

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	6044	Press ~~Mis.~~
Dated	26 6 1867.	

Not to be folded or roughly handled

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
26th June 1867.*

No. 245. Read the following letter from the Registrar General of Assurances, Madras, to the Chief Secretary to Government, Fort Saint George; dated Madras, 8th June 1867, No. 74.

I have the honor, at the request of the Registrar of Madras, to submit the accompanying letter of the 29th May, with reference to the Government Order, No. 818, of the 18th May.

2. If an instrument is presented with a Schedule, and it is found that the description of parcels is nevertheless incomplete, it does not appear to me that there is any objection to the addition of a second Schedule.

3. I believe Mr. Ferrand has been always most ready to afford any information that is asked for, and when the Act first came into operation he took special care to make known the existence of Rule 59, and made his clerks assist ignorant persons in the preparation of their Schedules.

From J. G. FERRAND, Esq., Registrar of Assurances, Madras, to the Registrar General of Assurances; dated Madras, 29th May 1867.

With reference to paragraph 2 of the Judicial Order of Government, dated 18th May 1867,*

* Inferring from paragraph 5 of Registrar General's letter of 1st April 1867, that the information necessary for the registration of the Freehold Certificate therein referred to may be easily supplied by a Schedule, and remarking that this should have been stated by the Registrar of Madras in his letter to the Deputy Collector, and the delay which has been occasioned in the registration of the certificate obviated.

No. 818, I beg you will have the goodness to submit the following explanation to Government, as I do not consider it just that I should be in any degree blamed for the delay which has occurred in the registration of the Freehold Certificate therein alluded to.

2. The certificate when received by me already contained a Schedule intended for the very purpose of describing the property, and I should have considered it a most singular mode of conveyancing to have two Schedules for one property. I could not, therefore, have expressed an opinion contrary to my views.

3. Besides this, I submit that I should have exceeded my duty as a Registering Officer, if I had volunteered a suggestion how the description in the certificate might be completed. I am always prepared to give information when it is desired; but, in this case, it may be seen that the Board of Revenue had the rules before them (I referred to paragraph 57 in my letter to the Deputy Collector, and the one allowing a Schedule to be appended is the next but one following that) and yet did not authorize a Schedule to be added to the certificate. It seems hardly right, therefore, that I should be blamed for not suggesting a course which the Board of Revenue did not feel themselves called upon to adopt.

4. Under existing circumstances, I take the liberty of stating that what appears to me to be necessary is, that the information needed in the Freehold Certificate should be added to the present Schedule, the addition being attested by the Secretary to Government in the Revenue Department, and the person claiming under the certificate. It will be further necessary that the same course should be pursued with all other Freehold Certificates already executed, and that the Officer filling up the Schedules hereafter should attend to Section 21 of the Registration Act, and Clause 57 of the Rules.

No. 246. ORDER THEREON, 26th June 1867, No. 1014.

Communicated to the Revenue Department, with reference to G. O. of the 18th ultimo, No. 818.

(True Extract).

Acting Chief Secretary.

To the Revenue Department.

Exd. J. Tulloch.

26 June 1867 R: 104

communicated to the
Revenue Department
with reference to G. O.
of the 18th ultimo - R. 818.

RM

1867
11/10/67

To the Revenue Department 1867