M.R.O. 1—23,000—16-10-23.

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Judicial **DEPARTMENT.**

G.O. No. 626 — Press Mis.

1885-190

Dated 26 — 4 — 19 1885

4/4

Not to be folded or roughly handled

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

No. 189. Read the following lett[illegible]jor R. M. MACDONALD, Registrar General [illegible]urances, M[illegible] the Honorable A. J. ARBUTHNOT, Chief Secretary to Go[illegible] Fort Saint George; dated Madras, 31st March 1865, No. 130.

I have the honor to submit a correspondence with the Collector of Madras in which that Officer recommends that the Salt pans of the villages noted in the margin be withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the Deputy Registrar of Ponneri, and constituted a Sub-District under the Salt Superintendent of Madras, and that the Salt pans of Vadesemanjeri, in the Sub-District of Sydapett, and the Salt pans of Covelong and Kelambakum, in the Sub-District of Chingleput, be withdrawn from the jurisdiction of the Deputy Registrars of Sydapett and Chingleput, and constituted a Sub-District under the Salt Superintendent of Home's Gardens at Sydapett.

Attipatta.
Ennore.
Vallur.
Puludivakum.
Katupalli.
Voyalur.
Kattur.

2. This recommendation is based on a petition in which some of the Salt manufacturers of the Ponneri Sub-District state that they are frequently obliged to obtain loans at Madras by mortgaging their pans; that the registrations connected with such transactions can be more conveniently registered in the Salt Superintendent's Cutcherry than at Ponneri; and that there would be much less risk of frauds in this way, as the Superintendent knows the parties and their holdings, whereas the Tahsildar does not possess this special knowledge.

3. The inconvenience seems somewhat exaggerated, as the money lenders are not the parties executing the instruments, and are therefore in no way obliged to go to Ponneri, as is stated in the petition. Nor does it seem clear why any of the parties should be detained for several days at Ponneri in consequence of the Tahsildar's absence, as in such cases the Sheristadar takes his place. With regard to fraud it may be observed that a Registering Officer has to satisfy himself that an instrument was executed by the parties by whom it purports to have been executed, but that it is not his duty to go into the validity of the transactions registered by him.

[illegible]ns anomalous that there should be a special Deputy Register Office in Madras for the registration of instruments affecting property not in the Madras District when such registration, if really necessary, can take place in my office under the provisions of Section 26 of 1864.

5. In the case of Sydapett it seems still more anomalous that there should be two Deputy Register Offices in the same place, and particularly so as regards Vadesemanjeri, which is already in the Sub-District of Sydapett.

6. I am therefore of opinion that it is not advisable to constitute additional special Sub-Districts for the convenience of the Salt manufacturers of the Chingleput District.

No. 190. ORDER THEREON, 26th April 1865, No. 626.

The Government decline to adopt the Collector's suggestion. No sufficient [illegible] for the step having been adduced, and Salt Superintendents having sufficiently onerous duties of their own to discharge.

(True Extract).

Chief Secretary.

To the Registrar General of Assurances.

Ed. R. H. Lee.

I do not think that the suggestion should be entertained - there seems no valid ground for the change proposed. Judicial Depart. No 856.

From
The Registrar General of Assurances.
Dalio 31 March 1865.

For Orders.

I am doubtful on the propriety of making the said Separation of [redacted] of such parts connected with the Northern Salt-pans of the Bandra District - but if Government decide to Grant Leases on the point - At any rate upon anticipating the measure we should know from them whether it would be [illegible] with the Sup[t] proper duties - to

for Sydney [illegible]
[illegible]
-tain of the Hannah Lucas and
[illegible]
bonds to sail to Sydney at Hornes'
foundress is in my view a
mistake & it should not be
kept up.

JP

I would agree to adopt the
Collectors' system. As to the last-clause
as Sydney appears being a unsuitable place
with the Bonds to Sydney —

WDH

20th April 1865 No 520.

The Govt decline to adopt
the Colls suggestion — no
sufficient reason for
the Bonds having been ord.
Read — and Sollr Genl
having sufficiently averred
Letter of their own to
Discharge.

JP

WDH

To the Registrar General
Assr
with the Enclosures returned desd 15/5

