



INTEGRITY COMMISSION

Corporate Office
3rd to 6th Floors, Sagcor-Sigma Building, 63-67 Knutsford Boulevard
Kingston 5, Jamaica W.I.
Tel: (876)-929-6460, (876)-929-8560, (876)-929-6466
Fax: (876)-929-7335
Website: www.integrity.gov.jm

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Statement from the Integrity Commission on Applications in *Andrew Holness et al v Integrity Commission et al*

August 1, 2025- The Integrity Commission (“the Commission”) takes this opportunity to clarify the decisions delivered by a judge of the Supreme Court in the captioned claim as there appears to be some misconceptions in the media.

On July 31, 2025, Miss Justice Althea Jarrett dismissed the application by the Hon. Prime Minister and 3 connected companies to strike out parts of the Director of Information’s affidavit as being scandalous, irrelevant and an abuse of process. The Judge held that the evidence is relevant to the claim and that the Director of Information had a duty to disclose the information.

The Judge also dismissed the Claimants’ application to obtain unredacted versions of the minutes and memoranda for meetings of the Commission and committees of the Commission. The Judge accepted the Commission’s explanation that the minutes and memoranda included information on public officials and other business which did not relate to the claim and was therefore irrelevant. The Judge also agreed that disclosing this information would breach the confidentiality provisions of the Integrity Commission Act.

The Judge refused to grant the Claimants the wide disclosure they wanted of all documents prepared by three investigators who worked on the investigation report, instead limiting the disclosure to such documents, if they exist, which contain their analysis, conclusions and recommendations concerning the investigation and the investigation report. The Judge expressly refused the Claimants’ application for disclosure of the resignation of one of the investigators on the basis that it was irrelevant.

The Commission’s application to strike out parts of the Claimants’ claim on the basis that they were an abuse of process was largely granted. The Judge agreed with the Commission’s attorneys that the parts of the claim that suggested the Director of Information had “purportedly” examined

the statutory declarations for 2022 and 2023 was not correct given the court's earlier ruling that the Director of Information had discharged his statutory duty in relation to those declarations. Similarly, the Judge struck out that part of the claim which alleged that the Commission (as opposed to the Director of Investigation) had carried out the investigation or issued the investigation report.

The Claimants' attorneys applied for permission to appeal the decisions made against them. They also applied for the proceedings to be stayed pending appeal. The Judge granted both applications. In the circumstances, it is unlikely that the trial of the claim which was scheduled for October 2025 will proceed on that date.

The Commission did not seek permission to appeal the Judge's orders as those orders were largely consistent with its position and the submissions its attorneys made. The Commission would have preferred to resolve the substantive issues in the shortest possible time but remains ready to defend its position in any appeal which the Claimants file.

For more information, contact the Integrity Commission on the numbers listed below.

END

Contact: Nasseta Stewart

Communications Department, Integrity Commission

E-mail: communications@integrity.gov.jm

Tel: (876)929-6460/ (876) 929-8560/ (876)929-6466, Fax: (876)929-7335