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

In the matter of an appeal made under the Constitution of Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka against the Judgement dated 28.09.2020 of the Court of Appeal.

# SC/APP/No.113/2021 SC.SPL.LA.No.261/2020

CA Writ Application No.395/2017

- 01. 88<sup>th</sup> Developers(Pvt)Ltd.
  No.15/5, Circular Road
  Sapumal Place,
  Rajagiriya.
- 02. M.S.C. Perera,
  Director
  88<sup>th</sup> Developers(Pvt)Ltd
  No.15/5, Circular Road
  Sapumal Place,
  Rajagiriya.

**PETITIONERS** 

01. Urban Development
Authority of Sri Lanka
6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Floors,
"Sethsiripaya"
Battaramulla.

- 02. Dr. Jagath Munasinghe,
  Chairman,
  Urban Development
  Authority of Sri Lanka,
  6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Floors,
  "Sethsiripaya"
  Battaramulla.
- 03. Eng. S.S.P.Ratnayake,
  Director General,
  Urban Development
  Authority of Sri Lanka,
  6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Floors,
  "Sethsiripaya"
  Battaramulla.
- 04. N.A.S.N. Nissanka,
  Director, Western Province,
  Urban Development
  Authority of Sri Lanka,
  6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Floors,
  "Sethsiripaya"
  Battaramulla.
- 05. M.P. Ranasinghe,
  Director Enforcement,
  Urban Development
  Authority of Sri Lanka,
  6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Floors,
  "Sethsiripaya"
  Battaramulla.

- 06. Wasantha RatnapalaMunicipal CommissionerSri Jayawardenapura Kotte.
- 07. Patali Champika Ranawaka
  Minister of Megapolis and
  Western Development,
  17<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Floors,
  "Sethsiripaya"
  Battaramulla.

### **RESPONDENTS**

#### And now Between

- 01. Urban Development
  Authority of Sri Lanka
  6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Floors,
  "Sethsiripaya"
  Battaramulla.
- 02. L.P. Harshan De Silva,
  Chairman,
  Urban Development
  Authority of Sri Lanka,
  6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Floors,
  "Sethsiripaya"
  Battaramulla.
- 03. N.P.K. Ranaweera,Director General,Urban Development

Authority of Sri Lanka, 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Floors, "Sethsiripaya" Battaramulla.

04. N.A.S.N. Nissanka,
Director, Western Province,
Urban Development
Authority of Sri Lanka,
6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Floors,
"Sethsiripaya"
Battaramulla.

## 05. Lalith Wijeratne

Director Colombo Metro Region
(Former Enforcement)
Urban Development
Authority of Sri Lanka,
6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Floors,
"Sethsiripaya"
Battaramulla.

# RESPONDENT-PETITIONERS-APPELLANTS

Vs.

01. 88<sup>th</sup> Developers(Pvt)Ltd.
No.15/5, Circular Road
Sapumal Place,
Rajagiriya.

02. M.S.C. Perera,

Director

88<sup>th</sup> Developers(Pvt)Ltd

No.15/5, Circular Road

Sapumal Place,

Rajagiriya.

### PETITIONERS-RESPONDENTS-

### **RESPONDENTS**

06. Municipal Commissioner

Sri Jayawardenapura Kotte.

07. Mahinda Rajapaksa

Minister of Urban Development & Housing

17<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Floors,

Suhurupaya, Subuthipura, Battaramulla.

6<sup>TH</sup> AND 7<sup>TH</sup> RESPONDENT-RESPONDENT

## **RESPONDENTS**

Before : Hon. Jayantha Jayasuriya, PC, CJ

Hon. Murdu N.B. Fernando, PC, J

Hon. S. Thurairaja, PC, J

Counsel : Milinda Gunetilleke, PC, ASG with S.Wimalasena, DSG for the

Respondents-Appellants.

Faisz Musthapha, PC with Faiza Marker and Bishran Iqbal

instructed by Tharmaraja Tharmaja for the Petitioner-Respondent.

Neville Abeyratne, PC with Ms, Kaushalya Abeyratne Dias instructed by Aruni Gunerathne for the 6<sup>th</sup> Respondent-Respondent in SC Appeal 113/21.

Written Submissions: Petitioner-Respondent on 24.01.2022

Argued on : 04.07. 2023 13.09.2023, 01.12.2023 and 08.08.2024

Decided on : 12.11.2024

#### Jayantha Jayasuriya, PC, CJ

Respondents-Petitioners-Appellants (hereinafter referred to as "Appellants") by these proceedings impugn the judgement of the Court of Appeal in case CA/WRIT/385/2017, delivered on 28.09.2020. The learned justices of the Court of Appeal in the impugned judgement have recognised that the main dispute between the parties is reflected in another writ application, namely CA/WRIT/85/2018. Judgements in both these matters had been delivered on the same day and the appellants impugned both judgements before this Court. The judgement of the Court of Appeal in CA/WRIT/85/2018 is challenged before this Court in SC Appeal 112/2021 and these proceedings (SC Appeal 113/2021) relate to the Court of Appeal Judgment in CA/WRIT/385/2017.

Hearing of these two appeals namely SC Appeal 112/2021 and SC Appeal 113/2021 were taken up together before this Court in view of the interrelationship between the matters urged in them. Whilst the main issue in SC Appeal 112/2012, is the legality of the Quit Notice dated 28<sup>th</sup> December 2017, issued by the Urban Development Authority (the first respondent appellant in both appeals) under State Lands (Recovery of Possession) Act in relation to Lot 1 and Lot 14 of PPCo 5534, in this appeal (SC Appeal 113/20121), issues revolve on a letter directing the petitioner- respondents (petitioners in the Court of Appeal – hereinafter referred to as the "respondents") to stop construction in Lot 14 of PPCo 5534 and the cancellation of an approval for a building plan which has initially been issued in favour of the respondents by the Local Government Authority. Both these impugned documents pre date the impugned Quit Notice issued in 2017.

The Court of Appeal in SC/WRIT/85/2018, held in favour of the respondents and quashed the

Quit Notice first and thereafter granted relief to the respondents by quashing the two letters

mentioned above by the judgment delivered on the same day in CA/WRIT/358/2017. Appellants

impugned both these judgments of the Court of Appeal.

We considered all material presented and the submissions of counsel in the course of hearing of

both matters that were taken up together and by our judgment in SC Appeal 112/2021 allowed

the appeal and set aside the judgment of the Court of Appeal. Therefore, the Quit Notice issued

by the UDA against the respondents remains valid. The decisions impugned by the respondents

in CA/WRIT/358/2017 predate the Quit Notice and are steps that were taken by the UDA and

other agencies as a prelude to the Quit Notice. As the Quit Notice is now restored by the

judgment of this Court in SC Appeal 112/2021, it is irrational to allow the judgment of the Court

of Appeal that quashed the prior steps to be in force. Hence, we allow the appeal and set aside

the impugned judgment of the Court of Appeal dated 28.09.2020 in CA/WRIT/395/2017.

Chief Justice

Murdu N.B. Fernando, PC.

I agree

Judge of the Supreme Court

S.Thurairaja, PC.

I agree

Judge of the Supreme Court

7