

Dear Tony

Thank you for your message of 27 May. Given your stated wish at the end of our meeting to “lower the temperature”, some of the claims made in your message are quite remarkable.

We have now seen the draft article planned for a future edition of BCN, which is even more incendiary and unbalanced than your previous one! Our reply below is intended to address points made in both your email and the draft article.

The following points arise:

1. You begin by stating that much of our report “relied on allegations made by Muralee, a Sri Lankan pastor, and his friends”. This is simply untrue. We list below just some of the matters which did not emanate from Muralee or his friends:
 - The initial complaint letter written, not by Muralee, but by 6 former workers of Jeyakanth. They had not had dealings with Muralee prior to their break from Jeyakanth, and most of them, even now, are not working under his aegis;
 - The solemn church discipline imposed by Amyand Park Chapel, which the CofR and yourself appear airily to wave aside;
 - The Metropolitan Tabernacle’s decision in August 2023 (before our August 2024 Report – henceforth, “Report”), to stop supporting Jeyakanth;
 - Kanna’s secession from Grace Fellowship Church, Thampalagamum;
 - Jeyaakanth’s attack on the church at Veeramanagar (we have just heard that LEFC has now gone to court against Pastor Mahendran with a view to dispossessing the church of the building in which it has worshipped for many years, and which was largely financed by a German church. This is truly deplorable);
 - The concerns raised by Belvidere Church, Liverpool;
 - The concerns raised by the Children for Jesus charity trustees;
 - The proof of Jeyakanth lying to David, cited in 3.15 of our Report;
 - Paul Fountain’s concerns over the misuse of a £33,000 restricted fund donation.

Other examples could be given, but these suffice to show that from that outset you appear to be swallowing unquestioningly the misleading narrative of the Council of Reference, who seem to have lost all sense of what is right in this matter, and who seem to hope that by repeating this false allegation – that it all stems from Muralee – others will just accept it (as you seem to have done). It is a rank falsehood.

2. With regard to your criticism of our Report as not being independent, you are entitled to your opinion. We would merely point out that we made every effort to ensure that we were *not dependent* on anyone in carrying out our investigation. For this reason, as we have repeatedly stated, we stayed entirely in hotels, used a hire car, and employed an Anglican translator from Colombo who had no prior knowledge at all of LEFC or the allegations against Jeyakanth. Of course, as stated in our Report, an investigation of this sort is “only embarked upon when suspicion arises”; nevertheless, we “sought to be as impartial as possible, following the evidence wherever it might lead us” (Report, 2.2). It was Jeyakanth’s decision not to engage

with us, which prevented us from having access to his supporters. And the CofR have been unwilling to help us to remedy this perceived deficiency, despite criticising us for it. In any event, we are surely more independent than the CofR, whose very *raison d'être* is to “defend Jeyakanth”! Similarly with yourself: given your (understandable) close emotional links to Jonathan Northern, surely you should have recused yourself in such circumstances and asked somebody without any such ties to consider the evidence?

3. The whole matter of the Christian Worship Conference (CWC)’s email list is totally overblown, and misstated in both your article and your email, though we are interested that you received your information “from LEFC”. How did LEFC obtain this information? The following points arise:
 - You state that we had received an email from CWC on 21-22 March 2024. This is untrue. The email in question had been sent to Mark in March 2020, and the email addresses included in it thereafter formed part of his email address book for the following 4 years. No one complained about him having them until the confected outrage about the mailout of our Report;
 - We do not recall agreeing to the term “the end justifying the means” – it is an expression that we would never approve of. David explained to you that, having come under repeated attack from CWC for “unlawful” use of their email list, we had contacted the Information Commissioner’s Office. They had great difficulty in seeing that there was any problem at all, but in the end said that so long as our respective churches authorised what we had done, there was no breach of data protection regulations.
 - We also take this opportunity to point out to you (as we have done repeatedly to the CWC trustees) that GDPR would in any case allow a public interest defence, in alerting the Christian public against a charlatan.
 - Your claim that “CWC attendees contacted CWC asking for an explanation” begs the question: how did these individuals know that their email addresses had been obtained from the CWC list? You state that the CWC organisers “were suddenly inundated with complaints”. At best, this is a gross exaggeration, at worst, another falsehood. The total number of recipients on that email was just 50, and approximately half of the email addresses were already in our possession from other sources. It is surely more likely that those offended would contact us – as they did. David confirmed to you that the number of those who had objected could be counted on the fingers of one hand. (There were one or two more who wrote to us following our Supplementary Report asking to be removed from our mailing list.)
 - This whole matter seems to be a clear case of gnats and camels: we are concerned to alert the Christian public to the activities of a rogue; his defenders are concerned about whether we have technically breached GDPR, which we have not. We are sorry to note that you continue to spread this misinformation (about an apparent breach of Data Protection regulations) in your draft article, despite the fact that we advised you that it was false during our meeting. Like the

CofR, you continue to accuse us of acting unlawfully, despite knowing that it is not true. Where is the integrity in that?

4. We note that you are seeking to frame our report as an attack on “LEFC’s pastors”. This is another distortion, and a rather obvious attempt to deflect attention from Jeyakanth. However, as we have said to you, one of our witnesses told us that Jeyakanth himself has claimed, “*I am LEFC*”. Our concern is over the immoral and illegal activity of a man holding himself to be a fit recipient of the support of UK churches, when he is manifestly not so. It is unlikely that LEFC as an organisation would continue to exist if he were removed, but let us be clear: we are not attacking a group of churches; we are seeking to expose an imposter.
5. It is striking that in the case of the other matters you raise (whether LEFC is a registered legal entity, and whether land and property is appropriately registered), you are seeking – as the CofR typically do – to get the discussion bogged down in arguments over legal technicalities, while carefully avoiding addressing the fact that we have multiple witnesses to the serious moral failings of the man at the centre of this whole controversy. Nevertheless, in the interests of completeness, we turn next to the other matters you raise –
6. You quote the CofR’s rebuttal (incidentally, it is interesting that they are now identifying themselves wholly as LEFC), in which they state that “LEFC is a registered body ... and has been for a long time.” (Paragraph 8.12.) That statement is certainly untrue: it was when the Metropolitan Tabernacle was alerted to the nature of the organisation that Jeyakanth was seeking to register with the authorities – which listed him as the chief pastor of every single congregation – that they disassociated themselves from him. That was less than 2 years ago. If it has been registered, it must have happened recently, as Godfrey Yogarajah confirmed to us in February 2024 that a search of both Company and Charity records did not yield any organisation called LEFC. We have of course seen the documents reproduced on p.86 of the so-called DPR. A letter is not proof of legal status. The simple question must be asked: why has the CofR not produced any excerpt or entry from an official register of organisations? Their critics have been pressing them to do so for years. (We are aware that the church at Thampalagamum has a registration for the conduct of marriages, but that is all.)
7. We note that the LEFC lawyer has listed the status of some 31 properties. (Again, we have seen no documentary evidence supporting his statements.) We recognise that there may have been changes since 2021 (when the charges were first brought against Jeyakanth) in the registration of these, though we note that of 31 properties, about 16 of them are Permit Land (there is uncertainty over the land at Kotagala). Of the other 15, only 3 are registered purely in the name of LEFC, and 3 are owned, or jointly owned, by Jeyakanth.
8. We turn next to your treatment of Muralee. Some of the points below are taken from a draft email Muralee has already written: he has agreed for us to incorporate his points here, so that you have only to address one document. The following points arise:

(a) We note that you claim, “there is doubt as to whether one can rely on all that he says”. As it stands, that is a deplorable and unsubstantiated slur against a minister of the gospel, a continuation of the constant smearing of Muralee by Jeyakanth’s defenders. You give no justification for making this underhand remark. Muralee himself does not claim to be infallible: during our meeting, as you may recall, he had forgotten that it was he who had brought Sasikumar and Padmini to us (on Monday 19 February 2024). When David insisted that he had, he phoned Sasikumar from your home. As he states, “I may have forgotten certain things. During our meeting with you I immediately corrected myself after phoning and confirming what had happened”. In doing so, he demonstrated his integrity, rather than the reverse. We note that no attention has been paid to 1 Timothy 5:19 in libelling Muralee while the CofR, and by implication BCN, are using the same verse to shield a proven liar and charlatan.

(b) You continue to misrepresent the matter of the van that was given to him in 2005. Concerning this, Muralee writes:

I strongly disagree with you on the issue of the vehicle, as there is NO CONNECTION between my resigning and re-joining the church.

If you are sincere, please contact [REDACTED] before publishing another cruel lie. His email is [REDACTED]. If you do not confirm, you risk committing a heinous sin and being held accountable for it.

Sri Manavalan apologised to me and made it clear that he had revoked the letter. Since then, he has not contacted me about this matter.

He admitted to his elder Niththi and one of his family members that he was pressured by JEYAKANTH to give a letter and gave that letter. He was reprimanded, NOT THREATENED, by Pr Selvarajah and the Elders of Grace Faith Church.

He was warned by leaders for some of his other actions, and asked not to repeat them.

One of the Elders and Son of Sri Manavalan, Manoj, admitted that there was neither a disciplinary meeting nor expulsion of me. He told me he was wrong.

(c) You also continue to doubt – without any evidence – Muralee’s consistent assertion that he *translated* the complaint letter issued in early 2021, but was not the originator of it. He writes as follows:

Concerning that letter, STILL THAT IS TRUE I NEVER ORIGINATED that letter. I just translated all they said directly via WhatsApp and email. Interestingly, many things they told me were new to me.

Incidentally, in conversation Muralee stated that the letter was sent to the UK, not by himself, but by Christopher (one of the 6 signatories). David has been able to confirm from his records that the email that was forwarded to him in February 2021 had

indeed originated from Christopher's email address. Again, Muralee's truthfulness is demonstrated.

(d) One of the most hurtful, and libellous, allegations that Jeyakanth has made against Muralee, and which the CofR continue to defend, is the claim that Muralee wrote "anonymous" letters to influence the Judge in the rape trial. (After all, how would anyone know, if they were anonymous?!) Concerning this, Muralee writes:

I asked the Council of Reference for a direct talk either here or UK, but they are not willing; instead, deplorably, they believe and spread the lies.

Judge Ilamcheliyan case is THE CLASSIC EXAMPLE. It is a pity they say they have evidence but would not show it. It is very strange. Let them produce that letter for you. They can never. Because even in a dream, it was not true.

In conclusion, we note that, having implicitly suggested in the course of your piece that we are guilty of breaching the 8th Commandment, you end your article by virtually explicitly accusing us of breaching the 9th! There is a sad irony in this: you are doing exactly what Jeyakanth has a long track record of doing: accusing his accusers of doing the very thing that he is guilty of.

Brother, you need to repent of even planning to follow your first unbalanced article with a second that is, frankly, scurrilous. We pray that you will be restrained from continuing to join forces with those who are determined to defend a man who has been exposed as a charlatan. Indeed, we trust that, on the contrary, you will now see your way clear to issuing an apology for your initial article – the wording that Mark has already suggested to you is something of a minimum.

Christian greetings

David and Mark

PS This was written before we heard the paper was going to be distributed, Michael having indicated that it should be held back pending our response. You need to realise that in spreading these scurrilous lies you are doing grave damage to the work of the Gospel in Sri Lanka and elsewhere.