

HOME



NEWS

OPINION

WIKILEAKS

VIDEO

EDITOR'S CHOICE

BOOKS

Archives

Search in site...

Full Text: Letter By Chief Justice Shirani Bandaranayake To DG Bribery Commission

May 11, 2013 | Filed under: Colombo Telegraph, Most Popular, News, STORIES | Posted by: COLOMBO_TELEGRAPH

Like 0 Share Tweet G+1 1 Pin it

The Commission to Investigate Allegations of Bribery and Corruption was in possession of enough evidence pertaining to ex-CJ Shiranee Bandaranayake to prove bribery and corruption allegations against her, state run Daily News today (11th) reported.

"The charges include the amassing of wealth beyond the means of an ordinary public servant and the submission of falsified reports regarding her assets and liabilities. The Commission had subject these allegations received several months ago to an initial investigation since prima facie evidence revealed that there was truth in the charges proffered before the commission. The commission summoned the ex-CJ to obtain a statement. Ex-CJ Shiranee Bandaranayake who raised objections to the investigations obtained a further date to make submissions. The ex-CJ who dodged making submissions on two earlier occasions yesterday appeared before the commission and made a statement after making written submissions. The commission is now due to consider the statement and submissions made by the ex-CJ within the next four days and decide whether to proceed with the case. If the oral and written submissions made by her are found insufficient to exonerate her, the commission will conduct further investigations in keeping with its powers irrespective of whether she assisted the investigations or not and if she is found guilty, the commission will file a case against her on bribery and corruption charges. Meanwhile, the Immigration and Emigration Department has impounded the ex-CJs passport at the request of the Commission, to prevent her from going abroad." the state run daily further said.

We publish below the letter sent by CJ Shirani Bandaranayake to the Director General of the Commission to investigate Allegations of Bribery and Corruption;

Director General

Commission to investigate Allegations of Bribery and Corruption

Colombo 07.

Dear Madam,

I have been noticed by the Director General of the Permanent Commission to Investigate Allegations of Bribery and Corruption to be present before the Commission to make a statement on purported allegations against me. I attended the Commission on the 18th March 2013 on which date I informed that I would be raising a preliminary objection to the Commission. Thereafter on the 1st of April 2013 I informed the officers of the Commission that I will be making a statement on the next day both on the objections and on the question of bank accounts which I was informed was the scope of the inquiry. I have not been given a copy of the complaint, but was specifically informed that the scope of the inquiry was my bank accounts.



Chief Justice Shirani Bandaranayake

At the outset I state that I am surprised to have received your letter of 2.4.2013 in that it was clearly understood that the objections and statements would be made on the 17.5.2013; the date was specifically agreed upon for inter alia the reason that my lawyers were not available prior to the 6th of May. Knowing this, you have now asked for objections to be filed on the 10th.

Before dealing with the contents of the letter under reference, I draw your attention to the fact that I have received a letter dated 18.4.2013 from the Director General Immigration and Emigration to the effect that in terms of an order given by your commission I have been prevented from travelling abroad.

Please note that the last time I travelled abroad was on 25.12.2006; at no time thereafter have I ever attempted to travel abroad, I have never applied for a visa to any country and save and except to Singapore I cannot travel abroad without visa

I am surprised Justice Balapatabendi violated the law of Confidentiality by giving various statements to the Press regarding the matter. Justice Balapatabendi could not have been unaware of Section 17 which reads as follows

Colombotelegraph.com
33,696 likes

Like Page Share

Be the first of your friends to like this

Interested in advertising?

Prestige land lots in BOI investment Zones with modern Infrastructure to be Leased

BOI SRI LANKA

LATEST COMMENTS

- Mallaiyuran on The Politics Of Denigrating Sinhala-Buddhists
- punchinilame on Be Firm Against Horrible Crimes And Plunder Of National Wealth: PDC Tells Govt
- K.A Sumanasekera on Ranil Does A Mahinda: Appoints Cousin As Sri Lankan High Commissioner To UK
- Nirmala N on President Reaffirms Commitment To Reconciliation Process
- MOHAMED MARZOOK on President Reaffirms Commitment To Reconciliation Process
- Native Vedda on The Politics Of Denigrating Sinhala-Buddhists
- Kanthisesu Nirmalan-Nathan. on Visiting HR Chief Pressures Government Over Fate Of Detained And Missing Tamils
- maalumiris on Elephants, Tourism & Cruelty To Animals
- Andy on Sarath Fonseka Back In Parliament
- Mallaiyuran on Ranil Does A Mahinda: Appoints Cousin As Sri Lankan High Commissioner To UK

ALL ENTRIES BY DATE

“Every member of the Commission, the Director-General and every officer or servant, appointed to assist the Commission shall, before entering upon the duties of his office, sign a declaration that he will not disclose any information received by him, or coming to his knowledge, in the exercise and the discharge of his powers and functions under this Act, except for the purposes of giving effect to the provisions of this Act.”

Your decision to prevent me from travelling abroad has been given wide publicity in the press though by law, the Commission is bound by secrecy. In the circumstances I have to conclude that there was no necessity whatever to prevent my travelling abroad and in any event it is against the law to give publicity to such a decision.

In my view neither Justice Balapatabendi nor Mr.Jayantha Wickramaratne should participate in any inquiry against me. I would briefly set out the reasons for such statement.

I state that both of them are disqualified from conducting any investigation or proceeding against me on the ground that their participation would violate the principles of natural justice, inter-alia, the Rule against bias. This will be dealt with after I set out my position regarding Bank Accounts which are the subject matter of the purported inquiry. I reiterate that I have not been informed of the reason as to why it is alleged that there is a discrepancy in the Bank Accounts.

BANK ACCOUNTS

On the last occasion your officers informed us that the scope of this inquiry would be regarding my bank accounts. There is nothing whatsoever incorrect in my bank accounts. They are perfect. There is absolutely nothing incorrect in my declarations of Assets and Liabilities.

I have been wrongly accused by the Parliamentary Select Committee of having more than 20 bank accounts in various banks. This was false, I said this was false, and there was no evidence whatsoever to substantiate this accusation though the P.S.C. had written to several banks in the country and had summoned the CEO of NDB to give evidence which evidence he gave.

Thus it was clear that at all times material, I had no accounts in any other Bank [false accusation against me that I had several accounts in several Banks] and that I did not have 20 accounts in the NDB [another false accusation].

All operative bank accounts have been declared by me in my assets and liabilities declarations. In fact, I had one current account, one savings account, one joint savings account and one RFC Account (in Australian Dollars) and two joint RFC Accounts (in Sterling Pounds and US Dollars). No money was deposited to the US Dollar RFC Account and Pounds Sterling RFC Account after I became a Judge of the Supreme Court. The RFC in Australian Dollars account solely consist of the money (Australian Dollars) (together with interest thereon) gifted to me by my sister in Australian Dollars by way of a cheque in 2011.

I have not only declared my bank accounts but also that of my son though I need not have done so, my son being a major. As at the date of the of the Declarations of Assets and Liabilities, neither my son nor my husband had any Bank Account except what had been declared by me. This shows transparency and honesty with which I made the declaration.

I have duly properly and correctly declared all my assets inclusive of investments in treasury bills and fixed deposits. As you are well aware the bank maintains routing accounts for investments in Treasury Bills; that is when the Treasury Bills matures, money is credited to routing account and on the same day the said routing account is debited when the money is reinvested in Treasury Bills. There have been two such routing accounts in the NDB. I have no cheque books in respect of such accounts, nor have I in any way or manner dealt with these accounts.

These accounts were maintained by the Bank solely for the purpose of crediting the accounts with the proceeds of Treasury Bills which matured and for the reinvestment of such proceeds in fresh Treasury Bills. The opening and closing balance of such accounts on any one day was zero, the money remains in such accounts only for a few hours for reinvestment. I could not withdraw such monies.

I may add that the full sums of money invested in Treasury Bills [which matured and were credited to these accounts] was fully and completely declared by me.

I reiterate that all assets and liabilities have been duly and properly declared by me.

In the circumstances all bank accounts have duly declared in my declaration of assets and liabilities.

I trust this should completely deal with all bank accounts and that this matter will be laid to rest if conducted in an impartial manner.

I may add that I have fully and completely declared all my Assets and Liabilities in my Declarations of Assets and Liabilities.

This statement is made without prejudice to my legal rights.

BIAS

I state that as set out earlier both Justice Balapatabendi and Mr.Jayantha Wickramaratne are disqualified from conducting any investigation or proceeding against me or taking any decision in the process on the ground that their participation would violate the principles of natural justice, inter-alia, the Rule against bias.

February 2016

M	T	W	T	F	S	S
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8	9	10	11	12	13	14
15	16	17	18	19	20	21
22	23	24	25	26	27	28

29
« Jan

I state that Justice Jagath Balapatabendi , the Chairman of the Commission is not entitled to participate in the proceedings or investigations being conducted against me or to take any decision in respect of me for the following reasons:

1. Justice Balapatabendi has acted contrary to the provisions of the Commission to Investigate Allegations of Bribery and Corruption Act No. 19 of 1994 by violating the provisions relating to secrecy which he is bound to comply, thus demonstrating that he is biased against me and is not in a position to conduct a fair and impartial investigation in respect of the allegations made against me.

2. I state that Section 17 of the said Act states as follows;

“Every member of the Commission, the Director-General and every officer or servant, appointed to assist the Commission shall, before entering upon the duties of his office, sign a declaration that he will not disclose any information received by him, or coming to his knowledge, in the exercise and the discharge of his powers and functions under this Act, except for the purposes of giving effect to the provisions of this Act.”

3. I state that Justice Balapatabendi whilst being the Chairman of the Commission is considered a member of the Commission and is thus duty bound not to disclose information received by him or coming to his knowledge in the exercise and discharge of his powers and functions – except for the purposes of giving effect to the provisions of the Act.

4. Notwithstanding the aforesaid provisions Justice Balapatabendi has as Chairman of the Commission on numerous occasions violated the secrecy provisions by making public statements to the media with regard to the investigation being carried out against me, by the Commission.

5. I state that the following instances demonstrate the manner in which Justice Balapatabendi has violated the provisions of the law:

a. On 11th November 2012 in the Sunday Lankadeepa newspaper on page 01 under the heading “අල්ලස් කොමසම අගවිනිසුරුවරියගෙන් ජරණ කරණ යයි” Justice Balapatabendi has stated that the Chief Justice would be questioned with regard to the complaint received. Further on page 23 in the continuation of the same news item he states that

i. An officer of the Commission was dispatched to the Chief Justice to obtain a statement of reasons for her innocence

ii. In order to prove the charges levelled against the Chief Justice documents from private and state banks, the Inland Revenue department and the Land Registry would be obtained

b. On 18th November 2012 in the Sunday Lankadeepa newspaper on page 01 Justice Balapatabendi has stated that a ‘Show Cause Notice’ had been sent to the Chief Justice (which at that time was factually incorrect).

c. On 16th December 2012 in the Sunday Lankadeepa newspaper on page 01 and page 11 under the heading “අගවිනිසුරුවරියගේ වත්කම් සොයන්න අල්ලස් කොමසම ඕස්ට්‍රේලියා යයි?” Justice Balapatabendi has stated that a number of teams of investigators are being utilised to investigate the charges levelled against the Chief Justice

d. On 16th December 2012 in the Sunday Times newspaper on page 01 under the heading “Bribery Commission probes complaint against CJ” Justice Balapatabendi has stated

“We have received a complaint against the Chief Justice about accumulation of assets. We are investigating the complaint. It has been sent under a name and therefore like any other complaint we receive we are investigating the allegations”

e. On 24th March 2013 in the Sunday Lankadeepa newspaper on page 23 under the heading “දේශපාලකයන් හතරු පහකට එරෙහිව අල්ලස් පැමිණිලි” Mr. Balapatabendi has stated that, as the complaints are against politicians of various levels the secrecy of the investigations and proceedings have to be maintained. Although Justice Balapatabendi has sought to maintain secrecy in respect of investigations and proceedings against politicians he has failed to observe the same duty of confidentiality in respect of the investigations against me.

6. I further state that based on the statement made by Justice Balapatabendi on the 24th March 2013 in the Sunday Lankadeepa and his actions prior to that date with regard to the investigation being carried out it is evident that he is acting in violation of Section 17 of Act No. 1994 and opened himself up for prosecution under Section 22 of the aforesaid Act. I further state that Section 22 of the Commission to Investigate Allegations of Bribery and Corruption Act No. 19 of 1994 provides for the consequences of breaching the secrecy provisions in section 17 of the said Act. It states;

“Every person who acts in contravention of the duty imposed on him by section 17 to maintain secrecy shall be guilty of an offence and shall on conviction after summary trial before a

Magistrate be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years or to a fine not exceeding one hundred thousand rupees or to both such fine and imprisonment."

7. I state that Justice Balapatabendi has made a statement to the "Ceylon Today" newspaper of the 2nd April 2013 that I had tried to buy time and delay proceedings. He is quoted as saying "she is trying to drag the proceedings." The newspaper also quoted him as saying that the Commission would proceed to take legal action, based on my brief statement given to the Commission, should I ask for more time. I state the aforesaid statement to the Ceylon Today is not only a breach of confidentiality but also confirms that he has already made up his mind- even before I have been heard. I state that this statement disqualifies Mr.Balapatabendi from taking any further part in the proceedings against me on the ground of bias.

8. I further state that Justice Balapatabendi has at no instance denied the fact that he has in fact made public statements to the media with regard to the investigation being carried out against me, thus confirming that he has revealed particulars of the investigations against me in violation of the law.

9. I state that Justice Balapatabendi breaching the duty of confidentiality in respect of the purported investigations against me by the Commission, whilst striving to safeguard confidentiality pertaining to other investigations especially against politicians, has manifestly demonstrated a clear bias against me. I state that it is apparent from the said statements that Justice Balapatabendi has failed to maintain the necessary standard of impartiality and independence required by the Chairman of the Permanent Commission to Investigate Allegations of Bribery and Corruption.

10. I further state that Justice Balapatabendi has also issued statements to the media claiming that the Commission has already sufficient material to prosecute me and also claiming that I am attempting to delay investigations. I state that these statements too demonstrate that Justice Balapatabendi is not acting in an impartial manner but is demonstrating malice and bias towards me.

11. I state that without any reasonable cause Justice Balapatabendi has caused the Controller of Immigration and Emigration to prevent me from travelling abroad. I state that the said move had been given wide publicity in the media by Justice Balapatabendi, in violation of the law. I state that the said move too demonstrates manifest bias since I had made no arrangements whatsoever to leave the country at any point of time.

12. I state that I verily believe that among the reasons for Justice Balapatabendi to demonstrate bias against me arises as a result of his relationship to retired Chief Justice Mr. Asoka de Silva. I state that Justice Balapatabendi's son Isuru is married to Mr. Asoka de Silva's daughter Kanishka.

13. I state that during the course of the impeachment proceedings against me I submitted to the Parliamentary Select Committee that in fact former Chief Justice Asoka de Silva himself purchased a housing unit at Trillium Residencies whilst the case with regard to the Ceylinco Group of Companies was ongoing, demonstrating the fact that there was no impediment to my sister and brother-in-law to purchase such a housing unit. I state that Mr. de Silva had written a letter to the Parliamentary Select Committee and made numerous statements against me in the print and electronic media.

14. I state that I verily believe that Justice Balapatabendi's daughter-in-law Mrs.Kanishka de Silva Balapatabendi is a co-owner of the said Trillium Apartment purchased by her father.

15. I state that in view of the aforesaid Justice Balapatabendi is disqualified from participating in the proceedings or decisions of the Commission in respect of the allegations against me.

16. I state that Mr.Jayantha Wickremeratne (also known as H.A.S.K. Wickremeratne) a Member of the Commission is not entitled to participate in the proceedings or investigations being conducted against me or to take any decision in respect of me for the reasons set out below.

17. I state Mr Wickremeratne instituted a Fundamental Rights Application bearing No. 671/2003 in the Supreme Court. This application was dismissed and on the 10th February 2004, and I was a member of the bench which dismissed the aforesaid Fundamental Rights Application bearing number 671/2003 filed by Mr.Wickremeratne.This was an application pertaining to his promotion. I state that since I was the presiding judge of the bench which dismissed the aforesaid case filed by Mr.Wickremeratne there is a strong likelihood of bias against me.

18. I state that Mr.Jayantha Wickramaratne is the husband of Mrs.Anoma Gunathilake, Attorney-at-Law and Notary Public who has demonstrated ill-will and bias towards me and who has cast personal aspersions against me. I state that the manifest ill will and animosity shown by Mrs.Gunathilake against me creates a strong likelihood of bias against me by Mr.Wickremeratne.

19. I state that the following instances support my contention:

a. On 20th December 2012 in the Dinamina newspaper on page 01 and 04 under the heading "අනවිනිසුරුවරිය පිටුපස එල්ලවීම් නිතරවැදීන්" Mrs.Anoma Gunathilake has stated at a Conference that the LTTE organisation & Non-Governmental Organisations are supporting the Chief Justice.

b. On 20th December 2012 in the Daily News newspaper on page 01 under the heading "CJ's Writ Application to Discredit House" Mrs.Anoma Gunathilake has stated that there is no provision in the constitution that enables Chief Justice Shirani Bandaranayake to make any application before a Court of Appeal against a Parliamentary Select Committee that has conducted an impeachment trial against her. Mrs.Anoma Gunathilake is quoted as stating,

"I think the Chief Justice Bandaranayake has done this in an attempt to drag the process with an intention to discredit the House"

"We have reasons to believe that she is trying to complicate a normal constitutional process that impeached her on charges of misbehaviour with her current actions"

c. On 22nd December 2012 in the Dinamina newspaper on page 01 and 04 under the heading "දෝෂාභියෝගය අවසන් වී නොකිවියදී ඊට එරෙහි නීතිමය පියවර ගන්න බැහැ" Mrs.Anoma Gunathilake has stated that when impeachment proceedings are commenced against other Chief Justices' the law is good but when it is against Chief Justice Shirani Bandaranayake the law is not good. She further states that the Chief Justice has no basis upon which institute action against the Parliamentary Select Committee.

20. I further state that subsequent to the General Meeting of the Bar Association of Sri Lanka on the 15th of December 2012 and consequent to making these statements to the media Mrs.Anoma Gunathilake resigned from her post as deputy president of the Bar Association of Sri Lanka (BASL) as she was supportive of the impeachment process whereas the vast majority of the BASL was of the view that it was unconstitutional.

21. I state that Mrs.Gunathilake has appeared several times on the State Media including the Independent Television Network (ITN) criticising me.

22. I verily believe that Mrs.Gunathilake's animosity towards me has inter alia arisen from the fact that on the 10th February 2004, I was a member of the bench which dismissed the Fundamental Rights Application bearing number 671/2003 filed by her husband Mr.Wickremeratne, an application pertaining to his promotion. I state that since I was the presiding judge of the bench which dismissed the case filed by Mr.Wickremeratne there is a strong likelihood of bias against me.

23. Given the above circumstances Mr.Wickramaratne would be influenced by the strong views of his wife against me and also the fact that I dismissed his fundamental rights application bearing No. 671/2003 and therefore there would be a strong likelihood of bias against me.

24. As such I state that I state that in view of the aforesaid Mr.Wickremeratne is disqualified from participating in the investigation, proceedings or decisions of the Commission in respect of the allegations against me.

25. In support of my statement I am tendering to the officer recording my statement the following newspaper articles as proof of what I have contended above.

- a. Sunday Lankadeepa Newspaper – 11th November 2012 – pg 01
- b. Sunday Lankadeepa Newspaper – 18th November 2012 – pg 01 & 27
- c. Sunday Lankadeepa Newspaper – 25th November 2012 – pg 01 & 23
- d. Sunday Lankadeepa Newspaper – 09th December 2012 – pg 01
- e. Sunday Lankadeepa Newspaper – 16th December 2012 – pg 01
- f. Sunday Lankadeepa Newspaper – 23rd December 2012 – pg 01
- g. Sunday Lankadeepa Newspaper – 30th December 2012 – pg 01
- h. Lankadeepa Newspaper – 25th December 2012 – pg 01
- i. Sunday Lankadeepa Newspaper – 06th January 2013 – pg 01
- j. Rivira Newspaper – 04th November 2012 – pg 01
- k. Rivira Newspaper – 16th December 2012 – pg 01
- l. Dinamina Newspaper – 20th December 2012 – pg 01 & 04
- m. Dinamina Newspaper – 22nd December 2012 – pg 01 & 04
- n. Divayina Newspaper – 17th December 2012 – pg 01 & 04
- o. Daily News Newspaper – 20th December 2012 – pg 01 & 13
- p. Daily News Newspaper – 21st December 2012 – pg 01,09 & 13
- q. A copy of the deed of the Trillium Apartment co-owned by Mr.Balapatabendi's daughter-in-law
- r. Ceylon Today- 2nd April 2013
- s. Certified copy of the order dated 10th February 2004 in SCFR 671/2003.

 Follow @colombotelegrap

43 Responses to Full Text: Letter By Chief Justice Shirani Bandaranayake

Go to...

Expose` 4- a most despicable wrongful action of former CJ Dr. Shiranee Bandaranaike when she was Dean of law faculty !



(Lanka-e-News- 10.March.2016, 8.45PM) Following the report posted by Lanka e News 'like how SL Universities should be freed from the grip of politicians so they are not the property of University Dons', and after reading the other revelations associated with it , I felt that if I don't make my own contribution to those exposures , I shall be failing in my duty towards society.

This incident took place in the faculty of law of the Colombo University during the period 1991/1992 . It was Dr. G.L. Peiris who was the Vice Chancellor of the Colombo University , and the Dean of the faculty was Dr. Shirani Bandaranaike who was dismissed from the post of Chief Justice after being enmeshed in a storm of controversy. The chief of the law division was Ms. Shriya De Soysa at that time.

Ms. Indira Nanayakkara who was a lecturer in the law faculty during that period aided and abetted Shiranee in all her wrongful activities , while also doing all her lowliest sordid biddings . Indira who was not married at that time carried on an illicit love affair with a

second year law faculty student because of the support given by Shiranee.

Owing to this illicit love tangle , Indira secretly arranged to supply all the question papers ahead of the exam to her second year law student lover , and also corrected his answer scripts giving him high marks to ensure that he passed the exam with flying colors. That is because Indrani and Shiranee assumed that the law faculty was part of their personal belongings.

When Shiranee's father was working in the Anuradhura education office , the Shiranee Bandaranaike family was residing in a rented house at 754, second phase, new Town , Anuradhapura. Shiranee went to school until her advanced level class from that address.

However , because Shiranee's father Wilfred Bandaranaike did not pay the rent on time for that house they were residing in , he entered into conflicts with the owner of the house , Sylvester Perera.

Sylvester Perera's son later gained admission to the law faculty of the Colombo University in the academic year 1986/87, and it was Shiranee who was the Dean of the law faculty then . Shiranee getting wind of this spoke to the son of Sylvester Perera most fondly , only to begin her ' vengeful works' when he reached the third year . That is , she took special pains secretly to see that Sylvester's son is made to fail in three of the five subjects he offered at the third year exam.

Unfortunately , things did not work according to Shiranee's plan. His failure triggered huge student protests , compelling Dr. Peiris the Vice Chancellor to appoint a three member commission to inquire into this issue.

The Commission comprising members who are lecturers and Professors of other faculties (other than law faculty) of the Colombo University , examined the answer scripts of the student. It was finally concluded that in every answer script two answers have been cut off and discarded. In their words , answer scripts of two of the five question papers have been discarded deliberately .

Shiranee Bandaranaike who was the chief of the law faculty at that time, and in charge of the answer scripts resorted to this racket because she thought the law faculty is her private property .

For this gross, ruthless and monumental injustice she inflicted on the student which could have ruined that student's future , retribution took toll of her not immediately , because if she was punished during that period itself , that would not have had much impact. She was punished much later . Her facing various stigmatic experiences including embarrassment and humiliation before society culminating in her dismissal from the post of chief justice are part of the inescapable retributory process.

By a law faculty student who was in the Colombo University at that time

Translated by Jeff

(open for debate)

by (2016-03-10 16:15:48)

Go to...

ආචාර්ය ශිරාණි බණ්ඩාරනායක කොළඹ සරසවියේ සිටියදී කළ බලු වැඩක්..! -සරසවිය ආචාර්යවරුන්ගේ බුදලයක් වීම -හෙලිදරව්ව-අංක 4



(ලංකා ඊ නිවස් -2016.මාර්.09, පෙ.ව.7.40) ලංකා ඊ නිවස් හි පළ වූ ශ්‍රී ලංකාවේ විශ්ව විද්‍යාල දේශපාලකයන්ගෙන් මුදා ගත යුතුවා සේම ආචාර්ය වරුන්ගේ බුදලයක් ද නොවිය යුතුය යන ලිපිය හා ඉන් අනතුරුව ඊට එකතු වූ අනෙකුත් ලිපි ද කියවීමේ දී ඊට තවත් යමක් එකතු කිරීමේ සමාජ යුතුකමක් ඇතැයි මට සිතීණ.

මේ සත්‍ය සිදුවීම වූයේ වර්ෂ 1991 / 1992 කාලයේදී කොළඹ විශ්ව විද්‍යාලයේ නීති පීඨයේදී ය. එවකට කොළඹ විශ්ව විද්‍යාලයේ උප කුලපතිව සිටියේ මහාචාර්ය ජී.එල්.පීරිස් මහතා ය. නීති පීඨයේ දෙපාර්තමේන්තු ජර්නානී ලෙස සිටියේ පසුකලෙක මහත් ආන්දෝලනයකට ලක්ව අගවිනිසුරු ධුරයෙන් ඉවත් කරන ලද හිටපු අගවිනිසුරුවරිය ආචාර්ය ශිරාණි බණ්ඩාරනායක මහත්මිය යි. නීති පීඨ අංශ ජර්නානී ලෙස කටයුතු කෙළේ ශර්‍යා ද සොයිසා මහත්මියයි.

එවකට නීති පීඨයේ ආචාර්යවරියකව සිටි ඉන්දිරා නානායක්කාර මහත්මිය ශිරාණි බණ්ඩාරනායකගේ සියළු වැරදි වැඩ වලට සහාය දෙමින් බණ්ඩාරනායකට සියළු බල මෙහෙවර කම් කළ අයෙකි. ඉන්දිරා නානායක්කාර මහත්මිය (එවක මෙනෙවිය) සඳහා එවකට නීති පීඨයේ දෙවන වසරේ සිටි සිසුවෙකු ජරේම සම්බන්ධයෙන් රහසිගතව පවත්වාගෙන ගියේ බණ්ඩාරනායක ආශීර්වාදය ඊට ලැබුණු නිසාවෙනි. මේ ආකාරයට හොර රහසේ පවත්වාගෙන ගිය ජරේම සම්බන්ධය නිසා ඉන්දිරා නානායක්කාර තම

ජරේමවත්තයා වූ සිසුවාට සියළු ජරණ පත් කලින් ලබා දී ඔහුගේ බොහෝ උත්තර පත් ඇය විසින්ම පරීක්ෂා කර ඊට අධික ලෙස ලකුණු ලබා දී ඔහු ඉහලින්ම සමත් කිරීමට වග බලා ගත්තාය. ශිරාණි බණ්ඩාරනායක සහ ඉන්දිරා නානායක්කාර සිතුවේ නීති පීඨය ඔවුන්ගේ බුදලයක් කියා ය.

තවද ශිරාණි බණ්ඩාරනායකගේ පියා අනුරාධපුර අධියාපන කාර්යාලයේ සේවය කරන වකවානුවේදී බණ්ඩාරනායක පවුල කුලියට සිටියේ අංක 754, දෙවන පියවර, නව නගරය, අනුරාධපුරය යන ලිපිනයේ ය. ශිරාණි බණ්ඩාරනායක උසස් පෙල සඳහා පාසැල් ගියේ එම ලිපිනයේ තිබූ කුලී නිවැසියන්ව සිට ය.

ශිරාණි බණ්ඩාරනායකගේ පියා වූ විල්ෆ්රඩ් බණ්ඩාරනායක මෙම කුලී නිවසට නිසි පරිදි කුලී නොගෙවීම නිසා එම නිවසේ අයිතිකරු වූ සිල්වෙස්ටර් පෙරේරා සමග ආරවුලක් ඇතිකර ගන්නා ලදී.

ඉහත කී සිල්වෙස්ටර් පෙරේරා මහතාගේ පුතෙකු කොළඹ විශ්ව විද්‍යාලයේ නීති පීඨයට තේරී පත්වන්නේ 1986/87 අධියාපන වර්ෂයේදී ය. එවකට පියාධිපති ලෙස සිටි ශිරාණි බණ්ඩාරනායකට මේ බව ආරංචි වී පෙරේරා මහතාගේ පුතා සමග බොහෝ සුභදව කථා කර පසුව එම සිසුවා 3 වන වසරට පැමිණි විට ශිරාණි 'වැඩ' ආරම්භ කරන්නීය. ඒ අනුව සිල්වෙස්ටර් පෙරේරා මහතාගේ පුතා 3 වන වසරේ පෙනී සිටි විෂයන් 5 න් 3 කින්ම ඔහුව අසමත් කිරීමට බණ්ඩාරනායක වැඩ සිද්ධ කරන්නීය.

නමුත් ශිරාණි බලාපොරොත්තු වූ ආකාරයටම සියල්ල සිදුවූයේ නැත. මේ අසමත් කිරීම පිලිබඳව නැගුණු බරපතල සිසු විරෝධය හමුවේ එවක උප කුලපති වූ මහාචාර්ය ජී.එල්. පීරිස්ට වූයේ සිදු කරන ලද අසමත් කිරීම පිලිබඳව සොයා බැලීමට තීරුපුද්ගල කොමිෂන් සභාවක් පත් කිරීමට ය. කොළඹ විශ්ව විද්‍යාලයේ වෙනත් පීඨ (නීති පීඨය හැර) වලින් තෝරාගත් ආචාර්යවරු හා මහාචාර්යවරුන්ගෙන් යුක්ත වූ කොමිෂන් සභාව පරීක්ෂණයක් පැවැත්වූ අතර එම සිසුවා අසමත් වූ උත්තර පත් පරීක්ෂා කරන ලදී. ඒ සෑම උත්තර පත්රයකම පිලිතුරු 2 බැගින් කඩා ඉවත් කර ඇති බවට තීරණය විය. එනම් පිලිතුරු ලද ජරණ පත් 5 න් 2 ක්ම ඉවත් කර මෙම සිසුවා හිතාමතාම අසමත් කර තිබිණ.

මෙම උත්තර පත් රහරව සිටි එවක නීති පීඨ දෙපාර්තමේන්තු ජර්නානීව සිටි ශිරාණි බණ්ඩාරනායක එම ක්රියාවට පෙළැඹුනේ නීති පීඨය ඇයගේ බුදලයක් යැයි සිතූ නිසාය.

මේ මහ පොළොව නුහුලන අපරාධයට දෙවියන් දඬුවම් දුන්නේ ඊට ආසන්න කාලයක දී නොවේ. එම කාලයේදීම ඊට ඇයට දඬුවම් දුන්නේ නම් එහි කිසිදු ගැමුමක් නැත. නමුත් පසු කලෙක ශිරාණි බණ්ඩාරනායක නොයෙක් චෝදනා වලට ලක්වෙමින්, සමාජය ඉදිරියේ හැල්ලුවට ලක් වෙමින් තම රැකියාවද නැතිකර ගන්නේ එම වැරදි වලට දඬුවම් ලෙසය.

-එකල කොළඹ විශ්ව විද්‍යාලයේ නීති පීඨයේ සිටි සිසුවෙකු විසිනි-

(සංවාදයට විවෘතයි)

by (2016-03-09 02:10:40)

ඔබගේ කාරුණික පරිත්‍යාගයෙන් තොරව ලංකා ඊ නිවස් පවත්වාගෙන යා නොහැක.



(http://s3.lankaenews.com/si_news_image/CJ_Shirani_Bribery_Commission_J.jpg)