THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA

IN THE CONSTITUTIONAL COURT OF UGANDA AT KAMPALA

CONSTITUTIONAL PETITION NO. 29 OF 2025

1. **OBBO OLOGE GIDEON**
2. **EPAJU PIUS**
3. **AHIMBISIBWE ASIIMWE DAVID::. PETITIONERS**
4. **ETUKET DAVID**
5. **BETTY KASIMBAZI**
6. **ORODRIYO JESCA**

VERSUS

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL::: RESPONDENT

REJOINDER TO THE RESPONDENT'S CONFERENCING NOTES

These conferencing notes are filed in Rejoinder to the conferencing notes filed by the Respondent on 13th July, 2026. The petitioners reiterate their earlier submissions in support of this Petition. The Petitioners further respond to the Respondent's Conferencing Notes as hereunder:

The Petition seeks to interpret Article 254(2) of the Constitution against Regulations 5 and 6 of the Pensions Regulations enacted under Section 68(1)(c) of the Public Service Pensions Fund Act, 2025, formerly the Pensions Act Cap 89.

ISSUE ONE

Whether the Petition raises any question requiring constitutional interpretation.

The Petitioners do not dispute the settled principle that this Honourable Court's jurisdiction under Article 137 of the Constitution is confined to matters involving interpretation of the Constitution. However, the Respondent's contention that the present Petition does not raise a question requiring constitutional interpretation is misconceived.

As demonstrated in the Petitioners' Conferencing Notes, the instant Petition falls squarely within the jurisdiction of this Honourable Court under Article 137(3) of the Constitution. The Petition invokes both limbs of Article 137(3).

The Petitioners invoke Article 137(3)(a) by challenging the constitutional validity of Regulations 5 and 6 of the Pensions Regulations on the ground that they are inconsistent with Article 254(2) of the Constitution insofar as they restrict periodic pension reviews exclusively to inflation-based adjustments while excluding other relevant economic factors, including salary enhancements enjoyed by serving public officers.

The Petitioners further invokes Article 137(3)(b) by challenging the acts and omissions of the Government in failing and/or refusing to review and adjust the Petitioners' pensions to reflect prevailing salary enhancements and other relevant economic realities. The Petitioners contend that such acts and omissions are inconsistent with and contravene **Articles 20, 21, 45 and 254(2) of the Constitution.**

As previously submitted, for the interpretative jurisdiction of this Honourable Court to be properly invoked, it is not sufficient merely to allege a constitutional violation. The Petition must demonstrate that the determination of the dispute depends wholly or substantially upon the interpretation of the Constitution.

Under paragraphs 19, 20 and 21 of the Petition, the Petitioners demonstrate that there exists a real controversy regarding the proper interpretation of Article 254(2) of the Constitution, as evidenced by the conflicting legal opinions issued by Government legal authorities over time. Whereas earlier opinions issued by the Attorney General and the Deputy Solicitor General affirmed that Article 254(2) and the relevant provisions of the Pensions Regulations were intended to take into account salary enhancements for serving officers, subsequent opinions asserted that pension adjustments are limited solely to inflationary changes. ***See Annexures marked "K" and "M" attached to the Petition***

The Petitioners contend that these inconsistent official legal positions reveal a genuine dispute regarding the meaning, scope and intended application of Article 254(2) of the Constitution. The controversy is neither hypothetical nor academic. It concerns the constitutional standard governing pension reviews and has directly affected the Petitioners' constitutional rights.

Further, the Respondent's interpretation of **Article 274 of the Constitution** on existing law is misleading. The Respondent argues that the duty to construe existing law under **Article 274** belongs to Parliament is not supported by the wording of the Article itself. **Article 274(1)** provides that existing law "shall be construed with such modifications, adaptations, qualifications and exceptions as may be necessary to bring it into conformity with this Constitution." The provision does not state that Parliament shall be the authority responsible for such construction. Rather, it establishes a constitutional requirement that all existing law must operate consistently with the Constitution.

The Petitioners submit that the duty of this Honourable Court is to interpret and apply legislation in conformity with the Constitution. This duty arises from the supremacy of the Constitution under **Article 2** and the mandate of this Honourable Court under **Article 137(3)(a) and (b)** to determine whether any Act of Parliament or any other law, act or omission is inconsistent with or in contravention of the Constitution.

The Petitioners do not dispute that the Pensions Act, having been enacted prior to the promulgation of the 1995 Constitution, constitutes "existing law" within the meaning of Article 274. However, the legal consequence of Article 274 is not to preserve or insulate pre-Constitution legislation from constitutional scrutiny; rather, it imposes a mandatory constitutional obligation that such legislation must be construed with such modifications, adaptations, qualifications and exceptions as may be necessary to bring it into conformity with the Constitution.

The scope of **Article 274** was explained by the Supreme Court, and reaffirmed in **Aboneka Micheal v Attorney General Constitutional Petition No. 35 of 2021**, where the Court held:

> ***"This Court's role is to interpret the 1995 Constitution and pronounce itself on whether any provisions of the law, whether existing law or not, challenged in a Petition are inconsistent with cited provisions of the Constitution. Article 274 serves its own purpose, too, which is to provide a quick remedy for trial or appellate Courts, when deciding a specific case, to construe existing laws in conformity with the 1995 Constitution and avoid application of existing laws in an unconstitutional manner."***

The Supreme Court further illustrated the scope of Article 274 by referring to the decision of **Osotraco Ltd v Attorney General, High Court Civil Suit No. 1380 of 1986**, where the High Court construed section 15(1)(b) of the Government Proceedings Act consistently with constitutional guarantees instead of applying it in an unconstitutional manner. Therefore, the decision demonstrates that **Article 274** is an interpretive mechanism designed to prevent unconstitutional application of existing legislation. It does not prevent this Honourable Court from declaring legislation inconsistent with the Constitution where such inconsistency exists.

Consequently, if the interpretation of the Regulations 5, 6 and 7 is inconsistent with Article 254(2), this Honourable Court is constitutionally obliged to construee these impugned regulations so as to bring them into conformity with Articles 2, 20,21, 45 and 254(2) of the Constitution.

The Petitioners therefore submit that Article 274 reinforces, rather than undermines, the present Petition. It requires this Honourable Court to ensure that the Pensions Act and Regulations 5, 6 and 7 of the Pensions Regulations are interpreted and applied consistently with the Constitution.

The case cited by the Respondent that is **Rogers Kinobe Binega v Attorney General & Uganda Revenue Authority, Constitutional Petition No. 1 of 2016,** stating that Article 254(2) had already been interpreted by this Honorable Court is misleading. The decision in Binega's case is based on whether constitutional pension exemption extends to contractual gratuity and whether such gratuity is taxable under the income tax. The petitioner in this case was seeking for the interpretation of the first limb of Article 254(2) of the Constitution, namely whether gratuity constitutes "pension" for purposes of the constitutional exemption from tax, and whether section 19(1)(a) of the Income Tax Act was inconsistent with Article 254(2). The Court held that Section 19 (1) (a) of the Income Tax Act is not inconsistent with Article 254(2) of the Constitution and that gratuity is legally distinct from pension and therefore remains taxable. The present Petition raises no issue relating to taxation of pension, gratuity or the Income Tax Act.

The constitutional question before this Honourable Court is fundamentally different. The present Petition concerns the distinct obligation under Article 254(2) requiring that pensions "**shall be subject to periodic review to take account of changes in the value of money**." The Petition invites this Honourable Court to determine the proper meaning and scope of the phrase "changes in the value of money" and whether Regulations 5 and 6 of the Pensions Regulations, together with their implementation by the Respondent, impermissibly restrict pension reviews exclusively to inflation-based adjustments. That specific constitutional question neither arose nor was determined in ***Rogers Kinobe Binega v Attorney General.***

Further, unlike in Rogers Kinobe Binega, the present Petition challenges both the constitutionality of subsidiary legislation and the Respondent's acts and omissions under **Article 137(3)(a) and (b) of the Constitution**. The Petition also alleges violations of **Articles 20, 21 and 45** arising from the creation of unjustifiable disparities between pensioners of equivalent rank who retired at different times. These issues of equality, fairness, dignity and the constitutional implementation of pension review obligations were not before the Court in Rogers Kinobe Binega.

Accordingly, Rogers Kinobe Binega is distinguishable on both the facts and the law and does not determine the issues before this Honourable Court. Rather, the present Petition raises a novel constitutional question requiring interpretation of the second limb of Article 254(2), namely the scope of the constitutional obligation to review pensions so as to take account of changes in the value of money. The Petition therefore properly invokes the interpretative jurisdiction of this Honourable Court under Article 137 of the Constitution.

Accordingly, the resolution of this dispute depends primarily upon the proper interpretation of Article 254(2) of the Constitution, particularly the meaning and scope of the phrase "***changes in the value of money***." It also requires this Honourable Court to determine whether Regulations 5 and 6 of the Pensions Regulations, as well as the Government's implementation of those Regulations, are consistent with the Constitution.

The Petitioners have therefore discharged the burden required under Article 137 of the Constitution by demonstrating the existence of substantial and bona fide questions requiring constitutional interpretation. The Petition is not founded on a mere allegation of constitutional violation; rather, it raises a genuine dispute regarding the meaning, scope and application of Article 254(2), which falls squarely within the jurisdiction of this Honourable Court.

ISSUE TWO

Whether Regulations 5 and 6 of the Pensions Regulations are inconsistent with Article 254(2) of the Constitution

The Petitioners disagree with the Respondent's submission that **Regulations 5 and 6 of the Pensions Regulations,** made under **Statutory Instrument No. 33 of 2018,** properly implement **Article 254(2) of the Constitution**. The Petitioner further disagree with the Respondent's contention that the phrase "**changes in the value of money**" is clear and unambiguous because it is confined solely to inflation as officially declared by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics. That interpretation is neither borne out by the language of **Article 254(2)** nor consistent with the established principles of constitutional interpretation.

The Respondent's argument that Article 254(2) is not ambiguous basing on the court's decision in **Rogers Kinobe Binega v Attorney General & Another**, is misleading. The Petitioners acknowledge that in Rogers Kinobe Binega's case, this Honourable Court held that Article 254(2) of the Constitution is not ambiguous. However, that finding must be understood in the context of the specific issue that was before the Court. The question before the Court concerned the first limb of Article 254(2) of the Constitution, namely the scope of the constitutional exemption of pension from taxation. The Court was not called upon to determine the meaning, scope or application of the second limb of Article 254 (2) of the Constitution concerning periodic pension review and changes in the value of money.

Therefore, the Respondent cannot rely on the finding that Article 254(2) is unambiguous in relation to the taxation issue to suggest that all questions arising from the provision have already been conclusively determined. The present Petition concerns the separate constitutional obligation imposed by the second limb of Article 254(2), which requires pension to be periodically reviewed so as to preserve its value over time.

We reiterate our earlier submission, that ccontrary to the Respondent's contention, the phrase "***changes in the value of money***" is reasonably capable of more than one interpretation. Indeed, the conflicting legal opinions issued by successive Attorneys General and Deputy Solicitors General, referred to in paragraphs 19, 20 and 21 of the Petition, demonstrate that there is a genuine constitutional controversy regarding the meaning and scope of Article 254(2) in relation to Regulations 5,6 and 7 of the Pensions Regulations. It is precisely that controversy which calls for the interpretative jurisdiction of this Honourable Court under Article 137 of the Constitution.

As already submitted in the Petitioners' Conferencing Notes, the Constitution itself does not define the expression "***changes in the value of money***." It was therefore incumbent upon the Respondent to demonstrate that limiting pension reviews exclusively to inflation faithfully reflects the constitutional text, purpose and context. The Respondent has failed to do so.

Rather, as demonstrated under paragraphs 24 and 25 of the Petition and in the Supplementary Affidavits of **Wyclif Jonathan Ssali and Samuel Semanda**, the concept of the value of money is a broader economic concept that is influenced by several interrelated factors. While inflation is undoubtedly one indicator, it is not the only determinant of the real value or purchasing power of money.

Contrary to our submissions, the Respondent argues that the constitution does not state that Article 254(2) is intended to preserve parity between serving officers and pensioners over time. We reiterate our earlier submissions that the Respondent's restrictive interpretation is inconsistent with the settled principles governing constitutional interpretation. In **Major General David Tinyefuza v Attorney General,** this Honourable Court held that constitutional provisions are permanent provisions intended "to cater for all time to come" and must therefore be interpreted dynamically, progressively and liberally so as to give full effect to their underlying purposes. Such a static interpretation is inconsistent with the settled principle that the Constitution is a living instrument intended to respond to changing social and economic realities.

The Petitioners further reiterate that Regulations 5 and 6, as presently framed and implemented, impermissibly narrow the constitutional standard established under Article 254(2). Whereas the Constitution envisages a flexible review mechanism capable of accounting for changes in the value of money, the Regulations reduce that constitutional obligation to a single inflationary index, thereby diminishing the protection guaranteed by the Constitution.

Contrary to our submissions and the reading of Article 254(2) of the Constitution, the Respondent effectively substitutes the constitutional phrase **"changes in the value of money"** with the words **"inflation as declared by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics**." Respectfully, that is not what **Article 254(2)** provides. Had the framers intended to confine pension reviews exclusively to inflation, they would have said so expressly. Instead, they adopted broader constitutional language which must be given its full and ordinary constitutional meaning. **Regulations 5 and 6** cannot lawfully narrow the scope of the constitutional protection guaranteed under **Article 254(2).**

The Petitioners also maintain, as pleaded in paragraph 27 of the Petition, that the historical practice reflected in Circular Standing Instruction No. 4 of 1994 is only cited for **reference purposes** since it recognised the need to recompute pensions following salary revisions in order to preserve parity and fairness among pensioners. See Annexure marked The Respondent has not adduced any constitutional justification for departing from that historical and long-standing practice.

Further, the Respondent's submission that the Petitioners stated that Regulation 4A has since been repealed is incorrect and does not reflect the Petitioners' Conferencing Notes. The Petitioners did not make any such assertion. The Petitioners' position is that Regulation 4A, now renumbered as Regulation 5, remains part of the existing legal framework. The issue before this Honourable Court is therefore not whether Regulation 4A, now Regulation 5, has been repealed, but whether it is consistent with Article 254(2) of the Constitution.

Accordingly, the Petitioners pray that this Honourable Court finds that Regulations 5 and 6 of the Pensions Regulations are inconsistent with Article

254(2) of the Constitution insofar as they confine periodic pension reviews exclusively to inflation-based adjustments and thereby exclude consideration of other relevant economic factors necessary to preserve the real value and adequacy of pensions over time.

ISSUE THREE

Whether the refusal and/or failure by Government to consider salary enhancements and other relevant economic factors when reviewing pensions violates Articles 20, 21, 45 and 254(2) of the Constitution

The Petitioners disagree with the Respondent's submission that the Government's interpretation of Article 254(2) of the Constitution; namely, that periodic pension reviews are to be undertaken solely by reference to inflation as declared by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics, is consistent with the Constitution. The Petitioners contend that such a restrictive interpretation undermines the purpose of Article 254(2) and has resulted in unjustifiable disparities among pensioners of the same rank who retired at different times, thereby contravening **Articles 20, 21 and 45 of the Constitution**. While the Petitioners agree that **Articles 20, 21, 45, 254(1) and 254(2)** must be read harmoniously as an integrated constitutional framework, they reject the Respondent's interpretation, which unduly narrows the constitutional guarantee of periodic pension review and fails to give full effect to the protections afforded by the Constitution.

Contrary to the Petitioners' submissions, the Respondent contends that inflation is the sole objective measure of changes in the value of money and that, by reviewing pensions solely on the basis of inflation as determined by the Uganda Bureau of Statistics, the Government has discharged its constitutional obligation under Article 254(2). The Respondent further argues that Article 254(2) does not require Government to recompute pensions by reference to subsequent salary enhancements enjoyed by serving public officers and that the failure to do so neither amounts to discrimination nor violates the Petitioners' constitutional rights.

For the avoidance of doubt, the Petitioners do not contend that every salary enhancement granted to serving public officers must automatically be replicated in the pensions of retired officers. Nor do they argue that salary increments are the sole or mandatory measure of changes in the value of money. Rather, the Petitioners' case is that where subsequent salary enhancements and other prevailing economic indicators demonstrate a material change in the economic value of money or the adequacy of pension benefits, the Government is constitutionally obliged under **Article 254(2)** to take such factors into account when conducting periodic pension reviews. The Petitioner's case is therefore directed at the Respondent's exclusion of all relevant economic considerations, save for inflation, in the implementation of Article 254(2).

Therefore, the Petitioners disagree with the Respondent's submissions and reiterate that the Government's refusal and/or failure to consider salary enhancements and other relevant economic factors when reviewing pensions is inconsistent with Articles 20, 21, 45 and 254(2) of the Constitution.

Contrary to the Petitioners' submissions, the Respondent contends that the pension framework applied by the Government is authorized by the Constitution, is demonstrably justifiable in a free and democratic society, and does not amount to unconstitutional discrimination. In support of that contention, the Respondent solely relies on the decision of this Honourable Court in **Hon. Justice (Rtd) Dr. Yorokamu Bamwine v Attorney General, Constitutional Petition No. 15 of 2021 [2022] UGCC 3.** The Petitioners submit that the Respondent's reliance on that decision is misplaced, as both the factual circumstances and the constitutional questions determined in **Hon. Justice (Rtd) Dr. Yorokamu Bamwine** are materially distinguishable from those arising in the present Petition.

We submit that in **Hon. Justice (Rtd) Dr. Yorokamu Bamwine**'s case, the issue concerned whether a retired Principal Judge could claim the same retirement benefits as retired Chief Justices and Deputy Chief Justices. The Court found that differentiation was permissible because the persons compared had occupied different judicial offices with different constitutional responsibilities, status and rank within the judicial hierarchy. The question before the Court was whether different ranks could attract same retirement benefits. This decision is distinguishable on both the facts and the constitutional question before this Court, in the present petition.

The present Petition raises a fundamentally different issue. The Petitioners are not challenging differentiation based on rank or responsibility. They accept that pension must be commensurate with rank, salary and length of service under **Article 254(1).** Their grievance is that persons who retired at the same rank are receiving substantially different pensions solely because of the timing of their retirement and subsequent salary enhancements granted to serving officers.

For instance, the Petitioners under paragraph 29 of the Petition illustrate that two former Commissioners of Prisons who retired from the same office at different times receive significantly different pension benefits. The Commissioner who retired earlier receives a monthly pension of **UGX 1,006,790,** whereas the Commissioner who retired after 1st July 2025 receives **UGX 7,378,000**. (***See Annexure marked R attached to the Petition***). The Petitioners contend that this disparity illustrates the discriminatory effect of the current pension review framework, which disadvantages earlier retirees despite their comparable rank, service and contribution to the nation.

The disparity complained of in this Petition, is therefore not a distinction based on different ranks or responsibility, but a disparity between persons of the same rank but retired at different times. Unlike **Hon. Justice (Rtd) Dr. Yorokamu Bamwine's** case, where the differentiation was between different judicial offices who served in different ranks, the present Petition concerns whether pensioners of the same rank may constitutionally be treated differently after retirement merely because one retired before a salary enhancement and another retired after the enhancement.

Further, **Hon. Justice (Rtd) Dr. Yorokamu Bamwine case** did not determine the meaning and scope of Article 254(2) concerning the obligation to periodically review pensions to take account of changes in the value of money. The present Petition concerns whether the failure to consider salary enhancements and other relevant economic factors in pension reviews defeats that constitutional obligation and perpetuates inequality among similarly situated pensioners.

Accordingly, **Hon. Justice (Rtd) Dr. Yorokamu Bamwine's case** does not support the Respondent's position. It only confirms that differentiation based on genuine differences in rank and responsibility may be permissible. It does not justify unequal treatment among pensioners who retired at the same rank.

As pleaded under paragraphs 28 to 32 of the Petition, pensioners who retired from equivalent offices and rendered comparable service to the Government receive substantially different pension benefits solely because they retired at different times and were therefore affected differently by subsequent salary revisions.

We therefore reiterate our earlier submissions that the refusal and/or failure by Government to consider relevant economic factors affecting the value and adequacy of pensions, including salary enhancements where they demonstrate changes in economic value, has resulted in the progressive erosion of pension benefits, unjustified disparities among pensioners and infringement of the constitutional values protected under Articles 20, 21 and 45 of the Constitution

As already submitted under Issue Two, Article 254(2) imposes a substantive constitutional obligation upon Government to periodically review pensions so as to take account of changes in the value of money. That obligation cannot be discharged through a mechanical application of inflation figures alone where other relevant economic factors demonstrate that the real value and adequacy of pension benefits have substantially diminished.

The Petitioners submit that the phrase "***changes in the value of money***" must be interpreted in its proper constitutional context and not in isolation. The Constitution does not define the phrase or limit it to inflation. Indeed, the conflicting legal opinions issued by Government's principal legal advisers, as pleaded in paragraphs 19, 20 and 21 of the Petition, demonstrate that the meaning and scope of Article 254(2) has been the subject of genuine constitutional controversy.

The Petitioners contend that the Respondent's interpretation unduly narrows the constitutional obligation by equating changes in the value of money exclusively with inflation. An interpretation of Article 254(2) which excludes such relevant economic considerations undermines the constitutional purpose of ensuring that pensions retain their real value and remain adequate to support retired public officers. Such an interpretation fails to give effect to the constitutional values of dignity, equality, fairness and social justice embodied in Articles 20, 21 and 45 of the Constitution.

The Petitioners further rely on the principle of constitutional interpretation established in **Major General David Tinyefuza v Attorney General, Constitutional Petition No. 1 of 1996**, where this Honourable Court held that constitutional provisions must be interpreted broadly, liberally and dynamically so as to give effect to their purpose and to accommodate changing social and economic circumstances.

Similarly, in **Paul K. Ssemogerere and Others v Attorney General**, the Supreme Court affirmed that constitutional provisions relating to a particular subject must be read together and interpreted as an integrated whole so as to achieve the purpose of the constitutional instrument.

Applying these principles, Article 254(2) cannot properly be interpreted separately from Articles 20, 21 and 45 of the Constitution. The constitutional obligation to review pensions must therefore be understood as requiring Government to adopt a review mechanism that preserves not only the numerical value of pension payments but also their adequacy, purchasing power and ability to sustain the dignity and welfare of retired public officers.

As illustrated under paragraphs 13 and 14 of the Affidavit of Obbo Ologe Gideon, the deponent states that stagnant pension payments and failure to adjust pensions in accordance with prevailing economic realities have made it difficult to meet basic necessities, including food, utilities and medical expenses.

Similarly, in paragraphs 10, 11, 12 and 15 of the Supplementary Affidavit of Samuel Semanda, the deponent states that his pension has become inadequate to meet essential needs such as medical care, food and other living expenses. He further explains that economic changes over time have significantly reduced the purchasing power and real value of pensions.

The Petitioners submit that these circumstances demonstrate that the Government's restrictive interpretation of Article 254(2) has failed to achieve the constitutional purpose of protecting pensioners from the erosion of their retirement benefits.

We reiterate that our earlier submissions that the obligation to review pensions to account for all factors that affect the changes in the value of money is a constitutional guarantee intended to preserve the adequacy, dignity and purchasing power of pensions. This assertion is supported by the case of **Attorney General v Masalu Musene Wilson & Others (Supra)** where the Supreme Court recognised that constitutional protections relating to remuneration and pensions are intended to safeguard the dignity, status and adequacy of benefits payable to persons who have served the Government. The same constitutional principle applies to Article 254(2), which seeks to preserve the adequacy and value of pensions payable to retired public officers.

The Petitioners therefore pray that this Honourable Court finds that the Government's failure to adopt a pension review mechanism that takes into account all relevant factors affecting changes in the value of money is inconsistent with and in contravention of Articles 20, 21, 45 and 254(2) of the Constitution, and that the Respondent has failed to discharge its constitutional obligation.

The Petitioners further pray that this Honourable Court finds that they have established the constitutional violations pleaded in the Petition and are entitled to the declarations and remedies sought therein.

ISSUE FOUR

Whether the Petitioners are entitled to the declarations and orders prayed for in the Petition

The Petitioners disagree with the Respondent's submissions and reiterate that they have demonstrated that the Petition raises substantial questions requiring constitutional interpretation under Article 137 of the Constitution and that the Respondent's pension review framework and conduct are inconsistent with Articles 20, 21, 45 and 254(2) of the Constitution.

The Petitioners submit that this Petition is not a mere claim for pension enhancement, but a constitutional challenge to the interpretation and application of Article 254(2) and the failure by Government to adopt a pension review mechanism that preserves the real value and adequacy of pensions.

Accordingly, having established the constitutional violations pleaded in the Petition, the Petitioners pray that this Honourable Court grants the declarations and orders sought.

We so pray.

DATED at KAMPALA this 24th day of July, 2026.

MWESIGWA RUKUTANA & CO. ADVOCATES

&

KASIRYE BYARUHANGA & CO. ADVOCATES

JOINT COUNSEL FOR THE PETITIONERS

Drawn & Filed by:

M/s Mwesigwa Rukutana & Co. Advocates
Plot 690/691, Entebbe Road
Najjanakumbi
P. O Box 73326,
Kampala.
Tel: +256 200 900 823

&

M/s Kasirye Byaruhanga & Co. Advocates
Plot 33, Clement Hill Road off Nile Avenue
P.O Box 10946
Kampala, Uganda