



JUDICIAL SERVICE COMMISSION

31st July 2026

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

JSC REAFFIRMS COMMITMENT TO JUDICIAL ACCOUNTABILITY, INDEPENDENCE AND THE RULE OF LAW

1. The Judicial Service Commission (JSC) today held a consultative meeting with the leadership and members of the Law Society of Kenya (LSK) and the Senior Counsel Bar (SCB). The engagement provided an important platform to discuss matters relating to judicial accountability, institutional integrity and the need for continued improvement of efficiency in the administration of justice.
2. The Commission welcomes constructive engagement with stakeholders and recognises the important role played by the legal profession in strengthening Kenya's justice system. Such dialogue is essential in advancing a Judiciary that is independent, accountable and responsive to the people it serves.
3. The Commission remains firmly committed to discharging its constitutional mandate to promote and facilitate the independence and accountability of the Judiciary, and to ensure the effective, efficient and transparent administration of justice.
4. During today's engagement, concerns were raised regarding judicial accountability. The Commission acknowledges these concerns and reiterates that accountability remains at the core of its constitutional responsibilities. It is,

however, important that the Commission's ongoing work be viewed in its proper context.

5. This year alone, the Commission has received **506 petitions and complaints** against judges and judicial officers. Of these, **417 have already been processed**, while the remaining matters are at various stages of the disciplinary process. Some are undergoing formal hearings, while others are pending responses from the affected judicial officers or other procedural steps as required by law. These matters are being handled diligently, fairly and strictly in accordance with the Constitution and the Judicial Service Act to accord the parties the required due process.
6. Since 2011, the Commission has recommended the **removal of ten Judges from office** and recommended the appointment of constitutional tribunals to investigate their conduct. Of these, **four Judges were subsequently removed from office**. These outcomes demonstrate the Commission's unwavering commitment to ensuring that judges and judicial officers uphold the highest standards of integrity, professionalism and accountability.
7. The Commission has undertaken significant reforms to strengthen transparency and accountability within the Judiciary. A key milestone is the adoption of a **landmark policy providing for the publication of individual performance data for Judges and Judicial Officers**. Although the matter is currently the subject of litigation, the Judiciary continues to validate the data in readiness for publication, subject to the outcome of the proceedings. This will be the **first time** that the Judiciary and the Judicial Service Commission publish individual performance data, demonstrating a bold commitment to openness, institutional accountability and public scrutiny.
8. Further reinforcing this commitment to transparency, the Judiciary publishes **Annual Court Performance Reports**, providing the public with an objective assessment of court performance across the country and reaffirming its commitment to openness, accountability and continuous institutional

improvement. The recently published Court Performance summary for FY 2024/2025 is as follows:

Summary of court performance

Court Rank	Performance Score	Grade	Summary
Supreme Court	96.30%	Very Good	Improved from 94.06%. Achieved a 103% Case Clearance Rate (CCR), reduced backlog by 57%, improved bench productivity (71 cases), maintained 100% registry efficiency and 100% trial date certainty. Main weakness was timely determination of advisory opinions and appeals within 90 days.
Court of Appeal	84.97%	Good	Improved from 81.64%. Resolved 3,718 appeals compared to 2,832 the previous year. Performance was constrained by shortage of judges despite improved productivity and higher disposal of appeals.
High Court	86.80%	Good	Declined from 97.70%. Of the 51 stations evaluated, 13 attained Very Good, 35 Good and 3 Fair. Twenty-one stations improved while thirty declined. Performance was affected by growing caseloads and delayed case resolution, although several stations recorded significant backlog reduction.
Employment & Labour Relations Court (ELRC)	88.67%	Good	Declined sharply from 100%. Four stations attained Very Good, five Good and one Fair. The decline was largely attributed to increased workload and

			administrative reorganization, although several stations continued to perform strongly.
Environment & Land Court (ELC)	87.12%	Good	Slight decline from the previous year. Seven stations attained Very Good, 28 Good and two Fair. Performance remained stable with good case clearance and ADR implementation, while backlog reduction varied considerably across stations.
Magistrates' Courts	87.12%	Very Good	Largest court system evaluated (138 stations). Eighteen stations achieved Very Good, 118 Good and two Fair. Although overall performance declined from 94%, the courts continued to perform well in productivity, registry operations and case management despite increasing caseloads.
Small Claims Courts	82.34%	Good	Lowest-performing court category. Twenty-nine stations achieved Good while five attained Fair. Performance was affected by rapid expansion from 26 to 38 stations, shortage of adjudicators and staff, limited infrastructure and demanding statutory timelines.
Kadhi Courts	95.41%	Very Good	Among the highest-performing courts. Twenty-nine stations attained Very Good and nine Good. Strong performance was driven by efficient case management, high registry standards and effective administration.

Tribunals	89.91%	Good	Eight tribunals attained Very Good while seven attained Good. Overall performance remained strong although it declined slightly from 92.27% in the previous year.
------------------	---------------	------	---

9. In addition, the Commission has developed the *Judicial Service (Petition for Removal of a Judge) (Procedure) Regulations, 2026*, which are currently before Parliament. The Regulations establish a clear, transparent and predictable framework for handling petitions seeking the removal of judges. They were developed through an extensive consultative process involving key stakeholders, including the Law Society of Kenya and the Senior Counsel Bar, reflecting a shared commitment to strengthening judicial accountability while safeguarding judicial independence.
10. These reforms underscore the Commission's deliberate efforts to build an accountable Judiciary that commands public confidence while preserving the decisional independence that is fundamental to the rule of law.
11. The Commission has taken note of the Law Society of Kenya's call for a targeted boycott of judges and judicial officers. While every person and institution has the right to express concerns regarding the administration of justice, the Commission is concerned by reports that court proceedings before some of the affected judges and officers have been deliberately disrupted under the guise of enforcing the announced boycott.
12. Such actions do not advance judicial accountability. Instead, they impede the administration of justice, inconvenience litigants, delay the determination of cases and undermine the constitutional right of every person to have disputes heard and determined fairly and without unreasonable delay.
13. The Judicial Service Commission and the Law Society of Kenya have reaffirmed their shared commitment to working together to combat corruption and unethical conduct within both the Judiciary and the Bar. We shall strengthen cooperation, encourage the reporting of credible complaints and ensure that all allegations

are addressed promptly, fairly and in accordance with the law and established disciplinary processes.

14. We also condemn the targeting, intimidation and cyberbullying of Judges, Judicial Officers, members of staff and advocates. While constructive criticism and public scrutiny are essential to accountability, personal attacks, threats and deliberate campaigns of vilification undermine the dignity of individuals and public confidence in the administration of justice. All discourse concerning the justice sector must remain respectful, responsible and grounded in fact.
15. The Commission reiterates that where there are complaints against any judge or judicial officer, the Constitution and the law provide a clear and legitimate mechanism for addressing them through the Judicial Service Commission. These processes exist to ensure that every complaint is considered fairly, impartially and in accordance with due process. Resorting to extra-constitutional measures or actions that undermine the orderly administration of justice is inconsistent with the rule of law and cannot be condoned.
16. The Judiciary will continue to discharge its constitutional mandate without fear, favour or prejudice. Judges, judicial officers and members of staff across the country remain committed to ensuring uninterrupted access to justice for all Kenyans.
17. The Judicial Service Commission recognises that strengthening public confidence in the administration of justice is a continuous responsibility. The Commission remains steadfast in its commitment to building a Judiciary that is both independent and accountable. These are not competing constitutional values but complementary pillars of the rule of law. The Commission will continue to strengthen mechanisms that promote integrity, transparency and public confidence, while safeguarding the decisional independence that enables judges and judicial officers to administer justice fairly, impartially and without fear, favour or undue influence.

18. To all Judges, Judicial Officers and members of staff, we urge you to continue serving with courage, professionalism and courtesy, guided by your Oath of Office and the Constitution. The Commission will stand by every Judge, Judicial Officer and member of staff who faithfully discharges their constitutional mandate with integrity and professionalism.
19. To the people of Kenya, be assured that the Judicial Service Commission and the Judiciary remain steadfast in their commitment to delivering fair, impartial and people-centred justice.

Hon. Justice Martha K. Koome, EGH
Chairperson
JUDICIAL SERVICE COMMISSION