

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

*In the matter of an application under and
in terms of Articles 17 and 126 of the
Constitution of the Democratic Socialist
Republic of Sri Lanka*

SC/FR/64/2023

1. Widana Ralalage Sudewa Sisira Kumara,
Rambukana Mola, Walidalla,
Nikadalupota.
2. Indika Lakmal Nandasena,
198/2a, St. Mariya Road,
Usvatakeyyawa.
3. Samantuawasm Rohan Asela Kumara,
206/3, Venamulla, Kuligoda,
Ambalangoda.
4. Thennakoon Mudiyaaselage Preeti Viraj
Candana Bandara Thennakoon,
No. 37/1, Gowammulla,
Nikaweratiya.
5. Lewke Bandaralage Wajira Lewke
Bandara, No. 07, Gajaba Place,
Nagolla, Ukuwela.
6. Chanaka Sampath Wijesekara,
No. 73, Sandasiri Uyana,
Kurunduwathta, Akmeemana, Galle.
7. Arumadura Harsha Priyadharshana De
Silva, No. 181, Hegalle, Kosgoda.

8. Senarath Koonara Mudiyansele Ranjan
Senarath Bandara, No. 1, 3/10,
Anderson Flat, Narahenpita, Colombo 05.
9. Ravindra Srinath Nakandala, No. 127,
Herman Estate, Step 1, Dodangoda.
10. Indighawela Gamage Nuwan Asiri, No.
180, Tuwin Park, Etanamadala,
Kalutara North.
11. Bastiyanwaduge Isuru Gihan Pathijeewa
Hospital Road, Uduwila Batapola.
12. Ajanta Deepal Wickramasinghe Palliya
Gurugewatta, Udahagedara,
Wawaihalagoda, Kakunadura, Matara.
13. Hettiarchchilage Don Pulasthi Chamika
Jayasekara, 240/4/A, Phalabiyawila,
Kadawatha.
14. Ranawaka Archchige Krishan Indika
Perera, 16B, Maeligama, Maeliya, Jaela.
15. Nambukara Gamage Manoj Prasanna
Abegunawardhana, No. 145/1,
Pugngnananda, Mawatha, Dibbadda,
Panadura.
16. Chandana Prasad Ilangasinghe,
No. 3249, Stage 3, Anuradhapura.
17. Urumuththa Gamage Chandra Kumara
Welamita Ulla Road, Hataraman,
Hadiyaabuttala.
18. Gammana Widanalage Don Thushara
Chathuranga, 54/1, Waliketiya,
Pamunugama.
19. Wajira Lakmal Wedisinghe,
164/2, Walwwatta,
Korosagoda, Udatuththiripitiya.

20. Kukulpane Mudiyanseelage Milan Malinda Bandara, 546/A, Vatadageya Road, Medirigiriya.
21. Tharindu Lasantha Jayasinghe, 28/1, Obbegodha, Monaragala.
22. Rankiri Hettige Chanaka Sandaruwan Ranasinghe, No. 139/1, Pansala Para, Mahabuthgamuwa, Angoda.
23. Moaragal Pedige Sameera Karunarathna C 8, Police Field Force Head Quarters, Timbirigasyaya, Colombo 5.
24. Kannangara Koralalage Rajitha Saeera Kannagara, 270/2B, Iddagodella Road, Kimbulapitiya.
25. Kalyanathunga Hatharasinghe Yapa, 32/A Ikkagoda, Katiyape, Deyyandara.
26. Wickrama Akila Sapumal Bandara Wickrama, No. 157/B/2, Dodamphapitiya, Utungama, Matugama.
27. Amila Chandima Govinna Perera, 270 Seelawimala Mawata, Oruwala, Aturugiriya.
28. Priyankara Metrige Indika Saman Kumara, Hirigalketiya, Madakeembiya, Galle.
29. Ediriwira Jayawickrama Patabadige Pradeep Thushan Ediriweera, H-2, Police Quarters, Kirulapana, Colombo 5.
30. Rathnayaka Mudiyanseelage Sumith Chandana Rathnayaka, No. 233, Pandikaramaduwa, Galenbindunuwewa.

31. Amrakoon Gedara Mahesh Kumara
Dissanayake, Amara Sewana,
Habbunkaduwa, Mawanella.
32. Haldola Yamanalaya Lalith Samrakoon
No. 78, Elapata South, Rathnapura.
33. Watagoda Gedara Nuwan Priyangika
Thilakaratna, 133/9, Sunilahama,
Yahalatenna, Kandy.
34. Imihamillage Nandana Pradeep
Somathilaka, Paramaulla, Alawwa.
35. Wickramaarchchige Danushka
Wickramaarachchi, 75/01, Helamba,
Agalawatta.
36. Harsha Janaka Muththettutenna
234/5, Police Quarters,
Sapugaskanda.
37. Disanayaka Mudiyansele
Premakumara Bandara Disanayaka
15/1, Janatapura, Lunugala.
38. Weerakkodi Archchige Tharindu
Madushanka, Dulya, Kiulawaththa,
Bombuwala, Kalutara South.
39. Patikiri Arachchige Roshan Niroshana
Dilruk, No. 56/A1, Horagasmulla,
Divulapitiya.
40. Mudalihami Arachchige Roshan
Chandrasekara, Kirigalwewa,
Medawachchiya.
41. Pankaja Maduranga Arumapperuma
Koongaha Waththa, Dodampe, Thalpe.
42. Kahawalage Arjuna Kumara Perera
No. 201/A, Bellanthudawa,
Bandaragama.

43. Kuda Durage Jagath Kulathilaka
No. 70/40, Mapanawathura Passage,
Kandy.
44. Liyandeniye Arachchilage Asanka
Bandara Liyandeniya, No. 329/26/C,
Parapaha, Nawagurukale, Doluwa,
Gampola.
45. Smarakoon Mudiyanseelage Upul Buddika
Samrakoon, 10, Dewaragampola,
Mawanalla.
46. Akuresse Yapa Kasun Rangana Saumya
Kumara Radalage, No. 67 D, Balika
Vidyala Mawatha, Pahala Kosgama,
Kosgama.
47. Wickrama Arachchige Pradeepa
Ranasighe Naduwatta, Batuwita,
Ruawanwella.
48. Imihami Mudiyanseelage Damith Asnaka
Kumarasena, No. 37/1, Cemetery Road,
Awulegama.
49. Prawalathenna Liyana Ralalage Nuwan
Madushanka, 6 Mile Post, Laxapana.
50. Wijesundara Sabhapati Mudiyanseelage
Prasad Sanjeeva Wijesundara, “Epita
Gedara”, Hiddana, Gokarella.
51. Dewage Sisitha Indika
Kiriporuwa, Erepola, Eheliyagoda.
52. Manik Boove Gale Gedara Sudesh
Chathuranga, No. 109, Halagama
Breaside, Gampola.
53. Sanjaya Milinda Welathanthri
No. 98/22, Bope Cross Road,
Wakunugoda, Galle.

54. Rathnayake Mudiyanseelage Nihalsiri
Rathnayake, No. 226/1, Wathuwangaya
Road, Mahadiwulwewa, Ambanpola.
55. Gunarathna Gayan Priyanga Perera
No. 17/4 A, Jayanthi Mawatha,
Dadalla, Galle.
56. Wijesekara Hetti Arachchige Yasantha
Randunu Wijesekara, No. 22, Pallegama,
Hungama.
57. Ulapagoda Pathira Archchige Kamal
Karunanayaka, No. 101, Ranatunge
Mawata, Mirigama.
58. Pilimathalawwe Wijerathna
Narendrasinghe Pandiatta Wasala,
Bandaralage Dilshan Arjuna Wijerathna
No. 330/J, Devamiththa Place,
Heiyanthuduwa.

Petitioners

Vs.

1. C.D. Wickramarathne,
Inspector General of Police,
Office of Inspector General of Police,
Church Street, Colombo 1.
2. Nilantha Jayawardane,
Senior Deputy Inspector General of
Police, Support Services,
Police Head Quarters,
Colombo 1.
3. P.B.J.S. Chandrasekara,
Acting Director,
Police Examinations Division,

No.7, Cotta Terence,
Dr. N.M Perera Mawatha,
Colombo 08.

4. D.G.N. Jayawardena,
Senior Deputy Inspector of Police
(Administration), Police Head Quarters,
Colombo 1.
5. Sisira Kumara,
Deputy Inspector General of Police,
Human Resource Management,
Police Head Quarters, Colombo 1.
6. Mr. S.P. Prasad Ranasinghe
Director – Personnel, Sri Lanka Police
Police Head Quarters, Colombo 1.
7. Mr. S.C.S. Fernando,
Chairman,
8. Mrs. Thamara D. Perera,
Secretary,
9. Mr. M.P.P. Perera,
Member,
10. Mr. S. Liyanagama,
Member,
11. Mr. G. Wickramage,
Member,
12. Mr. A.S.P.S.P. Sanjeewa,
Member,
13. T.P. Paramaswaran,
Member,
14. Mr. N.S.M. Samsudeen,
Member,
National Police Service Commission,
7th to 14th Respondents all of;
National Police Service Commission,

- Block 9, BMICH Premises,
Buddhaloka Mawatha, Colombo 7.
15. Mr. P. Viyani Gunathilaka,
Secretary, Ministry of Public Security,
14th Floor, Suhurupaya, Battaramulla.
16. Hon. Dinesh Gunawardena,
Hon. Prime Minister,
Minister of Public Administrations, Home
Affairs, Provincial Councils and Local
Government, Prime Minister's Office, No.
58 Earnest de Silva Mawatha,
Colombo 7.
17. Hon. Nimal Siripala de Silva,
Minister of Ports, Shipping and Aviation,
Ministry of Ports, Shipping and Aviation,
No. 19, Chaithya Road, Colombo 1.
18. Hon. Douglas Devananda,
Minister of Fisheries, Ministry of
Fisheries, New Secretariat, Maligawatte,
Colombo 10.
19. Hon. Susil Premajayantha,
Minister of Education,
Ministry of Education, Isurupaya,
Pelawatta, Battaramulla.
20. Hon. Bandula Gunawardena,
Minister of Transport and Highways,
Minister of Mass Media,
Ministry of Transport and Highways,
7th Floor, Sethsiripaya, Stage II,
Battaramulla.
21. Hon. Keheliya Rambukwella,
Minister of Health, Minister of Water
Supply, Ministry of Health, Health &

Nutrition Division, No. 385, Ven.
Baddegama Wimalawansa Mawatha,
Colombo 10.

22. Hon. Mahinda Amaraweera,
Minister of Agriculture, Minister of
Wildlife and Forest Resources
Conservation, Ministry of Agriculture,
No. 80/5, Govijana Mandiraya,
Rajamalwatte Lane, Battaramulla.
23. Hon. Wijayadasa Rajapaksha,
Minister of Justice, Prisons Affairs and
Constitutional Reforms,
Ministry of Justice, Prisons Affairs and
Constitutional Reforms, Supreme Court
Complex, Colombo 12.
24. Hon. Hareem Fernando,
Minister of Tourism and Lands,
Ministry of Tourism and Lands, 6th Floor,
No. 21, Rakshana Mandiraya, Vauxhall
Street, Colombo 02.
25. Hon. Romesh Pathirana,
Minister of Plantation Industries,
Minister of Industries,
Ministry of Plantation Industries, 11th
Floor, Stage II, Sethsiripaya,
Battaramulla.
26. Hon. Prasanna Ranatunga,
Minister of Urban Development and
Housing, Ministry of Urban Development
and Housing, 17th Floor, Suhurupaya, Sri
Subhuthipura Road, Battaramulla.
27. Hon. M.U.M. Ali Sabri,
Minister of Foreign Affairs,

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Republic
Building, Sir Baron Jayathilake
Mawatha, Colombo 1.

28. Hon. Vidura Wickramanayaka,
Minister of Buddhasasana, Religious and
Cultural Affairs, Ministry of
Buddhasasana, Religious and Cultural
Affairs, No. 135, Srimath Anagarika
Dharmapala Mawatha, Colombo 7.
29. Hon. Kanchana Wijesekera,
Minister of Power and Energy,
Ministry of Power and Energy,
No. 72, Ananda Coomarswamy Mawatha,
Colombo 7.
30. Hon. Ahamad Zenulabdeen Naseer,
Minister of Environment, Ministry of
Environment, 416/C/1, Sabadam Piyasa,
Robert Gunawardana Mawatha,
Battaramulla.
31. Hon. Anuruddha Ranasinghe Arachchige
Roshan, Minister of Sports and Youth
Affairs, Minister of Irrigation, Ministry of
Sports and Youth Affairs, No. 9, Philip
Gunawardana Mawatha, Colombo 7.
32. Hon. Nalin Manusha Nanayakkara,
Minister of Labour and Foreign
Employment, Ministry of Labour and
Foreign Employment, 6th Floor,
Mehewara Piyasa, Narahenpita,
Colombo 5.
33. Hon. Tiran Alles,
Minister of Public Security,

Ministry of Public Security, 14th Floor,
Suhurupaya, Battaramulla.

34. Hon. Nalin Ruwanjiwa Fernando,
Minister of Trade, Commerce and Food
Security, Ministry of Trade, Commerce
and Food Security, No. 27, CWE
Secretariat Building, Vauxhall Street,
Colombo 2.
35. Hon. Jeewan Thondaman,
Minister of Water Supply and Estate
Infrastructure Development,
1st Floor, Lakdiya Medura, No. 35, New
Parliament Road, Battaramulla.
36. Hon. Pavithra Wanniarachchi,
Minister of Wildlife & Forest Resource
Conservation, Ministry of Wildlife &
Forest Resource Conservation, No. 1090,
Sri Jayawardenepura Mawatha,
Sri Jayawardenepura Kotte.
37. Mr. W.M.D.J. Fernando,
Secretary, Office of Cabinet of Ministers,
Republic Building, Sir Baron Jayathilaka
Mawatha, Colombo 1.
38. Hon. Attorney General,
Attorney General's Department,
Colombo 12.

Respondents

Before: Hon. Chief Justice P. Padman Surasena
Hon. Justice Mahinda Samayawardhena
Hon. Justice Sampath K.B. Wijeratne

Counsel: Saliya Pieris, P.C. with Geeth Karunaratne and
Dhimarsha Marso for the Petitioners in SC/FR/64/2023.
Chamith Senanayake with Yohan Coorey and Thenura
Samarasuriya for the Petitioners in SC/FR/39/2023.
Yuresha De Silva, D.S.G. with Sabrina Ahmed, S.S.C. for
the Respondents.

Argued on: 30.06.2025

Written submissions:

By the Petitioners on 07.08.2025.

By the Respondents on 25.08.2025.

Decided on: 08.09.2026

Samayawardhena, J.

Fifty-eight Petitioners, who are Inspectors of Police, filed this application on 14.02.2023 against the Inspector General of Police, the National Police Commission, the Cabinet of Ministers, and the Attorney General seeking declarations that their fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 12(1) and 14(1)(g) of the Constitution have been infringed by the Respondents by the issuance of RTM 584 (CRTM 398) dated 23.12.2022 marked P4 whereby certain Sub Inspectors of Police were promoted to the rank of Inspector of Police with effect from 08.02.2020.

The material before Court demonstrates that the Petitioners themselves are beneficiaries of an earlier one-off promotion scheme introduced pursuant to Cabinet Decision No. 20/0373/203/036 dated 15.02.2020 and communicated by RTM 636 (CRTM 1247) dated 19.02.2020.

The said Cabinet Decision formed part of a broader policy initiative intended to address longstanding stagnation within the Police Department. Promotions were granted in several stages.

Under the first stage, Sub Inspectors of Police who had completed more than twelve years of service in that rank as at 31.12.2018 were promoted to the rank of Inspector of Police with effect from 01.01.2019.

Under the second stage, Sub Inspectors of Police who had completed more than ten years of service in that rank as at 31.12.2018 were promoted to the rank of Inspector of Police with effect from 01.07.2019.

Under the third stage, Sub Inspectors of Police who had completed more than eight years of service in that rank as at 31.12.2018 were promoted to the rank of Inspector of Police with effect from 01.01.2020.

The Petitioners accepted the benefits flowing from the second stage of that one-off promotion scheme and were promoted accordingly.

Thereafter, by Cabinet Memorandum No. 32/2022 dated 03.10.2022 and the Report of the Expert Committee appointed to make recommendations regarding stagnation in promotions within the Police Department, the Government considered further measures to address continuing stagnation affecting several categories of police officers. Having considered those materials, the Cabinet of Ministers took Cabinet Decision No. 22/2056/626/005-1 dated 21.12.2022.

The said decision was communicated by RTM 584 (CRTM 398) dated 23.12.2022. Under that scheme, officers who had completed eight years of service in the rank of Sub Inspector of Police as at 08.02.2020 were promoted to the rank of Inspector of Police with effect from the same date.

The Petitioners contend that officers promoted under RTM 584 obtained promotion after eight years of service whereas the Petitioners were required to complete ten years of service before obtaining promotion under RTM 636. The Petitioners further contend that the seniority gap between themselves and the newly promoted officers has not been maintained.

The Petitioners also complain that, under the scheme from which they benefited, there was a gap between the date by reference to which eligibility was assessed and the effective date of promotion, whereas under RTM 584 eligibility and promotion were linked to the same date, namely 08.02.2020. According to the Petitioners, this constitutes a violation of Articles 12(1) and 14(1)(g) of the Constitution.

I am unable to see how this circumstance assists the Petitioners. The fact that, in an earlier one-off promotion scheme, the competent authorities adopted different qualifying and effective dates owing to prevailing institutional, administrative, financial, or other practical considerations does not mean that the same approach must necessarily be maintained indefinitely. On the contrary, as a matter of principle, there is much to be said for fixing the qualifying date and the effective date of promotion as the same date whenever circumstances permit. Such an approach promotes clarity, certainty, and administrative consistency.

Merely because the Petitioners benefited from a scheme in which the qualifying date and effective date were different does not entitle them to contend that the competent authorities were constitutionally obliged to perpetuate that arrangement in all future promotion schemes. The adoption of a different and, arguably, more rational methodology in a subsequent one-off promotion scheme cannot, without more, constitute a violation of Article 12(1) of the Constitution.

At the outset, it must be borne in mind that the impugned promotions were not made under an ordinary promotion scheme. They were introduced as exceptional and temporary measures intended to address longstanding stagnation within the Police Department.

Temporary promotion measures introduced to address stagnation within the Police Department are not intended to operate as permanent and immutable frameworks. The first stage was not identical to the second stage. The second stage was not identical to the third stage. The fourth

stage introduced by RTM 584 adopted yet another approach. The competent authorities were attempting to address different manifestations of stagnation affecting different categories of officers at different times.

The very purpose of such measures is to respond to prevailing institutional circumstances and administrative requirements existing at a particular point in time.

The object of these schemes was not to preserve historical seniority gaps with mathematical precision. Rather, the object was to alleviate accumulated stagnation affecting large numbers of police officers and thereby ensure the continued functioning of the Police Department.

Every phased promotion scheme necessarily results in some narrowing of previously existing seniority gaps. Such consequences are often unavoidable where the competent authorities seek to provide relief to officers who have remained stagnated in a particular rank for prolonged periods. Article 12(1) of the Constitution does not guarantee the perpetual preservation of every historical seniority advantage enjoyed by one batch of officers over another.

Nor does Article 12(1) require that every future promotion scheme maintain precisely the same relative distance between successive batches of officers.

In *A.S. Sangwan, Col. v. Union of India* AIR 1981 SC 1545, the petitioner contended that the Government could not depart from an existing executive policy governing promotions after a select list had been prepared under that policy. Rejecting the contention, the Supreme Court of India held that a promotion policy is not immutable and may be revised or modified where justified by changing circumstances and other weighty administrative considerations. Krishna Iyer J. held:

A policy formulated with regard to promotions is not good forever. It is, therefore, within the competence of Government to change or re-change, adjust or re-adjust it according to compulsion of circumstances and the imperatives of material considerations, when there are good and weighty reasons for doing so.

Chaudhari & Chaturvedi's Law of Fundamental Rights, 4th edition (Delhi Law House, 2001) at page 426 states:

No one can claim a right to promotion. The right extends merely to being considered for promotion on just and equitable principles, without unfair discrimination against him, unless there is some statutory rule giving right to any person to be promoted, because in the absence of any such rule, the Government can keep any due promotion in abeyance, provided the Government has acted fairly, reasonably and in public interest: and, then again, this simple right to being considered for promotion is only when the aspirant possesses the minimum qualifications for the post.

In *Nagaland Senior Government Employees Welfare Association v. State of Nagaland* (2010) 7 SCC 643, the Supreme Court of India upheld the constitutional validity of the Nagaland Retirement from Public Employment (Second Amendment) Act, 2009, which provided that a government employee should retire on attaining the age of 60 years or on completing 35 years of public service, whichever occurred earlier. Rejecting the contention that the legislation violated the constitutional guarantee of equality because it operated differently depending on the age at which an employee entered public service, the Court observed:

The doctrine of equality enshrined by Article 14 of the Constitution is not necessary to be nor it is capable of being applied with mathematical exactitude and some amount of advantage or disadvantage to persons who may seemingly appear to be equally placed can occur in a given situation. In the present case, persons joining Government service after 25 years of age, say at 30 or 35

years, though may retire at 60, will have a lesser period of service than the persons who may retire at an earlier age by virtue of the rule of retirement on completion of 35 years of service. Each and every instance of such advantage and corresponding disadvantage will not attract Article 14.

As I have already stated, the Petitioners themselves are beneficiaries of one stage of the one-off promotion scheme they now seek to challenge. They accepted the benefits flowing from that scheme and the promotions granted thereunder without challenge. At that time, they did not contend that the difference between the qualifying date and the effective date of promotion was arbitrary, unlawful, or violative of their fundamental rights. Having accepted the benefits of that scheme, the Petitioners cannot now complain merely because a subsequent scheme adopted a different methodology and conferred benefits upon another category of officers.

The Petitioners' argument, if accepted, would have far-reaching consequences. It would mean that every subsequent one-off promotion scheme would have to be calibrated by reference to every previous batch of officers so as to preserve historical seniority gaps. Such an approach would make the administration of temporary promotion schemes practically impossible and would perpetuate the very stagnation those schemes were intended to address.

The fallacy in the Petitioners' argument becomes apparent when one considers the position of the officers who benefited under the first stage of the one-off promotion scheme. Those officers were required to complete more than twelve years of service in the rank of Sub Inspector of Police as at 31.12.2018 before becoming entitled to promotion with effect from 01.01.2019. If the Petitioners' argument is accepted, those officers could equally contend that their fundamental rights were infringed when the Petitioners, who had completed only ten years of service as at 31.12.2018, were promoted under the second stage with

effect from 01.07.2019. They could argue that, since they were required to complete twelve years of service whereas the Petitioners obtained promotion after completing only ten years of service, their own promotions should be backdated to the date on which they completed ten years of service in the rank of Sub Inspector of Police.

The same reasoning could then be advanced by every subsequent batch of officers affected by every subsequent one-off promotion scheme. Such a process would lead to an endless chain of competing claims for retrospective promotions and continual restructuring of seniority. The law cannot countenance such a result. Temporary and one-off promotion schemes introduced to address institutional stagnation must be assessed as a whole and in light of the purpose they seek to achieve, rather than by comparing individual batches of officers in isolation.

I must also observe that the date 08.02.2020 was not selected arbitrarily. The material before Court demonstrates that the same date had already been adopted in several Cabinet decisions and promotion schemes relating to different ranks within the Police Department. The adoption of that date in RTM 584 therefore formed part of a broader policy framework and cannot be characterised as irrational or arbitrary.

The formulation of promotion policies and the management of cadre structures within the Police Department involve matters of public policy which, under the constitutional framework, primarily fall within the responsibility of the executive branch of government. In terms of Article 55(1) of the Constitution, matters of policy relating to public officers including promotions are entrusted to the Cabinet of Ministers. While such policy decisions remain subject to constitutional scrutiny, courts are generally slow to interfere with decisions taken by the competent authorities in the exercise of those functions. The question before Court is not whether a different policy might have been preferable, but whether the impugned decision is arbitrary, irrational, *mala fide*, discriminatory, or otherwise inconsistent with the Constitution.

Having considered the material before Court, I am unable to conclude that the impugned promotion scheme suffers from any such infirmity.

The Petitioners have failed to establish that the introduction of RTM 584 resulted in any unconstitutional discrimination against them. At its highest, their complaint amounts to a grievance that another category of officers received a greater benefit under a subsequent one-off promotion scheme. Such a grievance, without more, does not constitute a violation of Articles 12(1) or 14(1)(g) of the Constitution.

For the aforesaid reasons, I hold that the Petitioners have failed to establish any infringement of their fundamental rights guaranteed under Articles 12(1) and 14(1)(g) of the Constitution. Accordingly, I dismiss the Petitioners' application, but without costs.

The issue arising in SC/FR/39/2023 is substantially the same as that arising in the present application. Accordingly, the parties to SC/FR/39/2023 shall abide by this judgment.

Judge of the Supreme Court

P. Padman Surasena, C.J.

I agree.

Chief Justice

Sampath K.B. Wijeratne, J.

I agree.

Judge of the Supreme Court