I said



# STATEMENT BY THE INTEGRITY COMMISSION OF TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

The recent statements by Senator the Honourable Anand Ramlogan, Attorney General need to be addressed by the Integrity Commission; they are misleading and inaccurate and could lead to serious misunderstanding on the part of the public.

The Integrity Commission has been accused of the following:

- (a) That the Commission suppressed his letters of 7<sup>th</sup>, 11<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> November 2013;
- (b) That the Commission has breached his legal right to be informed of the investigation in respect of the Range Rover vehicles;
- (c) Procedural impropriety; and
- (d) Leakages to the Express Newspaper.

### **Suppression of letters**

Three (3) letters were received from Senator Ramlogan over a period of seven (7) days;

- November 7<sup>th</sup> 2013 enquiring whether a complaint had been lodged.
- November 11<sup>th</sup> 2013 (received November 13) implying deliberate leaks to the Express.
- November 13<sup>th</sup> 2013 requesting that copies of correspondence be sent to all Commissioners.

The Commission meets weekly. There was a meeting held on Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> November, 2013. At that meeting the Commission had before it for consideration Mr. Ramlogan's letter dated 7<sup>th</sup> November 2013. However, the Commission also had before it a draft letter of November 6<sup>th</sup> 2013 for approval which was intended to inform Mr. Ramlogan that an investigation on the matter had commenced. The Commission found it necessary to adjust its letter of November 6<sup>th</sup> 2013 to *inter alia* acknowledge receipt of Mr. Ramlogan's letter of November 7<sup>th</sup> 2013. Mr. Ramlogan was so informed.

It must be emphasised that the Commission was under no obligation to apologise to Mr. Ramlogan. It merely extended discretionary courtesy in view of the six-week period that had elapsed between September 23<sup>rd</sup> (when the investigation commenced) and November 7<sup>th</sup> 2013. Similar courtesies have been extended to others. Mr. Ramlogan's letters of 11<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> November 2013 are scheduled for the next meeting of the Commission.

### **Breach of Legal Rights**

Mr. Ramlogan alleges that his right to be heard was breached by the Commission. Nothing could be further from the truth. Mr. Ramlogan can point to no legal right to be informed of an investigation being conducted by the Integrity Commission unless he comes within section 38 of the Integrity in Public Life Act (IPLA), (The Act).

Section 38 is pellucidly clear:

"No report concluding that a person to whom this Act applies has failed without reasonable justification to fulfil a duty or obligation under this Act shall be made until reasonable notice has been given to such person of the alleged failure and the person has been allowed full opportunity to be heard either in person or by an Attorney-at-Law."

Mr. Ramlogan's legal right to be heard only arises if the report from the Commission concludes that the person under investigation has breached any of his obligations under the Act. A report is only prepared following completion of the investigation.

## Procedural Impropriety.

Mr. Ramlogan can point to nothing that was procedurally improper in the course of action taken by the Commission. The Commission has followed both the letter and the spirit of the law in the conduct of this investigation.

#### **Leaks to the Express**

The Commission rejects outright the clear inference made by the Attorney General that the Commission and more particularly its Chairman, has leaked information to the Express Newspapers. It is unfortunate and to be deeply regretted that so irresponsible a charge could be flippantly made without any supporting evidence. The Commission has previously demonstrated its commitment to its oath of office and will continue to do so.

November 18th 2013.