

BEFORE HER HONOR : YAMIE QUIQUI GBEISAY, SRCHIEF JUSTICE
 BEFORE HER HONOR : JAMESETTA H. WOLOKOLIE.....ASSOCIATE JUSTICE
 BEFORE HIS HONOR : YUSSIF D. KABAASSOCIATE JUSTICE
 BEFORE HER HONOR: CEATNEH D. CLINTON JOHNSONASSOCIATE JUSTICE
BEFORE HIS HONOR : BOAKAI N. KANNEHASSOCIATE JUSTICE

Habakuk Watara Sackor of the City of Monrovia,	)	
Montserrado County, Liberia Appellant	)	
	)	
Versus	)	Appeal
	)	
Andrew Anderson for an on behalf of himself	)	
and his minor children, Andrew Anderson, Jr.	)	
and Rachel Juliet Anderson of the City of	)	
Monrovia, Liberia Appellees	)	
	)	
<u>GROWING OUT OF THE CASE:</u>	)	
	)	
Andrew Anderson for an on behalf of himself	)	
and his minor children, Andrew Anderson, Jr.	)	
and Rachel Juliet Anderson of the City of	)	
Monrovia, Liberia Plaintiffs	)	
	)	
Versus	)	Action
	)	Damages for Injury to
Habakuk Watara of the City of Monrovia,	)	Domestic Relations
Montserrado County, Liberia Defendant	)	

Heard: March 25, 2026

Delivered: May 20, 2026

MADAM JUSTICE WOLOKOLIE DELIVERED THE OPINION OF THE COURT

This appeal grows out of an action of damages for injury to domestic relations filed on March 14, 2022, by Mr. Andrew Anderson, for himself and on behalf of his two minor children, the appellees, against Mr. Habakkuk Watara Sackor, the appellant, before the Sixth Judicial Circuit, Civil Law Court for Montserrado County.

In his complaint, the co-appellee alleged that he and Mrs. Loraine Dunn Anderson have been married since June 16, 2012; that in their marriage they begot two children, Rachel Juliet Anderson and Andrew Anderson, Jr., both minors; that he and his wife lived in harmony and

peace for fifteen (15) unbroken years until April 2021, when the appellant upon seducing his wife, entered a romantic relationship with her, so much so, that she abandoned her matrimonial home and began living and cohabiting with the appellant; that although the co-appellee has exhausted all efforts to have the appellant refrain from said relationship with his wife and have her resumed her conjugal vows, and relationship with the appellees, all efforts proved futile as the appellant has continued his extramarital affairs with the appellee's wife resulting to the appellee being exposed to severe public ridicule not only from the community but the appellant as well. Said action, the appellee says has led to him suffering mental anguish, humiliation, embarrassment, and loss of affection and for which damages will lie.

The appellee further averred that the appellant in insisting on keeping a relationship with his (appellee's) wife, travelled with her to Ghana on June 27, 2021, and has continuously engaged in the conduct of professing open intimacy and affection for her in public and on social media, including Facebook, all at the expense of the appellee's family which have been made to suffer inherent shame and disgrace based on their conduct; that the appellant's action has also succeeded in inciting his wife against them (appellees) leading to the co-appellee Juliet Rachel Anderson falling into depression and subsequently hospitalized for two days at the ELWA Hospital to become stabilized; that the continued intimacy between the appellant and the co-appellee's wife which caused the co-appellee's wife to abandon her home and begin cohabiting with the appellant amounts to interference with the appellees marriage and family relations and constitutes grave injury to domestic relations for which damages will lie; and that because the action of the appellant against the appellees domestic relations is unjustified and constitute a domestic wrong, the appellee prayed the lower court to adjudge the appellant liable for injury to domestic relations and have the appellant pay to the appellees Five Hundred Thousand United States Dollars (US\$500,000. 00) as special damages and Five Hundred Thousand United States Dollars (US\$500,000.00) as general and exemplary damages for injuries caused to the appellees domestic relations and their reputation.

On March 24, 2022, the appellant filed his answer to the appellees' complaint along with a motion to strike, basically contending that the averments in the appellees' complaint are all false and misleading and same should be denied and dismissed, and that the appellant be adjudged not liable to the appellees for injury to domestic relations on grounds that he is happily married and lives with his wife, Joyce Monroe Sackor, and minor children in Matadi, Sinkor; that he is not engaged in any extramarital affairs with the co-appellee's wife and there exists no proof to establish same especially since nothing in the appellees' complaint establishes any romantic affair ongoing between the appellant and the co-appellee's wife.

children, to the appellant's home which resulted to the appellees suffering from mental anguish; that the appellant's claim of employment with CONDI is false and misleading as there exists no legally registered entity in Liberia as such and that the appellant infact failed to provide any Article of Incorporation and or Business Registration documents to establish proof of the legal existence of CONDI; that the co-appellee's wife is an employee of the Ministry of Justice and works at no other institution besides the Ministry of Justice; that the co-appellee upon getting hold of the passengers manifest and appellant's flight ticket, followed the appellant and his wife to Accra, initiated investigation with the Ghanaian Police based upon which the appellant failed to show up for interrogation but instead escaped to Liberia; that the closeness between the co-appellee's wife and the appellant is not work related, but solely an illicit affair to the detriment of the appellees; that on several occasions the appellant had been restrained from contacting the co-appellee's wife but none have yielded fruitful results as the appellant constantly violates said restraining orders including one from the Paynesville City Magisterial Court; that contrary to the false and misleading claims of the appellant that the co-appellee's wife, more than being a professional colleague, is like a friend and sister to him, there exists no professional relationship between the appellant and the appellee's wife, and his interference has directly resulted to the appellees shame, embarrassment and mental anguish, and for which the appellees are entitled to special and exemplary damages in a court of law.

The pleadings having rested, the case was called for the disposition of law issues and it was subsequently ruled to trial on June 10, 2022. Upon empaneling the jury, the appellees presented four (4) witnesses including co-appellee Andrew Anderson, while the appellant presented two witnesses including himself.

Co-appellee Anderson took the stand as appellees first witness. He testified that he and his wife lived together before getting married on June 16, 2012 and they have two minor children; that the family lived in relative comfort and often went on family vacations based on his salary earned from his job at the National Investment Commission (NIC); that it was not until April 2021, when his wife began coming home at very late hours and giving frivolous reasons; that upon getting information that his wife had gotten involved in an extramarital relationship with the appellant, he placed a phone call to the appellant to desist from said conduct but the appellant insulted and threatened him instead. He stated that once spotted his wife's vehicle at the Wash Commission in Sinkor, and upon waiting outside the building for hours, he saw his wife leave the building around 9:00 p m and entered the appellant's vehicle; that he drove patiently behind them to Mataldi where she and the appellant entered the appellant's house; that he stayed in his car outside the appellant's home until 12 midnight, after which he went

home; that when his wife got home hours later, she did not give him any explanation as to her whereabouts; that he thereafter complained the appellant to the Liberia National Police (LNP) who advised the appellant to desist from any relationship with the co-appellee's wife; that subsequently, he instituted an action against the appellant at the Paynesville City Magisterial Court, where the Magistrate cited the parties to a conference and advised the appellant to refrain from interfering with the co-appellee marital relationship.

The co-appellee further explained that on one occasion, his wife stated that she was to attend a church conference in Gbarnga; that when she was leaving, he provided his pick-up and a driver to take her, but along the way, she instructed the driver to head in the direction of the Roberts International Airport (RIA) where she boarded a flight to Accra; that he proceeded to get copies of her air ticket and flight manifest and discovered that both his wife and the appellant were on the same flight. He traveled to Ghana along with his eight (8) year old son and a family friend named Mrs. Malynda Omans Davis to persuade his wife to return home, and found her staying with the appellant; that based on Mrs. Davis persuasion, his wife came to the hotel and met him and their son and she agreed to return home. Later, she headed out of the compound along with her son pretending to go to purchase some items, but she abandoned the child on the streets and went back to the appellant.

The co-appellee testified that he contacted the Ghana Police reporting that his wife was missing, and the police had a charge put out for the appellant, charging him for kidnapping his wife. The police apprehended his wife and asked her to return home with co-appellee, but all efforts to arrest the appellant proved futile as the appellant mobilized thugs to resist his arrest.

The appellee second witness, Moses Gardea, testified that he knows the appellant and had interacted with him on several occasions based on a court issue between the appellant and his sister which led him and some court officers to frequent the appellants home in an attempt to serve him with a writ of arrest; that he had seen the appellant and the co-appellee's wife on two separate occasion, the first occasion being one night at A 'La Lagoon, an amusement center, where the appellant and co-appellee's wife were out having fun; that on another occasion when he had gone with court officers to serve a writ on the appellant at his home in Mataldi, the appellant's doors were locked but he recognized the co-appellee's wife from within the house instructing the appellant not to open the door. On cross examination, questioning the witness as to how he knew that the person instructing the appellant not to open the door was the co-appellee's wife, the witnesses stated that he had known her since 2011.

The appellees' third witness Edward S. Karpeh testified that he is the uncle of the co-appellee Andrew Anderson; that he was present at the Paynesville Magisterial Court with the co-appellee where he met the appellant; that he was engaged with the co-appellee's wife in a conversation at the court when the appellant came from within the court and commanded the co-appellee's wife to enter his vehicle so they could leave the court yard, but she told the appellant go ahead, that she would join him later.

The appellees' fourth and last witness Mrs. Malynda Omans Davies testified that she is a social worker, a family friend and a close neighbor to the Andersons; that she had travelled with the appellee to Ghana in an effort to use her expertise as a social worker and female influence to search for and persuade the co-appellee's wife to return home; that while in Accra she visited Mrs. Anderson three times, but the appellant on her first visit refused to have her spend time alone and talk to Mrs. Anderson as he seemed not comfortable with her visit; that she however was able to get Mrs. Anderson away during her last visit, and at which time upon persuasion Mrs. Anderson went to the hotel and met her son and husband, but she later abandoned her son on the streets and went to the appellant; that at one point the appellant mobilized thugs who attacked her (witness) at the appellant's residence but she was swiftly rescued by the arrival of the Ghanaian Police; that upon her return to Liberia without Mrs. Anderson, she decided to withdraw from the co-appellee's marital problems because the appellant kept calling and threatening her.

The appellees rested with oral testimonies after Mrs. Malynda Omans Davies testified and gave notice that they would bring rebuttal witnesses if need be.

The appellant took the witness stand and testified that he is married and lives with his wife and children at his residence in Mataldi; that he got connected to Mrs. Anderson for about a year as she was first a donor to CONDI and later became a volunteer; that being the Executive Director of CONDI, his relationship with Mrs. Anderson is purely professional and being that Mrs. Anderson was a volunteer with expertise in women and children's affairs, she was selected to participate in a training in Ghana where he and four other staff attended for about a month; that he and Mrs. Anderson travelled on the same flight to Ghana, and while in Ghana, he stayed in Kumasi while she stayed in Accra; he denied ever seeing Mrs. Malynda Davies. The appellant further stated that he and the co-appellee have never been to the police or the Magisterial Court, and neither of the two had advised him to desist from interfering with the appellee's wife; that on the contrary, it was the co-appellee who had issued several accusatory threats to his person, prompting him to file actions of criminal cohesion, terroristic

threats and menacing against the appellee before the Monrovia City Court and which action remains pending undetermined.

In regards to his Facebook posts, the appellant stated that it is a tradition of CONDI members to make a post of each other on celebratory occasions, especially birthdays; that at the close of the training in Ghana, he and Mrs. Anderson took photos at the occasion; that the co-appellee's wife had explained to members of CONDI that she was not at peace in her home as her husband was abusive and violent and that she was thereafter counseled by CONDI members. Regarding a photo of the co-appellee's son, Andrew Anderson, Jr., being up at appellant's house, the appellant stated that it was taken on one of his children's birthdays which Mrs. Anderson had attended with her son.

The appellant second and final witness Mr. Ernest K. Nelson, who stated that he was the Finance Officer of CONDI, testified that the relationship between the appellant, Executive Director of CONDI and Mrs. Anderson was strictly professional; that CONDI was invited to a workshop in Ghana where Mrs. Anderson along with three other staff, including the appellant were selected to attend; that the appellant and his wife live together in Mataldi and that he has seen Mrs. Anderson at the appellant's house during one of the appellant son's birthday celebration.

When the appellant rested with oral evidence, the appellees brought forth two rebuttal witnesses. The first, Officer Alex G. Neewray of the LNP, who testified and debunked the appellant's testimony that he (appellant) and the co-appellee had never been at the police station and the magisterial court on matters of his interference in the co-appellee's domestic relations.

Officer Alex G. Neewray stated that the appellant had been called in based on the co-appellee's complaint that the appellant was interfering with the co-appellee's domestic relations and that he had warned the appellant that though he had denied being in a relationship with the co-appellee's wife, he should disengage if the contrary was true.

Mr. Edward S. Karpeh, uncle of the co-appellant came back to rebut that the appellant did appear at the Paynesville Magisterial Court where the appellant was charged with simple assault for interfering in a fight between the co-appellee and his wife; that however the magistrate let him off with a warning that he should refrain from engaging with the co-appellee's wife since he was already accused of being romantically involved with her.

After the parties rested with their testimonies and upon conclusions of deliberation by the trial jury, a unanimous verdict of liable was entered against the appellant, awarding to the

appellees United States One Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (US\$150,000.00) as damages for injury to domestic relations. .

The appellant thereafter filed a motion for new trial, praying the court to vacate the verdict of liable entered by the jury against him on grounds that said verdict was contrary to the weight of the evidence adduced at trial. This motion was resisted, argued, and denied by the lower court judge who subsequently entered the court's final ruling on July 29, 2022, affirming the verdict of the trial jury on grounds that the court upon analysis of the evidence adduced at trial found that the unanimous verdict was supported by the evidence. The relevant portion of the lower court's ruling is quoted verbatim below:

"In the instant case, the court is without doubt that the jury verbally listened, received and analyzed the evidence adduced on both side of the coin and it judgment is manifestly supported by the evidence.

In this jurisdiction, the standard of proof in civil litigation is the preponderance of evidence.

The Black's Law Dictionary Abridge edition defines preponderance of evidence on page 991 as follow: "The greater weight of evidence, not necessarily established by the greater number of witnesses testifying to fact, but by evidence that has the most convincing force; superior evidentiary weight that, though not sufficient to free the mind wholly from all reasonable doubt, is still sufficient to incline a fair and impartial mind to one side of the issue rather than the other." From the testimonies before this Court, the Plaintiff met the above standard of the burden of proof.

Wherefore and in view of the foregoing, the unanimous verdict of the trial jury is confirmed and affirmed. The defendant Habakkuk Watara Sackor is hereby adjudged liable for damaging the plaintiff's home and is ordered to pay USD\$150,000.00 as general damages as awarded by the trial jury."

It is against this final ruling of the lower court that the appellant noted exceptions, announced an appeal and subsequently filed a bill of exceptions contending that the trial judge final ruling contained several reversible errors such that same should be reversed.

Given the facts and circumstances narrated supra, the issue that this Court considers determinative of this matter is whether the verdict of the trial jury was consistent with the evidence adduced at trial.

Our jurisprudence provides for the jurors, otherwise known as fact finders, to weigh the evidence presented by all parties at a trial as to the certainty of occurrences and render a verdict as to the guilt and liability of either of the parties to the case. Ordinarily, the jury retains

the final say in the passage of their verdict, after listening to all sides of the case and upon subsequent deliberations at the close of the trial. This Court have furthered cautioned judges against randomly setting aside the verdict of the Jury.: *Cavalla Rubber Corporation v. Harris, Morris v Diggs*, Supreme Court Opinion, March Term 2011; the Court has opined that no judge should disturb a verdict reached by a trial jury, after it has exercised its authority within the acceptable legal perimeters, and after said jury's due consideration of the evidence presented during trial.

However, there exists a lone ground which precludes the privilege of finality of the jury's verdict in all cases heard by it and such occurs where the verdict of the jury is manifestly and palpably against the weight of the evidence adduced at trial and at which time the Supreme Court shall set aside same in the interest of justice and fair play. *Intestate Estate of Margaret Stubblefield v Ma. Bendu Kamara*, Supreme Court Opinion, October Term, 2023; *Embassy Suite Corporation v The Management of Ecobank Liberia*, Supreme Court Opinion, March Term 2023; *Fatorma v Republic of Liberia*, Supreme Court Opinion, October Term, 2010.

In view of the principles cited supra, we shall now review the evidence adduced at trial to determine whether the jury's verdict was consistent with the evidence.

The crust of the appellees' complaint in the court below is that the appellant is carrying on extramarital affairs with their wife and mother after seducing her, so that she has abandoned her conjugal obligations and domestic relationship with her family and that this has caused the appellees shame, public ridicule, and embarrassment which behavior constitutes interference to domestic relations and for which damages will lie.

The major premise of the appellant's defense and denial of the appellees' contention is that the relationship that exist between he and the co-appellee's wife is purely professional as they work for the same organization, CONDI; that he only posted the co-appellee's wife on Facebook because it was her birthday and that the organization normally celebrate its members on said occasion. He admitted that he and co-appellee's wife went on a trip to Ghana but that the said trip was not to have fun as she was a volunteer with his Organization (CONDI) and it was a professional mission fully sponsored by CONDI for four of its staff members including the co-appellee's wife who works for CONDI as a volunteer; that while in Ghana, his program was held in Kumasi while the co-appellee's wife had hers in Accra. The appellant further contends that he is married with three children and he and his family live in the Matadi estate so he could not have had the co-appellee's wife cohabit with him at the same residence in Matadi.

The appellant assigned as error the jury's verdict ignoring the appellant's testimony that he is married and resides in Old Matadi with his wife and three minor children which makes it impossible and impracticable for him to be cohabiting with the appellee's wife at his home.

The Court notes the co-appellee Anderson's testimony that on one occasion he had followed the appellant and his wife to the appellant's home in Madadi and had sat outside his (appellant) home until midnight after which he left; that it was not until later in the morning that his wife came home. Though the appellant denied that he ever took the co-appellee's wife to his house in Matadi and in his testimony claims that he is married and living happily with his wife and children at home, and proffered into evidence a marriage certificate, he however did not provide sufficient evidence to establish that he, his wife, and children live together at his home in Matadi. The appellant attached to his pleadings a copy of his marriage certificate in defense of his claim of innocence against the appellee's allegation, however, we are at loss as to why the appellant did not go any further to prove his case of having a joyous and happy family life especially given the fact that the standard of proof in civil actions is the preponderance of evidence. A neighbor, a relative or his wife herself could have come to testify that it was impossible for the appellant to have been cohabiting with the co-appellee's wife or entertaining her in his home when he lived there with his family. This Court has held that the best evidence of a case is the testimony of a person with direct knowledge thereof and said best evidence must always be produced as no other evidence can be produced which presupposes the existence of better evidence. *Sayeh et al v Liberia Telecommunications Authority (LTA)*, Supreme Court Opinion, October Term, 2016; *Dennis et al v Reed*, Supreme Court Opinion, March Term, 2014; *Dennis et al v Reed*, Supreme Court Opinion, October Term 2012. In this case, the Court is convinced that the appellant's wife whom he alleged to be living happily with in Matadi would have been the best evidence to rebut the appellees testimonies that the co-appellee's wife is entertained by the appellant in his home.

This Court has also consistently held that mere allegations does not constitute proof and that a party who alleges a fact or set forth a claim has the burden of proving or substantiating the allegations by the preponderance of evidence. *Universal Printing Press v. Blue Cross Insurance Company*, Supreme Court Opinion, March Term 2015; *Kamara et al v. The Heirs of Essel*, Supreme Court Opinion, March Term 2012; *V. H. Timber v. Naca Logging Company et al*, 42 LLR 527, 536 (2005) *Urban Marketing, Inc. v. Tubman*, Supreme Court Opinion, October Term A.D 2024.

The appellant has also assigned as error the inconsistency in co-appellee Andrew Anerson's testimony during trial, that he got information from the airline that the appellant purchased a one-way ticket for him and the co-appellee's wife to travel to Ghana, but the co-appellee contradicted himself on cross examination when he stated that he was not sure about who actually purchased the plane ticket, and that although the appellant testified that his trip to Ghana along with three others including the appellee wife was sponsored by their employer (CONDI) and while in Ghana he and the other two members of the team were in Kumasi attending the Poultry Project while the co-appellee's wife was in Accra attending the Ending Period Poverty Program, the jury failed to give due consideration to said testimony of his and the accompanying documentary evidence which would have confirmed that he was not in Ghana with the co-appellee's wife for fine time but purely on a professional mission sponsored by his employer.

The Court says that the question of who purchased the tickets for the appellant and the co-appellee's wife is irrelevant in the face of the fact that the co-appellee and his 4th witness, Mrs. Malynda Omans Davies, testified that both the appellant and the co-appellee's wife were found cohabiting in Accra and the co-appellee even tried to get the police in Accra to get his wife to come to him to the hotel. We note that the co-appellee's wife was the lone female to attend the alleged Ending Period Poverty Program Workshop in Accra which also coincided with the appellant's alleged poultry program in Kumasi. The appellant showed no evidence of invitations of CONDI to attend these programs and for it to submit an attendee to the Ending Period Poverty Program allegedly held in Accra. What we find disconcerting is that although the appellant claims that the CONDI sponsored trip to Ghana was for four staff members including him and the appellee's wife, there exist no evidence in the records of the other two participants from CONDI. Furthermore, there is no evidence of the other participants names on the travel manifest or their presence at any of the events or activities of the professional mission to Accra.

This Court has numerously held that the burden of proof lies upon the party that alleges a fact and that said party must establish his allegations by the preponderance of evidence. *Kasser et al v Judson*, Supreme Court Opinion, March Term, A.D 2025 *Intestate Estate of Shad Kaydea v Turay Family*, Supreme Court Opinion, March Term 2024; *Urban Marketing Inc. v Tubman*, Supreme Court Opinion, October Term A.D. 2024; *Jackley v Siafa*, 42 LLR, 3, 9 (2004).

All that the Court has deduced from the appellants own attached pictorial evidence is that if the appellant's testimony that Four (4) CONDI staff travelled to Ghana to attend a conference

is even true, we are not convinced that four staffs of CONDI travelled to Ghana or even participated in any training in either Accra or Kumasi where the appellant claimed to have stayed for the entire duration of his stay in Ghana. Consequently, we are obliged to side with the appellee's claim that the trip to Ghana was for "fine time" especially given that the testimony of Mrs. Davis proves that both the appellant and the appellee wife were seen staying together at the same apartment in Ghana for the period they were in Accra. This Court ask, why did the appellant not cite the others who were on the trip to authenticate that indeed two of the other staff were sent to participate in the training in Kumasi Ghana. Where were the other two persons named in the trial absent as witnesses throughout the course of the trial to substantiate the appellant's claim? There is no photographic evidence of his attending any function or events in Kumasi save for the photos of the him and the co-appellee's wife visiting a pad production center in Accra. From the evidence adduced, the appellant failed to prove his assertions that the trip to Ghana was sponsored by CONDI for four other staffs including him and the appellee's wife.

Marriage contract entered by individuals includes the state as a third party and such tripartite contract imposes an obligation on the citizens of the state to uphold the sanctity of said union and to ensure that it is not prematurely terminated or unduly interfered with by any intruding third party. In such case, the intrusion of a third parties, as the appellant in this case, in a manner and form that endangers the longevity of the union or destabilizes its functionality amounts to a violation of our Domestic Relations Laws (1973). Healthy marriages and children is the life line to a wholesome functioning society. Any intrusion into a marital union therefore constitutes injuries to the union, and the accompanying damages that are accorded such acts is contained in Section 13: 1 & 2 of our Domestic Relations Laws (1973) which state:

Subsection 13.1. What constitutes injuries to domestic relations.

"Injuries to the domestic relations are committed by any of the following acts to wit: adultery; seduction of wife or daughter; breach of promise, contract or engagement to marry; enticing, taking away, confining or detaining the wife, child or ward of any person, or an incompetent, from his or her legally appointed guardian or trustee; harboring or assisting a wife, child or ward who has unlawfully left the protection or services of his or her husband, parent or guardian; beating or otherwise injuring the wife of any parent or guardian beating or otherwise injuring any person sustaining any of the domestic relations in such a manner as to incapacitate him or her from performing the duties of such relation" (13.1).

Subsection 13.1. Damages.

"The provisions of the Civil Procedure Law shall govern actions brought under the provisions of this chapter except that in the assessment of damages the jury may take into consideration the willful misconduct of the defendant and may in its discretion award punitive damages in addition to compensatory damages" (13.2).

The appellee's allegation of the appellant intrusion into his marriage resulting to the injury to his domestic relations, we find, is consistent with the verdict of the trial jury, and the appellant's conduct of interference with the appellees' wife and mother was the proximate cause of her outward abandonment of her conjugal vows that has resulted to a breakdown of the appellees' home, and has led to their shame, embarrassment, and mental anguish. For the injury and damages to the appellees domestic relations, the award by the trial jury, we therefore uphold.

WHEREFORE AND IN VIEW OF THE FOREGOING, the final ruling of the trial judge is hereby affirmed. The appellant is held liable to the appellees for injury to domestic relations and is hereby ordered to pay to the appellees, damages of United States One Hundred & Fifty Thousand Dollars (US\$ 150,000.00). The Clerk of this Court is ordered to send a Mandate to the court below, commanding the judge presiding therein to give effect to the Judgment emanating from this Opinion. Costs are ruled against the appellant. AND IT IS HEREBY SO ORDERED.

WHEN THIS CASE WAS CALLED FOR HEARING, COUNSELLORS WILFUEH SAYEH AND KENNEH FLOMO OF THE LAW OFFICES OF SAYEH & SAYEH APPEARED FOR THE APPELLANT. COUNSELLOR MARK M. MARVEY OF THE BEYOND LAW CHAMBERS INC. APEARED FOR THE APPELLEES.