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

Case No. CA/Writ /270/2013

Rupahinge Gunaratne Ganga Addara Hena Udakarawita Ratnapura.

### **Petitioner-Petitioner**

#### Vs.

Land Reform Commission, C 82, Gregory's Road, (Now Hector Kobbekaduwa Mawatha) Colombo 07.

The Chairman C 82, Gregory's Road, (Now Hector Kobbekaduwa Mawatha) Colombo 07.

Hon. John Amarathunga The Minister of Lands and Land Development Ministry No. 1200/6, Mihikatha Medura, Rajamalwatta Road, Battaramulla.

Respondent-Respondent

## C.A.(Writ) Application No. 270/2013

**BEFORE** : VIJITH K. MALALAGODA, PCJ (P/CA) &

S. THURAIRAJA, J.

**COUNSEL** : D.D.P.Dasanayake with Chandana

Gunaratne Kanchana Ranatunga

for the petitioner.

R.M.D.Bandara instructed by Lilanthi de

Silva for the Intervenient-petitioner.

S.S.Sahabandu PC with Mr. Rajapakshe

for the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> respondents. Manohara Jayasinghe for the 3<sup>rd</sup>

respondent.

**ORDER ON**: 21st October, 2016

## VIJITH K. MALALAGODA, PCJ (P/CA)

This matter is coming up today to inquire into the application made by one Dudley Jayasundera to intervene in this application. As observed by this Court the papers for intervention by the said intervenient petitioner had filed before this Court on 11.07.2016. It is further observed by this Court that another application for intervention had been filed in the year 2014 by one Migara Jayasundera and the said matter was taken up inquiry before this Court on 11th December 2014, this Court had refused the intervention to the said intervenient petitioner. We observe that the present application had been filed to intervene by the intervenient petitioner to the present

2

application Dudley Jayasundera after the refusal of the previous

application by this Court. However, in a recent decision by this Court in

case No. 187/2016 Dilmi Kasundara Malshani Sooriyaarachchi vs. Sri

Lanka Medical Council and others Court Appeal minute dated

10.05.2016 this Court had concluded, based on the Divisional Bench

decision in C.A. Writ Application No.586/2007 reported in 2012 BLR

page 310 that the Court of Appeal Rules of 1990 had not provided for

intervention by the intervenient parties. Therefore, an application for

intervention cannot be granted by the Court of Appeal. In following the

said decision this Court decides to refuse the application for

intervention made by the intervenient petitioner in this case. Application

for intervention is refused.

As the three writ applications can now be fixed for argument, we

decide to send these applications before Court No.206 to fix a date for

argument since all these three applications are filed in the year 2013.

Mention in Court No. 206 on 31.10.2016 for fix a date for

argument.

PRESIDENT OF THE COURT OF APPEAL

S. THURAIRAJA, J.

I agree.

phononer.

JUDGE OF THE COURT OF APPEAL

Kwk/=