

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE DEMOCRATIC SOCIALIST
REPUBLIC OF SRI LANKA**

*In the matter of an application for Writs in
the nature of Certiorari, Mandamus, and
Prohibition under and in terms of Article 140
of the Constitution of the Democratic Socialist
Republic of Sri Lanka.*

G.K.A Chaminda Kumara Kularatne,
No. 34/35, Saman Uyana, Dambahena
Road, Maharagama

CA(Writ) Application No.
109.../2026

PETITIONER

Vs.

1. Mrs. Kushani Anusha Rohanadeera,
Secretary General of the Parliament,
Parliament of Sri Lanka,
Sri Jayawardanapura,
Kotte
2. Hon. (Dr) Jagath Wickramaratne,
Hon. Speaker of the Parliament of Sri
Lanka,
Parliament of Sri Lanka,
Sri Jayawardanapura, Kotte
3. Hon. Bimal Rathnayake,
Minister of Transport, Highways and
Urban Development and Leader of the
House of Parliament,
Parliament of Sri Lanka,
Sri Jayawardanapura, Kotte
4. Hon. Sajith Premadasa,
The Hon. Opposition Leader of the
Parliament,
Parliament of Sri Lanka,
Sri Jayawardanapura,
Kotte

5. Hon. (Dr) Anil Jayantha (M.P),
Minister of Labour and Deputy
Minister of Finance and Planning,
Parliament of Sri Lanka,
Sri Jayawardanapura,
Kotte

6. Hon. Gayantha Karunathilake,
Member of Parliament and the Chief
Opposition Whip,
Parliament of Sri Lanka,
Sri Jayawardanapura,
Kotte

7. Mr. Hansa Abeyrathne,
Assistant Secretary General of
Parliament,
Parliament of Sri Lanka,
Sri Jayawardanapura,
Kotte

8. Mr. S.K. Liyanage,
Inquiring Officer,
Parliament of Sri Lanka,
Sri Jayawardanapura,
Kotte

And

12/1A,
Andarawatta Road
Polhengoda,
Colombo 05

9. Mr. Mahinda Yapa Abeywardena,
30/5A,
Robert's Garden, Kalubowila,
Dehiwala

10. Mr. Dinesh Gunawardena,
Former Prime Minister of the
Republic,
No. 84, Kirillapone Avenue,
Colombo 05
11. Mr. A. D. Susil Premajyantha,
No. 123/1, Station Road,
Gangodawila,
Nugegoda
12. Mr. Lakshman Kiriella,
No. 121/1,
Pahalawela Road, Pelawatta,
Battaramulla
13. Mr. Chameera Gallage,
Private Secretary to the Hon. Speaker,
Office of the Hon. Speaker,
Parliament of Sri Lanka,
Sri Jayawardanapura,
Kotte
14. Mr. Sinnadurai Nandanan,
No. 83/3,
Balapakuna Road,
Kirulapona,
Colombo 06

RESPONDENTS

On this 18th day of February 2026;

**TO: HIS LORDSHIP THE HON. PRESIDENT AND THE OTHER
HONOURABLE JUDGES OF THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE
DEMOCRATIC SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF SRI LANKA.**

**The Petition of the Petitioner above-named, appearing by S.W.Amila Kumara,
his Registered Attorney-at-Law, states as follows:**

THE PETITIONER

1. The Petitioner is the Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament.
 - a) The Petitioner is an Attorney-at-Law, who took oaths before the Hon Supreme Court on 09 December 2005:
 - b) The Petitioner previously functioned inter alia as Additional Secretary (Office of the Leader of the Opposition of Parliament), Additional Secretary to the Presidential Secretariat (acting), Secretary to the Chief Government Whip of Parliament etc, from the year 2005, prior to his appointment as the Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament, and therefore, it is very clear that the Petitioner is an officer with extensive experience in the Public Service. In addition to the above he has held several other senior Public offices.

A true copy of the CV of the petitioner is annexed hereto marked P-1, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

- c) The petitioner is an LLB graduate .

A true copy of the LLB Certificate of the Petitioner is annexed hereto marked P-2, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

A true copy of the Attorney-at-Law certificate of the Petitioner is annexed marked P-3, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

- d) The petitioner is life member of the BASL.

A true copy of a letter dated 27-01-2026, issued by the Secretary of the BASL, confirming the aforesaid, is annexed hereto marked P-4, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

- e) The Petitioner has also obtained, a Postgraduate Diploma in Business Management on 01st June, 2009 from University of Colombo

A true copy of a Postgraduate Diploma in Business Management on 01st June, 2009, is annexed hereto marked P-5, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

- f) The Petitioner is currently reading for M.phil which could be upgraded to a PhD at the University of Colombo , focusing on Constitutional Affairs.

A true copy of the Confirmation letter from the Faculty of Graduate Studies, University of Colombo, on 24th October, 2024, is annexed hereto marked P-6, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

- g) The Petitioner has also followed Diplomas and professional qualifications, and the certificates pertaining to the said Diplomas, Professional Qualifications and training programmes are annexed hereto marked **P-7** to **P-12**, and are pleaded as part and parcel hereof.
 - h) The Petitioner is married with three children, and two of his children are following higher studies in China and Malaysia and the youngest son is still schooling at Royal College, Colombo.
2. The petitioner was duly functioning in the post of Deputy Secretary General of Parliament, until he was interdicted from service, by the purported, grossly heinous and deplorably malicious decision of the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, dated 23-01-2026, **WHICH, AS MOREFULLY ADVERTED TO HEREINBELOW, WAS MOBILIZED, LAUNCHED, PRE-ENGINEERED AND, DRIVEN VIRTUALLY SINGLE HANDEDLY, BY THE 2ND RESPONDENT , DUE TO HIS MISCONCIEVED PERCEPTION, (BECAUSE OF THE FACT THAT THE PETITIONER WITNESSED A CERTAIN OCCURRENCE, IN THE SPEAKER'S "PERSONAL DINING ROOM" (RESERVED ONLY FOR THE HON. SPEAKER), THAT CERTAIN OF HIS PROCLIVITIES AND PROPENSITIES, HAD BEEN MENTIONED BY THE PETITIONER, WHICH PERCEPTION IS IN FACT, ERRONEOUS.**
3. **THE PETITIONER, MOST RESPECTFULLY SEEKS THE DISPENSATION FROM YOUR LORDSHIPS' COURT, NOT TO EXPRESSLY ARTICULATE THE SAID OCCURRENCE, AT LEAST AT THIS INTITAL JUNCURE, AS THE PETITIONER FEELS CONSTRAINED, BY CERTAIN CIRCUMSPECT, INHIBITIONS, AND FOR WHICH, HE HAS RECEIVED HIS SENIOR COUNSEL'S CONCURENCE.**
4. **HOWEVER, WHICH IS BOTH IRRESISITBLY OBVIOUS AND APPARENT, FROM CERTAIN OF THE ACCOMPANYING DOCUMENTATION AND FROM WHAT IS ALSO, UNFORUNATELY, COMMON AND WIDESPREAD KNOWLEDGE AND WHICH HAS ALSO BEEN THE SUBJECT OF CERTAIN REFERENCES, IN**

PARLIAMENT, AND ALSO, VIRALLY KNOWN AND THE SUBJECT MATTER OF INTENSE AND WIDESPREAD SCRUTINY, ON SOCIAL MEDIA.

5. AS SUCH, THE PETITIONER RESPECTFULLY RESERVES HIS RIGHT TO DO SO, BY A SUPPLEMENTARY AFFIDAVIT IN COURT, OR MORE PREFERABLY, AND IF NECESSARY OR SO DIRECTED, TO BE FILED, UNDER CONFIDENTIAL COVER, FOR THE PERUSAL, OF YOUR LORDSHIPS' COURT.
6. WHILST THE PETITIONER BRINGS TO BEAR, THROUGH HIS OWN INTROSPECTION, SELF IMPOSED RESTRAINTS IN RESPECT OF THE ARTICULATIONS IN THIS PETITION, AS THE PETITION, UPON FILING, WOULD CONSTITUTE A PUBLIC DOCUMENT, NEVERTHELESS, WHAT IS DEEPLY AND MOST SEVERELY CONDEMNABLE, IS THE MOST OUTRAGEOUS AND HORRENDOUSLY OBNOXIOUS, MALICIOUS MOTIVATION AND ACTUATION, THAT THE 2ND RESPONDENT, HAS MOST PALPABLY BROUGHT TO BEAR, IN PRE-ENGINEERING THE INTERDICTION AND MARGINALIZATION OF THE PETITIONER, NOTWITHSTANDING THAT THE PETITIONER, IS THE CHIEF OF STAFF OF PARLIAMENT AND THE DEPUTY SECRETARY GENERAL OF PARLIAMENT, WHICH IN CONJUNCTION, CONSTITUTE THE PETITIONER'S OFFICIAL DESIGNATION AND DEFINE HIS FUNCTIONS.
7. THIS DEEPLY DISTURBING, DEPLORABLE AND DESPICABLY NOXIOUS AND VENOMOUS, ACTUATION AND INCITATION, IS PATENTLY AND MOST IRREVERSIBLY, BEYOND ANY FORM OF RESUSCITATION OR SALVAGING OR REDEMPTION, IN LAW, AS WELL AS, IN TERMS OF THE JUDICALLY EMBRACED, DOCTRINE OF THE RULE OF LAW, WHICH IS DEPLOYED BY THE SUPERIOR AND APEX COURTS OF SRI LANKA, AS WELL AS BY THE COURTS IN COMPARATIVE JURISDICTIONS, AS THE PRIMARY TOOL IN ITS ARMOURY, TO HOLD A DECISION MAKER, AMENABLE TO A VIBRANT, INCISIVE, FORENSIC, JUDICIAL AUDIT AND THE CONSEQUENT VISITATION, OF FAR REACHING PUNITIVE SANCTION, BOTH AS RETRIBUTIVE, AS WELL AS PUNITIVELY CURATIVE, AND DETERRENT MEASURES.

8. THE IMPUGNED, MOST VIRULENT, SINISTER AND INSIDIOUS MOTIVATIONS, ARE CONSPICUOUSLY BEREFT OF ANY FORM OF EMBELLISHMENT OF LEGALITY AND JUSTIFICATION, BOTH FROM A MORAL PERSPECTIVE OF JUSTICE, AS WELL AS NECESSARILY, SHOCKING THE SHUDDERING CONSCIENCE, OF ALL RIGHT THINKING PERSONS, INVESTED WITH EVEN A MODICUM OR THE MOST MINUTE FORM OF REGARD AND RESPECT, FOR THE PRE-EMINENTLY OVER-RIDING, RIGOROUS GOVERNANCE, OF THE RULE OF LAW.
9. IN THE PRESENT ERA, JUDICIAL DICTA PROVIDES DEEP INSIGHTS INTO THE SENSITIZATION OF THE COURTS, TOWARDS THE PARAMOUNTTCY, VITALITY AND INDISPENSABILITY, AND PRE-EMINENCE AND ASCENDANCY, OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE RULE OF LAW, WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF EVEN THE MOST NASCENT AND FLEDGING OF DEMOCRACIES, AND THE PLAYBOOK OF AN INTERNATIONALLY ESPOUSED, "RULES BASED ORDER", AS OPPOSED TO THE TYRANNICAL CONDITION OF THE PROVERBIAL "BANANA REPUBLIC" AND HENCE, ANY OUTLIER DEVIATION FROM THE PRESENT NORMATIVE ELEVATION OF THE RULE OF LAW OR ANY ABERATION OF THE DOCTRINE, CANNOT BUT, BE VIRULENTLY DENOUNCED, AS AN OBNOXIOUS ANACHRONISM.
10. EVEN MORE SEMINALLY, THE DOCTRINE OF THE RULE OF LAW, CONSTITUTES THE DEEPEST SUB-STRUCTURE AND ROCK HEAD, OF THE INTRINSIC AND NATURALLY OCCURING, INSTINCTIVE, "ANTHROPOMORPHIC CONCEPTION OF JUSTICE" AND FAIR PLAY, THAT HUMANS ARE, MOST REDEEMINGLY AND INDEED, RELIEVINGLY, INVESTED WITH, AS A CORROLARY AND ALTER-EGO, OF THE TIME IMMEMORIAL DOCTRINE, OF "NATURAL LAW", WHICH FORMS THE UNDERPINNING BED ROCK, OF ALL ACTION, WHICH IN FACT, VIRTUALLY NEEDED NO MUNDANE OR PEDANTIC, ARTICULATION BY EVEN THE ENLIGHTENED WISDOM OF THE "HELLENIC ANCIENTS", GIVEN SUB-TERANEOULY EMBEDDED, IN THE FORM OF A CASCADING CONSCIOUSNESS, IN THE "HUMAN SOUL".
11. THE 2ND RESPONDENT, IN ORDER TO SERVE HIS MACCHIAVELLIAN, INSIDIOUS AGENDA, HAS MARSHALLED A

VERY SMALL COTERIE, OF PLIABLE, VERITABLE TROOPS, WHO LIKE THE MERCENARY WARRIORS OF YORE, HAVE CAPITULATED, TO THE GENERAL'S AGENDA AND SUNG "HALLELUJAH".

12. LIKE THE MUCH REVEILED SPANISH INQUISITION, THIS SMALL COTERIE, HAS DELIBERATELY AND BLATANTLY, VENALLY ABUSED, USURPED AND ARROGATED TO THEMSELVES, THE OSTENSIBLE POWER OF TRANGRESSION AND INTRUSION, TO THE OPPROBRIUM , CENSURE AND VILLIFICATION, OF ALL PRUDENT PERSONS, WHO HAVE ACROSS THE BOARD, AND WITHOUT EXCEPTION, CASTICATED AND HAVE MOVED FOR DUE ACCOUNTABILITY AND STIGMATIZATION, OF THESE MISGUIDED PERSONS, FOR BLATANT WRONG DOING.

A true copy of a service letter issued by a former Secretary to the Prime Minister, dated 04-07-2023, is annexed hereto marked P-12(a), and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

13. The petitioner states that there were no disciplinary complaints or complaints, pertaining to any irregularities or wrongdoing, against the Petitioner, during the said period.
14. The Petitioner further states at the very forefront of this Petition that, on 19 previous instances in the past, from the year 2023, the Petitioner has been appointed by former Presidents and His Excellency the present President Anura Kumara Dissanayake, as the Acting Secretary General of the Parliament, and the Petitioner, during such appointments, discharged his duties to the best of his ability and with due diligence, in the said post of Acting Secretary General of the Parliament .

True copies of the said letters of appointment are annexed hereto compendiously marked P-13, and are pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

THE RESPONDENTS

15. The Petitioner states that:-

- a) The 1st Respondent is the Secretary General of the Parliament of Sri Lanka, and is the proper disciplinary authority of the Parliamentary staff, including the Petitioner, and is also the immediate superior of the Petitioner;

The 1st Respondent is also the Secretary, to the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee and was a member who interviewed the petitioner for the said post, together with the 4th Respondent and the 9th to the 12th Respondents;

- b) The 2nd Respondent above named, is the Hon. Speaker of Parliament. He is also the Chairman of the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee;
- c) The 3rd to the 5th Respondents, are all members of the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee;

The 4th Respondent is the Hon. Opposition Leader and he was one of the members of the interview panel, which interviewed the Petitioner, for the post/office of Chief of Staff and the post of Deputy Secretary General of Parliament;

- d) The 6th Respondent above named, is a member of Parliament and Chief Opposition Whip and to the best of the knowledge and understanding of the Petitioner, he represented the Opposition leader of Parliament, in his absence, at the meeting of the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, when the impugned decision to interdict the Petitioner, had been most illegally taken, in total and utter ultra vires action, in view inter-alia of the fact that there is not the remotest power or authority, vested in any such purported committee to assume such a role, thereby resulting in a total usurpation of power and authority.
- e) The 7th Respondent, is the Assistant Secretary General of Parliament;
- f) The 8th Respondent is the inquiry officer, who conducted a purported preliminary inquiry against the Petitioner, and had submitted a purported, utterly illegal inquiry report. As will be morefully and in detail adverted to above, the 8th Respondent above named, had no power or mandate whatsoever, to conduct the said preliminary inquiry, and therefore, the conduct of the same, is ab initio, null and void, *in limine*;
- g) The 9th to the 12th Respondents above named, are all members of the interview panel, that interviewed the Petitioner, for the post of Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of the Parliament.

The 9th Respondent above named, was the former Speaker of the Parliament and the 10th Respondent, was the former Prime Minister of the Republic.

- h) The 13th Respondent above named is the private secretary to the Hon. Speaker;

- i) The 14th Respondent above named is the applicant who submitted a RTI Application referred hereinbelow.

THE HISTORICAL NARRATIVE OF THE FACTUAL MATRIX FACTS

THE PETITIONER'S APPOINTMENT TO THE OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY TO THE OFFICE OF THE CHIEF GOVERNMENT WHIP

16. The Petitioner states that, a Cabinet Memorandum No. PMO/CM/03/2020, dated 07-01-2020, was submitted by the Hon Prime Minister, seeking the approval of the Cabinet of Ministers to appoint the Petitioner to the office of the Secretary to the office of the Chief Government Whip of the Parliament of Sri Lanka as well as as an Additional Secretary to the office of Hon. Prime Minister.

A true copy of the said Cabinet Memorandum No. PMO/CM/03/2020 dated 07-01-2020, is annexed hereto marked P-14, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

17. Accordingly, by way of the decision of the Cabinet of Ministers, No. 20/0094/202/004 dated 14-01-2020, the Cabinet of Ministers, granted its approval to appoint the Petitioner, to the post of Secretary of the Chief Government Whip, as well as an Additional Secretary to the Hon. Prime Minister.

A true copy of the decision of the Cabinet of Ministers No. 20/0094/202/004, dated 14-01-2020 is annexed hereto marked P-15, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

18. Accordingly, the Petitioner received a letter dated 23-01-2020, from the Secretary to the Cabinet of Ministers, appointing him to the said post of Secretary to the Chief Government Whip.

19. Thereafter, by way of a letter dated 03-02-2020, the Petitioner accepted the duties as the Secretary to the office of Chief Government Whip, with effect from 03-02-2020.

A true copy of the said letter of appointment, dated 23-01-2020 is annexed hereto marked P-16, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

A true copy of the said letter of the Petitioner, dated 03-02-2020 is annexed hereto marked P-17, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

20. The Petitioner further states that it is pertinent to note that by way of the decision of the Cabinet of Ministers, dated 07-02-2002, the posts of the Leader of the Opposition, Leader of the House and the office of the Chief Government Whip, were elevated to the rank of a Cabinet Minister (all three posts were elevated to the status of a Cabinet of Minister). Accordingly, the post of Secretaries to the said offices, including the Secretary to the office of Chief Government Whip too, was elevated to the rank and status of a Secretary to a Cabinet Ministry.

21. Therefore, the appointment of the Petitioner to the said office of Secretary to the office of Chief Government Whip, was as same as being appointed to the office of a Secretary to a Ministry of the Cabinet. This is a clear and an unequivocal recognition of the fact that the said post, is a pensionable post.

True copies of the Note to the Cabinet of Ministers and the decision of the Cabinet of Ministers, respectively dated 06-08-2002 and 07-08-2002, are annexed hereto, compendiously marked P-18, and are pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

22. The Petitioner further states that, a Joint Note to the Cabinet, dated 29-06-2018, was submitted to pay a pensionable allowance, to inter alia the Secretaries of the office of Leader of the House and the Chief Government Whip. Accordingly, on 24-07-2018, inasmuch as the said posts are on par with the Secretaries to the Ministries, accordingly, the Cabinet of Ministers granted permission to the same, on 24th July 2018.

True copies of the said Note to the Cabinet and the decision of the Cabinet of Ministers, dated 24-07-2018, are annexed hereto compendiously marked P-19, and are pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

23. The petitioner further states that, according to Clause 9 of the Service Minute of the Secretaries, Published in the Gazette(Extraordinary) No. 48/2, dated 29/08/1979, the pension of the Secretaries should be determined according to the provisions contained in Clause 25 of the Pension minutes.

A true copy of the Service Minute of the Secretaries, Published in the Gazette(Extraordinary) No. 48/2, dated 06/08/1979, is annexed hereto marked P-20(a), and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

24. The Petitioner further states that, according to Clause 25(a)(xi)(i)(a), which is an amendment made to the pension minute, published in the Government gazette No. 708, dated 27-03-1992, any officer who is appointed to a post of Secretary to a Ministry of similar post, from outside, and if such officer has an uninterrupted period of 5 years in the said post, is entitled for the pension.

25. Clause 25(a)(xi) (iv) provides that, any officer who is receiving a similar salary as a Secretary to Ministry and holding a similar post, falls within the definition of a Secretary to the Ministry, for the purposes of pension minutes.

A true copy of the pension minute, published in the Government gazette No. 708, dated 27-03-1992, is annexed hereto marked P-20(b), and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

THE VACANCY OF THE POST CHIEF OF STAFF AND DEPUTY SECRETARY GENERAL OF PARLIAMENT

26. The petitioner states that, whilst the Petitioner was serving as the Secretary to the Chief Government Whip of Parliament, the Office/Post of the Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament, fell vacant in the year 2023, with effect from 07-06-2023.

27. Accordingly, the Committee on Parliamentary Business, at its meeting dated 08-06-2023, granted its permission and approval for the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, advertise the said post and to prepare a scheme of recruitment. The said committee was compelled to recruit a qualified officer from outside, inasmuch as, the Assistant Secretary General of Parliament, the 7th Respondent, was very junior in the Parliamentary Service and in fact, had not even been confirmed in Parliamentary Service, as he has joined the Parliamentary service only three months prior to that event.

A true copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Committee on Parliamentary Business dated 08-06-2023 is annexed hereto marked P-21, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

28. Accordingly, at the meeting of the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, dated 20-06-2023, the committee decided to recruit an officer having following requirements, through an interview process and the advertisement in this regard, also was approved at the said meeting:-

- Attorney-at-Law of the Supreme Court with minimum of 10 years seniority;
- 10 years of Managerial experience in a Senior Management position in the field of Human Resources Management/Public Administration, in the Public sector or in a reputed organization in the private sector ;
- Experience in International relations.

A true copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, dated 20-06-2023, is annexed hereto marked P-22, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

29. The Scheme of recruitment adopted for the recruitment of the Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General to the Parliament is published in the Gazette Notification No. 2,338, dated 23-06-2023, annexed hereinbelow, marked P-25(a).

30. Thereafter, at the meeting dated 18-07-2023, of the Parliamentary Advisory Committee, the Interview Board, pertaining to the recruitment of the Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament, was appointed, and the said Interview Board consisted of the following high-ranking officials:-

- Hon. Prime Minister;
- Hon. Speaker;
- Hon. Leader of the House;
- Hon. Leader of the Opposition;
- Secretary General of Parliament.

A true copy of the minutes of the meeting dated 18-07-2023, of the Parliamentary Advisory Committee, is annexed hereto marked P-23, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

31. At the meeting dated 16-08-2023, of the Parliamentary Advisory Committee, the Hon. Opposition leader, urged to add the Hon. Chief Opposition Whip to the interview panel, and accordingly said Parliamentary Advisory committee decided that the interview panel to be comprised of following members, in order to maintain a balance between the Government party members and the opposition party members :-

- Hon. Prime Minister;
- Hon. Speaker;
- Hon. Leader of the House;
- Hon. Leader of the Opposition;
- Hon. Chief Opposition Whip;
- Secretary General of Parliament.

A true copy of the minutes of the meeting dated 16-08-2023, of the Parliamentary Advisory Committee, is annexed hereto marked P-24, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

32. The Petitioner states therefore that it is clear from the aforesaid that, even at the stage of interviews for the post/office of Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament, a well deliberated, meticulous process was put in place, in order to ensure that there was Due Process and transparency.

33. The Petitioner states that, as adverted to above, usually, whenever there is a vacancy in the post of Deputy Secretary General to the Parliament, the officer holding the post of Assistant Secretary General to Parliament is promoted to the said

post/office. However, in this occasion, when the vacancy occurred, the officer holding the post of Assistant Secretary to the Parliament was a junior officer, who was appointed to the said office, a mere 3 months prior, and had not even been confirmed in the said post. Therefore, the Parliament Committee was compelled to recruit a suitable, well experienced officer, outside the parliamentary staff.

34. In fact, it is most respectfully submitted that advertising the post and calling for applications from externally, rather than mechanically internally filling the vacancy, is undoubtedly the prudent and judicious decision, inasmuch as, by externally calling for applications, the interview panel will have a much wider and a broad spectrum of candidates, to select the very best and most suitable for the job role. The post/office of Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament, is a very crucial position in the Parliament, as the said office is required to carry out functions of assist the Secretary General of Parliament, as the second in command and function as the Administrative head of the Staff at Parliament.

CALLING FOR APPLICATIONS FROM ELIGIBLE CANDIDATES FOR THE POST OF CHIEF OF STAFF AND DEPUTY SECRETARY GENERAL OF PARLIAMENT

35. Accordingly, the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, called for applications from eligible candidates for the said post of Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament, by publishing an advertisement in the Government Gazette No. 2,338, dated 23-06-2023, and in several other newspapers.

A true copy of the Government Gazette No. 2,338, dated 23-06-2023, is annexed hereto marked P-25(a), and pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

A true specimen copy of a newspaper advertisement is annexed hereto marked P-25(b), and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

THE APPLICATION SUBMITTED BY THE PETITIONER, FOR THE SAID POST OF CHIEF OF STAFF AND DEPUTY SECRETARY GENERAL OF PARLIAMENT

36. The Petitioner states that, accordingly, the Petitioner submitted an application for the said post, dated 04-07-2023, via the official channel of Secretary to the Hon. Prime Minister, with all the supporting documents, to establish that the Petitioner is an eligible candidate.

A true copy of the said Application, dated 04-07-2023, together with the supporting documents are annexed hereto marked P-26, and are pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

37. The Petitioner states that, according to and in terms of the decision of the Cabinet of Ministers, dated 27-05-2015, the Secretary to the Prime Minister is the Administrative Authority over the Secretary to the office of the Chief Government Whip, and therefore, the Petitioner submitted the said application, by and through the Secretary to the Hon. Prime Minister.

A true copy of the decision of the Cabinet of Ministers, dated 27-05-2015, is annexed hereto marked P-27, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

38. The Petitioner further states that, a Cabinet Memorandum, dated 28-01-2016, had been submitted to the Cabinet of Ministers, seeking permission from the Cabinet of Ministers, to re-designate the post of Deputy Secretary General of Parliament as "Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament", and to assign the same powers, entitlements and the salary scale of a Secretary to a Ministry. The said proposal had been approved by the Cabinet of Ministers, by its decision dated 23-02-2016.

True copies of the said Cabinet Memorandum and the decision of the Cabinet of Ministers, date 23-02-2016 are annexed hereto, compendiously marked P-28, and are pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

39. The Petitioner states that, in view of the above, it is clear that the previous office of the Petitioner, i.e. Secretary to the office of Chief Government Whip is at the similar level of salary and other status, to the office of the Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament.

40. The Petitioner states that, by way of Gazette(Extraordinary) No. 2351/04, dated 25-09-2023, the post of Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament was declared a pensionable post.

A true copy of the said Gazette(Extraordinary) No. 2351/04, dated 25-09-2023, is annexed hereto marked P-29, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

THE INTERVIEW DATED 08-09-2023, HELD AT THE PARLIAMENTARY COMPLEX

41. The Petitioner states that, by way of letter dated 06-09-2023, issued under the hand of the 1st Respondent, the Petitioner was informed to attend an interview on 08-09-2023, at the parliamentary complex.

A true copy of the said letter of the 1st Respondent, dated 06-09-2023, is annexed hereto marked P-30, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

42. The Petitioner states that, six candidates had been selected to face the interview and out of which, 5 candidates faced the interview, including the Petitioner.

43. The Petitioner states that, as had been informed to the former Hon. Speaker by the 1st Respondent, by way of the communication, dated 12-09-2023, the Petitioner had received by far, the highest marks, and therefore, the interview panel, and the 1st Respondent, had recommended the Petitioner to be appointed to the post of Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General to Parliament. The said communication received the approval from the Hon. Speaker as well.

A true copy of the said communication, dated 12-09-2023 is annexed hereto marked P-31, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

44. It is significant to note that following were the members of the Interview Panel :-

- Hon. Mahinda Yapa Abheywardana – Former Speaker;
- Hon Dinesh Gunawardana – Former Prime Minister;
- Hon. (Dr) Susil Premajayantha – Former Leader of the House;
- Hon. Sajith Premadasa - Hon. Opposition Leader (both at the time and as at present);
- Hon. Lakshman Kiriella – Former Chief Opposition Whip;
- Mrs. K.A. Rohanadeera – Secretary General of the Parliament.

45. From the said list of members of the interview panel it is clear that both the Government members and Opposition members were represented in the said Interview panel and the petitioner was selected for the said post, through a transparent and multilateral procedure.

THE APPOINTMENT OF THE PETITIONER AS THE CHIEF OF STAFF AND DEPUTY SECRETARY GENERAL OF PARLIAMENT

46. The Petitioner states that, accordingly, by way of a letter dated 13-09-2023, the 1st Respondent informed the Secretary to the Hon. Prime Minister that the Petitioner has been selected for the office/post of Chief of Staff and the Deputy Secretary General of Parliament and sought permission from the Secretary to the Prime Minister, to release him from service, from the post of Secretary to the post of Chef

Government Whip of Parliament, in order to assume duties as the Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament.

A true copy of the said letter dated 13-09-2023 is annexed hereto marked P-32, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

47. Thereafter, by way of a letter dated 14-09-2023, addressed to the 1st Respondent, the Secretary to the Prime Minister, released the Petitioner from the service in the office of Secretary to the Chief Government whip of Parliament, thereby allowing him to assume duties, as the Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament.

A true copy of the said letter dated 14-09-2023 is annexed hereto marked P-33, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

48. Accordingly, by way of letter dated 15-09-2023, the Petitioner assumed duties in the office of Chief of Staff and the Deputy Secretary General of Parliament.

A true copy of the said letter dated 15-09-2023 is annexed hereto marked P-34, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

A true copy of the said letter dated 09-01-2024, is annexed hereto marked P-35, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

THE ANNOUNCEMENT/DECLARATION MADE BY THE HON. SPEAKER ON 19-09-2023, DECLARING THAT THE PETITIONER HAS BEEN APPOINTED TO THE POST OF CHIEF OF STAFF AND DEPUTY SECRETARY GENERAL OF PARLIAMENT

49. The Petitioner states that, thereafter, on 19-09-2023, the Hon. Speaker made a formal and official announcement to the House, that the Petitioner has been appointed to the office of Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament. No member objected to the said appointment. The Hansard, dated 03-10-2023, reflects the appointment of the Petitioner as the Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament.

True copies of the Hansards, dated 19-09-2023 and 03-10-2023 are annexed hereto respectively marked P-36(a) and P-36(b), and are pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

50. The Petitioner states that, on 19-09-2023, when the Hon. Speaker made a formal and official announcement to the House, of the petitioner's appointment, even the incumbent Prime Minister, Hon. Harini Amarasuriya was present in Parliament, and the Petitioner re-iterates that no member objected to the said appointment.

A true copy of the Minutes of the Parliament, dated 19-09-2023, is annexed hereto marked P-36(c), and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

51. The Petitioner re-iterate once again that he was selected for the said post, by and through a transparent multilateral and multi layered interview process, properly and validly conducted, in accordance with strict objectivity, whereat, the interview panel assessed and evaluated the qualifications of all candidates, in terms of the selection criteria and awarded marks accordingly.
52. The Petitioner states that it is staggeringly that the 2nd Respondent is so far-reachingly ill disposed towards the Petitioner as a result of his erroneous perception viz-a-viz the compromised incident that occurred in the speakers dining room which the Petitioner happened to witness as a result of the petitioner being compelled to bring an urgent matter of official business pertaining to a motion in the house in Parliament, to the attention of the speaker, that the 2nd Respondent has been blinded and occluded and in a motivated thus, in order to wantonly marginalize the Petitioner at any cost, even by and through the most facile and artificial and superficial excuse ("inasmuch as there is absolutely non misdemeanor or wrong doing on the part of the Petitioner that the 2nd Respondent could pin on him) that he has most ludicrously and despicably, scrape the proverbial "bottom of the barrel" and lent over far backwards in now attempting to go back most astonishingly, in point of time and contrive and engineer, the calling in question of the qualifications of the petitioner etc, to be appointed as the deputy Secretary general of Parliament.
53. The Petitioner states that, the formal letter of appointment for a period of one year from 15-09-2023, was issued to the Petitioner on 07-05-2024, and by way of the letter dated 22-05-2024, the Petitioner informed the 1st Respondent that he accepted the said appointment and assumed duties with effect from 15-09-2023.

True copies of the said letters dated 07-05-2024 and 22-05-2024 are annexed hereto respectively marked P-37(a), and P-37(b), and are pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

54. The petitioner states that, thereafter, by way of a letter dated 18-09-2024, the Petitioner requested the 1st Respondent to make his appointment permanent and confirm the same, in as much as, he wishes to continue to serve as the Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General to Parliament, permanently.

A true copy of the said letter of the Petitioner, dated 18-09-2024 is annexed hereto marked P-38, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

55. Accordingly, a subordinate officer of the 1st Respondent, for and on behalf of the 1st Respondent, wrote to the Secretary to the Hon. Prime Minister a letter dated 19-09-2024, and requested him to release the Petitioner, permanently from the post of Secretary to the office of Chief Government Whip of Parliament. Accordingly, by way of a letter dated 19-09-2024, the Petitioner was released permanently from the said post.

True copies of the said letters dated 19-09-2024 are annexed hereto respectively marked P-39(a) and P-39(b), and are pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

56. Accordingly, by way of a letter dated 23-12-2024, the 1st Respondent informed the Petitioner that he was made permanent in the post/ office of Chief of Staff and the Deputy Secretary General of Parliament , with effect from 15-09-2023.

A true copy of the said letter of the 1st Respondent, dated 23-12-2024 is annexed hereto marked P-40, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

57. Upon receipt of the said letter, dated 23-12-2024, by way of a letter dated 31-12-2024, the Petitioner informed the 1st Respondent that he received the said letter.

A true copy of the said letter of the Petitioner, is annexed hereto marked P-41, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

58. The Petitioner states that, by way of a letter dated 15-01-2025, the Petitioner requested the Commissioner General of Pensions, to take into account the initial period of service of the Petitioner in the post/office of Secretary to the Chief Government Whip of Parliament, for the purposes of calculation of the pension.

A true copy of the said letter dated 15-01-2025 is annexed hereto marked P-42, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

59. The petitioner states that, by way of a letter dated 16-06-2025, the Commissioner General of Pensions, had informed the 1st Respondent that the period of service from 03-02-2020 to 14-09-2023, at which the Petitioner served in the capacity of Secretary to the office of Chief Government Whip of Parliament, cannot be taken into account, for the purposes of calculating the pension of the Petitioner, inasmuch as, the petitioner had been employed in the said office, on contract basis. The same

was communicated to the Petitioner, by way of the 1st Respondent's letter, dated 07-07-2025.

True copies of the said letters are annexed hereto compendiously marked P-43, and are pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

60. The petitioner states that, upon receipt of the said letter dated 07-07-2025 of the 1st Respondent, the Petitioner submitted an appeal to the Secretary to the Ministry of Public Administration, dated 28-07-2025, via the 1st Respondent, which the 1st Respondent has submitted to the said Secretary of Ministry of Public Administration, by way of her letter dated 28-07-2025.

True copies of the said letter of the Petitioner, dated 28-07-2025 and the letter of the 1st Respondent, dated 28-07-2025 are annexed hereto compendiously marked P-44, and are pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

61. In response thereto, by way of a letter dated 24-10-2025, the said Secretary of the Ministry of Public Administration had informed the 1st respondent that the service period of the Petitioner in the said post of Secretary to the Chief Government Whip of Parliament cannot be considered as a pensionable service period. However, he recommended to obtain the approval of the Cabinet of Ministers, in order to consider the said period of service in the post of Secretary to the Chief Government Whip of Parliament, to be pensionable. The said letter of the Secretary to the Ministry of Public Administration was sent to the Petitioner, by way of a letter dated 04-11-2025, by a subordinate of the 1st Respondent.

True copies of the said letter of the Commissioner General of Pensions, dated 24-10-2025 and the letter of the subordinate of the 1st Respondent, dated 04-11-2025, are annexed hereto compendiously marked P-45, and are pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

62. The Petitioner further states that, by way of an appeal dated 10-11-2025, the Petitioner appealed to the Secretary to the Hon. Prime Minister, through the 1st Respondent, urging him to take steps to submit a Cabinet paper seeking a Cabinet decision, to take into account the initial period of service of the Petitioner in the post/office of Secretary to the Chief Government Whip of Parliament, for the purpose of calculation of the pension.

True copies of the letter of the Petitioner, dated 10-11-2025 and the cover letter of the 1st Respondent, dated 10-11-2025, are annexed hereto compendiously marked P-46, and are pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

63. The petitioner verily believes and has reasons to believe that the said request made by the Petitioner is pending.

64. The Petitioner most respectfully states that, the Petitioner is entitled for the pension for the period of office he served as the Secretary to the office of the Chief Government Whip :-

- a) As adverted to above, according to Clause 25(a)(xi)(i)(a), which is an amendment made to the pension minute, published in the Government gazette No. 708, dated 27-03-1992, any officer who is appointed to a post of Secretary to a Ministry or of a similar post, from outside, and if such officer has an uninterrupted period of 5 years service in the said post, such officer is entitled for the pension.
- b) Clause 25(a)(xi) (iv) provides that any officer who is receiving a similar salary as a Secretary to Ministry and holding a similar post, falls within the definition of a Secretary to the Ministry, for the purposes of pension minutes;
- c) Accordingly, as adverted to above, the Petitioner served in the office of Secretary to the office of Chief Government Whip of Parliament, from 03-02-2020 to 14-09-2023, and thereafter, and continuously functioned as the Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary of Parliament. Both the said offices are equivalent to the rank, status and salary scale of a Secretary to the Cabinet Ministry;
- d) Compositely, the Petitioner has worked in said similar posts, for more than 5 years, continuously and without any interruptions;
- e) In the event of the Secretary to the Hon. Prime Minister refused to agree to release the Petitioner to be appointed to the post of Chief of Staff and Secretary General of Parliament, as at 02-02-2025, he would have completed 5 years of uninterrupted service in the said post of Secretary to the Chief Government Whip of Parliament;
- f) Section 9(3) of the Parliamentary Staffs Act No. 9 of 1953, as amended, provide as follows :-

“(3) Where the holder of a post on the staff of the Clerk to each Chamber which is declared under subsection (1) to be a pensionable post was, prior to his appointment to that post-

(a) the holder of a post under the Government which was declared under the Minutes on Pensions to be pensionable (notwithstanding that it was so declared after he ceased to hold it); or

(b) the holder of a post on the staff of the State Council; or

(c) the holder of a post referred to in paragraph (a) and thereafter - of a post referred to in paragraph (b),

and his service in such post or posts and his service on the staff of the Clerk to the Chamber were continuous, then the service of such holder in each such post shall be deemed to be service in a pensionable post for the purposes of the Minutes on Pensions ; and those Minutes shall apply accordingly.”

For ease of perusal of Your Lordships' Court, Parliamentary Staffs Act No. 9 of 1953, as amended, is annexed hereto marked X, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

- g) The Petitioner also state that in terms of Section 20 of the Public Service Provident Fund Ordinance No: 18 of 1942 read with 48(3) and (4) of the Pension Minute, a person upon being appointed to a pensionable post in the public service, the period during which such person if had made contributions to the Public Service Provident Fund, shall be deemed service and be added to his service in the public service

A true copy of the said S.20 of the Public Service Provident Fund Ordinance No: 18 of 1942 read with 48(3) and (4) of the Pension Minute, is annexed hereto marked P-47, and pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

65. The petitioner states that, the aforesaid matters only pertain to the pension of the Petitioner and the Petitioner was functioning as the Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament, without any interruptions or hindrances, from the date of his appointment.

66. The petitioner states that, these provisions referred to above demonstrates and substantiate the position that the purported findings contained in the report of the 8th Respondent is patently, irreversibly and irremediably misconceived in law.

THE MOTIVE OF THE 2ND RESPONDENT, WHICH LED TO THE IMPUGNED INTERDICTION OF THE PETITIONER

67. The petitioner states that, on 18-06-2025, the Petitioner, entered the dining room at the office of the 2nd Respondent, to discuss a very urgent official issue that had arisen, in the petitioner's capacity as the Chief of Staff and the Deputy Secretary General of the Parliament, during usual office hours, which was also, in the usual course of discharging his functions.
68. The Petitioner states that, the Petitioner was compelled to meet the Hon. Speaker to seek instructions from the Hon. Speaker pertaining to a adjournment motion handed over to the Hon Speaker by Hon. Ajith P. Perera MP, to ascertain whether the said motion was a joint motion filed jointly by Hon. Ajith P. Perera MP and Hon. Nizam Kariyappar MP, and to obtain a copy or the original of the said motion, in order to fully clarify as to whether or not the said motion is a joint motion, inasmuch as, a claim was made by Hon. Nizam Kariyappar that the same was a joint motion, handed over to the Speaker by Hon. Ajith P. Perera and him.
69. Therefore, the Petitioner, as the Chief of Staff and the Deputy Secretary General to Parliament was forced to visit the chambers of the Hon. Speaker and meet him.
70. The Petitioner was ushered in by a Parliamentary Service Assistant, attached to the Hon. Speaker's office and upon partial entry, when the door was open, at the entrance to the said dining room, the petitioner witnessed the 2nd Respondent, and his private Secretary, the 13th Respondent.(who is known across the board, to be associated with the 2nd Respondent, even prior to the 2nd respondent's elevation as the Speaker of Parliament), in a very curious, (to articulate it charitably and relatively mildly), situation, uncommon to a male high ranking official, let alone the Speaker of Parliament and his male private secretary or for that matter, any official and his private secretary or any other person for that matter as well, which is seriously exacerbated by it occurring in the official private dining area of the Speaker of Parliament
71. The 2nd Respondent and his own private Secretary, the latter of whom is an extraordinarily close and immensely proximate associate of the 2nd respondent, and whose said proximity, had been well known, even prior to the time the 2nd Respondent was elected to Parliament, were seated very closely together, at the round dining table, in the said formal dining room, exclusively allocated to he Hon. Speaker, and very clearly, the 2nd Respondent was starkly taken aback and perturbed, by the unexpected entry of the Petitioner and hence, expressed his displeasure to the said Parliamentary Service Assistant, who ushered the Petitioner in.

72. The Petitioner does not wish to narrate in detail, as to what transpired, at the dining room exclusively allocated only to the 2nd Respondent, at this juncture, given the sensitivity of the matter, in as much as, this petition will be readily accessible to the public at large, given that it will acquire the character of a Public Document upon filing.
73. The Petitioner is however, obviously compelled, to reserve the right to narrate, the entire incident that he witnessed, by and through an Affidavit, if necessary, and to file the same, under confidential cover, for the eyes of Your Lordships' only.
74. The petitioner states that, in or around the same period, public media reported that a) the 2nd Respondent was in the habitual practice of having lunch with his private Secretary, Mr. Chameera Gallage i.e. the 13th Respondent, and b) both of whom are said to be residing at a Government House at Lauries Road, Colombo 5, c) They have unlawfully taken belongings, from the official residence of the Hon Speaker to said Lauries Road residence; d) the 2nd Respondent is using 3 vehicles, without due approval or entitlement and e) the 2nd Respondent is enjoying two petrol allowances, without approval.

True copies of the media reports pertaining to the above are annexed hereto compendiously marked P-47A, and are pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

75. However, to reasons best known to the 2nd Respondent, , the Petitioner learnt that the 2nd Respondent, and his Private Secretary, Mr. Chameera Gallage, had suspected that the Petitioner had played a direct or indirect role, in relating what he had witnessed, in the said dinning room, which was a patent, perceptual error on their part, and as a result of that misconceived perception, they developed a stark animosity against the petitioner, which was very apparent to the Petitioner.
76. The Petitioner states that, the 2nd Respondent was extremely upset and perturbed by the said news reports, and he purported to direct the 1st Respondent to carry out a preliminary inquiry into what, as stated above, he perceived erroneously, as the relaying of a certain narrative, pertaining to the 2nd Respondent and his conduct.
77. Accordingly, by way of a letter dated 11-08-2025, the 1st Respondent requested the petitioner also, to furnish evidence in respect of the said inquiry, which clearly demonstrates that the 2nd Respondent has directed the Petitioner to show cause before the inquiry.

A true copy of the said letter dated 11-08-2025 of the 1st Respondent is annexed hereto marked P-48, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

78. The petitioner states that he is reliably informed that the said inquiry is now concluded and the final report, has also been submitted to the Hon. Speaker. However, the said report was never made known to the petitioner and never even made available to the staff of the Parliament.

The Petitioner most respectfully moves that Your Lordships' Court be pleased to call for the said report, from the Respondents above named, under Article 140 of the Constitution.

79. The Petitioner states that, in those circumstances, the Petitioner learnt that one Mr. Sinnadurai Nandan, i.e. the 14th Respondents, from Kiruolopana, had submitted a purported, undated, RTI request, on 23-07-2025, inquiring about the Petitioner's previous employment, such as whether the Petitioner prior to his appointment to the post of Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General to the Parliament, held a pensionable and a permanent office, in the Public Service.

A true copy of the said RTI request, submitted by the said Mr. Sinnadurai Nandan is annexed hereto marked P-49, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

80. Most curiously, the said RTI request was copied to the 2nd Respondent and the 2nd Respondent's office had received the same on 23-07-2025, whereas the RTI unit of the Parliament, had only received it on 24-07-2025. Further curiously, the email address given in the RTI request to forward the said information is "Salithsperera433@gmail.com", which belongs to a third party, not to Sinnadurai Nandan.

81. Further most curiously, as can be observed from P-49 it self, on 23-07-2025, itself, the 2nd Respondent had directed the 1st Respondent to provide said information to the said Sinnadurai Nandan, who sought the said information. Very clearly, the said actions/directions of the 2nd Respondent were most palpably motivated and driven by an extraneous and a collateral consideration and he was acting with a personal vendetta against the Petitioner, reeking of Malice.

82. The 2nd Respondent has usurped into the functions of the Information officer of the Parliament, who is the 7th Respondent, who was exercising statutory power and authority under the provisions of Right to Information Act No. 12 of 2016.

83. The Petitioner states that, whether or not the Information officer of the Parliament is furnishing the information sought by an applicant is an objective decision, that

must be taken by the information officer and information officer alone, considering the provisions contained in the Act itself, the surrounding circumstances, and the information that had been sought.

84. Therefore, the said unlawful direction made by the 2nd Respondent, amounts to usurpation of the powers and the authority of the 2nd Respondent, and the 7th Respondent has clearly acted under dictation.

85. Therefore, the Petitioner verily believes and has reasons to believe that the 2nd Respondent and/or his Private Secretary, was behind the said RTI request and that they orchestrated the same, in order to victimize and marginalize the Petitioner and the rights and interests of the Petitioner.

86. Accordingly, and being dictated by the 2nd Respondent, the 7th Respondent has provided the said information sought purportedly by one Sinnadurei Nandanan, by way of a letter dated 25-07-2025.

A true copy of the said letter of the 7th Respondent, dated 25-07-2025 is annexed hereto marked P-50, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

87. Thereafter, by way of a further letter, dated 21-08-2025, copied inter alia to the 2nd Respondent, the said S.Nandanan, informed the information officer of the Parliament, that he has not received the information sought.

A true copy of the said letter purportedly of one S. Nandanan, dated 21-08-2025, is annexed hereto marked P-51, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

88. Furthermore, most curiously and to the shock and concern of the Petitioner, he could observe a notation from the Private Secretary of the 2nd Respondent, drawing the attention of the 7th Respondent, to the purported and utterly unlawful and illegal direction, given by the 2nd Respondent, to release the said information to said Mr. Nandanan.

89. The Petitioner states that, it is shocking and utterly unprecedented, that the Hon. Speaker and his own Private Secretary, personally called upon the 7th Respondent to provide the requested information, to the said Mr. S. Nandanan.

90. The petitioner states that, in any event, as adverted to above, on 25-07-2025 itself, the 7th Respondent had released the said information, being unlawfully dictated to by the 2nd Respondent.

91. However, to the best of the knowledge and understanding of the Petitioner, the said Mr. S. Nandanar nor any other person, had complained against the petitioner, to the office of the 1st Respondent, despite the fact that the 1st Respondent, is the proper appointing and disciplinary authority of the Petitioner.

92. In addition to the aforesaid, the Petitioner further learnt that, on or around 24-07-2025, in a further curious and disturbing move, the 2nd Respondent had unlawfully and illegally, taken possession of the personal file of the Petitioner, and upon learning of the same, the Petitioner inquired about the same from the 1st respondent.

93. On the other hand however, several RTI requests respectively bearing No.

- P/1/25/0104,
- P/1/25/0112;
- P/1/25/172;
- P/1/25/173;
- P/1/25/183;
- P/1/25/195;
- P/1/25/197;
- P/1/25/198, were submitted seeking information pertaining to the Hon. Speaker, his personal staff including the private secretary, allocated vehicles, his media units, official residence and also the report pertaining to the inquire done in respect of the leakage of purported confidential information pertaining to the Speaker, and to the best of the knowledge of the Petitioner, the 2nd Respondent, has directed the 7th Respondent and the petitioner to refrain from releasing the said information.

The Petitioner most respectfully moves that Your Lordships' Court be pleased to call for the files pertaining to the above mentioned RTI requests from the 1st and/or the 7th Respondents, under Article 140 of the Constitution.

94. In response thereto, by way of a letter dated 26-09-2025, the 1st Respondent categorically confirmed the said information, which underscores and demonstrates that the said 2nd Respondent is acting with a malicious and Machiavellian agenda, to victimize and marginalise the Petitioner.

A true copy of the said letter of the 1st Respondent, dated 26-09-2025, is annexed hereto marked P-52, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

95. The Petitioner states most respectfully that, according to Public Administration Circular No. 06/2019, dated 27-02-2019, the personal file of any officer could only be perused by a staff officer, Chief clerk/chief Management assistant or the Department Head or an officer authorized by the Head of the department.

A true copy of the Public Administration Circular No. 06/2019, dated 27-02-2019, is annexed hereto marked P-53, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

96. In the instant case, the 1st Respondent is the Head of the Department of the Petitioner and the Hon. Speaker is not a "staff officer", chief clerk or the Head of the Department of the Petitioner, and he has not been authorized by the 1st Respondent to peruse the personal file of the Petitioner, and therefore, it is undoubtedly clear that the Hon. Speaker has most illegally, taken possession of the Petitioner's file, without authority, and therefore, his actions are completely unlawful and illegal.

THE DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURE PERTAINING TO THE PARLIAMENTARY STAFF, CONTAINED IN THE DEPARTMENTAL REGULATIONS MADE UNDER SECTION 06 OF THE PARLIAMENTARY STAFFS ACT NO: 09 OF 1953 AS AMENDED BY ACT NO: 20 OF 1959 FOR DISCIPLINARY CONTROL OF THE STAFF OF PARLIAMENT, AS APPROVED BY THE STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENT ON JULY 06, 1989

97. The Petitioner states that, in terms of Sections 6 and 7 of the Parliamentary Staffs Act, **THE DISCIPLINARY AUTHORITY OF THE PETITIONER IS THE 1ST RESPONDENT, BEING THE SECRETARY GENERAL OF THE PARLIAMENT**, who shall exercise the said powers, in consultation with the Hon. Speaker, in terms of the procedure, provided for in the Regulation promulgated under Section 6 of the Act.

THE PARLIAMENTARY STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE HAS AND INDEED, CANNOT IN LAW, HAVE ANY DISCIPLINARY POWERS OR AUTHORITY OVER THE PETITIONER, IN THE PETITIONER'S CAPACITY AS THE DEPUTY SECRETARY GENERAL OF PARLIAMENT AND THE CHIEF OF STAFF OF PARLIAMENT

98. It is pertinent to state that, according to the said most categorical provisions contained in Parliamentary Staffs Act, the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee exercises no disciplinary power or authority, over the Petitioner or any other officer,

and therefore, any and all the disciplinary and other decisions taken by the said Committee, in respect of the Petitioner, is/are immediately rendered, in limine void, illegal, unlawful and ex facie ultra vires, the provisions of the Governing Law, and therefore, is/are resultantly, grossly null and void ab initio.

99. The Disciplinary Procedure in respect of the Parliamentary Staff has been promulgated under Section 6 of the Parliamentary Staffs Act, and the same is applicable in respect of the staff members of the Parliament, including the Petitioner.

A true copy of the said Disciplinary Procedure in respect of the Parliamentary Staff is annexed hereto marked P-54, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

100. The Petitioner states that, Clause 4(1) of the said Disciplinary procedure provides that the 1st Respondent Secretary General is vested with power to terminate members of the staff and vested with Disciplinary power of the Parliamentary staff, subject to the approval of the Hon. Speaker.

101. Clause 4(1) of the said Disciplinary procedure, provides that the power or mandate to cause a preliminary inquiry, when a decision has been taken to take disciplinary action against a staff member, is vested with none other than the 1st Respondent Secretary General.

102. Therefore, it is very clear and must be most categorically and most emphatically reiterated, that neither the Hon. Speaker nor the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, exercises any disciplinary or appointing power or control over the Petitioner or any other member of the staff of the Parliament.

**THE PURPORTED DECISION OF THE PARLIAMENTARY STAFF
ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO CONDUCT A PRELIMINARY INQUIRY
AGAINST THE PETITIONER, DATED 25-07-2025**

103. The petitioner states that, in a shocking and most disturbing move, at the Parliamentary Advisory Committee, dated 25-07-2025, the 2nd Respondent, informed the committee, of his own volition, that a purported ambiguity had been observed between the information in the reply letter, dated 25-07-2025, to the RTI application and the information found in the Petitioner's personal file, and therefore, the 2nd Respondent had astonishingly moved that a preliminary inquiry should be conducted in respect of the said information and the ambiguity.

A true copy of the minutes of the meeting of the Parliamentary Advisory Committee, dated 25-07-2025, is annexed hereto marked P-55, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

104. The Petitioner states that on the said date, the Opposition leader nor any member representative from the opposition, were present at the said purported meeting of the Parliamentary Advisory Committee, and the decision to conduct a preliminary inquiry, was resolved/ passed, by a purported Parliamentary Advisory Committee, which was not lawfully constituted.

105. The petitioner further states that, according to Section 3(b) of the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Act, a member nominated by the Prime Minister, may only serve on the Staff Advisory Committee, if the Minister of Finance also holds the office of Leader of the House. As the President currently holds the Finance portfolio and is not the Leader of the House, this legal requirement is not satisfied. Consequently, the statutory condition for such a nomination has not been met, rendering the appointment and participation of Deputy Minister of Finance Dr. Anil Jayantha is inter alia patently illegal, unlawful, arbitrary, ad hoc, and null and void ab initio.

106. It is most significant that, the said purported committee had decided to appoint the said one member inquiry committee, when the same had no power or mandate, in law to do so. Therefore, the said decision to appoint a single member preliminary inquiry committee, is patently illegal and unlawful and moreover, utterly misconceived in law, and therefore, null and void ab initio.

THE PURPORTED DECISION OF THE PARLIAMENTARY STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE TO APPOINT THE 8TH RESPONDENT TO CONDUCT A PRELIMINARY INQUIRY AGAINST THE PETITIONER, DATED 19-08-2025

107. The Petitioner states that, to the further shock and dismay of the Petitioner, on 19-08-2025, the 2nd Respondent, had proposed by himself to the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, to appoint the 8th Respondent, as the single member Inquirer, to conduct a purported preliminary inquiry, into the purported ambiguities arising out of the RTI query, regarding the appointment of Chief of Staff and the Deputy Secretary General of the Parliament, which the said committee had pliantly approved.

A true copy of the minutes of the said meeting of the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, dated 19-08-2025 is annexed hereto marked P-56, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

108. The Petitioner states AD INFINITUM, MOST CATEGORICALLY that, the said purported Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee and the 2nd Respondent

has/have no power or mandate whatsoever in any form of manner in law, to appoint such a Preliminary Inquiry, and therefore, the said appointment of the 8th Respondent, to conduct the said preliminary inquiry per se, is ex facie illegal, unlawful, arbitrary, precipitous, capricious and null and void *ab initio*.

109. The Petitioner states that, accordingly, any ancillary, and consequential decisions, recommendations issued by the 8th Respondent and the purported report, contrived to be compiled and prepared by the 8th Respondent too, is *inter alia* in limine nillegal, unlawful, arbitrary, precipitous, capricious and null and void *ab initio*.

110. The Petitioner further states that, from the aforesaid events and as per the minutes of the said meetings that 2nd Respondent's Private Secretary, Mr. Chameera Gallage, had also attended the meeting, without any official authority.

111. The Petitioner further states that, from the aforesaid events and the minutes of the said meetings, it is very clear that the 8th Respondent is an inquiry officer, hand picked by the 2nd Respondent and/or his Private Secretary, to conduct the said purported preliminary inquiry, and the Petitioner verily believes and has reasons to believe that they are all acting hand in glove with the 2nd Respondent and he, as a stooge of the 2nd Respondent, is acting at the behest of the said respondent, executing a well -engineered plan **MACHIAVELLIAN INTENT AND displaying an EXTREME FORM OF INSIDIOUS AND SINISTER, TOXICALLY VENOMOUS AGENDA**, to wantonly inflict, the greatest possible and to prejudice, harm and damage to the Petitioner and to his career, his standing, and to his impeccable reputation.

THE APPOINTMENT LETTER ISSUED BY THE 7TH RESPONDENT, DATED 20-08-2025, ADDRESSED TO THE 8TH RESPONDENT

112. The petitioner states that, accordingly, the 7th Respondent has sent a letter, dated 20-08-2025, addressed to the 8th Respondent, informing him that he has been appointed to carry out the said preliminary inquiry.

A true copy of the said letter of the 7th Respondent, dated 20-08-2025 is annexed hereto marked P-57, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

113. The Petitioner states that, it is shocking and disturbing that, from a perusal of the said letter, it could be observed that the mandate contained in the said letter is different and distinct, to the mandate of the single member inquirer, approved by the purported Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee.

According to the said letter, purported mandate or the subject matter before the 8th Respondent, is to inquire into the selection of the Petitioner to the post of Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament, and the Petitioner's qualifications and the confirmation of employment of the Petitioner. However, (very strictly without any prejudice to the primary abiding position, that the entire process of appointing and mobilizing the advisory committee, the purported mandate, as contained in the letter marked P-56, was to inquire into the purported ambiguities arising out of RTI query regarding the appointment of Chief of Staff and the Deputy Secretary General of the Parliament, and hence, they are completely contradictory.

114. Furthermore, and once against, without any the mandate approved by the Staff Advisory Committee on 19.08.2025 marked as P-56 was to conduct a 'preliminary investigation', whereas the appointment letter of the 8th Respondent produced marked as P-57, was for a 'preliminary inquiry'.

115. The Petitioner further states, once again without any prejudice, that, according to the minute dated 20-08-2025, entered by the Director (Administration) of the Parliament, the mandate approved by the Staff Advisory Committee, was arbitrarily changed, and the said letter dated 20-08-2025, carries the arbitrarily altered/changed mandate, according to the direct instructions given by the 2nd Respondent.

116. From the very same minute, it could be observed that the said minutes have been duly approved by the 2nd Respondent.

A true copy of the relevant document containing the said minute, dated 20-08-2025, is annexed hereto marked P-58, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

117. The Petitioner further states that, the aforesaid turn of events, further fortifies the position of the Petitioner that the 2nd Respondent is acting in furtherance of a virulent, vicious and a malicious agenda, against the Petitioner.

118. The Petitioner re-iterate most respectfully that, in terms of the provisions contained in Clauses 4 and 5 of the Disciplinary procedure, produced, marked P-54, it is only the 1st Respondent, Secretary General of Parliament, who has been vested by law, with the legitimate power, mandate and jurisdiction, to conduct a preliminary inquiry if any, against the Petitioner, and the 2nd Respondent or the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee are totally and utterly denuded and devoid of any such power or authority. Therefore, this procedure is most patently, bad in law, both per se as well as simpliciter

119. The Petitioner further states that, the 8th Respondent is only retired Additional Secretary. His last rank was below the rank of the Petitioner, in as much as, the office of the Chief of Staff and the Deputy Secretary General of Parliament, is equivalent to the rank of a Secretary to the Cabinet Ministry.

A true copy of the CV of the 8th Respondent is annexed hereto marked P-59, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

120. The Petitioner states that upon a perusal of the said CV of the 8th Respondent, produced marked P-59, it is pertinent to note that the 2nd Respondent has inserted a minute addressed to the 1st Respondent, to appoint the 8th Respondent as the purported inquiring officer, to conduct the said preliminary inquiry.

121. The Petitioner states that, according to Clause 7(1) of the Disciplinary Procedure of the Parliamentary staff, marked P-54, an inquiry in respect of an officer of the Parliamentary staff, should be a person who holds and has held, an office in the Parliament Staff or in the Public Service or the Judicial Service and who is senior to that of the accused officer.

122. The petitioner states that, as can be observed from the CV of the said 8th Respondent, produced marked P-59, the most senior post/office held by the 8th Respondent, prior to his retirement, had been the office/post of Additional Secretary to a Ministry, which is below the rank of the office/post of Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General of Parliament, AND therefore, the appointment of the said 8th Respondent, to conduct the said purported preliminary inquiry, in respect of the appointment of the Petitioner, is inter alia, totally violative of the provisions contained in Clause 7 of the Disciplinary Procedure, produced marked P-54 and Chapter XLVIII Section 13 of Establishment Code, regarding the suitability of investigating officers and therefore, is illegal, unlawful and null and void.

123. The petitioner further states that it also constitutes a Violation of the Principles of Natural Justice: being specifically the rule against bias (Nemo iudex in causa sua), because a junior investigating a senior, at the behest of another person, who is blatantly usurping power (given that the 2nd respondent has no powers) creates a "reasonable apprehension of bias."

THE LETTER OF THE 8TH RESPONDENT, DATED 04-09-2025, BY WHICH THE PETITIONER WAS ASKED TO APPEAR BEFORE HIM ON 04-09-2025, TO GIVE A STATEMENT

124. The Petitioner states that, thereafter by way of a letter dated 04-09-2025, the 8th Respondent informed the Petitioner to appear before him, to give a statement for the purported preliminary inquiry, conducted by him.

A true copy of the said letter dated 04-09-2025 of the 8th Respondent is annexed hereto marked P-60, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

125. The Petitioner states that, thereafter, on 17-09-2025, 22-09-2025 and 16-10-2025, the Petitioner appeared before the 8th Respondent and recorded statements.

126. However, it was most categorically recorded that the petitioner is furnishing the said statements, without any form of prejudice whatsoever, to *inter alia* the right of the Petitioner, to object to and challenge the legality of the appointment of the 8th Respondent, as well as the purported preliminary inquiry conducted by the 8th Respondent and the objections pertaining to the lack of due seniority in public service.

The Petitioner does not have the copies of the said statements given by the petitioner, and therefore, most respectfully moves, that Your Lordships' Court be pleased to call for the same under Article 140 of the Constitution.

127. The Petitioner states that he also submitted a written statement, dated 30-10-2025, addressed to the 8th Respondent.

128. By way of the said statement, the Petitioner more fully answered the purported allegations made against the petitioner, but however, he reserved the right to raise objections in respect of the illegality pertaining to the said preliminary inquiry.

A true copy of the said statement of the Petitioner, dated 30-10-2025, is annexed hereto marked P-61, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

129. The Petitioner re-iterate that the said purported preliminary inquiry conducted by the 8th Respondent, is patently illegal, unlawful and ultra vires the disciplinary procedure, pertaining to the Parliamentary staff, produced marked P-54, and the provisions contained in Parliamentary Staffs Act as well.

**THE PURPORTED REPORT, DATED 10-11-2025, SUBMITTED BY
THE 8TH RESPONDENT**

130. Most disturbingly, the petitioner learnt that the 8th Respondent had also submitted his purported illegal and unlawful report, addressed to the 2nd Respondent, finding most purportedly, and without basis inter alia that the Petitioner had submitted false information, in order to be selected for the post of Chief of Staff and Deputy Secretary General to the Parliament, and thereafter, to confirm his employment and to obtain a salary scale or increment, which it was alleged, the Petitioner is not entitled to, and he has most grievously, proceeded to purportedly recommend, to interdict the Petitioner from service and to take disciplinary action.

131. The Petitioner states that the said purported report was never made available to the Petitioner, but however, the said report was later submitted to the Parliament by a member of Parliament.

A true copy of the said purported report, dated 10-11-2025 is annexed hereto marked P-62, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

132. The Petitioner further states that, from a perusal of the said report, it is very clear that the said findings of the 8th Respondent, are without any form of the remotest merit whatsoever and are completely baseless.

133. It is clear that the said actions and the findings of the 8th Respondent are motivated by collateral and extraneous considerations, and that he has been acting at the behest and urgings of the 2nd respondent, in order to serve the 2nd respondent's most virulent agenda against the petitioner and therefore, cannot withstand objective scrutiny.

134. The appointment letter of the 8th Respondent, had been prepared solely based on the verbal instructions provided by the 2nd Respondent to the 1st Respondent and the Director Administration at the time, being Ms. Indira Dissanayaka, containing a paragraph specifically requiring the 8th Respondent to have the report submitted directly to him, denying any opportunity for the 1st Respondent who is the disciplinary authority of the Petitioner, to access the report

THE PURPORTED IMPUGNED DECISION OF THE PARLIAMENTARY STAFF ADVISORY COMMITTEE, TO INTERDICT THE PETITIONER, AS EVINCED BY THE LETTER OF THE 1ST RESPONDENT, DATED 23-01-2026

135. The Petitioner states that, thereafter, and to the utter shock, dismay and anguish of the Petitioner, he received a letter dated 23-01-2026, informing the petitioner that on 23-01-2026, the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, had purportedly

decided to interdict the Petitioner forthwith, and that a Charge sheet will be issued in the future.

A true copy of the said purported letter of interdiction, dated 23-01-2026 is annexed hereto marked P-63, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

136. The Petitioner states that the said purported decision of the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, to interdict the Petitioner is inter alia illegal and unlawful and is patently ultra vires, in as much as, the said Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee or the 2nd Respondent, have no power or mandate, in law, in any manner whatsoever, to interdict the Petitioner or to conduct an illegitimate inquiry and to recommend the interdiction of the petitioner, and in fact, the said Committee exercises no disciplinary control or power, whatsoever, over the Petitioner and nor for that matter, over any other officer of the Parliamentary staff.

137. The Section 7 of the Parliamentary Staff Act no: 09 of 1953, has expressly excluded the Staff Advisory Committee from exercising any disciplinary control whatsoever over the staff, and has expressly vested in the 1st Respondent, the power to take disciplinary action, including interdiction, punishment and dismissal of the staff, in consultation with the 2nd Respondent.

138. Hence, the impugned decision to interdict the Petitioner is ultra vires the provisions of the Parliamentary Staff Act No: 09 of 1953. It is amply clear that such an exclusion is embodied in the said Section 7, which is intended to avoid any political interference on the staff of the Secretary General, by the Staff Advisory Committee, which is a body comprised of politicians and thereby, to ensure an independent, and high integrity, Parliamentary staff service, that does not ingratiate himself/herself, itself to any politician/s nor succumb to any pressures. The independence of the parliamentary staff, is of the utmost, vital essence.

139. Therefore, the said decision of the Parliamentary Advisory Committee, is vitiated by a patent want of Jurisdiction, and therefore, is not only patently and ex facie bad, but also irremediably bad in law and cannot be resuscitated in any form or manner.

140. The Petitioner further states that, clearly, the said Parliamentary Advisory Committee, has usurped the powers of the 1st Respondent, and therefore, on that score alone, the impugned decision of the said Committee, to interdict the Petitioner and to serve a Charge sheet on the Petitioner, is inter alia, patently misconceived in law, and is therefore, immediately rendered, in limine, illegal, null and void.

141. According to the provisions contained in Clause No. 9 of the Disciplinary procedure pertaining to the staff of the Parliament, the power to interdict is vested with the 1st Respondent and the 1st Respondent alone, and she must exercise the said power, using and bringing her objective mind to bear.

142. However, in the instant case, the impugned interdiction was not caused or decided upon by the 1st Respondent, and instead, the said decision has been taken by the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, which is not lawfully vested with any mandate or jurisdiction to impose any disciplinary action.

143. The petitioner further states that, the circumstances under which or instances in which, an officer of the Parliamentary staff, is to be interdicted, are stipulated in Clause 9 of the Disciplinary procedure marked P-54. The Petitioner most respectfully states that, in any event, the purported allegations or charges, against the petitioner, do not satisfy the said criteria as well.

144. Without any form of prejudice to the aforesaid argument advanced by the Petitioner, the Petitioner states as follows.

145. The Petitioner states that, as could be observed from the purported letter of interdiction, dated 23-01-2026, the said Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, has suddenly taken a decision to interdict the Petitioner and to subject him to a purported formal disciplinary inquiry, without providing any form or prior notice to the Petitioner and without affording him a full and fair hearing to the Petitioner nor with any form of even the remotest recourse to the petitioner.

146. Therefore, the said decision of the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, to interdict the Petitioner, dated 23-01-2026, and to issue a charge sheet on the Petitioner, has been taken in gross and most recklessly wanton, violation of the fundamental postulates of the doctrine of of Natural Justice, including *audi alterem partem* and fundamental tenets of public law, Administrative Law and the paramount, Rule of Law.

THE LETTER OF THE PETITIONER, DATED 23-01-2026

147. Upon receipt of the said letter of the 1st Respondent, the Petitioner addressed a letter dated 23-01-2026, informing the 1st respondent, that he received the said letter, without any form of prejudice to his legal rights, and requested the 1st Respondent to hand over a copy of the purported preliminary inquiry report, compiled by the 8th Respondent forthwith.

A true copy of the said letter of the Petitioner, dated 23-01-2026, is annexed hereto marked P-64, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

148. The Petitioner states that, as adverted to above, he requested a copy of the said purported report submitted by the 8th Respondent to the 2nd Respondent by P-64, but however, the 1st Respondent by letter dated 29-01-2026 responded to the Petitioner, on the instructions of the 2nd Respondent, refusing to issue the said report.

A true copy of the said letter of the 1st Respondent, dated 29-01-2026, is annexed hereto marked P-64(a), and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

149. This clearly indicates that the 2nd Respondent, intends to deny the Petitioner of having any access whatsoever to the said purported illegal report, based on which the illegitimate and ill fated letter of interdiction, had been issued. This in it self is a patent violation of basic Rules of Natural Justice, including Audi Alterem Partem, and fundamental tenets of Administrative Law, by the 2nd Respondent and/or any one or more of the Respondents above named.

150. The Petitioner also submitted a RTI request, dated 25-01-2026, addressed to the information officer of the Parliament, *inter alia* requesting for a certified copy of the purported preliminary inquiry report compiled and submitted to the 2nd Respondent by the 8th Respondent. In response thereto, by way of a letter dated 26-01-2026, the 7th Respondent informed the Petitioner that he received the said request.

True copies of the said RTI request of the Petitioner, dated 25-01-2026 and the letter of acknowledgement of the 7th Respondent, dated 26-01-2026, are annexed hereto compendiously marked P-65, and are pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

151. The Petitioner further states that the Petitioner observed that the salary of the Petitioner for the month of January was fully paid, and therefore, by way of a letter dated 27-01-2026, the Petitioner informed the 1st Respondent of the same, and queried as to whether he should take steps to return part of the said salary, in as much as, he had been interdicted with effect from 23-01-2026, without pay.

A true copy of the said letter of the petitioner, dated 27-01-2026, is annexed hereto marked P-66, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

**THE PURPORTED CHARGE SHEET, DATED 02-02-2026, SERVED ON
THE PETITIONER**

152. To the further shock and dismay of the petitioner, he received a purported Charge sheet, dated 02-02-2026, sent to the Petitioner by the 1st Respondent, as directed and decided upon by the Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, pursuant to its decision.

A true copy of the said Charge sheet, dated 02-02-2026 is annexed hereto marked P-67, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

153. Whilst most categorically and totally emphatically denying the charges contained in the said purported charge sheet, the petitioner states that the said charge sheet is demonstrably Ab Initio void, in as much as, the same has been issued pursuant to a decision taken by the purported Parliamentary Staff Advisory Committee, which has no power or mandate or jurisdiction, in law, to issue the same, and therefore, the same is patently ultra vires,

154. Therefore, the said purported charge sheet, dated 02-02-2026, which was served on the Petitioner is inter alia illegal, unlawful, arbitrary, capricious and null and void ab initio.

155. The Petitioner out of abundance caution, sent a letter to the 1st Respondent, dated 09-02-2026, requesting for several documents to respond to the illegally issued charge sheet and requested for a period of 30 days from the receipt of said documents to the said patently misconceived and illegal charge sheet, inasmuch as, the petitioner was contemplating to institute legal action against the said actions of the Respondents above named.

A true copy of the said letter of the Petitioner, dated 09-02-2026 is annexed hereto marked P-68, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

156. The petitioner further states that, the Petitioner made a complaint dated 02-02-2026, to the Commission to investigate Bribery and Corruption, against the 2nd Respondent, as well as against the private Secretary of the 2nd Respondent, ie. 13th Respondent, in respect of as many as eight specific acts of corruption committed by the said 2nd and the 13th Respondents.

A true copy of the said complaint submitted by the petitioner, to the Commission to investigate Bribery and Corruption, against the 2nd Respondent, as well as against the private Secretary of the 2nd Respondent, ie. 13th Respondent, dated 02-02-2026, is annexed hereto marked P-69, and is pleaded as part and parcel hereof.

157. In the totality of all the aforesaid circumstances and the events and decisions taken that the petitioner has expressly pleaded in great detail, and for the reasons set out unequivocally and with complete clarity, The impugned decisions **is/are totally illegal, *ultra vires*, unlawful, wrongful, arbitrary, unreasonable, unfair, discriminatory, irrational, misconceived, erroneous, in breach of the principles of Natural Justice and reeking most despicably, with mala fides and with ulterior motives and collateral and extraneous considerations and severely undermine and erode the legitimate expectations entertained by the Petitioner and therefore, cannot withstand even the most basic test of objective scrutiny and are most despicably bad in law.**

158. In view of the foregoing, the Petitioner is now left with no other alternative, but to invoke the Writ jurisdiction of Your Lordships' Court under and in terms of Article 140 of the Constitution, in order to seek due redress and to urgently safeguard its rights, interests and expectations.

159. The Petitioner further state that grave and irreparable loss, damage and harm will be caused to the Petitioner and that this Application will be rendered nugatory, unless the interim orders prayed for herein are granted.

160. The Petitioner states that, given the brevity of time and the extreme exigent attendant circumstances under which the Petitioner has filed the instant Application, the Petitioner most respectfully reserves the right to amend this petition and/or to plead and produce further documents and material and/or to add further parties to the instant application, should the necessity arise for the same, and depending on the disclosures made by the Respondents above- named.

161. The Petitioner state that he has not invoked the jurisdiction of Your Lordships' Court previously, in respect of the identical subject matter of this application.

WHEREFORE the Petitioner prays that Your Lordships' Court be pleased to ;

- a) Issue Notice on the Respondents;
- b) Grant and issue a mandate in the nature of a Writ of Certiorari, quashing the grossly illegal, unlawful, patently *ultra vires*, and grievously mala fide and malicious, impugned decision of the 2nd to the 6th Respondents and/or any one or more of them, to interdict the

petitioner, with effect from 23-01-2026, without pay, as demonstrated in the letter of the 1st Respondent, dated 23-01-2026, produced marked P-63;

- c) Grant and issue a mandate in the nature of a Writ of Certiorari, quashing the purported letter of interdiction, issued by the 1st Respondent, dated 23-01-2026, produced marked P-63, both *per se* and simpliciter;
- d) Grant and issue mandate/s in the nature of Writ of Certiorari, quashing the totally illegal Charge sheet, dated 02-02-2026, produced marked P-67;
- e) Grant and issue a mandate in the nature of a Writ of Certiorari, quashing the purported impugned preliminary inquiry report, dated 10-11-2025, prepared by the 8th Respondent, produced marked P-62, and the findings and the recommendations contained therein;
- f) Grant and issue mandate/s in the nature of Writ/s of certiorari, calling for and quashing any and all ancillary decisions and/or consequential decisions if any, taken by the 1st to the 6th Respondents, relying on the purported illegal findings and recommendations contained in the purported preliminary inquiry report, dated 10-11-2025, as prepared by the 8th Respondent, produced marked P-62;
- g) Grant and issue a mandate in the nature of Writ of Prohibition, restraining the 1st to the 6th Respondents and/or any one or more of the Respondents and/or their servants and Agents, from conducting or causing to be conducted, any disciplinary inquiry, against the Petitioner, based on an illegal charge sheet, produced marked P-67;
- h) Until the final determination of this Application, issue an interim order, staying the grossly illegal, unlawful, patently ultra vires, and grievously mala fide and malicious, impugned decision of the 2nd to the 6th Respondents and/or any one or more of them, to interdict the petitioner, with effect from 23-01-2026, without pay, as demonstrated in the letter of the 1st Respondent, dated 23-01-2026, produced marked P-63;
- i) Until the final determination of this Application, issue an interim order, staying the purported letter of interdiction, issued by the 1st Respondent, dated 23-01-2026, produced marked P-63;

- j) Until the final determination of this Application , issue an interim order, staying the totally illegal Charge sheet, dated 02-02-2026, produced marked P-67;
- k) Until the final determination of this Application, issue an interim order, staying the purported impugned preliminary inquiry report, dated 10-11-2025, prepared by the 8th Respondent, produced marked P-62, and the findings and the recommendations contained therein;
- l) Until the final determination of this Application, issue an interim order, staying any and all the ancillary decisions and/or consequential decisions if any, taken by the 1st to the 6th Respondents, relying on the purported illegal findings and recommendations contained in the purported preliminary inquiry report, dated 10-11-2025, as prepared by the 8th Respondent, produced marked P-62;
- m) Until the final determination of this Application, issue an interim order, , restraining the 1st to the 6th Respondents and/or any one or more of the Respondents and/or their servants and Agents, from conducting or causing to be conducted, any disciplinary inquiry, against the Petitioner, based on an illegal charge sheet, produced marked P-67;
- n) Make order directing the 1st to the 7th Respondents above named to maintain the status quo that prevailed prior to the impugned decision of the 2nd to the 6th Respondents and/or any one or more of them to interdict the petitioner, with effect from 23-01-2026, without pay, as demonstrated in the letter of the 1st Respondent, dated 23-01-2026, produced marked P-63;
- o) Make Order in terms of article 140 of the Constitution, and call for and examine the entire record, including inter alia :-
 - a) A certified copy of the purported preliminary inquiry report, dated 10-11-2025, prepared by the 8th Respondent;
 - b) All the statements recorded by the 8th Respondent, including the petitioner and other purported witnesses;
 - c) Report pertaining to the leakage of sensitive information in respect of the Hon. Speaker, carried out by the office of the 1st Respondent, which is in possession of the 1st and/or the 7th Respondents above named;

d) The original files of record under following references

- i. PS/ADM/EST/3/EOG173(xiv)
- ii. PS/ADM/EST/01/PF 2115
- iii. PS/ADM/EST/03/EOG 173 (xv)
- iv. PS/ADM/EST/03/EOG 173 (XIV);

e) Relevant files pertaining to the following RTI requests :-

- P/1/25/0104,
- P/1/25/0112;
- P/1/25/172;
- P/1/25/173;
- P/1/25/183;
- P/1/25/195;
- P/1/25/197;
- P/1/25/198;

f) Any minutes and directions issued by the Hon. Speaker addressed to the 1st Respondent, the Petitioner and/or the 7th Respondent, in respect of the following RTI requests :-

- P/1/25/0104,
- P/1/25/0112;
- P/1/25/172;
- P/1/25/173;
- P/1/25/183;
- P/1/25/195;
- P/1/25/197;
- P/1/25/198;

a) Award costs to the Petitioner; and

- b) Grant the Petitioner such other and further reliefs as to Your Lordships' Court shall seem meet.


**REGISTERED ATTORNEY-AT-LAW
FOR THE PETITIONER**

S. W. Anila Kumara

Attorney-at-Law & Commissioner for Oaths
No. 349/1 D, Ganewaththa, Biyagama.
Tel: 077 5257722

Settled by:-

**Rukshan Senadheera
Attorney-at-Law**

**Sanjeeva Jayawardana
President's Counsel**