

*the
boards &
calico bag
and binding*
OS
8/3/20

REPORT

ON THE

JUDICIAL ARRANGEMENTS

CONSEQUENT ON

Mr. Meyer's Proposals for the Constitution of fresh Districts and the
Redistribution of Divisional Charges,

and on connected questions

BY

A. G. CARDEW, Esq., I.C.S.,

ON SPECIAL DUTY.

*Chief Secretariat
Library
Fort St George*

Government of Madras.		
SECRETARIAT LIBRARY		
Class	<u>XIII A</u>	No. 193

Ch. S. III (Library)-1-3,000-23 12 36.

MADRAS:

PRINTED BY THE SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT PRESS.

1905.

Not for Sale.

Embrey

81-
REPORT

ON THE

JUDICIAL ARRANGEMENTS

CONSEQUENT ON

Meyer's Proposals for the Constitution of fresh Districts and the
Redistribution of Divisional Charges,

and on connected questions

BY

A. G. CARDEW, Esq., I.C.S.,

ON SPECIAL DUTY.

MADRAS:

PRINTED BY THE SUPERINTENDENT, GOVERNMENT PRESS.

1905..



R
324(4,7,2)170-1
1705

R
V211,7 N03E
N05

CONTENTS.

	Page
Letter No. 35, dated 28th January 1905	1
Introductory and General remarks	1
Proposals relating to individual districts—	
Group 1.—Gódvári, Kistna, Guntúr and connected districts	5
" 2.—The North Arcot District and the proposed new districts of Chittoor and Vellore	15
" 3.—The Ceded districts—Cuddapah, Bellary and Anantapur	19
" 4.—The South Arcot, Coimbatore, Salem and Trichinopoly districts	20
" 5.—Madura, Tanjore and Tinnevely districts	26
Appendix.—Statement showing the territorial jurisdictions of District, Subordinate Judges' and District Munsifs' Courts as they stood on 31st December 1904	36
Letter No. 40, dated 15th March 1905	43
Further remarks regarding redistribution of jurisdictions in the Ceded districts	43
Proposed establishment of a Sub-Court at Erode	45
Suggested establishment of a Sub-Court in place of the District Court of North Malabar at Tellicherry	46
General and concluding remarks	47
Letter No. 45, dated 25th March 1905	51
Proposals for the reduction of ministerial and other establishment in the Gódvári District Court	51
Ministerial and other establishment proposed for the new Guntúr District Court	51
Proposals for the reduction of ministerial and other establishment in the Cuddapah District Court	52
Proposals for the reduction of ministerial and other establishment in the Salem District Court	52
Proposals for the reduction of ministerial and other establishment in the Coimbatore District Court	52
Proposals for the reduction of ministerial and other establishment in the Madura District Court	52
Ministerial and other establishment proposed for the new Ramnad District Court	53
Appendix I.—Statement showing the existing ministerial and other establishments of all District Courts	54
Appendix II.—Proposition statements of ministerial and other establishments in District Courts in which modifications are proposed to be made	58

From A. G. CARDEW, Esq., I.C.S., on Special Duty, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Judicial Department, Fort St. George (through the Honourable the Judges of the High Court), dated Madras, 28th January 1905, No. 35.

I have the honour to submit the following report with reference to G.O., No. 1556, Judicial, dated 14th October 1904.

2. In that order I am directed to enquire and report on the judicial aspect of Mr. Meyer's proposals for the redistribution of districts and divisional charges including those relating to the three already formed districts of Gódvári, Kistna and Guntúr. No reference is made to Mr. Meyer's proposals for the revision of taluk limits, and these, I understand, have not yet been finally approved by Government. These proposals are, therefore, not dealt with in this report, except where expressly mentioned, or where district boundaries are affected.

3. Before dealing with Mr. Meyer's proposals concerning individual districts, a few general points may be noticed. One of the questions which will frequently arise in the following report is the amount of work which may fairly be expected from a court of the different classes concerned. As bearing on this question, the following table showing the actual annual outturn of the more important classes of work during the three years ending 1903 in the courts of the several District and Subordinate Judges of the Presidency has been prepared:—

DISPOSALS in District Courts and Sub-Courts—Three years' average.
(Contested and uncontested litigation.)

District Courts.						Sub-Courts.			
District Courts.	Ordinary suits.	Civil appeals (excluding rent appeals).	Small causes.	Sessions cases.	Criminal appeals and revision cases.	Ordinary suits.	Civil appeals.	Small causes.	Sub-Courts.
Arcoot, North ..	23	185	..	73	91	40	230	134	Formerly Bellary—Salem, and now additional Sub-Court, Gódvári.
Arcoot, South ..	25	300	..	55	104				
Bellary ..	27	164	..	55	86				
Canara, South ..	10	273	..	19	74	68	183	255	Mangalore.
Chingleput ..	38	184	..	23	76				
Coimbatore ..	32	167	..	118	150	111	4	684	The Nilgiris.
Cuddapah ..	17	211	..	80	90				
Ganjam ..	47	231	43	23	54				
Gódvári ..	43	232	..	47	93	59	200	1,236	Cocanada.
Kistna ..	21	280	..	56	105	42	219	1,913	Masulipatam.
Karnool ..	13	159	..	80	73				
Madura ..	4	375	..	107	146	87	54	1,365	Madura, East.
Malabar, North ..	14	350	663	38	20	43	48	1,714	Do. West.
Malabar, South ..	4	381	..	77	148	36	312	440	Calicut.
Nellore ..	45	219	145	49	45	41	331	1,276	Palghat.
Salem ..	19	205	28	91	104				
Tanjore ..	1	630	..	61	165	49	75	1,864	Tanjore.
						92	86	2,693	Kumbakonam.
						56	72	1,812	Negapatam.
Tinnevelly ..	3	193	..	65	97	56	106	1,965	Tinnevelly.
						59	97	733	Tuticorin.
Trichinopoly ..	24	227	228	38	78				
Vizagapatam ..	28	314	..	20	38				
Average ..	22	262	221	59	92	60	144	1,292	

4. The above table shows actual outturn of the several main classes of work, but as one court tries more civil suits, another more appeals and a third more sessions cases, comparison is difficult. To obviate this, an attempt has been made in the next table to convert into days the contested portion of the outturn of work shown by each of the courts included in the table in paragraph 3 *supra*, and thus to present it in a common denomination. Estimates received from various District Judges indicate that, on an average, three days should be allowed for the trial of a contested civil suit and one day and a half for a sessions case, while four civil appeals or ten criminal appeals or criminal revision cases can be disposed of per diem. It seems probable that this calculation overstates the time required for criminal work and therefore exaggerates the outturn of those courts where a large number of sessions trials are held. If allowance is made for this, the table will perhaps be of some use in estimating the work done by District Courts:—

Contested litigation (disposals) of District and Sub-Courts reduced to a uniform standard.

Name of District Court.	District Courts.						Sub-Courts.				
	Ordinary suits	Civil appeals excluding rent appeals	Sessions cases	Criminal appeals and revision cases	Total work (in days).	Percent- age of column 6 to average (in days).	Ordinary suits	Civil appeals	Small causes	Total work (in days).	Percent- age of column 11 to average (in days).
	at three days for one suit.	at one day for four appeals.	at one day and a half for one case.	at one day for ten cases.			at three days for one suit.	at one day for four appeals.	at one day for thirty cases.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Arcoot, North ..	46	21	110	9	185	95	111	49	1	161	91
Arcoot, South ..	42	68	83	10	203	105	153	42	2	197	111
Bellary ..	63	38	83	9	193	99	141	1	5	147	83
Canara, South ..	12	61	29	7	109	56	141	49	12	202	114
Chingleput ..	78	37	35	8	158	81	139	13	12	214	121
Chingleput ..	48	38	177	15	278	143	139	11	14	112	63
Cuddapah ..	39	50	120	9	218	112	102	74	6	176	99
Ganjum ..	114	53	35	5	207	107	102	74	14	190	107
Godavari ..	84	33	11	5	137	70	98	17	17	162	92
Kistna ..	51	46	84	11	192	99	139	13	12	214	121
Kurnool ..	33	33	120	7	193	99	139	11	14	112	63
Madura ..	12	80	161	15	268	138	139	74	6	176	99
Malabar, North ..	27	81	57	2	167	86	102	74	14	190	107
Malabar, South ..	9	89	116	15	229	118	102	74	14	190	107
Nellore ..	99	43	74	5	221	114	102	74	14	190	107
Salem ..	21	40	137	10	208	107	102	74	14	190	107
Tanjore ..	3	74	92	17	186	96	102	74	14	190	107
Tinnevely ..	9	46	98	10	163	84	102	74	14	190	107
Trichinopoly ..	36	47	57	8	148	76	102	74	14	190	107
Vizagapatam ..	57	73	30	4	163	84	102	74	14	190	107
Average ..	44	63	88	9	194	100	130	33	13	177	100

Formerly Bellary-Salem, now Additional Sub-Court, Godavari.

Mangalore.

The Nilgiris.

Ocanada.

Masulipatam.

Madura, East.

Madura, West.

Calicut.

Palghat.

Tanjore.

Kumbakonam.

Nagapattinam.

Tinnevely.

Tuticorin.

5. Further light on the outturn of work which may properly be expected from a District or other Court is furnished in the statement of actual average disposals during ten years (1894—1903) which was furnished in Mr. Gillespie's letter to Government, Dis. No. 742, dated 12th August 1904. This statement, which the Honourable the Judges of the High Court offered as a standard *minimum* scale of work, is as follows:—

Class of Courts.	Ordinary Suits.			Small Causes.			Civil Appeals.			Sessions cases.	Criminal appeals and revision cases.
	Contested.	Uncontested.	Total.	Contested.	Uncontested.	Total.	Contested.	Uncontested.	Total.		
District and Sessions Court ..	15	7	22	..	..	..	* 208	47	255	57	87
Sub-Court ..	47	20	67	418	957	1,375	128	12	140	..	..
District Munsif's Court ..	331	367	698	224	853	1,077	..	..	..	..	..

* Rent appeals, average number 101, have been excluded from the figure here furnished by the High Court for reasons given in paragraph 10.

Converting into days on the basis adopted in paragraph 4 the outturn of contested work here shown, each District Court is expected to turn out 192 days' work per annum. A court actually has about 215 working days per annum after deducting Sundays, holidays and the recess, and the difference between 192 and 215 is devoted to uncontested and unclassified cases and to administrative work. Reference to the figures in column 7 of the table in paragraph 4 appears to show that during the three years 1901—1903 a good many courts failed to reach the average outturn which is regarded by the Honourable the Judges of the High Court as a minimum.

6. It is, of course, to be remembered that all such numerical estimates of judicial outturn afford only a very rough and imperfect means of estimating the real work coming before a court. In some parts of the country suits are less intricate and are less keenly contested than in others. In other localities suits, especially suits for rent, are filed in batches, thus swelling the file out of proportion to the work done. Again some classes of suits, notably those relating to land, take more time than suits relating to money. Occasionally a single complicated civil suit may engage a court for weeks.

7. A feature which cannot but attract attention in the tables given in paragraphs 3 and 4 is the fact that in some of the wealthiest and most litigious districts of the Presidency, such as Madura, South Malabar, Tanjore and Tinnevely, the District Judge rarely tries an original civil suit, and the whole original civil litigation above Rs. 2,500 is tried by the Sub-Judges. This seems undesirable, seeing that from these districts the Civilian Judges of the High Court are often selected. Even in other districts the District Judge is unable to devote more than a small portion of his time to original civil suits, as he has to spend so large a proportion of it in trying sessions cases. While the District Judge's opportunities of studying civil law and procedure are thus unduly limited, the Sub-Judges on the other hand do not now try sessions cases and thus remain without experience of criminal work. Both defects would be remedied if it were possible to impose on Sub-Judges a definite share of sessions work, thus leaving the District Judge more time for the exercise of his civil original jurisdiction.

8. In 1895 the Government of India framed a rule under Statute 33 Vict., c. 3 section 6, enabling Subordinate Judges to be appointed Assistant Sessions Judges, at the same time limiting the number of such appointments to two. After due trial of this system, the High Court reported in Mr. Cowie's letter No. 1548, dated 9th September 1897, that it had proved successful, but there is at present no Sub-Judge exercising powers as an Assistant Sessions Judge. If it is desired to increase the share of original civil work done by District Judges, it might be worth while to extend the system which was commenced in 1895. Mr. Meyer's proposals contemplate the appointment of at least one Sub-Judge as Assistant Sessions Judge.

9. In rearranging the jurisdiction of District Courts in accordance with Mr. Meyer's proposals for revenue limits, the question has frequently arisen whether the jurisdiction of the District Court must be conterminous with that of the revenue district. There would be considerable administrative inconvenience to the Police, Public Prosecutor and District Magistrate if the Sessions divisions varied from the revenue district. But there would be no administrative inconvenience involved in allowing a part of one revenue district to be subject, for civil work, to the Judge of another district. This arrangement may, however, cause inconvenience to the public and both the High Court and Government are understood to wish that the present system, which makes the revenue district the unit for Judicial administration, should be as far as possible maintained. This has accordingly been adhered to except in two or three instances, in which the grounds for the exception are fully stated.

10. In the following paragraphs, miscellaneous classes of work, such as petitions, execution proceedings, criminal appeals and criminal revision petitions are not shown. These classes of work are usually proportionate to the main classes which are exhibited. Rent appeals, which, in statement F-4 of the Civil Justice Report, are lumped under civil appeals, have on the other hand been separately set forth, as they are frequently filed in large batches, each batch being disposed of by a single judgment and their inclusion under civil appeals would be liable to give an exaggerated notion of the work under that head.

11. The existing territorial jurisdictions of all Civil Courts in the Presidency are shown in an appendix to this report, but this appendix is only approximately accurate and the compilation of an exhaustive statement of territorial jurisdictions is now under consideration in the High Court.

12. Mr. Meyer's proposals affecting individual districts will now be referred to. The districts affected by those proposals may for the purposes of this report be divided into five groups, viz.—

- (1) The northern group consisting of Gódvári, Kistna, Guntúr and in a minor degree Nellore and Kurnool.
- (2) The North Arcot district and the proposed new districts of Chittoor and Vellore.
- (3) The Ceded districts group containing Cuddapah, Bellary and Anantapur.
- (4) The central group comprising South Arcot, Salem, Coimbatore and Trichinopoly.
- (5) The southern group consisting of Madura, Tanjore and Tinnevely.

GROUP 1.—GÓDVÁRI, KISTNA, GUNTÚR AND CONNECTED DISTRICTS.

13. In the following table the revenue arrangements of the above group of districts as they existed before the 1st October 1904 and since that date (under G.O., No. 560, Public, dated 29th June 1904), are briefly set forth:—

Arrangement prior to 1st October 1904.			Arrangement now in force.		
A. Gódvári District.			A. New Gódvári.		
Divisions.	Taluk.		Divisions.	Taluk.	
1. Rajahmundry ..	Rajahmundry.	Ramachandrapuram.	1. Rajahmundry ..	Rajahmundry.	Amalapuram.
	Amalapuram.			Nagar Island (from Narasapur).	Bhadrachalam.
2. Ellore ..	Ellore.	Yernagudem.	2. Bhadrachalam Agency ..	Nagar ..	From Central Province on 1st January 1905.
	Tanuku.	Pollavaram.		Pollavaram.	
3. Pollavaram (Agency) ..	Yellavaram.	Chodavaram.	3. Pollavaram Agency ..	Chodavaram.	Peddapuram.
	Bhadrachalam.	Narasapur.		Ramachandrapuram.	Cocanada.
4. Narasapur ..	Bhimavaram.	Peddapuram.	4. Peddapuram ..	Pithapuram.	Tuni.
	Cocanada.	Pithapuram.	5. Head-quarters ..		

Arrangement prior to 1st October 1904.			Arrangement now in force.		
B. Kistna District.			B. New Kistna.		
Divisions.	Taluku.		Divisions.	Taluku.	
1. Guntúr	Guntúr.	Tenali.	1. Narasapur	Narasapur (except Nagaram island).	Bhímavaram.
2. Bezvada	Bápatla.	Sattenapalle.	2. Bezvada	Bezvada.	Nandigáma.
3. Narasaraopet	Nuzvid.	Tiruvur.	3. Ellore	Nuzvid.	Tiruvur.
4. Head-quarters	Narasaraopet.	Vinukonda.	4. Gudiváda	Ellore.	Yernagudem.
	Palnad.		5. Head-quarters	Gudiváda.	Bunder.
	Bunder.	Gudiváda.			
C. Nellore.			D. Guntúr (New District).		
Ongole	Ongole.		1. Ongole	Ongole.	Bápatla.
(remainder not interfered with.)			2. Narasaraopet	Narasaraopet.	Vinukonda.
			3. Tenali	Palnad.	Tenali.
			4. Head-quarters	Tenali.	Guntúr.
				Guntúr.	Sattenapalle.

14. The main changes in revenue arrangements above shown are —

(1) The transfer of the revenue taluks of Bhímavaram, Ellore, Narasapur (except Nagaram island), Tanuku and Yernagudem from Gódvári to Kistna.

(2) The transfer of the revenue taluks of Bápatla, Narasaraopet, Vinukonda, Palnad, Tenali, Guntúr and Sattenapalle from Kistna and of the Ongole taluk from Nellore to form the new district of Guntúr.

15. The three taluks of Albaka, Cherla and Nugar which, with effect from 1st January 1905, are to be transferred from the Central Provinces to the new Gódvári district, will be within the agency tracts, and their civil work will be dealt with by agency officers and will not affect the judicial arrangements outside the agency. If the further changes in taluks which are proposed in Mr. Meyer's report, dated 28th January 1904 (paragraphs 76 to 81), and which have been accepted by Government in Mr. Hammick's letter to the Government of India, No. 795, Public, dated 26th September 1904, are eventually sanctioned, they will not materially affect the proposals made in the following report.

16. Although the changes in the revenue limits of the Gódvári and Kistna districts (with Nellore) shown in paragraph 14 took effect from the 1st October 1904, no change has yet been made in the jurisdiction of the Civil or Sessions Courts, which therefore remain as heretofore, as shown in the appendix to this report. In each district there is, besides the District Court, a Subordinate Judge's Court, situated in the case of Gódvári at Cocanada, and in that of Kistna at Masulipatam. Below these superior courts there are the courts of District Munsifs, eight in the former district and seven in the latter.

17. In addition to the regular superior courts of the Gódvári district, there is also at present stationed at Rajahmundry a temporary additional subordinate judge's court which was previously employed at Salem, Bellary and elsewhere. This court was sent to work in Gódvári as a temporary measure and for a special purpose, namely to assist in clearing off the arrears of work which had arisen in the District Court owing to that Court being long occupied with the trial of the suit relating to the partition of the Nidadavolu zamindari (*vide* correspondence recorded in G.O., No. 692, Judicial, dated 12th May 1903). These arrears will probably be cleared off by the

end of the present official year, and as the Sub-Judge will then presumably be withdrawn, his Court has not been taken into account in regard to future judicial arrangements, except in so far as its presence has affected past statistics.

18. In the following table the principal classes of civil and criminal litigation received in the superior courts of the old districts of Gódvári and Kistna and the Ongole taluk of the Nellore district are shown and are compared with the distribution of the same litigation between the three new districts of Gódvári, Kistna and Guntúr, adopting the new revenue limits also for judicial purposes:—

	Average of institutions for three years 1901—1903.							
	A. DISTRIBUTION AMONG OLD DISTRICTS (PRESENT FILES).							
	Old Gódvári.			Old Kistna.			Nellore.	Grand total of both districts plus Ongole taluk.
	District Judge.	Sub-Judge.	Total.	District Judge.	Sub-Judge.	Total.	Ongole taluk.	
Ordinary Suits	60	65	125	20	45	65	4	194
Small Causes	..	1,245	1,245	..	1,937	1,937	..	3,182
Civil Appeals (other than rent appeals)	388	203	591	469	..	469	43	1,103
Rent Appeals	715	..	715	599	..	599	..	1,314
Sessions Cases	47	..	47	53	..	53	4	104

	B. DISTRIBUTION AMONG NEW DISTRICTS.							
	New Gódvári.			New Kistna.			New Guntúr.	Grand total of three districts.
	District Judge.	Sub-Judge.	Total.	District Judge.	Sub-Judge.	Total.		
	District Judge.	Sub-Judge.	Total.	District Judge.	Sub-Judge.	Total.		
Ordinary Suits	24	67	91	34	47	81	22	194
Small Causes	..	1,245	1,245	..	1,937	1,937	..	3,182
Civil Appeals (other than rent appeals)	86	214	300	295	248	543	260	1,103
Rent Appeals	8	..	8	1,306	..	1,306	..	1,314
Sessions cases	29	..	29	40	..	40	35	104

19. The above table shows that the total amount of litigation which will be received whether in the new Gódvári district or in the new Kistna district will be greatly in excess of the powers of a single District Court. The figures of actual output given in paragraphs 3 and 4 *supra* and the High Court's figures of standard work given in paragraph 5 *supra* prove that no District Court can be relied on to deal with 91 ordinary suits, 308 civil and rent appeals and 29 sessions cases, as in Gódvári, or with 81 ordinary suits, 543 civil appeals, 1,306 rent appeals and 40 sessions cases, as in Kistna. In each district, therefore, a second court is needed and must be retained.

20. It may be suggested that if one Sub-Court were provided for the two districts, sitting half the year in one district and half the year in the other, or if a single Sub-Court were located at Ellore with jurisdiction over parts of both districts, it might be possible to carry out Mr. Meyer's suggestion and to abolish one of the two existing Sub-Courts. I have carefully examined these alternatives and I am convinced that they are entirely impracticable. An itinerating court is always an expensive and ineffective arrangement, weeks being wasted before and after each move owing to the difficulty of posting cases, and no such plan should be at all entertained. The establishment of a single Sub-Court at Ellore would also be ineffectual and expensive. In the first place it would involve a serious divergence between the judicial and revenue limits of districts which is contrary to the wishes of Government and of the High Court. In the second place it would be impossible to prevent some of the

munsifs of new Kistna which lie just south of the Gódvári river such as Tanuku, Narasapur and Bhímavaram having to be included within the jurisdiction of the District Court, Kistna, and litigants being thus required to go a very long and costly journey by canal, rail, and canal again to reach Masulipatam. In the third place, the amount of litigation contributed by the two districts, viz., 172 ordinary suits, 3,182 small causes, 843 civil appeals, 1,314 rent appeals, and 69 sessions cases is in excess of what can be dealt with by three courts. It would certainly be necessary immediately to create two additional munsifs in order to deal with the small cause work now done by the Sub-Courts, and as the cost of two District Munsifs with their establishments would be Rs. 9,024 per annum while the saving obtained by the abolition of a Subordinate Judge's Court would be Rs. 10,560, the economy would be inappreciable. Even if the three Courts were thus relieved of small cause work, an average file of 57 ordinary suits, 281 appeals, and 34 sessions cases, without reckoning rent appeals, would be clearly in excess of the outturn to be expected of an average District Court, as the figures in paragraphs 3, 4, and 5 sufficiently prove. In fact on the basis adopted in paragraph 4 it is equivalent to 292 days' work. It may, therefore, be confidently affirmed that the result of attempting to work the two districts of Gódvári and Kistna with three superior courts would certainly be delay, arrears, and the early re-creation of another Sub-Court with all the disadvantages of increased expense and temporary tenure.

21. There are other objections to any proposal which would involve the abolition of the Sub-Court at Cocanada. That abolition would raise in an acute form the long-standing dispute as to whether the single remaining Court should be located at Rajahmundry or at Cocanada. When, in 1882-83, Mr. Kelsall, then District Judge, proposed that the building for the District Court of Gódvári should be built at Cocanada, the proposal was negatived in G.O. No. 596, Judicial, dated 2nd March 1883. This decision may have been correct at the time, but since then the town of Cocanada has greatly increased its lead in advance of the town of Rajahmundry. This will be apparent from the census figures of population, namely:—

	1871.	1881.	1891.	1901.
Cocanada	17,839	28,856	40,553	48,096
Rajahmundry	22,738	24,555	28,397	36,408

Cocanada is now as large again as Rajahmundry. It is the centre of trade in the district. The assertion that the trade of Cocanada is dwindling is not borne out by facts as the following table will show:—

Year.	Tonnage of ships entering the port of Cocanada.	Total value of imports (excluding Government stores).	Total value of exports (excluding Government stores).
1899-1900	Tons. 438,714	Rs. 26,25,148	Rs. 1,16,25,186
1900-1901	346,338	47,17,660	75,54,460
1901-1902	441,462	41,25,284	89,79,908
1902-1903	477,608	25,10,361	1,22,80,168
1903-1904	524,545	28,72,312	1,67,31,526

22. There are at Cocanada a considerable body of British merchants, a Chamber of Commerce and a branch of the Bank of Madras. These interests have always been strongly opposed to any change which would deprive Cocanada of the presence of a superior court, and representations on this subject have recently been made to the High Court, and were repeated to me. Rajahmundry, on the other hand, is not an important trade centre, shows less growth of population, and has no European population beyond officials and missionaries. There can be little doubt that, if the Gódvári district were to have only one Court, that Court should be located at Cocanada. But

jurisdiction over the Narasapur and Bhimavaram munsifs, in lieu of over the Masulipatam munsifi. On this arrangement taking effect, it will be unnecessary to maintain a separate District Munsif's Court at Bhimavaram. This court was only established in 1899 and has always been a light one. I propose therefore that this court should be abolished, and that the District Munsif thus set free should be transferred to the Masulipatam taluk, where he will be utilized to take over the large amount of work hitherto done on the small cause side of the Sub-Court. The Collector of Kistna (Mr. Parsons) states that the court-house now under construction at Bhimavaram can be utilized for the Stationary Sub-Magistrate. One other minor change is caused by the retention in the Kistna district of the Voyyur pargana of the Nuzvid zamindari which has hitherto been included in the Tenali munsifi. Upon this munsifi being transferred to the Guntur district the Voyyur pargana must be separated from it and will be incorporated in the Gudivada munsifi of new Kistna. These changes in jurisdiction, together with the present and future files of the fifteen munsifs concerned are shown in the following table:—

A. Present files—Average Institutions—3 years.

Munsifi.	Local jurisdictions.	Ordinary suits.	Small causes.
<i>I. Godavari District.</i>			
1. Cocanada	The Coringa Revenue division, the Revenue taluk of Cocanada except 20 villages, the Revenue taluk of Peddapuram except 86 villages.	534	1,008
2. Peddapuram	The Revenue taluks of Peddapuram, Pithapuram, and 20 villages of Cocanada taluk and 20 villages of Ramachandrapuram.	536	854
3. Amalapuram	The Revenue taluk of Amalapuram except 81 villages and 7 villages of Ramachandrapuram.	646	983
4. Rajahmundry	The Revenue taluk of Rajahmundry outside the Agency tracts, 40 villages of Ramachandrapuram, 31 villages of Amalapuram, 7 villages of Yernagudem and Yernagudem taluk except 46 villages.	876	1,344
5. Narasapur	The Revenue taluk of Narasapur except 1 village and 1 village of Bhimavaram taluk.	577	1,324
6. Bhimavaram	The Revenue taluk of Bhimavaram except 1 village and 1 village of Narasapur taluk.	708	623
7. Tanuku	The Revenue taluk of Tanuku except 10 villages and 4 villages of Yernagudem.	706	626
8. Ellore	The Revenue taluk of Ellore except 3 villages of Tanuku and 41 villages of Yernagudem.	604	1,216
<i>II. New Godavari District.</i>			
9. Masulipatam	The Revenue taluk of Masulipatam except 1 village and part of Valluru zamindari.	437	1,592
10. Bezvada	The Revenue taluks of Bezvada and Nandigama, the Visanagpet sub-division, and the Nuzvid zamindari except 2 parganas.	519	1,521
11. Gudivada	The Revenue taluk of Gudivada, with 1 village of Masulipatam, 1 pargana of Nuzvid, and 30 villages of the Valluru zamindari.	371	755
12. Guntur	The Revenue taluk of Guntur, 21 villages of Narasaraopet, 87 villages of Sattenapalle and 28 villages of Bapatla.	629	1,382
13. Bapatla	The Revenue taluk of Bapatla except 28 villages, 53 villages of Narasaraopet and 53 villages of Tenali.	760	922
14. Narasaraopet	The Revenue taluks of Palmad and Vinukonda, 99 villages of Narasaraopet and 76 of Sattenapalle.	1,270	891
15. Tenali	The Revenue taluk of Tenali except 53 villages and the Voyyur pargana of the Nuzvid zamindari.	437	714

B. Future files—Average Institutions—3 years.

<i>I. New Godavari District.</i>			
1. Cocanada	Unchanged	534	1,008
2. Peddapuram	Unchanged	536	854

This is undoubtedly a somewhat light file, though not lighter than that of South Canara.

—	Ordinary suits.	Civil appeals.	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
* File of District Court, Kistna (as shown in paragraph 27) ..	47	252	1,306	40
File of District Court, Guntur (as shown in paragraph 30) ..	22	260	..	35
Total ..	69	512	1,306	75

—	Ordinary suits.	Civil appeals.	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
† New district of Guntur (including Ongole) ..	22	260	..	35
Nellore district (excluding Ongole) ..	42	107	53	43
Total ..	64	367	53	78

32. Rail communication also exists by the Southern Mahratta line with the station of Dhone or Kurnool road, which is only 33 miles from Kurnool, and the possibility of uniting the civil and criminal work of the Guntur district with that of the Kurnool district has been considered. The Kurnool District Court has, in

—	Ordinary suits.	Civil appeals.	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
† New district of Guntur ..	32	260	..	35
Kurnool District (three-year average) ..	15	189	..	81
Total ..	37	449	..	116

respect of civil work, one of the lightest files in the Presidency, and could therefore well take over the civil work of the Guntur district. Unfortunately, however, the sessions work of Kurnool is already heavy, and if that of the Guntur district were added to it, the total would certainly be excessive. This is shown from the table in the margin,† and the plan of uniting Kurnool and Guntur districts under one District Court must therefore be held to be impracticable.

33. Another arrangement which deserves mention is that of attaching the five munsifs of the Guntur district for Sessions purposes to the Nellore or Kurnool district and establishing a Sub-Court at Guntur. There can, however, be no doubt that in view of the great distance between Nellore or Kurnool and the Guntur district, this plan would involve considerable difficulties. The rail journey from Bezwada to Nellore, 158 miles, takes 7½ hours by mail and double that time by ordinary trains. From Bezwada to Guntur is another 1½ hours. The third-class fare from Guntur to Nellore—Rupees 2-4-3—is a heavy charge for witnesses. From stations west of Guntur town, the journey would be still longer. That from Guntur to Kurnool Road is equally costly, the third-class fare being Rs. 2-4-0, while it takes even more time, viz., 14½ hours. There then remains the 33-mile road journey from Kurnool Road to Kurnool. On the whole, I do not think that either of these arrangements is suitable, and as I understand that a fresh recommendation has already been made to the Government of India regarding the creation of a District Court at Guntur, it is unnecessary to consider them further.

34. It has been suggested that in view of the lightness of the file which will come before the District Court of Guntur, that Court should be given civil jurisdiction over some part of the Kistna district. It would be quite easy to allow the District Court of Guntur to exercise original and appellate jurisdiction over the District Munsifi of Bezwada. There is rail communication between Bezwada and Guntur, and it

would be easier for litigants to go to Guntūr than to Masulipatam. If this arrangement were adopted, the Bezvada munsifi would still remain within the Masulipatam Sessions division for criminal purposes, but for civil work it would fall within the Guntūr district. The effect on the files of the two District Courts would be as follows :—

	Ordinary suits.	Civil appeals.	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
<i>A.—Guntūr District Court.</i>				
File as shown in paragraph 30	22	260	..	35
Add average institutions, Bezvada munsifi	18	75	..	..
Total	40	335	..	35
<i>B.—Kistna District Court.</i>				
File as shown in paragraph 27	47	252	1,306	40
Deduct average institutions, Bezvada munsifi	18	75	..	..
Balance	29	177	1,306	40

35. An objection to this arrangement is that it would give the District Court of Guntūr rather too much work while affording the District Court of Kistna an undue measure of relief. It may also be objected that suitors of the Bezvada munsifi would have to go to Guntūr for their ordinary civil suits and appeals, to Ellore for small causes, and to Masulipatam for sessions cases. This would certainly be awkward, but it seems undesirable to impose on the District Court of Guntūr the work of trying the 507 small causes contributed by the District Munsifi of Bezvada. The overlapping of one district by another is also contrary to the views of the High Court, and, it is believed, of Government too. For the present at least, therefore, I think that the district limits may be adhered to. The litigation received in the Guntūr District Court may increase, and if not, it will always be possible, at some later date, to extend its jurisdiction over the Bezvada Munsifi.

36. It will be necessary to build a court-house for the accommodation of the District Court at Guntūr. The cost of this building has been roughly estimated at Rs. 50,000.* The latest estimate for building a District Court, namely, that sanctioned in G.O., No. 586 W., dated 20th February 1904, amounted, however, to Rs. 98,400, so that the rough estimate of Rs. 50,000 may prove inadequate. Pending the construction of a court-house, the new District Court can be accommodated in the present District Munsifi's Court-house, the District Munsifi being temporarily located in a hired building.

37. The recommendations made in the foregoing paragraphs regarding this group of districts may be thus summed up :—

- (1) to adopt for judicial purposes the revenue limits of the three new districts of Gódvāri, Kistna and Guntūr;
- (2) to relieve the Sub-Court of Cocanada by transferring to the District Court of Gódvāri ordinary original and appellate jurisdiction over the Amalāpuram munsifi;
- (3) to allot to the District Judge of Kistna ordinary original and appellate jurisdiction over the munsifs of Masulipatam, Bezvada and Gódvāda;
- (4) to transfer the Kistna Sub-Court from Masulipatam to Ellore, giving it ordinary original and appellate jurisdiction over the Munsifs of Bhīmavaram, Narasapur, Tanuku and Ellore;
- (5) to abolish the small cause jurisdiction now exercised by the Sub-Court of Masulipatam over the Masulipatam munsifi and in lieu thereof to invest it with small cause jurisdiction over the Narasapur and Bhīmavaram munsifs;
- (6) to abolish the Munsifi's Court at Bhīmavaram, including its area within the Narasapur munsifi, and to establish instead an additional District Munsifi's Court at Masulipatam in order that it may take over the work hitherto done by the small cause side of the Sub-Court.

GROUP 2.—THE NORTH ARCOT DISTRICT AND THE PROPOSED NEW DISTRICTS OF CHITTOOR AND VELLORE.

38. The main features of Mr. Meyer's proposals regarding the North Arcot district are to divide it into two new districts, called Chittoor and Vellore, respectively, adding to the former the Madanapalle and Vayalpad taluks from Cuddapah and to the latter the Tiruppattūr taluk from Salem and the Tiruvannāmalai taluk from South Arcot. He also proposed to convert the present Wandiwash, Arcot and Walajapet taluks into four new taluks, to be named Wandiwash, Tiruvattiur, Arcot and Arkonam, respectively, but as these last arrangements do not appear to have been finally scrutinized and sanctioned by Government, they are not here taken into account.

39. The average file of the present District Court of North Arcot consists of 40 Ordinary suits, 155 Civil appeals, 42 Rent appeals and 71 Sessions cases. It has thus been a court of medium heaviness, but owing to the occurrence of some heavy suits, a Subordinate Judge's Court has on several occasions been deputed to the district to render assistance.

40. The future files of the Chittoor and Vellore districts will be as follow :—

Local areas.	Ordinary suits.	Civil appeals.	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
<i>A. Chittoor District.</i>				
Revenue taluk of Chittoor	2	21	1	4
" " of Palmanér	..	8	..	5
" " of Chāndragiri	2	11	3	5
Zemindari of Punganūru	1	5	..	2
" " of Kālahasti	9	7	2	5
" " of Karvetnagar	11	21	27	10
Total contribution from North Arcot	25	68	33	31
Revenue taluk of Madanapalle	1	19	..	6
" " of Vayalpad	..	9	..	7
Total contribution from Cuddapah	1	28	..	13
Total, new Chittoor	26	96	33	44
<i>B. Vellore District.</i>				
Revenue taluk of Vellore	3	18	..	10
" " of Gadiyāttam	5	13	1	9
" " of Arcot	1	9	..	5
" " of Walaja	4	23	..	6
" " of Polur	..	4	..	3
" " of Wandiwash	..	10	..	2
Zemindari of Kangundi	1	3	..	3
Jaghire of Arni	1	7	8	2
Total contribution from North Arcot	15	87	9	40
Revenue taluk of Tiruppattūr from Salem	6	27	5	11
" " of Tiruvannāmalai from South Arcot	1	25	..	8
Total, new Vellore	22	139	14	59

41. In paragraph 168 of his report Mr. Meyer proposes that one District Judge should be provided for the two new districts, a Subordinate Judge, who would also be an Assistant Sessions Judge being appointed to the Vellore district with head-quarters at Vellore. In Mr. Hammick's letter No. 795, Judicial, dated 26th September 1904, to the Government of India, this point has been reserved for further report. On the one hand it may be contended that Mr. Meyer's proposal is contrary to the established Madras system of having a District Judge for every Revenue district (with the exception of Anantapur and the Nilgiris) and that the files of the new Chittoor and Vellore districts will not be lighter than those of existing districts, such as Kurnool and South Canara. On the other hand the system of having a separate District Judge for each district has already been broken into by the exceptions made in the case of the Nilgiris and Anantapur. If the work of the two new districts can be efficiently managed by a District Judge aided by a Sub-Judge, the large extra expenditure, amounting to at least Rs. 20,000 per annum, which would be involved in employing two District Judges is unnecessary. The two districts will be closely connected by lines of rail and each head-quarters will be easily accessible from the other district. Their revenue history and tenures will be similar. Their combination in a single district for judicial purposes will greatly facilitate the formation of munsifs and as in the two

istrict Munsif's Court is held in the fort at Arni. This has been reported to be satisfactory and proposals for erecting a new court have already been made. No extra cost will therefore arise if it is erected at Tiruvannamalai.

50. The foregoing arrangement of the Munsifs in the Chittoor and Vellore districts effects a saving of one District Munsif's Court, as the Madanapalle District Munsif disappears.

51. The effects on the districts concerned of the transfer of Madanapalle and Vayalpad taluks from the Cuddapah district, of Tiruppattūr from Salem district and of Tiruvannamalai from South Arcot will be noticed in the following paragraphs.

GROUP 3.—THE CEDED DISTRICTS—CUDDAPAH, BELLARY AND ANANTAPUR.

52. Mr. Meyer's proposals affecting this group of districts involve the separation of the Kadiri, Madanapalle and Vayalpad taluks from the Cuddapah district, the first being added to the district of Anantapur and the two others to the new district of Chittoor. The contribution which the two last-named taluks will make to the Chittoor district has already been noticed.

53. The effect of these reductions on the file of the District Court of Cuddapah is shown in the following table :—

							Cuddapah District Court—Institutions—Three years' average.			
							Ordinary suits.	Civil appeals.	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
Present file	..	..	..	..	..	..	16	192	..	80
Subtract Kadiri taluk	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	13	..	3
Do. Madanapalle taluk	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	19	..	6
Do. Vayalpad taluk	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	9	..	7
Total							18	211	..	96
Balance (future file)							14	168	..	59

The Cuddapah District Court file, at present a heavy one, will thus be considerably reduced and will be one of the lightest in the Presidency.

54. The effect on the Bellary District Court of the transfer of Kadiri taluk to Bellary district is shown in the next table :—

							Bellary District Court—Average institutions—Three years.			
							Ordinary suits.	Civil appeals.	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
Present file	..	..	..	..	..	..	25	155	3	55
Add Kadiri taluk	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	13	..	3
Total (future file)							26	168	3	58

The District and Sessions Judge of Bellary (Mr. A. T. Forbes) has raised no objection to this addition to his file.

55. The taluks of Kadiri, Madanapalle and Vayalpad, which thus leave the Cuddapah district, constitute almost the whole jurisdiction of the District Munsif of Madanapalle, who should therefore be transferred, along with his head-quarters, to the new district of Chittoor. The District Judge of Cuddapah (Mr. Hughes) proposes to

provide for the remnant of the District munsifi remaining in Cuddapah, namely, 42 villages of the Ráyachóti taluk, by attaching it to the District munsifi of Cuddapah which already includes the rest of the Ráyachóti taluk. This can easily be done, as will be seen from the following table :—

Madanapalle Munsifi.		Average institutions.	
—		Ordinary suits.	Small causes.
Present file		501	360
Deduct Kadiri, Madanapalle and Vayalpad		467	337
Balance (42 villages of Ráyachóti)		34	23

District Munsifi of Cuddapah.		Average institutions.	
—		Ordinary suits.	Small causes.
Present file		842	704
Add 42 villages of Ráyachóti taluk		34	23
Total (future file)		876	727

56. Under Mr. Meyer's proposals, the Kadiri taluk will be attached to the Anantapur district, and geographical reasons render it necessary that for civil judicial purposes it should be added to the already extensive area over which the District Munsifi of Penukonda has jurisdiction. Investigation arising from this area is, however, not heavy, and the District Judge Bellary considers that Kadiri taluk can be added to the file without any reduction of the jurisdiction of other District Munsifs. In this view I concur. Resulting files will be as follows :—

District Munsifi of Penukonda.		Average institutions.	
—		Ordinary suits.	Small causes.
Present file		787	340
Add Kadiri		129	53
Total (future file)		916	393

57. It has been suggested that it may be desirable, in view of the reduction in the file of the Cuddapah District Court, to undertake a more complete re-adjustment of the jurisdictions in the Ceded Districts than is here contemplated. As this suggestion is still under enquiry, it will be dealt with in a subsequent portion of this report.

GROUP 4.—THE SOUTH ARCOOT, COIMBATORE, SALEM AND TRICHINOPOLY DISTRICTS.

58. Leaving out of consideration those proposals relating to taluk areas which are not finally sanctioned, Mr. Meyer's proposals concerning this group of districts are as follow :—

- (1) to transfer the Tiruvannamalai taluk from the South Arcot district to the new district of Vellore ;
- (2) to transfer the Tiruppattur revenue taluk from Salem to the new Vellore district ;
- (3) to transfer the Námakkal revenue taluk, except twelve villages, from Salem to the Trichinopoly district ; and
- (4) to transfer the Karur revenue taluk from the Coimbatore district to Trichinopoly.

65. The changes in district areas necessitate various re-arrangements in the jurisdictions of the District Munsifs. In the South Arcot district the Tiruvannamalai taluk is divided between the Tirukkóvilár and the Villupuram courts. The effect of its transfer from those courts is shown below. It will be seen that it gives each court a measure of merited relief. The District Judge of South Arcot (Mr. Tate) reports that no redistribution of the Munsif's jurisdiction is thereby rendered necessary, and this view may be accepted :—

Munsif.	Ordinary suits.	Small causes.
<i>Tirukkóvilár.</i>		
Present file	1,082	
Deduct—Tiruvannamalai taluk except Pennathur firka ..	292	
Balance, future file ..	790	
<i>Villupuram.</i>		
Present file	1,024	
Deduct—Pennathur firka of Tiruvannamalai taluk ..	92	
Balance, future file ..	932	1,115
<i>Tiruvannamalai taluk.</i>		
Contribution from Tirukkóvilár munsif		814
Do. from Villupuram munsif		78
Total file contributed to Vellore district		892

66. In the Coimbatore district, the transfer of the Karúr District Munsif, with head-quarters and court-house, to the Trichy district leaves the revenue taluk of Dhárápúram except 30 villages to be provided for. The District Judge of Coimbatore (Mr. Power) proposes to add the taluk to the file of the District Munsif of Udamalpet, and states that the addition will not give the District Munsif more work than he can get through, especially if small cause powers are raised to Rs. 200. This view may be accepted. Although the District Munsif's file is numerically large, the proportion of contested cases is low. The suits as a rule are not of intricate character. Nine hundred and eighty out of 1,461 being money suits, and if the District Munsif's small cause powers are raised to Rs. 200, as many as 718 suits will be transferred to the small cause. The distance by road from Dhárápúram to Udamalpet is 23 miles, as compared with 10 miles to Karúr. The general effect of the transfer of the Karúr revenue taluk from the Coimbatore district on the files of the District Munsifs affected is shown in the following table :—

Institutions.	Three years' average.	
	Ordinary suits.	Small causes.
District Munsif, Karúr, present file	1,031	607
Deduct—Karúr revenue taluk	775	512
Balance	256	95
District Munsif, Udamalpet, present file	1,221	587
Total	1,477	682

67. In the Salem district there are at present five Munsifs with local jurisdictions as follows :—

- (1) *Principal Munsif of Salem—Head-quarters, Salem.*—Jurisdiction over the revenue taluk of Salem less the Rasipur Deputy Tahsildar's division.
- (2) *Additional Munsif of Salem—Head-quarters, Salem.*—Jurisdiction over the Rasipur Deputy Tahsildar's division of Salem taluk, the Atur revenue taluk and the Sankari Deputy Tahsildar's division of Tiruchengódu.

70. This arrangement may, I think, be accepted. It involves the creation of an additional Munsif's court at Dharmapuri, but against this may be set off the court which will be saved in the new Chittoor district by the abolition of the Madanapalle court. Litigation in Salem is certainly more troublesome than in Cuddapah.

71. If the above arrangement is not accepted, it will be necessary to add the Uttangarai taluk to the jurisdiction of the Krishnagiri Munsif, and to divide South Dharmapuri between the principal and additional Munsifs of Salem. This arrangement would produce the following results:—

Munsifs.	Local areas.	Ordinary suits.	Small causes.
Principal Munsif of Salem	Present file	2,040	218
	Add part of South Dharmapuri	2,268	110
	Future file	1,033	110
Additional Munsif of Salem	Present file	728	1,143
	Add part of South Dharmapuri	677	610
	Future file	237	450
Krishnagiri Munsif	Present file	914	1,060
	Add Uttangarai taluk		
	Future file		

72. These files are heavy, and the distance between Uttangarai taluk and Krishnagiri is considerable. If the Uttangarai taluk is added to the jurisdiction of the District Munsif of Krishnagiri, it will be possible to maintain the High Court's Proceedings, No. 2989, dated 14th December 1891, No. 2267, dated 14th August 1894, No. 390, dated 5th February 1896, and No. 174, dated 16th February 1900. The arrangement sanctioned in the High Court's Proceedings noted in the margin, under which the District Munsif sits at Hosur four times a year for periods of 3 weeks at a time.

73. If it were decided to transfer the work of the Námakkal taluk also from the Salem district, the Námakkal Munsif and head-quarters would go over to the Trichinopoly district, and the Revenue of Tiruchengodu except Sankari would have to be provided for. As shown in this produces an average number of 215 ordinary suits and 185 small causes, and this file would have to be apportioned between the principal and additional Munsifs of Salem. I cannot, however, think this a good arrangement, as it would give the Principal Munsif over 2,000 small causes, besides 800 ordinary suits. Litigation is usually more keenly contested at the head-quarters of the District Court, where there is a large bar, than elsewhere, and the work of the principal Munsif would probably prove excessive.

74. The Trichinopoly District will, in accordance with the recommendations above made (paragraph 66), take over the Karur taluk, together with the head-quarters, court-house and Munsif. This taluk (as shown in paragraph 66) produces an average number of 493 ordinary suits and 512 small causes. The existing munsifs of the Trichinopoly district are four in number with jurisdiction and files as shown below:—

	Ordinary suits.	Small causes.
(1) Trichinopoly Munsif. Jurisdiction—Trichinopoly town and a part of Trichinopoly taluk	288	1,873
(2) Srirangam Munsif. Head-quarters—Trichinopoly. Jurisdiction—remainder of Trichinopoly taluk	493	1,052
(3) Kulitalai Munsif. Jurisdiction—taluk of Kulitalai and Musiri	1,129	1,025
(4) Ariyalur Munsif. Jurisdiction—Perambalur and Udaiyarpalayam taluks.	1,189	1,136

Mr. Meyer further proposed some redistribution of taluk areas and boundaries in Tinnevely and Tanjore, which need not be further noticed here, as they are not finally settled. It will be convenient to deal with each of the districts in this group separately.

79. The Tinnevely district at present possesses, besides a District Court, two Sub-Courts and seven District Munsifs' Courts. The local jurisdiction of the Sub-Courts has been much changed of late, and for purposes of this report it will probably suffice to show the present and future files of the two Sub-Courts jointly in comparison and in combination with that of the District Court. This is done in the following table:—

Classes of litigation.	A. Present files—Tinnevely district—In 1905— Three years' average.		
	District Court.	Tinnevely Sub-Court.	Tuticorin Sub-Court.
Ordinary suits	3	60	372
Civil appeals (other than rent appeals)	367	..	367
Rent appeals	13	..	13
Small causes	..	2,019	2,773
Sessions cases	84	..	84

Classes of litigation.	B. Future files (deducting Srivilliputtur taluk and Sattur taluk from present files).		
	District Court.	Tuticorin Sub-Court.	Total district.
Ordinary suits	..	60	93
Civil appeals (other than rent appeals)	..	..	305
Rent appeals	..	..	13
Small causes	..	1,941	2,616
Sessions cases	..	..	69

80. With the substantial relief to be given to the District Court will receive in respect of appeals and sessions cases as a result of the transfer of the Srivilliputtur taluk and Sattur taluk (less Koilpatti tract) to the new Ramnad district, it will not, in my opinion, be necessary to retain the present number of Courts in the district in order to dispose of the file shown in the last column of Division B of the above table. That file is not much heavier (if so heavy) as the file now disposed of by two superior Courts in Gódvári or the file that will be disposed of by two superior Courts in Kistna. There seems no sufficient reason why litigation in Tinnevely should be more difficult to dispose of than that in the equally small and thickly populated districts* of Gódvári and Kistna.

In the district which immediately adjoins Tinnevely, the Sub-Court of Madura, East, shows an actual average disposal of 87 original suits, 1,365 small causes and 54 appeals, while the District Court, shows an actual average disposal of 375 appeals excluding rent appeals and 107 sessions cases. The future Tinnevely file can therefore well be dealt with by a District Court and one sub-court, provided that some reduction can be made in the small cause file. In the proposals relating to Munsifs' jurisdiction which follow it is proposed to revise the territorial jurisdictions so as to enable much of the Sub-Courts' small cause jurisdiction to be taken over by the Munsifs. It is proposed to relieve the Sub-Court altogether of small cause jurisdiction over three † out of the six munsifs which will in future exist. From the remaining three munsifs an average number of 1,459 small causes have been

	Population per square mile.
* Tinnevely	382
Gódvári	448
Kistna	254

† Srivilliputtur.
Tuticorin.
Koilpatti.

District Munsifs of Tinnevely, Srivilliputtūr and Srivaikuntam. It appears to me that the system of having a District Munsif without local jurisdiction and of using him to relieve other Courts which get into arrears is unsound. It must tend to encourage other Munsifs to get into arrears, for the man with most arrears will get most help. It must at the same time tend to discourage hard work on the part of the Additional Munsif, for as he has no definite task and is merely supplied from other courts, he cannot help seeing that the more work he does, the more he will have to do. On the other hand, if he does less, less will be given him. The natural effect of the method is exhibited in the figures of outturn. While the average outturn of the Additional Munsif is only 313 suits and no small causes, the average outturn of the other six Munsifs has been 606 suits and 1,270 small causes. This will be seen from the following table:—

Munsif.	Tinnevely District—Munsifs' Courts—Disposals—Three years' average.	
	Ordinary suits.	Small causes.
Tinnevely	544	1,008
Srivilliputtūr	753	641
Sáttūr	608	448
Ambásamudram	592	506
Srivaikuntam	643	898
Tuticorin	502	1,027
Average	606	1,270
Additional Munsif	313	..

84. The explanation that would doubtless be put forward of the short outturn of work in the Court of the Additional Munsif would be that the suits which are transferred to him are usually of a troublesome character. It is probable that there is some amount of truth in this excuse, but it is not the objection that it is not susceptible of definite proof. Who can tell whether a suit is more troublesome and takes longer to try than another set? To establish the value of such a plea it would be necessary to examine the judgment, and the records, in each suit. But even allowing some amount of weight to the excuse, it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that an outturn of 313 suits per annum does not represent the amount of help which might reasonably be expected from a District Munsif's Court. This outturn is far below the standard minimum scale laid down by the High Court and shown in paragraph 5 *supra*, and must, therefore, be held to be inadequate. As the additional District Munsif's Court has been in existence for twelve years, it can no longer be considered merely temporary, and the time has come when it may, with advantage, be given definite local jurisdiction. I propose, therefore, while retaining the seat of the additional Munsif's Court at Tinnevely, to assign to him jurisdiction over the Nángunéri taluq and other adjacent areas, thus relieving the District Munsif of Tinnevely and other courts needing relief by direct transfer of jurisdiction instead of by periodical transfer of suits. This arrangement will be to the benefit of suitors, who are at present put to some appreciable expense and inconvenience when their suits, after being filed in one court, are transferred to another for disposal.

85. Of the other District Munsifs' Courts shown in paragraph 82, two, viz., those at Sáttūr and Srivilliputtūr, are affected by the transfer of a portion of their jurisdiction to the new Ramnad district. Both head-quarters will be included within the new district, but one of the two courts must be retained in Tinnevely for the disposal of the remaining portions of the former Sáttūr and Srivilliputtūr Courts' jurisdictions. It is accordingly proposed to locate the new court at Koilpatti, a central place on the line of rail, and to revise the jurisdictions of the other courts, so as to equalize as far as possible the work of the several courts. The scheme of revised jurisdiction of the District Munsifs' Courts in the reduced Tinnevely district, together with the files of which each will have to dispose, is set forth in the following table:—

Tinnevely, to form a new district with head-quarters at Ramnad. The Madura district is a heavy one on the Judicial, as on the Revenue side. It possesses two subordinate courts, both sitting in Madura, in addition to the District Court, and the file of these three courts is exhibited in the following table:—

Madura district—Institutions—Three years' average.

Classes of litigation.	District court.	Sub-court, East.	Sub-court, West.	Total.
Ordinary suits	3	90	47	140
Small causes	154	1,230	1,841	3,071
Civil appeals	124	54	48	454
Rent appeals	125	..	..	124
Sessions cases	..	..	..	125

* Disposals.

91. Of these three courts, the Sub-Court of Madura, West, is wholly unaffected by Mr. Meyer's proposals. The jurisdiction of the Sub-Court of Madura, East, on the other hand, exactly corresponds with the portion of the Madura district which it is proposed should be alienated to the new Ramnad district. The Sub-Court of Madura, East, would therefore be of necessity transferred to the new Ramnad district, leaving the District Court of Madura and one Sub-Court to deal with the work of the reduced Madura district. What that work will be is shown in the following table:—

Institutions—Three years' average.

Courts and files.	Ordinary suits.		Small causes.		Civil appeals.		Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
	District court.	Sub-court, West.	District court.	Sub-court, West.	District court.	Sub-court, West.	District court.	District court.
Present file	3	47	..	1,841	454	* 48	124	125
Less Ramnad division ..	1	..	..	..	217	..	73	44
Future file	2	47	..	1,841	237	* 48	51	81

* Disposals.

92. Thus the effect on the Madura District Court of the transfer of the Ramnad division to the new district of Ramnad will be beneficial. It will reduce the present heavy sessions file within more manageable limits, and it will relieve the District Court of nearly half the total number of civil appeals filed and of more than half the rent appeals, while only depriving it of the East Sub-Court's assistance in respect of 54 appeals disposed of, equal to less than 12 per cent. of the appeals instituted. After this relief it may be practicable, following the same principle as is proposed in the case of Tinnevely, to give the District Judge of Madura some actual original jurisdiction thus enabling him to acquire some experience in the trial of original suits. With this object, the munsifi of Dindigul from which an average number of 9 original suits may be expected annually, may be removed from the jurisdiction of the Sub-Judge, Madura West, and left under the direct jurisdiction of the District Court. Subject to this change and to the separation of the Ramnad division and Madura East Sub-Court, no other change in connection with the Madura district is necessitated by Mr. Meyer's proposals.

93. The new Ramnad district will, if the proposals made by Mr. Meyer are accepted, consist of the Ramnad sub-division from the Madura district, the Srivilliputtur and Sattur taluks from Tinnevely (except a tract of 45 villages round Koilpatti) and the Arantangi sub-division from Tanjore. Leaving out of account except for Criminal work the last of these areas (in accordance with the recommendation in paragraph 89 *supra*) the new district will supply the following file to be dealt with by superior courts:—

New Ramnad district. Institutions—3 years' average.

	Ordinary suits.	Small causes.	Civil appeals.	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
Contribution from Ramnad sub-division	91	1,230	217	73	44
Contribution from Srivilliputtur and Sattur taluks.	9	..	62	1	15
Contribution from Ramnad zamindari through small cause jurisdiction of Sub-Court being extended to four additional zamin taluks (see paragraph 96).	..	362	..	..	..
Contribution from the future Arantangi taluk (for sessions purposes only).	..	..	..	..	2
Total future file ..	100	1,592	279	74	61

94. This file is too heavy for a single court, and the District Judge of Madura (Mr. Moberly) considers the work will be sufficient for two courts but proposes that the small cause work should be increased by giving the Subordinate Judge small cause jurisdiction over all the six taluks of the Ramnad zamindari, instead of only two taluks as at present thus increasing the small cause file by 362 causes. I agree in these opinions, and I recommend that, in view of the heaviness of the criminal file of the Madura district, a District and Sessions Judgeship should, as contemplated by Mr. Meyer, be created at Ramnad, while the Subordinate Judge will be provided by the transfer to the new district of the present Sub-court of Madura East. It is desirable to give the new District Court of Ramnad some original jurisdiction, and the District Court may, therefore, exercise original jurisdiction over the Manamadurai munsifi. This will give the new District Court a file of about 14 ordinary suits, which, with 202 appeals, 74 rent appeals and 61 sessions cases, will be as much as it can get through. The Sub-court should be located at Ramnad, and will have ordinary original jurisdiction over the Srivilliputtur and Sattur taluks to be transferred from Tinnevely and over the Sivaganga and Ramnad zamindaris except the Manamadurai munsifi. It will also have small cause jurisdiction over both zamindaris, and it may be given appellate jurisdiction over the Sivaganga munsifi, which will yield about 77 appeals a year, and, if necessary, the District Court will be able to transfer to the Sub-court any further number out of the remaining 202 appeals received.

95. Below these two superior courts there will be four District Munsifs' Courts whose jurisdictions and files are shown in the following table:—

New Ramnad District—District Munsifs' Courts—Institutions—3 years' average.

Munsifi.	Jurisdictions.	Ordinary suits.	Small causes.
Srivilliputtur	Srivilliputtur and Sattur taluks (except tract near Koilpatti).	975	1,022
Sivaganga	Five taluks of Sivaganga, viz., Sivaganga, Tiruvagambattu, Sholapuram, Tirupattur and Elavankottai.	541	1,057
Manamadurai	Three taluks of Sivaganga, viz., Tirupuvanam, Manamadurai and Nalayangudi, and two taluks of Ramnad, viz., Karudi and Pallimadam.	627	812
Paramagudi	Four taluks of Ramnad, viz., Ramnad, Rajasingamangalam, Anumantakudi and Mudukulattur.	1,111	1,554

96. The files of each of these courts, as shown in this table, are somewhat heavy and may be thus dealt with—

(1) As already stated, the District Judge of Madura (Mr. Moberly) considers that the Subordinate Court of the Ramnad district may be given small cause jurisdiction over the whole of the Sivaganga and Ramnad zamindaris, instead of over Sivaganga and two taluks of Ramnad (Karudi and Pallimadam) as at present. This arrangement will relieve the District Munsifi of Paramagudi of 362 suits, thus reducing

Tinnevely, to form a new district with head-quarters at Ramnad. The Madura district is a heavy one on the Judicial, as on the Revenue side. It possesses two subordinate courts, both sitting in Madura, in addition to the District Court, and the file of these three courts is exhibited in the following table:—

Madura district—Institutions—Three years' average.

Classes of litigation.	District court.	Sub-court, East.	Sub-court, West.	Total.
Ordinary suits	3	90	47	140
Small causes	..	1,230	1,811	3,071
Civil appeals	154	54	48	454
Rent appeals	124	..	..	124
Sessions cases	125	..	..	125

• Disposals.

91. Of these three courts, the Sub-Court of Madura, West, is wholly unaffected by Mr. Meyer's proposals. The jurisdiction of the Sub-Court of Madura, East, on the other hand, exactly corresponds with the portion of the Madura district which it is proposed should be alienated to the new Ramnad district. The Sub-Court of Madura, East, would therefore be of necessity transferred to the new Ramnad district, leaving the District Court of Madura and one Sub-Court to deal with the work of the reduced Madura district. What that work will be is shown in the following table:—

Institutions—Three years' average.

Courts and files.	Ordinary suits.		Small causes.		Civil appeals.		Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
	District court.	Sub-court, West.	District court.	Sub-court, West.	District court.	Sub-court, West.	District court.	District court.
Present file	3	47	..	1,841	454	48	124	125
Less Ramnad division ..	1	..	..	..	217	..	73	44
Future file	2	47	..	1,841	237	48	51	81

• Disposals.

92. Thus the effect on the Madura District Court of the transfer of the Ramnad division to the new district of Ramnad will be beneficial. It will reduce the present heavy sessions file within more manageable limits, and it will relieve the District Court of nearly half the total number of civil appeals filed and of more than half the rent appeals, while only depriving it of the East Sub-Court's assistance in respect of 54 appeals disposed of, equal to less than 12 per cent. of the appeals instituted. After this relief it may be practicable, following the same principle as is proposed in the case of Tinnevely, to give the District Judge of Madura some actual original jurisdiction thus enabling him to acquire some experience in the trial of original suits. With this object, the munsifi of Dindigul from which an average number of 9 original suits may be expected annually, may be removed from the jurisdiction of the Sub-Judge, Madura West, and left under the direct jurisdiction of the District Court. Subject to this change and to the separation of the Ramnad division and Madura East Sub-Court, no other change in connection with the Madura district is necessitated by Mr. Meyer's proposals.

93. The new Ramnad district will, if the proposals made by Mr. Meyer are accepted, consist of the Ramnad sub-division from the Madura district, the Srivilliputtur and Sattur taluks from Tinnevely (except a tract of 45 villages round Koilpatti) and the Arantangi sub-division from Tanjore. Leaving out of account except for Criminal work the last of these areas (in accordance with the recommendation in paragraph 89 *supra*) the new district will supply the following file to be dealt with by superior courts:—

	New Ramnad district. Institutions—3 years' average.				
	Ordinary suits.	Small causes.	Civil appeals.	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
Contribution from Ramnad sub-division	91	1,230	217	73	44
Contribution from Srivilliputtur and Sattur taluks.	9	..	62	1	15
Contribution from Ramnad zamindari through small cause jurisdiction of Sub-Court being extended to four additional zamin taluks (see paragraph 96).	..	362	..	..	..
Contribution from the future Arantangi taluk (for sessions purposes only).	..	..	..	..	2
Total future file ..	100	1,592	279	74	61

94. This file is too heavy for a single court, and the District Judge of Madura (Mr. Moberly) considers the work will be sufficient for two courts but proposes that the small cause work should be increased by giving the Subordinate Judge small cause jurisdiction over all the six taluks of the Ramnad zamindari, instead of only two taluks as at present thus increasing the small cause file by 362 causes. I agree in these opinions, and I recommend that, in view of the heaviness of the criminal file of the Madura district, a District and Sessions Judgeship should, as contemplated by Mr. Meyer, be created at Ramnad, while the Subordinate Judge will be provided by the transfer to the new district of the present Sub-court of Madura East. It is desirable to give the new District Court of Ramnad some original jurisdiction, and the District Court may, therefore, exercise original jurisdiction over the Manamadurai munsifi. This will give the new District Court a file of about 14 ordinary suits, which, with 202 appeals, 74 rent appeals and 61 sessions cases, will be as much as it can get through. The Sub-court should be located at Ramnad, and will have ordinary original jurisdiction over the Srivilliputtur and Sattur taluks to be transferred from Tinnevely and over the Sivaganga and Ramnad zamindaris except the Manamadurai munsifi. It will also have small cause jurisdiction over both zamindaris, and it may be given appellate jurisdiction over the Sivaganga munsifi, which will yield about 77 appeals a year, and, if necessary, the District Court will be able to transfer to the Sub-court any further number out of the remaining 202 appeals received.

95. Below these two superior courts there will be four District Munsifs' Courts whose jurisdictions and files are shown in the following table:—

Munsifi.	New Ramnad District—District Munsifs' Courts—Institutions—3 years' average.		
	Jurisdictions.	Ordinary suits.	Small causes.
Srivilliputtur	Srivilliputtur and Sattur taluks (except tract near Koilpatti).	975	1,022
Sivaganga	Five taluks of Sivaganga, viz., Sivaganga, Tiruvagamattu, Sholapuram, Tirupattur and Elavankottai.	541	1,057
Manamadurai	Three taluks of Sivaganga, viz., Tirupuvanam, Manamadurai and Maivangudi, and two taluks of Ramnad, viz., Katodi and Pallimadam.	627	842
Paramagudi	Four taluks of Ramnad, viz., Ramnad, Rajasingamangalam, Anumantakudi and Mudukulattur.	1,111	1,554

96. The files of each of these courts, as shown in this table, are somewhat heavy and may be thus dealt with—

(1) As already stated, the District Judge of Madura (Mr. Moberly) considers that the Subordinate Court of the Ramnad district may be given small cause jurisdiction over the whole of the Sivaganga and Ramnad zamindaris, instead of over Sivaganga and two taluks of Ramnad (Kamudi and Pallimadam) as at present. This arrangement will relieve the District Munsif of Paramagudi of 362 suits, thus reducing

his suit file to 749. If, at the same time, his small cause powers, which now extend to Rs. 100, were reduced to Rs. 50, his small cause file would also be reduced by 339 to 1,215, but this seems to me unnecessary, while the addition of as many as (362 + 339) 701 small causes to the file of the Subordinate Judge would be heavy. It will, I think, suffice to add 362 small causes to that court's file, as shown in paragraph 93 *supra*.

(2) The file of the munsifi which has to be formed out of the two taluks transferred from the Tinnevely district may be lightened by attaching the two firkas of Sattūr and Virudupatti on the line of rail near Sattūr to the Mánámadurai Court. The rail journey from Sattūr to Mánámadurai *via* Madura takes 4½ hours and costs 14 annas. These two firkas yield an average number of 213 suits and 419 small causes, and if this is deducted from Srivilliputtūr and added to Mánámadurai, it will make the file of the former consist of 762 suits and 603 small causes, while that of the latter will comprise 840 suits and 1,261 small causes.

(3) As there will then be a considerable inequality between the files of the Mánámadurai and Sivaganga District Munsifs, I propose to correct this by transferring the zamin taluq of Tirupuvanam with 81 suits and 88 small causes from the one to the other. The revised files of the several District Munsifs' Courts within the new Ramnad district will then be as follows:—

							Ordinary suits.	Small causes.
Srivilliputtūr	..	..	..	..	..	..	762	603
Sivaganga	..	..	..	..	..	..	622	1,145
Mánámadurai	..	..	..	..	..	..	759	1,173
Paramagudi	..	..	..	..	..	..	749	1,554

97. The head-quarters of the munsifi formed out of the two Tinnevely taluks should be at Srivilliputtūr. This is a town of 26,382 people, and though 32 miles from the line of rail, it is considered by the Collector of Tinnevely (Mr. Buckley) to be the most suitable place for a court. A court-house already exists there. There is also a court-house on the standard plan at Sattūr, but that place will in future be within the jurisdiction of the District Munsif of Mánámadurai. Moreover, although on the line of rail, it is a place of comparatively small population, 7,870 in 1901, and is said to possess a very relaxing climate.

98. It will be necessary to build a court-house both for the District and Sessions Court and for the Sub-Court at Ramnad, as no buildings are at present available there for this purpose.

99. The arrangements proposed in regard to the fifth or southern group of districts may be thus summarized. I propose—

(1) to transfer the Srivilliputtūr and Sattūr taluks of the Tinnevely district (less the tract round Koilpatti) to the new Ramnad district;

(2) to abolish the Subordinate Judge's Court at Tuticorin, distributing the work of the reduced Tinnevely district between the District Court and the Sub-Court of Tinnevely;

(3) to redistribute the territorial jurisdictions of the Munsifs of the Tinnevely district, so as to give definite local jurisdiction to the additional Munsif, to impose on the District Munsifs some part of the small cause work at present done by the Sub-Courts and to locate a new District Munsif's Court at Koilpatti;

(4) to allow the Arantangi division of the Pattukkóttai taluk to remain for civil purposes subject to the jurisdiction of the District Court of Tanjore, and of the District Munsif of Pattukkóttai, while for Sessions purposes it will be within the jurisdiction of the Sessions Court of Ramnad;

(5) to transfer the Ramnad division of the Madura district to the new Ramnad district;

(6) to create a District and Sessions Judge for the Ramnad district, and to transfer to that district the Court of the Subordinate Judge of Madura East;

(7) to impose on this Subordinate Judge of Ramnad small cause jurisdiction over the whole of the Ramnad zamindari; and

(8) to revise the territorial jurisdictions of the Munsifs' Courts within the new Ramnad district so as to equalize their files.

100. This concludes the consideration of the judicial aspects of Mr. Meyer's proposals. In a further instalment of this report I propose to notice certain connected matters and to deal with the question of establishments, but as I understand that it will be more convenient to the Hon'ble the Judges of the High Court, I submit this instalment separately.

APPENDIX.

STATEMENT showing the Territorial Jurisdictions of District, Subordinate Judges' and District Munsifs' Courts as they stood on 31st December 1904.

Districts.	Names of District, Subordinate Judges' and District Munsifs' Courts.	Names of Revenue Taluks comprised within the jurisdiction of each Court.	Date and page of the Fort St. George Gazette.
Arcot (North)	District Court Vellore Munsifi	<i>Ordinary jurisdiction.</i> —The whole district.	2nd September 1902, page 1117.
	Arni do.	The Revenue Taluk of Vellore and the Zamindari of Kangundi.	
	Sholinghar do.	The Revenue Taluks of Polur and Wandiwash and the Jaghir of Arni.	
	Chittoor do.	The Revenue Taluk of Walajanagar less the Wallaja Firka, and Pallipat and Tiruttamai Taluks of the Zamindari of Karvetnagar.	
	Tirupati do.	The Revenue Taluks of Chittoor and Palmanér and the Revenue Firkas of Pernambet and Thutthipet in the Gudiyattam Taluk, Kallur and Pulicherla Palayams and the Revenue Firka of Pakala in Chondragiri Taluk and the Punganuru Zamindari.	
	Ranipet do.	The Revenue Taluk of Chondragiri less the Pakala Firka, Kallur and Pulicherla Palayams, the Kálahasti Zamindari and Narayanavanam Taluk of the Karvetnagar Zamindari.	
Arcot (South)	District Court Cuddalore Munsifi.	<i>Ordinary jurisdiction.</i> —The whole district.	28th February 1899, pages 356 and 357. 19th March 1901, page 428.
	Chidambaram do.	The Revenue Firkas of Cuddalore and Kurinchipadi of the Cuddalore Taluk and the Revenue Firka of Bhuvanagiri in Chidambaram Taluk.	
	Villupuram do.	The Revenue Firkas of Villupuram, Anniyur and Valavanur in the Villupuram Taluk, the Parannur Firka of the Tirukkóyilúr Taluk and Pennathur Firka of the Tiruvannámalai Taluk.	
	Vriddhaachalam do.	The Revenue Taluk of Vriddhaachalam and the Palayamkottah Firka of the Chidambaram Taluk.	
	Tirukkóyilúr do.	The Revenue Taluk of Kallukuchi and Tiruvannámalai Taluk less the Pennathur Firka, the Revenue Firkas of Tirukkóyilúr and Elavanásar in the Tirukkóyilúr Taluk and 17 villages in the Tiruvannallúr Firka of the Tirukkóyilúr Taluk.	
	Tindivanam do.	The Revenue Taluk of Tindivanam and the Vanur and Vikravandi Firkas of the Villupuram Taluk.	
	Panruti do.	The Revenue Firkas of Panruti, Nellikuppam and Kadamboliyur in the Cuddalore Taluk; the Tiruvannamallur Firka of the Tirukkóyilúr Taluk and 50 villages in the Tiruvannanallúr Firka of the said Tirukkóyilúr Taluk.	
	District Court Bellary Munsifi	<i>Ordinary jurisdiction.</i> —The whole district.	
Bellary	Penukonda do.	The Revenue Taluks of Anantapur, Dharmavaram, Penukonda, Hindúpur, Madakasira and Kaiyandrug.	13th October 1891, page 1442. Do. and 8th October 1895, page 1158.
	Hospet Munsifi	The Revenue Taluks of Hospet, Kúdligi, Hadagalli and Harpanahalli.	31st October 1890, page 1248.
	District Court Sub-Court, Mangalore	<i>Ordinary jurisdiction.</i> —The whole district. <i>Do.</i> <i>Small Cause jurisdiction.</i> —22 maganes in the Mangalore Munsifi, 21 maganes in the Kárkál Munsifi and 2 maganes in the Kasaragod Munsifi.	11th December 1883, pages 813 and 814. 21st December 1883, pages 1496 and 1497.
Canara (South)	Mangalore Munsifi	The Revenue Taluk of Mangalore (excepting 7 maganes which form part of the Puttur Munsifi and 18 maganes which form part of the Kárkál Munsifi) and the magane of Vorkodi in the Taluk of Kasaragod.	21st December 1883, pages 1495 and 1496.

Statement showing the Territorial Jurisdictions of District, Subordinate Judges' and District Munsifs' Courts as they stood on 31st December 1904—cont.

Districts.	Names of District, Subordinate Judges' and District Munsifs' Courts.	Names of Revenue Taluks comprised within jurisdiction of each Court.	Date and page of the Fort St. George Gazette.
Canara (South)—cont.	Kasaragod Munsifi	13 maganes in the Revenue Taluk of Kasaragod and the villages of Ferdal, Ubrangala, Bela, Kumbadaji, Padre, Kundalmerkál and Chippar.	21st December 1883, pages 1495 and 1496. 22nd January 1884, page 76. 28th April 1885, page 647.
	Udipi do.	The Revenue Taluk of Udipi (excepting the eastern portion consisting of 11 maganes and the magne of Padubedri included in the Kárkál Munsifi, the northern portion lying to the north of the Sitánadi river consisting of 4 maganes included in the Coondapoor Munsifi and the village of Padukadur in Nilavar magane and 10 villages included in the Kárkál Munsifi.	21st December 1883, pages 1496 and 1497. 28th April 1885, pages 646 and 647. 23rd June 1891, page 916.
	Coondapoor do.	The whole of the Coondapoor Taluk and the northern portion of the Udipi Taluk comprising of 4 maganes.	Do. and 1st September 1896, page 1102. 23rd June 1891, page 916.
	Kárkál do.	The northern portion of the Mangalore Taluk lying to the north of the Sashittal river and the village of Kallamundkur in Murnad magane, most of the eastern portion of the Mangalore Taluk comprising 12 out of the 16 maganes excluded from the Mangalore Munsifi, the Mujur magane in Uppinangadi Taluk and a portion of Udipi Taluk except Yermal magane.	11th December 1883, pages 813 and 814. 28th April 1885, page 646.
Chingleput	Puttur do.	The whole taluk of Uppinangadi (except the Mujur magane, 1 village in Soliya magane, 3 villages in Kolnad magane, 3 villages in Kasaragod Taluk, and the maganes of Irvathur, Kavala, Barikajikar and Mograná which are in Mangalore Taluk).	21st December 1883, pages 1496 and 1497. 28th April 1885, pages 646 and 647.
	District Court Chingleput Munsifi	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction.</i> —The whole District.	1st March 1892, page 327.
	Tiruvallúr do.	The Revenue Taluk of Tiruvallúr, the Revenue Taluk of Ponnéri, except 113 villages included in the Poonamalle District Munsifi and the 205 villages of the Kachinad Taluk of the Kálahasti Zamindari.	9th January 1894, pages 9—11.
	Poonamalle do.	The Revenue Taluk of Saidapet and 116 villages forming that portion of the Revenue Taluk of Ponnéri which lies to the east of the Madras-Nashore road and to the south of the road leading from Tachar to Pulicat.	1st March 1892, page 327.
Coimbatore	Conjeeveram do.	The Revenue Taluk of Conjeeveram	1st March 1892, page 327.
	District Court Sub-Court, Ootacamund.	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction.</i> —The whole District. The Revenue Taluks of Ootacamund and Coonoor and for ordinary suits above the value of Rs. 2,500 in the Taluk of Gúdalúr. <i>Small Cause Jurisdiction.</i> —The Revenue Taluks of Ootacamund and Coonoor.	18th January 1882, page 26. 14th November 1899, page 1651.
	Coimbatore Munsifi	The Revenue Taluk of Coimbatore and the portion of the Palladam Taluk lying to the south of the Madras Railway.	
	Erode do.	The Revenue Taluks of Erode and Bhaváni, a portion of the Palladam Taluk except the part lying to the south of the Madras Railway and the portion of the Satyamangalam Taluk lying below the gháts.	11th August 1891, page 826. 13th October 1891, pages 1009, and 1442. 30th January 1883, page 143.
Cuddapah	Kollegal do.	The whole of the Revenue Taluk of Kollegal and the portion of the Satyamangalam Taluk which lies above the gháts.	
	Udamalpet do.	The Revenue Taluks of Udamalpet and Polláchi and a portion of Dhárápuram Taluk comprising 34 villages.	
	Karúr do.	The whole of the Revenue Taluk of Karúr and the Revenue Taluk of Dhárápuram except the 34 villages included in Udamalpet Munsifi. Alagumalai village of the Palladam Taluk.	Do.
	Gúdalúr do.	The Gúdalúr Taluk.	
Cuddapah	District Court Cuddapah Munsifi	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction.</i> —The whole District. The Revenue Taluks of Cuddapah, Pulivendla and the Taluk of Káyachóti except 42 villages of the south-eastern portion of the taluk.	18th March 1884, page 423. 14th April 1891, page 591.

Statement showing the Territorial Jurisdictions of District, Subordinate Judges' and District Munsifs' Courts as they stood on 31st December 1904—*cont.*

Districts.	Names of District, Subordinate Judges' and District Munsifs' Courts.	Names of Revenue Taluks comprised within the jurisdiction of each Court.	Date and page of the Fort St. George Gazette.
Guddapah— <i>cont.</i>	Proddatur Munsifi ..	The Revenue Taluks of Proddatur and Jammalamadugu.	14th April 1891, page 591.
	Nandalam do. ..	The Revenue Taluks of Sidhout, Pullampet and Badvel.	Do.
	Madanapalle do. ..	The Revenue Taluks of Madanapalle, Kadra and Vayalpad and 42 villages in the Rayachoti Taluk (south-eastern portion of the Taluk).	18th March 1884, page 423.
	District Court ..	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction</i> —The whole District. <i>Small Cause Jurisdiction</i> —The District Munsifi of Berhampur.	
Ganjum ..	Aska Munsifi ..	The Revenue Taluk of Geomsur. The Zamindari estates of Podaguda, Dhakota, Serugada, Chinnu Kinedi and Atogoda. The proprietary estates of Aska, Kula and Devathoomi. 65 villages of the Purushottapur Khandam of Berhampur Taluk to the south of the Rushikulya river.	
	Berhampur Munsifi ..	The whole of the Berhampur Taluk including Ichchhapuram Khandam with the exception of 34 villages with their hamlets and Purushottapur Khandam with the exception of the 65 villages above stated. The Zamindari estates of Pedda Kinedi, Kolikoti, Humma, Paleor, Biridi and Chikana with the exception of Talatampara Mittah and 54 villages with their hamlets in Patrapuram, Jayanti-puram, Krishnapuram and Kotilingi Mittahs.	9th October 1888, pages 1478 and 1479.
	Sompeta do. ..	The entire Zamindari of Surangi, Talatampara Mittah, Patrapuram Mittah and Kotilingi Mittah of Chikati Zamindari and 34 villages with their hamlets of the Ichchhapuram Khandam of the Berhampur Taluk, lying to the south of the river Bahoda and the Zamindari estates of Jatantra, Jerada, Budarasingi, Mandasa, Jala and Tekkidi, the villages in Bagunala, Gurnadi and Kappa Khandams of Parlakimedi Zamindari. The proprietary estate of Barava.	1st February 1888, pages 180 and 181.
	Chicacole do. ..	Revenue Taluk of Chicacole. The proprietary estates of Utlam, Chittivalasa, Sowdan, Talam, Talasamudram, Panta, Kuravayasa and several petty proprietary estates. Sircakota, Kottoor and Varanasi Khandams of Parlakimedi Zamindari.	26th March 1901, page 457.
	District Court ..	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction</i> —The whole District.	
	Sub-Court, Cocanada ..	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction</i> — <i>Small Causes and Appeals</i> —The District Munsifs of Amalapuram, Cocanada and Peddapuram.	12th May 1874, page 770.
Gudavari ..	Additional Sub-Court, Rajahmundry ..	<i>Small Cause Jurisdiction</i> —The District Munsifs of Rajahmundry, Narasapur, Tanuku and Ellore.	24th November 1874, page 1672.
	Rajahmundry Munsifi ..	The whole of the Revenue Taluk of Rajahmundry except 5 mittahs in Agency tracts, 40 villages in the Revenue Taluk of Ramachandrapuram, 31 villages in the Revenue Taluk of Amalapuram. The whole of the Yerragodem Taluk except 4 villages shown against Tanuku and 41 villages shown against Ellore and 7 villages in the Revenue Taluk of Tanuku.	15th June 1875, page 1034.
	Poddapuram do. ..	The Revenue Taluks of Tuni, Pithapuram and Peddapuram, 20 villages in the Revenue Taluk of Cocanada and 38 villages in the Revenue Taluk of Ramachandrapuram.	19th May 1903, page 563.
	Cocanada do. ..	The whole of the Coringa Revenue Division. The whole of the Revenue Taluk of Cocanada except 20 villages shown against Peddapuram. The whole of the Ramachandrapuram Taluk except 40 villages shown against Rajahmundry, 38 villages shown against Peddapuram and 7 villages shown against Amalapuram.	
	Amalapuram do. ..	The whole of the Revenue Taluk of Amalapuram except 31 villages shown against Rajahmundry and 7 villages in the Ramachandrapuram Taluk.	28th Feb. 1899, page 347.
	Narasapur do. ..	The whole of the Narasapur Revenue Taluk except the village of Dirasammuru shown against Bhimavaram and Chintapur village in the Bhimavaram Revenue Taluk.	2nd May 1899, page 689.
	Tanuku do. ..	The whole of the Revenue Taluk of Tanuku except 7 villages shown against Rajahmundry and 3 villages against Ellore and 4 villages in the Yerragodem Revenue Taluk.	19th Sept. 1899, page 1172.
	Ellore do. ..	The whole of the Revenue Taluk of Ellore, 3 villages in the Revenue Taluk of Tanuku and 41 villages in the Revenue Taluk of Yerragodem.	

Statement showing the Territorial Jurisdictions of District, Subordinate Judges' and District Munsifs' Courts as they stood on 31st December 1904—*cont.*

Districts.	Names of District, Subordinate Judges' and District Munsifs' Courts.	Names of Revenue Taluks comprised within the jurisdiction of each Court.	Date and page of the Fort St. George Gazette.
Gudavari— <i>cont.</i>	Bhimavaram Munsifi ..	The whole of the Revenue Taluk of Bhimavaram except Chintapur village shown against Narasapur, Dirasammuru village in the Narasapur Revenue Taluk.	28th Feb. 1899, page 347.
	District Court ..	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction</i> —The whole District.	2nd May 1899, page 689.
	Masulipatam Munsifi ..	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction and Small Causes</i> —The District Munsifs of Masulipatam, Bezvada and Gudivada. The Revenue Taluk of Bandur (except Kuchipudi Agraharam) and part of Valluru Zamindari not under Gudivada.	19th Sept. 1899, page 1172.
	Bezvada do. ..	The Revenue Taluks of Bezvada and Nandigama, the Vissannapet sub division, the Nuzvid Zamindari except the Medur and Vuyyur Parganas.	
Kistna ..	Guntur do. ..	The Guntur Taluk, 21 villages in the Narasaraopet Taluk, 87 villages in the Sattenapalle Taluk, and 28 villages in the Bapatla Taluk.	17th Dec. 1895, page 1454.
	Bapatla do. ..	53 villages in the Narasaraopet Taluk, all the villages in the Bapatla Taluk not under Guntur and 53 villages in the Tenali Taluk.	28th Feb. 1899, page 355.
	Narasaraopet do. ..	The Palnad Taluk, the Vinukonda Taluk, 99 villages in the Narasaraopet Taluk, and 76 villages in the Sattenapalle Taluk.	
	Gudivada do. ..	The Revenue Taluk of Gudivada with Medur Pargana of the Nuzvid Zamindari, Kuchipudi Agraharam of Bandur Taluk and 30 villages of the Valluru Zamindari.	
	Tenali do. ..	Vuyyur Pargana of the Nuzvid Zamindari and all the villages in the Tenali Taluk except those under Bapatla.	
	District Court ..	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction</i> —The whole District.	
Kurnool ..	Kurnool Munsifi ..	The Revenue Taluks of Ramallakot, Nandikotkur and Pattikonda and 15 villages lying west of Kalva Hills in the Nandyal Taluk.	17th July 1895, pages 973 and 974.
	Nandyal do. ..	The Revenue Taluks of Koilkuntla, Sirvel and Nandyal except 15 villages shown against Kurnool Munsifi.	
	Markapur do. ..	The Revenue Taluks of Cumbum and Markapur.	
	Gooty do. ..	The Revenue Taluks of Tadpatri and Gooty of Anantapur District and Adoni of Bellary District.	13th Oct. 1891, page 1442, and 21st Nov. 1899, page 1714.
Madura ..	District Court ..	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction</i> —The whole District.	
	Sub-Court, Madura (East) ..	The Taluks of Sivaganga, Tiruvagambathu, Sholapuram, Tirupattur, Elavankottai, Tirupuvanam, Manamadurai and Ilayangudi in Sivaganga Zamindari, and the Taluks of Ramnad, Rajasingamangalam, Anumanth kodai, Mudukulattur, Pallimadam and Kamudi in the Ramnad Zamindari.	4th March 1884, page 156.
	Sub-Court, Madura (West) ..	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction</i> —The Revenue Taluks of Madura, Tirumangalam, Melur, Dindigul, Periyakulam, Kodaikanal and Palni.	
	Madura Munsifi ..	<i>Small Cause Jurisdiction</i> —The Revenue Taluks of Madura, Tirumangalam, Melur, Dindigul, Periyakulam and Kodaikanal.	Do.
	Tirumangalam Munsifi ..	The area lying within the local limits of the Madura Municipality, that portion of Revenue Taluk of Madura to the north of the Vaigai river.	13th Feb. 1900, page 257.
	Sivaganga Munsifi ..	The whole of the Revenue Taluk of Melur except Nattam and Kosikarchi Divisions, that portion of the Revenue Taluk of Madura which lies to the south of the Vaigai river and the whole of the Revenue Taluk of Tirumangalam.	Do.
Mánamadurai ..	Paramagudi do. ..	The Taluks of Sivaganga, Tiruvagambathu, Sholapuram, Tirupattur and Elavankottai comprised in the Sivaganga Zamindari.	15th Dec. 1891, page 1734.
	Manamadurai do. ..	The Taluks of Ramnad, Rajasingamangalam, Anomanthakudi and Mudukulattur comprised in the Ramnad Zamindari.	Do.
		The Taluks of Tirupuvanam, Manamadurai and Ilayangudi comprised in the Sivaganga Zamindari, and the Taluks of Kamudi and Pallimadam comprised in the Ramnad Zamindari.	Do.

Statement showing the Territorial Jurisdictions of District, Subordinate Judges' and District Munsifs' Courts as they stood on 31st December 1904—cont.

Districts.	Names of District, Subordinate Judges' and District Munsifs' Courts.	Names of Revenue Taluks comprised within the jurisdiction of each Court.	Date and page of the Fort St. George Gazette.
Madurai—cont.	Dindigul Munsifi.	The Revenue Taluk of Dindigul except Nilakkóttai Firka, Revenue Taluk of Palai, Sattam and Koskurichi Divisions of Melur Taluk.	28th Feb. 1899, page 358.
	Periyakulam do.	The Revenue Taluks of Periyakulam, Kodaikámal, Nilakkóttai Firka of the Dindigul Taluk.	13th Feb. 1900, page 257.
	District Court ..	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction.</i> —The Revenue Taluks of Chirakkal, Kóttayam and Kurumbranad and 7 amshoms in the Wynad Taluk. <i>Small Cause Jurisdiction.</i> —The Tellicherry Munsifi.	16th Oct. 1883, page 663, 2nd Mar. 1886, page 158. 26th Aug. 1902, page 834.
Malabar (North)	Tellicherry Munsifi.	9 amshoms in Kóttayam Taluk and 6 amshoms in Kurumbranad Taluk.	23rd Feb. 1904, pages 359 and 360.
	Cannanore do.	4 amshoms in Kóttayam Taluk and 18 amshoms in Chirakkal Taluk.	
	Talipparamba do.	25 amshoms in Chirakkal Taluk	
	Quilandi do.	11 amshoms in Kurumbranad Taluk	
	Kuttuparamba Munsifi.	22 amshoms in Kurumbranad Taluk	
	Nadapuram Munsifi.	15 amshoms in Kóttayam Taluk and 5 amshoms in Kurumbranad Taluk.	16th Oct. 1883, page 663, 3rd March 1886, page 158.
	District Court ..	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction.</i> —The Revenue Taluks of Calicut, Ernad, Ponnáni, Palghat, Walavanad, and Cochin and 6 amshoms in the Wynad Taluk.	
	Sub-Court, Calicut.	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction.</i> —Amshoms within the District Munsifs of Calicut, Manjeri, Parappanangadi, Tirur, Ponnáni and Chowghat, and the amshoms of Vayittiri, Kalpatta, Kotapadi, Muppanad, Mattil, Nemmini, Nulpoza, Kodaganad, Puthadi, Parakudi, Kurumbala, Kotattihara, Ennaputhi Vattam and Edanadassokure in the Wynad Taluk.	
	Do. Palghat ..	<i>Small Cause Jurisdiction.</i> —Amshoms within the District Munsifs of Calicut, Shernad and Betunad.	
	Do. Cochin ..	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction.</i> —Amshoms within the District Munsifs of Palghat, Alattur, Ottapalam and Walavanad.	
Malabar (South)	Calicut Munsifi	<i>Small Cause Jurisdiction.</i> —Town of Cochin The whole of the Calicut Taluk except the Panniccode amshom.	21st Dec. 1883, page 856. 5th Feb. 1884, page 70.
	Manjeri do.	The portion of the Ernad Taluk not included in the Parappanangadi Munsifi, the Panniccode amshom of the Calicut Taluk and 3 amshoms of the Walavanad Taluk.	21st Dec. 1883, page 856.
	Parappanangadi do.	26 amshoms of Ernad Taluk and the Pariyapuram amshom of Ponnáni Taluk.	Do. 5th Feb. 1884, page 70, and 21th Mar. 1886, page 229.
	Ponnáni do.	25 amshoms of Ponnáni Taluk	16th Oct. 1883, page 663, 30th Oct. 1883, page 1283, and 19th Feb. 1884, page 261.
	Chowghat do.	21 do.	8th Oct. 1901, page 1206.
	Tirur do.	27 do.	19th Feb. 1884, page 262.
	Alattur do.	29 amshoms of Palghat Taluk	Do.
	Palghat do.	21 do.	
	Ottapalam do.	80 amshoms of Walavanad Taluk and 6 amshoms of Palghat Taluk.	
	Walavanad do.	31 amshoms of Walavanad Taluk.	
	Vayittiri do.	Taluk of Wynad	
	Anjengo do.	2 amshoms of Cochin Taluk.	31st Aug. 1880, page 728, and 12th May 1891, page 763, and 31st Aug. 1880, page 728.
	District Court ..	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction.</i> —The whole District <i>Small Cause Jurisdiction.</i> —The District Munsifi of Nellore.	18th Nov. 1889, page 1543, and 19th May 1891, page 799.
Nellore ..	Nellore Munsifi ..	The Taluks of Gudur and Rapur, the portions of the Taluks of Nellore and Atmakur, which lie to the south of Pennéru river and the Zamindari Divisions of Venkatagiri and Póluru.	

Statement showing the Territorial Jurisdictions of District, Subordinate Judges' and District Munsifs' Courts as they stood on 31st December 1904—cont.

Districts.	Names of District, Subordinate Judges' and District Munsifs' Courts.	Names of Revenue Taluks comprised within the jurisdiction of each Court.	Date and page of the Fort St. George Gazette.
Nellore—cont.	Kávali Munsifi ..	The Taluks of Kávali and Udayagiri, the portions of the Taluks of Nellore and Atmakur which lie to the north of the Pennéru river and 39 villages of the Kandukur Taluk situated to the south of the Mannéru river.	18th Nov. 1889, page 1543, and 19th May 1891, page 799.
	Kanigiri do. ..	The remainder of the Kandukur Taluk, the Taluk of Kanigiri and the Zamindari Divisions of Podili and Darsi.	7th Oct. 1902, pages 1265 and 1266. 30th Oct. 1883, page 1283.
	Ongole do. ..	The Taluk of Ongole	
	District Court ..	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction.</i> —The whole District. <i>Small Cause Jurisdiction.</i> —Municipal limits of Salem.	
Salem ..	Salem Munsifi ..	The Revenue Taluk of Salem less Rasipur Deputy Tahsildar's Division.	21st Dec. 1883, page 1490.
	Do. Additional.	Rasipur Deputy Tahsildar's Division of Salem Taluk, Revenue Taluk of Atur, Sankari Deputy Tahsildar's Division of the Revenue Taluk, Tiruchengóda.	
	Námakkal Munsifi ..	The whole of Námakkal Taluk, Tiruchengóda Taluk, except Sankari Division.	
	Tiruppattúr do. ..	The Revenue Taluks of Tiruppattúr and Uttangarai and 495 villages in the southern half of Dharmapuri.	
	Krishnagiri do. ..	The Revenue Taluks of Krishnagiri and Hosúr and 243 villages in the northern half of Dharmapuri.	
	District Court ..	<i>Ordinary Jurisdiction.</i> —The whole District.	12th May 1874, page 770.
	Sub-Court, Tanjore.	The whole of Tanjore and Pattakkóttai Taluks and the Taluks of Mannárgudi, except the maganams of Sendangudi (Vadamugam and Thenmugam) and the maganam of Umbalapadi in Kumbakónam Taluk.	
	Do. Kumbakónam.	Revenue Taluk of Kumbakónam, except Umbalapadi and the whole of the Revenue Taluks of Máyavaram and Shiyali.	
	Do. Negapatam.	The whole of the Revenue Taluks of Tirutturaip-póndi, Negapatam and Nannilam and the maganams of Sendangudi Vadamugam and Sendangudi Thenmugam in the Mannárgudi Taluk.	
	Tanjore Munsifi	Portions of the Revenue Taluk of Tanjore except the maganams of Perambur, Varakoor, Nemam, Onpathiveli, Tiruvádi, Kandiyyur, Mangudi, Milattur, Kothangudi and Maráveri.	
	Tiruvádi do.	Portions of the Revenue Taluk of Tanjore consisting of the maganams above specified against the District Munsifi's Court of Tanjore and portion of the Revenue Taluk of Kumbakónam consisting of Umbalapadi maganam.	14th Aug. 1877, page 1016, 22nd Jan. 1884, page 76, and 14th April 1886, pages 567 and 568.
	Shiyali do.	The whole of the Shiyali Taluk and the maganams of Pagasalai, Korukkai, Manamodu, and Tiruchempalli in Máyavaram Taluk.	22nd Jan. 1884, page 76, and 14th April 1886, pages 567 and 568.
Tanjore ..	Máyavaram do.	The whole of the Revenue Taluk of Máyavaram except the maganams of Manamodu Korukkai, Pagasalai and Tiruchempalli.	29th Jan. 1884, page 131.
	Kumbakónam do.	The maganams of Kumbakónam Kusba, Suvámi-malai, Sholapuram, and Tiruppánandal in Kumbakónam Taluk.	Do.
	Valangiman do.	The whole of the Revenue Taluk of Kumbakónam except the maganams of Kumbakónam, Suvámi-malai, Sholapuram, Tiruppánandal and Umbalapadi.	
	Negapatam do.	The maganams of Negapatam, Kivalúr, Palaya-valam, Palakurichi and Tevur in Negapatam Taluk, and the maganams of Polagam and Tirumarugal in Nannilam Taluk.	
	Tiruválúr do.	The whole of the Revenue Taluk of Nannilam except the maganams of Polagam and Tirumarugal and the maganams of Tiruválúr and Sigar in Negapatam Taluk.	
	Mannárgudi do.	The whole of the Revenue Taluk of Mannárgudi except the maganams of Sendangudi Vadamugam and Sendangudi Thenmugam.	
	Tirutturaip-póndi Munsifi.	The whole of the Revenue Taluk of Tirutturaip-póndi and the maganams of Sendangudi Vadamugam and Sendangudi Thenmugam, and the maganams of Kilayur and Sattiagudi in Negapatam Taluk.	13th Feb. 1877, page 266, and 17th March 1885, page 478.

Statement showing the Territorial Jurisdictions of District, Subordinate Judges' and District Munsifs' Courts as they stood on 31st December 1904—cont.

Districts.	Names of District, Subordinate Judges' and District Munsifs' Courts.	Names of Revenue Taluks comprised within the jurisdiction of each Court.	Date and page of the Fort St. George Gazette.
Tanjore—cont.	Pattukkottai Munsifi.	Revenue Taluk of Pattukkottai, the Zamindari of Kallakottai and Konoor and the villages of Thevar, Pisanathur, and Kundayampatti and 16 villages forming the north and north-eastern portion of Kannangudi Revenue Taluk of Madura District.	
	District Court ..	Ordinary Jurisdiction.—The whole District.	6th May 1879,
	Sub-Court ..	Do. The Revenue Taluks of Tinnevely, Nanguneri, Ambasamudram and Tenkasi.	page 336.
	Tuticorin Sub-Court.	Ordinary Jurisdiction.—The Revenue Taluks of Srivilliputtur, Sattur, Ottappidaram, Sankaranayinarkoyil and Srivaikuntam.	17th June 1902, page 609.
		Small Cause Jurisdiction.—The Revenue Taluks of Tinnevely, Nanguneri, Ambasamudram and Tenkasi.	17th May 1904, page 603.
Tinnevely	Tinnevely Munsifi.	Ordinary Jurisdiction.—The Revenue Taluks of Sattur, Srivaikuntam and Sankaranayinarkoyil.	17th March 1903, page 339.
	Srivilliputtur do.	The Revenue Taluks of Tinnevely and Nanguneri.	9th Feb. 1892, page 193.
	Ambasamudram Munsifi.	The Revenue Taluks of Srivilliputtur and Sankaranayinarkoyil.	
	Srivaikuntam do.	The Revenue Taluks of Ambasamudram and Tenkasi.	
	Tuticorin do.	The Revenue Taluk of Srivaikuntam ..	Do.
	Sattur do.	The Revenue Taluk of Ottappidaram except Vilattikulam Division.	
	District Court ..	The Revenue Taluk of Sattur and Vilattikulam Division.	
	Trichinopoly Munsifi.	Ordinary Jurisdiction.—The whole District.	
		Small Cause Jurisdiction.—The District Munsifs of Trichinopoly and Srirangam.	
Trichinopoly	Kulittalai do.	The Municipality of Trichinopoly and all that part of the Revenue Taluk of Trichinopoly which lies east of the high road from Trichinopoly to Pudukkottai and south of the River Cauvery.	
	Ariyalur do.	The Revenue Taluks of Kulittalai and Musiri.	2nd Feb. 1892, page 141.
	Srirangam do.	The Revenue Taluks of Perambalur and Udaiyarpalayam.	
		That portion of the Revenue Taluk of Trichinopoly which is not comprised in the jurisdiction of the District Munsif of Trichinopoly including the Iluppér maganam.	
	District Court ..	Ordinary Jurisdiction.—The whole District.	
	Yellamanohili Munsifi.	The Revenue Taluks of Survasiddhi and Golconda.	
Vizagapatam	Vizianagram do.	The Revenue Taluks of Vizianagram and Gajapati-nagaram.	
	Chodavaramu do.	The Revenue Taluks of Viravalli and Sringavarapukota.	16th Oct. 1889, page 1404.
	Párvatipuram do.	The Revenue Taluks of Bobbili, Párvatipuram and Sálurn.	
	Vizagapatam do.	The Revenue Taluks of Bimlipatam, Vizagapatam and Anakápallo.	
	Razam do.	The Revenue Taluks of Chipurupalle and Palkonda except the Agency Tracts of latter Taluk.	

From A. G. CARDEW, Esq., I.C.S., on Special Duty, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Judicial Department, Fort St. George (through the Honourable the Judges of the High Court), dated Madras, 15th March 1905, No. 40.

In my letter No. 35, dated 28th January 1905, I submitted the first instalment of my report dealing with the judicial aspects of Mr. Meyer's proposals for the redistribution of districts and divisional charges. In the present letter I propose to consider such other matters connected with the judicial administration as have been referred to me by the Honourable the Judges of the High Court since I entered on my present enquiries.

2. The first of these matters concerns the possible redistribution of jurisdictions in the Ceded districts which has been mentioned in paragraph 57 of my letter No. 35.

3. Up to the year 1900 the District Court of Bellary had original and appellate jurisdiction, civil and criminal, over the whole of the two Revenue districts of Bellary and Anantapur. In 1900 the Gooty Munsifi, which includes one taluk (Adóni) of the Bellary Revenue district and two taluks (Gooty and Tadpatri) of the Anantapur Revenue district, was placed for civil purposes under the District Court of Kurnool, while, in regard to Sessions work, the Gooty and Tadpatri taluks were made subject to Kurnool, the Adóni taluk continuing to be attached to the Bellary Sessions Division. This arrangement proved inconvenient, as prisoners committed to Sessions from the Gooty and Tadpatri taluks had to be marched over 30 miles by road from Dhone to Kurnool. With effect from 1st October 1903 it was accordingly altered, and for Sessions purposes the Gooty and Tadpatri taluks were again made subject to the Bellary District Court. As these taluks supply a considerable amount of crime, their transfer will in future add somewhat largely to the work of the Bellary Court, which will also receive some addition from the transfer of Kadiri taluk from Cuddapah to Anantapur. At the same time the Cuddapah Court, being relieved of three taluks, will have a decidedly light file and the Kurnool Court will likewise be a light one. Allowing for the effect which these changes will have, the future files of the three Courts may be thus estimated:—

District Court.	Ordinary (original) suits.	Civil appeals (other than rent appeals).	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
Cuddapah.. ..	14	152		59
Kurnool	15	189		65
Bellary	24	168	3	79
Total	53	509	3	203

4. The civil work which these figures represent is light, the three districts together not exceeding that of the single Court of the present Gódvári district. But the Sessions work is heavy, and this fact, combined with the large area of the Revenue districts concerned, makes it necessary to maintain the three District Courts. Some steps to equalize the files of the three Courts may however be possible.

5. The position of Kurnool at a distance of 33 miles from the line of rail places a great difficulty in the way of any readjustment of jurisdictions, as it is a hardship on litigants to impose on them this long road journey. The present arrangement which requires suitors from the Gooty Munsifi to proceed to Kurnool for civil business (Original suits above Rs. 2,500 in value and appeals) certainly causes such a hardship. But unfortunately it is impossible to alter this arrangement without seriously reducing the work of the Kurnool Court. Of its total file of 15 suits and 189 appeals the Gooty Munsifi provides nearly one-third (5 suits and 57 appeals). It must, therefore, be assumed, I think, that no change in this respect is possible.

6. By natural position the most convenient arrangement would be to attach the Gooty and Tadpatri taluks wholly to the Cuddapah District Court. They are on the direct line of rail and within three hours of Cuddapah. As shown in the last paragraph they cannot be conveniently detached from Kurnool for civil work, but for criminal work, they may be placed under the jurisdiction of the Cuddapah Sessions Court.

Their Civil and Criminal jurisdictions are already separated, the former being under Kurnool and the latter under Bellary. This latter may now be transferred from Bellary to Cuddapah. The resulting files will then be as follows :—

District Court.	Ordinary suits.	Civil appeals (other than rent appeals).	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
Cuddapah	14	152	..	76
Kurnool	15	189	..	65
Bellary	24	168	3	62
Total ..	53	509	3	203

7. It may be objected to this arrangement that it involves a departure from the principle of keeping Revenue and Magisterial jurisdictions conterminous, and that it will oblige the Magisterial and Police authorities of the Anantapur district to deal with two different Sessions Courts. This was not, however, considered an insuperable objection when in 1900, these taluks were attached to the Kurnool district. The Inspector-General of Police to whom a reference has been made in his letter No. 820, dated 24th February 1905, that he has no objection to the Gooty and Tadpatri taluks being made subject for criminal purposes to the Sessions Court of Cuddapah, and the District Magistrate of Anantapur (Mr. Scott) also saw no objection. This change will produce a fairly equal distribution of business between the three District Courts, and will be rather advantageous than otherwise to the public. I therefore recommend its adoption. No other redistribution of jurisdictions in the Ceded districts seems to be practicable.

8. A second matter which was reserved for further mention in my letter No. 35 (*vide* paragraph 76 thereof) concerns the Coimbatore, Trichinopoly and Salem districts. This is a group of districts in which the temporary interposition of a Sub-Judge to clear off arrears has been frequently necessary. The average file of the District Courts in these districts has been as follows :—

Districts.	Ordinary suits.	Small causes.	Civil appeals.	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
Salem	33	44	269	118*	92
Coimbatore	33	..	223	6	119
Trichinopoly	42	367	242	4	37

* Representing 21 batches.

9. Under Mr. Meyer's scheme, Salem will be relieved of the Tiruppattūr and Námakkal taluks and Coimbatore of Karūr taluk, while the Námakkal taluk from Salem and the Karūr taluk from Coimbatore will be added on to the Trichinopoly district. The effect of these changes, if applied to the jurisdiction of the District Courts, would be to produce the following files :—

Districts.	Ordinary suits.	Small causes.	Civil appeals.	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
Salem	18	44	160	84	71
Coimbatore	30	..	196	6	106
Trichinopoly	54	367	361	33	60

10. This result would leave the District Judge of Salem an unnecessarily light file, while it would make that of the District Judge of Trichinopoly unduly heavy. In paragraphs 63 and 75 of my letter No. 35, I have therefore proposed to leave the taluk of Námakkal for purposes of civil jurisdiction under the District Court of Salem and to relieve the District Judge of Trichinopoly of his small cause work. The files that would be received in the District Courts, if this recommendation were accepted, are shown in the following table :—

Districts.	Ordinary suits.	Small causes.	Civil appeals.	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
Salem	27	44	242	113	71
Coimbatore	30	..	196	6	106
Trichinopoly	45	..	269	4	60

11. Under this arrangement, it will be observed that the civil file of the Trichinopoly District Court continues to be somewhat heavy, while the criminal file of the Coimbatore District Court is open to the same remark. To remedy this, it has been suggested that a permanent Sub-Court, which would help all the three District Courts in its vicinity, should be established at Erode. This plan has a good deal to recommend it, as it would probably entirely prevent the recurrence of any demand for temporary assistance from this group of districts. It is, however, not without difficulties. In order to give assistance to more than one district, the Sub-Court must be placed in a central position, such as Erode, but the civil file which can then be allotted to it will not be very extensive. Of the three districts, Salem evidently stands in least need of relief, and it seems unnecessary to give the proposed Sub-Court any ordinary original jurisdiction in that district. The criminal file of the District and Sessions Judge of Trichinopoly is not heavy, and the relief needed by him is in respect of civil work. But in order to give such relief it will be necessary to split up some of the existing jurisdictions. The District Judge (Mr. Hewetson) at first proposed to place the Karūr taluk and the whole of the Kulitalai Munsifi, containing the Musiri and Kulitalai taluks under the Sub-Court of Erode, with the possible exception of the Manapparai firka of Kulitalai. But as will be seen from the sketch enclosed, it would be inconvenient to require persons living in areas bordering on the Trichinopoly-Dindigal line of rail to go to Erode for their civil suits above Rs. 2,500, as they would actually have to pass through Trichinopoly town *en route*. I, therefore, proposed that the areas in the Trichinopoly district to be placed under the Erode Court should be (1) the Karūr and Musiri taluks, (2) the Krishnarayapuram and Kulitalai firkas of Kulitalai taluk and the northern halves of the Togamalai firka and of Kadavur, (3) the Srirangam firka of the Trichinopoly taluk. Mr. Hewetson has accepted this proposal, as involving less inconvenience than his own. The area thus proposed to be placed under the Erode Sub-Court will produce about 17 ordinary suits per annum, thus reducing the file of the Trichinopoly District Court under this head from 45 to 28. In the Coimbatore district the civil work is not excessive. It would, I think, be a mistake to make over to the Sub-Court the whole of the original civil work of the Coimbatore District Court (as was at first suggested by the District Judge) thus adding Coimbatore to the list of Courts in which no original civil work is done. The Sub-Judge can, however, be given ordinary original jurisdiction over the Erode Munsifi, and this will transfer to him an average number of six original suits. But as some further relief to the Coimbatore District Court is necessary, especially on the criminal side it seems the best plan to require the Sub-Judge to sit for seven or eight days per mensem at Coimbatore as an Assistant Sessions Judge thus enabling him to try about 40 sessions cases per annum. During the four years ending 1904, an average number of 46 cases a year out of the 114 disposed of have been punished with sentences of seven years and under, so that the District Judge would have no difficulty in transferring to an Assistant Sessions Judge a sufficient number of sessions cases. During the rest of the month, the Sub-Judge would sit at Erode for civil work.

12. The ordinary original file which the Sub-Judge would there receive would be only 23 suits.* He may also be utilized to give much needed relief to the District Munsif of Erode whose file (882 ordinary suits and 2,821 small causes) is unduly heavy. In order to enable the District Munsif to get through this file at all, it has hitherto been necessary to give him small cause powers up to Rs. 200, but in future a junior Munsif may be employed here, with small cause powers limited to Rs. 50.

By this arrangement the Sub-Judge will be enabled to try some 1,100 small causes per

annum from the Erode Munsifi. He may also relieve each of the District Judges of Trichinopoly and Salem of not more than 100 civil appeals per annum. The number of appeals coming before the District Court of Coimbatore will, at the same time, be slightly reduced by the reduction in the number of appealable decrees consequent on the extended small cause jurisdiction exercised by the Sub-Court. The Sub-Judge's work would then be as follows:—

23 ordinary suits.	200 appeals.
1,100 small causes.	40 sessions cases.

13. The files which would then remain to the several District Courts, if the above relief is taken full advantage of, would be as shown below, the result being a fairly equal division:—

Districts.	Ordinary suits.	Small causes.	Civil appeals.	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
Salem	27	44	142	113	71
Coimbatore	24	..	196	6	66
Trichinopoly	28	..	169	4	60

* Representing twenty batches.

14. I accordingly recommend that a permanent Sub-Court be created at Erode with ordinary original jurisdiction over the Erode Munsifi of the Coimbatore district, the Karur and Musiri taluks, the Krishnarayapuram and Kulittalai firkas and the northern halves of the Togamalai firka and of Kadavur in Kulittalai taluk and the Srirangam firka of Trichinopoly taluk of Trichinopoly district. The Sub-Judge should also exercise small cause jurisdiction over the Erode Munsifi, and should be invested with the powers of an Assistant Sessions Judge and should sit for one week per mensem at Coimbatore for the trial of sessions cases. The District Judge of Trichinopoly and the District Judge of Salem may be empowered to transfer to the Sub-Judge at Erode not more than 100 civil appeals each per annum.

15. A third matter to which attention may be invited is the possibility of replacing the District Court of North Malabar by a Subordinate Judge under the control of the District Court of South Malabar, the area subject to the Palghat Sub-Court being at the same time transferred to the Coimbatore District Court. The file of that Court will, under the arrangement proposed in the last paragraph, consist of 24 ordinary suits, 196 civil appeals, 6 rent appeals and 66 sessions cases. At the rate of disposal assumed in paragraph 4 of my letter No. 35, this represents work for about 220 days, and is thus sufficient to occupy fully the time of a District Court. If, however, the Palghat Sub-Court, with the District Munsifis of Palghat, Alattur, Ottapalam and Walavanad were made subject to the District Court of Coimbatore, the file of this Court would be raised by an average number of 14 appeals and 32 sessions cases. The addition of 32 sessions cases to the file of the Coimbatore District Court would render it necessary to relieve that Court of the whole of its original civil work, thus leaving it with only appellate and criminal files. This appears to me to be a move in the wrong direction. Moreover, no cause has been shown for the transfer of Palghat from the Malabar to the Coimbatore district. The revenue areas subject to the Palghat Sub-Court are the Palghat and Walavanad taluks. To separate the Walavanad taluk from the West coast and to attach it to Coimbatore would evidently be a mistake, whatever may be said as to Palghat taluk. Both in respect to language and land-tenure these taluks are connected with Malabar rather than with Coimbatore, and as the Coimbatore District Court has already to deal with areas speaking Tamil and Canarese, it would be disadvantageous to include a third language within its jurisdiction. There is no popular demand for revision of existing jurisdictions in respect of South Malabar, and no administrative convenience to be gained by the proposed change. I cannot, therefore, recommend the suggested transfer of Palghat to Coimbatore.

16. If the transfer of Palghat to Coimbatore is negatived, the plan of closing the District Court of North Malabar, and substituting a Sub-Court in its place, thus bringing the northern part of Malabar under the jurisdiction of the District Court of South Malabar, must—I think—fall to the ground. The average files of the District Courts of North and South Malabar are shown in the following table:—

District Court.	Institutions—Three years' average ending 1903.				
	Original suits.	Civil appeals.	Rent appeals.	Small causes.	Sessions cases.
North Malabar ..	26	485	..	676	38
South ..	3	939	..	..	76

In these figures the number of original suits instituted in the temporary Sub-Court which sat at Tellicherry in 1902–1903 have been included, and the future file of Small Causes of the District Court of North Malabar will probably not exceed 160, the Small Cause jurisdiction being now limited to the Tellicherry Munsifi. But, after making allowance for this reduction, it does not appear to me that the District Court of South Malabar could undertake the additional work which would be thrown upon it if the District Court of North Malabar were closed. Besides the 38 sessions cases, which would be a most serious addition, equal to 50 per cent. of its present sessions file, it would receive a certain number of appeals from the Sub-Court, and it would have to exercise supervision over an additional Sub-Court and seven more District Munsifs. The District Judge of South Malabar has already under his control a larger number of Courts (3 Sub-Courts and 13 District Munsifs) than any other District Judge in the Presidency. It does not seem advisable to add to this branch of work.

17. It is certainly a fact that the number of original suits filed in the District Court of North Malabar has shown of late a remarkable tendency to diminish. Ten years ago the average number of institutions was 52, but in 1901 it was 32, in 1902 it was 22, in 1903 it was 23, and in 1904 it was only 12. The causes of this decline are not entirely clear. One probable reason is the operation of certain decisions of the High Court on the subject of the valuation of tenants' improvements. A change in the method of valuing suits for the removal of Karnavans, which has greatly raised the institution fee payable in such suits, may also have had some effect in checking the institution of that class of suit. The introduction of the new settlement, which has taken six lakhs extra out of the pockets of the people, may also have reduced the funds available for the luxury of litigation. Finally local opinion finds a sufficient cause for the falling off in the personality of the District Judge, and the fact that the decline in institutions of original suits in 1904 was so large and so sudden, while the Munsifs' files show no corresponding reduction suggests that some temporary cause, confined to the District Court, has been at work.

18. It is thus not improbable that the number of institutions in the District Court of North Malabar may again increase in future years. Should, however, this not occur, a course alternative to the abolition of the court would be the addition to it of jurisdiction over the most southerly taluk of South Canara. This taluk, Kasaragod, is inhabited by a Malayalam-speaking population up to the Chandragiri river, i.e., to within 2 miles of Kasaragod town. The Railway, which is now under construction, will bring the southern parts of the taluk into easy communication with Tellicherry, while it is probable that the inhabitants would prefer to resort to the Malayalam-speaking Court of Tellicherry, rather than to the Canarese-speaking Court of Mangalore. No change seems to me to be at present called for, but if the file of the District Court of North Malabar should continue to dwindle, the possibility of thus adding to its jurisdiction might be worth consideration.

19. Reference has several times been made both in this report and in my letter No. 35, to the presence in certain districts of temporary Sub-Courts which had been sent there for a time to clear off accumulated arrears of work. This system of employing Sub-Courts temporarily in one district after another with the object of giving assistance to the regular Courts appears to have grown up during the last ten or twelve years. For the first two decades after Sub-Courts were created by Act III of 1873, instances of such temporary employment were comparatively rare. In 1876 the Cuddapah Sub-Court was sent to work at Bellary and the Salem Sub-Court was sent to work at Madura. In 1877 a Sub-Court was temporarily opened at Chicacole to aid the District Courts of Ganjam and Vizagapatam and in 1881 and 1882 a Sub-Court temporarily existed at Vizagapatam. In 1884 the Cocanada Sub-Court was temporarily located at Rajahmundry and in 1888 the Ellore Sub-Court was temporarily employed at Masulipatam. These seem to be the only instances during the first

eighteen years after the passing of the Madras Civil Courts Act. Since 1891 the practice of locating a Sub-Court temporarily in a district in order to aid in clearing off arrears has much increased. In that year a Sub-Court was sent temporarily to the Tinnevely district and one sat there also in 1892-93. A Sub-Court was also temporarily employed at Vizagapatam in 1892-93, and between 1894 and 1904 Sub-Courts have been temporarily located in as many as nine districts, viz., North Arcot (three times, 1894, 1900 and 1902), Trichinopoly (three times, 1894, 1898 and 1901), Coimbatore (three times, 1895, 1900 and 1904), Nellore (twice, 1895 and 1897), Tinnevely (1896), Vizagapatam (1898), North Malabar (1902), Gódvári (1903) and Tanjore (1904). In addition to this a Sub-Court has temporarily given assistance in Bellary (twice, 1894 and 1897) and at Salem (four times, 1894, 1896, 1899 and 1901), Bellary-Salem being its proper or quasi-permanent seat when not employed elsewhere. It will be seen that in the fourteen years ending 1904, temporary Sub-Courts have on nineteen occasions been temporarily deputed to districts to which they did not permanently belong, and when I was at Trichinopoly in December 1904 the District Judge there had just again applied to the High Court for further assistance from a Sub-Court. Had this been granted, it would have made the fourth temporary Sub-Court employed in Trichinopoly within twelve years.

20. The system of deputing a Sub-Court to a district temporarily to clear off arrears seems to be a bad one. It puts a premium on lack of industry, for the conscientious worker, who works long hours to keep his file current, is no better off than the "slackster" who allows arrears to grow up and then gets a Sub-Judge to clear them off. While it is thus calculated to destroy in the officer who receives relief any sense of responsibility for the state of his file, it is not likely to encourage much enthusiasm in the officer who gives relief, i.e., the Sub-Judge, as he must feel himself to be always a mere under-study, employed to supplement the labours of some one else. It also imposes a very real hardship on suitors, whose suits drag on undischarged until a sufficient array of arrears has accumulated to justify application for a temporary Sub-Court.

21. Advantage should therefore be taken of the present opportunity to put an end to this system, and to give such permanent relief as will render it possible to hold District Judges definitely responsible in future for keeping their files current. This object will, I think, be achieved if the proposals which have been made in my letter No. 35 and in this letter are accepted. The first group of districts, Gódvári, Kistna and Nellore, will receive relief through the establishment of the Guntúr District Court. In the second group—that of North Arcot—the establishment of a Sub-Court for the Vellore district will prevent any chance of the Chittoor District Judge being overburdened in future. In the third group of districts—Cuddapah and Bellary—Cuddapah is relieved by making over Kadiri to Anantapur and Madanapalle and Vayalpad to Chittoor, while Bellary will be lightened by the sessions work of Gooty and Tadpatri taluks going to Cuddapah. In the fourth group—Salem, Trichinopoly and Coimbatore—the establishment of a permanent Sub-Court at Erode ought to guard against any future demand for special assistance in that direction. The decrease in the file of the North Malabar District Court renders any necessity for a Sub-Court at Tellicherry very improbable. Madura will be materially relieved by the creation of the District Court of Ramnád, and in Tinnevely the work remaining after the transfer of Srivilliputtúr and Sáttúr taluks to Ramnád will probably not be in excess of the powers of the District Court and one Sub-Court. The effect of these proposals will thus be in a large measure to achieve that measure of relief which was laid down in Mr. Justice Benson's minute, dated 12th May 1897, recorded in G.O., No. 290, Judicial, dated 15th February 1899, and will afford reasonable grounds for hoping that the system of temporary deputations of Sub-Courts will in future be unnecessary.

22. The net result on the superior courts of the Presidency will be as follows. Two additional District Judges will be needed, namely, at Guntúr and Ramnád. The proposed Sub-Judge for Vellore will be provided by the abolition of the Sub-Court at Tuticorin, and the Sub-Judge at Erode will absorb the Sub-Judge who is now temporarily employed at Rajahmundry. The Sub-Judge of South Canara, who has several times been employed on temporary jobs, has now returned to his permanent post at Mangalore and will remain there. There remains only the case of the temporary Sub-Court which has been sitting at Tanjore since 21st March 1904 and whose retention up to the end of 1905 has already been sanctioned. The question whether this additional Sub-Court

can be abolished at the end of this year or whether it should be made permanent can be decided on the results of the current year's work. This is a separate question unconnected with any of the proposals made in this report.

23. One other matter may be briefly noticed. The Government has proposed to create four appointments on Sub-Collector's pay for the purpose of training officers of the Indian Civil Service in District Judges' work. For purposes of the Civil Courts Act the officers under training will be presumably classed as Sub-Judges, but they will not be placed in independent charge of any Court, but will be attached to the Courts of selected District Judges, who will transfer suitable cases to them for trial. In Mr. Gillespie's letter No. 885, dated 26th September 1904, it has been stated that the location of these Civilian Judges under training may be determined later, but it has now been suggested that it should be dealt with in connection with the questions discussed in this report. In order to determine where the officers under training should be placed it is desirable to form a clear conception of the object with which their training is to be given. It is to give them "some experience of civil judicial work" (Mr. Hammick's letter, R.C. No. 2524, dated 24th June 1904). The Government evidently holds that training in criminal work is unnecessary. It doubtless considers that a civilian of Sub-Collector's standing has usually had sufficient experience, as a magistrate, of criminal law and procedure, to enable him to take up the duties of a Sessions Judge without much difficulty. Hence it follows that the whole time allowed for training, which will be short enough at the best, should be devoted to the study and practice of civil law and procedure. Nor does it seem desirable that these Civilian Judges under training should be regarded in any way as intended to relieve District Judges of any part of their legitimate work. As shown above, those District Judges who have in the past been overworked will receive a sufficient measure of relief from the steps proposed to be taken in consequence of Mr. Meyer's scheme. The treatment of the Civilian Judges under training should be determined solely with the view of enabling them to get the maximum of benefit from their training irrespective of the effect on the Courts to which they are attached. For this reason it seems undesirable to call them Assistant Judges, or to give them powers as Assistant Sessions Judges, or in any way to favour the idea that they are to be regarded as assistants to the District Judge.

24. It appears then that the period of training to be undergone by Civilian Judges under training should be devoted to civil work and should be employed so as to give the learner as much practical experience as possible. With this object the cases to be transferred to these Civilian Judges under training should not be limited to the suits ordinarily coming before a District Judge, but should include a selection of the District Munsifs' cases. This was suggested by Mr. Justice Shephard in his minute, dated 18th May 1897. Care should be taken that the Civilian Judge under training is supplied with plenty of work to keep him well occupied, and that he acquires experience of branches of work that do not usually come before District Judges, such as execution proceedings. During his first year no small cause powers should be exercised, but during the second year it might be useful to allow a limited amount of small cause work to be done by the Judges during training. It would be incongruous to impose any appellate work on officers undergoing training.

25. Assuming that these will be the principles to be followed in regulating the training of Civilian Judges under training, the question of the Courts to which they should be attached should be settled more with reference to the character of the District Judge than to that of the amount of litigation. No Civilian Judge under training should be attached to a district unless the District Court is presided over by a man who will give him an example of careful attention to business and judicial temper and demeanour. This is the first consideration. The second consideration is the presence at the head-quarter station of an efficient Bar. The quality of the Bar differs considerably in different districts, and it will be much to the advantage of a novice to hear the pleadings of a superior class of practitioner. A third consideration is the existence of a sufficient volume of litigation. It would obviously be undesirable to place a Civilian Judge under training in such a District Court as Kurnool, Cuddapah or Guntúr. A Court using a language other than Tamil or Telugu, e.g., that of Mangalore, should also be avoided. The notion of selecting particular districts to which the Civilian Judge under training should be regularly sent is, I think, to

be deprecated, both because it may result in the officer under training being placed under an undesirable type of District Judge and because it will tend to support the idea that the Civilian Judge under training is placed there principally to assist the District Judge, whereas he is really placed there to receive a training in civil law and procedure.

26. This concludes the matters which have been referred to me for enquiry by G.O., No. 1556, Judicial, dated 14th October 1904, and by subsequent instructions. In a separate letter the High Court will be furnished with suggestions as to possible modifications in the ministerial and other establishments of the several Courts affected by these proposals, but this is an independent matter and it may be convenient not to include it here.

From A. G. CARDEW, Esq., I.C.S., on Special Duty, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Judicial Department, Fort St. George (through the Honourable the Judges of the High Court), dated Madras, 25th March 1905, No. 45.

With reference to the concluding paragraph of my letter No. 40, dated 15th March 1905, I have now the honour to submit proposals relating to modifications in the ministerial, copyist, and nazarat establishments of the several District Courts rendered necessary by the proposed changes in territorial jurisdictions. For convenience of reference a consolidated statement of the existing establishments of all District Courts is shown in Appendix I.

2. In the first group of districts comprising Gódvári, Kistna, Guntúr and Nellore, the transfer from Gódvári to Kistna of the four Munsifs of Ellore, Tanuku, Narasapur and Bhínavaram and the consequent reduction of work in the Gódvári District Court will enable some substantial reduction to be made in the establishment of that court. The District Judge (Mr. C. G. Spencer) who has been consulted on the subject proposes a reduction of six clerks on the regular establishment, viz., one on Rs. 25 *per mensem*, two on Rs. 20 each *per mensem*, two on Rs. 17½ and one on Rs. 15. On the copyist establishment he proposes to reduce one Examiner on Rs. 17½ and one Reader on Rs. 15, while reducing the pay of the Attender by Rs. 2 *per mensem* (i.e.) from Rs. 10 to 8; and on the Process-service establishment he proposes to reduce two amins, one on Rs. 12 and the other on Rs. 8 *per mensem* and 5 peons, two on Rs. 7½ and three on Rs. 7 *per mensem*.

3. The District Judge has further agreed, in view of the diminished work and responsibility which will in future rest on the Record-keeper of the District Court, that the pay of that officer shall in future be fixed at Rs. 50 instead of Rs. 60 *per mensem*, but he recommends that as the present Record-keeper has 21 years' service, of which six years have been in his present post, the reduction shall take effect only when the present occupant of the post vacates.

4. These proposals will result in an immediate saving of Rs. 205½ *per mensem* and in a future saving of Rs. 215½ *per mensem* and may be accepted. They are set forth in the form of proposition statements appended to this letter—*vide* Appendix II.

5. No changes in the establishments of the District Courts of Kistna and Nellore appear to be rendered necessary by the proposals submitted in my letter No. 35, and as regards the Guntúr district a scale of establishment has already been drawn up and has been shown in the proposition statement which accompanied Mr. Hammick's letter to the Government of India, No. 840, Public, dated 13th October 1904. The scale there provided appears to be ample with two exceptions, one the omission of a type-writing clerk on Rs. 20—1—35 *per mensem* and the other the provision of a Central Nazir with no establishment of amins and peons. As the Guntúr District Court will be a light one, it may be possible to avoid the creation of a Nazarat at all in the District Court, leaving the service of District Court processes to be carried out by the local District Munsif, as is done in the District Courts of North Arcot, Bellary, Coimbatore, Ganjám and Kurnool. If this view is accepted, the appointment of a Central Nazir in the District Court will be unnecessary. The establishment of the Guntúr District Court revised in accordance with these suggestions is shown in appendix II to this letter. The total cost of the ministerial and copyist establishments will then be Rs. 751½ *per mensem* against which the reduction of Rs. 215½ *per mensem* in the Gódvári district forms a set-off.

6. In the second and third groups of districts, no change is called for in the case of the District Courts of North Arcot or Bellary. If the proposal made in paragraph 41 of my letter No. 35 to place a Sub-Court at Chittoor, giving it civil jurisdiction over the new Vellore district, is accepted, the Sub-Court will require the usual establishment costing Rs. 376 *per mensem* of a Subordinate Court, but it does not seem necessary at least for the present to make any addition to the establishment of the future Chittoor District Court. It may be found desirable later to establish a Central Nazarat as there will be three courts at Chittoor, but this can await the result of experience.

7. The work of the Cuddapah District Court will be somewhat diminished by the reduction of one of its four munsifis (that of Madanapalle) and the District Judge (Mr. A. C. Dutt) reports that the services of an assistant Record-keeper on Rs. 17½ *per mensem* and of two clerks, one on Rs. 25 and the other on Rs. 17½ *per mensem*, can be dispensed with, besides two copyists on Rs. 10 *per mensem* each. These proposals will effect an economy of Rs. 80 *per mensem* and may be approved. The effect is shown in the form of a proposition statement in appendix II.

8. The fourth group of districts includes South Arcot, Salem, Coimbatore and Trichinopoly. The amount of relief which the South Arcot District Court will receive will be insignificant, and no change there is necessary or possible. In the Salem district the number of District Munsifs will remain unchanged, but there will be a considerable reduction in the District Court's work, and the regular establishment may, I think, be reduced by one clerk on Rs. 17½ and one clerk on Rs. 15 *per mensem*. The District Court of Trichinopoly will also receive some relief, but the establishment of that Court is already smaller than that of Salem, and no reduction is possible. Coimbatore occupies a position midway between the two, and a reduction of one clerk on Rs. 17½ *per mensem* is here possible. Proposition statements to this effect are submitted.

9. As regards the fifth group composed of Tanjore, Madura and Tinnevely, no change is called for in Tanjore, as the District Court there will not be affected, and the District Judge of Tinnevely (Mr. Phillips) has reported that no reduction of establishment in his Court is possible. I consider that this view may be accepted in consideration of the fact that the establishment of the Tinnevely District Court is less than that of the other courts with equally heavy files. In Madura the District Judge proposes a reduction in the Nazarat establishment of six amins, two on Rs. 15 each and four on Rs. 12 each, and in the Copyist establishment of one examiner on Rs. 20, one reader on Rs. 15 and five copyists on Rs. 10 each. He adds that the regular establishment is already so overworked that he cannot recommend any reduction, even if three Munsifs' Courts and one Subordinate Judge's Court be removed from the district. But, as shown in paragraphs 90—92 of my letter No. 35, the effect of the creation of the new Ramnad district will not only be to remove four out of the existing nine courts which are subordinate to the District Court of Madura, but also to reduce the work of the District Court itself, as follows:—

District Court, Madura.								Ordinary suits.	Civil appeals.	Rent appeals.	Sessions cases.
Present file	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	3	454	124	125
Future file	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	2	237	51	81
Reduction	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	1	217	73	44

The reduction here shown is equal to more than one-third, and it is impossible to suppose that an establishment which has been able to keep pace with the present file need be retained when the amount of work coming before the court is diminished by 40 or 50 per cent. I accordingly recommend that one assistant Record-keeper on Rs. 20 *per mensem* and one on Rs. 15, one clerk on Rs. 25, one on Rs. 17½ and one on Rs. 15 be abolished. The changes proposed by the District Judge in the copyist and nazarat establishments are also inadequate, seeing that one court out of five is to be entirely removed, while the work of another is largely reduced. A reasonable arrangement would be to assimilate the copyist and nazarat establishments at Madura to the scale actually obtaining in South Malabar where also there are four courts at head-quarters, and where the number of processes executed hitherto has been about one-fifth less than in Madura. The adoption of this principle would, however, effect so heavy a reduction in the very liberal scale of establishment existing at Madura that I hesitate to recommend it, and I would propose therefore the following smaller reductions, viz., in the copyist department three Examiners on Rs. 20 *per mensem*, two Readers on Rs. 15 *per mensem* and five copyists on Rs. 10 *per mensem* and in the nazarat two amins on Rs. 20 *per mensem*, four amins on Rs. 15 *per mensem*, nine amins on Rs. 12, ten peons on Rs. 8, twenty peons on Rs. 7½ and fifteen peons on Rs. 7. The total saving effected by these proposals will amount to Rs. 775½ *per mensem*.

10. The regular establishment to be provided for the new District Court of Ramnad will be the same as that proposed for Guntur District Court, with the addition of a typist on Rs. 20—1—35 *per mensem*. But the nazarat and copyist establishments of a typist on Rs. 20—1—35 *per mensem*. But the nazarat and copyist establishments will probably have to be on a more liberal scale in Ramnad than in Guntur. As there is no District Munsif's Court at Ramnad, a Central Nazarat attached to the District Court will be necessary, and provision should be made accordingly, while the copyist establishment must include a minimum staff of copyists on Rs. 10 *per mensem* and an attender. In both respects a scale equal to some of the lighter District Courts of the Presidency has been adopted and is shown in the proposition statement in appendix II.

11. Among courts in which no change of jurisdiction is proposed that of North Malabar shows a heavy regular establishment, and in view of the large reduction in the work of this court, it may be worth considering whether one of the clerks on Rs. 17½ and 15 *per mensem* may not be reduced.

APPENDIX I.
STATEMENT showing the existing establishments of all District Courts.

Designation.	North Arcot.		South Arcot.		Bellary.		South Canara.		Chingleput.		Coimbatore.		Cuddapah.		Ganjām.		Gōdāvari.		Kistna.	
	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
A. Regular Establishment.		Rs.		Rs.		Rs.		Rs.		Rs.		Rs.		Rs.		Rs.		Rs.		Rs.
Surintendent ..	1	150	1	150	1	150	1	150	1	150	1	150	1	150	1	150	1	150	1	150
Head clerk ..	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100
Translator ..	1	75	1	75	1	75	1	75	1	75	1	75	1	75	1	75	1	75	1	75
Recorder per ..	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Assistant recorder ..	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25
Do. ..	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½
Do. ..	1	40	1	40	1	40	1	40	1	40	1	40	1	40	1	40	1	40	1	40
Clerk on Rs. 40 ..	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30
Do. " 25 ..	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50	2	50
Do. " 20 ..	2	40	2	40	2	40	2	40	2	40	2	40	2	40	2	40	2	40	2	40
Clerk for typewriting 20—1—35 ..	1	25½	1	25½	1	25½	1	25½	1	25½	1	25½	1	25½	1	25½	1	25½	1	25½
Clerk on Rs. 17½ ..	1	35	1	35	1	35	1	35	1	35	1	35	1	35	1	35	1	35	1	35
Do. " 15 ..	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15
Attender on Rs. 10 ..	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10
Muchli on Rs. 10 ..	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10
Daffadar on Rs. 10 ..	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10
Peons on Rs. 7 ..	4	28	4	28	4	28	4	28	4	28	4	28	4	28	4	28	4	28	4	28
Sweeper on Rs. 6 ..	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6
Scavenger ..	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30
Short-hand allowance ..	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30
Kasi ..	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30
Total ..	23	724	21	694½	23	731½	23	708½	22	686½	23	724	23	724	20	664	27	809	27	804
B. Copyist Establishment.																				
Superintendent ..	1	30	1	40	1	30	1	40	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	40
Assistant Superintendent ..	1	20	2	40	1	20	2	40	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	2	40
Examiner on Rs. 20 ..	1	20	2	40	1	20	2	40	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	2	40
Reader on Rs. 15 ..	1	15	2	30	1	15	2	30	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	1	15	2	30
Copyists on Rs. 10 ..	8	80	10	100	6	60	10	100	8	80	10	100	6	60	10	100	10	100	10	100
Attender ..	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10
Total ..	11	140	16	220	8	110	16	218	12	152	14	175	8	95	9	112	15	192½	16	220

* Sanctioned in G.O., No. 764, Judicial, dated 4th March 1904.

Statement showing the existing establishments of all District Courts—cont.

Designation.	North Arcot.		South Arcot.		Bellary.		South Canara.		Chingleput.		Coimbatore.		Cuddapah.		Ganjām.		Gōdāvari.		Kistna.	
	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
C. Nazarat Establishment.																				
Central nazir ..	1	60	1	60	1	60	1	60	1	60	1	60	1	60	1	60	1	60	1	60
Assistant nazir ..	1	95	1	95	1	95	1	95	1	95	1	95	1	95	1	95	1	95	1	95
Amil on Rs. 20 ..	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20
Do. " 16 ..	1	16	1	16	1	16	1	16	1	16	1	16	1	16	1	16	1	16	1	16
Do. " 12 ..	1	12	1	12	1	12	1	12	1	12	1	12	1	12	1	12	1	12	1	12
Do. " 8 ..	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8
Peons on Rs. 7½ ..	29	217½	29	217½	29	217½	29	217½	29	217½	29	217½	29	217½	29	217½	29	217½	29	217½
Do. " 7 ..	1	196	1	196	1	196	1	196	1	196	1	196	1	196	1	196	1	196	1	196
Total ..	33	576½	33	576½	33	576½	33	576½	33	576½	33	576½	33	576½	33	576½	33	576½	33	576½

Statement showing the existing establishments of all District Courts—cont.

Designation.	Kurnool.		Madura.		North Malabar.		South Malabar.		Nellore.		Salem.		Tanjore.		Tinnevely.		Trichinopoly.		Vizagapatam.	
	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.
<i>A. Regular Establishment.</i>																				
Barishadar ..	1	150	1	150	1	150	1	150	1	150	1	150	1	150	1	150	1	150	1	150
Head clerk ..	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100	1	100
Translator ..	1	75	1	75	1	75	1	75	1	75	1	75	1	75	1	75	1	75	1	75
Recordkeeper ..	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50	1	50
Assistant recordkeeper ..	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30
Do. ..	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20
Do. ..	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½
Do. ..	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30
Clerk on Rs. 40 ..	1	40	1	40	1	40	1	40	1	40	1	40	1	40	1	40	1	40	1	40
Do. " 30 ..	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30
Do. " 25 ..	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25
Do. " 20 ..	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20	1	20
Clerk for typewriting 20—1—35 ..	1	27½	1	27½	1	27½	1	27½	1	27½	1	27½	1	27½	1	27½	1	27½	1	27½
Clerk on Rs. 17½ ..	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½	1	17½
Do. ..	2	30	2	30	2	30	2	30	2	30	2	30	2	30	2	30	2	30	2	30
Attender on Rs. 10 ..	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10
Muchli on Rs. 10 ..	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10
Dufadar on Rs. 10 ..	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10
Peons on Rs. 7 ..	4	28	4	28	4	28	4	28	4	28	4	28	4	28	4	28	4	28	4	28
Sweeper on Rs. 6 ..	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6	1	6
Scavenger ..	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30
Short-hand allowance ..	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30
Kasi ..	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30	1	30
Total ..	20	659	28	821½	26	756½	28	821½	23	736½	24	739	25	794	24	749	23	696½	25	731½
<i>B. Copyist Establishment.</i>																				
Superintendent ..	1	60	1	40	1	50	1	20	1	30	1	40	1	30	1	40	1	30	1	30
Assistant Superintendent ..	1	140	3	60	3	60	3	60	1	20	1	20	3	60	2	40	2	40	1	20
Examiner on Rs. 20 ..	1	75	3	45	3	45	3	45	1	15	1	15	3	45	2	30	2	30	1	15
Reader on Rs. 15 ..	34	340	15	150	23	230	8	80	7	70	7	70	20	200	13	130	16	160	8	80
Copyists on Rs. 10 ..	5	50	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10	1	10
Attender ..	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	10	1	10	1	8	1	8	1	10	1	8
Total ..	6	70	49	623	24	313	39	483	12	155	10	116	29	363	20	248	22	280	12	163

* To be reduced to Rs. 25 when the present incumbent vacates.

† Temporary staff sanctioned in G.O. No. 1871, Judicial, dated 10th September 1912—

Assistant recordkeeper .. 20

Do. .. 15

Attender .. 10

Total .. 45

Statement showing the existing establishments of all District Courts—cont.

Statement showing the existing establishments of the Government.																				
Designation.	Kurnool.		Madura.		North Malabar.		South Malabar.		Nellore.		Salem.		Tanjore.		Tinnevely.		Trichinopoly.		Vizagapatam.	
	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.	Number.	Amount.
	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41
C. Nazarat Establishment.																				
Central party ..	..	..	1	70	1	40	1	50	1	60	1	40	1	60	1	70	1	60	1	50
Assistant party ..	..	..	1	25	1	20	1	20	1	25	1	20	1	25	1	25	1	25	1	25
Amun on Rs. 20 ..	..	..	12	180	4	60	5	75	6	90	3	60	2	40	3	60	3	60	5	75
Do. " 15 ..	..	..	23	300	10	120	10	120	17	204	9	108	18	216	17	204	15	180	11	132
Do. " 12 ..	..	..	28	336	10	120	10	120	17	204	10	120	15	180	20	240	17	204	8	96
Peons on Rs. 8 ..	..	..	56	448	19	152	24	192	33	264	28	224	29	232	41	328	34	272	16	128
Do. " 7½ ..	..	..	40	300	18	135	26	195	33	231	34	255	29	217½	32	240	35	262½	16	120
Do. " 7 ..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..	..
Total ..	..	..	174	1,641	63	588½	79	723	110	1,033½	92	813	102	986½	121	1,140½	112	1,051	58	473

APPENDIX II.

PROPOSITION statements of Ministerial establishments in District Courts in which modifications are proposed to be made.

Department.		Office to which the proposition refers.			Nature of charge.				Present scale.				Proposed scale.				Proposition.		Remarks.		
Number.	Date.	1	2	3	Number.	Designation.	Pay.		Average cost.	Number.	Designation.	Pay.		Average cost.	Permanent.		Decrease per month.				
							Minimum.	Increment.				Minimum.	Increment.		Amount.	Amount.					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18				
Gadchery District Court.																					
Regular establishment.		1					Sheristadar	Rs. 150 0 0	1						Rs. 150 0 0			(a) A. Personal allowance of Rs. 10 to be allowed to the present incumbent until he is re-entrusted.			
		1					Head clerk	Rs. 100 0 0	1						Rs. 100 0 0						
		1					Translator	Rs. 75 0 0	1						Rs. 75 0 0						
		1					Record-keeper	Rs. 60 0 0	1						Rs. 60 0 0						
		1					Assistant record-keeper	Rs. 25 0 0	1						Rs. 25 0 0						
		1					Do.	Rs. 20 0 0	1						Rs. 20 0 0						
		1					Do.	Rs. 17 8 0	1						Rs. 17 8 0						
		1					Clerk	Rs. 40 0 0	1						Rs. 40 0 0						
		1					Do.	Rs. 30 0 0	1						Rs. 30 0 0						
		1					Short-hand allowance	Rs. 30 0 0	1						Rs. 30 0 0						
		1					Clerk	Rs. 25 0 0	1						Rs. 25 0 0						
		1					Do.	Rs. 20 0 0	1						Rs. 20 0 0						
		1					Clerk	Rs. 17 8 0	1						Rs. 17 8 0						
		1					Typist	Rs. 27 8 0	1						Rs. 27 8 0						
		2					Clerks on Rs. 15 each	Rs. 30 0 0	2						Rs. 30 0 0						
3					Servants on Rs. 10 each.	Rs. 30 0 0	3						Rs. 30 0 0								
4					Peons on Rs. 7 each	Rs. 28 0 0	4						Rs. 28 0 0								
1					Sweeper	Rs. 6 0 0	1						Rs. 6 0 0								
27					Total	Rs. 809 0 0	21						Rs. 884 0 0			125 0 0					
Copyist establishment.		1					Superintendent	Rs. 30 0 0	1						Rs. 30 0 0						
		1					Examiner	Rs. 20 0 0	1						Rs. 20 0 0						
		1					Do.	Rs. 17 8 0	1						Rs. 17 8 0						
		1					Reader	Rs. 15 0 0	1						Rs. 15 0 0						
		10					Copyists	Rs. 100 0 0	10						Rs. 100 0 0						
		1					Attender	Rs. 10 0 0	1						Rs. 10 0 0						
		15					Total	Rs. 192 8 0	13						Rs. 153 0 0				34 8 0		
		Central Nazim establishment.		1					Central nazir	Rs. 50 0 0	1						Rs. 50 0 0				This scale differs from that appended to Public, letter to India, No. 840, dated 13th Oct. 1901, in that a typist on Rs. 20-1-35 is substituted for a clerk on Rs. 15 per annum with reference to G.O. No. 1813, dated 1st December 1903. The appointment of a central nazir is also omitted for reasons stated in the accompanying letter.
				2					Amir, 1st grade, on Rs. 20 each.	Rs. 40 0 0	2						Rs. 40 0 0				
				5					Amir, 2nd grade, on Rs. 15 each.	Rs. 75 0 0	5						Rs. 75 0 0				
15							Amir, 3rd grade, on Rs. 12 each.	Rs. 180 0 0	14						Rs. 168 0 0			12 0 0			
11							Peons, 1st grade, on Rs. 8 each.	Rs. 88 0 0	10						Rs. 80 0 0			8 0 0			
23							Peons, 2nd grade, on Rs. 7-8-0 each.	Rs. 172 8 0	21						Rs. 157 8 0			15 0 0			
24							Peons, 3rd grade, on Rs. 7 each.	Rs. 168 0 0	21						Rs. 147 0 0			21 0 0			
81							Total	Rs. 773 8 0	74						Rs. 717 8 0			56 0 0			
Regular establishment.				1					Sheristadar	Rs. 150 0 0	1						Rs. 150 0 0				
				1					Head clerk	Rs. 100 0 0	1						Rs. 100 0 0				
				1					Translator	Rs. 75 0 0	1						Rs. 75 0 0				
				1					Assistant record-keeper	Rs. 25 0 0	1						Rs. 25 0 0				
				1					Do.	Rs. 20 0 0	1						Rs. 20 0 0				
				1					Do.	Rs. 17 8 0	1						Rs. 17 8 0				
				1					Clerk	Rs. 40 0 0	1						Rs. 40 0 0				
		1					Do.	Rs. 30 0 0	1						Rs. 30 0 0						
		1					Short-hand allowance	Rs. 30 0 0	1						Rs. 30 0 0						
		1					Clerk	Rs. 25 0 0	1						Rs. 25 0 0						
		1					Do.	Rs. 20 0 0	1						Rs. 20 0 0						
		1					Clerk	Rs. 17 8 0	1						Rs. 17 8 0						
		1					Typist	Rs. 27 8 0	1						Rs. 27 8 0						
		2					Clerks on Rs. 15 each.	Rs. 30 0 0	2						Rs. 30 0 0						
		3					Servants on Rs. 10 each.	Rs. 30 0 0	3						Rs. 30 0 0						
4					Peons on Rs. 7 each	Rs. 28 0 0	4						Rs. 28 0 0								
1					Sweeper	Rs. 6 0 0	1						Rs. 6 0 0								
21					Total	Rs. 686 8 0	21						Rs. 686 8 0								
Copyist establishment.		1					Superintendent	Rs. 30 0 0	1						Rs. 30 0 0						
		1					Examiner	Rs. 20 0 0	1						Rs. 20 0 0						
		1					Reader	Rs. 15 0 0	1						Rs. 15 0 0						
		3					Total	Rs. 65 0 0	3						Rs. 65 0 0						
		Regular establishment.		1					Sheristadar	Rs. 150 0 0	1						Rs. 150 0 0				
1							Head clerk	Rs. 100 0 0	1						Rs. 100 0 0						
1							Translator	Rs. 75 0 0	1						Rs. 75 0 0						
1							Record-keeper	Rs. 60 0 0	1						Rs. 60 0 0						
1							Assistant record-keeper	Rs. 25 0 0	1						Rs. 25 0 0						
1							Do.	Rs. 20 0 0	1						Rs. 20 0 0						
1							Do.	Rs. 17 8 0	1						Rs. 17 8 0						
1							Clerk	Rs. 40 0 0	1						Rs. 40 0 0						
1							Do.	Rs. 30 0 0	1						Rs. 30 0 0						
1							Short-hand allowance	Rs. 30 0 0	1						Rs. 30 0 0						
1							Clerk	Rs. 25 0 0	1						Rs. 25 0 0						
1							Do.	Rs. 20 0 0	1						Rs. 20 0 0						
1							Clerk	Rs. 17 8 0	1						Rs. 17 8 0						
1							Typist	Rs. 27 8 0	1						Rs. 27 8 0						
2							Clerks on Rs. 15 each.	Rs. 30 0 0	2						Rs. 30 0 0						
3					Servants on Rs. 10 each.	Rs. 30 0 0	3						Rs. 30 0 0								
4					Peons on Rs. 7 each	Rs. 28 0 0	4						Rs. 28 0 0								
1					Sweeper	Rs. 6 0 0	1						Rs. 6 0 0								
40					Total	Rs. 400 0 0	40						Rs. 400 0 0			17 8 0					

Proposition statements of Ministerial establishments in District Courts in which modifications are proposed to be made—cont.

Order sanctioning present establishment of Government Department.		Nature of charge.																		
Department.		Office to which the proposition refers.		Present scale.										Proposed scale.					Proposition.	
				Designation.		Pay.			Average cost.	Number.	Designation.		Pay.			Average cost.	Increase per month.	Decrease per month.	Permanent.	
Minimum.	Increment.	Maximum.	Minimum.			Increment.	Maximum.													
Number.	Date.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	
																	Amount.	Amount.	Remarks.	

Cuddalore District Court—cont.

1	1			Clerk	Rs. 30 0 0	Rs. 30 0 0	Rs. 30 0 0	Rs. 30 0 0	1	Clerk	Rs. 30 0 0	Rs. 30 0 0	Rs. 30 0 0	Rs. 30 0 0	Rs. 30 0 0	Rs. 30 0 0	
2	2			Do. on Rs. 25	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	2	Do. on Rs. 25	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	
3	3			Typist	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	1	Typist	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	
4	4			Clerk on Rs. 17½	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	1	Clerk on Rs. 17½	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	
5	5			Servants on Rs. 10 each	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	3	Servants on Rs. 10 each	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
6	6			Peons on Rs. 7 each	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	4	Peons on Rs. 7 each	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	
7	7			Sweeper	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	1	Sweeper	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	
8	8			Short-hand allowance	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	1	Short-hand allowance	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
9	9			Total	724 0 0	724 0 0	724 0 0	724 0 0	20	Total	664 0 0	664 0 0	664 0 0	664 0 0	664 0 0	664 0 0	
10	10			Examiner	20 0 0	20 0 0	20 0 0	20 0 0	1	Examiner	20 0 0	20 0 0	20 0 0	20 0 0	20 0 0	20 0 0	
11	11			Reader	15 0 0	15 0 0	15 0 0	15 0 0	1	Reader	15 0 0	15 0 0	15 0 0	15 0 0	15 0 0	15 0 0	
12	12			Copyists on Rs. 10 each	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	4	Copyists on Rs. 10 each	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	
13	13			Total	95 0 0	95 0 0	95 0 0	95 0 0	6	Total	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	

Salem District Court.

1	1			Sheristadar	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	1	Sheristadar	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	
2	2			Head clerk	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	1	Head clerk	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	
3	3			Translator	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	1	Translator	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	
4	4			Record-keeper	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	1	Record-keeper	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	
5	5			Assistant Record-keeper	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	1	Assistant Record-keeper	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	
6	6			Clerk	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	1	Clerk	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	
7	7			Do.	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	1	Do.	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
8	8			Clerks on Rs. 25 each	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	2	Clerks on Rs. 25 each	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
9	9			Do. on " 20 "	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	2	Do. on " 20 "	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
10	10			Total	739 0 0	739 0 0	739 0 0	739 0 0	22	Total	706 8 0	706 8 0	706 8 0	706 8 0	706 8 0	706 8 0	

Regular establishment.

1	1			Typist	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	1	Typist	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	
2	2			Do. on Rs. 17½ each	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	1	Do. on Rs. 17½	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	
3	3			Servants on Rs. 10 each	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	3	Servants on Rs. 10 each	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
4	4			Peons on Rs. 7 each	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	4	Peons on Rs. 7 each	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	
5	5			Sweeper	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	1	Sweeper	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	
6	6			Short-hand allowance	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	1	Short-hand allowance	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
7	7			Total	739 0 0	739 0 0	739 0 0	739 0 0	22	Total	706 8 0	706 8 0	706 8 0	706 8 0	706 8 0	706 8 0	

Coimbatore District Court.

1	1			Sheristadar	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	1	Sheristadar	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	
2	2			Head Clerk	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	1	Head Clerk	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	
3	3			Translator	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	1	Translator	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	
4	4			Record-keeper	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	1	Record-keeper	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	
5	5			Assistant Record-keeper	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	1	Assistant Record-keeper	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	
6	6			Clerk	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	1	Clerk	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	
7	7			Do.	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	1	Do.	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
8	8			Clerks on Rs. 25 each	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	2	Clerks on Rs. 25 each	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
9	9			Do. on " 20 "	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	2	Do. on " 20 "	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
10	10			Typist	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	1	Typist	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	
11	11			Do. on Rs. 17½	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	1	Do. on Rs. 17½	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	
12	12			Clerk	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	1	Clerk	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	
13	13			Servants on Rs. 10 each	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	3	Servants on Rs. 10 each	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
14	14			Peons on Rs. 7 each	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	4	Peons on Rs. 7 each	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	
15	15			Sweeper	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	1	Sweeper	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	
16	16			Short-hand allowance	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	1	Short-hand allowance	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
17	17			Total	724 0 0	724 0 0	724 0 0	724 0 0	22	Total	706 8 0	706 8 0	706 8 0	706 8 0	706 8 0	706 8 0	

Regular establishment.

1	1			Sheristadar	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	1	Sheristadar	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	150 0 0	
2	2			Head Clerk	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	1	Head Clerk	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	100 0 0	
3	3			Translator	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	1	Translator	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	75 0 0	
4	4			Record-keeper	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	1	Record-keeper	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	60 0 0	
5	5			Assistant Record-keeper	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	1	Assistant Record-keeper	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	17 8 0	
6	6			Do.	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	1	Do.	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
7	7			Assistant Record-keepers on Rs. 15 each	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	1	Assistant Record-keepers on Rs. 15 each	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	
8	8			Clerk	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	1	Clerk	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
9	9			Do.	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	1	Do.	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
10	10			Clerks on Rs. 25 each	50 0 0	50 0 0	50 0 0	50 0 0	1	Clerks on Rs. 25 each	25 0 0	25 0 0	25 0 0	25 0 0	25 0 0	25 0 0	
11	11			Do. on " 20 "	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	2	Do. on " 20 "	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	40 0 0	
12	12			Typist	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	1	Typist	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	27 8 0	
13	13			Do. on Rs. 17½	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	1	Do. on Rs. 17½	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	35 0 0	
14	14			Servants on Rs. 10 each	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	4	Servants on Rs. 10 each	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
15	15			Peons on Rs. 7 each	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	4	Peons on Rs. 7 each	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	28 0 0	
16	16			Sweeper	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	1	Sweeper	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	6 0 0	
17	17			Short-hand allowance	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	1	Short-hand allowance	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	30 0 0	
18	18			Total	821 8 0	821 8 0	821 8 0	821 8 0	23	Total	729 0 0	729 0 0	729 0 0	729 0 0	729 0 0	729 0 0	

* To be reduced to Rs. 26 when the present incumbent vacates.

