



# NIGERIAN BAR ASSOCIATION

NATIONAL SECRETARIAT: Plot 1102, Muhammed Buhari Way, Cadastral Zone A00, Central Business District, Abuja Nigerian Tel: +234 800 333 1111  
[www.nigerianbar.org.ng](http://www.nigerianbar.org.ng)

July 7, 2026

## ONLY THE NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COUNCIL OF THE NBA CAN DIRECT THE POSTPONEMENT OF THE 2026 NBA NATIONAL OFFICERS' ELECTION

Our attention has been drawn to a document which purports to be a Report of a Sub-Committee and the comments of the Honourable Attorney General which, amongst other things allegedly ordered

- (a) the disbandment of the Electoral Committee of the Nigerian Bar Association and postponement of the election of National Officers,
- (b) the termination of the appointment of the current service provider because he is a sole proprietor and the appointment of a new service provider,
- (c) the setting up of a caretaker committee to conduct the elections of national officers,
- (d) the incorporation of NIN in the data of voters in the conduct of the NBA Election.
- (e) the “recalibration” of the NBA Constitution to take away universal suffrage ETC.

The Nigerian Bar Association believes that the Honourable Attorney General of the Federation could not issue the said directive as it is entirely unconstitutional, ultra vires the powers of the Honourable Attorney General of the Federation, and an attempt to bring the Nigerian Bar Association under the control of the office of the Honourable Attorney General.

For the record, the Nigerian Bar Association is an independent body not under the control of the Honourable Attorney General of the Federation. By the provisions of section 10(2) of the Legal Practitioners Act, the only time a body distinct from the Nigerian Bar Association is empowered to interfere in the activities of the Nigerian Bar Association is stated clearly therein and none of the events have occurred as to entitle the Honourable Attorney General take the position stated in the purported directive.

We are strengthened in our believe that the Honourable Attorney GERAL could not have given the purported directives when in fact the purported directives are no different from the reliefs sought in the two Egbe Amofin Cases pending at the High Court of Oyo State. Indeed the Honourable Attorney General cannot grant reliefs sought in the two Egbe Amofin Suits in his capacity as a

#### NATIONAL OFFICERS:

Mazi Afam Josiah Osigwe, SAN - President

Dr. Mobolaji Ojibara - General Secretary; Sebastine Anyia - 1st Vice-President; Mrs. Bolatumi Olasunbo Animashaun - 2nd Vice President; Zainab Aminu Garba - 3rd Vice-President; Blessing Imo Udofa-Poromon - Treasurer; Nyada Auta - Welfare Secretary; Bridget Ijeoma Edokwe - Publicity Secretary; Henry Barnabas Ehi - Assistant General Secretary; Ebire Emmanuella Ekpese - Assistant Publicity Secretary

convener of mediation meeting or even as the Chief Law Officer of the Federation. The Honourable Attorney General is at best a party/ mediator and it is settled that a mediator does not give directives to the parties in a matter in which he is a party.

All Past Presidents of the Nigerian Bar Association in attendance, to the exclusion of Chief Wole Olanipekun, were of the view that the cases initiated by Egbe Amofin are frivolous and should be withdrawn. It was therefore the decision of the attendees of the Meeting that the Sub-Committee set up is to ONLY liaise with the contending parties for the purpose of overseeing the withdrawal of the actions. The Sub Committees was never empowered to make any inquest as to the conduct of the President of the Nigerian Bar Association to the extent of making far reaching condemnation against him when he is not a candidate in the election. Their reliance on the memos submitted by some candidate as the basis for those finding violates the Constitutional safeguard of fair hearing as the President was never served with those memos to enable him make a response before such condemnations were made assuming he was a necessary person to appear before the sub-committee.

The resolution of the meeting of 11<sup>th</sup> June 2026 is that sub-committee is to report to the entire body at a reconvened meeting. From the face of the purported report, it is clear that none of these persons who attended the 11<sup>th</sup> June 2026 meeting were availed a copy of the purported report or make any input to the purported Report. Assuming without conceding that they have received the report, the meeting cannot give the directions as it violates the Legal Practitioners Act and the Nigerian Bar Association Constitution. Until the Honourable Attorney General reconvenes another meeting after the 11<sup>th</sup> June 2026 Meeting to consider the report of the sub-committee, there cannot be any decision.

If the sub-committee were empowered to review the issues contained in the Report, Chief Wole Olanipekun SAN, who is the proponent of the cases of the Plaintiffs cannot Chair such sub-committee as he is clearly bias and has lost any neutrality to enable a sub-committee chaired by him to propose a resolution to these cases. There is no way the Nigerian Bar Association would have agreed that a person who is bias over one of the parties should head any committee considering his partisan role in the entitle matter. This report which is said to have been purportedly accepted by the Honourable Attorney General is unacceptable owing to its source. One is reminded of the dicta in the case of **MOHAMMED vs THE NIGERIAN ARMY (2001) I CHR 470 at 485at 485**

“The easily noticeable disfavour manifestly discernible from the proceedings in the court martial betrays an indecent primordial intent of conviction very much reminiscent of a sheriff in the Wild West in U.S.A. who while speaking of a horse thief said: ‘‘We will give him a fine trial and after that we will hang him The trial should therefore be vitiated’’. The unnecessary prejudice and the devil may care attitude shown by the presiding adjudicator in the trial ‘‘Court martial’’ does not augur well for the tenets and principle of fair hearing enshrined in our constitution to reign’’ page 491-2.

We therefore state categorically that the purported Sub-Committee report which contain the Purported directives of the Honourable Attorney General is beyond its remit and biased.

We are by this press release stating categorically that

- a. That the Nigerian Bar Association is an independent body not subject to control and directive of the office of the Honourable Attorney General of the Federation or any other arm of government.
- b. The NBA National Officers electoral process shall continue as scheduled by the ECNBA
- c. That the Nigerian Bar Association attended the meeting convened by the Honourable Attorney as a Co-Respondent with the aim of amicable resolution of the law suit commenced by Egbe Amofin giving rise to Appeal No. CA/IB/110/2026 Between Aham Ejelam SAN & 4 Ors v Ibrahim Lawal and 7 Ors. Suggested Resolution in a meeting seeking to resolve a dispute already before the Court can only be considered binding on the parties if all the parties accept same and cannot in any guise be termed a directive that must willy nilly be accepted by the parties in the matter.
- d. At no time was the Honourable Attorney General empowered to issue directives that are capable of truncating the democratic succession process of the NBA or even suggest a ‘‘recalibration’’ of the NBA Constitution.
- e. We consider the report suspect as the Report is not contained on the official letter of the Honourable Attorney General of the Federation, the Nigerian Bar Association is not in receipt of any communication from the office of the Honourable Attorney General of the Federation and cannot take it as the position of the Honourable Attorney General of the Federation who is a Bar man.

- f. The Nigerian Bar Association since the time that Aare Muyiwa Akinboro raised the issue of the use of NIN in the electoral process checked the risk assessment and have come to the conclusion that any modification of the current platform configuration will truncate the election particularly as the NIMC platform may not be able to accommodate the surge in the authentication requests during the periods of the Election.
- g. The Nigerian Bar Association is a body that have clear decision making bodies and can only subject itself to its Constitutional mechanism, the office of the Honourable Attorney General of the Federation is not one of them.
- h. The ECNBA have not been shown to have done anything wrong in its activities since its constitution.
- i. It is discriminatory to contend that merely because a service provider is a sole proprietorship then he cannot provide services when most legal practitioners including members of the Committee have sole proprietary law offices where they continue to discharge stellar legal practice.

We are committed to due process of the law



Mazi Afam Osigwe, SAN  
President