



GLOBAL JOURNAL OF MANAGEMENT AND BUSINESS RESEARCH: G
INTERDISCIPLINARY

Volume 16 Issue 1 Version 1.0 Year 2016

Type: Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal

Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA)

Online ISSN: 2249-4588 & Print ISSN: 0975-5853

The Constitutional Validity of the Ohada Treaty in Cameroon

By Dr. Ngaundje Doris Leno

University of Buea, Cameroon

Abstract- The incompatibility of articles 42 and 63 of the treaty relating to the Organization for the Harmonization of Business Law in Africa (OHADA treaty) and article 1 (3) of the constitution of Cameroon gives rise to the question: is the OHADA treaty constitutionally valid in Cameroon given its mixed legal system? The author answers in the affirmative. The paper seeks to investigate into the constitutional validity of the OHADA treaty. In so doing, the paper shall explore the Cameroonian legal system and some key provisions of the OHADA Treaty, which will be highly selective for this article with the view to determine whether the Treaty establishing OHADA is constitutionally valid in Cameroon. The value of this article lies in the insight it offers into OHADA and Cameroon's legal system.

Keywords: constitution, validity, ohada, treaty, cameroon, legal system.

GJMBR - G Classification : JEL Code : A29



Strictly as per the compliance and regulations of:



The Constitutional Validity of the Ohada Treaty in Cameroon

Dr. Ngaundje Doris Leno

Abstract- The incompatibility of articles 42 and 63 of the treaty relating to the Organization for the Harmonization of Business Law in Africa (OHADA treaty) and article 1 (3) of the constitution of Cameroon gives rise to the question: is the OHADA treaty constitutionally valid in Cameroon given its mixed legal system? The author answers in the affirmative. The paper seeks to investigate into the constitutional validity of the OHADA treaty. In so doing, the paper shall explore the Cameroonian legal system and some key provisions of the OHADA Treaty, which will be highly selective for this article with the view to determine whether the Treaty establishing OHADA is constitutionally valid in Cameroon. The value of this article lies in the insight it offers into OHADA and Cameroon's legal system.

Keywords: constitution, validity, ohada, treaty, cameroon, legal system.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the early 1960s, the African states in the franc zone applied outdated and inconsistent French laws, ranging from the French civil code to the 1804 commercial code (Tiger 2004, p35). This inconsistency resulted in legal uncertainty regarding the applicable laws and incurred unnecessary costs to cross-border business transactions, considerably harming investment prospects in the zone. Consequently, the ministers of finance in the franc zone decided to appoint high-level working group to investigate the problem, and consider the possible solutions (Martor and Thouvenot 2004, pp 5-11). After months of investigations, the group concluded that it was feasible and necessary to create a new business law for the francophone African states. This led to the signing of the Treaty relating to the harmonization of business law in Africa (OHADA Treaty) by 14 African states which established OHADA, literally translated as the organization for the harmonization of business Law, with the signatory states agreeing to relinquish some of their sovereignty (Abarchi 2000, pp10-11).

The OHADA treaty strives for the harmonization of business law in Africa with the aim to attract foreign investment in order to foster regional economic integration and development of member states. This is not to say that harmonized laws are enough. Harmonized laws are necessary but not a sufficient condition for development because there are other

factors which must be considered for the development of a country or continent. To date, this treaty is ratified by 17 western and central African states. Anglophone Cameroon is distinct from the rest of OHADA member states because it inherited the British common law system while the rest of the member states inherited the French civil law from their colonial past and OHADA's official language is French (Article 42 OHADA treaty). Taking into account articles 42 and 63 of the OHADA treaty and article 1 (3) of the Constitution of the Republic of Cameroon which formalized the equality of English and French by introducing the phrase "having the same status", this paper raises one important question: Is the treaty establishing OHADA constitutionally valid in Cameroon? The author answers in the affirmative.

II. CAMEROONIAN LEGAL SYSTEM

Historically, Cameroon was colonised by Germany and then Great Britain and France. France took the larger eastern sector and Britain the smaller western sector, which they administered separately as mandated territories under the League of Nations. Britain transplanted her English common law system in West Cameroon while France transplanted the civil law system in East Cameroon. In 1960, East Cameroon gained independence as *La Republique du Cameroun* (Republic of Cameroon). In 1961, West Cameroon joined the Republic of Cameroon to form the Federal Republic of Cameroon made up of West and East Cameroon, with each section maintaining its own legal system. The federation was replaced in 1972 by a Unitary Republic of Cameroon while the name of the unitary state was subsequently changed in 1984 to the Republic of Cameroon. The Federal Republic was formed with article 1 of the Federal constitution of 1961 providing that the official languages shall be French and English. This was retaken in article 1 of the unitary constitution of 2 June 1972 and article 1 (3) of the revised constitution. This reunification left the country with two distinct legal systems: the civil law system operating in francophone Cameroon, and the common law system operating in anglophone Cameroon.

Legal systems varied greatly across the world, but civil and common law is the most used. Like South Africa, Cameroon operates a dual legal system, the difference of which is demonstrated herein. First and foremost, civil law is defined as written rules of law enacted by parliament. Its originates from Europe and

Author: University of Buea Higher Technical Teachers' Training College (HTTTC) Kumba P.O. Box 63, Buea. e-mail: dorisleno2008@gmail.com

does not recognize the English concept of *stare decisis*, a concept that obliges lower courts to comply with decisions of the higher courts (Tetley 1999, pp 591-618). On the other hand, Common law is what francophones refer to as “driot anglophone”. In both systems, judges play an important role. In civil law, the inquisitorial or investigatory system obtains. Under the system, the judge is the chief investigator who comes to court already acquainted with the facts of the case. He is assisted by a lawyer whose role is to advise a client on legal proceedings, write pleadings and help provide favorable evidence to the judge. In common law, adversarial or accusatorial system prevails. Under the system, the judge acts as a referee that is neutral person or obiter – ignorant of the facts of the case while the two lawyers argue their sides of the case. The judge listens to both sides to come to a conclusion about the case.

Examination of witnesses is a key feature under the common law system, the importance of which rests with the concept of presumption of innocence. Meaning an accused is presumed innocent until proven guilty (*actori incumbit probatio onus probandi incumbit et qui dicit* meaning imputes no guilt until guilt is proven). This concept is well outlined in section 11 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights 1948 and the preamble of Cameroon's constitution which affirms Cameroon's firm attachment to the United Nations. More so, trial is done by a jury be it in a criminal or civil suit while in civil law, there is no trial by jury except in criminal cases because the fact finding function is entrusted to a specially appointed judge called “*le juge d'instruction*”. *le juge d'instruction* is an investigatory magistrate who never sits in the panel of trial judges. In civil law, police have arbitrary powers where it is believed that the fear of gendarmes is the beginning of wisdom. A contrary view obtains in Anglo-Saxon where the fear of the law is the beginning of wisdom (rule of law shall prevail) (Anyangwe 1983, p245).

Based on the differences in legal education and training in francophone and Anglophone Cameroon, the judges approached the question of statutory interpretation differently, which, according to Tabe-Tabe Simon (2009, p18) hinders the uniform interpretation and application of the OHADA UAs. Technically, interpretation is a process whereby meaning is accorded or assigned to words in a statute while construction is the process whereby exuberances in a statute are resolved or the process whereby uncertainties or ambiguities in a statute are resolved. Interpretation is both a power and obligation for judges. Judges are obliged to interpret the law failing which they shall be prosecution for denial of justice. This is on the bases of article 37 of the Cameroon's constitution and article 4 of the Civil Code. Generally speaking, interpretation is part of legal reasoning and every statute that comes before the court must be interpreted and

interpretation is generally when a word in a statute is obscure which may have resulted from drafting error made by parliament without noticing. It may also result from the use of broad terms designed to cover several possibilities like motorcycle taken to include motorbike, from changes in the use of language and ambiguity, that is, when a word has two more meanings with difficulty of ascertaining the right one.

French codes do not contain provisions regarding methods of interpretation. It is thus left for the judges to decide on the methods to be used or to find ways of interpreting statutes. In francophone Cameroon, judges rely on grammatical, logical, historical and teleological approaches to the interpretation of states (Anyangwe 1983, p294). Anglophone judges like their counterparts in England and other Anglophone countries rely on rules of construction such as the literal rule, golden rule and the mischief rule (Tabé-Tabé, 2009 pp 9-10). In Practical terms, the approaches are similar because the literal rule correlates to the grammatical method, the golden rule to the logical method and the mischief rule to the both the historical and teleological methods.

The historical evolution of Cameroon equally leaves the legal landscape with three laws: rules of customary law (which most Cameroonians follow in matters such as marriage and divorce), English-derived laws and French-derived laws) and two distinct languages: English and French (Leno 2014, p 26). By virtue of Art 1(3) of the Republic of Cameroon's constitution, “The official languages of the Republic of Cameroon shall be French and English, both having the same status. The state shall guarantee the promotion of bilingualism throughout the country. It shall endeavour to protect and promote national languages”. Art 1(3) lays down the principle of equality of both languages, which involves equal protection and promotion”. Accordingly, Art 31(3) Cameroon Constitution provides that “laws shall be published in the official gazette of the Republic in English and French”. This means that any act of parliament, ordinance of the president, treaty or convention, decree, order, or regulation intended to apply throughout the Republic of Cameroon must be made, enacted, printed, or published simultaneously in French and English (Enonchong 2007, p 101).

In practical terms, most of the laws of the country are enacted and published in French. An example of such is the presidential decree (Decree 2006/441 of 14 December 2006) appointing the vice-chancellor of the English-speaking University of Buea; although it was a decree appointing an English-speaking Cameroonian, it was issued and published in French only. Coins and notes of the national currency which were bilingual in the past have become unilingual in French only. Even the road signs in the English-speaking parts of Cameroon are sometimes printed with the French version more conspicuous and prominent

than the English version. The principle of equality of languages is only enshrined in the constitution without actual implementation. The principle of equality does not avail English-speaking Cameroonians the right to receive information from state institutions in the official language of their choice. Moreover, it does not give equal opportunity to obtain employment in state institutions or regional bodies such as OHADA. On the strength of article 1 (3) of the Cameroon constitution, such discriminatory practices should be condemned as outright violation of a core constitutional provision.

Cameroon is signatory to several international agreements and treaties including but not limited to the OHADA treaty. Business laws fall within the jurisdiction of the legislative power that is the parliament, meaning that the area covered by the treaty is effectively reserved for parliament. However, "with regard to the subjects listed in Art 26 (2) [of the Constitution], Parliament may empower the President of the Republic to legislate by way of ordinance for a limited period and for given purposes" (art 28 (1)). Art 36 (1) further states that:

The President of the Republic *may* after consulting with the President of the Constitutional Council, the President of the National Assembly and the President of the Senate, submit to a referendum any reform bill which, although normally reserved to the legislative power, could have profound repercussions on the future of the Nation and National Institutions. This shall apply in particular to; inter alia, bills to ratify international agreements or treaties having particularly important consequences.

(Italics are author's emphasis).

It follows that the President of the Republic of Cameroon may ratify international agreements or treaties within the area of competence of the parliament, but only with the authorisation of parliament. With the power bestowed on the president of the republic (law 94/04 of 4 August 1994 authorizing the President of the Republic of Cameroon) to ratify the Treaty, The OHADA treaty was ratified (decree 96/177 of 5 September 1996) but without consideration of the legal peculiarities of the country, that is, art 1 (3). The constitutional principle of "hierarchy of norms" confers precedence on duly ratified international treaties and agreements over national laws. This is properly underscored in art 45 of the Cameroonian constitution which clearly states that: "Duly approved or ratified treaties and international agreements shall, following their publication, override national laws, provided the other party implements the said treaty or agreement". Art 45 underscored the supremacy of ratified international treaties to the effect that in the event of conflict between a ratified treaty and national law, ratified treaty shall prevail. The ratification of the OHADA treaty is Cameroon's first attempt to provide a uniform law on business law matters. But is that ipso facto enough to militate for the ratification of

the OHADA treaty if not in line with a constitutional provision? As regards Cameroon in particular, it would be an aberration for Cameroon to ratify a treaty which clearly excludes any of these languages (French and English) as working languages.

III. APPRAISAL OF OHADA AND ITS LEGAL FRAMEWORK (OHADA TREATY)

OHADA is a French acronym literally translated as an Organisation for the Harmonisation of Business Law in Africa. For Martor *et al* (2007, pp284-285), OHADA is a manifestation of the political will of the ministers of finance and justice of the France zone to create uniform rules for the restructuring and amendment of the legal environment. Keba (2004, p7) succinctly describes OHADA as "a legal tool thought out and designed by and for Africa to serve the purposes of regional integration and economic growth on the continent." Dickerson (2005, p21) provides a more elaborate definition; she predicates that:

OHADA is a system of uniform laws; it is a unified legal system designed to protect and enhance the pro-investment qualities of OHADA laws. It accomplishes this by erecting an entire legislative and judicial structure that formulates and interprets the OHADA laws, and prepares them for enforcement.

Martor *et al* (2007, p1) described OHADA as an international organization with a legal personality distinct from those of its members. As a legal entity, it has the capacity to conclude or negotiate international contracts. It is useful to note that OHADA cannot be sued but can appear before domestic courts, and it enjoys privileges and immunities in the exercise of its functions in all member states. The judges of the CCJA enjoy diplomatic immunity, and so do the officials, employees, and the court-appointed arbitrators. OHADA is not a federation, economic or monetary union, but it does possess certain characteristics thereof (Paillusseau 2004, pp 1-2). OHADA member states have control over their own affairs, but are subject to OHADA for national decisions pertaining to business laws. Although it remains to be seen how Anglophone countries might be integrated into OHADA, by virtue of article 53 of the OHADA treaty, it might be described as a continental organization that seeks to unify the business law of the African states.

The beginnings of OHADA can be traced to the signing of the treaty, which entered into force in 1995. The OHADA treaty is to be read with the Revised OHADA treaty. To date, this treaty is ratified by 17 western and central African states. Ratification is in accordance with constitutional procedures of the member states. The constitution of most of the member states requires the intervention of the national parliament for its authorization. For Abarchi (2000, p10), the

immediate effects of ratification are to modify the internal laws of the signatory states and engage those states financially. In other words, following ratification member states are obliged to apply the UAs and contribute financially towards the functioning of OHADA's institutions. Apart from Cameroon, which was colonized by the Germans and then the French and British, the rest of OHADA's member states were French colonies where consequently, the French imparted their tradition and laws on which OHADA is prodigiously based. Accordingly, French is the official language and Article 42 of the OHADA treaty provides "*le français est la langue de travail*", meaning French is the working language of OHADA. This means that the drafting of the Uniform Acts (UAs), the language of instruction at Higher Regional School of Magistracy and Administration (ERSUMA) and proceedings at the Common Court of Justice and Arbitration (CCJA) and council meetings are all conducted in French.

The treaty seeks for the harmonization of business law in Africa through the "...elaboration and adoption of simple modern common rules adapted to their economies, by setting up appropriate judicial procedures, and by encouraging arbitration for the settlement of contractual disputes". Underlying this is the aim to attract foreign investment in order to foster regional economic integration and development of the member states. To this effect, nine UAs have been adopted by the council of ministers. The provisions of the UAs are self-executing and enjoy precedence over nationally-enacted business laws. This implies that upon ratification of the OHADA treaty by a state, the state becomes automatically bound by the provisions of the treaty and the UAs (Leno 2012, pp 261-262). According to Leno (2014, p133), this eliminates any possibility of escape by contracting states from the provisions of the treaty and the UAs. Because the provisions of the UAs are automatically binding, there is no need for any transformation or enactment by national parliaments.

The OHADA treaty has put in place five supranational institutions to serve the organization. These include the Conference of Heads of State, the Council of Ministers of Justice and Finance, the Permanent Secretariat, ERSUMA and the CCJA whose role is to ensure that the treaty and the UAs are interpreted uniformly across the entire OHADA territory. Every qualified citizen of the signatory states is eligible for employment by any of these institutions. Given that the working language is French, the possibility of Anglophone Cameroonians serving in some of the institutions is limited. This is true for admission into ERSUMA predicated to train and improve knowledge of the UAs and other regional laws. This is equally true for conduct of proceedings in the CCJA. The altitude of art 42 clearly explains why most of the cases to the court originate from the French-speaking countries of OHADA. Saadani (2008, p487) showed that 90 percent of the

cases decided by the CCJA are transferred locally from the Ivorian courts. English, Portuguese and Spanish translators have been appointed to serve the non-French citizens of the organization but it leaves much to be desired.

In recognition of the difficulties raised by article 42 of the treaty, the provision of article 42 has been amended providing for four official languages: French, English, Spanish and Portuguese. The author commends OHADA for its effort and postulates that the new article 42 will have far-reaching effect on the membership of OHADA. According to Leno (2014, p25), it will encourage other African states to join the organization. The new article 42 not only portrays OHADA's effort in integrating English, Spanish and Portuguese-speaking African states into the system, but also a laudable step towards fulfilling article 53 of the OHADA treaty, which gives every member and non-member of the African Union the opportunity to join OHADA. A significant feature of the treaty is the opportunity it provides for other African states to join. Art 53 of the OHADA treaty offers every member and non-member of the African Union the opportunity to join OHADA. Considering the benefits to be derived from a unified business law, many African leaders have agreed to the extension of this priceless tool of economic integration to their respective countries. Nigeria, Ghana, Liberia and Angola have expressed interests in joining OHADA. This is a sign of confidence in the OHADA initiative. The initiative has also attracted the attention of the international community which, through the World Bank, European Union (EU) and the United Nations Development Program, has significantly contributed to and participated in its projects (Dickerson 2009, P 1).

It is noteworthy that the new article 42 emphasizes the supremacy of the French language in which the UAs are first published before being translated into the different languages. In the event of conflict between the languages, the French version prevails. This situation raises the issue of the authenticity of the translated versions of the UAs. Unfortunately, the new art 42 has not resolved the difficulty created by the old article 42. French remains the working language in the drafting and printing of the UAs and conduct of proceedings at the CCJA (Thouvenot 2006, p3). This is in line with article 63 of the OHADA treaty which provides that: "the present treaty, written in two copies in the French language, will be deposited in the archives of the Republic of Senegal which shall deliver a certified true copy to each Government of the contracting States. This is another aspect to show that the treaty is discriminatory and unconstitutional.

Article 31 (3) of the UA on Arbitration excludes English when it provides that where the documents on recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards are not in French, a party shall have to produce a translated version, certified by a translator registered on the list of

experts established by a competent court. These articles contradict the various constitutions which have always provided English and French as the official languages with equal status. It is no secret that English is the leading commercial language in the world of business today. And this has been excluded by the OHADA treaty. This is wrong and leaves us with the impression that Cameroonian authorities just appended their signatures to the treaty without having read through them or worse still that they did not participate in the elaboration of the treaty.

IV. THE CONSTITUTIONAL VALIDITY OF THE OHADA TREATY IN CAMEROON

The constitution is the fundamental law of the country to which all laws must conform to. Thus, for any law to be constitutionally valid, it must conform to all the provisions of the constitution. When we look at the OHADA treaty critically, there are some articles such as articles 42 and 63 of the OHADA treaty discussed above which do not conform to the provisions of the Cameroonian constitution. A summary of articles 42 and 63 of the OHADA treaty reveals that the treaty is unconstitutional and therefore cannot be applied in Cameroon, because the articles are contrary to article 1 (3) of the Cameroonian constitution. The said articles violate the educational, justice and employment rights of Anglophone Cameroonians guaranteed by international human rights instruments such as the African Charter on Human and People's Rights, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. These instruments have been signed and ratified by Cameroon, confirming their strong support and respect of fundamental human rights. In light of the international instruments, the application of the OHADA treaty amounts to domination, discrimination and marginalisation of the minority Anglophone Cameroonians by the majority francophone Cameroonians (Lerner 1991, pp 23-37).

The marginalisation of Anglophone Cameroon has caused great resentment and resistance by Anglophone practitioners, who see OHADA as a form of domination and as an instrument to undermine the cherished common law of the provinces. The following examples illustrate Anglophone Cameroonians grave resentment and reluctance to apply the UAs. In *Meme lawyers association v Court registrars of Kumba*, a group of Anglophone lawyers demonstrated their resentment against the extension of a ministerial order to anglophone Cameroon. In terms of the circular, a claimant is required to pay a fee of five percent of the amount of his claim before the claim can be listed for hearing. In response to this circular, the group of lawyers brought an action before the High Court of Kumba seeking a declaration that the ministerial circular was unconstitutional and illegal in that part of the

country (Enonchong 2007, p 111). The High Court ruled in favour of the lawyers to the effect that it is illegal to collect five percent of a claimant's amount as condition precedent for filing.

In fact, while some judges in Cameroon west of the Mungo have persistently refused to apply the UAs, others only make allusions to the OHADA treaty without discussing the substantive law (Ekome 2002, p86). A case in point is that of *Mariner Max and DM Ltd v Dumas Jean Raymond* which involves mismanagement, fraud and misappropriation of a company's funds by the defendant (Raymond), a director and shareholder of the company. The applicants (DM Ltd) sought a restraining order against the defendant on the following terms:

An order restraining the defendant from exercising the functions of director or any other administrative or supervisory functions, whatsoever in regard to the affairs of the company; to hand over all key documents of title, records of accounts, money and other objects which were the property of the company and from interfering with the day to day business of the company or from visiting the premises of the company save for the purpose of inspecting documents of accounts.

In deciding the matter the trial judge referred to the provisions of article 326 of the Uniform Act on Commercial Companies and Economic Interest Groups (Companies Act) and the Companies Ordinance of 1958 applicable in that part of the country. On appeal, his judgment was revised without reference to any provision of the uniform Act. The same strand of reasoning was followed in the case of *Ngu Chang Celestin and Maitre Mba Godwill v Celestin Asangwe* wherein the uniform Act on Simplified Recovery Procedures and Enforcement Measures was set aside for Law 92/008 of 14 August 1992 relating to the execution of court judgments in anglophone Cameroon, on the basis that it was the applicable law in part of the country.

In *Akiangan Fombin Sebastin v Foto Joseph and Others*, Ayah (2000) dismissed the application of the OHADA treaty in Cameroon on the basis that, "a treaty which is basically French suffers from self-exclusion from the English-speaking provinces". For him, the treaty as well as the UAs are not applicable in Cameroon, and are thus constitutionally invalid. He further argue that "no piece of legislation can bring in Napoleonic or civil law principles through the back door and even parliament cannot make laws which will abrogate the duality of laws in Cameroon since it was a matter at the heart of negotiations leading to the reunification of the federated states." The same line of reasoning was adopted in *Limbe Urban Council v Isidore Bongam* wherein the presiding judge of the High Court of Fako Division said: "as to the OHADA treaty, I want to point here straightforward that it is not applicable in this part of the Mungo and i find it idle to discuss its effects on this matter".

Since the OHADA treaty infringes on the constitutional and human rights of anglophone Cameroonians, the question is whether it can be declared unconstitutional by the Cameroonian Constitutional Council (CC). Article 46 of the constitution provides for a CC whose responsibility, *inter alia*, is to rule on the constitutionality of laws, treaties and international agreements. Even though the CC has not gone operational, article 67 (4) states that: "the Supreme Court shall perform the duties of the Constitutional Council until the latter is set up". Based on article 1 (3), the CC or the Supreme Court can declare the OHADA treaty unconstitutional. However, the government of Cameroon cannot invalidate its consent to be bound by the OHADA treaty on the basis that it is in violation of its internal laws, because the treaty was duly approved by the parliament and ratified by the president, giving the treaty the force of international law in the country. This is supported by article 46 of the constitution which provides: "duly approved or ratified treaties and international agreements shall, following their publication, override national laws, provided the other party implements the said treaty or agreement".

The validity of the treaty is also based on the fact that no threat was used against the president of Cameroon to secure its consent, which implies that the treaty is legally binding on Cameroon in accordance with the principle of *pacta sunt servanda*. Articles 43 and 47 (3) of the Constitution also seem to suggest that the OHADA treaty is valid and applicable in Cameroon. Article 43 provides:

The President of the Republic shall negotiate and ratify treaties and international agreements. Treaties and international agreements falling within the area of competence of the Legislative Power as defined in Article 26... of the constitution shall be submitted to Parliament for ratification.

On the other hand, article 47 (3) of the constitution provides: "laws as well as treaties and international agreements may, prior to their enactment, be referred to the Constitutional Council by the President of the Republic, the President of the National Assembly, the President of the Senate, one-third of the members of the National Assembly, one-third of the Senators, or the Presidents of regional executives". It follows therefore, that after the enactment or ratification of a law or treaty, it cannot be questioned or challenged the constitutional council, which indicates that the OHADA treaty is valid and constitutional. From this article, it can be deduced that even though the treaty is unconstitutional, there is nothing the state can do once it has been ratified. Thus, Anglophone Cameroonians cannot appeal against the fact that the president has not complied with the constitutional requirements as justification for non-compliance with the treaty.

Article 9 of the OHADA treaty provides yet another argument in support of the author's view that the treaty is constitutionally valid in Cameroon. Article 9 gives signatory states like Cameroon the opportunity to oppose the authenticity of the treaty and UAs after 30 days yet the power that be did nothing about it. Thus, despite the verdict in anglophone Cameroon, referred to above, one can say without fear of contradiction that the treaty is constitutionally valid in Cameroon and the rest of the signatory states. If it intends to bring together all African states as depicted in article 53 of the OHADA treaty, OHADA should be authorized to adopt legal rules independent of national interests but without losing sight of each signatory's state legal peculiarities. To achieve this, OHADA should have many official working languages. This requires an amendment of article 42 and consequently article 63 of the OHADA treaty.

Drawing from article 1 (3) of the Cameroonian constitution, the languages shall have the same status and OHADA should be entrusted with the task of guarantying the promotion and protection of the languages throughout the African continent. The implication is that all drafting and printing of the UAs shall be done in the different official working languages. It also requires a democratic decision-making processes involving all stakeholders such as business people who live daily with the laws, academics and experts from signatory states for the treaty and it UAs to be internationally accepted. For Leno (2014, p 133), this would enhance the prospect of common law jurisdiction to joining OHADA and the potential of OHADA being a model for the development of uniform commercial rules in Africa.

V. CONCLUSION

Having looked at OHADA, one thing is clear, OHADA is a good initiative. The mile stone made by OHADA in a bid to harmonise and unify business law in Africa given the prevailing circumstances is a gesture worth commending and not to carry such initiative like red hot potato in the mouth ready to spit it out at any moment. But is that ipso facto enough to militate for its ratification if not in line with the constitution? The ratification of the OHADA treaty we say violated a constitutional provision, that is article 1 (3) of the constitution, a provision which Cameroonian authorities should have insisted on during the negotiations leading to the signing of the treaty and which they failed to do. Thus, the treaty should not have been ratified or better still should not have been ratified in the present form for reasons discussed above. Despite the verdict in anglophone Cameroon, the OHADA treaty is constitutionally valid and remains so notwithstanding the numerous arguments against its application which, though logical, are void of statutory backings. Thus,

anglophone Cameroonians cannot appeal against the fact that the president has not complied with the constitutional requirements as justification for non-compliance with the treaty.

REFERENCES RÉFÉRENCES REFERENCIAS

Books and Chapters in Books

1. Anyangwe, C 1983, *Introduction to Law and Legal Systems*, University of Yaoundé, Faculty of Law and Economics.
2. Allan, M 2003, *Regional Integration and Food Security in Developing Countries*, Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations.
3. Dickerson, M 2009, *Community Laws in International Business Transaction* in M Dickerson (ed) *Unified Business Laws in Africa: Common Perspectives on OHADA*, Kogan Pages London, p1.
4. Evans, M and Murray, R (eds.) 2008, *The African Charter on Human and People's Rights: The System in practice 1986-2006*, 2 ed Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 1-6.
5. Lerner, N 1991, *Group Rights and Discrimination in International law*, Kluwer Academics Publishers, Netherlands pp 23-37.
6. Martor, B, Pilkington, N. Sellers, D and Thouvenot, S, 2002 *Business Law in Africa: OHADA Harmonization Process*, kogan Page Ltd, London 2002, p 147.
7. Sohn, L 1986, *International Organizations and Integration*, Kluwer Academics Publishers, Boston, pp 1060-1075
8. Wehmeier, S and Asby, M (eds.) 2000, *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English* 6th ed, Oxford University Press, Clarendon, pp 428.

Journal Articles

9. Abarchi, D 2000, 'La Supranationalité de l'Organisation pour Harmonisation en Afrique du Droit des Affaires (OHADA)', *Revue Burkinabé du Droit*, pp10-11 (translated as the Supranationality of OHADA).
10. Dickerson, M 2005, 'Harmonizing Business Laws in Africa: OHADA calls the Tune', *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law*, pp 21.
11. Ekome, E 2002, 'Landmark Development in Commercial Law Practice in Anglophone Cameroon: Conflicts beyond Relief', *Juris-Périodique*, P 86.
12. Enonchong, N 2007, 'The Harmonisation of business law in Africa: Is article 42 of the OHADA Treaty a problem?', *Journal of African Law*, p 111.
13. Germain, J 2013, 'Approaches to Statutory Interpretation and Legislative History in France', *Duke Journal of Comparative and International Law*, PP 195-206.

14. Keba, M 2004, 'L'histoire et les Objectifs des l'OHADA', *Le Quotidien Juridique*, P 7 (translated as 'History and Objectives of OHADA').
15. Leno, N 2004, 'Regionalism: Lessons the SADC may learn from OHADA' *Journal of Contemporary Roman-Dutch Law*, PP 261-262.
16. Martor, B, and Thouvenot, S 2004, 'L'Uniformisation du Droit des Affaires par l'OHADA', *Juridis periodique*, PP 5-11 (translated as "Unification of business laws by OHADA").
17. Paillusseau, J 2004, "Le Droit de l'OHADA: Un Droit très Important et Original", *Juridis periodique*, PP 1-2 (translated as 'OHADA Laws: A very Important and Original Law').
18. Saadani, S 2008, 'Communication: Ohada, a Continent-wide Perspective', *Uniform Law Review*, P 487.
19. Tiger, P 2004, 'Les Procédures Collectives après Cessation des Paiements en Droit Harmonisé de l'OHADA', *Petites Affiches*, P 35 (translated as 'Collective Insolvency Proceedings under OHADA Law').
20. Tetley, W 1999, 'Mixed Jurisdictions: Common Law vs. Civil Law (Codified uncoded) (Part 1)' *Uniform Law Review*, PP 591-618.
21. Thouvenot, S 2006, 'News on the Development of the Organization for the Harmonization of Business Law in Africa (Ohada)', *International Business Law Journal*, P 3.
22. Youmis, J 1997, 'Traite relative a Harmonization du Droit des Affaires en Afrique Commentaire', *Juridis Periodique*, P 98 (translated as 'Treaty relating to the Harmonisation of Business Law in Africa').

Legislation

23. African Charter on Human and People's Rights, 1981/1986.
24. Circular 00012MJ/SG/DAG of 13 May 1996
25. Cameroon's Constitution of 11
26. French Decree of 16 April 1924
27. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights 7 July 1994.
28. League of Nations 1992
29. Rules of Procedure of the Joint Court of Justice and Arbitration 1998
30. Revised OHADA Treaty 17th of October 2008
31. Southern Cameroon's High Court Law of 1955
32. Treaty relating to the Harmonisation of Business Law in Africa 17 October 1993
33. Uniform Act on Arbitration 11 March 1999
34. Universal Declaration of Human Rights 10 December 1948
35. Vienna Convention 1945

Thesis and Dissertation

36. Leno, N 2014 'The Development of a Commercial Law Structure in the SADC with Specific References

to OHADA', LLD Thesis, University of Pretoria, South Africa.

37. Tabe-Tabe, S 2009 'Company Formation under the OHADA Uniform Act on Commercial Companies and Economic Interest Groups: Changes in the Law Hitherto Applicable in Former West Cameroon' LLD Thesis, University of Yaoundé 11, Cameroon.

Websites

38. Penda A 2004, *The Applicability of OHADA Treaty in Cameroon: the Way Forward*, viewed 29 February 2016 <www.ohada.com/infohada_details.php> 1-6>
39. Fontaine M 2004, OHADA Uniform Act on Contract Law: Explanatory Notes to the Preliminary Draft, viewed 29 February 2016 <<http://www.unidroit.org/english/legalcooperation/ohada%20explanatory%20note-e.pdf>>

Cases

40. *Ngu Chang Celestin and Maitre Mba Godwill v Celestin Asangwe*, Case 59/92-2000 (unreported).
41. *R v Judge of the City of London Court* [1892] 1 QB 273.
42. *Mariner Max and DM Ltd v Dumas Jean Raymond*, Case 36/OM/200-2001 (unreported).
43. *Limbe Urban Council v Isidore Bongam*, Suit HCF/E98/IN/99 (unreported).
44. *Akiangan Fombin Sebastin v Foto Joseph and Others*, Suit HCK/3/96 of 6 January 2000 (unreported).