M.R.O. 1—50,000—16-10-28.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Judicial **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 1046 Press Mis.

99-200.

Dated 26.7.1865 19 .

5/6

Not to be folded or roughly handled

No. 199. Read the following letter from the Honorable D. ARBUTHNOTT, Collector of Salem, to the Honorable A. J. ARBUTHNOT, Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George; dated Salem, 1st July 1865, No. 17.

With reference to the Government Proceedings, dated the 30th May 1865, No. 773, I have the honor to forward translation of an explanation furnished by the Government Vakeel of this District, as called for in paragraph 2 of the above Proceedings.

Translation of an Urzi from NARASIAH, Government Vakeel of the Salem District, to the Honorable D. ARBUTHNOTT, Collector of Salem, dated 12th June 1865, No. 13.

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your Takeed, dated 8th instant, calling upon me for an explanation of the remissness imputed to me in paragraph 2 of the Government Proceedings, dated 30th May 1865, No. 773, in Original Suit, No. 3 of 1857, on the file of the Principal Sudder Ameen's Court, instituted by Iyavian and others of Andapuram against Government.

2. In reply, I beg to state that from the commencement of the suit till its close, all the proceedings connected with it were conducted by Gholam Hussain Saib, my predecessor, and the documentary evidence also was adduced by him. At this stage of the suit, I was appointed Government Vakeel.

3. The Collector of Salem, in his answer, filed in the suit, stated that he had no connection whatever with the suit.

4. The District Engineer of Trichinopoly took up the defence, and furnished all materials for the defence, from the commencement of the suit.

5. After I was appointed Government Vakeel, a date was fixed by the Court for hearing for the final disposal of the suit. I duly communicated this to the District Engineer of Trichinopoly by two reports, copies of which are herein enclosed, requesting him at the same time to instruct me if there was any thing to be urged at the time of hearing, but I received no reply.

Translation of an Urzi from NARASIAH, Government Vakeel of the Salem District, to the District Engineer of Trichinopoly, dated 29th May 1861, No. 46.

In the suit, No. 3 of 1857, on the file of the Sub-Court at Salem, instituted by Iyavian and 10 others against Government, the Acting Principal Sudder Ameen has issued a notice fixing the hearing on the 14th June next. If there is any thing to be urged at the time of hearing, I request that I may be informed of the same.

Translation of an Urzi from NARASIAH, Government Vakeel of the Salem District, to the District Engineer of Trichinopoly, dated 16th August 1861, No. 66.

In the Suit No. 3 of 1857, on the file of the Sub-Court at Salem, instituted by Iyavian and others of Andapuram, in the Namkul Taluq, against the Collector and the District Engineer of the Salem District, and against the Collector and the District Engineer of the Trichinopoly District, regarding the Muroonga Colattur channel, the Principal Sudder Ameen has appointed 26th August for the hearing of the case. If there is anything more to be urged in the hearing on your behalf, I request that I may be informed of the same.

(True Translation).

(Signed) D. ARBUTHNOTT,
Collector.

No. 200. ORDER THEREON, 26th July 1865, No. 1040.

It appears from the explanation now afforded by the Government Vakeel of Salem that his predecessor, Gholam Hussain, who is dead, was the person immediately responsible for the neglect which Government imputed to him, in their Order of the 30th May.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
26th July 1865.

2. The Government desire the Collector of Salem to explain his omission, when requested to file an answer in the suit, to set forth in that answer that the Andiparam people had agreed to the cutting of the new channel, as is now shown to have been the case.

(True Extract).

Chief Secretary.

To the Collector of Salem.
" Public Works Department.

Ghoolam Hoosain Sahib, the late Govt. Vakeel, is reported in this paper to be dead. He is the man shown mainly at fault in the answer put in by the Collector of Salem was to the effect that the Collector highly neglected his duty. He was bound to set forth in that answer that the Andiparam people had agreed to the excavation of the new channel, as is shown to have been the case.

I think the Ground Collector showed be directed to explain his omission for the consequences of the High Court's judgment if against the Govt. Solicitor, will be most embarrassing & require first explanation & perhaps steps to have cleared up.

22 July

Ed. J. H. Burns

Judicial Department.

3

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following
letter from the Collector of
Salem
dated Cutcherry 1st July 1865 No. 171

Order thereon 26 July 1865 No. 1026.

It appears from the
Explanation now afforded
by the Government Vakeel
of Salem that his pre-
-decessor, Gholam Hussain,
who is dead, was the
person immediately responsible
for the neglect which
Government imputed to
him in their order of the
30th May.

The

Ed. J. H. Burns

2. The Government desire the Collector of Salem to Explain his omission, when requested to file an answer in the suit, to set forth in that answer that the Andapuram people had agreed to the cutting of the new channel, as is now shown to have been the case.

Chs.

To the Coll of Salem. 3
Public Works Depart 3 Dec 1917

Judicial (1865. Department.

No. 1046

PROCEEDINGS OF GOVERNMENT.

~~Feb 1769~~ 2127.

Dated 26 July 1865.

Pro. 215-16
30/5/65

199-200.