

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	1133	Press
		~~Mis.~~
	11-12	
Dated	18-8-	~~19/8/8~~

Not to be folded or roughly handled

MS

Fort St. George, Judicial Consultation, 24th August 1858.

No. 11. Read the following letter from C. J. SHUBRICK, Esq., Magistrate of Chingleput ; to T. PYCROFT, Esq., Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George, dated Sydapet, 29th July 1858.

SIR,

*A To Magistrate of North Arcot, No. 427, dated 10th December 1857.
B Translation of Urzee from Duffadar Rungiah Naik, to Magistrate of Chingleput, dated 2nd December 1857.
C From Magistrate of North Arcot, No. 38, dated 3rd February 1858.
D From Head Assistant, to Magistrate of North Arcot, dated 18th January 1858.
E To Magistrate of North Arcot, No. 54, dated 8th February 1858.
F To Magistrate of North Arcot, No. 128, dated 19th April 1858.
G From Magistrate of North Arcot, No. 250, dated 28th April 1858.
H From Head Assistant, to Magistrate of North Arcot, dated 27th February 1858.
I To Magistrate of North Arcot, No. 145, dated 3rd May 1858.
J From Magistrate of North Arcot, No. 440, dated 10th July 1858.

I have the honor to lay copies of correspondence noted in the margin,*before the Right Honorable the Governor in Council, relative to the want of support shewn me by

the Magistrate of North Arcot in the matter of a Warrant issued against certain parties residing at Wallajahpett in the Cavaripauk Talook, of his jurisdiction, whose apprehension was failed to be effected by the apparent connivance and neglect of of the Head of Police and his Subordinates.

Not to lengthen this letter unnecessarily, I have put a few notes in red ink in the margin of the correspondence, which will explain the matter fully.

A.

From C. J. SHUBRICK, Esq., Magistrate of Chingleput ; to C. WHITTINGHAM, Esq., Magistrate of North Arcot, Chittoor, dated Sydapet, 10th December 1857, No. 427.

SIR,

1. I have the honor to enclose you copy of an Urzee addressed to me by one of my Hoozoor Duffadars, charged with a Warrant for the apprehension of certain parties accused of having perpetrated a gang robbery at Mamundoor, in the Conjeveram talook of this district, from which it will be seen, that he brings very grave charges of neglect of duty, and assistance refused him against the Tahsildar, Cutwall, Duffadar, and others at Wallajahpet in the Cavaripauk talook under your jurisdiction.

2. The Warrant was taken by my Duffadar some time ago to your Head Assistant, Mr. Elliott at Raneepett, with a letter from me, and that gentleman then passed orders directing every assistance to be afforded to the Duffadar. Some parties were in consequence seized, and property found, and the neglect of duty, and want of assistance now complained of, was on the Duffadar going a second time to Wallajahpett for the apprehension of such of the parties named in the Warrant, as were not there when he first went.

3. I request you will be good enough to enquire into the charges brought by my Duffadar and acquaint me with the result, the preservation of the peace of our respective districts being intimately concerned in the matter. Should you wish it, the Duffadar will be directed to appear before you.

4. I avail myself of this opportunity to inform you, that I have referred your construction of Act XVII of 1856, to the decision of the Fouzdary Udalut.

B.

Translation of an Urzee, dated Mamundoor, 2nd December 1857, addressed by the Hoozoor Duffadar Rungiah Naiken, to the Magistrate of Chingleput.

In order to apprehend the prisoners stated in the Warrant issued in my name to have been involved in the Mamundoor robbery case, I proceeded to Wallajahpet on the 25th Ultimo, and on

Fort St. George, Judicial Consultation, 24th August 1858.

the morning of the 26th, I asked the Cutwall of the town of Wallajahpet named Vasoodava Naiken to render me his assistance in apprehending the said prisoners, and searching their houses, in accordance with the practice hitherto observed in matters like the present occurring in the said place, or town. The Cutwall told me that he had been ordered by the Tahsildar of the place to take me up to him, if I should come to Wallajahpet. I accordingly went to the Tahsildar and made my request, as stated above, when he asked me for the Warrant issued in my name. The informant who accompanied me, thereupon refused to shew the Warrant, and observed that as a demand of this kind had never been made before in similar cases, it led to suspicion, and that if the Warrant is shewn, the opponents would know the circumstance, and try to conceal their property. At 12 on the 27th, I was told that the Tahsildar insisted upon his seeing the Warrant, and I was requested to shew it, which I have accordingly done on that evening and asked for a ready compliance with my request as stated above. The Tahsildar then took a copy of the Warrant, and stated that he would address the Magistrate of the district on the subject, and obtain orders, promising however to issue the necessary orders to the Cutwall early next morning, that is the 28th, for the purpose of rendering us the required aid. I accordingly went up to the Tahsildar on that morning, when he at once ordered his Duffadar to go to the Cutwall, and ask him to accompany me for the purpose stated, and to be present also at the search. The Duffadar obeyed his orders accordingly, but the Cutwall refused to act unless favored with a written order from the Tahsildar, which circumstance was reported to that officer by that Duffadar and the Hoozoor Magistrate peon, Moonesawmy Naiken of the Chittoor Collector's Cutcherry, who was allowed to accompany me for the purpose of helping me in the present matter. The Tahsildar, it would appear, then expressed that he would personally order the Cutwall to do the duty. The Cutwall immediately after, went to the Tahsildar, and after reporting what he had to say, returned and promised to accompany me at noon, in consequence of his having had to procure a supply of Bandies or Carts; but came to me in the evening and stated that he would accompany me for the search the next morning, that is, the 29th. I accordingly went up to the Cutwall that morning, when he told me that the Moonsiff and the Curnum should also be present and that he deputed a peon to look after and bring them. The peon came and reported that the Moonsiff took a dose of physic that day, and the Curnum had gone to the Palar. We waited till 12, and saw none of them coming, when I complained to the Cutwall of the unnecessary delay and called his attention to the necessity of standing answerable for it. He therefore went to the Tahsildar and returned after noon, stating that the presence of the complainant was necessary. I replied that the complainant had come along with me, and was present. Meanwhile, I found the Tahsildar proceeding on Circuit to the villages, and I went up to him, and complained of the great delay in the matter. He promised to return that night or the next morning and on his return to cause the immediate apprehension and search to be made. But he never returned either that night or the next, that is the 30th. The informant told me that as a copy had been taken of the Warrant, the circumstance would have been known to the parties, and that if even a search were made, their property would not be found and that under these circumstances, no search was necessary. These matters he said he would bring to your honor's notice, and with this view returned to Mamundoor, whither I have also come. If the necessary aid had been afforded the moment I reached the place with the Warrant, the stolen property would have been found. Obstacles having been thrown in the way, it was not possible for the property being found.

C.

From C. WHITTINGHAM, Esq., Magistrate of North Arcot; to C. J. SHUBRICK, Esq., Magistrate of Chingleput, dated Numbauk, 3rd February 1858, No. 38.

SIR,

With reference to your letter of the 10th December 1857, No. 427, forwarding copy of an Urzee addressed to you by one of your Hoozoor Duffadars, and bringing to notice the conduct of the head of Police, Cuttawall, Duffadar, and others of Caveripauk talook, in refusing to give

Fort St. George, Judicial Consultation, 24th August 1858.

assistance to the Duffadar of your office who was charged with a Warrant for the apprehension of certain parties accused of having perpetrated a gang robbery at Mamundoor in the Conjeve-ram talook of your district, I have the honor to forward for your information, copy of a communication and of its enclosures received from the Acting Head Assistant Magistrate, Mr. Elliott, to whom I had referred the matter for enquiry.

D.

From E. F. ELLIOTT, Esq., Acting Head Assistant Magistrate; to C. WHITTINGHAM, Esq., Magistrate, North Arcot, dated Raneepett, 18th January 1858.

SIR,

As requested in your letter, dated 16th December 1857, I have the honor herewith to forward you the depositions taken from the Tahsildar, Cutwall and others at Wallajahpet, with regard to the charges preferred against them by the Hoozoor Duffadar of the Chingleput district, (whose original petition they also return) with a report in full from myself on the subject.

1. The charge preferred is that the head of Police and others at Wallajahpet instead of rendering every assistance for the apprehension and searching of the house of the persons named in the Warrant presented by the Chingleput Hoozoor Duffadar, raised so many frivolous objections and put so many hindrances in the way that both the Duffadar and the secret informant, who accompanied him were compelled to return to Mamundoor without having accomplished their object and with an unnecessary detention of 5 days from the 26th to the 30th November last.

2. The head of Police in answer to that portion of the charge which reflects on himself, states, that the accusation is perfectly unfounded inasmuch as every assistance* in his power was rendered to the Duffadar and others with him, on this occasion as well as on two former occasions, when he was applied to in a similar manner under similar circumstances and by the same persons and he attributes their failure on this occasion either to a fear† on their part, that as the persons named in the Warrant were the richest Sowcars in the town, that in the event of no stolen property being found in their house, they might be put into the Civil Court for damages, or to their having heard a report that these Sowcars had complained to me against the secret informant, who accompanied the Duffadar, that he had first endeavoured to extract a heavy sum from them, on a threat that if it was refused, their names would be put down in the Warrant, and they would be arrested, which complaint was in reality made to me personally by these shroffs, and referred by me to the head of Police for report, and was under investigation by him when the Duffadar's Urzee was forwarded here.

The head of Police further goes on to describe the character of the secret informant Sashadri Iyengar, who is an inhabitant of the village Oorianellore in the Cauvery-pauk talook, and questions the propriety of his being employed by the Duffadar, as an informant,‡ when his bad character is so well known and when there is a Warrant still out, for his apprehension in a case of robbery committed by him seven years ago in Wallajahpet, since which time he has been missing, also he asks how it was these Sowcars were not apprehended or their names even mentioned on the two former occasions, the Duffadar§ and his informant came for the same purpose, to the town, which appears to me a very reasonable argument all throughout.

* The Duffadar states that he complained to the head of Police that the Warrant had not been served, and the head of Police instead of having it served left the village.

† This is perfectly gratuitous, the Warrant was issued on sworn information and consequently no action on it could lie against the Duffadar.

‡ All secret informants are likely to be bad characters but this is no reason for refusing to receive their information.

§ Nothing more was requisite for the apprehension of these parties than their names being in the Warrant.

The Duffadar may have acted injudiciously in not complaining to Mr. Elliott, but how does this exculpate Mr. Elliott's Duffadar for not delivering to him the persons mentioned in the Warrant.

over he was in my immediate neighbourhood, and I was accessible to him at any moment.

Fort St. George, Judicial Consultation, 24th August 1858.

On the two former occasions the parties were poor and were seized. On the present they were rich and were not seized.

4. These are the principal depositions and from what is contained in them, I think that every thing goes to exonerate the authorities of this district from all blame, every assistance was rendered on two former occasions, these are no reasons to be given why the same should not be afforded this time, the blame, if there be any, appears to me, to rest with the accusers themselves.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) C. WHITTINGHAM,
Magistrate.

E.

From C. J. SHUBRICK, Esq., Magistrate of Chingleput; to the Magistrate of North Arcot
dated Sydapet, 8th February 1858, No 54.

SIR,

1. I have had the honor of receiving your letter, No. 38, of the 3rd Instant, together with copy of one from your Acting Head Assistant, dated 18th Ultimo, with its enclosures. I regret very much that I cannot agree with your Acting Head Assistant's views.

2. The charge against the head of Police of Cavarypauk is that he failed to give over certain parties to my Duffadar, agreeably to the Warrant issued to him against them and to have their houses searched and that the Duffadar had in consequence to return without the parties alluded to, though he had waited 5 days for them.

3. The excuse of the Head of Police is that he ordered the necessary assistance to be given to the Duffadar and that it was the Duffadar's own fears which prevented him acting in the matter. These fears being caused from apprehension of being sued in the Civil Court by the parties who were wealthy Sowcars.

4. I beg here to state that the fears alluded are perfectly gratuitous and can have no foundation whatever. It is of no consequence whether the Sowcars were wealthy or not, an action from them could not lie against the Duffadar who was armed with a Warrant for their apprehension and to search their houses, and instead of his being afraid to apprehend them, his complaint is that he was perpetually asking to be allowed to do so, but could get no permission. I would submit to you that with the head of Police in the town at the time, it was that functionary's bounden duty to see the warrant executed himself and not to allow the Duffadar to remain uselessly for 5 days, being shoved about from the Cutwall to the Talook Duffadar and from the Moonsiff who had taken physic to the Curnum who had gone away, according to the head of Police's own shewing, he acknowledges that the Warrant was not executed and his reasons being shown to be groundless, the responsibility must attach to himself alone. If the Sowcars were the wealthy, influential people he describes, the more reason for his being personally present at their apprehension and delivery. There can be no question of the law not having been carried out and of the Sowcars being still at large and their houses unsearched, of course there is no use in doing either the one thing or the other at this distance of time, but, I must confess that if there were any fears, they appear to me to have lain rather in the mind of the head of Police who may have had reasons for being on good terms with the Sowcars, than in the Duffadar who had never otherwise been thrown in the way and could have none whatever.

5. The head of Police also admits that he left the town during the Duffadar's stay there for the purpose of making collections and collecting supplies and it is only too clear that whatever orders he may have issued to his Police to assist my Duffadar, he took no measures whatever to see his orders carried out. If he had delivered the Sowcars into the hands of my Duffadar and the latter had refused to receive them, he might have charged him with fear on some good grounds but not otherwise. Under the actual circumstances, I can do no otherwise than consider the head of Police responsible for the failure of the Warrant.

Fort St. George, Judicial Consultation, 24th August 1858.

6. As regards the charge that the informant on whose sworn information the Warrant was issued, was an indifferent character. I would submit, that that is no excuse or reason for refusing his information and if it was to be advanced as a reason for the failure of his duty by the head of Police in the case of the Sowcars, it should have been equally advanced by him in the case of other parties entered in the Warrant whom he allowed to be apprehended without objection. And further that if as stated, a Warrant had been issued for the apprehension of the informant on a former occasion which had not been executed owing to his absconding instead of instancing it as an accusation against his character, action should have ensued on it and he should have been apprehended, if not at the time owing to any reasonable doubt which required clearing up, at least afterwards when time permitted; nothing of the kind seems to have been done and the charge would seem to have been allowed to drop.

7. As regards the charges of conspiracy alluded to by your Acting Head Assistant against the informant, that too would seem to have fallen to the ground, at least nothing is said of any decision being come to.

8. I request therefore you will be good enough to take these matters into your careful consideration, and if you agree with me in the failure of duty, I have as I hope to prove to your satisfaction against the head of Police that you will visit him with some substantial punishment indicative of your opinion of his conduct and sufficient to guard against a resemblance of it in other quarters.

9. I will say nothing about the Cutwall and other superior parties as the head of Police, responsible for their proceedings and as regards my Duffadar not coming and complaining to your Acting Head Assistant as remarked by that gentleman, it appears to me that the lapse of 5 days which rendered all advantage of complaining to him illusory, was sufficient to account for it.

F.

From C. J. SHUBRICK, Esq., Magistrate of Chingleput; to C. WHITTINGHAM, Esq.,
Magistrate of North Arcot, Chittoor, dated Sydapet, 19th April 1858, No. 128.

SIR,

I have the honor to draw your attention to my letter of the 8th February last, No. 54, to which you have not as yet replied.

G.

From C. WHITTINGHAM, Esq., Magistrate of North Arcot; to C. J. SHUBRICK, Esq.,
Magistrate of Chingleput, dated Penmarry, 28th April 1858, No. 250.

SIR,

With reference to your letters of the 8th February and 19th April 1858, bringing to my notice the conduct of the head of Police of Cavarypauk talook, I have the honor to forward for your information, the accompanying copy of a communication received from the Acting Head Assistant Magistrate, Mr. Elliott, to whom I had referred the matter for report.

Time intimated to

Fort St. George, Judicial Consultation, 24th August 1858.

H.

From E. F. ELIOTT, Esq., Acting Head Assistant Magistrate, North Arcot; to CHARLES WHITTINGHAM, Esq., Magistrate of North Arcot, dated Raneepet, 27th February 1858.

SIR,

With reference to your official Memorandum, No. 50, dated 11th Instant, enclosing copy of a letter from the Magistrate of Chingleput, No. 54, dated 8th Instant, and calling for what answers I may have it in my power to make to the observations contained therein, I have the honor in reply to submit, that in my opinion there are only two points in which the conduct of the head of Police of Caverypauk appears culpable, the 1st consists, in his not having apprehended the secret informant Shashadra Iyengar, when he was authorized to do so by a Warrant in his possession, immediately on that individual making his appearance within the limits of this district; and the 2nd, in the delay in the examination of the charges brought against that individual by certain Sowcars of Wallajapett, on whose petition to me, a Takeed to the above effect was sent to him on the 5th December 1857. The first error appears to have arisen from a mistaken notion, which certainly ought not to have existed in the mind of a man of his experience and standing in the Service, that because the informant came armed with a Warrant, issued by the Magistrate of another district and accompanied by his peons, that he had no right to interfere till such Warrant had been served; the parties apprehended and the case finally disposed of, until when he was not authorized to act or employ means for his apprehension. The 2nd error is excusable, considering the onerous and multifarious duties which fall on a man of his position, in the two-fold character of head of Police and Tahsildar, and considering the very strict injunctions lately issued to him from yourself, that at present he is to confine himself, principally to

* He was at the Cusbah when the Warrant arrived and remained there 3 days after he had seen it and taken a copy of it, and only left the Cusbah after the Duffadar charged with the Warrant had complained to him that his subordinates had failed to execute it.

The next to be replied to after these two last questions, is the one why did the head of Police being himself at the time present in the Cusbah not in person, see to the serving of the Warrant, the apprehension of the parties named therein, and the searching of their houses? To this I would in reply beg to submit, that I am not aware in what Regulation or elsewhere it is so distinctly stated that a head of Police himself where there are immediate subordinates under him present on the spot, is explicitly directed to serve a Warrant, or search houses in person to the detriment of his other numerous duties; the issuing of explicit orders to such subordinates and the rendering of the required assistance by forwarding peons and in many other ways would, I deem it be sufficient. On the occasion referred to, considering there were present a Cutwall, Police Duffadar, Moonsiff, Curnum, two Hoozoor peons, a Deloyet and a Magistrate peon, the Chingleput Hoozoor Duffadar, and the secret informant, I think that the services of

+ Vide previous remark, the complaint against the head of Police is that he left his station and the warrant unexecuted: knowing that his directions to his Subordinates had come to naught. It is clear that he should have had his directions executed during the 3 days he was in the Cusbah after he had taken a copy of the Warrant.

the head of Police been obliged to leave the Cusbah on other as important duties in his civil capacity, as mentioned above, he would himself have attended the execution of the Warrant and seen his directions enforced. The fault on this head therefore, in my opinion, I again beg leave to state, does not rest with him. It lies betwixt the Sub Police Officers present. With regard to the former, there is a complaint that the Moonsiff did not appear when called on, because he had taken physick, though the Moonsiff did not appear, the searching might have been carried

‡ The complaint against these parties is that they throw obstacles in the way of the Warrant being executed.

on without him as there were quite a sufficient number present for the purpose.‡ There must have been some other latent cause, and from what I have since heard from my Daloyet who was present on the occasion, it appears that a dispute arose betwixt the secret informant and the Chingleput Duffadar regarding the propriety

Fort St. George, Judicial Consultation, 24th August 1858.

of the names of the persons mentioned in the Warrant having been shown to the head of Police and that a split^s ensued between them, on which the informant departed to Mamundoor and the Duffadar followed him without either

of them having confided one word previously, regarding their movements to either of my peons co-operating with them, and who in consequence afterwards also followed them to Mamundoor. On such evidence it is difficult to say who were in the wrong, with the exception of the Monia-

|| Then why was it not executed? The Duffadar complained to the head of Police that the Warrant had not been executed and the head of Police left the town promising to return which he never did. His not returning was the reason of the Duffadar's departure, coupled with the fact that owing to the delay which had occurred he parties named in the Warrant had been warned and on their guard.

gar named above, both sides were ready, and the searching could have been executed without informality. || Such being the case, it is difficult to say, what were the causes of so immediate an ending to proceedings which were on the eve of being executed, or the reasons

for so abrupt and speedy, not to say unexpected departure of the Chingleput officials, the principal parties concerned.

With reference to the last para. of Mr. Shubrick's letter, I would beg leave to observe, that there was no necessity for his Duffadar, after my intimation to him at our first interview, if he considered that it was through the wilful opposition of the authorities of this district that his Warrant was not executed, to have waited 5 days, which as that gentleman observes, rendered

* The Duffadar's proceedings do not exonerate the head of Police.

all advantage of complaining illusory, on the contrary, his report ought to have been made and at once, and his not* having done so, I should consider a grave neglect on his part.

(True Copy.)

(Signed) C. WHITTINGHAM,
Magistrate

I.

From C. J. SHUBRICK, Esq., Magistrate of Chingleput; to C. WHITTINGHAM, Esq., Magistrate of North Arcot, dated Sydapet, 3rd May 1858.

SIR,

I have had the honor of receiving your letter of the 28th Ultimo, No. 250, enclosing one from your Acting Head Assistant* which, I regret to say, are not satisfactory. I should be willing to accept Mr. Elliott's excuses for the head of Police not seeing the Warrant served himself, if my Duffadar had not complained to him that his subordinates had failed to assist him in serving it and he had not left his Cusbah station knowing it to be unserved. But his leaving his station under these circumstances, implicates him in the failure of the service of the Warrant for which I must be permitted to hold him responsible.

2. As the protection of the peace and property of this district required that my Warrants shall be as effectually served in North Arcot as they are within my own limits, and as I presume you would not accept similar excuses or conduct on the part of your Police in the case of your own Warrants. I have no alternative left me but requesting you to inflict some substantial punishment on the head of Police, adequate to his deserts and sufficient to prevent a recurrence of similar neglect of duty either in his own case or that of others or of laying the matter before higher authority.

I request the favor of an early answer.

Time intimated to

Fort St. George, Judicial Consultation, 24th August 1858.

J.

From C. WHITTINGHAM, Esq., Magistrate of North Arcot; to C. J. SHUBRICK, Esq.,
Magistrate of Chingleput, dated Trivallum, 10th July 1858, No. 440.

SIR,

1. I have the honor with reference to your letter of 3rd May, No. 145, to state that a reconsideration of the case in question, has only confirmed me in the opinion I held, that the head of Police of Cavaripauk was not guilty of the neglect of duty imputed to him.

2. It appears from the report made to you by your Duffadar on the 2nd December 1857, that he arrived at Wallajapet on the 25th, but *refused* until the evening of the 27th to show the Warrant to the head of Police who of course could not act till he had seen the Warrant. The delay of these 2 days is therefore entirely attributable by his own admission to the highly culpable conduct* of your Duffadar. From the personal investigation held by the Acting Head Assistant Magistrate, there are strong grounds for believing that the subsequent proceedings of your Duffadar were also of a highly irregular nature. That investigation showed that there was no delay or neglect on the part of the head of Police when at last the Warrant was shown to him.

* The conduct of the Duffadar in no way exonerates the head of Police of neglect of duty. He was 3 days in the Cusbah after he had seen and taken a copy of the Warrant, and had received a complaint that his subordinates had prevented its being executed.

3. In your letter under reply, you seem to consider the gravamen of the charge against the head of Police to consist in his having left his station before the execution of the Warrant had been completed,† but his leaving the station was the result of positive and repeated orders from me that he should at once do so, and proceed to the villages to collect the revenue, and the head of Police might well believe that he would not be justified in disobeying those orders for the purpose in question when there was residing within 3 miles of his station, a European Magistrate, some of whose peons were then actually engaged in assisting‡ your Duffadar, and whose intervention could be invoked in the event of it being required.§

† Vide remark above, relative to 3 days.

‡ The complaint against all the officials of North Arcot is that they did not assist. It is allowed that they were ordered to assist but they frustrated their orders by frivolous objections.

§ As already stated any want of foresight or proper proceedings on the part of the Duffadar can in no way exonerate the head of Police.

introduction of a new assessment added to my

|| If Search Warrants were habitually left unserved like the one under notice, when or how would gang robberies ever be discovered.

4. The duties attendant on a Jumma-bundy of an unusual importance owing to the usual onerous duties have prevented my earlier re-investigating a matter which I consider to have been already satisfactorily|| disposed of by the Acting Head Assistant Magistrate.

(True Copies.)

(Signed) C. J. SHUBRICK,
Magistrate.

No. 12.

ORDER THEREON, No. 1133; dated 18th August 1858.

Resolved, that copy of the above letter with the original enclosures—to be returned—be forwarded to the Magistrate of North Arcot, and that he be desired to submit a full and early report on the alleged conduct of the Police authorities of Wallajapettah referred to by Mr. Shubrick, it being at the same time intimated to him that the explanation already furnished is wholly insufficient.

(Signed) T. PYCROFT,
Chief Secretary.

Chingleput
11th

11th Aug 1858
12th Aug 1858
13th Aug 1858
14th Aug 1858
15th Aug 1858
16th Aug 1858
17th Aug 1858
18th Aug 1858
19th Aug 1858
20th Aug 1858
21st Aug 1858
22nd Aug 1858
23rd Aug 1858
24th Aug 1858
25th Aug 1858
26th Aug 1858
27th Aug 1858
28th Aug 1858
29th Aug 1858
30th Aug 1858
31st Aug 1858

Received of the
Magistrate of
Chingleput
11th Aug 1858
12th Aug 1858
13th Aug 1858
14th Aug 1858
15th Aug 1858
16th Aug 1858
17th Aug 1858
18th Aug 1858
19th Aug 1858
20th Aug 1858
21st Aug 1858
22nd Aug 1858
23rd Aug 1858
24th Aug 1858
25th Aug 1858
26th Aug 1858
27th Aug 1858
28th Aug 1858
29th Aug 1858
30th Aug 1858
31st Aug 1858

The Govt do not understand why he
Magistrate of Chingleput should have referred his
case for their orders; he presumes cognizance
of "all matters relating to the administration
of justice in criminal cases" being vested
in the Foujdary Adawlut - vide Sect VIII
Reg VIII of 1802.
He will now submit the case to that Court.
The enclosures to his letter are returned.

Time intimated to

6
No 1135

No 1135

Extract Minutes of Consultation
dated 18th August 1858

Read the following letter
from the Mayor of Chinghap

(H.R. order 29th July/58 No 46)

Resolved that copies of

the above letter - with

the original enclosing

to be returned - to

forwarded to the

Magistrate of K. and

and that he be desired

to submit a full &

early report on the

alleged conduct of

the Police authorities

of Wallajapettah refer-

-red to by Mr. Shuck,

it being at the same

time intimated to

him that his explanation
- is on already furnished
- it is wholly in the
- spirit -

Mass of 1000 with 10 my. Incls: } Disposed 21st J.P.
- Chungmuul

[Faint, illegible handwritten text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side]

In 23 before 24. Aug 1858
In 23 before 24. Aug 1858

In 23 before 24. Aug 1858
In 23 before 24. Aug 1858

Post Paid: Per

of 18. Decr. 1857.

Forward to the
Magistrate of the District
of Suffolk containing
of the report in the fact
of the Chearbank's heirs
as to appoint the majority
and in the apprehension of
Porter & Bates Conscience
in a case of Gang Robbery
committed in the 9th
of January in the
District of Suffolk.