



Consultants 21 Limited

MANAGEMENT • OPERATIONS • FINANCE
FORENSIC ACCOUNTING • LITIGATION SUPPORT • TAXATION
PRIVATISATION • RESTRUCTURING • INFRASTRUCTURE

167/4 Vipulasena Mawatha, Colombo 10, Sri Lanka
Tel: 94-11-2696814, 94-11-2686364, 94-11-4715988
Fax: 94-11-2697134 Kandy Tel/Fax: 94-81-4470442
E-mail: consultants21@gmail.com
Website: www.consultants21.com

BY E-MAIL / COURIER

20th December 2012

Mr. Laurence Watt
Chair,
Commonwealth Lawyers
Association (CLA)
17, Russell Square
London WC1B 5DR
UK

Dr. Karen Brewer
Secretary General
Commonwealth Magistrates' and
Judges' Association (CMJA)
Uganda House,
58-59 Trafalgar Square,
London, WC2N 5DX
UK

Prof. David MacQuoid-Mason
President
Commonwealth Legal Education
Association (CLEA)
Centre for Socio-Legal Studies
Hut 11, Howard College Campus
University of KwaZulu-Natal
Durban 4041, South Africa

Dear Mr. Laurence Watt / Dr. Karen Brewer / Prof. David MacQuoid-Mason,

"Commonwealth Judges renew concern"

In the context of your previous Statement reported in the *media* on 15th November 2012 under the caption - "*Commonwealth legal bodies concerned over motion to impeach Lankan CJ*", I addressed to you my Letter dated 20th November 2012, attaching copies of the following:

1. My Petition dated 18th October 2012 to the Supreme Court, whereby I put in issue the very grave and serious matter of '*perceived judicial bias and disqualification*' on the part of the Chief Justice and two other Justices of the Supreme Court, who in my view had acted *without jurisdiction* and *ultra-vires* the Constitution. I cited the Judgment in Appeal in the House of Lords *re - Pinochet vide* paragraph 13 of my said Petition. *I intimated that the response I received was even more appalling*, but did not disclose the same in my said Letter.

Hence, I attach hereto my Affidavit dated 11th December 2012 addressed to the Hon. Speaker of Parliament, *inter-alia*, setting out the aforesaid responses I received, which are *lucidly self-explanatory*. Attached to my Affidavit was my further Written Submission, which I had tendered, *as far back as 9th February 2012*, to the Supreme Court on the same matter of '*perceived judicial bias and disqualification*', on the part of Chief Justice, also setting out other pertinent facts, which however was not entertained, but returned to me by the Supreme Court. I urge you to cause a close examination and study of the facts contained in my said Affidavit of 11th December 2012 and my further Written Submission of 9th February 2012, and reach your conclusions thereon, *as to whether such conduct could in anywise be condoned and/or ignored?*

2. My Letter dated 5th November 2012 to the Attorney General, with attachments thereto, which reveals the conduct on the part of the Supreme Court, *vis-à-vis*, *illegal contracts* pertaining to which, citing international authorities, I had sought *anti-suit injunctions*. As a consequence of such conduct, Sri Lanka faces Claims of around SL Rs. 40 billion (US \$ 315 million) - *a cognizable sum of money*.

Your aforesaid repeated concerns have been on the Resolution in terms of Article 107 of the Constitution, *which reigns supreme*, and the Standing Orders made thereunder for the process to impeach the Chief Justice, by 117 law makers of a total of 225, consequent to which, the Hon. Speaker had no option, other than to appoint a Parliamentary Select Committee to investigate into Charges contained in such Resolution. To *allay* the *controversy* caused, as in the famous instance in France of *Alfred Dreyfus* affair, I attach a Chart *depicting* the administrative procedure for disciplinary action against judicial and public officers, together with an Article I had caused to be published, and the relevant Articles of the Constitution. I have observed as reported in the *media*, that Article 14 of the International Covenant on Civil & Political Rights was to be extended. Nevertheless, Judges are accountable to the prevalent Constitution under which they entered upon Office, and must not usurp Parliament's Legislative function *vide* - Latimer House Principles; whereas as revealed in my Petition dated 18th October 2012 forwarded previously the Chief Justice has violated the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights and had overwritten Article 157 of the Constitution, which she could not !

I attach a *scanned* copy of the Report of the Parliamentary Select Committee, without the recorded proceedings of, the list of documents examined by and the oral submissions made before, the said Committee, the contents of which are *self-explanatory*. The Parliamentary Select Committee is only an administrative process, enabling the President of the Republic to remove a Chief Justice, if the Committee's Report makes an *adverse* finding and is passed after an Address of Parliament. I myself have appeared before Parliamentary Standing Committees, which are fact finding Committees, not exercising any judicial power, which I believe is as the same as in the House of Commons and Lords in the UK. The fact disclosed, that the Opposition Members of the Parliamentary Select Committee, after having seen the evidence, had '*walked out*', without participating and writing a *dissenting* Report, with *justifiable* reasoning only *reinforces* the findings.

A hue and cry has been raised on the matter of natural justice, which perhaps triggered your concerns. On an examination of the attached Report of the Parliamentary Select Committee, it would be revealed that the facts are otherwise, and that the Chief Justice had been, in fact, afforded adequate time of one month, to respond to matters, which were within her own knowledge. Please do compare this with the contents of my aforesaid Affidavit, where the people and I, particularly parties affected, had been knowingly denied natural justice of even having been heard, whilst she and the other Members of the Bench had acted in my view, without jurisdiction, ultra-vires the Constitution, rendering nugatory the tenet that all are equal before the law.

Given below are two strips of scanned newspaper photographs of scenes, within the precincts of the Supreme Court, portraying organized protests, including rituals performed, uproars created and the demeanor of the Chief Justice, whilst leaving to attend the Parliamentary Select Committee proceedings, which alone speaks volumes, and brings into issue, as to whether such hullabaloo is acceptable under the Commonwealth Latimer House Principles and the Bangalore Principles of Judicial Conduct adopted by the UN. Would any ordinary litigant have been permitted to so conduct demonstrations in the Supreme Court precincts, to bring about undue pressure to endeavour to stymie and stultify an inquiry ?

DAY 1



DAY 2



As disclosed in my previous Letter, my interest is as an Individual Member of the International Association of Anti-Corruption Authorities, committed to promoting and facilitating the implementation of the UN Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC), which Sri Lanka ratified on 31st March 2004, whilst India ratified same only on 9th May 2011. I believe the Commonwealth stands bound to support the same. In the circumstances revealed in my aforesaid Affidavit dated 11th December 2012 and further Written Submission dated 9th February 2012 attached thereto, the Chief Justice comes within the ambit of Article 52 of the UNCAC, pertaining to category of 'politically exposed persons' (PEPs), warranting enhanced scrutiny of their affairs in terms of the UNCAC.

Yours truly,

Nihal Sri Ameresekere, F.C.A., F.C.M.A., C.M.A, C.G.M.A., C.F.E.

cc: Dr. Ye Feng
Secretary-General
International Association of
Anti-Corruption Authorities
No. 147 Beiheyuan Street, Dongcheng District
Beijing 100726, China.

Mr. Dimitri Vlassis
UN Secretary General's Representative
Chief, Corruption & Economic Crime Branch
Division for Treaty Affairs, UNODC
Vienna International Center
Wagramerster. 5, A-1400
Vienna, Austria.

BY E-MAIL

23rd November 2012

Mr. Laurence Watt
Chair
Commonwealth Lawyers Association (CLA)
17, Russell Square
London WC1B 5DR
UK

Dear Mr. Laurence Watt,

“Commonwealth legal bodies concerned over motion to impeach Lankan CJ”

I read with interest the above captioned Statement, in the context of which, I forward for your kind attention, copies of the following:

1. My Petition dated 18th October 2012 to the Supreme Court of Sri Lanka, *the contents of which*, also dealing with issues under the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights and Universal Declaration of Human Rights and International Covenant on Civil & Political Rights, *are self-explanatory. The response I received is even more appalling.*
2. My Letter dated 5th November 2012 to the present Attorney General of Sri Lanka, and attached thereto Letter dated 13th August to the Minister of Petroleum Industries, and Letter dated 24th June 2010 to the former Attorney General of Sri Lanka, *the contents of which too are self-explanatory.*

As you are aware, I am a public interest activist from early 1990s – *vide* – www.consultants21.com. My very first derivative actions in law on fraud in the construction of the Colombo Hilton Hotel – upheld by the Supreme Court of Sri Lanka is reported in the Commonwealth (Commercial) Law Reports of 1992 @ Page 637.

I am also an Individual Member of the International Association of Anti-Corruption Authorities (IAACA) established in 2006, to promote and facilitate the implementation of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC), which came into force in December 2005.

Articles of the UNCAC, which Sri Lanka had ratified, contain mandatory obligations to be fulfilled on the part of the State Parties. I have published a series of Books in the US - *vide* - www.consultants21.com/publications.

In examining the foregoing documents, it would be relevant and pertinent to take into reckoning, the provisions in the Articles of the UNCAC, particularly with Sri Lanka being one of the countries selected to be reviewed this year, under the review mechanism conducted by UNODC on the implementation of the UNCAC.

Whilst I fully endorse the “The Commonwealth’s Latimer House Principles” and the dire necessity to have an independent fearless judiciary, it is of equal importance that the rights of citizens are recognized, upheld and protected in compliance with the applicable UN Conventions. In terms of the Constitution of Sri Lanka, the sovereignty is in the people, and is inalienable, and is exercised in trust by the Executive, Legislature and the Judiciary.

Yours truly, -

Nihal Sri Ameresekere, F.C.A., F.C.M.A., C.M.A, C.G.M.A., C.F.E.