

# REPORT OF THE PANEL SET UP TO INVESTIGATE ALLEGED MISCONDUCT, SEXUAL HARASSMENT AND ABUSE OF OFFICE LEVELLED AGAINST PROFESSOR CYRIL OSIM NDIFON, SUSPENDED DEAN OF FACULTY OF LAW, UNIVERSITY OF CALABAR

## 1. PREAMBLE

Sequel to the petition and protest of 14<sup>th</sup> August, 2023 by the students of the Faculty of Law, University of Calabar, in which certain allegations of improprieties were levelled against the sitting Dean of the Faculty, Professor Cyril O. Ndifon, the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Florence Obi, constituted an administrative Panel to thoroughly investigate the allegations. Prior to this investigation panel, the university management had issued a query to the suspended Dean, which he answered but the University management found his responses unsatisfactory. Given the negative publicity these allegations had generated for the corporate image of the University, this panel of investigation was set up to look at the facts, report the findings and make recommendations consistent with extant rules and conditions of service of the University to the University Management.

## 2. MEMBERSHIP

The membership of the Panel comprised the following:

1. Prof. Dorothy Oluwagbemi-Jacob - Chairperson
2. Dr. Brenda Akpan (Executive Director, Gender Development)  
- Member
3. Prof. Patrick Egaga (Director SERVICOM) - Member
4. Dr. Tony Eyang (Dean Students Affairs) - Member
5. Prof. Ayodeji T. Owolabi (Anti-Corruption and Transparency)  
- Member
6. Prof. Elizabeth Akpama (University Counselor)- Member
7. Barr. Gabriel O. Orok - Secretary

## Observers

1. Barr. Ann A. Awah (International Federation of Female Lawyers) -  
Observer
2. SP Philomina Modor (Nigerian Police commission, Gender Unit)  
- Observer
3. Ugboma, Juliet (Public Complaints Commission)- - Observer
4. Godwin Otang - Observer
5. Barr (Dr.) Sam Eboh (Representative, University of Calabar Alumni)  
- Observer
6. Ugbe, Emmanuella Ushiekpe (Chief Judge of Malabo High Court-  
Observer

## 3. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Panel was given the following terms of reference:

1. To thoroughly investigate cases of sexual harassment and molestation levelled against the suspended Dean of Law by female students and others who may have felt victimized.
2. To investigate the alleged abuse of office, extortion and high-handedness by the suspended Dean.
3. To establish the alleged serial violations of the University rules and regulations.
4. To investigate the allegation that majority of the suspended Dean's Supervisees and their Course Representatives were female students.
5. To investigate the allegation that a male Course Representative in LLB 2A was replaced with a female counterpart by the suspended Dean.
6. To examine the extent of result manipulation, mutilation and aberration in examination conduct in the Faculty of Law from 2021.
7. To check the records of those mobilized to Law School in the past two sessions and establish if those mobilized met the requirements for same,

especially in the light of the previous wrongful mobilization that led Management writing for the withdrawal of the students from Law School with its attendant embarrassment to the University. More so, as another 148 students have been mobilized recently to Law School without inputs from the Heads of Departments or the Faculty Board.

8. To check the Direct Entry Admissions from 2021 and establish if there were irregularities in the process, that is, if those admitted were duly qualified.
9. To investigate the allegation of students having been made to pay for Matriculation numbers, Students Union Government Constitution, clearance, etc., in the Faculty against the Senate approved payments by students.
10. To investigate the allegation that the suspended Dean was in the habit of always allocating courses to lecturers based on loyalty, using the young lecturers who were doing his biddings, rather than based on fairness, equity, specialization and experience, thereby “benching” most of the experienced lecturers.
11. To examine the course allocations of the Faculty of Law and establish if the suspended Dean assigned three core cases to himself, while other professors were either assigned one or two courses.
12. To ascertain the regularity or otherwise of convening meetings of Faculty Board of Law during the Deanship (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> tenure) of Prof. Cyril O. Ndifon; more so, after the 30<sup>th</sup> May 2023 directives by Management.

#### 4. ***MODUS OPERANDI***

In carrying out the investigations, the Panel adopted the following *modus operandi*:

1. **Written Submissions** - The Panel requested for written submissions by calling for memoranda from both the University Community and the General Public.
2. **Oral Submission** – The Panel also requested for oral submissions from testifiers who were willing to testify during the Panel’s sittings.

3. **Virtual Participation** – The Panel made provision for virtual participation via Zoom Link for testifiers who could not be available for physical participation.

4. **Physical and Virtual Participation** – While physical participation took place between 10.00 a.m and 2.00 p.m. for two days, virtual participation was held from 2.00 p.m. to 5.00 p.m. and beyond.

The spill overs were accommodated during the subsequent sittings.

The suspended Dean, Professor Cyril Osim Ndifon was properly invited thrice by the Panel to come and defend himself but he failed to appear. The invitations were done through written memos, text and WhatsApp messages, as well as radio announcements. The panel had to rely on his responses to the 10 point query issued to him by the University as guidance.

The call for memoranda was published in two Nigerian widely circulated National dailies namely, Leadership and the Sun Newspapers, as well as scroll bars on national television like AIT. The panel received memoranda from six academic staff of the Faculty of law, students of the Faculty of law, as well as alumni of the same Faculty. Some academic staff that did not send in memoranda were also invited. These included three Professors, Associate Professors and other categories of academic staff totalling fifteen in all. Ten females testified regarding sexual harassment. The students that testified concerning non approved payments were thirteen in number including the LAWSAN president, Mr. Ben Otu.

## 5. ORAL INTERVIEWS/ DELIBERATIONS

The Panel held ten sittings to accomplish the task. The sittings were conducted within the terms of reference listed under (3) above as follows:

1. “To thoroughly investigate cases of sexual harassment and molestation levelled against the suspended Dean of Law by female students and others who may have felt victimized.”

Regarding this term of reference, the investigation panel received sworn statements from students and alumni of the Faculty of Law, University of Calabar, three written and signed statements from other survivors of same. Five alumni gave evidence via zoom while four current students appeared in

person and gave evidence as follows:

1.1 

**Survivor 1.1** adopted her sworn statement before the panel. She is a 200L student. She encountered Prof. Ndifon while working her transfer from the Department of Conflict Studies to the Law Faculty. The suspended Dean promised to help her get into the Law Faculty on the condition that “she would be answerable to every sexual call put across to her...” Prof. Ndifon called her to come to the office the next day and when she came, he locked the office and brought out his penis and told her that if she sucked his penis, he would accept her into the Faculty. After much pressure from the suspended Dean and feeling frustrated, this survivor gave in and sucked his penis and almost got choked as Prof. Ndifon held her head while forcing his penis into her mouth. She further testified that someone else later assisted her to get admission into the Faculty of Law. When Prof. Ndifon saw her, he asked what she was doing in the Faculty of Law. She informed him that she had been admitted into the Faculty. He then sent for her again but she lied to him that she was in the hospital (**see sworn statement annexure 1**). She read to the panel different text messages from the suspended Dean to her. She also read the voice notes from him to her after the protest of 14<sup>th</sup> August 2023 by students of the Faculty of Law warning her to stay away from the investigation panel.

1.2 

**Survivor 1. 2** adopted her sworn statement before the panel. She is a 500L student who met Prof. Cyril Ndifon in November 2018 when she applied for a direct entry admission. On a particular day when she went to his office to check on the progress of her admission, Prof. Ndifon held her face firmly and tried to kiss her. When she refused, he inquired as to why she didn't want his sexual overtures and she told him that she didn't intend to have any sexual relationship with him. Thereafter, she stopped going to him for assistance and decided to seek some other way to gain admission. In the month of February 2023, she had missed an assignment in the 400 level course (Law of Trust) taught by Prof. Ndifon due to ill-health. She

approached, knelt down and pleaded for leniency but he collected the assignment from her and dumped it telling her to manage only the exams score since she failed to submit when others were submitting. That same evening, about 5.00pm, she walked into one of Prof. Ndifon's loyalists' (Dr. Owoche Antai) office and saw three female students (her course mates) writing a supplementary examination in a course (Equity and Trust Law) which their class had written in their 4<sup>th</sup> year, with their phones and text books while the lecturer and Prof. Ndifon watched. Prof. Ndifon saw her, laughed hysterically and stepped out. She felt unfairly treated. (See sworn statement annexure 2 for further details)

### 1.3 [REDACTED]

**Survivor 1. 3** adopted her Sworn Statement before the panel. She is a 300L student that encountered Prof. Ndifon when she went to write an examination in an elective course titled "Social and Political Philosophy." Due to the medication which she had to take, she arrived late at the examination venue only to be told that the answer scripts had been exhausted. Prof, Ndifon saw her and her friend not writing the examination and came to their rescue by arranging for answer booklets so that they could follow the other students to write. After the examination, she and her friend felt it was proper to go and thank him. When they got to his office, he asked them if they wrote well and that if they were not sure, he could help them get good grades in the course since he had someone in the Department who could help. She admitted sending her matriculation number and that of her friend due to Prof. Ndifon's insistence. He asked them to see him the next day. The next day she and her friend went to see him and as they were about entering the office, he sent her friend on an errand. When she and Prof. Ndifon entered the office, the latter locked the door and asked her to give him a hug. Initially, she felt there was nothing wrong in giving the Professor a hug. But when she hugged him, Prof. Ndifon pressed her so tightly to his body and brought his lips to kiss hers and she started

struggling with him to free herself. He kissed her neck and forehead severally. She got free when her friend returned. Prof. Ndifon sent her a text message another day to come and see him. When she got to the office, he forcefully grabbed her breasts and tried to have sex with her but she resisted him ((see further details in sworn statement 3 marked annexure 3).

The panel investigated this survivor's narrative regarding the elective course in Social and Political Philosophy. It confirmed the survivor's narrative that Prof. Ndifon actually sent two students' matric numbers to the Professor that taught the elective course. The Course Lecturer was invited by the Panel and he confirmed that he received a text message from Prof. Ndifon with those two matric numbers but at the time the text message came, he had already finished marking his scripts and that the survivor had a B grade. The panel called for the script of the girl and did not find any form of manipulation on the part of the Professor that taught and graded the scripts.

1.4 - 

**Survivor 1.4** spoke to the Panel from Canada via zoom. She adopted her Sworn Statement which corroborated her oral submission. She gained admission to study law in 2001 and graduated in 2008 instead of 2006. Prof. Ndifon was her Legal system lecturer and the examinations officer in the survivor's 4<sup>th</sup> year. Prof. Ndifon made several sexual advances towards her which she turned down. He on a few occasions asked her to accompany him to his office and would approach her, grope at her breast and attempt to grope at her vagina by inserting his hand under her skirt. She resisted his attempts to have sex with her. She received an "F" grade in Prof. Ndifon's Legal System (second semester). She carried the course over to her third year and received a failed grade again. When the candidate inquired from him the reason for failing his course consistently. Mr Ndifon as he was then, told her that "she had refused to have sex with him and that the trend would continue unless she yielded to his request to have sex with him." This candidate refused to register again for the Nigerian Legal System in year 4 and consequently did not write the examination for the said course as she knew she would fail again. She wrote her final exam in June 2006. However, Ndifon never published her 4<sup>th</sup> year results until sometime in 2007/2008. This survivor

reported her experience with Prof. Ndifon to her project supervisor, Mr. E.E. Eja (now late). Eja intervened on her behalf and her 4<sup>th</sup> year result got published where Ndifon had awarded her a B grade for Nigerian legal system, which was what she merited in 2002/2003. Her final year result was published by the then new examinations officer, Chief Thomas Ekpang (now late). This survivor spent two extra years in the University due to the frustrations she suffered in the hands of Prof. Ndifon **(see sworn statement annexure 4 for further details)**

The investigation panel contacted the exams and records office of the University and confirmed that the survivor's account regarding her results is true. She actually failed the Nigerian Legal system in her second year (second semester). She carried it over to her third year and failed again. There is no record of any fourth year result. However, she graduated with a second class lower (2.2). **(see photocopy of results annexure 5).**

1.5 [REDACTED]

**Survivor 1.5** is a legal practitioner of 16 years post call who obtained her LLB certificate from the University of Calabar in 2006. She testified via zoom after adopting her sworn statement. She told the panel that she had reason to come in contact with Mr. Ndifon because of her final year project. Her assigned project supervisor, one Dr O. Igwe was operating from Port-Harcourt and so directed some of his project supervisees, including herself to Mr. Ndifon as he was then, to assist in supervision as the need arose. She went to see Mr. Ndifon to discuss an issue regarding her project. She waited for her turn to see him and after a while, he opened his door and invited her inside. Without suspecting anything, Ndifon quickly locked the door behind her. While trying to figure out what he was up to, he started unzipping his trousers to bring out his genitals while launching at her to hold her down. Realizing what was about to happen, she started crying and pleading that he should open the door and let her go. Ndifon ignored her pleas and continued trying to embrace her while undressing at the same time. She was traumatised by the whole situation and immediately became sick to the point of feeling faint and vomiting all over the office. This made Ndifon to leave her and then implored her to clean up herself promising to open the door after she had recovered herself **(See sworn statement, annexure 6)**

1.6 [REDACTED]

**Survivor 1. 6** was admitted in 2004 and graduated in 2009. Ndifon taught



her the Nigerian Legal System. During one of the lectures, he told her to see him after the class. When she went, Ndifon made sexual advances toward her. He got her number from the class admit forms she submitted and used to call her to come and see him at odd hours but she refused. She prepared well for the Nigerian Legal system, which was taught by him and was convinced that she should have a good grade in the course but to her greatest surprise, she scored an "F." This survivor was convinced that she failed because she refused to give in to Ndifon's sexual demands. Ndifon told her that she would never graduate from the Faculty talk-less of going to the law school. On another fateful day, Ndifon asked the survivor to come to his office for her result and she went. She discovered that all the lecturers in the Faculty had closed for the day and it was only his car that was parked outside the Faculty building. When she entered the office, he asked her to get one big brown envelop where he had kept other files and books. He asked her to check for her script and when she saw her script, the "C" grade was boldly written on it. He tried to convince her to have sex with him if she wanted him to record that score for her, which was her real score. He brought out his penis and grabbed her and asked her to give him oral sex if she didn't want to have real sex with him. Ndifon pinned her down to the couch with his two legs and grabbed her neck and wanted to force his penis into her mouth. She felt strangled, started coughing profusely and almost choked. It was at this point that Ndifon left her and started apologising. She stood up from the couch and fell down as she had got weak struggling with him. She left the office feeling utterly humiliated and harassed. She narrated her ordeal to some of her classmates. Fortunately, another lecturer was assigned to teach the Nigerian Legal system. That gave the survivor the opportunity to write the course again as a carry-over and scored a "D". (see sworn statement annexure 7 for more details).

1.7 

Survivor 1.7 adopted her written statement and testified via zoom. She was admitted during the 1997/1998 academic session. In her first year, she met one Cyril Ndifon now Prof. Ndifon as she was doing her documentation at the Faculty of law building. Ndifon introduced himself as a lecturer and informed her that she needed a god-father or she would not graduate from the Faculty of law. He also stated that without this god-father, it would be better that she had not been offered admission. He offered to be her god-father. She was 19 years old at that time. Since she knew that Ndifon was

the sub-dean at that time and the lecturer of the course, “the Nigerian Legal system”, a core and compulsory course taught to second year students, she panicked and went and reported the matter immediately to her father, who is now late. Her father travelled all the way from Obudu to Calabar to come and find out what Ndifon meant by his comments. He apologised to her father and did not bother her in her first year. She took Ndifon’s course in her second year and studied very hard for it but she was shocked that she had failed the course. She went to Ndifon to complain and Ndifon mocked her and stated that he thought she would invite her father over once again. He told her that she knew what to do if she wanted to pass the course. She had to re-sit the course in her third year and failed again. Ndifon saw her on the staircase one day and told her not to bother to re-sit the examination as she would still fail same again. She had to re-sit the examination again in her fourth year (for the third and the maximum time a student was supposed to write a course). On the eve of the examination, she fearlessly confronted Ndifon in his office and asked him why he had repeatedly failed her and she asked her if she was ready to have sex with him and she told him that she would never be ready to do that and he told her that she would never graduate from the Faculty of law and would never become a lawyer. The survivor stated that she challenged Prof. Ndifon and the boldness with which she did that made him sober. He apologized and asked her to go and write the exam as he would pass her. However, this happened after he had succeeded in damaging her result by failing her in **Jurisprudence and Legal System** which contributed to her graduating with a 3<sup>rd</sup> Class. (see sworn statements for more details, annexure 8)

The panel called for this survivor’s results from exams and records and the results show that she graduated with an “E” (see annexure 9) in the stated course and graduated with a third class. She eventually went to the law school and passed very well. She did LLM and won prizes during her graduation.

## 1.8 This survivor pleaded anonymity

**Survivor number 1. 8 adopted her sworn statement and testified via zoom -** she graduated from the law Faculty in 2011. Her misery started when Prof. Ndifon made it mandatory that all students must come personally to his office to submit their class admit forms. She went to submit hers and as she was about to leave the office, Ndifon asked her to see him later that day. She never did. Ndifon was their Nigerian Legal System lecturer and one day when he came to class, he asked her to leave his class. Being too scared to ask him why, she packed her things and left. She stood outside hoping that he would change his mind but he didn't but rather immediately gave the other students a test. Sending her out of the class and giving other students tests became a routine. One day Ndifon called her to come and see him at the office but she decided to go with her two friends. However, Ndifon sent her two friends on an errand and asked her to stay back at the office. He started touching her and she resisted, he asked her if she was aware that she missed a compulsory course every student must pass in order to graduate? She told him she was aware. He told her that if she complied with his demands that he would ensure that she passed his course and that he would talk to other lecturers on her behalf. However, if she refused to give in, he would ensure that she didn't graduate and go to the law school with her mates. He said "the ball is now in your court." When the results of the examination were published, She saw that she failed, went to his office to find out why he failed only to be told by Ndifon that she did not write the examination. She reminded him that on the day of the examination, he wanted to search her but she refused to be searched by him on the grounds that as a man he would not search her but rather he should bring a fellow woman to do the searching. He further said that since she had refused to give him her body, he must get it whichever way. Ndifon kept to his threat and continued to fail her till her 4<sup>th</sup> year. One Saturday, he asked her to come

to the office and immediately she entered, he locked the door and asked her to search for her scripts so that he could grade it. She searched through all the envelopes to no avail. He walked close to her and started touching her inappropriately and when she resisted him, he grabbed her and was trying to bring out her breast. She struggled and pushed him off her body. She tried leaving the office and discovered that the office was locked. He attempted to forcefully kiss her and she pushed him off her body and grabbed a bottle she saw on top of the fridge and threatened to hit him with the bottle. It was in her final year that Ndifon gave her "E" in a course he had failed her several times after going to threaten him in his office. So when this survivor saw the protest, she relived her trauma all over again and identified with what other young girls might be passing through. That is what has prompted her to speak out (see her written statement annexure 10 for more details).

The panel also investigated her claim of victimization regarding her grade and found that her testimony is true. (see annexure 11). This survivor broke down in the course of giving this testimony. She stated that Prof. Ndifon made her stay in the Faculty of Law miserable.

#### 1.9 [REDACTED]

This survivor testified that she had been a victim of Prof. Ndifon's sexual harassment. She told the panel that her ordeal started in 400L when the professor returned as the Dean of Faculty of Law. He informed her that he had become his project supervisor whereas originally she was not assigned to him. He made sexual advances toward her when she went to submit her project at his office and when she refused he became harsh and angry toward her and made her subsequent submission attempts very difficult. Any time she went to the office, he would shout at her and send her out of his office. There was a day he called her on phone to come and meet him at a hotel at Marian road and she refused and that made him angrier. She had to change her supervisor to a female lecturer in the faculty with the help of

the then sub-dean. This survivor's results were not uploaded for two academic sessions of 2020/2021 and 2021/2022 to reflect her years 4 and 5 respectively.

As at time of the appearance before the panel, some of her results had not been uploaded. She was informed that the rest of the courses namely, **law of Evidence, Law of Equity and Land law** were in prof. Ndifon's custody and so could not be uploaded.

The fact is that Comfort Jumbo had missed her examination due to ill-health. Though supplementary examination was approved for her, she was not given the examination. The suspended dean would use junior lecturers to administer exams, not the lecturers who taught the courses. At the end of such exams, the Dean would collect the scripts from the junior lecturers. This was what happened to Comfort Jumbo. The suspended dean collected the scripts. As a result, Comfort's results on **Law of Evidence, law of Equity and Land law** cannot be uploaded, meanwhile, her class mates have been mobilized for law school. She informed the panel that she has suffered all these because she rebuffed all the sexual advances towards her by Prof. Ndifon. (see application Letter, annexure 12 attached).

The panel verified her claim that she had to change supervisor, which turned out to be true.

### **SUBMISSION BY THE PROFESSORS INVITED**

The three professors that were invited were asked questions regarding the happenings in the faculty including allegations of sexual harassment by the suspended Dean. Two said that they had heard rumours about such but refused to work on rumours. Only one of them was bold enough to speak out and had intimated the panel on the actions he had taken to save several female students from frustration by Prof. Ndifon. The Professor informed the Panel that the female students had come on several occasions to complain to him about "blow job," "sucking penis" and "touched my breasts" "stuff." That Prof. Ndifon had been using the "blow job" to sexually harass female students in return for grades. He said that he had on some occasions gone to beg the suspended Dean to release withheld results of students who refused to do his "blow job" and he released the said results. The professor told the panel that the girls "are scared to death." That is why

they had not been reporting the incidents.

Additionally, a female lecturer in the Faculty also confirmed the suspended Dean's inappropriate behavior towards the female gender. She told the panel that she experienced such on some occasions when she went to his office as she was her supervisor. She stated that some of the female lecturers in the faculty have experienced such also. She said that she even had to intervene on behalf of one female student, Theresa Oloko who had failed his course because she refused to do "blow job". The girl later graduated and has gone to Law School.

2. **"To investigate the alleged abuse of office, extortion and high-handedness by the suspended Dean."**

The Panel interviewed the LAWSAN president, Mr. Benedict Obi and some lecturers in the Faculty of law as follows:

2.1 **Benedict Obi (LAWSAN President)**

Mr. Obi adopted his written statement before the panel. He informed same that he petitioned against the suspended Dean and led the protest to the Vice-Chancellor over illegal charges, irregularities, interference in students' election and extortion that had been going on in the Faculty of Law. While addressing the Panel on the issue of interference in students' election, the LAWSAN President submitted that the suspended Dean had been using his position as the Dean of Law to determine who emerged as the LAWSAN Presidents. He added that the Defendant often boasted that as the Dean he alone had the prerogative to appoint the LAWSAN President. The LAWSAN President further informed the Panel that Eyo Emmanuel would have been LAWSAN President but Prof. Ndifon prevented it. Prof. Ndifon appointed two females as LAWSAN Presidents before his emergence as LAWSAN President, which the suspended Dean did everything to block but failed. It

took the intervention of the present Dean of Students' Affairs to save the situation. The Dean of Students' Affairs, Dr. Tony Eyang confirmed this. The LAWSAN reiterated all the allegations he made in his protest letter.

## **2.2 ALLEGATION OF VICTIMIZATION AND HIGH-HANDEDNESS- BARRISTER ANNE URUEGI AGI-**

**Regarding the above term of reference,** Barrister Agi, a lecturer testified that the suspended Dean denied her of the opportunity to do her internal defense on the ground that she had not fulfilled the mandatory five year duration required to complete the programme, a regulation applicable to academic staff of the university. This was despite her supervisor's intervention that she, the candidate had satisfied the condition. She registered for the Ph.D programme in 2017. At the point of internal defense, she had spent five years in the programme.

Agi further stated that the suspended Dean allowed another colleague of hers, one Lawrence Edu who started his PhD programme in 2017 to do both internal and final defense and has in fact done convocation. Another colleague, Owoche Antai, actually commenced his PhD programme in 2020 and did final defense in May 2023, three years later, while she that had spent five years was denied.

The panel interviewed the Law lecturers mentioned by Agi namely, Edu and Owoche. Edu confirmed that he registered for PhD in 2017 and has done final defense. Similarly, Owoche Antai confirmed that he registered for PhD in 2020 and defended in May 2023.

When asked if there was any reason for the suspended Dean to mistreat her, she told the panel that her problem with him can be traced to a document written by the 2004 law class on Prof. Ndifon's sexual assaults, which she followed others to sign. It was shortly after that she got the job in the Faculty of Law. She was systematically relieved of all her assignments in the Faculty.

She appealed to the Panel for expeditious report to enable her complete her Ph.D Programme and apply for her promotion.

## **2.3 Barr. Amarachi Ijiomah**

While addressing the Panel on the issue of abuse of office and highhandedness, she narrated her ordeal with the suspended Dean. First, he removed her from **Jurisprudence**, a course that she was co-teaching with him when she started objecting to certain irregularities in the way he was relating to the female students. Second, he would ask her to enter his scores for him in a course he never taught. Third, she had a scuffle with the suspended Dean in the classroom when he asked her to hand over files of students she was supervising to him and she refused. He even threatened that she would begin her PhD from the beginning. His physical assault led to her protesting to the Vice-Chancellor in writing (**See letter attached annexure 13**)

#### **2.4 Barrister Otu**

Barrister Otu in his sworn statement deposed that the genesis of the conflict between the LAWSAN president and the suspended Dean can be traced to the latter's undue interference in the affairs of the Law Students' Association. Prof. Ndifon wanted to appoint a LAWSAN president, which was unconstitutional. It took the intervention of the Dean of Students' Affairs, Dr. Tony Eyang for the incumbent LAWSAN president to contest and emerge as president. The protest that was staged by the law students was a reaction to culture of highhandedness, and intimidation of students being perpetrated by the suspended Dean.

He also intimated the panel on how Prof. Ndifon tried to take away the office accommodation he had given him and his Ph.D supervisees because he did not support him during his Deanship election. He also alluded to how Prof. Ndifon refused to fill his evaluation form to the rank of Associate Professor because he did not support his third term Deanship election bid.

### **3.1 "To establish the alleged serial violations of the University rules and regulations."**



### 3.2 Refusal to convene Faculty Board meetings.

All the lecturers in the Faculty of law including those that did not send in memoranda but were invited for interaction with the panel unanimously stated that Faculty board meetings were sparingly held and not monthly as directed by Senate. Consequently, results were not presented at the Faculty board meetings for checking and approval before submission to the University or Law school. This was also corroborated in the written statements submitted by some of the lecturers in the Faculty (**the written statements can be produced on demand**). The last Faculty board meeting held on 15th of February 2023. Further, there had been no Faculty board meeting since May 30<sup>th</sup> as directed by the Vice-Chancellor.

### 3.3 REFUSAL TO IMPLEMENT DECISION ON COURSE ALLOCATION

In his reply to the query on this issue, the suspended Dean stated that course allocation was the Dean's prerogative. However, the lecturers in the Faculty of law who testified stated that there were a lot of irregularities in the allocation of courses. The law lecturers including the professors bemoaned a situation where the teaching of core courses up till final year were left in the hands of junior lecturers, while very senior colleagues were made to teach elective courses, with scanty population of students in such courses. These junior colleagues were made to examine students in all supplementary and summer examinations, ignoring the main course lecturers who taught the courses. They complained of the manipulation of examination results in favour of students who succumb to their demands while those who refuse to compromise are frustrated detriment of some who are "targeted" and refusal to upload some students' results particularly of the most vulnerable.

According to them, the suspended Dean ran the faculty based on loyalty to him and did not allocate courses based on experience and areas of specialization. In the second semester of 2020/2021, the suspended Dean allocated four courses to himself, namely (1) criminology (serial no. 6), (2) Law of Trust (serial no. 13) (3) Jurisprudence (serial no. 21) (4) Conflict of Laws (serial no. 23). Two of these are core or compulsory courses (**course allocation for 2020/2021 attached annexure 14**).

In the 2021/2022 First semester course allocation, the suspended Dean assigned three core courses to himself namely, (1) Legal system (serial no.

3) (2) Law of Equity (serial no. 13) and (3) Jurisprudence (serial no. 21) **(see 2021/2022 course allocation annexure 15).**

In the second semester course allocation of 2021, the suspended Dean assigned three courses to himself, namely, (1) Legal system (2) Law of Trust (3) Jurisprudence **(see annexure 16)**

The aberration in the foregoing situation is that Professors were assigned two courses, some of which were elective courses. Elective courses are usually optional courses, with scanty population, which students may or may not take, By so doing, the suspended Dean had denied the students the opportunity of profiting from the experience of the Professors in the Faculty.

Furthermore, what the suspended Dean did in the allocation of courses for year two students of 2021/2022 (referred to as LL.B 2B) was scandalous. For that year the suspended Dean assigned courses to lecturers IIs and Assistant lecturers excluding senior academics such as Professors, Associate Professors and Senior lecturers **(see course allocation first semester annexure 17)**. Also, **(see course allocation second semester, annexure 18)**. This is against the university regulation that Professors, Associate Professors and Senior lecturers are to lead or coordinate the teaching of courses. The suspended Dean even included one Mr. Anyatang who was not a staff of the university in the course allocation. What the suspended Dean attached to his reply to the query titled "amended 2021/2022 first semester course allocation was yet to be implemented and not the initial allocation that was distributed.

#### **3.4. ASSIGNMENT OF FEMALE SUPERVISEES AND APPOINTMENT OF FEMALE COURSE REPRESENTATIVES**

Of the eight supervisees that the suspended Dean assigned to himself, seven were females. Only George Obong Asanam is a male **(See project supervision list of 2021 final year class annexure 19)**.

The elected male course representative that prof. Ndifon removed and replaced with a female submitted a letter to this effect to show that the allegation is true **(See letter attached annexure 20)**

#### **3.4 DIRECT ENTRY ADMISSION WITHOUT INPUTS FROM THE HEADS OF DEPARTMENTS IN THE FACULTY**

The HODs interviewed stated that they were marginalized and were not

allowed to function. The suspended Dean appropriated their departmental dues and other facilities meant for running their departments. Similarly, he deprived the PG coordinator funds to carry out his assignment to the point that sometimes, he had to use personal money to carry out his functions. Yet, the PG students were paying N10, 000 per person for that purpose (**see submitted memorandum attached annexure 21**)

The direct entry admissions were fraught with irregularities.

Out of the list of 37 candidates shortlisted for Direct Entry Admission for the year 2022/2023, majority of them were not qualified by virtue of the criteria for eligibility for admission to the direct entry law. The panel verified the criteria for eligibility from the incumbent acting Dean and a former dean of the faculty of law and the following facts emerged regarding the criteria for admission:

1. First degree holders with first class and second class upper degree.
2. Graduates of the diploma programme in law, University of Calabar.

These criteria were not followed in the 2022/2023 admission by the suspended Dean. Of the 37 candidates on the Direct Entry Admission list, only 8 candidates met the admission criteria. Below are the spread:

1. Degree holders - 8
2. Other Diploma and DIL-18
3. OND holders - 8
4. HND - 2
5. NCE holder-1
6. Awaiting Results -2 (Serial numbers 3 and 4) (**See direct entry admission list, annexure 22**)

#### **DIPLOMA IN LAW ADMISSION 2021/2022 AND DIRECT ENTRY**

Further, for 2021/2022 academic year, the following candidates among others were admitted for diploma:

1. Ashaku Peace Awhoriwhoghene (serial no. 56)
2. Idah, Goodness Ibena (serial no. 49)
3. Ishaje, Joseph Igbaji (serial no. 13)

4. Udoh Nwankwo William (serial no. 51)
5. Andem Andem Bassey (serial no. 94)
6. Obio, Sylvester Obio (serial no. 19 supplementary list)

### **DIRECT ENTRY LIST 2022/2023**

1. Ashaku Peace Awhoriwhoghene (serial no. 14, see GSS law list, serial no. 279)
2. Idah, Goodness Ibená (serial no. 41, see GSS law list serial no. 106)
3. Ishaje, Joseph Igbaji (serial no. 46)
4. Udoh Nwankwo William (serial no. 93)
5. Andem Andem Bassey (serial no. 11, GSS Law list serial no. 33)
6. Obio, Sylvester Obio (see serial no. 177, GSS Law list 2022/23)

Serial numbers 1, 2, 5 and 6 are already in year 2 law whereas they are supposed to be in second semester year 1 diploma in law. Furthermore, Ashaku Peace Awhoriwhoghene (serial no.17 with upper credit as result), and Andem Bassey Andem (serial no. 18 with upper credit) (see Direct Entry Admission list Annexure 22) were asked to present their certificates but they said they did not have any. Obio Sylvester Obio (serial no.19 of supplementary list 2021/2022 Diploma in law and 177 compiled list of LL.B 1B annexure, see annexure 23) claimed that he had an attestation letter the original of which he submitted to the Faculty during registration. He was asked to snap the photocopy and send. He hadn't done that at the time of writing this report. Idah Goodness Ibená has not responded to the call to bring her certificate. Some students still in Diploma II were admitted through direct entry and are in LL.B. 2 concurrently, which is against the University regulation.

### **UNAUTHORIZED CHARGES**

The students testified that they were forced to pay two thousand (#2000.00) only while some paid one thousand naira (#1000.00) initially during the presentation of their payment receipts for clearance and stamping at the Faculty's finance office. The accountant of the Faculty was invited for

questioning and she admitted that she collected the money to enable her equip her office which was not in good shape, buy ledger and other sundry items for office use.

The students actually paid the sum of N500 into an account with Unical Micro Finance bank for students' Union Government Constitution. However, the Faculty officer attested to the fact that the double payment for the SUG Constitution was a mistake and that the amount collected had been paid into the designated account domiciled in Unical Microfinance Bank. This was not linked to the suspended Dean.

All the students who testified affirmed that they paid five hundred naira (N500) only to collect their matric numbers.

Mr. Robert Omang, the former Faculty officer was invited for interaction with the Panel. He explained:

- (1) That the fee schedule was given to him by the suspended Dean.
- (2) That the amount for Law Journal was N1, 700 and the account was in Zenith Bank.
- (3) That the suspended Dean gave him 25 copies of the law Journal for contributors to the journal.
- (4) That N500.00 was charged for Departmental dues and the signatories to the account were Prof. Ndifon, the Faculty Accountant and himself.
- (5) That the double payment for the SUG Constitution was a mistake and that the amount collected had been paid into the designated account domiciled in Unical Micro Finance Bank.
- (6) That the N500.00 paid for matriculation numbers was used for the refreshment of the Faculty Screening Team since no money was made available to him to cater for such. In doing this, however, he did not get any official permission from the suspended Dean to collect the money from students.

### **Law Journal**

The LAWSAN president, Mr. Obi informed the Panel that close to 2000 students had paid the sum of N1, 700 each for their Law Journal for three

consecutive academic sessions without the Journal being given to them. The students testified that the last journal they collected was during Prof. Okom's tenure as Dean.

In his response to the query issued by the University management regarding this allegation, the suspended Dean said that he could not account for monies paid by students for 2019/2020 session for the law journal. The panel took it that the suspended Dean would be willing to account for payments made by the students for the years, 2020/2021, 2021/2022 and 2022/2023. He affirmed in his reply to the query that under his Deanship in 2020/2021 session which was in 2022, "that the money paid by law students was adequately utilised for that purpose," referring anyone who cared to access the website he created.

Nevertheless, the panel tried to access the website he said he created. That website was created on June 02-2023 and updated June 03-2023. But the website is empty with absolutely no papers uploaded. Taking a glance at the editorial board reveals the following:

1. Prof. C.O. Ndifon- Editor-in-Chief
2. Dr. Joseph E. Edet - Deputy Editor
3. Roland Ekpoudo -Deputy Editor

#### **Editorial Committee**

1. Mr.Edu Lawrence – Assistant Editor (Lecturer II)
2. Mr antai G. Owoche – Assistant Editor (Lecturer II)
3. Mr. Njong Cleverty – Assistant Editor (Lecturer II)
4. Mr. Anyatang F. B.

These are all junior lecturers. It is worrisome that in a Faculty with Professors, Associate Professors and Senior lecturers, the lecturers being projected in a Faculty journal on the web are all junior lecturers. This falls short of Journal publication requirements. This also lends credence to the allegation that the suspended Dean was out to project his loyalists at the cost of compromising known academic standards.

On checking the Law Journal account held with Zenith bank the, panel

discovered the following:

Opening balance-----73,777.72  
Total Debit-----3, 532, 279.32  
Total credit-----3,725,980.01  
Closing balance-----267,478. 41

#### WITHDRAWALS

Robert Omang -----250,000-----24/6/2021  
.....-----42,000-----5/8/2021  
.....-----500,000-----6/12/2021  
.....-----500, 000-----19/1/2022  
Antai Godswill-----130, 000-----7/3/2022  
Robert Omang-----250,000-----11/4/2022  
.....-----40,000-----20/4/2022  
.....-----240,000-----22/11/2022  
.....-----60,000-----7/12/2022  
.....-----100,000-----5/6/2023  
.....-----150,000-----9/6/2023  
.....-----200,000-----16/6/2023  
.....-----300,000-----25/7/2023  
.....-----400,000-----4/8/2023

Prof. Ndifon, the suspended Dean, Mr. Robert Omang, the then Faculty officer and the account were signatories to the account while the Dean was the principal signatory. Mr. Omang told the panel that the suspended Dean usually sent him to go and withdraw money from the account for him (the suspended Dean)

#### MOBILIZATION OF STUDENTS FOR LAW SCHOOL

1. Augustine Joy Kenjang (15/071144008). This candidate got admitted in 2015 and got mobilized in 2018- **See serial no. 22 of the mobilized students list for 2021/2022, annexure 24)**
2. Ekong Happiness Udo (15/071145021). This candidate's name is not

in the screened list of final year students of law. This matric number belongs to one Asamudo Iniobong Otu, serial number 17 of the mobilized law students list (see annexure 24). Further, Ekong Happiness Udo did not take Jurisprudence which is a core and compulsory course (**the examination result sheet can be produced on demand**) but Asamudo did. However, she got mobilized for law school.

3. Ejishie, David Atianabeshe (15/071144018). This candidate's name is not in the screened list of final year law students for his set (this can be produced on demand) Further Ejishie did not take Jurisprudence a core course but is mobilized for law school (**serial no. 45 of the mobilized law students' list annexure 24**)
4. Muogozie, Ngozi Adaora (16/071144037). This candidate's name is not in the screened list of the final year law students. However, she is mobilized for law school (**See serial no. 103 of the mobilized students' list annexure 24**).
5. Tangban, Pearl Assemgha (15/071145174). This name is not found on the screened list of final year students but is mobilized for law school (**see serial no. 155 of the law students' mobilized list annexure 24**).
6. Also, see attached 24 mobilized students for law school Admission whose results were not cleared. (**annexure 25**)

“To examine the extent of results manipulation, mutilation and aberration in examination conduct in the Faculty of Law from 2021.”

While addressing the Panel on the above term of reference, Barr. Rowland Okai Ipuole (Lecturer II) denied any knowledge of change of grades in the Faculty of Law. He added that results were usually given to him from the Dean's office and might contain changed grades as a lot happened behind the scene. Further the panel discovered based on the observations made by Quality Assurance that out of the nine courses not submitted to Quality Assurance for checking, three of them including Jurisprudence (**Jil 521**),



**Equity and Trust (PPL 421), and Law of Trust (PPL 352)** were taught by the suspended Dean. The results of these courses were still not available at the time of this report. Furthermore, the Acting Dean of law submitted scripts and Examination Results Report. However, the panel discovered the results submitted by Prof. Ndifon were scanty, not the entire results for the class. What the panel saw was a case of scripts without Examination Results Report (ERR) and ERR without scripts. So it was difficult to establish anything based on this.

### **OFFICES WERE NOT ALLOCATED ACCORDING TO SENIORITY**

A Professor was not allocated office whereas junior lecturers had offices.

### **FINDINGS**

**Following the terms of reference, the panel hereby report the findings:**

**Term of reference number 1:** To thoroughly investigate cases of sexual harassment and molestation levelled against the suspended Dean of Law by female students and others who may have felt victimized.

For the avoidance of doubt, "sexual harassment is an unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favours, and other verbal or physical conduct of sexual nature."

Cases of sexual harassment and molestation were established by reason of the various accounts of encounters with Prof. Ndifon by current female students of the faculty of law and the alumni who decided to speak up regarding the pains and suffering they had to endure during their student days in the hands of the suspended Dean. Most of these ladies, now married are still traumatized. The survivors affirmed that they were not coerced or influenced. Neither did they give their testimony under duress.

The panel also was able to establish that the testimonies of the current female students have substance in view of the fact that some of the things they said that transpired between them and prof. Ndifon turned out to be

true. For instance, the example of Omotola and her friend sending matriculation numbers and Prof. Ndifon forwarding such to the lecturer to influence their scores is a pointer to the fact that there was a transaction between Prof. Ndifon and these female students. That was an act of professional misconduct. A female colleague of the suspended Dean also testified that she had experienced Prof. Ndifon's sexual harassment. Even a male colleague, a senior Professor lent credence to the fact that the sexual harassment and molestation allegation was not made up by the survivors. There had been such going on in the faculty of law for years but the female students were "sore" afraid to report.

**Term of Reference number 2:** To investigate the alleged abuse of office, extortion and high-handedness by the suspended Dean.

Abuse of office and high handedness were established given the fact that the Dean was running the Faculty of law like a personal estate against all standards and rules. He never allowed the Heads of departments to function. He took away the facilities meant for their offices including appropriating the departmental dues students pay for the running of the departments. Even the coordinator of post graduate programme in the faculty was bereft of funds to run the office because the suspended Dean was solely in charge of the funds needed to perform his function.

The treatment of Barrister Ann Eruegi Agi, a colleague is one case of such unconscionable abuse of office. Right there inside the faculty, two different standards were used to treat colleagues just because the other two were loyalists of the suspended Dean. One is yet to find the principle of justice that will justify the suspended Dean's action in stopping Barrister Agi, who had spent five years running her programme from doing her internal defense while one of her colleagues that registered for the same degree has defended and done convocation and the other that spent only three years also defended.

His divide and rule tactic in the Faculty gave rise to a situation where a Professor has no office and has to keep his belongings at the corridor, and would have to go to the bush or drive home in order to ease himself whereas younger colleagues including Lecturer IIs have offices to themselves.

The panel could not establish the allegation of extortion as the illegal monies that the students were paying were imposed by the non-academic staff of the faculty. However, the suspended Dean was aware of such unapproved charges but chose not to them.

**Term of Reference number 3:** To establish the alleged serial violations of the University rules and regulations.

The panel referred to the provisions of the Conditions of Service revised 2014, page 35, specifically, Section 5.7 Sub section 5.7.2 (vii) under the category of "Major Misconduct," which states as follows: **"using of official position to intimidate or bargain for sexual favour."** It brought the testimonies of the female students and alumni who testified before it that Prof. Ndifon has for many years operated in the Faculty of Law in serial violations of this section of the conditions of Service. He not only used his office to intimidate but also to bargain for sexual favour from the female students he has been teaching.

Under the category of "Gross Misconduct," subsection 5.7.3 (xii) (a) which states as follows, **"cruelty to students: any action taken to forestall the graduation of any student at his/her appropriate time of graduation such as: hiding or destroying students file/records/examination scripts, etc (all examination scripts must be returned to the HOD and safely kept for at least five years); or threatening a student that he/she will never graduate from this University."**

The panel critically examined the testimony of the survivors who testified

regarding sexual harassment by Prof. Ndifon as this pertains to failing them several times and telling them that they would never graduate from the Faculty talk less of going to Law School to be in clear violation of this provision of the Conditions of Service. The testimony of one of the survivors (**Survivor 1.4**) that she spent two extra years and that of Comfort Jumbo Nkereuwem (**Survivor 1.9**) who has not been mobilized for Law School because some of her results have not been uploaded since Prof. Ndifon collected her answer scripts from the invigilators after her supplementary examinations are cases in point. In addition, the case of **Survivor 1.6** under term of reference number 1 that saw the grade “C” boldly written on her answer booklet but told by Prof. Ndifon that the score would not be published unless she had sex with him further confirms Prof. Ndifon’s violation of this provision. One recalls that the survivor in question had to carry over the course in question under another lecturer and scored a “D” grade.

Still, under the category of “Gross Misconduct” Section 5.7.3, sub-section xii (d), which states, **“Compelling students to pay for books yet to be published or not even in print. This amounts to trading on students.”**

The serial violations of this provision plays out in the Law Journal saga of the students. For three consecutive academic sessions, 2020/2021, 2021/2022 and 2022/2023, that Prof. Ndifon had been Dean of the Law Faculty, students were compelled to pay for a Law Journal that had neither been published nor in print. The word “compelled” is used here because without the receipt of payment for the Law Journal being among the bulk of receipts a student presents at the examination hall, such would not be allowed to write the examination.

**Term of Reference number 4:** To investigate the allegation that majority of the suspended Dean’s Supervisees and their Course Representatives were

female students.

The panel examined the list of final year project supervision prepared and distributed by the suspended Dean. Of the eight supervisees Prof. Ndifon allocated to himself, seven of them are female students.

**Term of Reference number 5:** To investigate the allegation that a male Course Representative in LLB 2A was replaced with a female counterpart by the suspended Dean.

The panel found this allegation to have substance. The elected male course representative that was removed and replaced with a female course representative sent in a written statement to the effect that the suspended Dean removed him and has not given him any reason for doing so.

**Term of Reference number 6:** To examine the extent of result manipulation, mutilation and aberration in examination conduct in the Faculty of Law from 2021.

It was difficult to prove this allegation because the professor's comprehensive results and scripts were not available to the panel.

**Term of Reference number 7:** To check the records of those mobilized to Law School in the past two sessions and establish if those mobilized met the requirements for same, especially in the light of the previous wrongful mobilization that led Management writing for the withdrawal of the students from Law School with its attendant embarrassment to the University. More so, as another 148 students have been mobilized recently to Law School without inputs from the Heads of Departments or the Faculty Board.

The panel observed some irregularities to the effect that some candidates whose names are not on the screened list of final year students had been mobilized for law school for the year 2021/2022.

**Term of Reference number 8:** To check the Direct Entry Admissions from 2021 and establish if there were irregularities in the process, that is, if those admitted were duly qualified.

The criteria for admission to direct entry for law was not followed. OND, HND, NCE and even those Awaiting Results (AR) were admitted. Candidates who were admitted to the 2021/2022 Law Diploma programme, who are supposed to be in second year of the Diploma programme are already in LL.B 2 without completing the Diploma programme. Two of such that had upper credit entered for them in the 2021/2022 admission list have no certificates to show for it.

**Term of Reference number 9:** To investigate the allegation of students having been made to pay for Matriculation numbers, Students Union Government Constitution, clearance in the Faculty against the Senate approved payments by students and paying for law journal which was not given to them.

No doubt, the students paid N500 for matriculation number, N500 for Students' Union Government Constitution and N1000/N2000 for clearance. The panel interviewed the then Faculty officer and the accountant. The Faculty officer admitted that indeed the students paid for matriculation and that the money was used to entertain the Screening Team of the Faculty. He also said that N500 for Students' Union Government Constitution was indeed a mistake and as such a double payment and that the money was paid into the Unical Microfinance bank of the university. The N1000/N2000 for clearance was imposed by the accountant for the purchase of the materials for clearance and for equipping her office since the office given to her lacked basic amenities. The Faculty officer and the accountant imposed

these levies without any official approval from the suspended Dean.

Though the panel could not establish that the suspended Dean, Prof. Ndifon had anything to do with the spending of the money collected, however, he cannot feign ignorance of these unapproved charges imposed by the administrative staff of the Faculty. He gave them a tacit approval. In this respect, the suspended Dean is culpable knowing that the mentioned charges were not approved by Senate.

However, there is evidence that the Prof. Ndifon misappropriated the money the students paid for the Law journal. Several withdrawals were made from that account by his authorization but he did not use the money withdrawn for the publication or printing of the journal.

**Term of Reference number 10:** To investigate the allegation that the suspended Dean was in the habit of always allocating courses to lecturers based on loyalty, using the young lecturers who were doing his biddings, rather than based on fairness, equity, specialization and experience, thereby “benching” most of the experienced lecturers.

This allegation was substantiated. The panel discovered also that junior lecturers were rather loaded with core and compulsory courses even up to year four. The case of year 2B where all the courses were assigned to junior colleagues in the faculty attests to this. This included assigning courses to a staff whose contract was not renewed while full time staff were left out.

**Term of Reference number 11:** To examine the course allocations of the Faculty of Law and establish if the suspended Dean assigned three core courses to himself, while other Professors were either assigned one or two courses.

The panel established that suspended Dean's allocation of courses was not guided by academic standards but by personal whims and caprices. There was clear evidence that he assigned three and in some cases four courses to himself, most of them core courses while his professorial colleagues were left with elective/optional courses that students might decide not to take.

**Term of Reference number 12:** To ascertain the regularity or otherwise of convening meetings of Faculty Board of Law during the Deanship (1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> tenure) of Prof. Cyril O. Ndifon; more so, after the 30<sup>th</sup> May 2023 directives by Management.

All the lecturers in the Faculty of law that the panel interviewed were unanimous in their position that the suspended Dean was not holding regular faculty board meetings.

From the foregoing findings, the panel has established the serial violations of some of the extant rules and regulations regarding the following conditions of service as amended or revised 2014 as follows:

1. **Major Misconduct-**The panel established that the suspended Dean, Prof. Cyril Osim Ndifon was using his official position to both intimidate and bargain for sexual favour from female students in the Faculty of Law.
2. **Gross Misconduct-**
  - 2.1. The panel established that the suspended Dean had been involved in students' exploitation. Elaborately, he had been perpetrating cruelty against students by forestalling the graduation of especially some female students at the appropriate time by withholding and refusing to release their results and threatening some that they



would never graduate from the Faculty or go to the law School.

- 2.2. The panel established that the suspended Dean was compelling the law students to pay for a Faculty Journal that was non-existent for three consecutive academic sessions.

In view of the foregoing violations, the panel makes the following recommendations:

1. That the suspended Dean of law should face the statutory Disciplinary Committee of the University of Calabar for appropriate sanctions applicable to acts of both Major and Gross – misconduct. The panel makes this recommendation in view of Prof. Ndifon's antecedents in the Faculty of Law, which from the testimonies given by both staff and students are in clear violations of the extant rules and regulations governing the conditions of service of staff of the University of Calabar. He has used his position as a lecturer and his position as Dean of the Faculty of Law for non-edifying purposes, frustrating, traumatizing and jeopardizing the future of some of the students, as well as the lecturers.
2. The suspended Dean should be made to refund over three million naira (N3m) realized from the payments made by the law students for the Law Journal which he neither published nor gave to the students.
3. That ~~████████████████████~~ be given another supplementary examination since the suspended Dean collected her scripts for Law of Evidence, law of Equity and Land law.
4. That the acting Dean should without delay arrange internal defense for Barrister Anne Eruegi Agi to defend her Ph.D and

encourage same to put in for promotion in the next promotion exercise.

5. That the university should make a rule to stop lecturers from asking students to come and see them at odd (after official) hours and if need be, encourage the culture of not locking their offices when consulting with students. This is consistent with global best practice.
6. The former accountant of the Faculty of law, Mrs. Aniekan Udeme Ekwere should be reprimanded for imposing N1000/2000 on the students for stamping clearance receipts.
7. The former Faculty Officer, Mr. Robert Ornam should be cautioned for not seeking approval for the N500 he charged the students though such was meant to meet a need in the Faculty.
8. The university should bend backwards so as to come to the aid of some law students who have been roaming around because of the lapses in the Faculty of Law over the years. There should be a call for such to come for supplementary examinations or mop up. This will go a long way to help the University gain the confidence among stakeholders and prove to the wider society that the University cares and is not indifferent.
9. Further steps should be taken to clean up the mess in the Faculty of Law. The seeds of discord planted over the years need to be uprooted. The culture of borderization seems to be entrenched both among staff and students. Such is unhealthy for academic standards, discipline and merit. The younger academics in the Faculty therefore, need re-orientation to the noble ideals and values the University system stands for. This can be achieved if they are willing to make conscious efforts to work on some of the barriers that stand in the way of critical thinking such as egocentrism and sociocentrism. It is indeed

possible with God on the side of the University for old things to pass away and for everything to become new in the Faculty of Law, University of Calabar, Calabar.

## 8. CONCLUSION

The members of the Panel wish to thank the Vice-Chancellor, Professor Florence Banku Obi for counting them worthy for this assignment. We hope that the above recommendations would be implemented by Management for the good of the Faculty of Law, the University and humanity.

Prof. Dorothy Oluwagbemi-Jacob - Chairperson Sign \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Dr. Brenda Akpan - Member

Sign \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Prof. Patrick Egaga - Member Sign \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Dr. Tony Eyang - Member Sign \_\_\_\_\_