint.
Figure 112: (PAT36) When you did not report the request of the bribe, why did you not?

![Bar chart showing reasons for not reporting bribe requests across different states.]

The views of lawyers differed to some extent, as they felt that the main reason for not filing a complaint was the concern that the authorities would not do anything about the complaint.

Table IX (L73) If he did not report the request of the bribe, why did he not?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fear of violent retaliation</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear of losing the case</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>You asked to pay the bribe</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorities are corrupt</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorities would not do anything about it</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, Specify</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows the percentage distribution of the reasons for not reporting bribe requests in different states, with the national average and individual state percentages.
6.6.2.2. Judicial officers

Only 15% of judicial officers interviewed were aware of a complaint against a judge during the last 12 months. When comparing the results across states, it became evident that the awareness of complaints was higher in Borno, FCT and Rivers states, which suggests also greater transparency in the way in which complaints are being handled in these jurisdictions.

Figure 113: (J54) Has any person(s) in your jurisdiction complained against a judge in the last twelve months?

Judicial officers were further asked whether the complaint, as far as they knew, had been investigated. On national average, 83% of the respondents indicated that this had been the case. Particularly high was the awareness of investigations in Borno, Enugu and Kaduna states, while considerably less judicial officers seemed to know whether the complaint had been investigated in Benue and Katsina states.
Figure 114: (J55) Was this complaint investigated by the competent authorities in your jurisdiction?

Furthermore, judicial officers were interviewed about the outcomes of the investigations. As it turned out, the majority of complaints had been found unjustified (57%). In those cases, where the complaints had merit, the most frequent sanction was the removal of the judge, followed by his or her relocation to another duty station or his or her suspension. In 17% of the cases, the final decision was still pending. Particularly high was the number of pending cases in Benue and Katsina states.

Figure 115: (J56) If yes, what was the outcome of the investigation or inquiry?
6.6.2.3. Prosecutors

Roughly a third of the prosecutors (29%) were aware of a complaint against one of their colleagues during the last 12 months.

In Anambra state the awareness of such complaints was comparatively high, while in Lagos state hardly any of the prosecutors were aware of such complaints.

Figure 116: (P48) Has any citizen formally complained against a prosecutor in your office or the court where you practice during the last twelve months?

Figure 117: (P49) Was the case investigated by the competent authorities?
As concerns the outcome of investigations, according to most of the prosecutors (28%) the complaint had been found to be unjustified. In particular high was the number of prosecutors who were found innocent in Anambra (54%) and Katsina (40%) states.

Figure 118: (P50) If yes, what was the outcome of the complaint?

6.6.2.4. Police

Complaints against police appeared to be more frequent, with 42% of the police officers indicating that they were aware of such complaints. More complaints against police were received in Enugu, Anambra and Delta states, while the least number of complaints were registered in Katsina and Borno states.

In 33% of the cases, according to police officers interviewed, the complaints had been investigated, and had been found without merit. In 36% of the cases, the police officer had been found culpable and was sanctioned. The most frequently used sanction was a transfer, followed by a reprimand and a suspension. There were stark differences among states when it came to finding the officer culpable of the alleged wrongful behaviour.

In Borno and Delta states in roughly half of the cases the complaint was found to have no merit, while in FCT only 6% of the cases were without merit. In the FCT there were no pending cases of which the police officers interviewed knew. This could suggest that the disciplinary process is dealt with more swiftly in the FCT than in the rest of the country.
Table X (POL29) If yes, what was the outcome of the complaint?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Description</th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No outcome/still pending</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police officer was not sanctioned because the complain</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police was reprimanded and continued his/her activity</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police officer was suspended</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police officer was moved to other police duties</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The police was removed from the police force</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.6.3. Performance Evaluation

Stakeholders were further interviewed about their opinions and experiences concerning the performance evaluation system.

Most judicial officers interviewed (47%) stated their job performance was formally *quarterly*, while 37% and 7% were evaluated *annually* and *bi-annually*. Only 3% of judicial officers had *never* been formally evaluated68.

Judicial officers in Enugu, FCT, Benue and Rivers states appeared to have been evaluated the most regularly. In Delta and Borno states it appeared that there were quite a number of judicial officers who had been either never or very seldom evaluated in the course of their careers.

---

68 It is likely, that these 3% represent judicial officers who have been called to the bench only shortly before the interview and therefore had not yet been evaluated.
The performance of prosecutors was less frequently evaluated. The majority of prosecutors (71%) stated they were formally evaluated *once a year*, while 7% indicated that they had never been evaluated during the course of their career. Prosecutors in Katsina state appeared to be evaluated the least regularly.
As concerns performance evaluation in the police, 65% of the officers interviewed confirmed that they were evaluated formally once a year, while 8% indicated that they had never been evaluated by the time of the interview.

Figure 121: (POL24) How frequently is your performance formally evaluated in writing?

![Performance Evaluation Frequency Chart]

In the eyes of the judicial officers (88%), the evaluation methodology applied covered all relevant issues, including the quality of judgments, procedural matters as well as the timeliness with which cases were disposed of. Other issues considered in the formal performance evaluation included administrative matters (72%), professional and ethical conduct (71%), as well as court-users’ complaints (65%). As a matter of fact when reviewing the responses, it would appear that the current performance evaluation system applies a balanced and holistic approach which takes into account a host of criteria.

However, it is noteworthy that on several occasions69 during the last years judicial officers expressed their dissatisfaction with the performance evaluation system which in their mind overemphasized quantitative over qualitative evaluation criteria. In particular, they criticized the performance evaluation system for relying too heavily on the number of judgments completed by an individual judge without taking into account the complexity of the respective case, the quality of legal drafting or other more qualitative criteria.

---

69 All Nigerian Judges Conference in November 2007, the focus group discussions conducted in the context of the state integrity meetings in Anambra, Benue, Enugu, FCT, Kaduna and Rivers, as well as the 4th and the 5th Meetings of the Working Group on Judicial Integrity and Capacity held under the auspices of the National Judicial Institute in April 2008 and in February 2009
Prosecutors’ performance evaluation primarily focuses on substantive, procedural and administrative aspects, while less attention was given to issues relating to professional conduct and ethics as well as court-users’ complaints.

Figure 123: (P46) Which criteria are considered in the context of your performance evaluation?
The performance evaluation system for police officers appeared to focus primarily on administrative matters followed by disciplinary issues, while citizens’ complaints did not play any significant role in the context of the evaluation according to the respondents.

Figure 124: (POL25) Which criteria are considered in the context of your performance evaluation?

With a view to assessing the effectiveness of the performance appraisal system, some of the stakeholders were also asked about the consequences of poor performance. Among the prosecutors, 34% were aware of a case during the last 12 months in which one of their colleagues had been reprimanded for poor performance.
Figure 125: (P47) In these last twelve months, has anyone in your organization been officially reprimanded for poor performance?

Similarly, the responses of the police officers that only 31% of the respondents were aware of a case during the last 12 months in which one of their colleagues had been reprimanded for poor performance.

Figure 126: (P26) In these last twelve months, has anyone in your division or station been officially reprimanded for poor performance?
CHAPTER 7. COORDINATION AND COOPERATION ACROSS THE JUSTICE SECTOR

The level coordination and cooperation among agencies involved in the administration of justice is an indicator of the efficiency and effectiveness of the justice system. When interrelated agencies such as the courts, prosecutors, police, prison, the bar, etc operate in isolation of each other and without proper coordination they risk that they work on cross purposes and undermine the overall effectiveness and impact of the justice system as a whole.

In order to assess the level of coordination and cooperation, stakeholders were asked to indicate what levels of cooperation they received from each other and to evaluate the functionality of the institutional and legal mechanisms that have been created to facilitate system-wide coordination and cooperation.

7.1. Evaluation of quality of coordination and cooperation

As concerns internal coordination and cooperation, all stakeholder groups confirmed that they received rather good cooperation from their respective colleagues. Most of the judicial officers interviewed (94%) indicated that the coordination that existed among judicial officers in the last 12 months prior to the interview was good or very good\(^{70}\).

7.1.1. Judicial officers and Prosecutors

Both judicial officers as well as prosecutors generally evaluated the cooperation they received from each other positively. The majority of judicial officers interviewed (81%) stated that coordination between them and prosecutors in the last 12 months prior to the interview had been good or very good.

Judicial officers in Katsina and Lagos states evaluated their cooperation with the prosecutors most positively, while those in Anambra and Delta States were most critical of the coordination and cooperation they received from the prosecutors.

This finding was confirmed by prosecutors, with 82% stating that their coordination with judicial officers in the last 12 months prior to the interview had been good or very good. Particularly, in FCT and Lagos state, prosecutors evaluated the cooperation received from the judiciary as positive.

\(^{70}\) See in appendix Figure 37-A: (J38) Please rate the coordination you have experienced with other judicial officers these last twelve months
Figure 127: (J39) Please rate the cooperation you have received from prosecutors during the last twelve months.

Figure 128: (P31) Please rate the cooperation you have received from judicial officers during the last twelve months.
7.1.2. Judicial officers and Lawyers

On coordination between the bar and bench, 95% of the judicial officers stated that their coordination with lawyers during the last 12 months had been good or very good. Lawyers mostly agreed with this finding, with 86% stating that coordination between them and judicial officers had been good or very good.

Figure 129: (J42) Please rate the cooperation you have received from lawyers during the last twelve months

Figure 130: (L47) Please rate the cooperation you have received from judicial officers during the last twelve months

Particularly in Katsina and Kaduna states, lawyers registered confirmation of highly
impressive bar-bench coordination, according to the lawyers, while those in Enugu and Lagos states indicated less impressive rate.

7.1.3. Judicial officers and Police

On the rate of coordination between the judiciary and the police, 68% of judicial officers stated that their coordination with police had been *good* or *very good* during the last 12 months prior to the interview, while 13% rated coordination as *poor* or *very poor*.

Figure 131: (J40) Please rate the cooperation you have received from the police during the last twelve months

![Bar chart showing cooperation ratings](chart.png)

However, the majority of police officers interviewed (83%) had a more positive opinion concerning their cooperation with the judiciary, stating that coordination between them and the judiciary had been *good* or *very good*, while only 8% stated it had been *somewhat poor*, and *poor* or *very poor*.

Particularly positive were the findings among police in Borno and Katsina states, while police officers in Lagos and Anambra states rated coordination with the judiciary comparatively low.
7.1.4. Prosecutors and Lawyers

As concerns the cooperation between prosecutors and lawyers, the majority of prosecutors interviewed (84%) stated that their coordination with lawyers had been good or very good. Particularly positive were prosecutors in FCT and Lagos state, while those in Anambra and Kaduna states were least impressed with the cooperation they received from the lawyers.

Figure 133: (P32) Please rate the cooperation you have received from lawyers during the last twelve months
It appeared, however, that lawyers were less positive about their cooperation with prosecutors, with only 64% stating that it had been good or very good, while 36% felt that coordination had been somewhat poor, poor or very poor.

Figure 134: (L48) Please rate the cooperation you have received from prosecutors during the last twelve months

![Graph showing cooperation ratings]

7.1.5. Prosecutors and Police

As concerns the cooperation between prosecutors and the police, the majority of police officers (74%) indicated that it had been good or very good.

Most of the prosecutors (79%) confirmed these findings, stating that the coordination between them and the police had been good or very good.
Moreover, with regard to cooperation between police and lawyers, 74% of police officers interviewed in the survey stated that their coordination with lawyers during the last 12 months prior to the interview had been good or very good.

However, the lawyers were not as positive concerning their coordination with the police and other law enforcement agencies. The majority of the lawyers (57%) stated that their cooperation with the police had been very poor, poor or somewhat poor. Only 42% said police-lawyer coordination had been good or very good.

Particularly negative about their coordination with police were lawyers in Enugu, Delta and Lagos states.
Figure 136: (POL20) Please rate the cooperation you have received from lawyers during the last twelve months.

Figure 137: (L49) Please rate the cooperation you have received from the police during the last twelve months.
7.1.7. Court staff

Similarly, stakeholders were asked to rate the level of cooperation that they received from court staff during the last 12 months prior to the interview. The findings showed that the majority of judicial officers (92%), prosecutors (88%), police (88%) and lawyers (84%) felt that the level of cooperation they had received from court staff had been good or very good.

Figure 138: (J41) Please rate the cooperation you have received from court staff during the last twelve months

![Chart showing cooperation ratings from 0% to 100%]

Figure 139: (P34) Please rate the cooperation you have received from court staff during the last twelve months

![Chart showing cooperation ratings from 0% to 100%]
Figure 140: (L50) Please rate the cooperation you have received from court staff during the last twelve months

![Bar chart showing cooperation ratings for different states.

Figure 141: (POL22) Please rate the coordination you have experienced with court staff during these last twelve months

![Bar chart showing coordination ratings for different states.]
7.1.8. Prison staff

Finally the study also explored the level of cooperation being provided by prison personnel. For that purpose prosecutors and police officers were asked to evaluate their coordination with court staff. It turned out that on the national average most of the prosecutors (85%) and police officers (73%) stated that their coordination with prison staff had been *good* or *very good* during the 12 months prior to the interviews.

Figure 142: (P35) Please rate the coordination you have experienced with prison staff during these last twelve months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>very poor</strong></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>poor</strong></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>somewhat poor</strong></td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>good</strong></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>very good</strong></td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2. Functionality of the criminal justice committees

With a view to enhancing coordination and cooperation across the criminal justice system, states have established criminal justice committees or administration of justice committees. These committees have been established by law and are composed of the heads of agencies and institutions involved in the administration of justice at state level for the purpose of exchanging information, identifying common challenges and joint policy making. Thus, stakeholders were asked about their awareness of the existence and work of these committees and to evaluate their effectiveness.

7.2.1. Awareness of criminal justice committees

As concerns the level of awareness of existence of criminal justice committees, a very significant portion among all respondents stated that they were *not* aware of such mechanism.
More specifically, only 51% of judicial officers, 49% of prosecutors, 44% of lawyers and 34% of police officers said that they knew of the existence of criminal justice committees in their respective states.

Figure 143: (J30 L34 P22 POL36) Are you aware of any forum or committee in your state that coordinates the criminal justice institutions (criminal justice/administration of justice committee?)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Judicial Officer</th>
<th>Prosecutors</th>
<th>Lawyers</th>
<th>Police</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7.2.2. Participation in the meetings of the criminal justice committees

Those respondents who said that they were aware of the existence of criminal justice committees and administration of justice committees, were further asked whether they had participated in such committees or forum.

Among judges, more than half of the respondents (57%) had participated in such forum, while prosecutors, lawyers and police had mostly not taken part in the meetings of such committees or forum.
Stakeholders who were aware of the criminal justice or administration of justice committees were also asked to evaluate their relevance.

Figure 145: (J32) If yes, how would you rate relevance of such forum or committee

7.2.3. Evaluation of relevance of the criminal justice committees

Stakeholders who were aware of the criminal justice or administration of justice committees were also asked to evaluate their relevance.
The findings showed that majority of the judicial officers (77%), lawyers (64%)\(^{71}\), prosecutors (45%) and police officers (53%) stated that the committee or forum had been useful or very useful in coordinating criminal justice institutions. However, as the same time, a considerable number of stakeholders – 22% of judicial officers and 52% of prosecutors - agreed that these mechanisms needed improvement.

**Figure 146:** (P26) If yes, how would you rate relevance of such forum or committee

![Image of Figure 146]

**Figure 147:** (POL38) If yes, how would you rate relevance of such forum or committee

![Image of Figure 147]

\(^{71}\) See in appendix Figure 39-A: (L36) If yes, how would you rate relevance of such forum or committee
7.2.4. Effectiveness of the criminal justice committees

The study sought also to establish if the decisions of these committees or forum had any impact on the criminal justice administration at state level. Therefore, stakeholders were asked whether to their knowledge, the decisions taken by such committee or forum were usually implemented.

Roughly a third of both judicial officers and prosecutors, as well as more than half of the police did not know whether these decisions had been implemented. At the same time 48% of the judicial officers, 25% of the lawyers and 54% of the prosecutors and 25% of police officers indicated that only some of the decisions had been implanted\textsuperscript{72}.

Figure 148: (J33) Are you aware whether the decisions taken by such forum or committee are usually implemented?

\textsuperscript{72} See in appendix Figure 40-A: (L37) Are you aware whether the decisions taken by such forum or committee are usually implemented? & Figure 41-A: (POL40) Are you aware of the outcome of the last decision of such forum or committee in terms of improvements of the work of the police or of the courts?
Figure 149: (P25) Are you aware whether the decisions taken by such forum or committee are usually implemented?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None have been</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some decisions</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most or all the</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 150: (POL39) Are you aware whether the decisions taken by such forum or committee are usually implemented?
CHAPTER 8. PUBLIC TRUST

The degree of public trust in the justice system was measured by the level of confidence which court users had in the system, as well as their readiness to use the courts in order to defend their rights and settle their disputes.

8.1. Confidence in the courts

In order to assess the confidence of the Nigerian public in the justice system, court users were asked about their perception concerning the ability of Nigeria’s justice system in the last two years prior to the interview to punish criminals and to protect households from crime.

The majority of the respondents (57%) stated that the justice system had only sometimes been able to punish criminals and protect households from crime, while 28% stated that the justice system had usually or always provided such protection. Only 15% of the respondents were of the opinion that the justice system had never or seldom been able to punish criminals and to protect households from crime during the last two years prior to the interview.

Particularly, court users in FCT (49%), Borno and Katsina (39%) had positive perceptions of the justice system, while those in Rivers (32%) were more doubtful concerning the ability of the justice system to punish criminals and protect households from crime.

Figure 151: (CU29) Do you think the justice system has been able to punish criminals and protect households from crime in the last two years?
Court users in FCT (49%), Borno and Katsina states (39%) had more positive perceptions of the justice system, while those in Rivers state (32%) were more doubtful concerning the ability of the justice system to punish criminals and protect households from crime.73

Figure 152: (CU30) From your experience, how would you rate the ability of the courts to punish criminals and protect households compared to two years ago?

Prisoners awaiting trial were also asked about their confidence in the courts. Most of the respondents (43%) stated that the justice system had been unable to protect civil rights including contract and property rights, while 21% shared a positive view in this regard.

When asked to compare the situation at the time of interview with the situation of two years prior to the interview, 42% of the prisoners awaiting trial stated that the situation had improved, while 24% said that the situation had deteriorated.

---

73 Court users were also asked to rate the ability of the courts to uphold civil rights including contract and property rights as compared to two years prior to the interview. Again, 46% felt that the ability of the courts in this regard had improved, while only 5% felt that the situation had deteriorated as compared to years prior to the interview. Figure 42-A: (CU32) From your experience, how would you rate the ability of the courts to uphold your civil rights, including contract and property rights compared to two years ago?
Figure 153: (PAT38) Are you confident that the justice system has been able to uphold your civil rights, including contract and property rights in this last 12 months?

![Bar chart showing responses to the question about confidence in the justice system. The chart includes data for different states and shows the percentage of respondents falling into each category: Never, Seldom, Sometimes, Usually, and Always.]

- Never: 29% in Anambra, 25% in Benue, 44% in Borno, 43% in Delta, 27% in Emugu, 25% in FCT, 10% in Kaduna, 37% in Katsina, 33% in Lagos, 43% in Rivers.
- Seldom: 14% in Anambra, 19% in Benue, 5% in Borno, 4% in Delta, 15% in Emugu, 16% in FCT, 15% in Kaduna, 13% in Katsina, 0% in Lagos, 36% in Rivers.
- Sometimes: 36% in Anambra, 45% in Benue, 35% in Borno, 32% in Delta, 46% in Emugu, 38% in FCT, 20% in Kaduna, 33% in Katsina, 45% in Lagos, 19% in Rivers.
- Usually: 13% in Anambra, 11% in Benue, 15% in Borno, 18% in Delta, 8% in Emugu, 9% in FCT, 20% in Kaduna, 11% in Katsina, 12% in Lagos, 19% in Rivers.
- Always: 8% in Anambra, 0% in Benue, 1% in Borno, 3% in Delta, 4% in Emugu, 12% in FCT, 35% in Kaduna, 6% in Katsina, 10% in Lagos, 4% in Rivers.

Figure 154: (PAT39) From your experience, how would you consider the ability of the courts to uphold your civil rights compared to two years ago?

![Bar chart showing responses to the question about the change in the ability of the courts to uphold civil rights. The chart includes data for different states and shows the percentage of respondents falling into each category: Much worse, Worse, The same, Better, and Much better.]

- Much worse: 9% in Anambra, 26% in Benue, 12% in Borno, 0% in Delta, 6% in Emugu, 3% in FCT, 0% in Kaduna, 16% in Katsina, 14% in Lagos, 6% in Rivers.
- Worse: 15% in Anambra, 23% in Benue, 20% in Borno, 30% in Delta, 18% in Emugu, 20% in FCT, 0% in Kaduna, 14% in Katsina, 4% in Lagos, 3% in Rivers.
- The same: 35% in Anambra, 26% in Benue, 49% in Borno, 30% in Delta, 56% in Emugu, 33% in FCT, 21% in Kaduna, 41% in Katsina, 11% in Lagos, 32% in Rivers.
- Better: 38% in Anambra, 23% in Benue, 15% in Borno, 40% in Delta, 20% in Emugu, 37% in FCT, 68% in Kaduna, 29% in Katsina, 68% in Lagos, 52% in Rivers.
- Much better: 3% in Anambra, 2% in Benue, 4% in Borno, 0% in Delta, 0% in Emugu, 7% in FCT, 11% in Kaduna, 0% in Katsina, 3% in Lagos, 7% in Rivers.
8.2. Readiness to use the courts

An indicator of the public trust in the justice system is the readiness of the citizens to use the court for the settlement of their dispute, to seek redress when they become victims of crime or to defend any of their basic rights in confront with the state authorities. Thus, the study sought to assess the readiness of court users to use the courts in the past as well as their willingness to use them again in the future.

More specifically, court users were asked to indicate whether during the last two years prior to the interview they or someone in their household had felt the need to use the court system but decided not to do so. On national average, 36% of the respondents said there had been such instances. Particularly, court users in Katsina state and FCT indicated their readiness to use the courts in the past, while those in Anambra and Benue states were most frequent in stating that they had refrained from using the courts in the past.

Figure 155: (CU57) During the past two years, have you or someone in your household felt the need to use the court system, but decided not to do so?

As concerns the reasons why they had decided not to use the courts, the majority of respondents stated that it was because the courts were too slow (35%), too expensive (27%) or too corrupt (11%). Only 7% and 4% of the respondents respectively did not use the courts because they thought that the courts were not fair or independent or were incompetent.
Court users were also asked to indicate whether, based on their experiences with the courts at the time of the interview, they would use the courts again to solve future disputes or defend their rights. A third of the respondents stated they would not use the courts again. In particular, court users in Rivers (40%), Benue (37%) and Enugu state (36%) indicated that they would not use the courts again, while those in Borno (82%), Lagos and FCT (76%) appeared most inclined to also use the courts in the future in order to resolve their disputes or defend their rights.
Based on your experience; do you think you would use the courts again to solve future disputes or problems?

As concerns the reasons why they would not use the courts again, the majority of respondents felt that the courts were too slow (50%), too expensive (19%) or too corrupt (12%).

If not, please specify the main reason (just one)?
CHAPTER 9. RESPONDENTS’ PROFILE

9.1. Court users

A total of 2,373 court users were interviewed, representing 23.7% of total survey samples. All court users were interviewed within the court premises.

Typically on the day of the interview, they were attending court sessions or were in the court premises for courtroom-related matters such as filing processes, obtaining information from the registry about their cases etc.

On the national average, most of the court users interviewed (73%) were males. More female court users were interviewed in Borno (41%) than in other states.

Figure 159: (CU60) Gender

The average age of court users interviewed was 35 years.
Most of the court users interviewed (37%) had university or tertiary education qualification, while only 7% had no formal education.
On average, 29% of the court users interviewed were plaintiffs, 22% were witnesses, 21% were defendants in criminal cases and 7% were victims of crime.

Figure 162: (CU2) In what capacity are you in the court today?

Mostly respondents were attending general civil cases (30%), followed by criminal cases (26%) and family cases (23%). Only 11% were in court for commercial cases.

Figure 163: (CU1) What is the nature of the case that brought you to court today?
9.2. Prisoner awaiting trial

A total of 479 prisoners were interviewed representing 4.8% of the total survey samples. All respondents in this category were either awaiting the commencement or the beginning of their respective trial.

Most of the respondents were interviewed while attending court, while a smaller portion was interviewed on the court premises. Very few (1%) were interviewed at the police stations.74

Most of the prisoners awaiting trial were males, with only 38 of them or 8% being female.

The average age of prisoners awaiting trial interviewed was 29 years. Only 6% of them were above 40 years and 7% were less than 20 years old. None of the respondents was under the age of 18.

---

74 Accused persons already arraigned in court but detained in police custody waiting to be tried or sent to prison premises for remand were classified under this category.
Mostly prisoners awaiting trial had completed secondary school (45%), while 20% had tertiary education and 10% had no formal education at all.

The average monthly household income of the prisoners awaiting trial interviewed was less than N45.000, with only Rivers state recording an average income of almost than N58.000.
Most prisoners awaiting trial (32%) had been charged with robbery, 15% were charged with stealing, 10% with homicide, 4% with rape or sexual assault, and 2% with drug related offences.

### 9.3. Lawyers

A total of 2,101 lawyers were interviewed, representing 21% of the total sample. They comprised 1,617 males (77%) and 484 females (23%).
The majority of the lawyers interviewed (48%) were aged between 31 and 40 years, and only 4% were older than 60 years.

The majority of lawyers (74%) held a university first degree, while 25% held post graduate degrees.

Figure 169: (L90) What is your highest level of education?

On average, lawyers had been 7 years in legal practice by the time of the interview, with 37% of the respondents indicating that they had less than 5 years of experience in legal practice, and 14% that they had more than 15 years experience in legal practice.

Almost all the lawyers interviewed (94%) practiced at the high courts of the states or of the FCT, 82% at the federal high court, and 91% at the magistrates court. 45% practiced at the Sharia courts. The majority of lawyers (80%) handled primarily criminal cases.

As concerns income, lawyers estimated to have an average monthly income of around N110,000. There were, however, some very stark differences among states, with lawyers in Delta, Lagos, FCT and Rivers earning significantly more than their colleagues in the other pilot states.

Only 3 of the 9 states and FCT have Sharia courts (Bornu, Kaduna and Katsina states).
9.4. Judicial officers

A total of 1,481 judicial officers were interviewed in all the pilot states, representing 14.8% of the total sample. The largest group among them was the magistrates (32%) while only 1% were judges of customary court of appeal. Justices of the Supreme Court or the Court of Appeal were not interviewed for the purpose of this study.

Table XI (J) Types of court of the judicial officers interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of court of the judicial officers interviewed</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Number interviewed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Federal High Court</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Court of the States/FCT</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Customary Court of Appeal of the States/FCT</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Sharia Court of Appeal of the State/FCT</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magistrate Court</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customary Court</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharia Court</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Court</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g. Rent tribunal, retired judges, etc)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1,481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the judicial officers were men (75%), mostly between 41 and 50 years old. The best gender balance among judicial officers was found in Lagos and Delta states, while Katsina, Benue and Kaduna states are far from achieving gender balance within their respective judiciaries.

Figure 171: (J103) Gender
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 172: (J102) Age
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Average Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of those interviewed, 54% held a law degree while 43% held post-graduate degrees. Only 3% held a secondary level education\textsuperscript{76}.

Figure 173: (J104) What is your highest level of education?

On national average, judicial officers had served 10 years on the bench, with 23% of the respondents indicating that they had less than 5 years on the bench.

Figure 174: (J2) How many years have you been on the bench?

\textsuperscript{76} Judges of the customary courts and Sharia courts are lay judges, and do not necessarily hold a tertiary degree. In some states, the presiding customary court judge must have legal training or tertiary education qualification.
Mostly judicial officers had been serving in their current function for less than five years (53%), while only 14% had been presiding over the same court for more than ten years.

Figure 175: (J3) How many years have you been presiding over this court?

9.5. Prosecutors

A total of 480 prosecutors were interviewed, representing 4.8% of the total survey samples. Only 13% of them were females. On average, prosecutors were between 30 and 40 years old.

Figure 176: (P97) Gender
On national average, 65% of the prosecutors had a tertiary education, and 8% held a postgraduate qualification.

On average, prosecutors claimed to have monthly income of roughly N58,000. However, there are some stark differences among states, with prosecutors in Delta and Enugu states, in particular, earning significantly more than their colleagues in the other pilot states.
The national average of time the prosecutors interviewed had been on the job was 7 years, with majority (81%) working as prosecutors between 6 and 10 years and only 9% for more than 10 years.

Primarily, prosecutors (95%) practiced at the magistrate courts and to a slightly lesser degree, at the high courts (84%). Where existent, prosecutors also appear in front of area courts (55%), Sharia courts or customary courts (51%). Roughly a third of the prosecutors had also appeared in front of the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court. The majority of the respondents had between 1 and 5 years of professional experience as prosecutors and only 2% had more than 15 years of experience.
9.6. Court staff

A total of 1,397 court staff were interviewed, representing 14% of the total survey sample. Almost half of the court staff interviewed were female (42%). The average age of court staff was 35 years.

Figure 181: (CS21) Gender

Figure 182: (CS20) Age

49% of court staff interviewed had university or tertiary education qualification, and 10% lower than secondary education. The national average of income was less than N22,000.
At the time of the interview, 31.7% of the court staff were working in the court room, 29% in the registry, 18% worked as support staff (secretaries or orderlies) to judicial officers, and 8.5% were bailiffs or worked within the sheriff’s office.
9.7. Police personnel

A total of 1,457 police personnel were interviewed, representing 14.5% of total respondents, 22% of whom are females, with more female police staff interviewed in Lagos (53%) than in other states. The average age of police respondents was 33 years old. 10% of those interviewed had supervisory or command responsibilities. 34% were on administrative duties in the police stations, and 33% were on operations. The ranks of those interviewed ranged from commissioned officers exercising supervisory roles, to operational, investigating and administration junior personnel.
Majority of police staff interviewed (58%) had secondary education, while 4% held a postgraduate qualification.

The average monthly income of police officers was less than N53,000.
On average respondents had been serving in the Nigerian Police Force for 10 years by the time of the interview.
APPENDIX

METHODOLOGY

Table I-A: Sample sizes of the states

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/N</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Population (2003 NPC estimate)</th>
<th>Population (NPC 2006 census)</th>
<th>Sample sizes per state</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Total pop.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>3,972,265</td>
<td>2,174,641</td>
<td>4,182,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>3910620</td>
<td>2,164,058</td>
<td>4,219,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>1801138</td>
<td>2,161,157</td>
<td>4,151,193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>3,679,674</td>
<td>2,074,306</td>
<td>4,098,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>2,240,326</td>
<td>1,624,202</td>
<td>3,257,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>527,946</td>
<td>740,489</td>
<td>1,405,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>5,590,366</td>
<td>3,112,028</td>
<td>6,066,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>2,665,577</td>
<td>2,978,682</td>
<td>5,792,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>8,132,267</td>
<td>4,678,020</td>
<td>9,013,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>3,060,576</td>
<td>2,710,665</td>
<td>5,185,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>35,580,775</td>
<td>47,371,433</td>
<td>98,181</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II-A: Returned sample sizes per state and categories of stakeholders interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>samples collected</th>
<th>Judicial officers</th>
<th>Lawyers</th>
<th>Prosecutors</th>
<th>Court staff</th>
<th>Court users</th>
<th>Police</th>
<th>Prisoners (ATP)</th>
<th>valid samples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>1116</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>1109</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>1044</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>690</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>682</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>1581</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>314</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>749</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>2023</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>1481</td>
<td>2101</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td>2373</td>
<td>1457</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>9818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of total samples:

- Judicial officers: 14.8%
- Lawyers: 21%
- Prosecutors: 4.8%
- Court staff: 14.5%
- Court users: 23.7%
- Police: 14.6%
- Prisoners (ATP): 4.8%
Table III-A: Number of questions by categories of respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of respondents</th>
<th>No. of questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judicial officers</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutors</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Staff</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court users</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police personnel</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prisoners awaiting trial</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table IV-A: Field researchers per state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S/No</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>No of Field Researchers</th>
<th>No of field supervisors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 1. BACKGROUND

Figure 1-A: Distribution of numbers and types of staff

Figure 2-A: Distribution of the Categories of staff
### Table V-A: Cases filed and disposed of per court staff in 2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>No of court staff</th>
<th>Cases filed at high court per court staff</th>
<th>Cases concluded at the high court per court staff</th>
<th>Cases filed at the magistrates court per court staff</th>
<th>Cases concluded at the magistrate court per court staff</th>
<th>No of Court-room staff</th>
<th>No of non-court-room staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>1264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>1361</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>3292</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2412</td>
<td>880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.C.T</td>
<td>2627</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>732</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>1729</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>1480</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>875</td>
<td>605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>1546</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>1777</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table VI-A: Number of cases filed in the High Court Registries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>3,243</td>
<td>3131</td>
<td>2726</td>
<td>2874</td>
<td>2257</td>
<td>1435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>5,354</td>
<td>5709</td>
<td>6375</td>
<td>6820</td>
<td>7445</td>
<td>8729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>1885</td>
<td>2867</td>
<td>2317</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.C.T</td>
<td>2806</td>
<td>2551</td>
<td>5444</td>
<td>3716</td>
<td>6249</td>
<td>4224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>2,895</td>
<td>3,207</td>
<td>1,915</td>
<td>6,202</td>
<td>4,931</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>1,749</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>2,624</td>
<td>1,912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>7731</td>
<td>7385</td>
<td>6,381</td>
<td>6,321</td>
<td>6746</td>
<td>6005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>4,111</td>
<td>5142</td>
<td>4087</td>
<td>2507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>2756</td>
<td>2924</td>
<td>2966</td>
<td>3512</td>
<td>3716</td>
<td>2880</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table VII-A: Number of cases disposed at the High Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>2551</td>
<td>1785</td>
<td>1346</td>
<td>3595</td>
<td>2187</td>
<td>1158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>4991</td>
<td>5145</td>
<td>5409</td>
<td>5946</td>
<td>6629</td>
<td>7458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>2453</td>
<td>1748</td>
<td>1853</td>
<td>1741</td>
<td>407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.C.T</td>
<td>2369</td>
<td>2690</td>
<td>2533</td>
<td>2906</td>
<td>3343</td>
<td>3839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>3,016</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>4,303</td>
<td>2,824</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>2544</td>
<td>2801</td>
<td>2551</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2347</td>
<td>3325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>2,222</td>
<td>3283</td>
<td>3758</td>
<td>4318</td>
<td>4500</td>
<td>2829</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Average</strong></td>
<td>1954</td>
<td>2259</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2546</td>
<td>2427</td>
<td>2205</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table VIII-A: Cases filed in the Magistrate Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>8287</td>
<td>5145</td>
<td>5106</td>
<td>3568</td>
<td>3216</td>
<td>1686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1989</td>
<td>2169</td>
<td>2482</td>
<td>2613</td>
<td>2819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>5010</td>
<td>5321</td>
<td>5712</td>
<td>6352</td>
<td>6858</td>
<td>7113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>3897</td>
<td>3052</td>
<td>2825</td>
<td>2136</td>
<td>1058</td>
<td>1468</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.C.T</td>
<td>7890</td>
<td>9109</td>
<td>7496</td>
<td>10513</td>
<td>12528</td>
<td>11614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>27,171</td>
<td>17,665</td>
<td>9,760</td>
<td>4,418</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>3,548</td>
<td>3,722</td>
<td>5801</td>
<td>8,775</td>
<td>12,502</td>
<td>11,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>1240</td>
<td>4156</td>
<td>4827</td>
<td>5601</td>
<td>5672</td>
<td>4962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>5506</td>
<td>5742</td>
<td>7098</td>
<td>5658</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Average</strong></td>
<td>6596</td>
<td>5608</td>
<td>4942</td>
<td>5009</td>
<td>5503</td>
<td>5235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table IX-A: Cases disposed by the Magistrate Court

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>7075</td>
<td>5640</td>
<td>4277</td>
<td>3215</td>
<td>3799</td>
<td>1576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>816</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>4682</td>
<td>4996</td>
<td>5333</td>
<td>5846</td>
<td>6314</td>
<td>6844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>4908</td>
<td>2489</td>
<td>2567</td>
<td>2085</td>
<td>1268</td>
<td>1117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.C.T</td>
<td>6480</td>
<td>7906</td>
<td>5461</td>
<td>6083</td>
<td>9840</td>
<td>14313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>14,599</td>
<td>19,700</td>
<td>12,702</td>
<td>6,781</td>
<td>4,980</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>2,426</td>
<td>2,773</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>922</td>
<td>3,257</td>
<td>8,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>1160</td>
<td>1952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3923</td>
<td>4174</td>
<td>4255</td>
<td>4136</td>
<td>4700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Average</strong></td>
<td>4940</td>
<td>4873</td>
<td>3703</td>
<td>3095</td>
<td>3580</td>
<td>4387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## CHAPTER 2. ACCESS TO JUSTICE

Table X-A: (PAT11) If yes, from whom did you receive such information?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Court staff</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prison staff</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family/friends</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge/ magistrate</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecutor</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your lawyer</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None you knew it</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before arrest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other prisoners</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 3. TIMELINESS OF JUSTICE DELIVERY

Table XI-A: (J23) From your experience, in the last 12 months do you consider the courts have been quick in concluding cases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3-A: (P15) In the last 12 months, from your experience, do you consider the court has been quick in handling cases?
Figure 4-A: (J24) From your experience, how would you rate the timeliness of the courts compared to two years ago?

Figure 5-A: (P16) From your experience, how would you rate the timeliness of the courts compared to two years ago?
Table XII-A: (J14) From your experience, on the average how long do contested criminal cases last in your court?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>River</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 month</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 and 12 months</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 years</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 4 yrs</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t handle such cases</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table XIII-A: (J15) From your experience, on the average how long do contested commercial cases last in your court?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>River</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 6 month</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 and 12 months</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 2 years</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 to 4 years</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 4 yrs</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t handle such cases</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6-A: (J11) Have you experienced what you consider in your personal opinion excessive delay at any of the stages of court proceedings in the past 12 months?

![Bar chart showing percentage of respondents experiencing excessive delay in court proceedings across various states.]

- National Average: 51% yes, 49% no
- Anambra: 51% yes, 49% no
- Benue: 30% yes, 70% no
- Borno: 68% yes, 32% no
- Delta: 30% yes, 70% no
- Enugu: 60% yes, 40% no
- FCT: 45% yes, 55% no
- Kaduna: 21% yes, 79% no
- Katsina: 52% yes, 48% no
- Lagos: 52% yes, 48% no
- Rivers: 67% yes, 33% no

Figure 7-A: (J9) Concerning this last contested case, during the entire trial, was this case ever adjourned because of the absence of one party in the trial?

![Bar chart showing percentage of respondents who had their cases adjourned due to party absence.]

- National Average: 64% yes, 36% no
- Anambra: 76% yes, 24% no
- Benue: 41% yes, 59% no
- Borno: 42% yes, 58% no
- Delta: 74% yes, 26% no
- Enugu: 79% yes, 21% no
- FCT: 78% yes, 22% no
- Kaduna: 55% yes, 45% no
- Katsina: 59% yes, 41% no
- Lagos: 66% yes, 34% no
- Rivers: 74% yes, 26% no
Figure 8-A: (P6) Concerning this last contested case, during the entire trial, was this case ever adjourned because of the absence of one party in the trial?

Figure 9-A: (L8) Concerning the last contested case, during the entire trial, was the case ever adjourned because of the absence of one party in the trial?
Figure 10-A: (L9) If yes, which party in particular, the last time it happened?

Figure 11-A: (P7) If yes, which party in particular, the last time it happened?
CHAPTER 4. QUALITY OF JUSTICE DELIVERY

Figure 12-A: (J27) While preparing your last case, did you make use of judicial resources such as laws, jurisprudence of higher courts, legal literature sentencing guidelines?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 13-A: (P20) While preparing your last case, did you make use of judicial resources such as laws, jurisprudence of higher courts, legal literature sentencing guidelines?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Average</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anambra</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benue</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borno</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enugu</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCT</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaduna</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katsina</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lagos</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 14-A: (J58) Do you have ready access to record of your court for the last 5 years?

Figure 15-A: (J59) Did you have any problem of lost or misplaced court records in the last twelve months?
Figure 16-A: (P29) In your organization to what extent are guidelines/policies/regulations in personnel and budget management formalized in writing personnel management?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>never</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seldom</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sometimes</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>usually</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>always</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5. INDEPENDENCE, IMPARTIALITY AND FAIRNESS OF THE COURTS

Figure 17-A: (J84) From your experience, how would you rate the independence of the court compared to two years ago?

Figure 18-A: (J44-49) Are you aware of any judgment of the courts in your jurisdiction in the last 12 months which have been influenced by ...?
CHAPTER 6. INTEGRITY, ACCOUNTABILITY AND OVERSIGHT

Figure 19-A: (POL50) From your experience, how would you rate the level of corruption of the courts compared to two years ago?

![Graph showing percentage of respondents rating the level of corruption in the courts]

Figure 20-A: (P78) From your experience, how would you rate the level of corruption of the courts compared to two years ago?

![Graph showing percentage of respondents rating the level of corruption in the courts]
Figure 21-A: (J82) From your experience, how would you rate the level of corruption of the courts compared to two years ago?

![Bar chart showing the level of corruption comparison](chart1.png)

- National Average
  - Much worse: 1%
  - Worse: 3%
  - The same: 10%
  - Better: 55%
  - Much better: 31%

- Anambra
  - Much worse: 0%
  - Worse: 2%
  - The same: 9%
  - Better: 32%
  - Much better: 5%

- Benue
  - Much worse: 0%
  - Worse: 0%
  - The same: 6%
  - Better: 67%
  - Much better: 22%

- Borno
  - Much worse: 6%
  - Worse: 10%
  - The same: 5%
  - Better: 1%
  - Much better: 22%

- Delta
  - Much worse: 3%
  - Worse: 3%
  - The same: 22%
  - Better: 55%
  - Much better: 36%

- Enugu
  - Much worse: 0%
  - Worse: 2%
  - The same: 0%
  - Better: 60%
  - Much better: 25%

- FCT
  - Much worse: 1%
  - Worse: 2%
  - The same: 0%
  - Better: 86%
  - Much better: 4%

- Kaduna
  - Much worse: 0%
  - Worse: 1%
  - The same: 0%
  - Better: 86%
  - Much better: 55%

- Katsina
  - Much worse: 1%
  - Worse: 2%
  - The same: 1%
  - Better: 43%
  - Much better: 8%

- Lagos
  - Much worse: 0%
  - Worse: 1%
  - The same: 0%
  - Better: 55%
  - Much better: 35%

- Rivers
  - Much worse: 0%
  - Worse: 1%
  - The same: 0%
  - Better: 50%
  - Much better: 50%

Figure 22-A: (CU35) In the last twelve months, have you been asked to give a bribe or favour in order to expedite the court proceedings?

![Bar chart showing the frequency of bribe requests](chart2.png)

- National Average
  - Yes: 2%
  - No: 81%
  - Don't know: 11%
  - Don't want to answer: 6%

- Anambra
  - Yes: 7%
  - No: 85%
  - Don't know: 11%
  - Don't want to answer: 4%

- Benue
  - Yes: 0%
  - No: 91%
  - Don't know: 1%
  - Don't want to answer: 7%

- Borno
  - Yes: 3%
  - No: 84%
  - Don't know: 1%
  - Don't want to answer: 5%

- Delta
  - Yes: 2%
  - No: 86%
  - Don't know: 5%
  - Don't want to answer: 3%

- Enugu
  - Yes: 1%
  - No: 93%
  - Don't know: 13%
  - Don't want to answer: 12%

- FCT
  - Yes: 0%
  - No: 75%
  - Don't know: 13%
  - Don't want to answer: 13%

- Kaduna
  - Yes: 1%
  - No: 85%
  - Don't know: 21%
  - Don't want to answer: 14%

- Katsina
  - Yes: 1%
  - No: 77%
  - Don't know: 13%
  - Don't want to answer: 21%

- Lagos
  - Yes: 1%
  - No: 74%
  - Don't know: 13%
  - Don't want to answer: 14%

- Rivers
  - Yes: 1%
  - No: 74%
  - Don't know: 13%
  - Don't want to answer: 14%
Figure 23-A: (P59) Are you aware of court users being asked to pay a bribe in order to influence or expedite the court proceedings in the last twelve months?

Figure 24-A: (P76) Are you aware whether these persons accepted to pay bribe?
### Table IX-A: (L54) If yes, at what stage the last time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Proceedings</th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution of proceedings</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue of summon on defendant</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service of summon on defendant</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery of documents</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogatories</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of bail order</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues of summon on witness</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services of summon on witness</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement of trial</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial proceedings</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of judgment</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining copy of judgment</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obtaining certified copy of proceedings</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transmission of court record to appeal court</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution of judgment</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table X-A: (PAT 13) If yes, at what stage the last time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage of Proceedings</th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institution of Proceedings</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue of summons on defendants</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogatories</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of bail order</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement of trial</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trial proceedings</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery of judgment</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Execution of judgment</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 25-A: (PAT14) In relation with this current case have you (or your lawyer on your behalf) been asked to pay a bribe to a judge or magistrate?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dont know</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dont want to answer</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 26-A: (PAT14) Are you aware of any concrete case during the last twelve months in which the court user gave bribe to a judge?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dont know</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dont want to answer</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 27-A: (CU40) In relation to this current case, have you been asked to pay a bribe to a prosecutor?

Figure 28-A: (J68) Are you aware of any concrete case during the last twelve months in which the court user gave bribe to a prosecutor?
Figure 29-A: (J71) Are you aware of any concrete case during the last twelve months in which a court user gave a bribe to a police officer?

Figure 30-A: (PAT23) In relation with this current case, have you (or your lawyer on your behalf) been asked to pay a bribe to a lawyer?
Figure 31-A: (J74) Are you aware of any concrete case during the last twelve months in which a court user gave a bribe to a lawyer?

Figure 32-A: (L64) In relation to the current cases you are dealing with, has your client been asked to pay a bribe to a lawyer?
Figure 33-A: (POL47) Are you aware of any concrete case during the last twelve months in which a court user or suspect or accused person gave a bribe to a lawyer?

Figure 34-A: (J77) Are you aware of any concrete case during the last twelve months in which the court user gave bribe to a court staff?
Figure 35-A: (PAT26) In relation with this current case, have you (or your lawyer on your behalf) been asked to pay a bribe to a court staff?

Figure 36-A: (L32) Are you aware of the existence of a code of conduct for judicial officers?
CHAPTER 7. COORDINATION AND COOPERATION ACROSS THE JUSTICE SECTOR

Figure 37-A: (J38) Please rate the coordination you have experienced with other judicial officers these last twelve months

![Chart showing ratings of coordination with other judicial officers across states.](image)

Figure 38-A: (POL21) Please rate the coordination you have experienced with police and other law enforcement officers during these last twelve months

![Chart showing ratings of coordination with police and law enforcement officers across states.](image)
Figure 39-A: (L36) If yes, how would you rate relevance of such forum or committee?

![Bar chart showing responses to the question about relevance of forums or committees.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>National Average</th>
<th>Anambra</th>
<th>Benue</th>
<th>Borno</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>Enugu</th>
<th>FCT</th>
<th>Kaduna</th>
<th>Katsina</th>
<th>Lagos</th>
<th>Rivers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>totally useless</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useless</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>need improvement</td>
<td>25%</td>
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Figure 40-A: (L37) Are you aware whether the decisions taken by such forum or committee are usually implemented?
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Figure 41-A: (POL40) Are you aware of the outcome of the last decision of such forum or committee in terms of improvements of the work of the police or of the courts?

Figure 42-A: (CU32) From your experience, how would you rate the ability of the courts to uphold your civil rights, including contract and property rights compared to two years ago?
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