

Tony Bennett, Editor of *British Church Newspaper*, responds as follows:

Regarding our article on page 22 of BCN 527 (5 May), "LEFC forced to defend its ministry from 'unfair' attacks", this was based essentially on reading four sets of documents: Both of the David Cooke/Mark Mullins reports, your own extensive blog on the subject, and the 'Definitive Public Response' put out in April this year by the LEFC 'Council of Reference'.

On your blog, you cite, very appropriately, Proverbs 18:17 ***"He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him."***

Ironically, this is precisely the situation here.

David Cooke, Mark Mullins and yourself are, in this case, "The first in his own cause". Together, you have set out your case to the wider public.

The LEFC's 'Council of Reference (CoF)', then, represents "the neighbour who cometh and searcheth him".

All we did in our article was to highlight a very small part of the CoF arguments against the verdict of Cooke, Mullins and yourself.

Regarding our articles on pages 13 & 14 of BCN 528 (2 June), you claim we are:

- (a) advocating Jeyakanth's innocence,
- (b) neglecting a mountain of data, and
- (c) "swallowing camels and straining at gnats."

I would characterise what we did in that issue as follows:

We are simply comparing two sets of data: comparing the data set out by Cooke/Mullins and yourself, with the voluminous and very well referenced data of the CoR 192-page report.

As per Proverbs 18:17, we are finding that many of the the data supplied by Cooke/Mullins and yourself is contradicted by the very detailed accounts of the CoR.

In particular, we take note of the 14 separate allegations questioning Muralee's reliability and honesty which are documented in great detail on pages 20-28 of the CoR report under the heading,

"The Conduct and Reputation of Muralee Kanagalingam".

On the matter of Cooke and Mullins, as they have admitted, using the private email addresses of data held by the Christian Worship Conference, the General Data Protection Regulations clearly state that:

"You should not use or publish email addresses from a database without consent or a clearly lawful reason...Email addresses are personal data under the UK GDPR and EU GDPR. You must have a lawful basis for processing personal data. These include: ◦ Consent, ◦ Contract, ◦ Legal obligation, ◦ Vital interests, ◦ Public task and ◦ Legitimate interests".

In summary, anyone concerned with the work of the Lanka Evangelical Fellowship of Churches should look at the reports of Cooke/Mullins, yourself, of the LEFC 'CoR', and of anyone else who can shed light on the matter.

And then make up their minds.

Which the whole point of Proverbs 18:17.

=====

Tony Bennett, Editor of *British Church Newspaper*, responds as follows:

Regarding our article on page 22 of BCN 527 (5 May), "LEFC forced to defend its ministry from 'unfair' attacks", this was based essentially on reading four sets of documents: Both of the David Cooke/Mark Mullins reports, your own extensive blog on the subject, and the 'Definitive Public Response' put out in April this year by the LEFC 'Council of Reference'.

On your blog, you cite, very appropriately, Proverbs 18:17 **"He that is first in his own cause seemeth just; but his neighbour cometh and searcheth him."** [As Mr Bennett will recall, the citation was first in the BCN article on 5/5/25.](#)

Ironically, this is precisely the situation here.

David Cooke, Mark Mullins and yourself are, in this case, "The first in his own cause". Together, you have set out your case to the wider public.

[In almost every case for my website there has been extensive contact with LEFC/CSL or its predecessors, JK's supervising churches. Latterly, after an investigation was refused, this has not been the case. In the case of both reports, there was exhaustive involvement with LEFC before publication. This was only after it became clear, nothing would be done otherwise.](#)

The LEFC's 'Council of Reference (CoF), then, represents "the neighbour who cometh and searcheth him".

All we did in our article was to highlight a very small part of the CoF arguments against the verdict of Cooke, Mullins and yourself.

Regarding our articles on pages 13 & 14 of BCN 528 (2 June), you claim we are:

[This claim is made with respect the fulsome promotion of Jeyakanth, details for his newsletter subscription and his support contact details on 5/5/2025, as well as the attack piece on Muralee, which we'll come to.](#)

(a) advocating Jeyakanth's innocence,

[BCN has unreservedly promoted him. Neither ET nor EN have been so unreserved.](#)

(b) neglecting a mountain of data, and

The BCN articles, letter and editorial have completely ignored charges of [intimidation](#), [extortion](#), [fraud](#), [dishonesty](#), [bribery](#), [serial adultery](#), and [corroborated allegations](#) of even more serious offences. The DPR's treatment of these has in some places been [superficial](#) and flies in the face

of serial court decisions. The DPR has [maligned one of the most respected judges](#) in Sri Lanka, and President of the Association of High Court Judges of Sri Lanka, which is a elected position by peers, not appointed by the government. Is reciting so flawed a report, after being aware of this critique, journalism or advocacy?

For example, BCN uncritically repeats the [DPR's letter 'confirming LEFC's legal status'](#) with the Sri Lankan Department of Christian Affairs. Ought not a journalist to have checked a disputed point? It is not, according to [recent correspondence from the Department's Director](#). (See also below). If the Editor is inclined to doubt, he is welcome to clarify the matter with the Department, as we did. By the way, does 'chairman JK' really have a [PhD](#)? At what institution, and for what subject we wonder, obtaining degrees with money?

(c) "swallowing camels and straining at gnats."

BCN has chosen to [focus on and overplay what you call a GPDR violation](#), which the [Commissioner's Office exonerated](#), *rather* than the [ongoing cover up of serial child rape](#) by JK's employees. You've sought to focus on the use of a single van, which, as you know, [the donor in 2005 defended](#), and sought to close, *rather* than examine the £50,000 deposit and £33,000 sums for which no clear explanation has been given and the millions of pounds donated to JK's organisations, donors of which are still looking for explanations, and for which no published accounts or records have been provided, despite years of requesting from different sources. I would characterise what we did in that issue as follows:

We are simply comparing two sets of data: comparing the data set out by Cooke/Mullins and yourself, with the voluminous and very well referenced data of the CoR 192-page report.

I would characterise it as advocacy, without serious analysis. Is that unfair?

As per Proverbs 18:17, we are finding that many of the the data supplied by Cooke/Mullins and yourself is contradicted by the very detailed accounts of the CoR.

We all make mistakes, but name one example in which the data I've supplied is 'contradicted', there are published statements by different parties to the conflict, including some by LEF, JK and his supporters, do I endorse the errors in these? No, I am simply providing an [archive of claim and counterclaim](#), with a modicum of commentary. The documents are all genuine and unsolicited, show me one that isn't, but that doesn't mean I can or do endorse them all in every detail. Where statements are incomplete, I have completed them, upon being informed. However, to any serious, enquiring mind it will very quickly become obvious that many different sources, in different ways and at different times have made substantial, serious and consistent charges against JK. The DPR is prolix but in places it is [seriously defective](#).

In particular, we take note of the 14 separate allegations questioning Muralee's reliability and honesty which are documented in great detail on pages 20-28 of the CoR report under the heading,

No, this is [gnat picking and pot stirring old](#), previously settled disputes to deflect from the much, much more serious, manifold and multi-sourced allegations against JK. Where is the evidence Muralee has bribed, has committed adultery, has used physical threats? There is none.

"The Conduct and Reputation of Muralee Kanagalingam".

On the matter of Cooke and Mullins, as they have admitted, using the private email addresses of data held by the Christian Worship Conference, the General Data Protection Regulations clearly state that:

"You should not use or publish email addresses from a database without consent or a clearly lawful reason...Email addresses are personal data under the UK GDPR and EU GDPR. You must have a lawful basis for processing personal data. These include: ◦ Consent, ◦ Contract, ◦ Legal obligation, ◦ Vital interests, ◦ Public task and ◦ Legitimate interests".

In summary, anyone concerned with the work of the Lanka Evangelical Fellowship of Churches should look at the reports of Cooke/Mullins, yourself, of the LEFC 'CoR', and of anyone else who can shed light on the matter.

And then make up their minds.

Perhaps they ought to look at the [rebuttal you received from the authors first](#), if they truly desire to honour:

Which the whole point of Proverbs 18:17.[sic]

=====

Original Message-----

From: [personal named account]

Sent: 04 June 2025 12:11

To: [Bill Goodmans address]

Subject: About Registration of Lanka Evangelical Fellowship of Churches

Rev. Pastor

About Registration of Lanka Evangelical Fellowship of Churches

The church mentioned here is not registered with this department.

When the department issues a document such as the attached document, it issues a covering letter with it.

I kindly request you to submit the covering letter or if it has any other documents along with this document for verification.

Thank you

Chathuri Pinto

Director

Department of Christian Religious Affairs

