

Ranjan Ramanayaka shall be Free

With reference to SC Rule No.1/2018 of Supreme Court, Sad da Vidda Rajapakse Palanga Pathira Ambakumarage Ranjan Leo Sylvester Alphonsu alias Ranjan Ramanayaka was sentenced to a term of four (4) years rigorous imprisonment.

The court has made attempt to backup secondary witnesses (recordings) with primary eye witnesses. That was not needed when respondent Ranjan Ramanayaka stated "Majority in Sri Lanka are corrupted Judges, corrupted lawyers. They work for money." and "I will not, under any circumstances, withdraw the opinion expressed by me. Therefore I told only about these Judges." Resulting rejection of his defence.

When considering cause-and-effect, if there are no corrupted judges and lawyers (cause), then Ranjan's statement shall be tested (effect) for contempt of court by Article 105(3) of the Constitution. If there are corrupted judges, the court system of Sri Lanka including Supreme court loses lawful existence in the eyes of sovereign people. The term 'majority' in Ranjan's statement is not significant when at least one judge found guilty and such incident cannot be isolated to favor the integrity of the judiciary. Is the court system in Sri Lanka designed to guarantee zero corruption? You can whisper the practical truth.

Did supreme court consider the aforesaid cause before giving judgment on result? If not, the decision is technically false (uncaused effect). Furthermore, CAN supreme court consider the content of Ranjan's statement as the cause? (භාරාගේ අම්මගෙන් ජේන ඇහුවා වාගේ - වැරදි වසන් කරන අයගෙන් ම වැරද්දක් ගැන ඇහුවා වගෙයි.) "Nemo judex in causa sua" - "no-one is judge in his own cause." It is a principle of natural justice that no person can judge a case in which they have an interest. Justice must not only be done, but must be seen to be done. In the eyes of sovereign people, supreme court has given a biased decision without adhering to natural justice. The intention was to cover-up their back side.

This case has cited a similar judgment Perera Vs The King 1951 AC 482. Perera being a Member of the House of Representative of Ceylon paid a visit to the Remand Prison in Colombo and made the following observation in the Prison Visitors Book: "Visited Remand Prison in the company of Jailor Wijewardena. Premises clean. Adequate library facilities required. The present practice of appeals of Remand prisoners being heard in their absence is not healthy. When represented by Counsel or otherwise the prisoner should be present at proceedings. In my opinion not more than one prisoner should be in a cell (7x9) approximately." Mr. Perera was found guilty of contempt of court. That decision with evil intent was overruled stating "Finally his criticism was honest criticism on a matter of public importance."

Let me emphasize the intentional hookup to be judged resulting Ranjan's rigorous imprisonment at the arraignment process, where he pleaded not guilty. His worst enemy was his attorney. Could that be M.A. Sumanthiran?

Whatever the case, any prisoner can be free in few days without court trial. Check my Freedom Project. www.intellectforum.com/freedom. Is Ranjan allergic to freedom? Can he handle it like a big boy?

Lakshan Bandara

(Agent of Sovereign People)