Financial (1899) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 860

DATED 29-7-99

INDEXED. 29/9

[Despatch Abstract.]

According sanction to write off the amou
of Rs 104-9-11 being the value of certain cloth r
cently stolen from the Stationery office, Mad
and informing the Supt. of Stationery that
considers it useless to move the High Court a
the acquittal by the Presidency Magt. of a pol
constable concerned in the theft

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Financial (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 2183

CHIEF SECRETARIAT
16 JUN 1899
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Sopm

From The Superintendent of Stationery Madras

For Orders

This Govt is competent to sanction the write off of the Rs 104.9.11 under article 279 of the ~~C.S.R.~~ C. A Code. The Supdt's report appears to exonerate the Storekeeper.

Govt. may, it is subd, be consulted as to ~~the~~ obtaining a further enquiry into the complaint

Cwl
23.6.99

J. D. u.o.

Ref No. 3282

Dated 13th June 1899
Despd 14 – 6. 99
Received
Registered 16. " "
Enclosures 1 (copy of Proceedings).
Spare copies -

SUBJECT.

Requesting the Sanction of Government to write off the amount of Rs 104-9-11 being the value of certain Cloth which were recently stolen from the Stationery Stores.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

In the Presidency Magistrates' Court, Black Town, Madras.

Tuesday the 6th day of June 1899.

(Application No. .)

Before B. H. Chester Esquire — Presidency Magistrate.

Calendar No. 14598 of 1899.

Complainant.	Charge.
Queen Empress on the prosecution of Singaravelu Mudali, Store-Keeper Stationery office, Madras.	Theft in a building of one long jacket made of long cloth and a pair of dungree trousers valued at Rs 1-12-0 between 6th and 13th May, 1899, in Black Town. or Sec: 380 I. P. C.
Accused.	
Shaik Ismail, 1st class Constable, attached to Stationery office, Madras.	Dishonestly receiving the abovesaid property then being stolen property and knowing the same to be stolen property at the same time and place. Sec: 411 I. P. C.

Form No. 72.

In the Presidency Magistrates' Court, Black Town, Madras.

Tuesday the 6th day of June 1899.

Before B. H. Chester Esqr. Presidency Magistrate.

Calendar No. 14598 of 1898.

Police Constable Shaik Ismael No. A/550 is the accuse

He is defended by Mr. Dorasawmi Modelly.

1st witness Singaravelu Modelly solemnly affirmed.—

I am store keeper at the stationery office, Madras. I know the accused. He is one of the men forming the Police Guard at the Stamp and Stationery office, Madras. On the 13th May it was brought to my notice that a bale of long cloth had b tampered with. I examined the bale. I found three pieces of long cloth missing. On the same day, I noticed that the other bales had been tampered with. I reported the matter the Assistant Superintendent Mr. Bird and on Monday the

more ?

15th day I examined the other bales. I found few small pieces of cloth missing from 5 bales in all. On the same day 15th day May, I missed 14 pieces of Porwar cloth or dungre This is a coarse cloth used for dusters, made in the Kurnool

district

B.

in connection with famine relief. A complaint was made of the loss to the Police. They arrested one Veera Raddy, a cooly lascar of the office. That man has been convicted. Subsequently Police showed me the long cloth Shirt (A) and pair of parvar cloth trousers (B) I identified them as made of cloth belonging to the Stationery offices. I never gave accused any cloth from Stationery office. No cloth (unless stolen) could have been given to him without my knowledge. I identify the cloth (A) as Stationery office property. I produced a sample of the long cloth used in the Stationery office (C). I say that the cloth in Exhibit A is exactly similar to that marked C. Ex: A has not been washed, and so, I am able to make the Comparison. As to Exhibit B, I produce a sample (D) of Stationery Office cloth. I say that B and D are alike. Exhibits A+B are worth about two Rupees. Cloth like Ex: A+B cannot be obtained in the Local Markets. I ~~had~~ have made efforts to get such cloth, but have failed to get any. I tried to get them 4 days ago. I tried for 2 days in the Local Goozily and Godown Street, Bazaar, where cloths are usually sold.

Cross-Examination

PRESIDENCY MAGISTRATES' COURT, BLACK TOWN, MADRAS

Cross-Examination: I examine bales received i.e. I ~~wish~~ look to see whether the marks agree with the packing account and whether the bales seem intact. I don't open them to examine contents. I receive long cloth from the Director General of Stores, England. The cloth that is manufactured is by Messrs. Thompson and Co.. I don't know whether Thompson + Co., make cloths for others. The store room is open ~~day~~ during office hours. When closed the key is in my custody, without my permission, no goods may be removed. The long cloth is kept in a store downstairs, the doors of which are open. The packers have access to the store. There is no special watch at the door. I sit upstairs. Two packers on 30 and 15 rupees per mensem are in the store downstairs. There is one exit from Stationery Office, a police Guard watches there. I am in charge of the goods in the Store. The only guardians are the Police. The police will not allow goods to leave the premises without a pass signed by me or the packers. There are two packers. ~~If~~ If a pass is produced, the police guard must allow the package to go out. The police have men to check the pass with the packages. Passes do not run as follows: "Pass - so many Carts of Stationery". The number of packages are not entered in the pass.

in the pass. When packages are sent to Railway Stations we mention the number of packages; when the articles are for the Presidency town, we quote the number of invoice to which the supply relates. The police are not shown the invoices. I pass such carts myself or my assistants pass them. The articles for Presidency towns are not packed up, they are put loose into the Carts. Sometimes the Stationery articles are visible to the Guard. Long cloth and Duster cloth is issued by the yard. Only I and two packers may issue passes. The bales of Long cloth that I found to be tampered with have been received in December last. The original stitches had been removed and fresh stitches put on. I can't say when these bales were tampered with. On 25th April last, I checked all the bales. They were then in order. When a bale is opened, the contents are brought up to my room and placed in a room. My inference that Sd/ cloth like A cannot be obtained in the Local market is based on Sd/ my enquiries made 4 days ago. Long cloth like A has starch only on one side. Specimens of local cloth examined by me had starch on both sides. Exhibits A & B were

Shown to me

Shown to me by Police on 22nd May. Ex: B is identified by me because it is the same in appearance with Ex: D. Ex: B is part of a famine relief stock for Kurnool District.

Dacomb Sd/

PRESIDENCY MAGISTRATES' COURT, BLACK TOWN, MADRAS.

2nd witness Frank ~~Dacomb~~ Bird sworn: —

I am assistant superintendent of Stamps & Stationery, Madras. I saw accused on duty once at the Stamp and Stationery office. I believe I saw him on Monday the 15th May. I see Exhibit A. It is like ex: C. Both are of the same kind. Of my personal knowledge, I am not able to say whether cloth like A is obtainable in the Market in Madras. I have not examined Ex: B.

Cross-Examination: I don't know how many compose the guard. There is a Head Constable and a certain number of men. I don't know when he joined the guard.

3rd witness Thomas Angus sworn: —

I am sole partner of the firm of Angus and Co:, chiefly piece goods importers, Madras. My knowledge of piece goods extends over 25 years. I had experience in Messrs: Arbuthnot & Co's service in former years. I see Exhibits A and C. I have examined them previously also. I think they are identical in quality. It is impossible to say that such cloth can't be had in Madras. I see Exhibits B and D. I have seen them before. I think the Sd/ — yarns they are made from are the same

One has been

One has been washed more than the other. I think that such cloth can even be got in Madras. This is not any special quality. There is no reason why we shouldn't get such quality in Madras.

Trousers only

Cross-Examination. Native firms deal largely with such cloths. They send out samples and get cloths made like it.

4th Witness Veera Reddy solemnly affirmed:—

I am now in Her Majesty's Penitentiary, Madras. I used to be a cooly lascar in the Stationery office. I was convicted on 26th May, 1899 for theft of Canvas from the Stationery office. I know the accused as one of the guard of the Stationery office. I had seen him 10 days before 26th May. I had not known him before. He and I had no conversation with one another. I know nothing about any longcloth. He, accused, once asked me whether long cloth bales are received from here or from outside. He asked me to show him where the long cloth bales were kept. I pointed to the stacked bales.

No Cross-Examination

Order

Cal No. 14598/99

Order

The expert evidence tendered (that of Mr. Thomas Angus) shows that it is not impossible to obtain cloth like Exhibits A and B in Madras. The evidence given only shows that accused wore a shirt and a pair of trousers made of cloth like that to be found in the Stationery office. There is absolutely nothing more against him. He is discharged. There is, as far as I can see, no reason to believe that accused has committed any offence. He has had to engage a vakil for his defence. He is being tried for conduct arising out of his employment as a Government servant. I think his expenses ought to be recouped if the rules of his department allow it. The shirt and trousers are returned to ~~complainant~~ accused.

(Signed) B. H. Chester
Presidency Magistrate
6th June 1899.

(True copy)

Presidency Magistrate's Court
Black Town, Madras, 9th June /99

S. Veeravancatachary
Chief Clerk

Presidency Magistrate's Court
Black Town
Madras

Cal No 14598 of 99

Queen Empress
v
Shaik Ismall
of

Copy of
Proceedings

1899
Judl Dept.
Enclos. No. 3
To
C. No. 3243

CURRENT NO. 2183

500—21-4-99.

Stationery Office,
Madras, 13th June 1899.

Ref. ~~Dis.~~ No. 3282

Enclosures.

From

HERBERT BRADLEY, Esq., I.C.S.,
Acting Superintendent of Stationery,
Madras,

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Financial Department,
STONEHOUSE HILL.

Sir,

I have the honour to request the sanction of Government to write off the amount of Rs 104-9-11 being the value of 614½ yards of cloth which were recently stolen from the Stationery Stores. Under ordinary circumstances this amount would have had to be made good by the Storekeeper, but the facts which I am about to detail hereafter induce me to submit my present recommendation.

2. On the morning of Friday the 12th May 1899 a man called at the residence of the Assistant Superintendent with some fruit. When asked who he was and for what purpose he had come, he replied that he was a constable attached to the guard at the Stamp and Stationery Office and had come to pay his respects. This was an unusual circumstance. Such a case had not happened before.

3. Late in the evening of Saturday the 13th May, Iyasawmy, a permanent lascar of the Stationery Stores, drew the attention of the Storekeeper to the condition of a bale of long cloth lying in the lower Store room, which looked as if it had been tampered with. The bale was examined and three

pieces

pieces of long cloth were found to be missing. As the Storekeeper suspected that a cooly lascar named Veera Reddy knew something about the missing long cloth he-on the morning of Sunday the 14th May-reported the loss at the Kilpauk Police Station and asked that Veera Reddy's house situated in Pursewalkam might be searched. He was referred to the B. Division in which the theft took place. The circumstance was reported by the Storekeeper to the Assistant Superintendent, the first thing on Monday morning. All the bales of long cloth were then opened and examined and ten more pieces were found to be missing. Particulars of the thirteen pieces are given in the margin. On the same day 14 pieces of Poruva cloth were missed. I at once wrote a D.O. to the Commissioner of Police on the subject, mentioning that I had taken no departmental action in order not to interfere with the chances of detection.

11 Pieces- 436½ yards Bleached Long cloth @ 2/6	= 68-3- 3
2 Pieces- 30 yards unbleached Long cloth @ 3/1	= 15-6- 8
14 Pieces of Poruva's (coarse cloth) @ Rs 1/8 per piece	= 21-0- 0
	Rs 104-9-11

4. On Tuesday the 16th-the next day-the Storekeeper attended the B. Police Station and gave all the information he could in connection with the matter. It was then arranged that Veera Reddy's house should be searched the next morning. When the Storekeeper, accompanied by the Police, proceeded to Veera Reddy's house at 6.15 on the morning of Wednesday the 17th, they ascertained that he had gone to the Egmore Railway Station. They at once followed and found Veera Reddy there with his mother and wife. Their bundles were examined and various articles such as Salampore cloth, Scissors, pieces of canvas, twine, tape and twisted thread, all the property of Government, were found, but no long cloth. Veera Reddy was thereupon arrested. On the same morning, when under examination by the Police at B. Station, Veera Reddy on being questioned in regard to the missing long cloth said, in the presence of the Storekeeper, a Sub Inspector of Police, a Head Constable and a Constable, that he had been asked by a Muhammadan Constable, of the Stationery Office Guard to remove pieces of long cloth

from

from the Stationery Stores and give them to him and that on refusing to comply with this request the Constable said it would be sufficient if he pointed out to him the bales containing the long cloth and that he would get them through another person. He thereupon pointed out the bales to the Constable. Veera Reddy stated in addition that the Constable he referred to had recently been transferred from the Stationery Office Guard to that of the Deputy Collector. This statement was communicated to me. On the same day, viz. Wednesday the 17th May, the Police arrested permanent lascars Chinnusawmy, Iyasawmy and Veerasawmy, and cooly lascars Varadan, Kistnan, Moonean and David. Eventually all were released except Veera Reddy, Kistnan and Iyasawmy, in whose houses stationery articles had been found.

5. The Police enquiry continued on Thursday the 18th but I could get no information as to any action having been taken by the Police on the charge made by Veera Reddy against the Constable. On Friday the 19th it came to my knowledge that no notice whatever had been taken of this charge. In fact it had not even been mentioned in the preliminary report on the case submitted to the Deputy Commissioner of the Police. That officer was therefore, at once made acquainted with it. I subsequently heard that on the following Sunday Veera Reddy picked out from a batch of Constables the man Shaik Ishmail No.550 A who he said had approached him in regard to the abstraction of the long cloth. This man was the same who had taken an offering of fruit to the Assistant Superintendent on the 12th. The man's moti~~on~~ve apparently was to obtain the Assistant Superintendent's "favour" in view of the fact that the loss of the long cloth was bound to be discovered sooner or later and of the probability that Veera Reddy, who no doubt would be examined in connection with the loss, would tell the story which he subsequently did tell. The Constable's house was thereupon searched by the Police and an incomplete long shirt, such as Muhammadans wear, made out of long cloth was found. A pair of trousers recently made

out

out of Poruva cloth were recovered the same day from the Constable's dhoby.

6. On Monday the 22nd these two articles were shown to the Storekeeper who said that they were made out of cloth identical with that in the Stores. The long cloth was received from the India Office, Store Department on annual indent, and the Poruva cloth is that which was made as a relief work in the Kurnool District during the last famine. During the succeeding days the Police were apparently engaged in watching the Constable's movements, but nothing else appears to have been discovered. Meanwhile, I sent to the bazaar to try to obtain samples of long cloth similar to that in the Stores, but none could be obtained. The peculiarity of the Store long cloth is that it has a considerable glaze on one side. I then submitted the coat taken from the Constable's house and a piece of the long cloth from the Stores to Mr. Thomas Angus, of Messrs Angus & Co., Madras, who is an expert in long cloth and he certified that the two were identical.

7. On Tuesday the 6th instant the Constable was put up before the 2nd Presidency Magistrate on the alternative charge of theft in a building "of one long jacket made of long cloth and a pair of dungree trousers" or "dishonestly receiving the above said property" etc. It was, however, the material that was stolen, not the made up articles and the "jacket" was a "shirt". The Storekeeper and the Assistant Superintendent identified the cloth of which the coat was made as being similar to the Store cloth. This was also sworn to by Mr. Angus. Neither of the last two witnesses, in answer to the question of the Court, would swear that it was impossible to obtain such cloth in the bazaar. They would have had to have an exceedingly intimate acquaintance with the bazaar to enable them to say that. Besides, they knew that thirteen pieces of the long cloth and fourteen of the poruva cloth had been removed out of the custody of the Stationery Stores or of Government Officials. It was pointed out to the Magistrate, that it would be tantamount to swearing that no piece of similar cloth had ever been on the Madras market. The last witness was

Veera

Veera Reddy, who together with Kistnan referred to above, had been convicted of the theft of other small articles from the Stationery Stores. On the 26th May these men were sentenced by the same Magistrate to one month and twenty days rigorous imprisonment respectively. Veera Reddy repeated his previous statement that the Constable in the dock had asked him to show him where the bales of long cloth were kept and he pointed to them. The Magistrate thereupon discharged the accused.

8. The first point to which I would invite the special attention of Government is the failure of the Police at first to record or take any action on the statement made by Veera Reddy on the 17th May implicating Constable No.550 A in the theft of the long cloth. Not only was no action taken on this but, as stated above, no mention of this piece of evidence was made in the Sub Inspector's report to the Deputy Commissioner. There is no occasion for the cooly lascars to come into contact with the Constables of the Guard in connection with their work. Yet Veera Reddy was able to give particulars in regard to the Constable, as to the day on which he alleged the Constable preferred his request to him and the day on which the Constable was transferred from the Stationery Office Guard to that of the Deputy Collector. These circumstances alone would be sufficient to justify some credence being given to Veera Reddy's statement. I cannot help thinking that if action had been taken at once and the Constable's house searched more direct evidence against him, possibly the whole of the stolen cloth, would have been discovered. The Constable, who no doubt was fully aware of what had taken place, had from the 17th to the 21st inclusive, to make his arrangements. It might naturally be asked why he did not dispose of the two articles of clothing which formed the subject of the charge against him. These, however, bore no marks of identification, and as the result shows he was justified in running the risk he did. He was not asked by the Mahistrate from where he obtained the cloth, but to the

Police

Police, I am told, he sheltered himself under the favourite explanation that he bought it from an itinerant hawker whose person or whereabouts he did not then know. I may add that I have ascertained that during the Police inquiry the Constable attempted to make away with the two articles, a fact which was altogether suppressed before the Magistrate.

I may be wrong in using the word "suppressed" as I believe this fact could have been proved by the Constable who searched the accused's house and who was not examined.

9. I forward for the information of Government copy of the Proceedings before the Magistrate. In the cross examination of the Storekeeper some stress was laid on the system of "passing" out articles issued from the Stationery Stores. I would explain that in all cases of issue to local offices they are asked to send a "responsible person" to take charge of the articles. These are issued loose; they are checked item by item and the person to whom they are delivered makes his own arrangements for removing them. The Storekeeper sees them off the Store premises and furnishes a plain "Pass" with the number of the invoice on it. In all other cases articles leave the Stores ready packed for despatch by rail and the Pass enumerates the number of packages. I have directed that all Passes shall contain sufficient particulars for the Police Guard to check the articles. The simplest way will be to pack local issues also in the presence of the person to whom they have been delivered.

10. In regard to Mr. Angus' evidence, I would point out that he was not asked whether he had ever seen such cloth as exhibits A and C in Madras and, if so, when. His statement "I think such cloth can even be got in Madras" referred only to exhibits B and D - the dungree or poruva cloth. The cross examination referred solely to this cloth.

11. The Magistrate in his "Order" writes "The expert evidence tendered (that of Mr. Thomas Angus) shows that it is not impossible to obtain cloth like exhibits, A and B in Madras" From the Magistrate's notes it appears that what Mr. Angus said in regard to exhibit A was "It is impossible to say that such cloth cannot be had in Madras." I submit that that does not amount to saying that "it is not impossible to obtain it." In this connection, please see the Storekeeper's evidence. Under my instructions he searched in the most likely places for the cloth, but could not obtain it. He told the bazaar men that if exactly similar cloth could be produced, a large order would probably be given. They were therefore anxious to suit his requirements but failed to do so. The "Order" continues. "The evidence given only shows that accused wore a shirt and a pair of trousers" etc. I cannot find this in the evidence. As a matter of fact, the shirt was only partially stitched and had not been washed, and the trousers were quite new. There was no evidence of either having been worn. The concluding sentence of the "Order" originally ran "The shirt and trousers are returned to complainant". It has since been ascertained that the last word was a clerical error for "accused" and the judgment was altered yesterday on the complainant applying for the garments.

12. It will be seen that the Order of discharge is based on the expert evidence, which however, does not appear to me to bear the interpretation put upon it in the Order. The Magistrate does not seem to have taken the other evidence or the surrounding circumstances of the case into consideration. Practically he declined to convict unless the witnesses were ready to swear in the affirmative that "the shirt and trousers before the Court were made out of cloth stolen from the Stationery Stores". But it seems to me that it was absolutely impossible to swear this. The case seems to have been very badly conducted both in the preliminary inquiry and in the trial and the Magistrate appears to have made up his mind to acquit at a very early stage of the Proceedings. But I would especially draw attention to the fact that the Magistrate did not examine the constable who searched the house of the accused or any other witness who could connect the accused with the garments. In fact, there is no evidence on the record to show that the accused ever had possession of them. Under these circumstances the Magistrate's order directing the clothes to be returned to the accused cannot be justified.

13. If the case could be retried before another

Ch 32 C.P.C.
§417

D. D.

Magistrate and properly conducted I have very little doubt that there would be a conviction, but on the evidence ~~placed~~ ~~before the~~ recorded by Magistrate, I doubt whether the High Court could be induced to order a retrial. Meanwhile, the Commissioner of Police has informed me that he is holding a departmental enquiry into the matter.

§ 435
- 437
- 441

14. I have no reasonable doubt that the pieces of long cloth could not have been removed from the Stores without the connivance of the Police Guard. Taking all the circumstances of the case into consideration I have the honour to recommend that the Storekeeper be relieved of responsibility for the loss and that the amount involved as detailed in para 3 Supra, be written off the books.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
Herbert Bradley
Ag. Superintendent of Stationery.

5.J.
14.6.99.

En. 2 to G.O. 3043 d. 7.10.99

Judicial

Note for the C.S.

~~Endt. No. 1686 d/28-6-99.~~

The Govt. Pleader may be asked whether there is any use in ~~asking~~ moving the H.C. in the matter?

[illegible]
26/6/99

Endt. No. 1686 d/ 28-6-99.
Referred to the Govt Pleader for favour of opinion as to the desirability of moving the H.C. in the matter.

[illegible] for C.S.
28/6/99

To
The Govt Pleader. Madras.) desp'd
28/6/99.

R.N. copy
A + Ie.

[G. / 69-]
500—15-3-98

~~Financial~~ Judicial DEPARTMENT.

MADRAS.

Date 3.7.99
MADRAS.

Memorandum No. 1686

CHIEF SECRETARY
25 JUL 1899
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

READ the following paper :—

From the Superintendent of Stationery, Madras, Ref No. 3282, dated 13th June 1899.

Referred to the Government Pleader for favour of opinion as to the desirability of moving the High Court in the matter.

For Chief Secretary

Rc
28/6/99.

Ootacamund
28th June 1899

To
The Government Pleader, Madras.
(with Financial current No. 2183 and encl: to be ret

[J. / 52.]
2,000—5-3-97.

Judicial (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 2954.

N/

From The Crown Prosecutor,
Madras.

~~Order~~ Endorsement:

Transferred to the Financial Department

Under Secretary

No.

Dated 17. 7. 99

Received
Registered } 19. 7. 99.

Enclosures

Spare copies

Ane
20/7

SUBJECT.

Re: a charge of theft and receiving stolen property instituted by the Stationery Dept. against Constable Shaik Ismail

To

The Financial Department.

BACK PAPERS. 8

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Jud

CURRENT No. 2954 - Jud

Crown Prosecutor's Office,
High Court, Madras
17th July 1899.

From

CHIEF SECRETARY
19. JUL. 1899
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Robert. F. Grant Esq.,
Crown Prosecutor.

To

The Chief Secretary,
to the Government of Fort Saint George.

Sir,

On the 10th July, I received from the Government Pleader, Madras, your memo No. 1686 dated 28th June 1899, forwarding for his opinion the papers relating to a charge of theft ~~and~~ receiving stolen property recently instituted by the Stationery Department against ~~the~~ Constable Shaik Ismail. These papers were evidently referred to the Government Pleader by mistake.

I am of opinion that the High Court will not interfere in Revision; as the Magistrate, I think, was justified, upon the evidence before him, in discharging the accused.

Awaiting your further instructions,

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient Servant,

Robert F. Grant
Crown Prosecutor.

S.D. copy.
R.N. tre'd

M 20/7/99

C. No 2954

Judicial

O. M. No 1893 d/ 21.7.99

With reference to his letter of 17th July 1899, ~~forwarding his opinion in the matter of a case~~ relating to a charge of theft and receiving stolen property instituted by the Stationery Dept. against a Police Constable, the Crown Prosecutor is requested to return the papers sent with Endt. no 1686 of 28 June 99 to the Govt. Pleader

Ar
20.7.99

AM
20.7.99

To

The Crown Prosecutor

Despd
21/7/99.

[J. / 52]
1,000—22 3-98.

Judicial (1899) Department.

CURRENT No. 3043

From The Crown Prosecutor,
Madras.

No.

Dated 24. 7. 99.
Received 25. 7. 99
Registered 26. 7. 99.
Enclosures 3.
Spare copies

SUBJECT.

Returning papers connected with the charge of theft instituted by the Stationery Dept. against Police Constable Shaik Ismail.

For Orders

Whether the Supt. of Stationery may be informed that having consulted the Crown Prosecutor Govt. ~~finds~~ consider it ~~[illegible]~~ useless to move the High Court in the matter

Ar.
26. 7. 99

Yes. 27. 7.

✓

To

The Financial Dept. (U.O.)

Au
27. 7. 99

Cn
29. 7. 99

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

Crown Prosecutors Office
High Court Buildings
Madras 24.7.1899.

From
Robert F. Grant Esqe.
Crown Prosecutor, Madras.

CHIEF SECRETARY'S OFFICE
25. JUL. 1899
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

To
The Chief Secretary to the
Government, Ootacamund.

Sir, With reference to your Memorandum No. 1893 dated Ootacamund, 21st July 1899 I have the honor to return herewith the papers sent to the Government Pleader with endorsement No. 1686.

I have the honor
to be
Sir
Your Most obedt. Servt.

Robert F Grant

Crown Prosecutor.

[G/24.]
1,000—25-3-99.

Appy

Financial DEPARTMENT.

K
31-7-99

(1) C. No. 2183 From the Supdt of Stationery, Ref No. 3282, dated 13. 6 1899.
(2) „ 2954 Judl „ Crown Prosecutor, „ ......, „ 17. 7. 1899.
(3) „ 3043 Judl „ Do., „ ......, „ 24. 7. 1899.
„ ...... „ „ ......, „ ......, „ ...... 189 .

Order No. 860 d/ 29-7-99.

Mr

Sanction to write off the amount of Rs 104. 9. 11 referred to in para 1 of the letter from the Supdt of Stationery read above is, under the circumstances, ~~sanctioned~~ accorded ~~with reference to~~ under article 279 of the C. A. Code.

V (11

2. The Supdt will be informed that Govt having consulted the Crown Prosecutor, this Govt. considers it useless to move the High Court in the matter

Cmd.
28/7/99

29. 7

Note
No report to India appears to be required
Cmd

Supdt of Stati (all q/)
Acct Genl (1 = a 2 + 3 = q/ to)

Despd
1.8.99.

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed } 189

READ AGAIN G.O., No. , DATED 189 .

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT .. .. .. A A A A A A A

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only