



THE REPUBLIC OF UGANDA
IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES ACT CAP. 106
AND
IN THE MATTER OF THE COMPANIES (POWERS OF THE REGISTRAR)
REGULATIONS SI NO. 71 OF 2016
AND
IN THE MATTER OF AFRICA WILD EXPLORATIONS LTD.
COMPANY PETITION NO. 37899 OF 2026
BRN: 80010004037899

- 1. KOMUGISHA MARTHA
 - 2. KAHERU HENRY AKIIKI:.....PETITIONERS
- VERSUS**
- AFRICA WILD EXPLORATIONS LIMITED:.....RESPONDENT**
- RULING**

Before: Daniel Nasasira - Assistant Registrar of Companies

A. Representation.

- 1. *Counsel Atusasirwe Godwin and Counsel Matsiko Andrew from MBS Advocates represented the Petitioners, whereas Counsel Julius Galisonga from Strand Advocates (formerly Galisonga & Co Advocates) represented the Respondent.*

B. Introduction and Background.

- 2. Africa Wild Explorations Limited is a limited liability company duly incorporated on 30th January 2014 under the laws of Uganda. "(Hereinafter referred to as 'the Company')."
- 3. The Petitioners assert that their shares in the Company were illegally and without their knowledge, consent, or authority transferred and the Company's directorship and membership altered. They contended that the aforementioned

actions were effected through contested resolutions and transfer forms bearing what they asserted were fabricated signatures.

4. The Respondent did not reply to the Petition.

C. Petitioners' Case

5. The Petitioners, through their respective Statutory Declarations in support of the Petition, deposed that their shares in the Company had been illegally and without their knowledge, consent or authority transferred and the company's directorship and membership altered. The Petitioners asserted that the acts complained of were effected through contested resolutions and transfer forms.
6. The Petitioners aver that they did not execute any share transfer instrument, sign any resolution purporting to authorise the said actions, or authorise any person to act on behalf of them.
7. The Petitioners further deposed that their purported signatures appearing on the contested documents were fabricated and attached a document analysis report from the Directorate of Forensic Services - Uganda Police in support of their assertion.
8. The Petitioners averred that the continued existence of the impugned entries amounted to misrepresentation of ownership and control, continuing illegality in the register and a violation of their proprietary rights and governance rights.
9. The Petitioners specifically challenge the following documents:
 - a) An Ordinary Resolution dated 11th January 2026 and filed on 12th January 2026 purporting to remove the first Petitioner as a director of the Company.
 - b) Company Form 20 (Notification of Appointment of Director and Secretary of Company) dated 12th January 2026, predicated upon the abovementioned Ordinary Resolution, omitting the first Petitioner as a director of the Company.

- c) A Board Resolution dated 11th January 2026 and filed on 13th January 2026 purporting to transfer each of the Petitioners' shareholding in the Company to a one Rwamwiri Abiaz.
 - d) A Certificate on Transfer of Share Stock dated 11th January 2026 and filed on 13th January 2026 certifying the transaction effected by the transfer of the aforementioned shares as a bona fide sale between a willing buyer and a willing seller.
 - e) A Transfer of Share Stock form dated 13th January 2026, predicated upon the abovementioned Board Resolution, purporting to transfer 40 ordinary shares in the Company from the First Petitioner to a one Rwamwiri Abiaz.
 - f) A Transfer of Share Stock form dated 13th January 2026, predicated upon the abovementioned Board Resolution, purporting to transfer 40 ordinary shares in the Company from the Second Petitioner to one Rwamwiri Abiaz.
10. The Petitioners prayed that the Registrar General be pleased to;
- a) *Investigate the impugned filings and the circumstances under which they were lodged.*
 - b) *Cancel, expunge, and nullify all entries and instruments founded on forged signatures.*
 - c) *Rectify the register of members and directors of the Company to reflect the true and lawful position prior to the contested alterations.*
 - d) *Restore the Petitioners' shareholding and rights in the Company.*
 - e) *Suspend further dealings in the Company pending the determination of this Petition.*
 - f) *Grant such further or other orders as the Registrar may deem just and expedient.*

D. Schedules

11. Pursuant to Regulation 35 of the Companies (Powers of the Registrar) Regulations, S.I. No. 71 of 2016, the Respondent was afforded an extension of time within which to file a formal response to the Petition. Notwithstanding that indulgence, the Respondent neither filed an Answer to the Petition nor a Statutory Declaration in Reply within the extended period or at all. The Respondent's failure to participate in the proceedings is accordingly noted and treated as a non-contest of the averments set out in the Petitioners' Statutory Declarations. In the circumstances, the Registrar proceeded to determine the matter on the basis of the evidence and submissions placed before the Registry by the Petitioners, having been satisfied that the Respondent was duly served and afforded a reasonable and adequate opportunity to respond.

12. At the closure of the hearing of this matter, having considered the state of the pleadings and the need to afford both parties a final opportunity to address the Registry on the applicable law, I directed both counsel to file and serve written submissions in accordance with the following schedule:

- a) Written submissions on behalf of the Petitioners were to be filed and served by the 22nd day of June 2026.*
- b) Written submissions on behalf of the Respondent were to be filed and served by the 24th day of June 2026.*
- c) Any submissions in rejoinder were to be filed and served by the 26th day of June 2026.*

13. Both parties were informed that the ruling would be issued on notice following the receipt and consideration of the written submissions.

E. Issues

14. I find that three issues are sufficient to address the concerns in this matter;

- a) *Whether the contested documents were legally and validly filed?*
- b) *Whether any oppression was occasioned to the Petitioners within the meaning of Section 243 of the Companies Act Cap. 106.*
- c) *What remedies are available to the parties?*

F. Determination

a. Whether the contested documents were legally and validly filed?

15. The Petitioners challenged filings that divested them of their shareholding and directorship in the company. They primarily challenge;

- a) An Ordinary Resolution that purported to remove the first Petitioner as a Director in the Company; and
- b) A Special Resolution transferring the Petitioners' shares to Rwamwiri Abiaz. It's upon these two resolutions that other contested filings come into play.

16. The validity of the other impugned filings is dependent upon the validity of these two foundational resolutions. It is therefore necessary to examine the impugned resolutions to determine whether they were lawfully and validly obtained.

Ordinary Resolution dated 11th January 2026 and filed on 12th January 2026

17. The Ordinary Resolution dated 11th January 2026 and filed on 12th January 2026 purported to remove the first Petitioner as a director of the Company and appoint Rwamwiri Abiaz in her stead. The resolution states verbatim that: "*At the meeting of the shareholders of AFRICA WILD EXPLORATIONS LIMITED...*"

18. During the hearing of this matter, the Petitioners asserted that, as shareholders of the Company, they neither attended the alleged meeting referred to in the resolution nor received any notice of such meeting. They maintained that they were unaware of any shareholders' meeting having taken place at which the contested resolution was passed.

19. The Petitioners further contended that the resolution bears fabricated signatures attributed to them. They denied attending any such meeting and denied executing any resolution removing the first Petitioner as a director of the Company.
20. On the other hand, the Respondent did not adduce any evidence to support the assertion that the alleged shareholders' meeting was ever convened or held. No notice of meeting, minutes, attendance register, or any other documentary evidence was produced to demonstrate that the meeting took place. Section 148 of the Companies Act Cap. 106 requires companies to maintain accurate minutes of all proceedings at general meetings and directors' meetings, which constitute the official record of decisions and deliberations. When properly kept, such minutes serve as *prima facie* evidence of the proceedings and create a legal presumption that the meetings were duly convened and held. Properly kept minutes constitute prima facie evidence of proceedings and create a rebuttable presumption of regularity. No such record was kept.
21. In support of their claim, the Petitioners tendered a document analysis report from the Directorate of Forensic Services of the Uganda Police Force. The report compared the Petitioners' specimen signatures with the signatures appearing on the contested resolution and concluded that there were fundamental differences in shape, proportions, legibility, design, manner of execution, connectivity of strokes, loop formation, and writing skill, among other characteristics. The report casts serious doubt on the authenticity of the signatures attributed to the Petitioners on the contested Ordinary Resolution dated 11th January 2026.
22. In the circumstances, I find it difficult to accept that the alleged shareholders' meeting was ever held. The Respondent failed to produce any evidence establishing the occurrence of the meeting. The Petitioners consistently denied attending the meeting or executing the resolution, and their position is further

supported by the forensic document analysis report, which indicates that the signatures attributed to them were not genuine.

23. Accordingly, I find that the Ordinary Resolution dated 11th January 2026 was illegally and wrongfully obtained and is therefore liable to be expunged from the Companies Register together with all filings founded upon it.

Board Resolution dated 11th January 2026 and filed on 13th January 2026

24. The Board Resolution dated 11th January 2026 and filed on 13th January 2026 purported to transfer each of the Petitioners' forty (40) shares in the Company to Rwamwiri Abiaz, thereby vesting in him a total of eighty (80) shares. The resolution is accompanied by share transfer instruments alleged to have been executed by the Petitioners in favour of the said Rwamwiri Abiaz.

25. The Petitioners challenged the authenticity of those instruments and asserted that they never executed any share transfer forms. Their position was that their shares were illegally transferred without their knowledge, consent, or participation.

26. A transfer of shares is, by its nature, a voluntary transaction through which a shareholder agrees to transfer his or her proprietary interest in a company to another person, usually for consideration. The element of consent is fundamental, particularly because shares constitute property under **Section 81** of the **Companies Act, Cap. 106**. The Petitioners maintain that they never expressed any intention to transfer their shares and never authorised any person to do so on their behalf.

27. A perusal of the Company's Articles of Association indicates under **Article 3** that *"Any party...proposing to transfer any shares shall give notice in writing to the other parties. The notice shall specify the number of shares the transferor proposes to transfer"*

28. The Respondent did not adduce any evidence demonstrating compliance with this requirement. No notice of intention to transfer shares was produced, nor was any evidence tendered to show that consideration was paid for the alleged transfer. Equally, no evidence was presented to demonstrate that the Petitioners had expressed any desire or intention to dispose of their shares.
29. The Petitioners also challenged the signatures appearing on the share transfer instruments, contending that they were fabricated. To support this assertion, they relied on a document analysis report from the Directorate of Forensic Services of the Uganda Police Force. The report concluded that there were fundamental differences in shape, proportions, legibility, design, manner of execution, connectivity of strokes, loop formation, and writing skill, among other characteristics, between the Petitioners' specimen signatures and the signatures appearing on the transfer of share stock forms, both dated 11th January 2026 and filed on 13th January 2026.
30. The forensic analysis report, at paragraph 4.0, sets out the following findings verbatim; *"An inter-comparison of the sample signatures of Komugisha Martha on exhibits A1, B and E show significant similarities between them in formation of letter A, shape and formation of loops, relative length, design and manner of execution, skill of writing, fluency and relative sizes and proportions of strokes among others. Fundamental differences were observed between the questioned signatures attributed to Komugisha Martha on exhibits B1 and B2 and the sample signatures on exhibits A1, B and E in the shape, proportions of loops, legibility, design and manner of execution, handwriting, skill, ending stroke, fluency and line quality, connectivity of strokes and relative sizes and proportions of strokes among others. Based on the fundamental differences observed above and the nature of documents examined, in my opinion there is strong evidence to show that*

the sample signatures on exhibits A1, B and E do not share common authorship with the questioned signatures attributed to Komugisha Martha on exhibits B1 and B2.”

31. Justice Stephen Mubiru in *Iwa Richard Okeny V Obol George Okot Miscellaneous Application No. 063 of 2012* highlighted that an expert is not a witness of fact and his/her evidence is only advisory. The learned judge opined that a court will *not act* on the *opinion of the expert* unless the facts upon which the *opinion* is based are proved in evidence. In this instance, I find that the forensic expert’s assessment, as detailed in the forensic Police report Ref: DFS/191/110/026, substantiates the Petitioners’ stated position that their signatures were illegally affixed onto documents transferring their shares in the Respondent Company without their knowledge or consent. The evidence of the expert, coupled with the lack of sufficient evidence from the Respondent Company to demonstrate that the meetings occurred, such as issuance of notices and minutes/attendance records for the meetings, convincingly demonstrates that the signatures on the contested documents were fabricated.
32. The authenticity of the signatures is central to the dispute. The Petitioners’ evidence includes expert forensic reports, which have not been materially rebutted by the Respondent; no independent forensic evidence has been presented to the contrary. The Respondent Counsel during the hearing sought to rely on a presumed assertion of legitimacy, but did not produce original signed documents or statutory declarations from the purported signatories to confirm their participation in the disputed resolutions and share transfers. The Respondent’s Company Counsel, while denying wrongdoing, did not provide any expert evidence to rebut the forensic findings. His defense rested primarily on assertions that the transactions were agreed upon and supported by meetings and correspondence. However, in matters where forgery is alleged and supported by

expert evidence, an evidential burden shifted to the Respondent to rebut the *prima facie* case established by the Petitioners. Mere assertions, without corroborating evidence such as proof of duly convened meetings, attendance records, minutes of the meetings, or independent verification of signatures, are insufficient. Further, in this case, the Petitioners denied participation in any meetings authorizing the impugned resolutions, and there is no evidence of proper notice having been issued to all relevant shareholders.

33. It is a recognised principle that once an illegality is brought to the attention of court, it cannot be ignored. The principle is emphasised in the case of *Makula International Ltd v. His Eminence Cardinal Nsubuga & Anor. (1982) HCB 11(supra)*. The illegality in this matter is in regards to the contested documents filed by the Respondent that bore illegally affixed signatures. These documents include, share transfer instruments, a number of Company resolutions and a company form 20 (particulars of directors and secretary).
34. The Petitioners have demonstrated, on a balance of probabilities, that the impugned company filings—namely, the resolutions, forms and share transfer documents—were procured illegally. It is a fundamental principle of company law that the register must accurately reflect the true legal position. Documents tainted by illegalities cannot be allowed to stand. The integrity of the company register depends on the authenticity of the documents filed with the Registrar of Companies.
35. In the circumstances, I am not persuaded that the alleged share transfers were genuine. The Respondent failed to produce any evidence showing that the Petitioners intended to transfer their shares, issued the requisite notice under the Company's Articles of Association, executed the transfer instruments, or received consideration for the purported transfer.

36. Shares constitute a species of property under Section 81 of the Companies Act, Cap. 106, which expressly recognizes shares as personal property transferable in accordance with the company's articles of association. Accordingly, any unlawful or unconscionable deprivation, transfer, cancellation, or appropriation of a person's shares amounts not merely to an infringement of statutory rights under company law, but also to an interference with proprietary rights. Such conduct potentially implicates the constitutional protection of property guaranteed under Article 26 of the Constitution of the Republic of Uganda, 1995, which safeguards every person's right to own property either individually or in association with others and prohibits the compulsory deprivation of property except in accordance with the law and upon payment of fair and adequate compensation. Although principally a matter of private law, the unlawful deprivation of shares may engage constitutional values relating to the protection of property rights. Consequently, the illegal dispossession of a shareholder's interest may constitute a violation of both statutory corporate rights and the fundamental constitutional right to property.

37. The available evidence instead points to a transaction that was orchestrated without the Petitioners' knowledge or consent. Where records filed at the Companies registry are shown to be founded on forged or fabricated instruments, the Registrar is empowered and, where appropriate, obligated to expunge such filings to preserve the sanctity of the register. In light of the foregoing finding, I hold that the impugned documents were illegally and wrongfully obtained and all documents filed as a result of these impugned documents shall be expunged from the register pursuant to Regulation 8 of the Companies (Powers of the Registrar) Regulations SI No. 71 of 2016.

38. I therefore find that the purported transfer of the Petitioners' shares to Rwamwiri Abiaz was not authentic and was effected in contravention of both the Petitioners' proprietary rights and the Company's Articles of Association.
39. Consequently, the Board Resolution dated 11th January 2026 and filed on 13th January 2026, together with the accompanying share transfer instruments, was wrongfully obtained and is liable to be expunged from the Companies Register. Any filings, resolutions, or changes in the Company's records founded upon that purported transfer are equally invalid and liable to be expunged.
40. Additionally, the Board Resolution dated 24th February 2026 and filed on 26th February 2026 authorizing the acquisition of a credit facility of UGX 40,000,000 with Ms. Kansiime Doreen designated as the cardholder is equally liable to be expunged from the register. The evidence before the Registrar demonstrates that the resolution was passed by a Board whose composition had been unlawfully altered through the impugned and forged resolutions and share transfers that have been found to be null and void. Since the authority of the persons purporting to act as directors of the Company was founded upon documents that were illegally endorsed and wrongfully obtained, any subsequent resolutions passed by that unlawfully constituted Board are similarly tainted by the original illegality. It is a settled principle of law that one cannot derive a lawful benefit or authority from an unlawful act (*ex turpi causa non oritur actio*), and that acts founded upon a nullity are themselves void and incapable of producing legal effect. Consequently, the Board Resolution of 24th February 2026, having been procured and endorsed through the exercise of authority derived from unlawfully obtained filings, constitutes a document that was illegally endorsed and wrongfully obtained within the meaning of Regulation 8 of the Companies (Powers of the Registrar) Regulations, S.I. No. 71 of 2016. Its continued presence on the public register

would perpetuate an illegality and misrepresent the lawful governance structure of the Company. Accordingly, the said Board Resolution ought to be expunged from the register.

b. Whether any oppression was occasioned to the Petitioners within the meaning of Section 243 of the Companies Act, Cap. 106?

41. The Petitioners brought this Petition under Section 243 of the Companies Act, Cap. 106. **Section 243**, titled "Alternative remedy to winding up in cases of oppression," provides that: "*A member of a company who complains that the affairs of the company are being conducted in a manner oppressive to a part of the members, including himself or herself ... may make a complaint to the Registrar by petition for an order under this section.*"
42. The issue for determination is whether the conduct complained of amounts to oppressive conduct against the Petitioners in their capacity as members of the Company, as contemplated under Section 243 of the Companies Act, Cap. 106.
43. In *Edward Ssentenza & Another v Donnie Company Limited & Another HCT-00-CV-CI-0005-2016*, the Court observed that oppressive conduct encompasses decisions and actions that are "burdensome, harsh and wrongful" against members. Similarly, the Supreme Court of Uganda in *Mathew Rukikaire v Incafex (U) Ltd, Civil Appeal No. 03 of 2015*, elaborated that for conduct to amount to oppression, it must affect a person in his or her capacity as a member of the company and not in some other capacity.
44. Oppression has also been described as conduct that violates a member's reasonable expectations regarding how a company's affairs should be conducted. In *Elder v Elder & Watson Ltd [1952] SC 49*, Lord Cooper stated that: "*...oppression requires a visible departure from standards of fair dealing and an infringement on the aggrieved party's proprietary or participatory rights*".

45. The foregoing authorities establish that, for conduct to amount to oppression, it must affect the complainant in his or her capacity as a member of the company, constitute a visible departure from standards of fair dealing and corporate propriety, and result in prejudice to the member's proprietary or participatory rights.
46. Applying those principles to the present matter, the Petitioners complained that they were unlawfully removed from the Company's records as members through the contested share transfers and related resolution. As already found above, the purported transfer of the Petitioners' shares to Rwamwiri Abiaz was not authentic and was effected without their knowledge, consent, or participation. The documents upon which the transfers were based were wrongfully obtained and are therefore void.
47. The effect of those actions was, by purporting to transfer all the Petitioners' shares to another person, the Respondent effectively extinguished the Petitioners' proprietary interests in the Company and deprived them of all rights attendant to membership, including the right to participate in the management and affairs of the Company, receive notices of meetings, vote on company matters, and enjoy the benefits accruing from their shareholding.
48. A member's shareholding constitutes his or her proprietary interest in the company in accordance with Section 81 of the Companies Act Cap. 106, and any attempt to divest that interest through fabricated or improperly obtained documents is a direct infringement of the member's rights in that capacity.
49. Further, the manner in which the contested filings were procured demonstrates a clear departure from standards of fair dealing and corporate propriety. The Respondent failed to establish that the Petitioners consented to the transfer of their shares or executed the documents relied upon to effect the changes in the

Company's membership. The use of documents found to be inauthentic to remove members from the Company amounts to actions that are burdensome, harsh, and wrongful conduct.

50. The complete exclusion of a shareholder from membership through fabricated instruments represents one of the clearest forms of oppressive conduct contemplated by Section 243. I therefore find that the wrongful removal of the Petitioners as members of the Company through the purported transfer of their shares amounted to oppression within the meaning of Section 243 of the Companies Act, Cap. 106. The conduct complained of directly affected the Petitioners in their capacity as members, infringed their proprietary and participatory rights, and effectively excluded them from the Company's affairs without lawful justification.

51. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the actions of the Respondent occasioned oppression against the Petitioners within the meaning of Section 243 of the Companies Act, Cap. 106.

c. What remedies are available to the parties?

52. The material factual assertions contained in the Petitioners' statutory declarations remained substantially un rebutted. Although the Respondent Company was represented by Counsel at the proceedings, no cogent evidence was adduced to challenge the specific allegations concerning the authenticity of the impugned resolutions, the circumstances surrounding the execution of the disputed documents, the alleged fabrication of signatures, or the irregular transfer and cancellation of the Petitioners' shares. The Respondent Company equally failed to produce documentary evidence within its exclusive possession, such as duly convened notices, minutes of meetings, attendance registers, share transfer instruments, instruments of consideration, or other corporate records capable of

rebutting the Petitioners' claims. It is a settled principle of evidence that where a party fails to adduce evidence to controvert facts peculiarly within its knowledge or possession, the court or tribunal is entitled to draw an adverse inference against that party. Consequently, the factual assertions advanced by the Petitioners, being supported by documentary and forensic evidence and remaining substantially unchallenged on their material particulars, must be accorded considerable probative weight.

53. The Registrar of Companies' statutory jurisdiction relates to the exercise of two distinct powers, first, the power to hear and determine complaints by an oppressed member under Section 243 of the Companies Act Cap 106 and second, the power to rectify and update the company's register pursuant to Regulation 8 of the Companies (Powers of the Registrar) Regulations SI No. 71 of 2016 that empowers the Registrar to expunge from the register any information or document included in the register which;

- a. Is misleading*
- b. Is inaccurate*
- c. Is issued in error*
- d. Contains an entry or endorsement made in error*
- e. Contains an illegal endorsement*
- f. Is illegally or wrongfully obtained*

54. Having found that filings removing the first Petitioner as a director in the Company and those purporting to transfer the Petitioners' shares were illegally and wrongfully obtained, they are all liable to be expunged.

55. Accordingly, pursuant to Section 243 of the Companies Act Cap 106 and Regulations 8 and 32 of the Companies (Powers of the Registrar) Regulations SI No 71 of 2016, I hereby make the following orders;

- 1) *I find that the actions of the Respondent were oppressive towards the Petitioners, contrary to Section 243 of the Companies Act, Cap. 106.*
- 2) *The Ordinary Resolution dated 11th January 2026 and filed on 12th January 2026 purporting to remove the first Petitioner as a director of the Company and appoint Rwamwiri Abiaz, is to be expunged for having been illegally and wrongfully obtained.*
- 3) *The Company Form 20 (Notification of Appointment of Director and Secretary of Company) dated 12th January 2026, predicated upon the abovementioned Ordinary Resolution, omitting the first Petitioner as a director of the Company and indicating Rwamwiri Abiaz, is to be expunged for having been wrongfully obtained.*
- 4) *The Board Resolution dated 11th January 2026 and filed on 13th January 2026 purporting to transfer each of the Petitioners' 40 shares in the Company to a one Rwamwiri Abiaz, is to be expunged for being inaccurate, misleading and having been illegally and wrongfully obtained.*
- 5) *The Certificate on Transfer of Share Stock dated 11th January 2026 and filed on 13th January 2026, certifying the transaction effected by the transfer of the aforementioned shares as a bona fide sale between a willing buyer and a willing seller, is to be expunged for being inaccurate, misleading and wrongfully obtained.*
- 6) *The Transfer of Share Stock form dated 13th January 2026, predicated upon the abovementioned Board Resolution, purporting to transfer 40 ordinary shares in the Company from the first Petitioner to a one Rwamwiri Abiaz, is to be expunged for being inaccurate, misleading, and illegally and wrongfully obtained.*
- 7) *The Transfer of Share Stock form dated 13th January 2026, predicated upon the abovementioned Board Resolution, purporting to transfer 40 ordinary shares in the*

Company from the Second Petitioner to one Rwamwiri Abiaz, is to be expunged for being inaccurate, misleading, and illegally and wrongfully obtained.

- 8) The Board Resolution dated 24th February 2026 and filed on 26th February 2026 authorizing the company to acquire a credit card of 40 million shillings with Kansime Doreen as the holder, is to be expunged for having been illegally endorsed and wrongfully obtained.*
- 9) It is hereby ordered that the Petitioners are lawful members of Africa Wild Explorations Limited, with the first Petitioner also acting as a director. Accordingly, the Company's records shall revert to the position that existed before the contested filings.*
- 10) The Registrar shall rectify the register to restore the company's records to the position existing prior to the impugned filings.*
- 11) I make no order as to costs.*

I so Order.

Given under my hand this 03rd day of July 2026

Daniel Nasasira

Assistant Registrar of Companies