

In the Administrative Appeals Tribunal

Appeal No: AAT/266/2025 (NPC)

A.G.D.S.Bandara

Appellant

Vs

National Police Commission

Respondent

Before : Justice K T Chitrasiri (Chairman)
J J Rathnasiri (Member)
S Nandasekaran (Member)

Date : 04.08.2026

Representation of parties

Appellant is present.

Ms.Sanjeewani Galagedara, Attorney-at-Law appears for the appellant.

Ms.Mala Basnayake Deputy Director is present representing the National Police Commission.

Justice K T Chitrasiri Chairman – AAT

ORDER

Appellant A.G.D.Srinath Bandara by his petition of appeal dated 21.11.2025 has prayed that he be appointed to the rank of Assistant Superintendent of Police for the reasons set out therein. It is to be noted that he has not stated in his petition of appeal, the particular post that he is seeking to have him appointed. However, we note that in his submissions filed on

14.07.2026, he has mentioned that he be appointed to the rank of Assistant Superintendent of Police (ASP).

In the petition of appeal he has sought to have three more marks but he has not mentioned therein, the cut-off-mark which is necessary to ascertain whether he has obtained the required marks to have his promotion. Upon perusal of the petition of appeal and the submissions filed by the appellant, the Tribunal is to presume that his application is to have his promotion to the rank of ASP and to place him at No.45 in the selected list. Therefore the Tribunal notes that the appellant, particularly being an Attorney at Law, should not have filed his petition of appeal with those deficiencies, particularly without a proper relief being mentioned.

However, the Tribunal considered the circumstances upon which the appellant has sought the reliefs, in order to arrive at the correct decision in this appeal. Basically, his claim is that he should have been allocated three more marks to his total marks enabling him to obtain his promotion to the rank of ASP. In 2nd paragraph of the petition of appeal, appellant has mentioned that he has obtained a total of 388 marks. He has further stated that in the event three marks are added to his total marks, he would have been selected for the promotion.

Appellant is claiming two more marks for the commendation he was awarded and one mark for the good entries. (සාධු සටහන්) Tribunal looked at the mark-sheet in which the marks allocated to all the candidates for the respective areas which are shown under separate columns. In column 23:1 where the marks are allocated for commendations, it is clearly stated that commendations would be considered only when such commendations are awarded to a particular officer referring to a specific act performed by that officer. In that same cage 23:1, it is also mentioned that the commendations issued in common will not be considered for the allocation of marks.

Then the issue is whether or not the commendation issued to the appellant by the Inspector General of Police by his letter dated 28.05.2014, amounts to a commendation given in common or is it a commendation given personal to the appellant. In the heading of that letter of commendation it is mentioned as follows:

“APPRECIATION – VICTORY PARADE HELD IN MATARA ON 18TH
MAY 2014”.

Plain reading of the said heading in the letter of commendation, the so called recommendation is only an appreciation and not a commendation. Moreover, the alleged appreciation had been made commonly, to the officers who had participated at the victory parade held in Matara on 18th May 2014. Even though, the appellant had been the Deputy Squad Commander of the Sri Lanka Police, nowhere it is stated that it was given personally to the appellant though it is mentioned that he was one of the Deputy Squad Commander of the contingent of the Sri Lanka Police. Therefore, the appreciation mentioned in the letter dated 28.05.2014 cannot be considered to allocate marks in favor of the appellant.

The appellant also has claimed one mark for good entries for traffic matters. Allocation for marks for such good entries is shown in the column 2:3:4:3 in the said results sheet. In that column, it is clearly mentioned that there should have been 20 good entries for traffic, in order to obtain one mark. Appellant in his petition appeal as well as in his submission has stated that he has only nine such good entries. Therefore, on the face of it, the appellant is not entitled to any mark for traffic good entries when he has only nine good entries. Having been aware of the criteria to allocate marks for good entries for traffic, it is wrong to have claimed more marks by the appellant, he being a senior officer in the Department of Police.

For the reasons set out before, it is clear that the appellant is not entitled to have three more marks on the basis he had claimed such marks. Therefore, Tribunal decides to dismiss this appeal.

Appeal is dismissed.

I agree.

**Justice K T Chitrasiri,
(Chairman)**

I agree.

**J J Ratnasiri
(Member)**

**S Nandasekaran
(Member)**

MD/