



Uvindu Kurukulasuriya &lt;uvinduk@gmail.com&gt;

---

## Re Need a Quote for a story

---

**Uvindu** <uvinduk@gmail.com>

Fri, Jun 19, 2015 at 4:24 PM

To: Kusal Perera &lt;kusal.perera@gmail.com&gt;

Thanks Kusal for the prompt reply. I agree with you , we need to keep the Ravaya alive and i always support it , but giving Ivan 5 Mill is a fraud and Ivan"s claim is immoral too according to whistleblowers. I'll get back to you soon.

Best

from iPhone pls excuse typing

On 19 Jun 2015, at 05:35, Kusal Perera <kusal.perera@gmail.com> wrote:

Hi Uvindu,

Appreciate your concerns on the issue of Ravaya funding we undertook as Ravaya Solidarity (RS). Guess you would use the whole response and NOT parts of it.

Your question has 2 parts in it.

- (i) As a Guarantee Ltd. there is no provision for anyone to claim monies.
2. (ii) The basis on which Victor was given Rs.5 mn is questionable.

Let me respond in that order.

1. The type of guarantee ltd. that Ravaya is, there is no sharing of "profit" between stakeholders. Yet stakes for ownership were accepted by the Registrar of Companies. The basis of a "Guarantee" in a company is that those who take responsibility for ownership of the company are not held responsible and liable as individuals. As for what stakeholders can do about their stake, Victor had openly written in Ravaya some time ago. Do Pls refer to those or contact Victor.

2. As for RS, all monies were raised through crowd funding which was a public initiative. RS was in agreement with Victor, he would transfer his personal stake to the value of Rs.20 million when we raise the fund. Accordingly, Victor transferred 20% of his stakes to RS. This was also accepted by the Registrar of Companies as within the Ravaya GTE Ltd articles and necessary amendments done accordingly.

There was also agreement and understanding between Victor and RS, though with the transfer of his stakes the total value of his stakes (Rs.20m) in money belongs to him alone, 75 percent of it should be re-channeled to upgrade the paper and the institution. That was what exactly happened. The credit for that goes to Victor.

I believe Gamini Viyangoda explained to you the whole process (which was not just buying and selling a commodity) and that settled your concerns.

Let's not forget the fact, Ravaya while it had to stay within legal parameters, was a "political intervention" in establishing an independent media pioneered by Victor and he never made it into a commercial business, which he could have, if he wanted to. Therefore with whatever shortcomings you and I could debate about (I have my own criticism), Ravaya still remains independent from State and party politics. That in our country remains a historic achievement and should not be clubbed together with what media Mudalalies do. Therefore any investigations into an "entity that acts with social responsibility" that Ravaya is, should not be narrowed down to "dots" and "crosses" in legal phrases for the mere sake of making a case, but to help it develop further.

Thanks Uvindu for taking this up for clarification

Rgds  
Kusal

**Kusal Perera**  
Journalist

<cockroach-.gif>

***We creep where most don't***

***I always take life with a grain of salt, plus a slice of lemon and a shot of old arrack.....!***

**For a decent e-mail ETIQUETTE:**

*Please delete details of all previous senders before forwarding/sending again to reduce spam, viruses & identity theft. Its best to use the Bcc field while forwarding e-mails. Thanks.*