

UNITED NATIONS

TRUSTEESHIP  
COUNCIL



DOCUMENTS  
UNDER UNIT

GENERAL

T/510

3 March 1950

ORIGINAL : ENGLISH

10 APR 1950

Dual Distribution

Sixth Session

Item 5 of the Agenda

PETITION FROM VINCENT LOKO, EX-COURT CLERK<sup>(1)</sup>  
CONCERNING THE CAMEROONS UNDER BRITISH ADMINISTRATION

Observations of the Administering Authority

Note by the Secretariat: The following observations were communicated to the Secretariat on 3 March 1950 by the representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on the Trusteeship Council.

1. The petitioner seeks the support of the Trusteeship Council in obtaining either an annual allowance or a gratuity from the Native Administration under which, prior to dismissal, he served as a court clerk.
2. He explains in his petition that he was compelled by the Fon of Kom to make good a loss of £60 cash which was in his custody and that he was later convicted by the Supreme Court on a criminal charge and fined £25. His appeal to the West African Court of Appeal was rejected and he was later dismissed from his employment. He applies for an allowance or gratuity on the grounds that his punishment was very severe, that his colleagues who retired received an allowance or gratuity and that he has a large family to support.
3. Mr. Loko was clerk of the Kom Native Court. He was given charge by the Fon of the key of the cash tank in which tax money was kept. He made use of

(1) T/PET.4/34

£62. 16s. of the cash and was convicted by the Supreme Court on a charge of stealing by a servant contrary to Section 390(6) of the Criminal Code. His appointment was terminated and he was paid one month's salary from the date of his suspension from duty. He refunded the £62. 16s.

4. He was subsequently convicted also by the Magistrate's Court of stealing by a servant of Court money, cautioned and discharged and ordered to refund a sum of £7. 5. Od., which he did.

5. He petitioned the Resident for reinstatement which was refused. He then applied to the District Officer for a gratuity which was refused on the grounds that having been convicted of stealing he was not eligible.

6. The Administering Authority considers that the fact of his convictions for stealing remains a disqualification for either of the awards claimed and that to the extent that the grounds adduced in support of his petition imply a criticism or a judgment of the Supreme Court the petition itself becomes inadmissible under Rule 81 of the Trusteeship Council's Rules of Procedure.

---