



Mr. Nisthar Casim

Editor

Daily FT

We write further to our email of 31st December 2015.

We point out that in addition to the Article published today, 31st December 2015 you had published another front page Article on 14th December 2015 on the same matter. An incomplete statement is, in fact and law a false statement. Both your Articles fall into that category.

We are constrained to state that from the contents of the Articles, it appears that your said article has been contrived intentionally to cause mischief and prejudice, and in an endeavour to destabilize the Government.

In order to rectify your incorrect reporting and misleading the public, we require you to publish in full the attached Article titled – ‘Truth Overcomes Falsehoods’

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S.P. Sriskantha', with a long horizontal line extending to the right and ending in a small flourish.

S.P.Sriskantha, LL.M. (U.K.),

Attorney-at-Law,

Solicitor [Eng. & Wales]

1.1.2016

Mr. Nisthar Cassim
Editor
Daily FT

We are a group of Lawyers, Accountants, etc, who wish to protect Mr. Nihal Sri Ameresekere, who has rendered yeoman service in fighting fraud and corruption. No other has proven so many Cases in Court saving colossal sums of moneys for the State. Some of the instances where State moneys have been saved by his public spirited actions are:

- Tax Amnesty write-off prevented Rs.200, 000 Million
- Sri Lanka Insurance plus Lanka Hospitals Rs. 75,000 Million
- Colombo Port Bunkering Facility & Monopoly Rs.15, 000 Million
- Citi Bank Oil Hedging Claim Rs.30,000 Million

Mr. Ameresekere has given full disclosure with facts and figures supported by documents in a series of books published him, including on the Hilton Case, which you should have read, before questionably writing false reports. An incomplete statement is in fact and a law a false statement.

We refer to your Article in today's Daily FT in the front page under Caption – "Ravi K under fire for batting for Nihal in Hilton claim".

We particularly refer to your reference to Competent Authority of HDL (Mr. Senaka Walgampaya P.C.). He had no status on an Agreement, the Government, as the Guarantor of Foreign Loans, had entered into with Mr. Ameresekere, admitting therein that Mr. Ameresekere's endeavours had immensely benefitted the Government. The Government cannot get unjustly enriched. The Competent Authority, whilst holding statutory public office had been a signatory to a media statement endorsing President Mahinda Rajapakshe at the last Presidential Election, asking people to vote for him. Was this proper ?

As regards Merchant Bank of Sri Lanka, their opinion is very clear. They stating that if there was no Settlement Agreements entered into, then professional compensation for Mr. Ameresekere would not have arisen is a fiction. If that was the case, then the Government would not have been a stakeholder of HDL today, but Mr. Cornel Perera and Mr. Ameresekere, among others.

Indeed it is the Government that required the settlement due to pressures, which had been exerted by the Japanese, who were the biggest Aid provider to Sri Lanka at that time. The write-off of Rs. 87,000 Mn., at current value is not a supposed write-off, but admitted with facts and figures in the Agreements signed by the Government, which clearly you have not even read !

Mr.Ameresekere had made a big mistake in withdrawing the Cases, because of the Japanese pressures on the Government. Had he continued with this Cases, he would certainly have won as undisputedly proven before the Special Presidential Commission. Then today, Mr. Cornel Perera and Mr. Ameresekere, among others would have been the main stakeholders of HDL, which they had promoted, and not the Government.

With payment to the Japanese after winning the Cases over several years, the Government Guarantees would have got cancelled and the Government would not have had any stakeholding of HDL today. When the settlement was executed HDL had accumulated US \$ 30 Mn., which had to be paid to the Japanese, which would not have been paid, if there was no Settlement which was on the pleadings of the Government.

I am sending a detail Statement of facts later today, and this is only an initial response to you. Your Article is intended to cause mischief on a matter pending before the Cabinet, and we trust you have been well advised. *The question indeed arises, as to whether you are batting for interested parties ?*

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'S.P. Sriskantha', with a horizontal line extending to the right and a small flourish at the end.

**S.P.Sriskantha, LL.M. (U.K.),
Attorney-at-law,
Solicitor [Eng.& Wales]**

31.12.2015