Lateef Omoyemi Akangbe, SAN, LL.M, MBA, FCIArb
legal practitioner

Seventh Floor
St. Nicholas House
Catholic Mission Street,
P.O. Box 80367 Lafiaji
Lagos Nigeria

Telephone
(0201) 630 7215
(0201) 227 22840

Mobile
0803 324 7080

e-mail
loakangbe@sooblaw.com

website
www.sooblaw.com

15 June 2026

The Chairman
Electoral Committee of the Nigerian Bar Association (ECNBA)
NBA House, 9 Oro Ago Street
Garki, Abuja

Dear Sir,

RE: RESPONSE TO THE ECNBA PRESS STATEMENT DATED 12 JUNE 2026 TITLED "CLARIFICATION ON THE ENGAGEMENT OF SERVICE PROVIDERS, THE VOTER AUTHENTICATION FRAMEWORK, RESPECTIVELY, AND ADVISORY TO MEMBERS OF THE NIGERIAN BAR ASSOCIATION ON RESPONSIBLE ELECTORAL COMMUNICATION"

I refer to the Press Statement of the Electoral Committee of the Nigerian Bar Association dated 12 June 2026, issued over the signatures of the Chairman, Aham Ejelam, SAN, and the Secretary, Ibrahim Aliyu Nassarawa, Esq.

I have read the Press Statement with great care. I commend the Committee for putting its position on the record and for engaging substantively, rather than by silence, with the concerns that have been raised. It is the mark of a healthy institution that it answers its members rather than ignores them, and I thank the Committee for that.

That said, I am compelled to respond on the record and in equal detail, because the Press Statement, on closer examination, confirms rather than dispels several of the concerns I originally raised. In a number of places, the Committee's own language reveals precisely the difficulties it seeks to explain away. In others, the statement introduces new difficulties that were not present in the original correspondence. And certain passages raise questions of an altogether different character, to which I shall come to in due course.

I address the matters in the order in which they appear:

1. The Allegation That Candidates Did Not Object During the Public Comment Period

The Committee records, in bold type, that **“there were no comments or objections by any of the Presidential candidates”** during the public comment and objection period that ran from 11 to 16 May 2026. The clear implication is that by not objecting then, the candidates have forfeited the right to object now.

With respect, this conflates two distinct stages of the procurement process and, in doing so, relies on a chronology that answers itself.

The public comment period related to six shortlisted entities, not two. At that stage, no final selection had been made. The assessment session at which the shortlisted entities gave their live demonstrations took place on 25 May 2026, fully nine days after the comment window had closed. The final selection of Mikrodigital Connect and Thanelinc Nigeria Limited emerged from that session. A candidate cannot object to an appointment that has not yet been made. A comment period that closes before the decision is supposed to be scrutinised has even been taken is not a safeguard. It is a procedural formality that cannot bear the weight the Committee now seeks to place upon it.

The concerns I raised related to the corporate standing, compliance history, and track record of the entities ultimately appointed, matters that came to light through due diligence conducted after the appointment was announced. They could not have been raised during the shortlisting comment period for the simple reason that the appointment had not yet occurred, and the due diligence had not yet been undertaken. The Committee’s suggestion that my silence during the shortlisting stage amounts to acquiescence in the final appointment is, with respect, a non sequitur that the dates on the Committee’s own timeline will not permit.

2. The Suggestion That the Candidates’ IT Consultants Endorsed the Selection

The Committee states that the candidates’ IT consultants “participated actively and whose technical contributions materially informed the final evaluation” and that they “contributed to the process that identified Mikrodigital Connect and Thanelinc Nigeria Limited as the strongest-performing entities.” The clear suggestion is that the candidates are, in some sense, co-authors of the very outcome they now challenge.

I must correct this characterisation. My IT consultant attended the assessment session of 25 May 2026 as an observer and technical adviser to my candidacy, not as a member of the Committee's evaluation panel. He was given no vote, no scoring sheet, and no decision-making authority. He did not sign off on, endorse, or ratify the Committee's final selection. Attending a hearing is not the same as delivering the judgment. Defence counsel does not become complicit in a conviction by reason of having been present at the trial.

The Committee's own statement, moreover, contains the answer to its own suggestion. In the same section, it says that "the weight of that direct, observed performance was the decisive factor in the final selection." That is an acknowledgment that the decision was the Committee's alone. If the decisive factor was the Committee's assessment of what was demonstrated before it, then the candidates' consultants were witnesses, not decision-makers. The Committee cannot simultaneously claim credit for the rigour of its independent evaluation and attribute responsibility for the outcome to the very candidates who now question it. The two positions are mutually exclusive, and the Committee must choose between them.

If the Committee maintains that the candidates' consultants had a binding role in the selection, I invite it to produce the evaluation scoring matrix signed by each participant, showing each consultant's individual scores and the weight assigned to those scores in the final determination. If no such document exists, the suggestion should be withdrawn.

3. Mikrodigital Connect: Corporate Form, Annual Returns and the Question They Do Not Answer

3.1 On the sole proprietorship

The Committee acknowledges that Mikrodigital Connect is a Business Name with a single proprietor. It then advances two defences. The first is that the NBA Constitution and the published RFP do not prescribe limited liability incorporation as a condition of eligibility. The second is that unlimited personal liability of the proprietor is, "if anything," stronger protection than limited liability incorporation.

On the first point, the Committee is correct that its own RFP did not require corporate form. But this is a criticism of the RFP, not a defence of the appointment. If the Request for Proposal for a national election of over 80,000 legal practitioners did not require even basic limited liability incorporation from the entity entrusted with the integrity of the ballot, then the RFP was not fit for purpose. The Committee's answer to the question "why did you appoint a sole proprietorship?" is, in substance, "because our

procurement document did not prevent us from doing so.” That is not reassurance. It is the problem restated in different words.

On the second point, I must say, with the greatest of respect, that the suggestion that unlimited personal liability of a sole proprietor is a stronger protection than the corporate form with insurance and capitalisation requirements will not survive a moment’s serious analysis. Unlimited personal liability means that in the event of a catastrophic failure, a data breach, or a disputed election result requiring indemnification, the NBA’s sole contractual recourse would be a personal judgment against Mr Shamsuddeen Haruna, enforceable only against whatever personal assets he holds at the time of enforcement. And that is the question the Committee does not answer. Against what assets does this unlimited liability operate? No capitalisation floor has been disclosed. No professional indemnity insurance has been disclosed. No performance bond has been disclosed. No guarantee has been disclosed.

Unlimited liability is a legal concept. It is not, by itself, money. A personal judgment against an individual of undisclosed means is not robust protection for a national professional association. It is a contractual right that may prove entirely worthless at the very moment it is most needed. Against a properly capitalised limited liability company carrying professional indemnity insurance, the NBA would have the company’s assets, the insurance proceeds, and the contractual protections operating in combination. The Committee’s attempt to present a structural weakness as a structural strength may read well in a press statement, but it will read very differently in an affidavit before a court of competent jurisdiction should anything go wrong on 20 July 2026.

3.2 On the annual returns

The Committee states that it “was aware of the timing of the regularisation” and took the view that “the decisive question was not administrative good standing with the CAC alone, but whether the entity had the demonstrated technical capacity to perform the specific mandate.”

With respect, the Committee has answered a question I did not ask. My concern was never that the Corporate Affairs Commission might strike off Mikrodigital Connect during the election. The concern is what six consecutive years of statutory default tells the membership about the entity’s institutional discipline. There are only three possible explanations for why an entity registered in November 2019 did not file a single annual return until the evening of 31 May 2026. Either the proprietor did not know the obligation existed, which would reflect poorly on his professionalism. Or he knew and did not consider it worth complying with, which would reflect poorly on his

compliance culture. Or the entity was effectively dormant and was only activated for this engagement. Each of these explanations is more troubling than the last, and none of them is answered by saying that the entity performed well at a live demonstration.

The Committee says that “there is currently no statutory and/or regulatory impediment to Mikrodigital Connect.” That is true today. It would not have been true on 30 May 2026. The compliance that the Committee now relies upon was purchased the day before it became publicly embarrassing. That is not a fact the Committee has explained. It is a fact the Committee has acknowledged and then walked past. The membership will not.

3.3 On “personnel expertise”

The Committee states that “apart from Mr Haruna, the company profile submitted with the bid, which was fortified by the presence of some members of his team, showed that the company has the requisite personnel expertise.” This raises concern rather than resolves the concern. The individuals who attended the assessment session may well be technically capable. But they are not party to the contract. The Service Agreement, on the Committee’s own account, is with Mikrodigital Connect, a Business Name belonging to Mr Haruna alone. If the individuals who impressed the Committee at the assessment session are contractors, freelancers, or associates rather than employees of a corporate entity, then their continued involvement depends entirely on the personal arrangements of the proprietor. There is no corporate structure to hold them. The Committee has given the NBA no assurance that the team it saw on 25 May 2026 is contractually bound to deliver on 20 July 2026. In a sole proprietorship, there is no mechanism by which it could.

4. Thanelinc Nigeria Limited: The Language That Answers Itself

4.1 On NDPC registration

I invite the membership to read the Committee’s response on this point with the care it deserves, because the Committee’s own language supplies the answer it withholds.

The Press Statement says the Committee “has required Thanelinc Nigeria Limited to provide evidence of compliance with applicable data protection regulations as a term of its engagement under the DPO Services Agreement (Contract Ref: SVC/ECNBA/DPO/2026), which expressly warrants NDPC registration or recognition where applicable.”

That sentence does not say that Thanelinc Nigeria Limited is registered with the Nigeria Data Protection Commission as a Data Protection Compliance Organisation. It says the contract warrants registration “or recognition where

applicable." The phrase "where applicable" is carrying all the weight. If Thanelinc were a registered DPCO, a single sentence would have ended this matter: "Thanelinc Nigeria Limited is a registered DPCO with the NDPC under registration number [X]." The Committee has not written that sentence. Instead, it has described a contractual warranty with a carefully drafted carve-out that allows for the possibility that registration does not, in the Committee's view, apply.

The same pattern reappears later, where the Committee says that "written confirmation of Thanelinc Nigeria Limited's NDPC registration or DPCO status is also discreetly available." Note the disjunctive: "registration or DPCO status." That is not how one describes a straightforward registration. It is how one describes a situation in which the "confirmation" may not be a registration certificate at all, but something else altogether: perhaps a self-certification, a contractual warranty, or an assertion of equivalence that the Committee has chosen to accept in lieu of formal registration.

I do not ask the Committee to concede the point. I ask it to resolve the point, simply and publicly. If the Committee holds a current NDPC registration certificate for Thanelinc Nigeria Limited, it should publish the registration number. One line will suffice. If it does not hold such a certificate, then the membership is entitled to know what "DPCO status" is being relied upon in its place, and on what regulatory authority the Committee has satisfied itself that an unregistered entity may lawfully act as Data Protection Officer for a national election involving the personal data of over 80,000 legal practitioners.

4.2 On track record

The Committee says its assessment of Thanelinc's track record "was based on the totality of the entity's presentation at the assessment session of 25 May 2026."

A presentation is not a track record. A track record consists of previous engagements of comparable scope, completed successfully, and verifiable by reference to the engaging bodies. In my original letter, I asked for particulars of any prior elections, of comparable scale, conducted or supported by either entity. The Committee has not named one. It has instead pointed to the quality of a live demonstration. I do not doubt that the demonstration was impressive. But a persuasive pitch and a proven capacity to deliver under the pressure of election day are very different things, and the Committee's reluctance to name a single comparable prior engagement is, in itself, informative.

5. The NIN Authentication Issue

5.1 On what was said at the meeting of 25 May 2026

The Committee's account of the meeting states that the NIN integration was merely a "proposal" by "two male presidential candidates," that some candidates "stoutly opposed" the proposals, and that "there was no moment or time that ECNBA agreed to follow the proposals" but merely undertook that they "will be looked into to see their applicability."

I note this characterisation. I do not accept every element of it, and the video recording of the meeting which the Committee itself cites will, in due course, bear its own witness. But even accepting the Committee's version of events at its absolute highest, it creates a difficulty the Committee has not addressed.

If the Committee undertook, in the presence of all candidates and stakeholders, to "look into" the NIN proposal and assess its applicability, then it assumed a corresponding obligation to communicate the outcome of that assessment to the candidates within a reasonable time. It did not do so. The Voters Register was frozen on 27 May 2026, two days after the meeting, without NIN as a component. The Step-by-Step Electronic Voting Guide was subsequently published without any mention of NIN. At no point between 25 May and 12 June 2026 did the Committee inform the candidates that the NIN proposal had been considered and rejected, or that it had been deferred, or that it had been found technically infeasible. The first time the candidates learned that the NIN layer had been silently abandoned was when they read the published Guide and observed its absence.

Whether the Committee "agreed" to the proposal or merely agreed to consider it, three weeks of silence followed by a fait accompli is not how a transparent electoral body communicates a decision on a matter expressly raised, discussed, and taken under advisement in the presence of all parties. The Committee says it conducted a "detailed technical assessment." If that assessment was conducted promptly after 25 May, it should have produced a prompt communication. If it was not conducted promptly, the Committee should not now present the conclusions as though they were the product of diligent contemporaneous deliberation. The three-week silence between the meeting and the Press Statement strongly suggests that whatever assessment took place was reactive rather than proactive, triggered by the candidates' letters rather than by the Committee's own initiative.

5.2 On the practical objections to NIN

I acknowledge that several of the practical objections the Committee has raised carry weight. The concern about disenfranchisement of married women whose NIN records have not been updated to reflect changes of name

on the Supreme Court Roll is a real one. The concern about diaspora members who have never enrolled for a NIN, or whose NIN records have fallen out of date, is equally real. The timeline constraint imposed by the frozen Voters Register and the constitutional requirement to hold the election on 20 July 2026 is understood.
I make three observations in response.

First, if these practical difficulties were known to the Committee, or discoverable by it, on 25 May 2026, they should have been raised immediately in response to the proposal so that the candidates could have engaged with them on their merits and explored alternatives in good time. Difficulties that are articulated for the first time on 12 June 2026, in a reactive press statement published three weeks after the meeting, do not carry the same force as difficulties that were raised and discussed at the moment the proposal was on the table. A committee that says nothing for three weeks and then presents a fully formed set of objections invites the inference that the objections were assembled after the fact to justify a decision already taken.

Second, the Committee's defence of the existing SCN-plus-OTP framework does not fully address the vulnerability I identified. The Committee says that "authentication cannot be completed without access to that voter's registered email address or mobile device." That is correct as a statement of the intended design. It is considerably less reassuring as a statement of real-world security. OTPs are routinely compromised through SIM swap fraud, through social engineering, through compromised email accounts, and through interception. The Supreme Court Enrolment Number is not a secret. It appears on call-to-bar records, on practice documents, on stamps and seals, on email signatures, and on court filings. Where the OTP delivery channel is compromised, the two-factor framework reduces, in practice, to a single-factor system. The Committee's assurance that the existing framework is "technically sound" does not engage with this vulnerability. It assumes it away.

Third, and importantly, I accept that a full NIN-NIMC API integration, involving biometric verification and live database queries, may not be achievable within the time remaining before 20 July. But NIN integration was never the only option for strengthening authentication, and the Committee has treated the proposal as though it were an all-or-nothing biometric exercise. It was not. A simple NIN-as-knowledge-factor check, in which the voter is asked to enter a NIN that is matched against a pre-collected dataset already held by the NBA or obtainable in advance, does not require a live API integration with NIMC, does not involve facial recognition, does not raise accessibility difficulties for diaspora members who already hold a NIN, and could have been deployed within the existing timeline. The Committee does

not appear to have considered this alternative. Its response treats the NIN proposal as synonymous with biometric verification and then demonstrates that biometric verification is impractical. That may be true, but it does not answer the proposal as it was actually made.

Having said that, it is pertinent to state that the use of SCN as a form of authentication overlooks the fact that there could be internal sabotage or compromise from the NBA itself, who is the custodian of the SCN. The previous allegations of manipulation in previous election years have always been about internal sabotage and not external sabotage of the system. Thus, the use of the SCN does not protect against this possibility. We cannot continue to do something in the same way and expect a different outcome. It is better to adopt a means of authentication that the NBA has no access to or cannot interfere with.

Furthermore, it is strongly advised that the ECNBA should access the database from the primary source, which is Access Bank, and not from the NBA, as a way of ensuring the database is not compromised either from internal or external sources.

6. Requests for Disclosure

The Committee states that the full technical and commercial proposals of the service providers are "commercially confidential." I note this position. I do not accept it without reservation. The NBA is not a commercial enterprise procuring services for profit in the open market. It is a membership association spending members' funds, collected through the Bar Practising Fee, on an election that determines the leadership of the profession. The candidates and the membership have a legitimate interest, rooted in the very nature of the Association, in knowing the material terms on which their election will be conducted and the basis on which the entities conducting it were chosen.

The Committee offers a "summary of the evaluation scores and criteria outcomes" but does not include it in the Press Statement. I invite the Committee to publish that summary to all candidates and to the membership, without further delay. If the evaluation was as rigorous and transparent as the Committee maintains, the Committee should welcome, rather than resist, the opportunity for its conclusions to be seen.

I note also the Committee's repeated use of the phrase "discreetly available" in relation to the past performance information of the service providers and the NDPC registration status of Thanelinc Nigeria Limited. If the Committee means "discretely," that is to say, separately or individually, I request that the

information be made available to me and to all candidates as a matter of course. If it means “discreetly,” that is to say, quietly and without publicity, I would respectfully ask why information about the qualifications and track record of entities entrusted with a national election should be made available only on condition that it is not discussed. Transparency and discretion are not natural partners in the governance of a professional association’s elections.

7. The Allegations Regarding “Sponsored Bloggers” and Threats of Professional Discipline

7.1 On the allegation that correspondence was “deliberately handed over to sponsored bloggers”

I deny this allegation. I deny it categorically, unreservedly, and on the record. My letter to the Committee was drafted and delivered in good faith as a formal, private communication through proper channels. I did not hand my letter, or any summary of its contents, to any blogger, sponsored or otherwise, before or after delivery. In line with our resolution at the meeting of the 25th of May 2026, we agreed that in the interest of fairness, candidates should copy other persons vying for the same office in order to avoid a one-sided communication with the ECNBA. Consequently, I delivered a hard copy to the ECNBA and a soft copy where I copied the other 2 candidates, and I cannot vouch for what any other candidate kept in copy of the email did with the copy. As far as I am concerned, I never authorised the publication of my letter.

However, it is of major concern to me that given the fact that my email had the 2 other candidates copied in on it, the ECNBA, in a formal press statement issued on the letterhead of the Electoral Committee and signed by both the Chairman and the Secretary, the Committee has chosen to accuse only two presidential candidates, by clear implication, of deliberately leaking private correspondence to “sponsored bloggers” in order to “publish slanted and jaundiced narratives” and to “intimidate members of the Committee and discredit its efforts.” These are serious allegations of dishonesty, bad faith, and coordinated media manipulation on my person. They are made without a shred of supporting evidence. If the Committee possesses evidence that I paid, instructed, or sponsored any person to publish any content in connection with this correspondence, it should produce that evidence now. If it does not possess such evidence, and I am confident it does not, then the allegation should be withdrawn, publicly, and with the same prominence with which it was made.

7.2 On the veiled threats of professional discipline

I note with concern that Sections 7 and 9 of the Press Statement contain passages that can only be read as a threat of professional disciplinary action

against candidates and members of the Bar who exercise their right to raise and to discuss concerns about the conduct of the electoral process. The Committee warns that publications by lawyers constitute "a professional conduct matter" regardless of platform and cautions that "the strategy to diminish and discredit the committee should not be allowed to continue; hence, caution is hereby necessary."
I wish to be measured but unequivocal in my response.

Raising factual concerns about the corporate standing, compliance history and track record of entities entrusted with a national election is not false, misleading, or inflammatory content. It is the exercise of a right. It is, I would argue, a duty. Every material factual statement in my original letter was sourced from the public register of the Corporate Affairs Commission. The Committee's own Press Statement has acknowledged the factual accuracy of those findings. The concerns I raised are not rumour, speculation, or propaganda. They are matters of verifiable public record, and they have been confirmed as accurate by the very body that now characterises them as part of a strategy to "diminish and discredit."

An electoral committee that threatens candidates with professional disciplinary proceedings for scrutinising its procurement decisions is not a committee that inspires confidence in the process it administers. If the Committee's processes are sound, they will withstand scrutiny and emerge stronger for it. If they cannot withstand scrutiny, the answer is to strengthen the processes, not to silence the scrutiny. The right of candidates and members to hold the ECNBA accountable is not a "strategy." It is a foundational principle of democratic governance within the NBA. I intend to continue exercising it, responsibly, factually, and without apology, for as long as the integrity of this election requires it.

I would also respectfully remind the Committee that the veiled invocation of disciplinary proceedings against candidates during an active election period is itself a matter capable of raising the gravest questions about the Committee's impartiality and the fairness of the electoral environment it is constitutionally charged with maintaining. A committee that is willing to threaten the professional standing of candidates who ask hard questions is a committee whose own conduct deserves at least as much scrutiny as the conduct it purports to regulate.

8. "The Electoral Committee's Decision on This Matter Is Final"
I note this declaration. I observe, however, that it is an assertion of the Committee's own authority, not a legal conclusion. The finality of the Committee's decisions is determined by the NBA Constitution 2015 (as

amended in 2025) and, ultimately, by the courts of the Federal Republic of Nigeria. No body, however constituted, can immunise its own decisions from constitutional review or judicial scrutiny by declaring them final in its own press statement. The Committee's confidence in its position is noted. Its attempt to foreclose all further discussion is not accepted.

9. A Note on the Gendered Language of the Press Statement

I observe that the Committee has chosen to describe the candidates who raised the NIN proposal as "the two male Presidential candidates," a formulation repeated for emphasis. The gender of the candidates who proposed an authentication measure is irrelevant to the merits of the measure itself. The NIN proposal is a proposal about election security. It does not gain or lose force depending on the gender of the person who advanced it.

The Committee's decision to foreground the gender of the proposing candidates in a discussion about voter authentication is, at best, an unnecessary and curious characterisation. At worst, it is a calculated attempt to impute a gendered motive to a gender-neutral governance concern, or to suggest, by implication, that male candidates who raise security measures are somehow acting against the interests of female candidates or female voters. If that was the intention, it should be stated openly so that it can be answered on its merits. If it was not, the characterisation was unfortunate, it is noted, and it should not be repeated.

10. Conclusion

I have written this response at length because the Committee's Press Statement was itself detailed and because the over 80,000 members of the Nigerian Bar Association who will vote on 20 July 2026 deserve a full account of both sides. I have sought throughout to be fair, precise, and anchored in verifiable fact.

To summarise my position:

(a) The Committee's reliance on the candidates' silence during the shortlisting comment period is misplaced. The comment period closed nine days before the final selection was made. One cannot object to an appointment that does not yet exist.

(b) The participation of the candidates' IT consultants at the assessment session does not constitute endorsement of the Committee's final selection. The Committee's suggestion to the contrary is both unsupported and logically inconsistent with its own claim that the final decision was driven by the Committee's assessment.

(c) The sole proprietorship of Mikrodigital Connect remains a material institutional risk. Unlimited personal liability against undisclosed and potentially modest personal assets is not the robust protection the Committee presents it as.

(d) Six consecutive years of annual returns default, remedied in the hours immediately surrounding the contract award, remains a serious governance red flag that no amount of demonstrated technical capability at a live presentation can explain away.

(e) The Committee's response on Thanelinc Nigeria Limited's NDPC registration is carefully and conspicuously hedged. The Committee has not confirmed that Thanelinc is a registered DPCO. It is invited to publish the registration number if one exists.

(f) Whether or not the Committee formally agreed to integrate NIN, it undertook to "look into" the proposal and then silently abandoned it without communicating the outcome to the candidates. The published Step-by-Step Guide presented a fait accompli.

(g) The allegation that I handed my correspondence to "sponsored bloggers" is denied in the strongest terms and is entirely without evidence.

(h) The veiled threats of professional disciplinary action against candidates who scrutinise the Committee's processes are inappropriate, counterproductive, and themselves raise questions about the Committee's impartiality.

I remain committed to a free, fair, transparent and credible election on 20 July 2026. I remain available to meet with the Committee at any time of its choosing to discuss these matters in good faith. I do not seek confrontation with the Committee. I seek accountability from the Committee. These are not the same thing.

Finally, and for the avoidance of doubt: the Committee's Press Statement of 12 June 2026 was not circulated privately. It was sent, by the Committee's own hand, to the registered email address of every member of the Nigerian Bar Association and given the widest possible circulation across the profession. In that statement, the Committee saw fit to impugn the integrity of "two of the three Presidential Candidates" by name and by implication, accusing them of leaking correspondence to "sponsored bloggers," of disseminating "slanted and jaundiced narratives," of orchestrating a campaign to "intimidate members of the Committee," and of conduct falling

below the standards of the legal profession. These are allegations that touch my reputation as a legal practitioner and as a Senior Advocate of Nigeria. They were published by the Committee to the entire membership without my knowledge and without affording me any opportunity to respond before publication. Having circulated those allegations to every lawyer in Nigeria, the Committee cannot now complain if I circulate this response with equal prominence and to the same audience. What is good for the Committee's narrative is good for the candidate's reply. I shall therefore be sharing this letter widely, as the Committee itself has demonstrated that the "proper way" to engage the membership on these matters is openly, publicly, and on the record.

Please accept the assurances of my highest professional regard.

Yours faithfully,

Lateef Omoyemi Akangbe, SAN
Candidate, Office of the President
Nigerian Bar Association

cc: Members, Electoral Committee of the Nigerian Bar Association
The President, Nigerian Bar Association
The General Secretary, Nigerian Bar Association