

Dear Keith, I refer to my mail of 11 May and wish to inform you that I had internal consultations with senior members of the Managing Committee of CILTM on the points you have raised in your your mail of 10 May and which you intend to bring to the attention of the Trustees tomorrow.

At first sight, it would seem that the advice of the Trustees communicated to me in your mail of 05 March was relied upon the fact that a case had been lodged by Dawoodarry and Lalsing against CILTM, in which circumstance any action on our part to initiate proceedings would be tantamount to pre-empting the decision of the Court, and could ultimately be prejudicial to the case in question.

And here I must hasten to add that indeed in one of his mails addressed to you, Dawoodarry and Lalsing had indicated that they had caused a Mise en Demeure to be served on CILTM on 04 February 2019 for damages amounting to Mauritian Rupees 2 million. On 26 February, CILTM issued a communique to set the record right for the benefit of the general public and our members. At the same time, through the good office of our Attorney, we reacted to the Mise en Demeure served on CILTM stating that we would resist any claim for damage in Court should the complaint be lodged accordingly.

I also recall that both Karan and myself wrote to you to provide our explanations on the intention of Dawoodarry and Lalsing. We also sent you a copy of the press communique we issued on 23 February 2019. You may wish to refer to my mail of 26 February which speaks volume.

As I write to you now, there is no evidence that there is any case that is pending before any Court of Law in Mauritius in which either CILTM, as a body corporate or any of the members of the Managing Committee, including me is involved. On the contrary, I have filed complaints against both Dawoodarry and Lalsing in my private capacity. The case will be heard by the Court in due course. As Chairman of CILTM, I have also given a statement to the Police against Dawoodarry and Lalsing for false and malicious denunciation in writing. Similarly, I am suing two local media for libel.

Therefore, our decision to contemplate action against Dawoodarry and Lalsing was premised on the fact that there was as such no case against CILTM which would otherwise prejudice our position in Court. It was not and neither is, our intention to depart from the instructions of the Trustees which were constructed on a number of facts which eventually proved to be "incorrect". I am sure if the Trustees are now made privy to the exact state of play, their guidance would be different. With due respect to the Trustees, we have neither ignored nor questioned, still less dismissed their advice. May be you understand now why we had to solicit your advice anew, the more so as, you were already fully alive to these new developments. I would consequently suggest that either you review paragraph 2 of the proposal you wish to bring to the attention of the Trustees or delete it altogether, so that it reflects the clarifications that we have provided above.

I am available for any comments from your side. Sorry for the late reply.

Warm personal regards.

Dass Appadu