

## Table of Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	VI
NOTE ON THE AUTHORS .....	VII
ABBREVIATIONS.....	VIII
LATIN MAXIMS AND PHRASES – GENERAL EXPLANATIONS.....	X
PREFACE .....	XII
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY .....	XIII
1. INTRODUCTION .....	1
1.1 INITIAL OBSERVATIONS.....	1
1.2 METHODOLOGY.....	10
2. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND TO THE WRIT REMEDY OF <i>HABEAS CORPUS</i> IN SRI LANKA AND EARLY CASES .....	13
2.1 <i>THE CASE OF W.A. DE SILVA</i> .....	13
2.1.1 The crux of the decision .....	13
2.1.1.1 Background.....	13
2.1.1.2 The scope of applicability of martial law.....	14
2.1.1.3 The power of superior courts to review by <i>habeas corpus</i> the legality of arrests and detentions .....	15
2.1.2 Reflections on the Ruling .....	16
2.1.2.1 Summary of the propositions of law established in the ruling .....	16
2.2 <i>THE BRACEGIRDLE CASE</i> .....	17
2.3 <i>THE CASE OF THOMAS PERERA ALIAS BANDA</i> .....	20
3. THE JUDICIAL RESPONSE TO THE <i>HABEAS CORPUS</i> REMEDY DURING 1948-1977.....	22
3.1 THE PERIOD PRIOR TO THE FIRST REPUBLICATION CONSTITUTION (1948-1972) .....	22
3.1.1 <i>Thamboo v. the Superintendent of Prisons</i> .....	22

<b>3.2 WRITS OF <i>HABEAS CORPUS</i> UNDER THE FIRST REPUBLICAN CONSTITUTION (1972-1977).....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>3.1.2 <i>Hidramani v. Ratnavale</i>.....</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>3.1.2.1 The crux of the decision.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>3.1.2.2 Other propositions laid down in the decision.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>3.1.2.3 Some observations .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>3.1.3 <i>Gunesekera v. De Fonseka</i>.....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>3.1.4 <i>Gunesekera v. Ratnavale</i> .....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>4. THE MODERN REMEDY IN ISSUE: RESPONSES OF THE SUPREME COURT AND THE COURT OF APPEAL TO THE <i>HABEAS CORPUS</i> REMEDY UNDER THE 1978 CONSTITUTION .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>4.1 INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS .....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>4.2 INTERNATIONAL STANDARDS.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>4.3 THE STANDARD PROCEDURE ADOPTED BY THE COURTS IN <i>HABEAS CORPUS</i> APPLICATIONS .....</b>	<b>36</b>
<b>4.4 JUDICIAL RESPONSE OF THE SUPREME COURT TO WRITS OF <i>HABEAS CORPUS</i> .....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>4.4.1 <i>Rasammah v. Major General Perera and Others</i>.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>4.4.2 <i>Chelliah v. Inspector of Police and Others</i> .....</b>	<b>38</b>
<b>4.4.2.1 What constitutes 'unlawful activity'? .....</b>	<b>39</b>
<b>4.4.2.2 Executive opinion regarding 'strong suspicion'.....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>4.4.3 <i>Juwani v. Lathif, Police Inspector, Special Task Force and Others</i> .....</b>	<b>40</b>
<b>4.4.4 <i>Shanthi Chandrasekeram v. D.B. Wijethunga and Others</i> ....</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>4.4.5 <i>Kanapathipillai Machchavallavan v. Officer in Charge, Army Camp Plantain Point, Trincomalee and Three Others</i> .....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>4.4.5.1 The crux of the decision.....</b>	<b>48</b>
<b>4.4.5.2 Reflections on the ruling.....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>4.5 THE IMPACT OF THE DOCTRINE OF THE SUPREMACY OF PARLIAMENT AND SEPARATION OF POWERS ON THE RIGHT TO SEEK <i>HABEAS CORPUS</i> .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>4.6 JUDICIAL RESPONSE OF THE COURT OF APPEAL TO WRITS OF <i>HABEAS CORPUS</i> .....</b>	<b>59</b>

4.6.1	Orders of the Court of Appeal during 1981-1993.....	61
4.6.1.1	Orders made in the context of the ethnic conflict .....	62
4.6.1.1.1	<i>Senthilnayagam v. Seneviratne</i> .....	62
4.6.1.1.2	<i>Paramasothy v. Delgoda and Another</i> .....	69
4.6.1.2	Orders relating to the second Southern insurrection .....	71
4.6.1.2.1	<i>Kodippilige Seetha v. Saravanathan</i> .....	71
4.6.1.2.2	<i>Susila de Silva v. Weerasinghe and Others</i> .....	73
4.6.1.2.3	<i>Dhammika Siriyalatha v. Baskaralingam and Four Others</i> .....	76
4.6.1.2.4	<i>Seetha v. Sharvananda</i> .....	84
4.6.2	Orders of the Court of Appeal in <i>Habeas Corpus</i> Applications during 1994-2002 .....	87
4.6.2.1	Decisions Upholding the Merits of the Applications .....	91
4.6.2.1.1	<i>Leeda Violet and Others v. OIC Police Station, Dickwella and Others</i> .....	91
4.6.2.1.2	<i>Vajira Ranjani Maddhumakumari v. OIC Peliyagoda..</i> .....	94
4.6.2.1.3	Reflections on the Cases .....	95
4.6.2.1.4	Developments in the post-1994 period.....	99
4.6.2.2	Dismissals by the Court of Appeal .....	107
4.6.2.2.1	Dismissals upon withdrawal on the basis that the detainee is indicted, or is arrested, or is produced before the Magistrate's Court and remanded or otherwise placed in lawful or fiscal custody .....	116
4.6.2.2.2	Dismissals upon withdrawal on the basis that the detainee is released or discharged .....	120
4.6.2.2.3	Dismissals upon withdrawal with no reasons disclosed .....	127
4.6.2.2.4	Dismissals upon application for withdrawal due to the inability of the petitioner to travel to Colombo.....	128
4.6.2.2.5	Dismissals on the basis that the petitioner is absent and unrepresented .....	128

4.6.2.2.6	Dismissals on the basis that the issue of the writ was not warranted .....	137
4.6.2.2.7	Dismissals on the basis that the detainee was imprisoned after arrest and the High Court or the Magistrate had granted bail.....	192
4.6.2.2.8	Dismissals on the basis that the detainee has been sent for rehabilitation.....	192
<b>5.</b>	<b>THE MODERN REMEDY IN ISSUE: <i>HABEAS CORPUS</i> APPLICATIONS BEFORE THE PROVINCIAL HIGH COURTS UNDER THE 1978 CONSTITUTION .....</b>	<b>194</b>
5.1	INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS ON THE PROVINCIAL HIGH COURT OF THE NORTHERN PROVINCE 2003–2004 .....	194
5.2	OVERVIEW OF THE CASE RECORDS AND FINDINGS.....	196
5.3	FAILURE OR INABILITY TO EFFICACIOUSLY EXERCISE THE REMEDY AT THE PROVINCIAL LEVEL .....	200
5.3.1	General Reflections .....	200
5.3.2	Inordinate Delays.....	202
5.3.3	Nature of the Complaint .....	206
5.3.4	The Defences Advanced by the Respondents.....	207
5.3.5	Delays at the Inquiry in the Magistrate's Court.....	209
5.3.5.1	Delays due to political conditions .....	209
5.3.5.2	Delays due to security concerns.....	210
5.3.5.3	Observations of the Magistrate .....	210
5.3.5.4	Appointment of an interpreter.....	211
5.3.5.5	Other factors .....	212
5.3.6	Contemporary Issues faced at the Provincial Level.....	212
5.3.6.1	Non-existing (or lapsed) detention orders.....	213
5.3.6.2	The question of surrendees and the need for a Special Division of the High Court to deal with them .....	215
5.3.6.3	The High Court's jurisdiction to hear and determine ( <i>ipso facto</i> ) <i>habeas corpus</i> applications .....	217
5.3.6.4	Issues relating to duplicity of indictments .....	218

5.3.6.5	Issues of rendering the writ of <i>habeas corpus</i> irrelevant or inapplicable .....	218
5.3.6.6	Furnishing of the order of the <i>prima facie</i> inquiry in the Magistrate's Court to the petitioner as of right .....	219
5.3.6.7	General issues .....	220
6.	<b>CONCLUSION: THE VIRTUAL ECLIPSE OF <i>HABEAS CORPUS</i> IN RESPECT OF ENFORCED DISAPPEARANCES IN SRI LANKA.....</b>	222
	<b>TABLE OF REFERENCES .....</b>	236
	<b>INDEX OF TERMS, CASES &amp; INSTRUMENTS.....</b>	275
	<b>LIST OF CHARTS.....</b>	282