NIU Journal of Legal Studies Copyright©2026
Nexus International University ISSN: *3007-1860;* 12(3): 27-43

Oil Theft in the Nigeria Oil and Gas Industry: Towards Timely Prosecution of Perpetrators

DANDY CHIDIEBERE NWAOGU, FOLARIN DIMOWO
University of Benin, Benin City, Nigeria

Abstract. Crude oil theft has in recent years become a major cause of challenge to the Nigerian government owing to the various negative impacts of the menace within the Niger-Delta Region of the country. The obvious effects of oil theft in the Nigerian nation state includes the loss of economic revenue, environmental hazards, and well as threats to the international oil companies. This article traces the historical background of oil theft in Nigeria together with the overall effects and challenges on both the government and residents of the areas where oil theft activities are carried out. The paper critically examines the Nigerian legal and institutional framework for combatting oil theft focusing on both constitutional provisions, the Petroleum Industry Act 2021, criminal law legislations and other subsidiary regulatory frameworks. The paper maintains that despite the availability of legal frameworks criminalizing oil theft, the act continues unabated and this is owing to the weak and ineffective enforcement thus leading to limited prosecution of perpetrators. The paper concludes that it is the will power on the part of the Nigerian government coupled with other factors like strict enforcement of legislations, attention and development of the Niger-Delta Region, prompt arrest and prosecution of identified perpetrators and decisive action from government that would help to bring oil theft to a quick end.

Keywords: Oil Theft; Niger-Delta Region, Arrest and Prosecution; Legal framework, Negative Impact.

1. Historic Perspective of Oil Theft in the Nigerian Oil and Gas Industry

The history of oil theft in Nigeria reveals the country's broader political and economic antecedent, since the discovery of oil at Oloibiri, in today's Bayelsa State, as far back as 1956 and the start of commercial production in 1958, Nigeria has transformed into an oil rich dependent state. However, centralization of oil revenues under federal control through laws like the Petroleum Industry Act 2021 and Section 44(3) of the 1999 Constitution as amended excluded local communities from benefiting directly from the resources beneath their land.[1] And thereby vesting all mineral resources found anywhere in the country on the Federal Government of Nigeria.

Oil theft in Nigeria was first recorded between (1960s–1980s) when it started as a survival strategy among the marginalized people of Niger Delta, who depended on resource deposit in their environment for survival, engaged in rudimentary pipeline tapping and artisanal refining. This subsistence-level activity provided local energy and moderate income, often justified as compensation for long-standing neglect by the Nigerian government.[2]

In the early 1990s, oil theft in Nigeria became militarized. Widespread poverty, environmental devastation, and political repression under military rule fueled insurgency in the Niger Delta. Militants in the region began large-scale, organized bunkering operations, targeting pipelines as symbols of state exploitation. The illicit trade expanded beyond local consumption into regional black markets, financing insurgent movements and deepening insecurity.[3]

In recent years, oil theft became institutionalization and internationalization with sophisticated bunkering methods, rampant falsification of shipping documents, and high-level collusion among politicians, security operatives, and oil industry together with insiders turning oil theft into a multi-billion-dollar enterprise. Nigeria soon started losing over 150,000 barrels of crude daily to theft.[4]

From the 2010s onward, oil theft became a trade became deeply rooted in Nigeria's political economy despite the Amnesty Programme which was meant to put an end to the ugly incidence, oil theft persisted taking various shapes and involving former militants, local refiners, and transnational actors. There emerged thousands of illegal oil refineries proliferated across the Niger Delta, providing livelihoods with products, but then causing severe environmental degradation. Available report show that stolen Nigerian crude reached markets in Asia and Europe, highlighting the global scope of the illicit trade.[5]

Today, however, oil theft has a lot of negative effects on the Nigerian economy, Nigeria losses up to $2 billion annually to the activities of perpetrators. What began as a form of local resistance has evolved into a globalized criminal enterprise sustained by weak governance, poverty, and international complicity. To address this menace, there is the need for more than adequate, policing, it thus requires the act of tackling the deep structural inequalities and governmental corruption which make oil theft an ugly feature of Nigeria's economy.[6]

2. Negative Impact of Oil Theft on the Nigerian Economy

Oil theft has become a serious and major crisis that continues to undermine Nigeria's economic development, political stability, as well as the nation's social well-being. As Africa's frontline oil producer and a key member of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), Nigeria's economy depends heavily on petroleum exports as its primary means of foreign exchange and government revenue. However, the large-scale theft and illegal bunkering of crude oil have significantly reduced the nation's economic potential benefits. The effects of this criminal enterprise are visible in lost government revenue, reduced foreign investment, thus leading to infrastructural decay, corruption, environmental degradation, and growing insecurity.

Loss of Government Revenue

The most immediate and devastating impact of oil theft is the huge loss of government revenue. Nigeria derives nearly 80–90 percent of its foreign exchange earnings and about half of its total government income from oil exports. When crude oil is stolen, the government loses vital revenue which otherwise could have been used for national development.[7] According to reports by the Nigeria Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (NEITI), the country loses between $1 billion and $2 billion annually due to crude oil theft and vandalism. [8]This heavy loss creates severe fiscal stress, and thus hinders the government's ability to make the following available for its citizen's education, healthcare, infrastructure, and social welfare programs, and by extension widens the budget deficit. Owing to this fact, the government resorts to heavy borrowing from foreign countries to the fill revenue gaps, thereby leading to an unsustainable debt burden and reduced fiscal independence. This unending cycle of revenue loss, borrowing, and corruption further weakens Nigeria's macroeconomic stability.[9]

Reduction in Oil and Gas Production and Export Earnings

Oil theft reasonably interrupts production and damages important oil and gas installations, leading to an obvious reduction in output and export earnings. When oil and gas pipelines are destroyed or illegally extracted, production must be stopped for repairs, which reduces the overall volume available for export. Thus, Nigeria's oil and gas production has frequently fallen below its OPEC quota due to theft-connected disruptions. [10]This reduction in export volume directly affects the inflow of foreign exchange, leading to shortages of dollars in the financial market. Consequently, the value of the naira depreciates, inflation rises, and the cost of imported goods including fuel soars. The Nigerian government also loses its ability to stabilize the economy through the Central Bank's monetary interventions.[11]Therefore, oil theft not only reduces immediate export income but also creates long-term macroeconomic instability that affects the standard of living of ordinary Nigerians.

Serious Discouragement for Investors and Capital loss

Oil theft and the insecurity surrounding oil facilities serve as a serious discouragement to both domestic and foreign investors. Frequent pipeline vandalism, sabotage, and illegal refining make the operating environment unsafe and frightening for oil companies. Oil firms put in huge sums of money on repairing damaged pipelines, hiring private security outfits, and paying higher insurance premiums. On the long run, these huge financial make business operations less profitable, prompting many multinational oil companies to divest from Nigeria's onshore operations.[12] Major companies such as Shell, Chevron, and Total have sold off significant assets and shifted focus to offshore fields or other African countries with lower security risks. The exit of these investor's results in job losses, reduced technological transfer, and fewer opportunities for local content participation. All of these put together results to huge economic loss for the country.[13]

Corruption

Oil theft gives rise to systemic corruption and lack of integrity in Nigeria's political and security institutions. The illegal business of crude oil is often facilitated by complex networks involving political elites, senior military officers, community leaders, and oil industry insiders. These individuals compromise their offices to shield illegal operations and thereafter partake in the proceeds therefrom. This institutional corruption makes it very hard to enforce extant legislations or bring offenders to book. The profits or gains of stolen oil are most times laundered through offshore accounts, this further shows the lack of transparency in the Nigerian financial system. As corruption increases, the rule of law is weakened, and citizens of the country loses trust in government institutions. These weak institutions and lack of enforcement as it were, enables oil theft to thrive.[14]

Environmental Impact

Aside from the economic losses, oil theft is a major cause of environmental degradation, particularly within the Niger Delta region, the primary location for illegal refining in Nigeria. Pipeline destruction and oil spillage cause devastating effects by destroying farmlands, pollution of water body, and pollution of the air with toxic chemicals. The environmental degradation impacts on fishing, farming, and other traditional means of livelihood, compelling local inhabitants into poverty and dependence on illegal refining as a survival strategy. The destruction of ecosystems also has long-term impact on food security and public health. In addition, the cost of cleaning up polluted region drains government resources that could have been invested in human capital development. Thus, oil theft not only impoverishes communities but also perpetuates the cycle of environmental injustice and underdevelopment in oil-producing areas.[15]

Impact on National Security and Energy Supply

Oil theft fuels insecurity and violence in Nigeria's oil-producing regions. The huge financial profits generated from the illegal trade are often used to finance militant groups, arms trafficking, and criminal networks. These groups attack pipelines, kidnap oil workers, and engage in piracy, posing significant threats to national security. The multiplication of illegal refineries also hinders energy stability, as they divert crude oil meant for official refineries, leading to scarcity of petroleum products and periodic fuel scarcity across the country. Moreover, the loss of energy security reduces productivity in other sectors of the economy, including transportation and the manufacturing sector.[16] The negative effect of oil theft on the Nigerian economy is somehow deeply rooted in the failure of administration of government. It drains public revenue, discourages investment, weakens the naira, fosters corruption, devastates the environment, and undermines national security.

To address issues of oil theft in Nigeria, there is the need for a comprehensive reform to deal with corruption, enthrone transparency in the oil sector, empower local communities, and diversify the economy beyond oil dependence. Only through strong political will, institutional accountability, and inclusive economic governance can Nigeria overcome this scourge and secure a sustainable future.

3. Oil Theft in Nigeria: Rationales and Perpetrators

Oil theft in Nigeria has evolved into a systemic challenge that is both a symptom and a driver of structural problems in the country's oil and gas sector. While the term "oil theft" might evoke images of pipeline tapping and clandestine bunkering in the Niger Delta, the reality is far broader encompassing metering fraud, illegal storage, unauthorized export, and even collusion within the regulatory and oil-company apparatus. Between 2009 and 2020, Nigeria reportedly lost about 619.7 million barrels of crude oil valued at US $46.16 billion.[17] Understanding the rationales behind these thefts and the profile of the perpetrator is critical if legal scholars, policy makers, regulatory agencies and legislators (such as yourself working in a legislative research role) are to craft meaningful responses that go beyond superficial enforcement. This essay will examine in depth the economic, institutional, socio-political and technological rationales, and then map the spectrum of actors involved in oil theft in Nigeria.

One of the primary rationales for oil theft is economic: crude oil and refined petroleum products represent high-value commodities and therefore offer very high profit margins. For individuals, communities and networks in regions where alternative livelihoods are weak, the theft of oil can become an economic lifeline. This is especially true in many parts of the Niger Delta where environmental degradation, declining fisheries/agriculture and unemployment prevail. A technical report of illegal bunkering in Igbomatoru Community (Bayelsa) shows how locals describe "we were eating, drinking, breathing oil" because of the constant leaks and siphoning around their communities.[18] The economic impact of crude oil theft in Nigeria is both profound and multifaceted. In macroeconomic terms, the losses to the nation are staggering. According to the Nigeria Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (NEITI), the country lost approximately 13.5 million barrels of crude oil in 2022 alone, representing a value of about US $3.3 billion due to theft and sabotage. Similarly, in 2023, the Speaker of the House of Representatives estimated that industrial-scale theft resulted in annual losses of N1.29 trillion, underscoring the magnitude of the fiscal drain on government resources.[19]

The economic rationale underpinning this illicit activity is multilayered. At the individual or community level, crude oil theft provides immediate financial gain through illegal tapping, refining, and sale of petroleum products. However, the consequences extend well beyond the direct beneficiaries. Structurally, oil theft creates a persistent "leakage" in state revenue, reducing funds available for public investment, infrastructure development, and social services, while simultaneously increasing fiscal pressure on the government to meet its obligations.[20]

Moreover, the incentives for engaging in crude oil theft are further exacerbated by the perceived enforcement risk. Where regulatory oversight is weak, surveillance is limited, or penalties are inconsistently applied, the potential profit from theft often outweighs the anticipated legal or financial consequences. This risk-reward calculation drives the persistence of illegal operations and underscores the importance of robust enforcement, regulatory oversight, and systemic reforms aimed at reducing opportunities for diversion and deterring participation in oil theft.[21]

The second major rationale is institutional: weak oversight, poor monitoring, inadequate infrastructure, and corruption. According to a UNU-WIDER working paper, theft and diversion in Nigeria may amount to up to a fifth of daily crude production, due to illegal bunkering, metering malpractices, smuggling and falsification. Crude oil theft in Nigeria is exacerbated by profound institutional vulnerabilities, which create persistent opportunities for illegal operations. For instance, in June 2024, the Nigerian National Petroleum Company Limited (NNPCL) recorded 400 incidents of oil theft in a single week, comprising 165 illegal refineries, 69 illegal connections, and 15 cases of pipeline vandalism. Such figures underscore the scale and frequency of theft, highlighting systemic weaknesses in surveillance, monitoring, and enforcement.[22]These vulnerabilities facilitate theft in several ways.

First, they allow illegal pipeline taps to remain undetected for substantial periods, providing criminals with the time and cover to siphon crude oil with minimal risk of interruption.[23]

Second, there are opportunities for insider collusion, including individuals within oil companies, regulatory bodies, and security agencies. Evidence of such collusion was uncovered in June 2024, when surveillance operatives discovered bunkering camps in Bayelsa containing identity cards belonging to a legitimate security firm contracted by an oil company, suggesting internal facilitation of illegal operations.[24]
Third, the penal and prosecutorial framework remains weak, with unclear sanctions and inconsistent enforcement. Advocacy groups, including the Socio-Economic Rights and Accountability Project (SERAP), have repeatedly urged authorities to identify and prosecute perpetrators, including complicit security personnel, to restore accountability.[25]

Consequently, institutional weakness is not merely a facilitator of crude oil theft but forms a structural rationale for its persistence. The combination of inadequate oversight, opportunities for collusion, and limited enforcement skews the risk-return calculus in favor of thieves. In such an environment, the potential financial gain from illegal tapping or refining substantially outweighs the likelihood of detection or sanction, perpetuating cycles of theft and complicity across the petroleum sector.

The third rationale is socio-political. The Niger Delta region has long been marked by economic exclusion, environmental damage from oil operations, weak infrastructure, and a sense of marginalization. This creates fertile ground for oil theft as an expression of grievance, an alternative economy, or even insurgency funding. The article by DW notes that some thieves are suspected members of militant groups and that authorities have even awarded pipeline-protection contracts to ex-militants to try to reduce theft a controversial but revealing step. [26] Beyond economic and institutional factors, social and security considerations also drive crude oil theft in Nigeria. In some instances, theft is motivated by a perceived sense of injustice: host communities may view the diversion or appropriation of oil as a means of reclaiming resources extracted from their territories without commensurate benefits.[27] This perception is particularly acute in regions of the Niger Delta, where decades of oil production have often coincided with environmental degradation, limited local development, and marginalization.
Crude oil theft also finances militant groups or insurgent economies, creating a nexus between illegal

extraction and organized criminality. Revenues generated from illicit bunkering, pipeline tapping, and oil diversion frequently support armed actors, fueling local conflicts and complicating security operations in the region.[28]

The broader consequences of theft and related pipeline vandalism extend beyond revenue loss to regional security and environmental stability. As highlighted by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, these activities result in substantial economic losses, environmental disasters, and heightened social instability. Such outcomes underscore that oil theft is not merely a fiscal problem but a multifaceted threat that intersects with governance, security, and community welfare, making its control both an economic and strategic imperative.[29]

A fourth rationale underpinning crude oil theft in Nigeria lies in the technological and market mechanics that make the crime both feasible and highly profitable. Advances in pipeline tapping techniques have enabled increasingly sophisticated forms of illegal extraction, including clandestine hook-ups, submerged pipelines, and concealed manifold systems that are difficult to detect. In one widely reported instance, authorities uncovered an illegal connection running from a major export terminal into the sea that had reportedly operated undetected for nearly nine years, underscoring the scale of technical penetration achievable by oil theft networks.[30]

Stolen crude is frequently processed through illegal refining operations, where it is transported by boats or trucks to makeshift facilities and refined using rudimentary "cooking ovens," metal drums, and improvised distillation units. These operations convert crude into products such as diesel and kerosene for local sale, significantly lowering entry barriers into the illicit petroleum market. The scale of this activity is substantial: in November 2024 alone, security forces reportedly dismantled dozens of illegal bunkering sites and recovered over a million litres of stolen crude alongside tens of thousands of liters of refined products.[31]

Beyond domestic consumption, oil theft is sustained by cross-border smuggling networks and illicit export markets, which provide ready outlets for stolen crude and refined products. These underground markets often supply jurisdictions where fuel prices are higher or regulatory oversight is weaker, enhancing profit margins. Relatedly, pricing arbitrage created by domestic subsidy regimes, price controls, and disparities between local and international petroleum prices further incentivizes diversion from lawful supply chains into illegal markets.[32]

Oil theft is not always overtly criminal in appearance. In many cases, it is facilitated through masked legal transactions, including undocumented domestic liftings, falsified shipping records, and metering fraud. As empirical studies have noted, diversion and inaccurate measurement are as significant as outright theft in accounting for crude oil losses. Together, these operational techniques and market dynamics substantially lower the risks and costs of theft while amplifying returns, thereby reinforcing the attractiveness and persistence of crude oil theft within Nigeria's petroleum economy.[33]

Oil theft in Nigeria is not a monolithic act. It involves a wide range of actors with different functions, motives and levels of organization. Below is an expanded typology of perpetrators.

Local Artisanal Operators / Community Based Actors

Local Artisanal Operators and Community-Based Actors represent a significant segment of crude oil theft in Nigeria. These actors are typically individuals or small groups drawn from oil-producing communities who engage in low-capital operations, often using rudimentary tools and equipment such as drums and makeshift "cooking ovens" to siphon crude from pipelines. The stolen crude is then transported via small boats or trucks to local refining sites and subsequently sold within local markets. Their operations are largely informed by intimate knowledge of the terrain, pipeline networks, and community structures, which facilitates both concealment and efficiency.[34]

Motivations for participation in these activities are frequently rooted in economic necessity. In regions such as Bayelsa, studies including the Igbomatoru survey, have documented substantial local involvement in bunkering camps, often leading to severe environmental degradation and social disruption. [35]While each individual operation may be modest in scale compared to organized syndicates, the cumulative impact of multiple artisanal operations across oil-producing areas is considerable, contributing meaningfully to aggregate losses and localised environmental harm.

Thus, community-based actors, though operating on a small scale, form an integral component of the broader crude oil theft ecosystem, reflecting both the socio-economic drivers of the crime and the challenges inherent in policing dispersed, low-capital operations in remote oil-producing regions.

Organized Criminal Networks / Syndicates

Organized Criminal Networks or Syndicates constitute the most sophisticated and high-impact actors in Nigeria's crude oil theft ecosystem. Unlike local artisanal operators, these groups coordinate operations across multiple sites and stages of the supply chain, including extraction, refining, storage, transportation, and sale. Their logistical capacity often includes access to vessels, barges, secure storage tanks, and road transport networks, allowing them to move large volumes of stolen crude both domestically and, in some cases, internationally.[36]

Syndicates frequently operate across state boundaries, and some maintain formal or informal relationships with insiders within oil companies or regulatory bodies, providing protection, logistical support, or intelligence to facilitate illicit activities. Evidence of the scale and reach of these networks can be found in reports from the Pipeline Infrastructure Nigeria Limited (PINL), which in 2024 dismantled over 500 bunkering flashpoints across several states, including Cross River, Abia, and Rivers. Such findings illustrate the extensive coordination and operational capacity of syndicates.[37]

The significance of these networks lies in their sheer scale: they can divert tens of thousands of barrels of crude per day, far exceeding the cumulative output of artisanal operations. Their activities not only cause substantial economic losses to the state but also exacerbate environmental degradation, fuel regional insecurity, and undermine governance structures within the petroleum sector. Understanding and targeting these syndicates, therefore, requires multi-agency cooperation, intelligence-led enforcement, and rigorous regulatory oversight.

Militant or Armed Factions

In the Niger Delta, militant groups have historically played a significant role in crude oil theft and pipeline vandalism, often using these activities both to fund operations and as a means of political leverage. Unlike purely economic actors, these groups operate within a hybrid framework, blending criminal activity with political objectives rooted in local grievances over resource control, environmental degradation, and perceived marginalisation.[38]

Militant actors frequently use force or the threat of force to secure pipelines, impose "tolls" on extraction operations, or protect illegal refining sites. Their involvement transforms crude oil theft from a purely economic crime into a security challenge, as their tactics include intimidation, armed enforcement, and sabotage, which can endanger personnel, local communities, and infrastructure. Evidence of this entanglement is seen in government contracts for pipeline security that engage ex-militants, illustrating the complex relationship between state actors and groups formerly involved in oil-related militancy.[39]

While the intensity of militant attacks has decreased in recent years, the structural presence of these groups remains significant. Their networks and knowledge of local terrain continue to facilitate theft and illegal operations, making them a persistent factor in the security calculus of the Nigerian petroleum sector. Addressing this dimension of oil theft therefore requires strategies that combine law enforcement, community engagement, and security sector reform to dismantle the residual power of these hybrid actors.[40]

Insiders / Colluding Officials / Oil-Company Employees

A critical yet often under-emphasized category of actors in Nigeria's crude oil theft ecosystem consists of insiders within oil companies, regulatory bodies, and security agencies, including private contractors tasked with pipeline monitoring. These actors play a pivotal role in enabling theft by providing unauthorized access, falsifying documentation, ignoring irregularities, or actively colluding with external perpetrators. Their involvement transforms oil theft from a simple illicit extraction into a sophisticated, organized operation that is significantly harder to detect and prosecute.[41]

Documented evidence highlights the extent of insider facilitation. For instance, surveillance operatives uncovered bunkering camps in Bayelsa where identity cards belonging to a legitimate surveillance company contracted by an oil firm were present on site, suggesting complicity of personnel tasked with oversight.[42] Advocacy groups, including the Socio-Economic Rights and Accountability Project (SERAP), have urged the authorities to publicly identify and prosecute not only the external thieves but also the insiders and security officials who enable large-scale operations.[43]

The significance of insider facilitation lies in its capacity to circumvent security protocols, manipulate operational records, and obscure detection. Without such collusion, large-scale oil theft would be far more difficult, if not impossible, to execute. As such, corruption and insider collusion are central to understanding the perpetrator profile and the structural vulnerabilities that allow organized theft networks to thrive. Effective enforcement strategies, therefore, must include stringent oversight of personnel, transparency mechanisms, and accountability measures to address the role of insiders in sustaining the illicit economy.

Exporters, Smugglers, and Buyers (Domestic & International)

The chain of crude oil theft does not conclude with extraction or refining; the route to market is a critical component in sustaining the illicit trade. A range of actors including domestic and international buyers, smugglers, and exporters play a pivotal role by purchasing stolen crude or refined products and facilitating their movement across borders. These actors create demand and profit incentives, effectively perpetuating the cycle of theft.

Evidence suggests that weak law enforcement and regulatory gaps enable stolen crude to reach foreign refineries, highlighting the international dimension of the problem. Studies, including the UNU WIDER research, document sophisticated methods employed by these actors, such as smuggling, tanker hijacking, and masked exports, all of which obscure the illicit origin of the products.[44]

The involvement of these actors is essential to the viability of crude oil theft. Without a ready market for stolen products, the economic rationale for theft diminishes significantly. However, their participation also increases the complexity of enforcement. International transactions, cross-border transportation, and foreign-based buyers necessitate cooperation with neighboring states, adherence to mutual legal assistance frameworks, and intelligence sharing to disrupt the supply chain. Thus, the market stage represents a critical node in the ecosystem of crude oil theft, linking domestic criminal activity with transnational networks and highlighting the need for coordinated domestic and international enforcement strategies.

1. Constitutional Provisions: Section 44(3) of the 1999 Constitution on Resource Ownership

Resource ownership lies at the heart of Nigeria's political economy, federal structure, and legal response to crude oil theft. The constitutional foundation of petroleum governance is Section 44(3) of the 1999 Constitution, which vests ownership and control of all mineral resources, including crude oil and natural gas, exclusively in the Federal Government. This provision is central to understanding crude oil theft, as it defines petroleum resources as property of the state rather than of individuals, communities, or federating units.[45]

Section 44(3) provides that all minerals, mineral oils, and natural gas in, under, or upon any land in Nigeria, including its territorial waters and Exclusive Economic Zone, vest in the Government of the Federation and shall be managed as prescribed by the National Assembly. This provision performs three key legal functions. First, it confers exclusive ownership of petroleum resources on the Federal Government, excluding states, landowners, and host communities from proprietary claims. [46]Second, it places petroleum governance within the exclusive legislative competence of the National Assembly. Third, it establishes a constitutional basis for criminalization, since any unauthorized interference with crude oil constitutes theft from the Nigerian state.[47]

The provision reflects Nigeria's historical approach to resource control. Colonial legislation, notably the Minerals Ordinance of 1914, vested mineral ownership in the Crown. After independence, this model was retained and strengthened, particularly under military decrees that placed all petroleum resources under federal control. These arrangements were ultimately constitutionalized in Section 44(3).[48] The Land Use Act 1978 further reinforced this structure by vesting land in state governors while preserving federal ownership of subsurface minerals.[49]

Judicial interpretation has consistently affirmed this constitutional arrangement. In *FRN v Osahon*[50], the Supreme Court held that the Federal High Court has exclusive jurisdiction over matters relating to petroleum resources under Section 251(1)(n) of the Constitution, thereby confirming that prosecutions for oil theft fall within federal jurisdiction. Similarly, in the *Resource Control* case,[51] the Supreme Court affirmed federal ownership of offshore petroleum resources by limiting the seaward boundaries of littoral states to the low-water mark. These decisions entrench federal dominance over petroleum resources and reinforce crude oil theft as an offence against the Federation.

Section 44(3) has direct implications for the prosecution of crude oil theft. Acts such as illegal bunkering, pipeline vandalism, artisanal refining, and unauthorized export are treated not as private property disputes but as acts of economic sabotage against the Nigerian state. This constitutional logic underpins statutory offences under laws such as the Miscellaneous Offences Act, the Petroleum Production and Distribution (Anti-Sabotage) Act 1975, and the Petroleum Industry Act 2021.[52]

Despite its legal clarity, Section 44(3) remains deeply contested. By centralizing resource ownership, it denies oil-producing states and communities any constitutional claim to petroleum resources, intensifying resource control debates in the Niger Delta. Although the Constitution provides for revenue derivation to producing states, critics argue that the existing allocation is inadequate given the environmental degradation and socio-economic costs borne by host communities[53]. Scholars further contend that the provision departs from principles of true federalism by concentrating economic power at the center, a dynamic often linked to militancy, sabotage, and illegal refining.[54]

In sum, Section 44(3) constitutes the bedrock of Nigeria's legal framework on crude oil ownership and theft. It enables the Federal Government to legislate, regulate, and criminalize unauthorized dealings in petroleum resources, thereby framing crude oil theft as a crime against the state. At the same time, its centralization of resource control continues to generate tensions with profound implications for federalism, security, and social justice in Nigeria's oil-producing regions.

4. Legal Framework for Combatting on Crude Oil Theft

Petroleum Industry Act (PIA) 2021

The Petroleum Industry Act (PIA) 2021 represents a decisive shift in Nigeria's legal response to crude oil theft, a problem that has long undermined national revenue, environmental sustainability, and investor confidence. One of the core objectives of the Act was to consolidate fragmented petroleum laws and introduce stronger regulatory, enforcement, and accountability mechanisms to curb theft, sabotage, and systemic leakages within the sector.[55]

Central to this framework is the empowerment of the Nigerian Upstream Petroleum Regulatory Commission (NUPRC) with enhanced investigatory and enforcement powers. The Act authorizes the Commission to conduct surveillance, inspections, and inquiries into upstream petroleum operations suspected of illegality. It may enter facilities, examine or seize records, and collaborate with law enforcement agencies to arrest offenders. Obstruction of these powers attracts substantial fines or imprisonment, marking a deliberate shift toward deterrence and the criminalization of regulatory non-compliance.[56]

The PIA also addresses crude oil theft through improved measurement and export controls. By vesting the NUPRC with exclusive responsibility for certifying the quality and quantity of crude oil exports and regulating terminal operations, the Act targets long-standing vulnerabilities arising from under-declaration and manipulated export figures. This centralization of measurement oversight is aimed at closing revenue leakages that previously flourished due to regulatory fragmentation and weak accountability.[57]

Further, the Act resolves jurisdictional ambiguities by classifying integrated upstream and midstream facilities as upstream operations, thereby placing them squarely under the regulatory authority of the NUPRC[58]. This clarification eliminates enforcement gaps that criminal networks previously exploited under the guise of overlapping regulatory mandates.

One of the most controversial anti-theft measures is the Host Community Development Trust Fund regime, which links community benefits to the protection of petroleum infrastructure. Where vandalism or sabotage occurs, host communities may forfeit entitlements under the trust fund to the extent necessary to repair damage.[59] While intended to incentivize community participation in infrastructure protection, this provision has been criticized for unfairly burdening communities that lack the capacity to confront organized criminal actors.[60]

Beyond regulatory measures, the PIA establishes comprehensive criminal sanctions for petroleum-related offences, including crude oil theft, illegal refining, false reporting, unauthorized operations, and obstruction of regulatory officers. Penalties range from fines and imprisonment to forfeiture of petroleum products and related assets, reinforcing the treatment of oil theft as a serious economic crime.[61]

In sum, the Petroleum Industry Act 2021 adopts a multi-layered legal strategy against crude oil theft by strengthening regulatory enforcement, ensuring transparency in measurement and exports, clarifying institutional jurisdiction, and introducing community-linked accountability. While the Act provides a robust statutory framework, its effectiveness ultimately depends on sustained political will, institutional capacity, and genuine collaboration between regulators, security agencies, host communities, and industry actors. Without effective implementation, the PIA's anti-theft provisions risk remaining aspirational rather than transformative.

Criminal Code and Penal Code Provisions

Crude oil theft in Nigeria constitutes not only a regulatory infraction under petroleum-specific legislation but also a serious criminal offence under the country's general criminal law. The Criminal Code Act, applicable in Southern Nigeria, and the Penal Code, applicable in Northern Nigeria, provide the foundational legal framework for prosecuting acts of theft, sabotage, and conspiracy associated with crude oil theft. These provisions are particularly relevant given the organized, transboundary, and collaborative nature of oil theft operations.[62]

Under the Criminal Code Act, stealing is defined as the fraudulent taking or conversion of anything capable of being stolen. Once crude oil is extracted or in transit through pipelines, vessels, or terminals, it qualifies as property capable of being stolen. Consequently, unauthorized pipeline tapping, illegal bunkering, and diversion of crude oil fall squarely within the offence of stealing, [63]punishable by terms of imprisonment that may extend to seven years depending on aggravating circumstances.[64]

The Penal Code contains parallel provisions. It defines theft as the dishonest taking of movable property without consent[65] and prescribes penalties including imprisonment or fines[66]. Given that petroleum pipelines traverse both northern and southern regions, these provisions ensure uniform criminal liability for crude oil theft across Nigeria's legal jurisdictions.

Sabotage of petroleum infrastructure is also criminalized under both codes. The Criminal Code punishes willful and unlawful destruction of property, with harsher penalties where public or government property is involved. Pipeline vandalisation and damage to oil installations therefore constitute serious offences. Similarly, the Penal Code criminalizes mischief involving destruction or alteration of property with intent to cause loss or damage, particularly where public safety or infrastructure is endangered. In the petroleum context, sabotage includes deliberate pipeline ruptures, damage to wellheads, and interference with export facilities.

Both codes further recognize conspiracy as an independent offence. Given that crude oil theft is typically perpetrated through organized criminal networks involving multiple actors, conspiracy provisions are crucial. An agreement to commit theft or sabotage is punishable even where the substantive offence is not completed, reflecting the law's intention to target the collaborative nature of oil theft.

Collectively, these provisions demonstrate that crude oil theft is firmly situated within Nigeria's criminal law framework as a serious offence against property, public infrastructure, and national security. However, despite clear statutory foundations, enforcement has remained weak due to corruption, limited investigative capacity, and a tendency to treat oil theft as a regulatory rather than criminal matter. Strengthening the application of the Criminal Code and Penal Code alongside petroleum-specific legislation is therefore essential to deter offenders and dismantle organized oil theft networks.

Miscellaneous Offences Act (MOA) and Crude Oil Theft

The Miscellaneous Offences Act (MOA) constitutes one of Nigeria's strongest criminal law responses to crude oil theft. Enacted to address serious economic and public-order offences, the Act complements petroleum-specific legislation such as the Petroleum Industry Act (PIA) 2021, as well as the general criminal law under the Criminal Code and Penal Code.

The MOA makes it a crime of any unauthorized dealing in crude oil or petroleum products, including importing, exporting, selling, distributing, or otherwise trading without lawful authority. Given the highly regulated nature of the petroleum sector, any transaction conducted outside the licensing framework established by petroleum laws constitutes a criminal offence. The Act prescribes life imprisonment for unlawful dealing in petroleum products,[67]
The Act also targets sabotage and interference with petroleum infrastructure. It criminalizes the tampering with, or damage to, oil pipelines and installations—conduct commonly associated with illegal bunkering and crude oil siphoning. This offence likewise attracts life imprisonment, underscoring the legal protection afforded to petroleum infrastructure as a critical national asset. Beyond economic loss, such acts frequently result in environmental degradation and threats to public safety, further justifying the severity of the sanction.[68]

The Nigerian Security and Civil Defense Corps (NSCDC) Act and Crude Oil Theft

Nigeria's oil and gas sector has long suffered from crude oil theft, illegal bunkering, and pipeline vandalism. Recognizing that police and military efforts alone were insufficient, the legislature established the Nigerian Security and Civil Defense Corps (NSCDC) under the NSCDC (Amendment) Act 2007 to protect critical national infrastructure, particularly petroleum pipelines, refineries, and depots, and to arrest and prosecute offenders. [69]

The Act empowers the Corps to safeguard petroleum infrastructure through physical security, surveillance, and deployment of personnel, often in collaboration with the Nigerian National Petroleum Company Limited (NNPC Ltd).[70] The Act further authorizes the NSCDC to arrest with or without a warrant, investigate, and institute legal proceedings in the name of the Attorney-General of the Federation against persons involved in vandalism, oil bunkering, or illegal dealings in petroleum products. [71]The Act also mandates collaboration with other security agencies, including the Navy, Police, and EFCC, facilitating joint operations against organized oil theft perpetrators.[72]

The Act further provides for specialized units, such as Anti-Vandalism Units, responsible for patrolling pipelines, detecting illegal tapping points, and dismantling makeshift refineries, particularly in remote areas of the Niger Delta[73]. Unlike the MOA or EFCC Act, which primarily focus on prosecution, the NSCDC Act emphasizes preventive security and deterrence, acknowledging that crude oil theft is a specialized crime requiring dedicated expertise.[74]

Other Laws and Regulatory Policies on Crude Oil Theft in Nigeria

Crude oil theft in Nigeria remains one of the major economic, security, and environmental challenges, thus, the under discussed

DPR/NUPRC Regulations

For decades, the Department of Petroleum Resources (DPR) served as Nigeria's principal regulator of petroleum operations. Following reforms under the Petroleum Industry Act (PIA) 2021, regulatory oversight was divided between the Nigerian Upstream Petroleum Regulatory Commission (NUPRC) and the Nigerian Midstream and Downstream Petroleum Regulatory Authority (NMDPRA). Despite this institutional transition, DPR-issued subsidiary regulations remain binding and continue to provide operational guidelines critical to combating crude oil theft.[75]

The Oil and Gas Pipelines Regulations 1995 establish conditions for the construction, operation, and maintenance of pipelines and related infrastructure. These regulations place legal duties on operators to maintain pipeline integrity, conduct regular surveillance, and report any damage or breaches. Given that pipeline tapping and vandalism constitute the primary methods of illegal crude extraction, these provisions directly reduce opportunities for theft while providing a basis for enforcement actions against negligent operators.[76]

The Petroleum (Drilling and Production) Regulations 1969, as amended, require accurate record-keeping of crude oil production, transport, and lifting. This legal obligation is particularly significant because theft frequently occurs through misdeclaration or diversion of oil volumes at different stages of the value chain. By mandating detailed and verifiable reporting, the regulations enable regulators to detect discrepancies and trace theft, providing a robust audit trail for investigations and prosecutions.[77]

Under the PIA 2021, the NUPRC also issued the Host Community Development Regulations 2022, operationalizing the creation of Host Community Development Trusts. These regulations require oil companies to allocate a portion of operating expenditure to host communities, addressing long-standing socio-economic grievances that have often led to sabotage or collusion with oil thieves. By linking community benefits to infrastructure security, the regulations incentivise local participation in protecting pipelines and installations, thereby mitigating one of the root causes of oil theft.[78]

Additionally, the NUPRC Crude Oil Measurement Guidelines 2021 provide precise standards for metering and accounting at every stage from wellhead to export. By standardizing measurement and reporting practices, these guidelines reduce the likelihood of manipulation, misappropriation, or underreporting of crude oil, ensuring that any unexplained losses are detectable. Accurate measurement also enhances transparency in export operations and facilitates international oversight, which is crucial for preventing cross-border diversion of petroleum products.[79]

Collectively, these DPR/NUPRC regulations and guidelines form the preventive and corrective arm of Nigeria's anti-oil theft framework. They complement criminal statutes by imposing operational obligations on operators, providing monitoring standards for regulators, and incentivizing host communities to act against theft and sabotage. In doing so, subsidiary legislation bridges the gap between law and practice, translating statutory prohibitions into enforceable rules and procedures that are essential to securing the nation's petroleum resources.[80]

Environmental Guidelines for Oil Operations (EGASPIN)

The Environmental Guidelines and Standards for the Petroleum Industry in Nigeria (EGASPIN), first introduced by the Department of Petroleum Resources (DPR) in 1991 and most recently revised in 2018, establish comprehensive environmental and operational standards for oil and gas operations. These guidelines cover pollution control, oil spill prevention, waste management, decommissioning of facilities, and general operational integrity. While primarily designed for environmental protection, EGASPIN also indirectly mitigates crude oil theft, as theft and pipeline vandalism are leading causes of spills and environmental degradation in the Niger Delta.[81]

Under EGASPIN, oil operators are legally required to report all oil spills promptly and provide detailed accounts of their causes. This requirement ensures that incidents arising from theft or sabotage cannot be misrepresented as operational accidents, allowing regulatory authorities to investigate and attribute responsibility. Similarly, provisions on periodic environmental audits mandate operators to submit comprehensive reports on environmental performance and operational integrity[82]. These audits not only monitor compliance but also create an evidentiary trail for identifying and prosecuting theft-related activities.

EGASPIN further prescribes strict standards for the decommissioning and abandonment of oil facilities. Poorly maintained or abandoned pipelines and flow stations are often exploited by criminal networks for illegal tapping or artisanal refining. By enforcing proper decommissioning procedures, EGASPIN closes such loopholes and reduces opportunities for theft. In addition, its rules on waste management and the prohibition of unauthorized discharges prevent operators from masking theft-induced losses as waste or flaring, reinforcing transparency in operations.[83]

Collectively, EGASPIN integrates environmental compliance with operational oversight, ensuring that oil companies maintain accountability not only for ecological protection but also for the integrity of petroleum infrastructure. In practice, this linkage creates a preventive mechanism against crude oil theft, as environmental monitoring, spill reporting, and audit requirements serve as tools for detecting and documenting illegal extraction or sabotage. While not a punitive statute, EGASPIN complements criminal and regulatory laws—such as the Miscellaneous Offences Act, the Petroleum Industry Act 2021, and NUPRC regulations—by embedding operational accountability into environmental compliance, thereby indirectly strengthening Nigeria's legal and regulatory response to crude oil theft.

The NOSDRA Act and Guidelines

The National Oil Spill Detection and Response Agency (NOSDRA) Act 2006 established NOSDRA as the principal body for oil spill preparedness, detection, and response. While primarily environmental, its functions intersect directly with combating crude oil theft, as pipeline vandalism and illegal bunkering—the main methods of theft—are major causes of spills. The Act requires operators to report spills within 24 hours, with fines of ₦500,000 per day for non-compliance, ensuring theft-related spills cannot be concealed. NOSDRA also supervises containment and clean-up operations, generating technical evidence that can be used by security agencies for prosecution.[84]

Notably, the Act imposes strict liability on operators for spills, though liability may be avoided if theft or sabotage by third parties is proven. This provision brings crude oil theft into the regulatory framework, enabling operators to document and report theft-related vandalism. Additionally, the Act mandates a National Oil Spill Contingency Plan (NOSCP) to coordinate responses among NOSDRA, oil companies, and security agencies, allowing rapid intervention to limit both environmental damage and theft losses.[85]

Combined with DPR/NUPRC regulations and EGASPIN, NOSDRA forms part of a multi-layered system that addresses crude oil theft through prevention, detection, and accountability. Regulatory oversight, environmental compliance, and spill investigations together create the technical and evidentiary backbone for criminal prosecutions under statutes such as the MOA and EFCC Act, making subsidiary legislation essential to Nigeria's broader legal regime against oil theft.

International Legal Framework on Crude Oil Theft

Oil theft in Nigeria is not just a domestic concern; it has significant international dimensions due to the cross-border movement of petroleum products, the involvement of transnational criminal networks, and the global economic and security implications of illicit oil trade. Consequently, addressing crude oil theft requires compliance with international legal standards and robust cooperation mechanisms, which complement Nigeria's domestic legal and regulatory frameworks.

At the international level, United Nations conventions are available for combatting the menace. The UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC, 2000) obliges states to criminalize participation in organized criminal groups[86], money laundering, [87]and illicit trafficking[88]. Since oil theft in Nigeria often involves syndicates operating across borders, UNTOC provides a legal basis for mutual legal assistance, joint investigations, extradition of offenders, and coordinated prosecution strategies. Similarly, the UN Convention against Corruption (UNCAC, 2003) recognizes that theft of national resources is closely linked with bribery,[89] corruption, and illicit enrichment.[90] UNCAC obliges states to adopt preventive measures, criminalize illicit financial gain, and facilitate international cooperation in asset recovery—provisions that are directly applicable to cases where proceeds from oil theft are laundered through foreign financial institutions or invested overseas. In practice, these conventions enable Nigerian authorities to collaborate with international counterparts in tracking illicit financial flows, recovering stolen revenues, and prosecuting actors who exploit cross-border networks.[91]

International maritime law also has direct relevance to Nigeria's fight against oil theft, particularly in offshore environments. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS, 1982) grants coastal states sovereignty and enforcement jurisdiction over their territorial waters and Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs), thereby empowering Nigeria to regulate, monitor, and secure offshore petroleum infrastructure. Pipelines, drilling platforms, and storage facilities located in these maritime zones are legally protected under UNCLOS, providing a basis for prosecution against theft, sabotage, or unauthorized extraction[92]. Additionally, International Maritime Organization (IMO) conventions, including MARPOL, indirectly support the detection of crude oil theft by mandating strict reporting and monitoring of oil spills and discharges. Since pipeline tapping and illegal bunkering are common causes of spills, compliance with IMO requirements provides regulators and security agencies with evidence of illicit activity, creating accountability mechanisms that expose theft or sabotage.[93]

Financial and trade standards constitute another essential layer of the international framework. Financial Action Task Force (FATF) Recommendations offer comprehensive guidelines on preventing money laundering, terrorist financing, and abuse of international financial systems. Because proceeds of stolen crude oil are often laundered through both domestic and international banking channels, FATF standards assist Nigeria in detecting suspicious transactions, tracing illicit financial flows, and coordinating with other jurisdictions. Similarly, the World Customs Organization (WCO) frameworks facilitate regulation of the import and export of petroleum products, enhance monitoring of smuggling, and provide procedural mechanisms for identifying illegally traded crude. Through such measures, these financial and trade instruments ensure that theft is addressed not only as a criminal act but also as an economic and systemic risk to national and global markets.[94]

Regional legal frameworks further strengthen the international response. Within West Africa, the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) has adopted protocols on maritime safety, security, and anti-smuggling, which promote collaboration among member states in addressing crude oil theft, piracy, and transnational smuggling networks. On a continental scale, African Union (AU) conventions, particularly the AU Convention on Combating Corruption and illicit exploitation of resources, encourage member states to criminalize theft and corruption in the petroleum sector, harmonize legal measures, and cooperate in asset recovery. [95]These regional mechanisms are particularly important for Nigeria, given that stolen crude oil often transits neighboring countries or is laundered through regional networks.

The international legal framework also provides practical enforcement and evidentiary benefits. Compliance with UNCAC and FATF enables Nigerian authorities to identify the financial trail of stolen petroleum and freeze or seize assets abroad. UNCLOS and IMO conventions facilitate monitoring of offshore installations and pipelines, enhancing surveillance and detection of unauthorized extraction. Regional cooperation through ECOWAS and AU frameworks ensures coordinated patrols, intelligence sharing, and prosecution of transnational syndicates, reducing the opportunities for criminals to exploit jurisdictional gaps.[96]

For Nigeria, these instruments provide multiple advantages: enhancing mutual legal assistance and extradition for cross-border oil theft cases; enabling alignment of domestic legislation with international standards for investigating illicit financial flows; strengthening maritime security and surveillance of offshore installations; and facilitating regional collaboration to prevent smuggling and prosecute organized syndicates. They also complement domestic statutes such as the Miscellaneous Offences Act (MOA), EFCC Act, NSCDC Act, and Petroleum Industry Act 2021, which focus primarily on substantive criminal liability, regulatory oversight, and infrastructure protection.[97]

5. Challenges in Combating Crude Oil Theft in Nigeria

Despite the existence of robust legal frameworks such as the Petroleum Industry Act (PIA) 2021, the Miscellaneous Offences Act (MOA), the NSCDC Act, and subsidiary regulations like NUPRC guidelines, EGASPIN, and the NOSDRA Act, crude oil theft remains pervasive in Nigeria. The persistence of this menace reflects not only the technical sophistication of theft operations but also systemic, institutional, and socio-economic obstacles that undermine enforcement and prosecution. These challenges span regulatory, operational, institutional, and socio-political dimensions.

Weak Institutional Capacity

A recurring challenge is the inadequate capacity of regulatory and enforcement agencies. The Nigerian Upstream Petroleum Regulatory Commission (NUPRC), NSCDC, often face shortages of trained personnel, modern surveillance equipment, and technical infrastructure required to monitor pipelines, terminals, and refineries effectively. While statutes vest agencies with broad powers of inspection, arrest, and prosecution, these powers are often underutilized due to limited manpower, insufficient funding, and logistical constraints, particularly in the challenging terrain of the Niger Delta. For instance, pipeline surveillance is hampered by the swampy, remote geography of theft-prone areas, allowing sophisticated syndicates to operate with impunity.[98]
Overlapping Jurisdiction and Regulatory Fragmentation

Nigeria's petroleum sector is characterized by a complex and multiple regulatory agencies tasked with overlapping responsibilities. The NSCDC, NUPRC, NMDPRA, EFCC, and traditional security agencies such as the Nigerian Navy and Police all have mandates related to oil infrastructure protection, anti-bunkering operations, and revenue monitoring. While coordination exists in theory, in practice, overlapping jurisdiction often creates gaps, delays enforcement, and encourages inter-agency turf wars, which oil theft networks exploit. Historical disputes over regulatory competence have allowed perpetrators to operate in legal grey areas, undermining statutory deterrence.[99]

Corruption and Conspiracy

Corruption as it were, remains one of the most significant impediments to combating oil theft. Criminal networks often operate with insider assistance, including but not limited to company employees, transport operators, and sometimes security personnel. Bribery and collusion enable syndicates to bypass checkpoints, manipulate measurement systems, and conceal illegal operations. Moreover, enforcement officers themselves may be compromised, leading to selective investigations or non-prosecution. This entrenched culture of impunity has historically weakened the impact of punitive statutes, despite severe penalties under the PIA, MOA, or EFCC Act.[100]

Technical Challenges

Oil theft in Nigeria has evolved into a highly technical crime. Sophisticated pipeline tapping, illegal refining, and use of mobile storage and transport vessels make detection and monitoring extremely difficult. Regulatory provisions such as NUPRC Crude Oil Measurement Guidelines 2021 aim to ensure accurate accounting, but implementing real-time monitoring across extensive pipeline networks is technologically demanding and resource-intensive. Theft often occurs faster than detection, and evidence collection is frequently delayed, complicating subsequent prosecution.[101]

Legal and Procedural Constraints

Even where offences are detected, the prosecution process faces numerous hurdles. Court backlogs, inadequate legal documentation, and the difficulty of securing technical and forensic evidence delay trials. Discrepancies in criminal procedure between State and Federal High Courts and between statutory instruments (e.g., MOA vs PIA) can also complicate case management. Furthermore, cross-border aspects of theft—such as smuggling to neighboring countries—require mutual legal assistance treaties (MLATs) and international cooperation, which can be slow and bureaucratically cumbersome.

Conclusion

Oil theft in Nigeria is a multidimensional problem that goes to the heart of the country's economic life and environmental integrity. As shown in this paper, oil theft is deeply embedded in Nigeria's historical experience of centralized resource control, socio-economic marginalization of host communities, weak regulatory oversight, and entrenched corruption. Its evolution from artisanal survival activity into an organized, transnational criminal enterprise reflects the failure of governance structures to equitably manage petroleum resources and enforce accountability across the oil and gas value chain.

The analysis of Nigeria's legal framework reveals that the problem is not an absence of law. From the constitutional vesting of petroleum resources in the Federal Government under Section 44(3) of the 1999 Constitution, to the stringent criminal sanctions imposed by the Miscellaneous Offences Act, the EFCC Act, and the Petroleum Industry Act 2021, Nigeria possesses an extensive statutory arsenal capable of addressing oil theft. Subsidiary legislation, regulatory guidelines, and environmental regimes further strengthen this framework by providing operational standards for monitoring, detection, and accountability. However, the persistence of oil theft underscores a critical gap between legal design and legal effectiveness.

Institutional fragmentation, overlapping mandates, weak prosecutorial coordination, and insider collusion have significantly undermined enforcement. Security-focused responses, while necessary, have proven insufficient when deployed in isolation. Similarly, community-linked accountability mechanisms under the Petroleum Industry Act, though innovative, risk exacerbating injustice if implemented without addressing power asymmetries between host communities and organized criminal networks. The involvement of political elites, security operatives, oil company insiders, and transnational buyers highlights that oil theft is sustained not only by local actors but by a complex ecosystem of beneficiaries operating across domestic and international spaces.

Therefore, this paper argues that an effective response to crude oil theft must be holistic and reform-oriented. Legal enforcement must be integrated with financial crime investigation, asset recovery, and prompt prosecution of perpetrators together with severe punishment for persons found guilty of crude oil theft in Nigeria. Conclusively, Effective laws and effective legal enforcement coupled with adequate and prompt punishment of perpetrators would serve as clear deterrence for prospective oil theft perpetrators in Nigeria.

Endnotes

[1] *June 1956 – Discovery of Oil in Nigeria, Oloibiri, Bayelsa State* (ClassNotes.ng, Primary 5 History Lesson), available at: https://classnotes.ng/lesson/june-1956-discovery-of-oil-in-nigeria-oloibiri-bayelsa-state/ November 2nd 2025

[2] Goddey Wilson, 'The Nigerian State and Oil Theft in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria' (2014) 16(1) *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa* 69–81

[3] Ibid

[4] Odalonu Happy Boris, 'The Upsurge of Oil Theft and Illegal Bunkering in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria: Is There a Way Out?' (2015) 6(3) *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences* 563,

[5] Mezie-Okoye, 'The Political Economy of Artisanal Refining in the Niger Delta' (2025) 8(2) *Sapientia Global Journal of Arts, Humanities and Development Studies (SGOJAHDS)*

[6] Ibid

[7] Bieh et al, 'Crude Oil Theft, Roles of Traditional Leaders and Development Implications in Nigeria: The Niger Delta Experience' (2023) 6(1) *International Journal of Advanced Research in Public Policy, Administration and Development Strategies (IJARPPADS)*

[8] Oluebube Christopher Offor, 'Oil Wealth and Illicit Financial Flows in Nigeria's Petroleum Sector'(2023) 3(1) *Journal Of Academics Stand Against Poverty* 17-36

[9] Ibid

[10] Henry A & Mohammed S.U, 'Oil Pipelines Vandalism and Oil Theft: Security Threat to Nigerian Economy and Environment' (2023) 03 (01) Journal of Environmental Law & Policy 170-188

[11] Omodero, C. O., & Dandago, K. I, 'Oil revenue, exchange rate and inflation: Evidence from Nigeria' (2019) *9*(5), *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy* 361–367.

[12] Akindoyo, O. A, 'Insecurity and foreign direct investment in Nigeria's oil sector' (2025) 3(3) *Kashere Journal of Politics and International Relations.*

[13] TotalEnergies completes Bonga oilfield divestment off Nigeria. *S&P Global Energy*. November 25, 2025. Available at: https://www.spglobal.com/energy/en/news-research/latest-news/crude-oil/112525-totalenergies-completes-bonga-oilfield-divestment-off-nigeria accessed November 4th 2025

[14] Sunny-Hart, B, 'Corruption in the Nigerian Oil and Gas Sector: The Role of the Judiciary in the Criminal Justice System' (2025) 16 *Beijing Law Review*

[15] Moses Obenade & Gordon Tami Amangabara, *Perspective: The Environmental Implications of Oil Theft and Artisanal Refining in the Niger Delta Region* (2014) 1(2) *Asian Review of Environmental and Earth Sciences* 25–29,

[16] Fie David Dan-Woniowei & Fidelis A. E. Paki, 'Crude Oil Theft, Illegal Bunkering and Pipeline Vandalism in Nigeria's Niger Delta: Effects and National Responses to Curb the Menace' (2024) 5(19) *Journal of Global Social Sciences* 69–84,

[17] OD Michael, *The Ecological and Economic Toll of Oil Theft in Nigeria: A Case in Ecocide and Stagnation* (9 October 2025) SSRN Scholarly Paper No 5674404, available at https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=5674404 accessed November 7th 2025

[18] *Economic Losses through Oil Theft in Nigeria: A 4-Year (2019–2022) Assessment* (2023) *European Modern Studies Journal* (Vol 8 No 6) 941–953, available at: https://lorojournals.com/index.php/emsj/article/view/941 accessed November 7th 2025

[19] Ibid

[20] Dimkpa et al, 'Economic Losses through Oil Theft in Nigeria: A 4-Year' (2023) 7(3) *European Modern Studies Journal* 68–76,

[21] Awodezi

[22] Akndoyo

[23] Ibid

[24] Ibid

[25] Ibid

[26] Olorunsemi Akin Akindoyo, 'The Shadow of Sabotage: Unraveling the Insecurity Threats Impacting Oil Operations in Ondo and Delta States of Nigeria ' (2025) 3(3) *Kashere Journal Of Politics And International Relations* 2025

[27] Collins H Wizor & Elekwachi Wali, 'Crude Oil Theft in the Niger Delta: The Oil Companies and Host Communities Conundrum' (2020) 7(1) *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation* 22–32

[28] Jonah Rexer, *Black Market Crude: Organized Crime and Environmental Externalities in Nigeria's Oil Sector* (5 March 2019) Kleinman Center for Energy Policy, University of Pennsylvania, available at: https://kleinmanenergy.upenn.edu/research/publications/black-market-crude-organized-crime-and-environmental-externalities-in-nigerias-oil-sector/ November 7th 2025

[29] Onisodumeya Elemchukwu James & Christian Ozimede, 'Impact of Sabotage, Oil Theft and Illegal Oil Bunkering Activities on the Nigerian Environment and Economy' (2023) *Journal of Agriculture, Environmental Resources and Management* 876–888

[30] Sylvester Efe Owhojeta, *Surveying of Oil Theft Activities in Wetlands Nigeria – A Case Study of Niger Delta Region* (Presented at the FIG Working Week 2024, *Your World, Our World: Resilient Environment and Sustainable Resource Management for All*, Accra, Ghana, 19–24 May 2024) (Paper No 12640), available at: http://www.fig.net/resources/proceedings/fig_proceedings/fig2024/ppt/ts05f/TS05F_owhojeta_12640_ppt.pdf accessed November 7th 2025

[31] n(21)

[32] Oluwole Ojewale, *State Collusion Perpetuates Oil Smuggling Across Nigeria-Cameroon Borders* (26 March 2021) *ENACT Observer*, available at: https://enactafrica.org/enact-observer/state-collusion-perpetuates-oil-smuggling-across-nigeria-cameroon-borders November 7th 2025

[33] Ibid

[34] Justin Eduviere Agheyisi, *Artisanal Oil Refineries or Kpo-fire: A New Dimension of Petro-Insurgency in Nigeria's Oil-Producing Niger Delta Region?* (29 June 2023) *SSRC – Kujenga Amani* (Social Science Research Council), available at: https://kujenga-amani.ssrc.org/2023/06/29/artisanal-oil-refineries-or-kpo-fire-a-new-dimension-of-petro-insurgency-in-nigerias-oil-producing-niger-delta-region/ November 7th 2025

[35] Raimi Lasisi, 'Illegal Oil Bunkering in Nigeria's Niger Delta Region: Prevalence and Consequences' (2023) 4(1) *International Journal of Advanced Research in Global Politics, Governance and Management* 1–16

[36] Balogun W A & Adesanya O P 'A Sea of Troubles": Oil Theft, Crude Economy and the Business of Organised Energy Crime in the Gulf of Guinea' (2022) *African Journal of Stability and Development* 1–36

[37] Ibid

[38] Damilola Olalekan Ogunlola, Nigeria's Oil and Gas Sector: Understanding the Niger Delta Militant Problem (Submitted to the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts of International Relations, Eastern Mediterranean University July 2020 Gazimağusa, North Cyprus)

[39] Oronto Douglas et al, 'Oil and Militancy in the Niger Delta: Terrorist Threat or Another Colombia*?* (Institute of International Studies Working Paper No 4, University of California, Berkeley, 2004), available at: https://geography.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/4-douglasvonokonta.pdf accessed November 8th 2025

[40] Osaretin Osho Akinola, 'From Resource Control to Oil Theft: Evolving Crime in the Niger-Delta and the Nigeria Police Force's Role in Mitigation and Enforcement' (2025) 6(1) *OCHENDO: An African Journal of Innovative Studies* 1–13.

[41] Goodnews Osah, 'The Milking of the Nigerian State: Interrogating the Rising Threat of Crude Oil Theft' (2020) *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Review* (IJSSHR) 605

[42] Emmanuel Addeh, 'NNPC-Backed Surveillance Operation Uncovers Illegal Oil Bunkering Camps in Bayelsa State' *THISDAY* (28 June 2024) https://www.thisdaylive.com/2024/06/28/nnpc-backed-surveillance-operation-uncovers-illegal-oil-bunkering-camps-in-bayelsa-state/ accessed November 8th 2025

[43] Ibid

[44] Ibid

[45] Sonia Okiti, Smart Okpara and Tonye Krukrubo 'Between Mineral Rights and Land Tenure: Navigating Land Acquisition in Nigeria's Oil and Gas Sector' Aluko & Oyebode (Insight, July 2025) https://www.aluko-oyebode.com/insights/land-acquisition-in-oil-and-gas-operations-nigeria/ November 8th 2025

[46] O K Edu, 'Ownership of Oil and Gas in Nigeria: Matters Arising' (2007) *The Constitution* 7(1) 62–75 https://doi.org/10.10520/AJA15955753_175 accessed 2 February 2026

[47] N 51

[48] Ugwu Dave Ude, 'A Critical History of Resource Control in Nigeria' (2019) 9(1) *International Journal of Development Strategies in Humanities, Management and Social Sciences*

[49] Section 1 of the Land Use Act 1978

[50] (2006) 5 NWLR (Pt. 973) 309 (SC)

[51] (2002) 6 NWLR (Pt. 764) 542 (SC)

[52] Opeyemi Oni, 'Oil Theft and Energy Transition Strategy: Comprehensive Roadmap for Revenue Protection, Security Reform, and Sustainable Energy Transformation' (2025) 5(6) *International Journal of Humanities Social Science and Management* 407–413

[53] Favour Ngozi Eke, 'Ownership of Oil and Correlative Rights of Land Owners in Nigeria' (2022) 9(1) *Rivers State University Journal of Public Law* 1–17

[54] Chuks Cletus Egugbo, 'Federalism and the Agitation for Restructuring in Nigeria' (2025) 5(5) *AKSU Journal of Administration and Corporate Governance* 41–50

[55] KPMG Advisory Services, *Petroleum Industry Act (PIA) 2021 – A Game Changer?* (KPMG in Nigeria, August 2021) https://assets.kpmg.com/content/dam/kpmg/ng/pdf/tax/petroleum-industry-act-(pia)-2021-a-game-changer.pdf accessed Noivember 10th 2025

[56] Section 6(1) Petroleum Industry Act (PIA) 2021

[57] Section 7(ee) Petroleum Industry Act (PIA) 2021

[58] Section 8(d) Petroleum Industry Act (PIA) 2021

[59] Section 244(2) Petroleum Industry Act (PIA) 2021

[60] (Section 256) Petroleum Industry Act (PIA) 2021

[61] Taiwo Adebola Ogunleye, 'Establishing Oil Theft and Other Related Crimes Tribunal for Speedy Trial: Legal Issues and Challenges' (2016) 21(4) *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science* 20–27

[62] Ibid

[63] Section 382 Criminal Code

[64] Section 390(2), 390(3)-(9) Criminal Code

[65] Section 286 The Penal Code

[66] Section 287 The Penal Code

[67] Section 1(17) of the Miscellaneous Offences Act (Cap M17 LFN 2004)

[68] Ibid

[69] Section 3(1)(f) The Nigerian Security and Civil Defence Corps (NSCDC) Act

[70] Section 3(1)(e) of the Nigeria Security and Civil Defence Corps (Amendment) Act

[71] Section 3(1)(f) of the Nigeria Security and Civil Defence Corps (Amendment) Act

[72] Section 4(2)(b) of the Nigeria Security and Civil Defence Corps (Amendment) Act 2007

[75] Nigerian Upstream Petroleum Regulatory Commission, *Crude Theft: DPR's Tracking System to the Rescue* (22 April2019) https://www.nuprc.gov.ng/crude-theft-dprs-tracking-system-to-the-rescue/ accessed November 12th 2025

[76] Oil and Gas Pipeline Regulations, S.1. 14 of 1995

[77] Nigerian *Petroleum (Drilling and Production) Regulations, 1969* (L.N. 69 of 1969)

[78] Ibid

[79] S.I. No. 40 of 2022 NUPRC Crude Oil Measurement Guidelines 2021

[80] Dayo Ayeyemi, 'Oil theft: NUPRC sets up regulatory framework to address revenue loss*' Tribune Online Nigeria (17 July 2023) https://tribuneonlineng.com/oil-theft-nuprc-sets-up-regulatory-framework-to-address-revenue-loss/ accessed* November 12th 2025

[81] Department of Petroleum Resources, Environmental Guidelines and Standards for the Petroleum Industry in Nigeria (3rd edn, DPR 2018) https://www.scribd.com/document/533874232/DPR-EGASPIN-2018 accessed November 12th 2025

[82] Ibid

[83] Damilola S Olawuyi and Zibima Tubodenyefa, Review of the Environmental Guidelines and Standards for the Petroleum Industry in Nigeria (OGEES Institute/Oxfam/IUCN 2019) *https://iucn.org/sites/default/files/content/documents/2019/review_of_the_environmental_guidelines_and_standards_for_the_petroleum_industry_in_nigeria.pdf accessed* November 12th 2025

[84] Sections 5-7 NOSDRA Act 2006 (Act No. 15)

[85] Nnedimma Ezenwa-Ohaeto, B.E. Ewulum & Ejike Okaphor, 'An Appraisal Of The Impact Of The National Oil Spill Detection And Response Agency On Environmental Pollution In Nigeria'(2024) 20 *AJCAL* 48-62

[86] Article 2/5) The UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC, 2000

[87] Article 7), The UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC, 2000

[88] Article 8) The UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC, 2000

[89] Articles 15-16 The UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC, 2000

[90] Article 20 The UN Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (UNTOC, 2000

[91] n (22)

[92] Articles 56, 60, and 73 of UNCLOS

[93] MARPOL 73/78 (Annex I) mandates oil spill/discharge reporting (Regulations 17, 20),

[94] Abiola J O 'Anti-Money Laundering in Developing Economy: A PEST Analysis of Nigerian Situation*' (2014) 3(6) Review of Public Administration and Management 1–9*

[95] Chibuike et al, 'ECOWAS Protocol on Free Movement of Persons and Cross-Border Dimensions

of Armed Banditry in Nigeria' (2023) 11(2) *Covenant University Journal of Politics & International Affairs*

[96] n (22)

[97] Ibid

[98] n(67)

[99] Peter Uzoho, *'Operators Seek Alignment Between NUPRC, NMDPRA in Oil Regulation' THISDAYLIVE (Abuja, 19 April 2023)* https://www.thisdaylive.com/2023/04/19/operators-seek-alignment-between-nuprc-nmdpra-in-oil-regulation/ accessed November 20th 2025

[100] Betty Sunny-Hart, 'Corruption in the Nigerian Oil and Gas Sector: The Role of the Judiciary in the Criminal Justice System*' (2025) 16 Beijing Law Review 1065–1086*

[101] Goddey Wilson, 'The Nigerian State and Oil Theft in the Niger Delta Region of Nigeria' (2014) 16 *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa* 59