

Dear [brother],

[Black my original statement, blue the reply, red my response]

Your central assertion is:

'Both [claims] are manifestly untrue, and I think I need say no more about the reliability of your sources.'

How do you know?

1/ Jeyakanth Selvarajah has lied repeatedly, publicly and brazenly

2/ He has lied deliberately not just about finances,

Rather than keep making these assertions, could you restrict yourself to statements for which you have two or three credible witnesses please.

The disparities between the court documents and Jeyakanth's written statements are huge. Unless the courts' findings are completely overturned this is a safe and appropriate legal assertion.

3/ but the repeated sodomy, under forced sedation, of at least one child under his own charge, and by his own employees.

I would just say 2 or 3 credible witnesses please. But what are the cases of sodomy you refer to here? Is this the testimony and/or evidence produced in the High Court case? I have not seen any reference to sodomy. Do you have any evidence please? The forced sedation also sounds like that individual testimony. But are there any witnesses at all for that claim, credible or not?

I am surprised at you, you know the psychiatrist's report, you've read the appeal court ruling. The psychiatrist makes a judgement on the testimony based on the interview and other evidence, so do the courts after weighing the testimonies of the parties. If you dispute this and the Supreme Court rules against the appellants, will you still maintain the innocence of the jailed men?

And can you also evidence that all of the accused were actually employees of Jeyakanth? I think this is quite important, especially if it applies to the person currently incarcerated.

It is the assertion of the Courts, as you know. For a long time, I have presented other evidence to the brethren at [...], but that the court directly asserts it is enough for here.

4/ He has libelled her and her family.

This is certainly not what the evidence I have seen suggests. Have you seen the written testimony of the very many school authorities who confirm the truth?

Jeyakanth claims in his article, the aunt wished to take her sister's land from the children's father and so 'falsely accused the father of rape'. Is this in the school reports? He claims, 'a police enquiry had shown no evidence for the rapes'. He claims the case had been thrown out at the Magistrate's Court. All these and other claims are refuted by the Appeal Court ruling.

As to the children's behaviour, we know both girls were disturbed and this is not at all surprising in case of repeated incest. An elder at the [...] claimed in writing 2011 the girls were incapable of schooling, which your own report contradicts and their own grades contradict. The victim in the court case is married and has admirably testified in court and attained reasonable grades, which I have seen.

5/ He has obstructed justice for many years. These are not my allegations; they are based on the repeated findings of courts. These lies are documented in the archive.

I am not questioning what is in the archive. What I am questioning is, are there 2 or 3 credible witnesses please? And surely you have heard of miscarriages of justice?

When court documents make multiple clear assertions, repeating your mantra about requiring additional external witnesses looks facile. We shall see what the Supreme Court makes of the case.

6/ Is he your only source? Don't you think that's a little precarious, brother? Has this documented rogue's reliability

Documented by whom? Could it be by 2 or 3 credible witnesses possibly, please?

Jeyakanth has documented his own lies. We need no better witness. Incidentally, he seems extremely concerned to defend convicts who he pretends have had nothing to do with him.

7/ in your eyes now become quasi-judicial, as sure as a court of law?

No, but I do believe that 2 or 3 credible witnesses are needed please. Do you ever have them for anything you write??

I have adduced many witnesses to most claims. Just to give you a recent example, in the Muthur dispute, there is the witness of the pastor who wrote the report, the witness of pastor Mahendran, the witness of Kanna, the witness of Prof Hoole who interviewed other participants and others who also interviewed participants too.

8/ I am not asserting the RDS President was bribed.

Good, because you know what my response would be!

His own board are.

9/ His own secretary is and his own board is. The letter he wrote, which is published on the site, was so out of character with the way the RDS operates and so out of kilter with the facts, in their opinions, that there was immediate & strong suspicion, which grew with their own investigation. The President had acted without coordination with them, outside their usual modus operandi. The fact he was seen by more than one party going to meet and returning from Jeyakanth a few days before, when the letter was drafted, strongly suggested to his own committee, not me, the source of the funds.

Incredible! But still no sign of any credible witnesses. I can only surmise that you have neither seen the final report sent to the District Secretary from the RDS, nor that from any similar organisation.

I have not seen the final report, though I know about it and a little of its contents from both the warring parties. I also know the President has not been dismissed despite the ongoing concerns about him. I also know Jeyakanth has been active, as he was with the disputed church at Thambapalangam, as his own letter reveals.

10/ As the RDS' role in allocating land, serving officials in Sri Lanka confirm, it is not qualified to act in this way. It has no jurisdiction over land allocation at all.

Although true, this is not the point in hand. It is the exasperation the RDS, and others, have with the way the current occupiers of the premises have been behaving, and the consequent request to Jeyakanth to take legal action to remove them. I suggest you ask your informants to let you see this correspondence since it appears it has been kept from you.

The letter from the RDS President requesting action is in my archive. It's the reason he was accused of receiving bribes.

11/ Actually, the basic predicate of all questions about land ownership remains, is LEF registered to hold ANY land?

Again, dear brother, you ask the wrong question and evidence serious misunderstanding. Official documentation exists, and I am getting very suspicious as to why your informants have not forwarded copies to you. I rather think you should be a little more concerned at this seeming 'oversight' on their part.

'Official documentation exists', no doubt it does. But does the LEF hold *any* registration in its own name as a trust? If it's an oversight, you could have corrected it from the outset by sharing it.

12/ Many churches do hold their land privately, others in their own names as trusts or businesses. For a small fellowship it can be a struggle, as in the UK. But for a society which has received millions of pounds in donations to hold ALL its holdings privately, as we've documented for you meticulously, in the name of Jeyakanth's relatives and friends, is dangerous, corrupt and myopic. Is that not the case, even now?

No, I don't think it is.

We differ

13/ There is absolutely NO excuse for LEF not to have done this long ago.

Actually, there is, for example if donors of land and assets wish to i) either retain ultimate ownership or ii) give it in its entirety to Jeyakanth.

This strikes me as corrupt practice.

14/ Has it? Yes or no?

What do your informants tell you? Yes, or no?

I have provided you with a list last year and will happily resend it of the assets of land and property all listed in the name of Jeyakanth's friends and family, none is registered in a trust for LEFC. If it's inaccurate please correct it.

15/ To put it very plainly again to you, if LEFC collapses, as several of its churches now have through disgust at its founder's conduct, Care Sri Lanka and the UK representatives of LEF would be knowingly complicit in the fraudulent acquisition of charitably donated money by that founder.

Churches who withdraw from LEFC property may indeed collapse, but that is hardly the fault of LEFC. And can also let me know how 'the fraudulent acquisition of charitably donated money' is obtained please?

No, not if churches collapse, if Jeyakanth is imprisoned for fraud or some other criminal offence, as he has been warned he may, by the High Court Judge. Then the society would implode but all the properties would belong to him and his cronies. That would be fraudulent use of charitable money.

16/ Are you still pumping money into a crime scene? I'm afraid the simple answer is, you are.

No, the simple answer is I am not and never have done.  
My opinion is the same.

17/ I expect and hope you are nobly seeking to correct this, long after the horse has bolted. May I ask, when and if LEF does gain some form of belated registration, before trumpeting it to all, will you insist that all the land and assets donated from charitable money, a portion of which we have listed for you, are registered in this organisation?

I will certainly continue to insist that all land and assets are correctly recorded.  
We do welcome that and want to facilitate not hinder these reforms.

18/ That the tenure of this particular church in Muthur was the central issue in dispute is the plain testimony of at least two ministers, who were present at the meeting of RDS, one of whom wrote the description AND all those who enquired into the affair from other participants. The RDS was not the appropriate forum for handling this and has no jurisdiction over land ownership. The distinction between public land (under permit to the supposedly landless poor, on a withdrawable lease) and other land is not seminal to this point, (though it may complicate the allocation of a lease for a disputed church's possession by the Divisional Secretary).

Who do your informants think holds 'tenure' to this particular church in Muthur'? Have they shown you the actual documentation? I suggest you ask to see the relevant recommendation made to the District Secretary, including the various supporting legal documentation. Again, if your 'informants' have withheld these from you, why do you think that might be?

I have not seen the documents, nor have I asked to. The District Secretary will make the ruling, based on the submissions of *both* parties and we await that opinion. A worshipping church is meeting in the building at present. The RDS itself was a red herring, except in so far that it reveals just how gangsterish Jeyakanth's own behaviour and that of his representatives.

19/ Who, I wonder, apart from the main suspect of instigating the crimes has reassured you there was no 'great scandal'? There are many witnesses that it has caused enormous scandal. The most cursory investigation will reveal that, as multiple sources have told me directly, instead of parroting the alleged criminal's own version.

Why, oh why, do you simply listen to what your many incredible informants tell you? Have they not seen the authenticated documentation which simply sweeps away all these wild assertions? Surely the verdict of the relevant Civil Authority is what matters here, i.e. The District Secretary.

The verdict will be relevant, but it is not just the outcome that matter, but the process by which it is reached.

20/ Yes, I have triangulated the High Court Judge's verdict, not least with the Appeal Judges, but also a forensic psychiatrist and multiple, other direct sources, long before the hearings took place.

Do you not agree that the High Court Judge's verdict, and that of the Appeal judges is based on evidence supplied. Are you seriously suggesting that that constitutes two or three credible witnesses?

More than three, in the sense that the evidence of employment, contractual hire by Jeyakanth, place of abuse, as well as the depraved acts are all in question and were all subject to examination in the courts. The defendants and their representatives have said their part and been found wanting.

[Section redacted as the material remains confidential]

26/ I continue to pray that you will wake up to the ugly reality of things, and rectify them quickly, it has already caused colossal damage to the Lord's Name in Sri Lanka and further afield,

If only I could 'hold up a mirror' for you, Charles, or alternatively remove the 'blindfold' from your eyes and heart! One day, perhaps, I dare to hope you will be able to appreciate the damage you have done and continue to do. May the Lord help you.

Have you read the Colombo Telegraph's articles about Jeyakanth's behaviour in Sri Lanka? I know you read the earlier one. There is huge reproach, and it doesn't come from the UK. There is an urgent need for a proper, well based, and impartial investigation.

As you know, I continue to live in hope that one day He will.

Yours ever hopefully,

Yours in the Beloved, for love warns and reprovcs, sometimes fiercely,

Charles