

BEN GALE -v- WILLY ABUITO'O

High Court of Solomon Islands

(Palmer J.)

Civil Case No. 203 of 1993

Hearing: 14 and 15 December 1993

Judgment: 22nd December 1993

A. Radclyffe for Appellant

T. Kama for the Respondent

C. Ashley for Attorney General

PALMER J: The Respondent was elected on the 26th of May 1993 as the winning candidate for the West Honiara Constituency with a majority of 51 votes over his nearest rival, the Petitioner, in this case.

There are five grounds to the petition. They are as follows:

- 3(A) (i) *That the people named on the attached lists were registered as voters for the West Honiara Constituency although they are not ordinarily resident therein contrary to section 55(2)(b) of the Constitution.*
- (A) (ii) *That the said Walton Willy Abuito'o and / or his agents including Moses Mani caused the said people to be registered by giving them form B registration forms in or about November or December 1992 in anticipation that the said Walton Willy Abuito'o would be a candidate in the General Election and Moses Mani in the Honiara Town Council Election and that the said people would vote for them.*
- (A) (iii) *The said people did vote at the said election on 26th May 1993.*
- (B) *The agents of the said Walton Willy Abuito'o provided transport to registered voters to take them to the polling stations on condition that they voted for the said Walton Willy Abuito'o.*
- (C) *That the said Walton Willy Abuito held a feast at his residence on the day of the election for people living in the area and that those who attended the feast*

were obliged in custom to vote for the said Walton Willy Abuito'o and that the said Walton Willy Abuito'o was therefore guilty of the corrupt practice of treating contrary to the provision of Section 71 of the National Parliament Electoral Provisions Act 1980.

- (D) *That Patricia Sipolo and Sakaholo who voted at White River polling station were under 18 years old at the time they were registered for voting.*

No evidence has been called in respect of ground 3(D) and accordingly that ground is dismissed.

The crucial ground in this application is ground 3(A)(i).

The thrust of the Petitioner's case under this ground is contained in section 55(2)(b) of the Constitution. That section reads: "*No person shall be entitled to be registered as an elector in any constituency in which he is not ordinarily resident.*"

The key words are 'constituency' and 'ordinarily resident'. For a person to be eligible for registration as an elector, he must necessarily be ordinarily resident in that constituency in which he intends to vote. The word 'constituency' is not defined under the Constitution, however, under the National Parliament Electoral Provisions Act 1980, the word 'electoral constituency' is defined as meaning 'a constituency prescribed for the purposes of section 54 of the Constitution'. Section 54 reads:

"54 (1) For the purpose of the election of members of Parliament, Solomon Islands shall be divided into such number of constituencies, being not less than thirty and not more than fifty, and each constituency shall have such boundaries, as may be prescribed by Parliament by resolution on a recommendation of the Constituency Boundaries Commission in accordance with subsection (4) of this section.

- (2) *The Constituency Boundaries Commission shall make recommendations to Parliament with respect to the number and boundaries of constituencies as soon as practicable after the commencement of this Constitution; and thereafter the Commission may review the number and boundaries of the constituencies whenever they consider this to be desirable and shall do so not later than ten years after they reviewed them, and may make recommendations to Parliament for alterations in the number and boundaries of the constituencies.*

- (3) *In making recommendations under the preceding subsection, the Constituency Boundaries Commission shall have regard to the principle that the number of inhabitants of each constituency shall be as nearly equal as is reasonably practicable:*

Providing that the Commission may depart from the foregoing principle to such extent as they consider expedient in order to take account of the distribution of the population, the means of communication, and ethnic affiliations.

- (4) *Parliament may, by resolution, approve or reject the recommendations of the Constituency Boundaries Commission but may not vary them; and, if so approved, the recommendations shall have effect as from the next dissolution of Parliaments."*

There are several wards in the West Honiara Constituency. The two wards whose boundaries are of relevance to this application are the Vavaea Ward, and Ngossi Ward. Vavaea Ward is Ward No. 5, and its southern boundary reads: 'Commencing at a point on the town boundary being the intersection of the southern boundary of the town of Honiara with the eastern boundary of Ward 2 thence in a general easterly direction following the said town boundary to a point being the intersection of the centreline of Mataniko River with the southern boundary of the town of Honiara....."

The boundary of the Ngossi Ward on its Western and southern end basically follow the town boundary. Several maps numbered, XK 0056, XK 0057, XK 0058, XK 0456, and a Honiara Photomap taken in 1992 have been submitted to give some indication to the court as to the location of two villages, namely Green Hill or Grass Valley at Kaibia, and Win Valley at White River Area.

The forceful submission of Mr Radclyffe is that all those occupants of those residences whose houses are beyond the town boundary and whose names are on the national register of those entitled to vote, should be disqualified from voting. In support of ground 3(A)(i), a total of 95 names of registered voters had been submitted by the Petitioner. The composition of this is as follows: Win Valley Settlement: 56 names; Koa Hill: 2 names; Green Hill or Grass Valley Settlement: 35 names; Vara Creek: 2 names. Out of all those however, only 53 voted.

The words 'ordinarily resident' is not defined under the Constitution, however, I accept that it must be interpreted in relation to the word 'constituency'. If we take the example of one of the witness, Charles or Silas Konai; should he be regarded as ordinarily resident within the West Honiara Constituency? He said in evidence that for

the past national elections he had been voting as a voter from the Kaibia area. The Honiara Town Council had also been deducting his basic rates for those years. Further, he says that his rubbish had been regularly collected by the Honiara Town Council. He says that the first time he became aware that something was not right in respect of his place of residence was when he was disqualified by the Honiara Town Council in April of 1993 from contesting in the Honiara Town Council election, on the ground that he was residing outside of the town boundary. On the eve of election day he had raised a question with the Respondent about his eligibility as a registered voter, but bearing in mind that his physical location was outside of the town boundary. He says that an assistant registration officer told him that it was alright for him to vote, and so on the said day he went and cast his vote, as he had always done in the past. This witness however did not deny that his residence is located outside of the town boundary. He did point out that it was only recently that he became aware that he was residing in customary land. This was when someone from the Lands Division of the Guadalcanal Provincial Office, attended at his place it seems, at the request of some land owners to sort out the town boundary. It was only then that he became aware that he was residing on customary land. He says that he has continued to reside there, however, after obtaining the permission of the customary land owners.

This witness says that most of the people who reside in that settlement are in some way related to him and he is regarded to some extent I guess, as the chief or leader or elder, in his settlement.

The limits or boundaries of the West Honiara Constituency are clearly visible and have been physically marked out. The problem we have it seems is in defining whether a person like Charles Konai is ordinarily resident in the West Honiara Constituency or not. For all purposes, Charles Konai would regard himself as a town dweller. He pays basic rates and enjoys the services of the Honiara Town Council in collecting his rubbish on a regular basis. He works in the town and seems to have moved beyond the town boundary only out of convenience and perhaps crowdedness at the Kaibia settlement. He did state in his evidence that initially he thought he was moving to another area or part of Government land, and only realised that he was squatting on customary land at a later stage.

It would seem that he could be regarded as residing within the town boundary, though his physical dwelling is outside of the town boundary. I do note that this point has not been pursued by the Respondent and on that basis, I must accept, that him and others in his settlement do reside outside of the West Honiara Constituency.

A total of 35 names has been submitted as consisting of the names of those registered from the Grass Valley or Green Hill settlement to vote. This would be quite consistent

with the evidence of Charles Konai that the total number of those who live in his settlement is about 47 or so. Out of those 35 registered voters, only 20 persons cast their votes, as cross checked and double checked by myself with the Master List of Voters, submitted by Mr Ashley. I am satisfied there is sufficient evidence before me to have those twenty voters who did cast their votes on the 26th of May 1993 disqualified. Their names are attached in schedule 1 and annexed to this judgment.

The registered voters list of the Win Valley Settlement area however, is slightly different and the results of this either breaks or makes this petition.

First, a total list of 56 names has been submitted as belonging to persons or voters who live in that settlement. Unfortunately, there is very little evidence to prove to this court that all or most of these voters do actually reside outside of the town boundary, or the boundary of the West Honiara Constituency. In his response to a question from Mr Kama, the Petitioner stated that he personally discovered that the settlement at Win Valley was totally outside of the town boundary. He also said that many of the people who lived at Win Valley were workers at the Ministry of Transport and Works Utilities. However, he could not identify who those workers were for purposes of proof to this court. It is one thing to produce a list of names and maps, and allege that these names on the list consist of persons who reside outside the boundary of the town. It is however, another matter to actually establish to the courts satisfaction that those persons whose names are on the list in this petition, do reside outside the boundary of the town. No witness has been called to that effect, and accordingly this court cannot make that assumption without due proof. In the Grass Valley or Green Hill allegation, there was clear evidence from one of the witnesses of the Petitioner, Charles Konai, that he and his family consisting of about 47 souls, reside outside the town boundary. In the Win Valley settlement, there is basically very little evidence to that effect.

Whatever evidence there is before this court did not come from the Petitioner, but rather from the Respondent's witness, Festus Moutai. This witness's name, was among those whose names had been listed as residing outside the Honiara Town Council Boundary. Unfortunately, this witness gave very clear evidence that the piece of land occupied by him at Win Valley had been obtained by him from the Commissioner of Lands, under a temporary occupation licence. He also stated that quite a number of those who live at Win Valley had t.o.l's as well. He however did point out that, Mr Kabwere's Poultry Farm area is outside the town boundary.

His evidence about the temporary occupation licence granted to him by the Commissioner of Lands, is quite significant. This virtually destroys the allegation of the Petitioner that all those who resided at Win Valley, are outside the town boundary. If they have t.o.l's, then most likely it means, that that land is within the town

boundary. With due respect, there has been virtually no evidence or very little evidence to convince me otherwise. No one from the Honiara Town Council has been called, or someone from the Lands Division, or Survey Department called to give evidence about the exact location of this settlement. None of the other persons listed in the list have also been called to verify this.

The witness Festus Moutai, also stated, that about 70-80 people lived at Win Valley Settlement, and that as far as he was aware, they all had their own t.o.l's as well. If any conclusion is to be made from his evidence, then the only names of registered voters who should be disqualified are those who reside at Kabwere's Poultry Farm Area. In the list of names submitted to this court, those residing at Kabwere's Farm have been conveniently identified. Their registration numbers and names are as follows:

1.1	220	Kabwere Bakatobo)	
1.1	221	Kabwere Eria)	
1.1	222	Kabwere John)	
1.1	223	Kabwere Katoka)	
1.1	224	Kabwere Mote)	KABWERE POULTRY FARM AREA
1.1	225	Kabwere Tateisi *)	
1.1	226	Kaieti Alick *)	
1.1	227	Kaieti Mamutei *)	
1.1	228	Kaieti Margaret *)	
1.1	229	Kaieti Mary *)	
1.1	230	Kaieti Teioki *)	

(Those marked with an asterisk (*) are those who voted).

The total number of registered voters in Kabwere's Farm is 11. However, only 6 persons voted. I am satisfied that these 6 voters should be disqualified.

Out of the remaining 45 names on the list for Win Valley Settlement, only 23 voted. Their names are as contained in schedule 2 as annexed herewith.

There is insufficient evidence before me with respect to satisfy me that the votes of these 23 persons should be disqualified. It is for the Petitioner to satisfy me that these voters should be disqualified as they lived beyond the town boundary. That has not been done in this case.

Under Area 9, Koa Hill of Ward 5, Vavaea, two names have been submitted of persons residing outside the Honiara Town Council Boundary. These are: Mani Moses, Registration No. 5.9 143, Manihunu Meltus, Registration No. 5.9 144.

Unfortunately, there has been no evidence whatsoever to show that these two persons resided outside the town boundary, and it seems that their names have been listed more out of presumption. Mr Mani gave very clear evidence that he stood in the Vavaea Ward for the Honiara Town Council election but lost. No challenge was made as to his place of residence. He also stated that he was a campaign manager of the Respondent. Manihunu Meltus, he says is his mother in law. His evidence is virtually unchallenged and accordingly, I must dismiss the allegation that those two persons resided out of the town boundary.

The only other two names submitted before this court as residing beyond the town boundary are: Kalu Clifton, Reg. No. 7.3 35 and Kalu Beyriel, Reg. No. 7.3. 34.

I am satisfied there is evidence before me to satisfy me that these two voters also resided outside of the town boundary. In his evidence, the Petitioner pointed out that both persons resided at Green Hill or Grass Valley, but that they were registered at Mataniko Ward.

This evidence has been corroborated by the witness Charles Konai, who also confirmed that not only does Clifton Kalu and Beyriel Kalu reside further up where he lives, but that Clifton Kalu was also disqualified in the same way he was disqualified from the Honiara Town Council elections; the reason being, that they both resided outside the town boundary. I am satisfied that the votes of these two persons should be disqualified.

The total number of votes to be disqualified therefore is 28. (ie. 20 from Grass Valley or Green Hill, 6 from Kabwere's farm, and the above two votes from Mataniko Ward).

It is clear that this number is insufficient to affect the result of the election, where the majority obtained was well in excess of this; being 51 votes.

But even if, for argument sake that only the votes of Festus Moutai and his family should have been considered valid by this court and not the others, I am still satisfied that the number of votes disqualified will still be less than the majority of votes obtained and therefore will not affect the result of the election. There are at least three persons with the surname, Moutai; namely, Festus Moutai, Charles Moutai, and Betty Moutai.

If I exclude only these 3 names, then the number of those whose votes would be disqualified at Win Valley settlement would be 26. If we add 26 to 20 from Grass Valley and the other 2 votes of Clifton Kalu and Beyriel Kalu, that still comes to only 48 votes; 3 votes less than the 51 majority vote. However, as I had stated, I am satisfied

that only the 6 votes from Kabwere's farm should be disqualified and not the others, as there is insufficient evidence to satisfy me otherwise.

There is one other factor which needs to be pointed out. Under his examination in chief, the Petitioner stated very clearly that in his view the votes of the people at Grass Valley or Green Hill would be split between him and the Respondent. I accept this is guesswork but if I am to give some credit to that, then the 20 votes cast by those from that settlement, to be fair, should be split equally between the Petitioner and the Respondent. If that is done, then this reduces the number of votes that should be disqualified even further, and does not assist the Petitioner in his application. I do bear in mind what Charles Konai had stated in court, but as pointed out earlier, his evidence should be treated with caution, and secondly, that it is his opinion only that those who reside at the settlement would actually follow what he says.

I am therefore clearly satisfied that the number of votes actually disqualified did not affect the result of the election.

The second submission put forward by Mr Radclyffe though not expounded upon is that the breaches of section 55(2)(b) of the Constitution were fundamental breaches and that therefore the whole election should be vitiated, irrespective of whether or not the election results have been affected. A good discussion of the principles of law applicable to this has been thoroughly covered in the judgment of *Sir John White ACJ., in the case Evo -v- Supa and Returning Officer, SILR 1985/1986 1, at page 15 to 19*. One of the grounds in the petition in that case was that 216 voters were illegally registered in the East Ysabel Electoral Constituency, and accordingly not entitled to be registered as electors, as provided for under section 55(2)(b) of the Constitution.

The thrust of Mr Kenneth Brown's submission, counsel for the Petitioner, was that *".....the provisions of the Act and the Constitution regarding the areas of constituencies showed that the error, even though the breach did not affect the result, should be held to vitiate the election because it was not conducted in accordance with the principles as to elections laid down in the Act and the Constitution"*.

At page 18, after discussing the applicable English authorities in detail, Sir John White said:

"The cases suggest there is sometimes difficulty in applying the test but Morgan's case is now clear authority for the proposition that s.9 of the Act of 1980 as to non compliance means that unless the matter relied on affects the results of the election the election will not be vitiated "provided it was conducted in accordance with the principles laid down in the body of the Act" which, put another way, means

"substantially in accordance with the law as to elections." As Stephen LJ said the non compliance sections are "enabling in that they envisage "circumstances in which, despite irregularity, a new election need not be held." The question, again using the words of Stephen Lord Justice is whether "the principles of the Act are violated" in the sense that an election will stand if proved breaches are "not substantial", have not departed "from the principles of election by ballot embodied in the statute" and have not affected the result.

Giving effect to the law as explained in Morgan's case in the present case, and bearing in mind that the error in boundaries affected voters whose votes did not affect the result in either of the electoral constituencies, and that in other respects the rules as to elections were complied with in "a real election by ballot", I am unable to agree that what happened amounted to a substantial breach or violation of the principles of the Act. Adopting the language of Stephenson LJ the departure from the requirements of the electoral law in this case, in my view, was not so substantial as "to make the ordinary man condemn the election as a sham or a travesty of an election by ballot."

The facts in Evo's case are similar to this. What is also clear in this case is that the mistake or error was not the deliberate work of those persons who resided in those settlements outside of the town boundary. The registration officers who went out to do the registration should have known which dwelling or settlements were within the town boundary and which were not, and accordingly who was eligible for registration and who was not. What is also very clear to me is that the mistake had been in existence during the previous national elections, but was never picked up or raised by those who knew about this.

In his evidence before this court, Charles Konai stated that he had been residing at Grass Valley or Green Hill settlement for some 8 years or so now and that he had voted in the previous national elections. He had voted he says then for the Petitioner.

The Petitioner also conceded that those settlements had been in existence for sometime and that it was possible that those persons would have been registered to vote within the West Honiara Constituency. It is interesting to note that the Petitioner was one of the few persons who was aware of the irregularity in the registration of voters from those settlements, but decided not to check or raise any issue about it. Had he done so at an earlier date prior to the elections, then it seems clear that a more careful and thorough check would have been done by the Registration Officers from the Honiara Town Council, to weed out the names of those who resided outside of the town boundary. He however chose to remain silent about it and then raise it only when he lost out in the elections.

Whatever his motivations were, I am not satisfied that the error in the registration procedures could be regarded as amounting to a substantial breach or violation of the principles of the Act. Re-echoing the words of Stephenson LJ, as quoted by Sir John White in Evo's case, I am not satisfied that the departure from the procedure laid down by parliament was so substantial so as 'to make the ordinary man condemn the election as a sham or a travesty of an election by ballot'.

I now turn to the second ground raised. The only evidence came from the Petitioner who said under examination in chief that he was aware that a campaign manager of the Respondent was registering people's names. That campaign manager was Moses Mani. He also alleged that the Respondent was involved in the registration of voters by giving them form B forms. There was however, no other satisfactory evidence produced in support of this.

In contrast, Moses Mani was called by the Respondent, as one of his witnesses, who explained to the court under cross-examination from Mr Radclyffe, that he did accompany the registration officer at some stage, but this was to assist him in pointing out those who were not eligible to vote because they had been residing at the village for less than the minimum requirement of 12 months. He denied however actually distributing the form B forms.

The Respondent also denied ever doing any registration of any voters or distributing any form B forms. The evidence of Moses Mani and the Respondent is very convincing and I accept what they have said in court.

In weighing all the evidence together, I am not satisfied that the Petitioner has established this allegation to the required standard.

Under ground 3(B), the first allegation related to the use of a yellow mini-bus. In his evidence, the Petitioner identified the bus as registration no. A2351. The witness, James Sade was called in support of this by the Petitioner. In his evidence this witness stated that he saw a yellow mini-bus coming to drop off people to vote. However, he could not identify who owned that bus, and whether it was arranged by anyone to pick up voters to come and vote, especially if it was arranged by the Respondent. Apart from this, there was no evidence from this witness of any form of bribery.

In contrast, the owner of the bus registration no. A2351, Mr Anthony Seketa, gave very clear and convincing evidence before this court that on the said election date, he took his family out to Bonege area for a picnic, as he was not registered as a voter, and because his wife was a foreign national, and therefore not eligible to vote. He stated

that he did not rent out his bus to anyone to use on election day. He also stated that about two weeks after the elections, the Petitioner had called in to make inquiries about hiring his bus, so he gave him all the details about his rates, the bus registration no etc. However, nothing further was heard from the Petitioner, thereafter. It was only a few weeks later that he says he became aware of the allegation of the Petitioner regarding his bus.

It seems that the so-called yellow mini-bus was not correctly identified on the election day, and therefore the Petitioner himself had to go and find out the necessary details. One of the eye-witnesses of the bus who described himself as a secret agent of the Petitioner, could not even make a proper identification of that bus, other than to say it was a yellow mini-bus.

What is however of more significance here is that there is basically an absence of any corrupt arrangement or evidence of such, in the use of this yellow bus. Mr Radclyffe has correctly pointed out that the improper thing about the use of such transport is in making its availability conditional for the support of any particular candidate.. And that accordingly must be proven to the required standard. That has not been done in this case.

The second allegation related to the use of a land-cruiser belonging to a person by the name of Sam Mouala. The witness, James Sade also confirmed seeing a similar vehicle coming to drop off voters at the Mbokonavera Clinic, where one of the polling stations was located. This witness did not know however, where or who, was responsible for the provision of this transport, or whether any corrupt arrangement was involved in its use.

The witness, Charles (Silas) Konai did state that he came in Sam Mouala's vehicle, but that he did not know who was responsible for the provision of the transport. He did say however that in the truck he said that he would vote for the Respondent. However, there is no evidence whatsoever, that whoever provided that transport made it conditional that they must vote for the Respondent. The evidence of Charles Konai did not show this.

There is one interesting point to note about Charles Konai. In his evidence under oath he stated that he was a campaign manager of another candidate; Mr Warren Paia. However, he says that he voted for the Respondent. When asked why this is so, he answered that he was playing politics. Before this court he stated that he was speaking the truth. I am cautious however about his evidence. Apart from his evidence, there is no other evidence to support the allegation of bribery with regards to the use of this land-cruiser.

In his evidence the Respondent denied emphatically ever using or hiring, or even asking Sam Mouala to transport voters to the polling station.

I am basically not satisfied that this allegation has been proven to the required standard and must fail.

The third allegation relates to a vehicle registration no. 9684, belonging to a Bougainvillean by the name of John Kopana. Again the same thing can be said about this allegation as well. The evidence as to any corrupt arrangement is basically non-existent.

The Respondent did point out in his evidence that John Kopana is his son-in-law. But apart from that, he says he did not make any arrangements with him to provide any transport for any voters. There is no evidence before me to say that John Kopana had been corruptly providing transport for the use of voters.

The final allegation in this petition relates to a feast alleged to have been held by the Respondent on the 26th of May 1993 at his residence.

In his evidence, the Petitioner stated that the feast was held on the evening of election day. Two pigs were killed that day.

In contrast to this, the Respondent stated that no feast whatsoever was held on election day. There was indeed a feast held, but this was he says, on the 14th of June 1993, over the Queens Birthday period. His evidence has been very strongly corroborated by the evidence of Moses Mani. This witness emphatically stated it was him who organised the feast that day. He says that he was a bit upset with the Respondent for not hosting any feast in which to thank all those who had spent a great deal of their time and energy in campaigning for him. As a result of this he arranged to hold the feast to show the Respondent what he should have done. The feast was held on the 14th of June 1993.

The evidence of the Respondent and Moses Mani in my view is very convincing. When contrasted with the sole evidence of the Petitioner, I must say that I am not satisfied that what he said in evidence is correct. It is quite possible that he may have been mistaken about the timing of the feast.

If a feast had indeed been held on the 26th of May 1993 then it is quite possible that the provision of such a feast at such a time could amount to treating. However, there must be cogent evidence before this court to show that that was indeed so. In the evidence of the Petitioner, he did say that the feast was done it seems in his view as a form of appreciation by the Respondent, to those who have helped him in his campaign. If that is so then that is hardly evidence of any form of treating. It must be borne in

mind that a recognised customary way of saying thank you to people for any form of work or help that they may have done is to put on a feast for them; and this would naturally include those who have helped out in the election.

From the evidence adduced in court, I am not satisfied that such a feast amounted to treating. I do not accept the version of the Petitioner that the feast was held on the evening of the 26th of May 1993. I prefer rather the evidence of the Respondent and Moses Mani as correct, that the feast was held on the 14th of June 1993. Mr Mani gave clear evidence that that feast was to thank those who had participated and helped in the campaign for the Respondent. This is some two weeks after election day, and I am not satisfied that such a feast could really ever amount to any form of treating. The evidence produced by the Petitioner basically falls short of proving this allegation.

All the grounds in the petition accordingly are dismissed. And it is determined pursuant to section 82(3) of the National Parliament Electoral Provisions Act 1980 that the Respondent, Walton Willy Abuito'o is the duly elected candidate of the West Honiara Constituency.

(A.R. Palmer)

JUDGE

SCHEDULE 1RESIDENCE OUTSIDE OF HONIARA TOWN BOUNDARY

WARD 5: VAVAE
 AREA 10: KAIBIA
 GREENHILL SETTLEMENT

5.10. 26 Bako John *
 27 Bakotee Lila *
 30 Bau Alison
 31 Bau Ben *
 32 Bau Rose
 33 Ben John
 35 Beto Billy
 36 Beto Roben
 38 Billy Sarah *
 50 Dauara Billy
 51 Dauara Eric
 95 Gulu Gaenet *
 96 Gulu Richard *
 117 Kaka Fred *
 127 Kerekere Rose *
 136 Konai Billy *
 137 Konai Silas *
 139 Kwaimani John
 161 Luita David *
 162 Luita Margaret *
 190 Mauala Rachel *
 191 Mauala Sam *
 196 Moli Ansy
 197 Moli Augustine *
 211 Niuala Nathaniel
 212 Niuala Fred *
 213 Niutaloa Jimmy *
 218 Niutaloa Pritus *
 219 Niutaloa John *
 222 Olangi Rex
 230 Onofia Nistal
 231 Onofia Pristus

286	Taigwata Simon *
302	Tua Gabriel
320	Wasa Allan

Total: 35
No. who voted: 20

Note: Those marked with an asterisk (*) were those who actually voted.

SCHEDULE 2RESIDENTS OUTSIDE OF HONIARA TOWN COUNCIL BOUNDARY

WARD 1: NGOSSI
 AREA 1: WHITE RIVER
 WIN VALLEY SETTLEMENT

1.1	6	Alafea Abiline	
	12	Aloisio Hellen *	
	46	Babaena Jimmy *	
	47	Babaru Ellen	
	61	Bana Mathew	
	62	Banabas Cecilia	
	63	Bao Jim	
	73	Bau Jim	
	134	Dorai Chrish	
	161	Filia David *	
	162	Filia Everlyn	
	163	Filia John *	

	220	Kabwere Bakatobo)	
	221	Kabwere Eria)	
	222	Kabwere John)	
	223	Kabwere Katoka)	
	224	Kabwere Mote)	KABWERE POULTRY FARM AREA
	225	Kabwere Tateisi*)	
	226	Kaieti Alick *)	
	227	Kaieti Mamutei *)	
	228	Kaieti Margaret *)	
	229	Kaieti Mary *)	
	230	Kaieti Teioko *)	

	226	Kivau Aloisio *	
	328	Lui Victoria	
	332	Luiramo David *	
	333	Luiramo Nathaniel	
	334	Luiramo Robert	
	367	Maeru Rose	
	370	Magi Malachi *	

	371	Magi Ray *
	423	Moutai Festus *
	424	Moutai Charles *
	425	Moutai Betty *
	464	Oiri Jack *
	465	Oiri Kaling *
	479	Ota Everlyn
	545	Roboliu Wilson *
	546	Roboliu Janet *
	575	Saeni Alice *
	576	Saeni Allen *
	577	Saeni Cristal
	578	Saeni Henzel
	579	Saeni Koroli *
1.1	580	Saeni Maggie
	617	Sipolo Andrew
	626	Sipolo Alafea
	627	Sipolo Fanai
	628	Sipolo Patricia
	629	Sipolo Sakaholo
	630	Sira Alick *
	631	Sira Anilafa
	632	Sira Queenly *
	633	Sira Rachel
	699	Taungani Alice *
	700	Taungani John *

Total:	56
No. actually voted:	29

Note: Those marked with an asterisk (*) were those who actually voted.