

English Media Exposés

HILTON PROMOTION IN 1960's

Ceylon Observer - 26.10.1968 THE OBSERVER TUESDAY OCTOBER 26, 1993

Govt: to acquire hotel land

HOTELS INTERNATIONAL Ltd. who are going ahead with the Ceylon Hilton project will not be able to make a large profit on the resale of the Stewart Place, Colpetty site on which the hotel was originally intended to be built.

Government will acquire the land.

The Ministry of State yesterday wrote to the Lands Ministry requesting that the acquisition machinery be made ready.

A spokesman for the Ministry of State said today that the CWE will be the purchaser of this four acres of valuable land with a Galle Road

frontage.

"If Hilton's want to build their hotel on this site as originally intended, they can lease the land from the CWE. But the site would be Crown land. We do not want to leave the possibility open for it to be blocked out and re-sold in small lots."

According to this spokesman Hotels International Ltd. will get the price they paid the Church of Ceylon for the land. Government valuation procedures takes the most recent sale price into account.

That would mean that Hotels International Ltd. will now only break even

as a result of the acquisition decision.

The Hilton which was to come up on the Hilton Hotel site is to be shifted to the property on which the South Wing of the Galle Face Hotel now stands.

In parliament on Tuesday. Mr. Bernard Soysa, MP for Colombo South raised the question of the decision of the Hotels International's Director to re-sell the land they purchased from the Church.

He alleged that the land had been bought from the Church at a low figure (approximately Rs 4.5 million) after the Bishop of

HILTON PROMOTED IN 1980's

THE SUNDAY TIMES, SUNDAY, OCTOBER 1991

The case of the missing storeys

Justice Ameen Ismail.

The order was in respect of petitions for leave to Appeal and Revision filed by Mr. Nihal Sri Amerasekera, a Director and a shareholder of Hotel Developers (Lanka) Ltd., submissions on whose behalf were made by Mr. K. Kanag-Isvaran, P.C.

Mr. Amerasekera is a Chartered Accountant who was closely associated with the early phases of the hotel project.

His action is based on the contention that while

The plaintiff in this case, Mr. Nihal Sri Amerasekera is a Director and Shareholder of Hotel Developers (Lanka) Ltd., the owning company of the hotel and one of the defendants.

The other defendants are Mitsui and Company Ltd., of Japan, Taisei Corporation and Kanko Kikaku Sekkeisha Yozo Shibata & Associates, two other Japanese firms, Mr. Cornel L. Perera, Chairman and Managing Director of the owning company, Mr. F.G.N. Director of

In consequence, the building that finally emerged was not the one originally envisaged and the original plan cannot be found.

After the hotel opened for operations, he says, Mitsui & Co. submitted profitability projections computed on 452 guest rooms. When queries were raised at this point and it was pointed out that the building lacked several storeys as per the original plan, an amended profitability projection was submitted, computed on 387 guest rooms.

HILTON PROMOTED IN 1980's

SUN Friday, September 21, 1990

Hilton hotel construction agreement Court issues interim injunction on Mitsui & Co.

Mr. P. Navaraj QC submitted that the original approved architectural plan provided for 23 floors there were only 20 floors, and without a mezzanine floor.

He submitted that the first and second defendants had practised a fraud on the plaintiff. Mitsui & Co. Ltd. added and abetted by two or three directors of the company.

THE ISLAND Friday 28th April, 1995

DAILY NEWS, SATURDAY JUNE 17, 1995

Original plans of the Hilton Hotel missing

By M. J. M. Zarook and Madhubashini Dayahandara

The original plans for the Hilton Hotel building submitted in 1983 to the Urban Development Authority were missing from the UDA files, witnesses said before the Special Presidential Commission sitting.

DAILY NEWS, THURSDAY SEPTEMBER 20, 1990

Chairman: Mr. Siriwardena has said in his evidence that the Tourist Board would not give approval to a hotel building project unless the architectural plans were submitted? - I do not know the legal requirement. I was

District Court issues injunction, enjoining order
Hilton Hotel short of floors?

The plaintiff, Mr. Nihal Sri Amerasekera, Chartered Accountant, has filed the report of a local architect/engineer, Mr. Shelton Wijayarathna, that the original architectural plan provided for 23 floors including a mezzanine floor, but the unauthorised approved architectural plan has only 20 floors including the ground floor and no mezzanine floor in the main building.

The original architectural plan provided for a building 274.6 ft tall. But on the unauthorised amended plan, the height of the building is 233.9 feet.

Other main differences pointed out in the engineer's report as averred in the plaint are:

The original architectural plan had provided for 19 floors of guest rooms, while the unauthorised amended architectural plan had provided for only 17 floors of guest rooms.

The original architectural plan had provided for 456 guest room bays, while the unauthorised amended architectural plans had provided for 408 guest room bays plus a further 17 guest room bays destined

the Hotel Developers Board, on the authority of the directors of the company.

The enjoining order and interim injunction has been issued on Mitsui and Co. Ltd., Taisei Corporation and Kanko Kikaku Sekkeisha Yozo Shibata and Associates.

According to the plaint, the Mitsui/Taisei Consortium had said on or about 30.10.85 that a fire had occurred at their site office and all documents had got burnt. They had said that their principals in Tokyo had sent copies of all documents and drawings and the hotel construction work had recommenced.

The plaintiff has averred that he had discovered in March 1990 that these drawings and documents had been replaced by the Mitsui/Taisei Consortium principals, and were not in conformity with the original approved architectural plans which were part and parcel of the construction agreement.

He had found that while profitability projections of the hotel had been made on the basis of 452 guest rooms, the hotel's monthly statements reflected only 387 rooms.

Hilton Hotel Project probe

Despite persistent urging there was continued silence — witness

by Dinukshi Handunnettil

Choksy were dated 20th April 1995

The President re-

THE ISLAND Wednesday 5th April, 1995

Board took no positive action

Hilton hotel project probe — Witness

By V. K. Wijeratne

Premadissa was com-

information to the Finance Ministry. Shortly thereafter

also that no ground exists

Soza were not made known to the board. He

THE ISLAND, Wednesday 28th June, 1995

Probe into malpractices

Choksy and Paskaralingam took all decisions — Witness

by Asumpta Alies

The former Director added that since he was not familiar with

cash flow of the hotel and when he highlighted the fact that the number of rooms had

ized the physical check objected in court.

Mr. Shanmugalingam

floor area of the amended plan approved in 1986 was 10,800 sq metres. The area in the 1985 plan

6,813,050 and the balance with interest was to be paid in 33 annual instalments.

Witness was referred to a letter addressed to Taisei Corporation at Hilton Hotel site by SI Gilbert Kalupahana.

The letter stated: With reference to your letter dated 10.10.85 with regard to the fire which occurred at

Contradictory report on fire by CDB Fort

By M. J. M. Zarook and Daryll de Silva

The report of the Engineer, Ceylon Electricity Board stated that the fire which had taken place in the office of the Hilton Hotel work site in October 1985 was not due to an electrical fault

THE ISLAND Sunday 3rd April, 1994

Ford Rhodes given time to file objections

HILTON HOTEL CASE

The Colombo District Court, has granted the partners of Ford Rhodes Thornton and Co. Ltd. auditors of Hotel Developers (Lanka) Ltd., owning company of Colombo Hilton, time until May 2, to file their objections to an action filed by a former director of Hilton Hotel and Shareholder, Nihal Sri Amerasekera.

Mr. Amerasekera, has petitioned Court challenging the accounts of Colombo Hilton Hotel for the year 1989/1990 passed by Ford Rhodes Thornton and Co. Ltd. He contends that the audited accounts do not make the necessary disclosures and has therefore not presented a true and fair picture of the hotel's financial position.

The defendants to the action are G. C. B. Wijesingha, R. N. Asiratham, A. N. Fernando, R. Sevaranatham, S. Srinivasanathan, M. R. Mubular, P. Y. S. Perera, C. P. Jayatilake and M. P. Senewirathna, all partners of Ford Rhodes Thornton and Co. Ltd.

Initially, Mr. Amerasekera had cited Hotel Developers (Lanka) Ltd., as the defendant in this case.

By this petition, he seeks to have all the partners of Ford Rhodes Thornton and Co. Ltd., added on as defendants.

Counsel for the defendants answering notice issued on them returnable on February 28, 1994, moved court for time to file objections.

District Judge, A. M. Somawansa accordingly granted the defendants time until May 2.

Previously, the District Court of Colombo, had

issued an enjoining order preventing H.D.L. Ltd., from adopting the Accounts that had been certified by the auditors.

Mr. Amerasekera, a professional Accountant himself and a Management Consultant, has complained to Court that the auditors had certified the Accounts without having carried out an examination and reporting, that had been required of them by H.D.L. Ltd., at his (Mr. Amerasekera's) instance, prior to the certification of the Accounts.

Mr. Amerasekera states that H.D.L. Ltd., has admitted that it has no inventory of the fixed assets, nor a copy of the originally approved plans and bills of quantities and measurements. All amended Plan has subsequent

lodged with the UDA, without the Company's approval, violating contractual agreements. Disregarding these serious issues the auditors had certified the accounts, without having the required documents to verify the correctness thereof.

In another action previously instituted by Mr. Amerasekera, on the premise of fraud, in the construction of the Colombo Hilton Hotel, the Supreme Court had upheld the interim injunctions that had been issued by the District Court of Colombo, observing that such injunctions were issued to prevent the devious syphoning of a large scale of foreign exchange from the company and the country.

The Accounts had been certified by the Auditors even after

Hotel Developers restrained from tabling accounts

DAILY NEWS Tuesday January 22, 1991

District Judge, Colombo, P. Wijayaratne, has issued an enjoining order restraining Hotel Developers (Lanka) Ltd. (formerly Lanka Japan Hotels Ltd, the owning company of the Colombo Hilton Hotel from tabling and adopting the account for the year ending March 1990 along with a specified note No. 19 at their annual general meeting which was scheduled for January 17 or at any meeting thereafter until the plaintiff's application for an interim injunction was finally determined.

In this case the plaintiff, Mr. Nihal Sri Amerasek-

ere of Sri Vipulasena Mawatha, Colombo 10, a business and management consultant has cited Hotel Developers Ltd as the defendant.

The judge also issued notice on the defendant company returnable on March 11 to show cause why the plaintiff's application for an interim injunction should not be granted.

Mr. P. Navaratnarajah, QC with Mr. P. Naguleswaran and Mr. A. A. M. Illiyas instructed by Messrs de Silva and Perera appeared in support of the plaintiff's application.



Mr. K. N. Chokay, Minister of Constitutional and State Affairs arriving for the 14th National Conference of Chartered Accountants held at the Colombo Marriott hotel at which he was the chief guest. With him are Mr. Nisward Cabral, President of the Institute of Chartered Accountants, Mr. M. A. Abeynayake, Vice-President of the Institute and Prof. Janku Ratnatunga of Monash University, Melbourne. (Picture by Berty Mendis)

THE SUNDAY TIMES, SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 03, 1991

Hilton case: stay order on payment

The District Court of Colombo has issued interim injunctions staying payment by Hotel Developers (Lanka) Ltd., the owning company of the Colombo Hilton Hotel, on any financial claims made by three Japanese

director/shareholder in the owning company, who claimed that the construction lacked many of the features specified in the original plans on the basis of which the project was approved and proceeded with.

Auditors have not performed their duties — Witness

Hotel Developers (Lanka) Ltd under scrutiny. The Commission of Inquiry comprising into the irregularities raised by him. At this stage the Commission observed that he expressed as raised and the irregularities in the implementation of the project and identify those responsible.

said in his evidence out the irregularities in the accounts. He said that he asked the directors either to relate his

THE ISLAND Thursday 4th July, 1991

Attorney General represented owning company

In our news report under the heading "Order, Restraining M.H. Objections filed against Company Limited from receiving payment from building Hilton Hotel" of July 2 we failed to state that the Owing Company of the Colombo Hilton. The Hotel Developers any payments to the (Lanka) Limited, was Japanese Companies, representative in the Hilton Hotel Case, heard for issues of the

DAILY NEWS, SATURDAY APRIL 22, 1995

AG's dept opposed inspection of Hilton project

(By M. J. M. Zarook and Daryll de Silva)

Mr. Nihal Sri Amerasekera, Chartered Accountant and Advisor to the Ministry of Finance said yesterday before the Special Presidential Commission that he made an application to the District Court to inspect the Hilton Hotel project

With regard to Japanese government sensitiveness in the matter, it has been pointed out that there has been growing public concern in Japan over frauds involving Japanese companies and public perceptions. No government in Japan, therefore, would like to have any Japanese firm involved in the

DAILY NEWS, MONDAY APRIL 03, 1995

SPC on malpractices by Govt Bodies We resisted mortgage of Hilton Hotel building to Japanese — Witness

When Hotel Developers (Lanka) Ltd could not meet the loan instalments on the Hilton Hotel project, the Japanese Consortium of Mitsui Taiisei suggested a debt rescheduling agreement which included the mortgage of the Hilton Hotel building to the Japanese.

This plan was stoutly resisted by Dr. A. C. Randeni, the government nominee on the Board of Directors and himself said Mr. Nihal Sri Amerasekera, Chartered Accountant and Advisor to the Ministry of Finance.

Mr. Amerasekera said that later the secretary to the

Mr. Nihal Amerasekera, a Management Consultant writing to "The Island" details out a number of instances wherein he had complained to the Securities and Exchange Commission and the Colombo

Douglas Premaratne PC acting Solicitor General in the inquiry into matters relating to the Hilton Hotel project and acts of commission and omission by government and public bodies in this connection.

The Special Presidential Commission comprises Justice Priyantha Perera (Chairman), Judge of the Supreme Court, Justice Hector Yapa, Judge of the Court of Appeal and High Court Judge, Mr. F. N. D. Jayasuriya.

Stock Exchange against violations of the existing laws by certain public quoted companies.

Here is an excerpted version of his letter.

Judge issues interim injunction in Hilton case

Colombo District Judge Mr. P. Wijayaratne (now, High Court Judge) has rejected the objections and issued an interim injunction restraining three Japanese firms (of contractors and architects) from demanding or receiving any monies whatsoever in connection with the construction of the Colombo Hilton hotel building until the final determination of the action.

An interim injunction was also issued restraining Hotel Developers (Lanka) Limited from entertaining any demand for claims on paying out any monies to the three Japanese companies.

Accordingly, the present position is that the Defendants' statement, that they have performed their part of the contracts and the willingness shown by the company to accept the same, as set out by the Defendants, cannot be accepted as the basis for payment.

Accordingly, what should be actually considered is, whether, the position of the company in relation to the said matters i.e. whether, the position taken concerning the agreements entered into with the 1st to 3rd Defendants, is adverse to the interests of the shareholders of the company, or else,

DAILY NEWS, FRIDAY MAY 31, 1996

Treasury chief Paskaralingam rejected requests for physical check of Hilton

By M. J. M. Zarook and Manjula Fernando

MR. Nihal Sri Amerasekera, Business and Management Consultant said yesterday before the Special Presidential Commission sitting at the BMCH that all his attempts to have a physical inspection of the Hilton Hotel building failed.

By Asantha Alles National List MP and former Director Hotel Developers Limited, D.C.L. K. N. Chokay, HDL Chairman and Managing Director Cornel Perera and other Directors of HDL

What is your present position on this. Was the building constructed according to the plan P4 and P4A? No.

Witness referred to the report of the Panel of Architects appointed by the Commission.

Witness said according to the construction

What is your present position on this. Was the building constructed according to the plan P4 and P4A? No.

Witness referred to the report of the Panel of Architects appointed by the Commission.

Witness said according to the construction

THE ISLAND Wednesday 2nd August, 1995

Commission to appoint panel of architects to check Hilton Hotel project plan

should be made available to the architects. There were certain documents not in dispute for example, the building application. There was a construction agreement entered into between the company will be appointing. There is a complete examination could be done.

Justice Perera - That is exactly what we want to do.

panel of architects. We are interested in finding out whether this building is in accordance with the original plan.

Chokay - We are not in any way going to do

which list the Commission will select five. The President of the Institute of Architects is directed to forward a list of architects from several firms of Chartered Architects before September 1.

The Island Sunday 5th June, 1994 Rs. 11,000 million held up by court injunction

Japanese concerned about Hilton case

The Japanese government has expressed its concern to the Sri Lanka government about the

the Japanese envoy in Colombo, Mr. I. Hashimoto. The ambassador

Constitutional and State Affairs. Mr. Harindra Dissanayake

copy of the originally approved Architectural Plans for the construction of Hilton Hotel

Japanese concerned... Continued from P1 Mr. Ameresekere further THE ISLAND Wednesday 2nd November 1994

Allegations against Hotel Hilton baseless

The action filed in the District Court of Colombo by Nihal Sri Ameresekere, a share-holder of Hotel Developers Limited against the contractor, architects and other directors of the Hilton Hotel was taken up before Mr. I. M. Lyanage District Judge, Colombo, for a ruling on the plaintiff's further pleadings. Mr. K. Kanagasaran FC submitted to Court that the original motion sought permission to file the further pleadings together with the request that the answer, filed by the 4th Defendant (Hotel Developers Limited) be rejected or returned for amendment. However, he stated, that he now only wanted to file further pleadings and was withdrawing the request that the 4th defendant's answer be rejected.

Mr. Shibly Aziz FC Additional Solicitor General who appeared for the 4th defendant Hotel Developers Limited submitted that it was unfair for the plaintiff to now argue that only the plaintiff's further pleadings should be accepted and deprive the 4th defendant from answering plaintiff's further allegations.

Mr. Aziz further stated that the 4th defendant company, did not consider it appropriate to support either of the parties in the original answer in view of the serious and grave allegations of fraud, collusion and irregularities in the building of the Hilton Hotel. Moreover, the plaintiff had purported to bring the action to safeguard the interests of the company. A careful and thorough examination conducted thereafter into these allegations had clearly shown that the allegations were totally baseless and unfounded and based on a misconception entertained by the plaintiff.

Mr. Aziz submitted that the hotel was built in accordance with the agreement reached between the parties and the plans, and that there was no justification at all for the plaintiff's allegations of

would have wished to file an amended pleading setting this out in greater detail, he did not wish to do so since this may delay the trial in this case which is fixed for a date in March this year.

However, he categorically reserved the right to controvert the plaintiff's allegations at the appropriate stage. Mr. Aziz also pointed out that this course of action was necessary in view of the fact that foreign firms are involved in this matter and policy considerations required that this action should be concluded as early as possible, in the interest of everybody.

Accordingly, the judge permitted the further pleadings subject to reservation made by the Additional Solicitor General.

In this case the plaintiff Mr. Nihal Sri Ameresekere of Sri Vipuluwana Mawatha, Colombo 10, a chartered accountant and a shareholder of Hotel Developers Ltd. has stated that the original architectural plans for the Colombo Hilton provided for 23 floors including a mezzanine floor but the unauthorised approved architectural plan had only 20 floors including the ground floor and no mezzanine floor in the main building.

There were also other differences in the building with regard to the number of guest rooms etc.

The District Court has already issued an interim injunction restraining the three Japanese firms of contractors and architects from demanding or receiving any monies whatsoever in connection with the construction of the Colombo Hilton building. An interim injunction has also been issued restraining Hotel Developers (Lanka) Ltd from entertaining any demand for claims or paying out any monies to the three Japanese companies.

Alleged Hilton kick-backs to be probed

By Ravi Loddurwahetty

Some influential persons connected to the J. R. Jayawardene regime are to come under investigation for fraud and corruption for alleged kickbacks received from a Japanese multinational, once the proposed permanent Commission for Bribery and Corruption is set up, informed Bribery Commissioner's sources yesterday.

Hong Kong based account of Deutsche Bank AG between April 1984 and December 1984 for alleged special favours it had obtained in connection with the Hilton Hotel project in Colombo, official sources disclosed.

c) The exemption of import duties on all materials and equipment for the Hilton Hotel.
d) The exemption of all corporate and other taxes.

quested by Mitsui. The Attorney General, by his letter dated 6th March 1984 had categorically stated that no exemption from Import Duty could be granted to the Colombo Hilton under the law.

Consequently, former Minister of Constitutional Affairs K. N. Choksy — a very powerful personality in the United National Party govern

Colombo had been granted, costing the government around Rs. 650 million.

The Customs (Amendment) Law No. 35 of 1974 empowers the Minister of Finance to grant such exemptions, only if he deems it expedient in public interest to do so. The then government also issued state guarantees under which the alleged claims today



ජනාධිපති ලේකම් කාර්යාලය
දුරකථන අංකය
THE PRESIDENTIAL SECRETARIAT
8th April 1993

Dear Sir,
Hilton Hotel
I am writing with reference to your letter dated 9th March 1993, addressed to His Excellency the President on the above subject.
I have been directed by His Excellency to refute your claim that my reply dated 5th February 1993, sent to you on His Excellency's instructions contained "false and untrue statements."
His Excellency has further directed me to inform you that,
(a). for the reasons set out in the aforesaid reply dated 5th February 1993, and
(b). in view of the decision of the Supreme Court, referred to in the penultimate paragraph of the aforesaid reply, your request for action by His Excellency is inappropriate and therefore cannot be acceded to.
Yours faithfully,
K H J Wijayadasa,
Secretary to the President
Mr Vasudeva Nanayakkaram,
Member of Parliament for
Ratnapura District,
143/3, New Road,
Colombo 2.

Embarrassed President wanted suit withdrawn

Mr. Nihal Sri Ameresekera told the Special Presidential Commission sitting at the BMICH yesterday, that when he filed action in the district court and obtained an enjoining order preventing payment to the Japanese consortium of Mitsui Taisei etc, Mr. R. Paskaralingam then secretary to the ministry of finance, informed him that President Premadasa was disturbed and wanted him to consider withdrawing the action.

Case against Hotel Hilton contractors

Interim injunction restraining drawing of payments issued

by Chitra Weeraratne
The District Judge of Colombo, Mr. I. M. Lyanage, recently issued an Interim Injunction, restraining Mitsui and Company Limited, Taisei Corporation and Kanko Kikaku Sekkeisha Yozo Shibata and Associates, Architects and Designers, from drawing any payment from Hotel Developers Lanka Limited for having constructed the Hilton Hotel of Colombo.
The Petitioner in this case is Mr. Nihal Sri Ameresekera, a Director of Hotel Lanka Developers Limited (the owners of Hilton Hotel Colombo).
The Petitioner Mr. Ameresekera in his petition, requested the District Court to grant him:
(1) an Interim Injunction restraining Mitsui/Taisei Consortium and architects the 1st, 2nd and 3rd defendants by themselves, their representatives, servants and agents or otherwise from demanding, claiming

SC to hear application for special leave to appeal against AG order

By Chitra Weeraratne
Contractors of Hilton Hotel Colombo, special leave to appeal to the Court of Appeal, against the Supreme Court's order of Mr. P. Weerasinghe, District Judge of the District Court, delivered on Friday 13th September, 1991 THE ISLAND

Vasudeva writes to President on Hilton

by Prabath Subandaru
Mr. Vasudeva has written to the President of the Republic of Sri Lanka, Mr. Premadasa, to inform him of the decision of the Supreme Court in the Hilton Hotel case. Mr. Vasudeva has also informed the President that the Government has expressed its intention to support the legal action directed by the plaintiff against the contractor and architects of the Hilton Hotel.

Minority shareholder rights against defiant majority

By Chitra Weeraratne
The Supreme Court has granted special leave to appeal against the order of the District Court in the Hilton Hotel case.

Director-shareholder files further pleadings

by Prabath Subandaru
Mr. Ameresekera filed further pleadings in the District Court of Colombo and obtained Enjoining Orders restraining any payments to the Mitsui/Taisei Consortium and the Japanese Architects, Kanko Kikaku Sekkeisha Yozo Shibata

Director, Hilton Hotel granted special leave to appeal to S.C.

By Chitra Weeraratne
The Supreme Court on Wednesday, granted Mr. Nihal Sri Ameresekera, director Hilton Hotel Colombo, special leave to appeal to the Supreme Court against an order of the Court of Appeal in the Hilton Hotel case. The Bench comprised,

then held not less than 5 per cent of the nominal value of the company's issued capital. The plaintiff Nihal Sri Ameresekera was a shareholder in the Mitsui/Taisei Consortium of Lanka Hotels Ltd which was incorporated in 1984 and which was the majority shareholder of Hotel Developers Lanka Ltd. Under these provisions, shareholders who held not less than 5 per cent of the nominal value of the company's issued capital, could apply to the court for an order compelling the company to purchase their shares. The plaintiff Nihal Sri Ameresekera was a shareholder in the Mitsui/Taisei Consortium of Lanka Hotels Ltd which was incorporated in 1984 and which was the majority shareholder of Hotel Developers Lanka Ltd. Under these provisions, shareholders who held not less than 5 per cent of the nominal value of the company's issued capital, could apply to the court for an order compelling the company to purchase their shares.

Historic Supreme Court judgment in the Hilton Hotel Case

Shareholder wins legal right to institute action on behalf of a company and in its right in exceptional circumstances

Colombo Hilton Hotel, owned by Hotel Developers (Lanka) Ltd, a public quoted company, had been promoted in 1984 by Mitsui & Co. Ltd and Taisei Corporation, both of Japan...

Architectural Plans had been carried out without the knowledge and approval of the Board of Directors of the Company and was a contravention and violation of the terms of the several Agreements and contracts that had been entered into...

Landmark Supreme Court Judgment

Establishes unique legal right of a shareholder to sue on behalf of a company

A Supreme Court Bench presided by the Chief Justice G. P. S. de Silva and comprising Justices Dr. A. R. B. Amarasinghe and K. M. M. B. Kulatunga...

keeping in conformity the established international legal practice and Case Law pertaining to Companies.

The Judgment gives comprehensive legal references and authorities in relation to such established international Case Law and the right of Court to intervene in the interest of justice.

THE ISLAND Sunday 14th November, 1993

Hilton Hotel judgment in C'wealth Law Reports

The Supreme Court judgment in the Hilton Hotel case has been given pride of place in the Commonwealth Law Reports of 1992 and released in U.K.

Court restraining the first, second and third defendants from demanding claiming, etc any moneys under contracts with the fourth defendant...

THE ISLAND Sunday 6th December, 1992

Legal experts view Hilton Hotel case judgment as historic

By Zack Jabbar Legal experts have described the Supreme Court judgment in the Hilton Hotel case as historic.

Court of Colombo, to be proceeded to trial and concluded as soon as practicable.

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

S. C. Appeal No. 3382 of 1992

PLAINTIFF-RESPONDENT PETITIONER-APPELLANT

1. Mitsui and Company Limited, a Company organized and existing under the laws of Japan and having the Principal place of business at 2-1, Ohtamachi 1-Chome, Ohyo-dai-ku, Tokyo, Japan and having a liaison office and place of business in Sri Lanka formerly at No. 65, High Level Road, Maroon and presently Nilai Sri Amarasereka, Colombo 10.

2. Taisei Corporation, a Company organized and existing under the laws of Japan and having the Principal place of business at 2-1, Ohtamachi 1-Chome, Ohyo-dai-ku, Tokyo, Japan and having a liaison office and place of business in Sri Lanka formerly at No. 65, High Level Road, Maroon and presently Nilai Sri Amarasereka, Colombo 10.

3. Mitsui and Company Limited, a Company organized and existing under the laws of Japan and having the Principal place of business at 2-1, Ohtamachi 1-Chome, Ohyo-dai-ku, Tokyo, Japan and having a liaison office and place of business in Sri Lanka formerly at No. 65, High Level Road, Maroon and presently Nilai Sri Amarasereka, Colombo 10.

4. Mitsui and Company Limited, a Company organized and existing under the laws of Japan and having the Principal place of business at 2-1, Ohtamachi 1-Chome, Ohyo-dai-ku, Tokyo, Japan and having a liaison office and place of business in Sri Lanka formerly at No. 65, High Level Road, Maroon and presently Nilai Sri Amarasereka, Colombo 10.

5. Mitsui and Company Limited, a Company organized and existing under the laws of Japan and having the Principal place of business at 2-1, Ohtamachi 1-Chome, Ohyo-dai-ku, Tokyo, Japan and having a liaison office and place of business in Sri Lanka formerly at No. 65, High Level Road, Maroon and presently Nilai Sri Amarasereka, Colombo 10.

6. Mitsui and Company Limited, a Company organized and existing under the laws of Japan and having the Principal place of business at 2-1, Ohtamachi 1-Chome, Ohyo-dai-ku, Tokyo, Japan and having a liaison office and place of business in Sri Lanka formerly at No. 65, High Level Road, Maroon and presently Nilai Sri Amarasereka, Colombo 10.

7. Mitsui and Company Limited, a Company organized and existing under the laws of Japan and having the Principal place of business at 2-1, Ohtamachi 1-Chome, Ohyo-dai-ku, Tokyo, Japan and having a liaison office and place of business in Sri Lanka formerly at No. 65, High Level Road, Maroon and presently Nilai Sri Amarasereka, Colombo 10.

8. Mitsui and Company Limited, a Company organized and existing under the laws of Japan and having the Principal place of business at 2-1, Ohtamachi 1-Chome, Ohyo-dai-ku, Tokyo, Japan and having a liaison office and place of business in Sri Lanka formerly at No. 65, High Level Road, Maroon and presently Nilai Sri Amarasereka, Colombo 10.

9. Mitsui and Company Limited, a Company organized and existing under the laws of Japan and having the Principal place of business at 2-1, Ohtamachi 1-Chome, Ohyo-dai-ku, Tokyo, Japan and having a liaison office and place of business in Sri Lanka formerly at No. 65, High Level Road, Maroon and presently Nilai Sri Amarasereka, Colombo 10.

10. Mitsui and Company Limited, a Company organized and existing under the laws of Japan and having the Principal place of business at 2-1, Ohtamachi 1-Chome, Ohyo-dai-ku, Tokyo, Japan and having a liaison office and place of business in Sri Lanka formerly at No. 65, High Level Road, Maroon and presently Nilai Sri Amarasereka, Colombo 10.

11. Mitsui and Company Limited, a Company organized and existing under the laws of Japan and having the Principal place of business at 2-1, Ohtamachi 1-Chome, Ohyo-dai-ku, Tokyo, Japan and having a liaison office and place of business in Sri Lanka formerly at No. 65, High Level Road, Maroon and presently Nilai Sri Amarasereka, Colombo 10.

THE ARCHITECTS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DESIGN AND SUPERVISION OF THE PROJECT, THE FOURTH DEFENDANT, IS IDENTIFIED AS AN OFFICER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE COMPANY THAT OWNS HILTON HOTEL.

THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AT THE TIME OF THE DESIGN AND SUPERVISION OF THE PROJECT, THE FIFTH DEFENDANT, IS IDENTIFIED AS AN OFFICER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE COMPANY THAT OWNS HILTON HOTEL.

THE ARCHITECTS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DESIGN AND SUPERVISION OF THE PROJECT, THE FOURTH DEFENDANT, IS IDENTIFIED AS AN OFFICER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE COMPANY THAT OWNS HILTON HOTEL.

THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AT THE TIME OF THE DESIGN AND SUPERVISION OF THE PROJECT, THE FIFTH DEFENDANT, IS IDENTIFIED AS AN OFFICER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE COMPANY THAT OWNS HILTON HOTEL.

THE ARCHITECTS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DESIGN AND SUPERVISION OF THE PROJECT, THE FOURTH DEFENDANT, IS IDENTIFIED AS AN OFFICER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE COMPANY THAT OWNS HILTON HOTEL.

THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AT THE TIME OF THE DESIGN AND SUPERVISION OF THE PROJECT, THE FIFTH DEFENDANT, IS IDENTIFIED AS AN OFFICER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE COMPANY THAT OWNS HILTON HOTEL.

THE ARCHITECTS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DESIGN AND SUPERVISION OF THE PROJECT, THE FOURTH DEFENDANT, IS IDENTIFIED AS AN OFFICER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE COMPANY THAT OWNS HILTON HOTEL.

THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AT THE TIME OF THE DESIGN AND SUPERVISION OF THE PROJECT, THE FIFTH DEFENDANT, IS IDENTIFIED AS AN OFFICER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE COMPANY THAT OWNS HILTON HOTEL.

THE ARCHITECTS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DESIGN AND SUPERVISION OF THE PROJECT, THE FOURTH DEFENDANT, IS IDENTIFIED AS AN OFFICER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE COMPANY THAT OWNS HILTON HOTEL.

THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AT THE TIME OF THE DESIGN AND SUPERVISION OF THE PROJECT, THE FIFTH DEFENDANT, IS IDENTIFIED AS AN OFFICER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE COMPANY THAT OWNS HILTON HOTEL.

THE ARCHITECTS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DESIGN AND SUPERVISION OF THE PROJECT, THE FOURTH DEFENDANT, IS IDENTIFIED AS AN OFFICER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE COMPANY THAT OWNS HILTON HOTEL.

THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AT THE TIME OF THE DESIGN AND SUPERVISION OF THE PROJECT, THE FIFTH DEFENDANT, IS IDENTIFIED AS AN OFFICER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE COMPANY THAT OWNS HILTON HOTEL.

THE ARCHITECTS RESPONSIBLE FOR THE DESIGN AND SUPERVISION OF THE PROJECT, THE FOURTH DEFENDANT, IS IDENTIFIED AS AN OFFICER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE COMPANY THAT OWNS HILTON HOTEL.

THE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS AT THE TIME OF THE DESIGN AND SUPERVISION OF THE PROJECT, THE FIFTH DEFENDANT, IS IDENTIFIED AS AN OFFICER OF THE ASSOCIATION OF THE COMPANY THAT OWNS HILTON HOTEL.

Hilton Hotel case AG directed to prepare papers for settlement

By Chitra Viraratne

Historic Supreme Court...

plaintiff has a reasonable and real prospect of success even in the light of the defects, objections and submissions of the defendants.

Therefore, what the plaintiff seeks for is not unreasonable and should be granted.

The court has granted an injunction restraining the defendants from demanding, claiming, etc any moneys under contracts with the plaintiff.

The court has also granted an injunction restraining the defendants from demanding, claiming, etc any moneys under contracts with the plaintiff.

The court has also granted an injunction restraining the defendants from demanding, claiming, etc any moneys under contracts with the plaintiff.

The court has also granted an injunction restraining the defendants from demanding, claiming, etc any moneys under contracts with the plaintiff.

The court has also granted an injunction restraining the defendants from demanding, claiming, etc any moneys under contracts with the plaintiff.

The court has also granted an injunction restraining the defendants from demanding, claiming, etc any moneys under contracts with the plaintiff.

The court has also granted an injunction restraining the defendants from demanding, claiming, etc any moneys under contracts with the plaintiff.

The court has also granted an injunction restraining the defendants from demanding, claiming, etc any moneys under contracts with the plaintiff.

The court has also granted an injunction restraining the defendants from demanding, claiming, etc any moneys under contracts with the plaintiff.

Commission allows settlement with Japanese firms on rescheduled payments

By Nav Ladduwatte

Japanese companies write off Rs. 10.2 b

The Special Presidential Commission (SPC) on Frauds and Irregularities in the Hilton Hotel case has allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

SPC on malpractices in public bodies

By Nav Ladduwatte

DAILY NEWS SATURDAY JULY 17, 1995

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.

The SPC has also allowed the Japanese companies to write off Rs. 10.2 billion.