M.R.O. 1—30,000—16-10-29.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No. 210 Press ~~Mis.~~

207-208

Dated 23 . 12 19/8/

24/24

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department, 23rd December 1863.

No. 207. Read the following letter from J. W. B. DYKES, Esq., Magistrate of Nellore; to the Honorable A. J. ARBUTHNOT, Chief Secretary to Government, Judicial Department, Fort Saint George, dated Nellore, 10th December 1863, No. 33.

Nyapathi Kisnta Rau, Sub-Magistrate and Tahsildar of the Taluq of Ongole in this District, having been tried and acquitted on two separate charges* of a corrupt and malicious exercise of his authority as a Magistrate, to keep persons in confinement, I submitted† for the consideration of the High Court, whether it was right that he should be allowed to remain a Sub-Magistrate, as the Court in acquitting him had observed,‡ his conviction would have been a certainty under a differently framed indictment, and the Court had not remembered till too late the provisions of Section 244 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

* Cases Nos. 63 and 64 on the file of the Sessions Court of Nellore. The calendars in which cases are forwarded herewith, and requested to be returned when no longer required.

† 13th October 1863, No. 223.

‡ No. 63, 20th and 21st paragraphs.

2. The Proceedings of the High Court in reply, ruling that the Judges could not interfere on the "extra Judicial remarks" of the Sessions Judge, &c., reached me just as a material witness in both the cases was being tried for perjury. And the man (the Tahsildar's Gumastah) having been convicted,§ I again addressed the High Court,¶ and submitted for the consideration of the Judges, whether it was to the public interests, that the Sub-Magistrate who had escaped Jail by an accident, or by perjury, should return to his Taluq to administer justice.

§ Cases Nos. 100 and 101 of 1863, on the file of the Sessions Court of Nellore. The calendars in which cases are forwarded herewith, and requested to be returned when no longer required.

¶ November 11th, No. 242.

3. I also submitted|| for the consideration of the Judges, whether the case ought not to be viewed with reference to the *right* the public have to be assured as far as possible, of the integrity of every Officer exercising the powers conferred on a Sub-Magistrate.

|| Paragraph 4.

4. And the High Court, in answer to this second application, having replied** that they deem themselves precluded from taking cognizance of such questions, and that the proper course for me to pursue is to address the Government direct, I do myself the honor to submit accordingly for the consideration of Government the correspondence, &c., referred to.

** 25th November 1863.

5. Hearing that the Sessions Judge, Mr. Story, who tried the Sub-Magistrate, had also written to the High Court to urge his dismissal, I applied for a copy of the letter and beg to submit the same†† with the other records.

†† 7th November 1863, No. 85.

6. And the whole case being fully set forth in these records, I shall perhaps be only swelling a somewhat bulky correspondence, if I again go over the details. And I will therefore simply submit as directed by the High Court, for the orders of Government, whether it is fit that a man should remain Sub-Magistrate, who, had he got his dues, would now be in Jail for gross oppression, and in the opinion of the Sessions Judge, who tried him, the Joint Magistrate, who committed him, and myself who have known him for four years, is wholly unfit for the post. He is no ways deficient in abilities. But his character is scandalous; and I strongly recommend his dismissal.

No. 208. ORDER THEREON, 23rd December 1863, No. 2010.

The High Court having, on a review of the evidence in the cases referred to, declined to order the dismissal of Nyapathi Kistna Rau, Sub-Magistrate of Ongole, the Governor in Council is not prepared to act on the Magistrate's recommendation.

2. If the Magistrate has other reasons for considering it undesirable that the Sub-Magistrate should resume his office, the specific instances in which the Sub-Magistrate has shown himself unfit for his appointment should be laid before the Board of Revenue who have been authorized to deal with such cases.

(Signed) A. J. ARBUTHNOT,
Chief Secretary.

Exd. T. McMootry.

[redacted] letter, [illegible] it is necessary that I

No. 223.

Nellore,
Magistrate's Office,
13th October 1863.

From

J. W. B. Dyster Esquire,
Magistrate of Nellore.

To

C. F. Chamier Esquire,
Registrar to the High Court of Judicature
Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the Proceedings of the High Court of the 6th August forwarding certain letters from the Joint Magistrate of this District No. 69 & 71, and directing me to proceed as might seem advisable with reference to the cases therein referred to.

2. Both cases have reference to the conduct of Vyrapati Krishna Raiu, and in regard to the case brought forward in the latter of these two letters, it does not seem to me necessary to trouble the High Court.

3. As regards the Case described in letter No. 69, it is necessary that I should

6

bring the case before the High Court as the
ordinet of the Sub Magistrate has been highly
irregular & calls for severe notice.

It appears that in the Taluq of Cuyala
the Public Works have been buying chunam
at 7½ Rs the puttie. That a Native man came
forward & offered to sell at 7 Rs. That
the bargain was struck by Mr O'Connor,
the overseer in charge for 40 puttis. And
that when half the 40 puttis had been pur-
nished & the other half was sent for, a
partner appeared who claimed the other
half, & refused to allow it to be taken
away, though the money had been paid for it.

5. It was a bad case. Before
paying for the chunam, or entering into the
bargain at all, Mr. O'Connor had had the
40 puttis carefully inspected & measured.

There

Returns forwarded

there had been no mention then of any
par Now that the second half of the
chunam was not forthcoming & the return
of the money was requested, the money was
not forthcoming any more than the chunam.
And no satisfactory explanation was given,
either as to the reticence in the first instance
or the insolvency in the second.-

6. Mr. O'Connor wrote to Nyapati
Krishna Rauw, the sub magistrate of the Taluq,
charging the man, who had offered to sell
the chunam had taken money when
the chunam was not his, with having
cheated him. And then leaving the case
to be conducted by a Gumasta, the case
became one of a Civil nature & was
dismissed.-

7. Mr. O'Connor, thereon, complained

to

to the Joint Magistrate. And the Joint Magistrate instead of applying for the orders of the High Court under Section 434, having himself directed the case to be brought on the file & properly investigated — the Sub Magistrate again took it up & this time unquestionably took an active part in effecting an amicable arrangement in a case that, as it stood, unquestionably did not come within the limits of the Exception to Section 214 of the Penal Code.—

8. Mr. Elliott recommends that the Sub Magistrate should be dismissed. I do not agree with him as regards this case. I do not think the Sub Magistrate was influenced by corrupt motives. There has recently been much underhand work going on. And would give the Sub Magistrate the benefit here

of having been actuated by correct motives though his conduct was incorrect. For instance, the security for the repayment of the money in the subsequent arrangements brought about by the Sub Magistrate was the original contractor who had been selling at Rs 7½ the pair etc. And it is quite possible that the man at the bar might have been himself cheated, & that the Sub Magistrate may have been personally aware of circumstances that were not on the record & may have acted on that knowledge.—

9. It is however my duty to bring before the High Court another case against this Sub Magistrate, in which I can find no such palliation. Which calls for a decision on the part of the High Court as to whether he can be fitly entrusted

any

any longer with magisterial powers - &
hence unnecessary any further proceedings
in respect to the preceding cases -

10. This case has been made the
subject of trial before the Sessions Court
And 2 charges having been brought against
Kyápati Krishna Rama Sub Magistrate
of Angole that he did corruptly and
maliciously commit & keep in confinement
in the Police station & for 5 & 3 days
respectively Potula Lataya & Paidi Ba-
laya, the Court has given judgment + that had the prisoners been committed to
take their trial for maliciously procuring
their confinement or had a formal Charge
to that effect been added, the prisoners
must have been convicted. Whilst it was
not till after the close of the second trial
that the provisions of Section 344 of the

+ Copies ...

Criminal Code Procedure occurred to the Court -

11. The men had come before the Sub
Magistrate as witnesses in a case of theft.
The carts going down the road with tobacco
& Cotton were being systematically plundered
at a place called Pangatarru. The Village
Munsiff getting information upon which
he determined to search certain houses,
had found a quantity of the stolen goods
and the man in question being sent
in as witnesses, found themselves prisoners
after giving their evidence. They were
thrust into the same cell with the man
and woman they had given evidence against -

12 One of these men Potula Lataya had
been named by the Munsiff as one of his informants.
And he supposing only to the search, the Sub
Magistrate might at the moment have supposed
that keeping him in Custody would perhaps
be

the means of inducing him to speak more freely.
But as regards Paidi Bapaya, there is nothing
that gives any colouring whatever to what the
Court has pronounced proved. And looking at
the mode in which the confinement was carried
out, the mode in which the parties were
released, & the whole facts of the case as proved
I can come to no other conclusion than that
the conduct of the Sub Magistrate was
thoroughly bad.

13 I took the opportunity of being
the Angole Taluq about a fortnight ago
to make full inquiries on the spot. And
from what I heard there as well as what
I myself told me I may state that it would
have been quite possible to have had evidence
before the Court as to the "Corruptly" charged,
the money given for the release was returned,
the conduct of the Sub Magistrate

because

because the subject of ~~[illegible]~~ & evidence
to both transactions could have been
had been desired, to add to the
charge that is generally so unsatisfactory
as bribery. Not having added it, it is
to be regretted that the indictment showed
"Corruptly" as commented on by the Court.
And it now only remains for me to apply
for the High Courts orders as to the course
to be pursued now.

14. Should the High Court be of opinion
that the error in respect to Section 264 of
the Code of Procedure brings the case within
the provisions of Section 404 of the said
Code, I beg the Court will be pleased
to pass such orders as may seem right
thereon. Or should the Court think fit,
the Sub Magistrate could be brought up
again under Section 161 for which there
would

would be, I believe, better evidence to
than be usually obtained in such cases.
But, seeing that the Sub Magistrate has
already once put upon his trial, and
whole, I beg to recommend that no fur
legal steps be taken against him & that
he be simply dismissed from the public
Services.-

16. The fact of the wrongful con-
finement having been inflicted last
May year, & no complaint made till
this year, till the sufferers thought they
saw that they might safely bring forward
the case, indicates a state of terror in
the Taluq, hitherto presided over magisterially
by Ryapati Krishna Rauu that I fear
was only too well founded. Put there
by myself 4 years ago, at the amalgamation
of the Talugs, from that day to this, I
have never heard a good word spoken
of him. His character has been, I regret
to say, notoriously bad. And in my
opinion his dismissal is no less called
for by the facts proved before the Court
than the general welfare of the people
of the Taluq.-

I have &c

(Signed) W. B. Dykes

Magistrate.-

Proceedings of the High Court of Judicature
at Madras 31st October 1863.

Read letter from the Magistrate of
Nellore, dated 13th Instant, requesting the
authority of the High Court to dismiss
from the Public Service Ryapati Krishna
Rauu, 2d Class Subordinate Magistrate
of the Taluq of Cuddapah.-

1 It is unnecessary to comment
on

on the case referred to in para 168 of the Magistrate's letter for that Officer himself considers that the Sub Magistrate may, in that instance, have acted in good faith.-

2. With respect to the remaining case, it is to be observed, that the Sub Magistrate has been formally tried on the same facts, and has been acquitted.

The High Court cannot act on the extra-judicial remarks of the Sessions Judge, nor upon the Reasons assigned which the Magistrate is said to have collected on his visit to the Police.-

3. The High Court are therefore of opinion that there is nothing that would justify them in directing the dismissal of the subordinate Magistrate.

True

(True Extract)

(Signed) C. F. Chamier

Registrar

To

The Magistrate of Nellore

Nellore
Magistrate's Office
11th November 1862.

No 2462

From

J. W. B. Dykes Esquire

Magistrate of Nellore

To

C. F. Chamier Esquire

Registrar to the High Court of Judicature

Madras.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the High Court's Proceedings of the 31st ulto ruling that a Sub Magistrate having been acquitted on a formal trial, the High Court cannot act on the opinion of the Judge that he was nevertheless guilty of the offence charged & direct his dismissal.-

2. The High Court further rule that "the hearsay evidence which the Magistrate is said to have collected" is equally inadmissible.

3. The Proceedings reached me at the Commencement of the Sessions for three months & a half before a Gymnastic of the Sub Magistrate had been put on his trial for perjuring himself at the Sub Magistrate's trial at the last Sessions.

4. In writing to the Court in [illegible] to the previous trial, & submitting for the Consideration of the Judges, whether it was right the Sub Magistrate should remain in his present position, I thought it my duty, to submit for consideration such information, as I had been able to collect as to the case in question & the character of the man referred to, [illegible] his [illegible] office as a Sub Magistrate,

Magistrate very deeply affects the welfare, and, on the same grounds, now do myself the honor to submit for the consideration of the High Court with reference to the same question, the result of the Gymnastas' trial in each case, best with reference to the deep interest the public have in the character & right I may add to be assured as far as possible of the integrity of every one exercising the powers conferred on a Sub Magistrate. And if in pursuing this Course & acting on these grounds I am mistaken, I beg I may be informed of the Court's views for my future guidance. At present, I look on myself, not as a Witness, but the Head of the District, fully justified in giving any information in my power in respect to my Magisterial Subordinates, provided it affects their

witness for the offic
are satisfied.

Plaus 6

Sub Magistrate and
commit the perjury of
convicted, in Subm
for consideration, I may be deemed acting
contrary to the ruling under acknowledgm
but that case, I must express my
to for the
it
hand, should be considered as mine for
reconsideration, the importa the
subject of the question involved is so
serious, that I submit the Calendar
beg the High Court will be pleased to
the question the benefit of their
reconsideration with the result of the
additional trial before them, & decide;
whether it is to the public interest
that

that the Sub Magistrate acquitted by a
stroke of the Judge, should continue
in justice, whilst his accomplice
is at the Andamans.-

Plaus 6 &c.

(signed) H.B. Dykes

Magistrate

Proceedings of the High Court of Judicature at
Madras, Appellate side 2nd December 1863

Read Letter dated the 11th instant,
from the Magistrate of Bellary, requesting
the High Court to reconsider their proceedings
of the 31st Ultimo in which they declined to sanction
the dismissal of Nyapati Krishna Rao,
Subordinate Magistrate of Cuddapah, on the
ground, that he had been formally tried
and acquitted on the same charge.-

The Judges see no ground whatever
for modifying the orders they have already
passed

passed in this matter - They were
forwarded for the Magistrate's guidance -
Copy of the High Court's Proceedings dated
the 31st October 1863 recorded on the
the Acting Magistrate of Chavakacheri explaining
the limits of the Court's jurisdiction
such Case and to inform Mr. Dykes that
if he considers the removal of Gopala
Krishna Rao necessary on other grounds
than those which the Magistrate have already
had under their consideration, he should
address the Government direct on the
subject -

(Intd) C. T. Layard

Registrar

To
The Magistrate of Point Pedro -

Proceedings of the High Court of Judicature
at Chavakacheri Appellate side 31st October 1863 -

Read letter [illegible] Government Agent
the

the Acting Magistrate of the Chavakacheri District,
bringing to the notice of the High Court the
misconduct and inefficiency of Vennmal Kanthe
2nd class Subordinate Magistrate of said district,
and recommending his dismissal -

1. Under the orders of Government
dated 24th February last, it is not within
the province of the High Court to direct
the dismissal of a Subordinate Magistrate
for [illegible] on the ground of general
inefficiency or neglect of duty - It is only
in particular instances of "misconduct,
"ignorance or inefficiency in the discharge
"of Magisterial duties shown in trials
before the Criminal Courts," that they
possess this power -

2. Without pronouncing any opinion
therefore on questions foreign to the jurisdiction
of the High Court, the Judges observe
that

that no such grounds for the course recommended appear in the present cases. On the charges of corruption instituted against the Subordinate Magistrate, a formal preliminary enquiry has been held, but the acting Magistrate allows, that they are not sustained by legal proof; and however reprehensible the Co[illegible] Subordinate Magis[illegible] may have been with reference to the latter cases enumerated in para 5 of the letter of the Acting Magistrate, it is manifest that it is not such as calls for the penalty of dismissal.

3. The Judges are therefore of opinion that nothing has been adduced in the Co[illegible]

case which would justify the High Court in directing the dismissal of the Subordinate Magistrate Perumal Naidu.

(True Extract)

(Signed) C. F. Lehmann

Registrar

(True Copies)

[illegible]

Magistrate

No 825.

Fort St. George

(From) C. Hay, Esquire,
Sessions Judge of Madura

(To) A. J. Mohammed, Esq
Registrar of the High Court of Judicature,
Madras.

Dated) I have the honor to forward for the consideration and orders of the Chief Justice and Judges of the Honble Court the Affidavit of [redacted] x of the Calendar Sessions Case No 63 & 64 of [redacted]

2. My reason for doing this is, that in my opinion the Prisoners in the said cases is unfit for the ensuing Office of a Subordinate

Magistrate and that it is therefore my duty to bring his conduct to the notice

[redacted]

x to the petitioner

Fort St. George

From the Magr.
of Madura to the Chief Secretary
to Govt. Judicial Depart.
Dated December 18 1863.

Copies of correspondence
with Agapathi Vasthia
Pandaram & Subordinate
Magistrate.

Rec'd 23rd Dec 1863 No 2010

Rec'd 1863
No 2274

notice of the High Court; for I consider that
the evidence proves beyond a doubt that the
witnesses in both cases were confined in the
Police Station and that the Prisoner caused
their illegal detention either by warning
by tampering with the Police.

3. In para 16 of my sentence in
Defence Case No 63 of 1863, I have expressed
the opinion that warrants were not issued;
but from the statements of the Prisoner (2nd
witness in those cases) in Defence Cases Nos 100
and 101 of 1863, that summonses were issued
to the 1st Witnesses in cases Nos 63 and 64
of 1863, having as 2nd witness these last cases

solemnly affirmed that no summonses were
issued, I am inclined to think that this
is perjured himself on this point also.

But be that as it may, it is
clear to me that the Prisoner in cases Nos 63
& 64 of 1863, either committed the said 1st
Witnesses on warrants to the Police Station
and subsequently bribed the Police to remove
the said warrants from the Book kept for
the insertion of all such warrants and allud-
-ed to by me in para 16 of my sentence in
Defence Case No 63 of 1863; or, that the said
Prisoner induced the Police to receive the
said Witnesses into the Police Station without
warrants.

warrants.-

5. In either case, if my arguments holds good, the said Prisoner is, I venture to think, wholly unfit to be a Subordinate Magistrate.-

6. I have also to urge against this Prisoner, that he must by a bribe or some other weighty inducement have pre-vaded the 2d Witness in these cases (Nos 63 and 64 of 1863.) to perjure himself; for it cannot be supposed, that the said 2d Witness did so voluntarily or without a sufficient motive.-

7. I should have made this reference earlier, but I was desirous, before doing so, of seeing the result of the trial of Prisoner in Sessions cases Nos 100 & 101 of 1863, and whose committal for perjury I knew would take place in time for the November Sessions, from a reference made to me on the subject by the Joint Magistrate of the District.-

I have &c.

(Signed) E. Story,

Sessions Judge.

(True Copy)

(Signed) E Story,

Sessions Judge,

Proceedings of the High Court of Judicature at Madras, Appellate side 19th November 63.

Read

Read letter dated the 7th instant,
from the Sessions Judge of Nellore, sub-
-mitting Office Copies of the Calendars,
and remarking regarding the O.
Sessions cases Nos 63 & 64 of 1863, that he is
unfit for his present Office of Subordinate
Magistrate.

Read also remarks of the Sessions
Judge of Nellore on cases Nos 100 & 101 on
the Calendar of his Court for 1863.

The Judges observe, that the
misconduct which the Session Judge ascribes
to the Subordinate Magistrate in con-
-nection with the facts of the above cases,
is merely matter of doubtful inference and
not sufficiently substantiated to justify
the High Court in sanctioning his
dismissal.

/True Extract/
/signed/ C. F. Chamier,
Registrar.

/True Copy/
/signed/ C. Story
Sessions Judge.

To
The Magistrate of Nellore
for his information.

/True Copies/
F. B. De Rose
Magistrate

Comptr O.D.

(Enc. II)

From 25" Despts G.O. No 2010

(Pay & a letter from the Magistrate, Nellore, to the Chief Secretary to Govt. Revenue Department, re-seeking sanction to the Public Prosecutor, Nellore, to proceed to Ongole to conduct the case against the Sub-magistrate of Ongole.—

Rep. Rs 2.0
Rec'd 25/4/13

(Recd the case against the Sub-magistrate of Ongole.

The Sub Magistrate of Ongole was tried in 2 Cases before the Sessions Court of Nellore on the charge of having corruptly & maliciously committed & kept in confinement for 5 & 3 days respectively Satayah and Bapayah, who were witnesses in a case.

2. The Court remarked that there was nothing whatever on the cases to show corruption.

3. The Court observed that the term "committed" implied the issue of a warrant, but expressed

expressed itself satisfied that no warrants had been issued. In acquitting the prisoner, however, the Judge added that convictions would have ensued, if the prisoner had been indicted for maliciously procuring the confinement of the complainants.

4. The Sub Magistrate's Goomastah was subsequently tried & convicted of having given false evidence in the trials of his superior, by stating that no summons had been issued to the complainants, whereas the summons to Tatayah bore his initials & that to Bapayah was prepared by a volunteer in the office under the Goomastah's instructions.

5. The Judge observed that the Goomastah's defence of lapse of time, which would have excused failure of memory, was ineffectual in the face of the positive assertions made by him. The Court had "not the shadow of a "doubt" that "the perjury "was corrupt" the Sub Magistrate, who was the prisoner in the original cases, having doubtless "by paid Prisoner well "for his villainy."

6. In regard to the argument that the false statements did not prejudice the cases in which they were made, the Judge pointed out that "in order to prove the "charges in those cases "it was necessary to show

"show that a summons
"had been issued to the
"witness in each of
"those cases; otherwise
"they could not, or at
"least ought not to have
"been received in the
"Police station; the proof,
"therefore, of summonses
"having been issued, was
"most material to the is-
"sue of those cases."

7. The Sessions Judge recommended the removal of the Sub-Magistrate on the ground that the evidence proved beyond a doubt that the complainants were confined in the Station House, & that the Sub-Magistrate caused their illegal detention either by warrant or by tampering with the Police. The Judge urged also that the Sub-Magistrate must have persuaded the Gomastah by bribes or some other

other weighty inducement to perjure himself, because it could not be supposed that he did so voluntarily "or without sufficient mo-
"tive." The High Court treated the misconduct ascribed to the Sub-Magistrate as "merely matter of doubtful "inference."

8. The Magistrate recommended the removal of the Sub-Magistrate [illegible] Cook. & at the mode in which confinement was carried out — the mode in which the parties were released — & the facts proved," he [illegible] no other conclusion [illegible] that the Sub-Magistrate had."

[illegible] personally made inquiries at Bugole, & from what he had heard there he [illegible] state that "it "would have been quite "possible to have sent evi-
"dence as to the "corruptly".

he

"In fact the money given
"for the release was return-
"ed, when the conduct of
"the Sub-Magistrate be-
"came the subject of inquiry
"& evidence to both trans-
"actions could have been
"sent, had it been desired
"to add to the case a charge
"that is generally so un-
"satisfactory as bribery."
The delay of one year in
making the complaint,
the Magistrate thought,
indicated "a state of
"terror in the Taluq." For
the last four years Mr.
Dykes has not heard a
good word spoken of the
Sub-Magistrate. The
High Court observed that
the Magistrate had been
formally tried on the same
facts & acquitted. They
declined to act on the
extra-judicial remarks
of the Sessions Judge, on
the hearsay collected
by the Magistrate.

9. The Magistrate requested the High Court to reconsider the case, submitting at the same time the Calendar of the Perjury Case, with the remark that there was "no evidence that the Sub-Magistrate suborned the Dumasta to commit the perjury." The High Court declined to modify their orders already passed on the case & explained the limits of their jurisdiction in regard to the dismissal of Sub-Magistrates.

207 to 208

Precis re Case of the Sub Magistrate of Ongole.

Recd 23d December 1863

Recd 10th Jan 1864 No 4

No 2010

Forwarded by Govt

Judicial Department

Proceedings of the Madras Government

Read the following letter from the Magistrate of Nellore

(Rec'd Enter 10th December 1863. No 33)

Order thereon 23d December 1863. No 2010

The High Court having on a review of the Evidence in the Case referred to, declined to order the Dismissal of Nyápathi Vistna Ráu, Sub Magistrate of Ongole, the Governor in Council is not prepared to act on the Magistrate's recommendation.

2. If the Magistrate has other reasons for considering it undesirable that the Sub Magistrate should resume his office, the specific instances in which the

The Sub Magistrate has shown himself unfit for his appointment should be laid before the Board of Revenue who has been authorized to deal with such cases.

The Magistrate of Nellore with 4 enclosures
The Revenue Dept.
The Hon'ble the Judges of the High Court

desp. No. 24