

MADRAS RECORD OFFICE.

Government of Madras.

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

G.O. No.	314	Press
		~~Mis~~
Dated	27-2-1867	

247-248

a/g

Not to be folded or roughly handled

Read the following papers :—

No. 217. From Brigadier General G. DeSAUSMAREZ, Commanding Malabar and Canara, to the Adjutant General, Bangalore; dated Cannanore, 14th December 1866, No. 221.

I have the honor to request you will bring to the notice of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief, that summonses have been served almost simultaneously upon three Officers belonging to Regiments of this Garrison for alleged debts of less than 400 Rupees, in violation of the provisions of Section 98 of the Mutiny Act.

2. Of these summonses, two issued from the Court of Small Causes at Madras against Lieutenant Gunthorpe and Weston, 40th Regiment N. I., and the third from that at Calicut, against Lieutenant Tremenhcere, Her Majesty's 102nd Regiment R. M. F., the whole for debts stated to have been respectively incurred by those Officers whilst resident and serving at Cannanore.

3. The two Madras summonses were forwarded to me by the Civil Judge at Tellicherry, with a request that I would cause them to be served on the Officers respectively named in them, and as they were simply preliminary, and not of immediate action of personal arrest or distraint of property, I deemed it right to comply with the requisition, although the documents bore evidence within themselves that the Court from which they issued had no jurisdiction in the matter.

4. I addressed the Civil Judge, however, in reply on the subject, and informing him of my compliance with his requisition; stated my objection to the procedure, (in which, from his reply it will be seen, he is disposed to concur); and requested him to bring the matter to the notice of the Judge of the Small Cause Court at Madras, from where he had received the summonses.

5. In Lieutenant Tremenhcere's case the summons, though for a debt for house-rent incurred here, was served direct upon him at Calicut, where he is serving on Detachment duty; this was reported to me by the Officer Commanding his Regiment, with a request for my interference. The case was to be called up on Monday, and with what result I am not informed; but he was instructed to plead "no jurisdiction," and I addressed the Judge of the Calicut Court of Small Causes, requesting that on that ground he would stay proceedings.

6. Subsequently to my taking action in these matters as detailed above, I have received a letter from the Judge Advocate General, to whom I had telegraphed for advice, and I find that in his opinion, if I apprehend him rightly, even a warrant of arrest or distraint under whatever circumstances, if served by a Court of Justice, should be carried into effect.

7. As such a step might not only be attended with great detriment to the Public Service, as well as with serious injury and loss to the parties so arrested, and with apparent heavy responsibility to the Officer carrying it into effect, should the warrants prove illegal, I have the honor to lay the subject before his Excellency the Commander-in-Chief and solicit instructions for future guidance.

8. In respect of the Madras summonses, the Officers concerned are prepared with funds to pay the required sum in Court, should their plea of "no jurisdiction" not be admitted; but in Lieutenant Tremenhcere's case, unless the proceedings are stayed it may proceed to judgment, and arrest or distraint probably

follow. The summonses are not at present in Cannanore, but copies will be procured and forwarded as soon as possible.

No. 1162.

HEAD QUARTERS, MYSORE DIVISION,
BANGALORE, 18th December 1866.

(Signed) F. P. HAINES, Major General,
Commanding Mysore Division.

From Lieutenant G. H. W. TREMENHEERE, 102nd Regiment, to the Adjutant, Her Majesty's 102nd Regiment; dated Calicut, 3rd December 1866.

I have the honor to request that you will be good enough to forward this report of a summons which has been served on me, and which I consider illegal, in order that steps may be, if possible, taken by the Brigadier for putting a stop to further proceedings. I, a few days ago, received a summons to attend the Small Cause Court here on the 10th of the present month to answer a claim of Rupees 185, the plaintiff being one Chokran Coofy, a house man, residing in Cannanore. Being an Officer, and the sum due by me being Rupees 185 only, I claim that the case should appear before a Court of Request, and that I am not under the jurisdiction of the Small Cause Court. I have the honor to state that the plaintiff has not applied for a Court of Request, neither for payment from the Regimental Paymaster, who is authorised by me to settle all claims made on me in turn. I have the honor to request that the matter may be referred, as, should the case go up before the Small Cause Court, I am quite unable to pay the amount, and the consequences would be most disastrous to me, and might result in arrest; whereas a Court of Request would allow the amount due to be deducted from my pay in monthly instalments.

No. 1208.

MEMORANDUM.

Transferred to the Brigadier Major, Malabar and Canara, with a request that he will be good enough to solicit the Brigadier General Commanding the Provinces to take such steps as he may consider necessary, to put a stop to the proceedings of the Small Cause Court at Calicut, against Lieutenant Tremeneere, as apparently, under the 98th Section of the Mutiny Act, he is not amenable to the jurisdiction of the Court referred to.

CANNANORE,
5th December 1866.

(Signed) J. B. SPURGIN, Colonel,
Commanding 102nd Regiment.

From Brigadier General G. DeSAUSMAREZ, Commanding Malabar and Canara, to the Judge of the Small Cause Court, Calicut; dated Cannanore, 6th December 1866, No. 210.

It having been officially brought to my notice by the Officer Commanding 102nd Regiment R. M. F., stationed at Cannanore, that Lieutenant Tremeneere, an Officer belonging to that Regiment on detachment duty at Calicut, has received a summons to appear before the Court of Small Causes of that city in a suit entered against him by a resident at Cannanore, for a debt of less than 400 Rupees contracted here, and requesting my interference under the provisions of Section 98 of (the Mutiny Act) Cap. XI, Act XXVIII Victoria Regina, I have the honor to bring the same to your notice, and to request you will be pleased to stay proceedings accordingly.

No. 873.

TO THE OFFICER COMMANDING,

Her Majesty's 102nd Regiment, Cannanore.

Who is requested to be good enough to obtain and forward to this Office copy of summons that was issued against Lieutenant Tremeneere by the Small Cause Court, Calicut, as it is required for a reference to be made to Head Quarters.

(By Order.)

CANNANORE,
10th December 1866.

(Signed) G. A. ARBUTHNOT, Captain,
Brigade Major of Malabar and Canara.

No. 877.

TO THE OFFICER COMMANDING,

Her Majesty's 102nd Regiment, Cannanore.

With reference to this Office docket, No. 873 of yesterday's date, it is requested that it may be stated where the Officer in question was when the debt was incurred by him.

(By Order.)

CANNANORE,
11th December 1866.

(Signed) G. A. ARBUTHNOT, Captain,
Brigade Major of Malabar and Canara.

No. 483.

MEMORANDUM.

In reply to docket, No. 877, dated 11th December 1866, from the Brigade Major, Malabar and Canara, the undersigned has the honor to state, for the information of the Brigadier General Commanding the Provinces, that the Officers in question were at Cannanore when the debts were incurred by them.

CANNANORE,
13th December 1866.

(Signed) A. HERVEY, Lieutenant Colonel,
Commandant, 40th Regiment N. I.

To the Brigadier Major, Malabar and Canara, Cannanore.

(True Copies).

(Signed) G. A. ARBUTHNOT, Captain,
Brigade Major of Malabar and Canara.

From the Civil Judge of Tellicherry, to the Brigadier General DeSAUSMAREZ, Commanding Malabar and Canara, Cannanore; dated Tellicherry, 29th November 1866, No. 234.

I have the honor, under Sections 295 and 296 of the Code of Civil Procedure, to request that you will be good enough to back with your signature two summonses, in duplicate, which will be produced to you by Peruvaman Ambu Korupu, the bearer of this letter, and afford him your assistance in serving the summonses upon the parties therein mentioned, residents of the Cantonment of Cannanore.

From Brigadier General G. DeSAUSMAREZ, Commanding Malabar and Canara, to the Civil Judge, Tellicherry; dated Cannanore, 1st December 1866, No. 201.

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter, No. 234 of 29th November 1866, which has reached me this morning, and to inform you that, on your requisition, I have backed the two summonses (in duplicate) for service upon the two Military Officers named respectively in those documents.

2. I think it my duty, however, to bring it to your notice that I am unaware of any precedent for a similar course, and that in my opinion the Small Cause Court of Madras (as indeed any other Civil Court) is debarred from action on a suit for the sums in question by the 98th Section of the Mutiny Act, such suits against Officers being cognizable by Military Courts of Request alone.

3. I shall feel obliged by your informing me whether you concur in the above view, and should you see fit by your bringing my objection to the procedure in question to the notice of the Judge of the Court from which the summonses were issued.

From the Civil Judge of Tellicherry, to Brigadier General G. DeSAUSMAREZ, Commanding Malabar and Canara, Cannanore; dated Tellicherry, 4th December 1866, No. 228.

With reference to your letter of the 1st instant, No. 201, I have the honor to state that the summonses alluded to in your letter were forwarded to, and received by me from the Madras Court of Small Causes, under Section 29, Act IX of 1850.

2. The parties named in the summonses being residents within the limits of the Military Cantonment of Cannanore, the proper course for me to adopt, according to law, was to request, as I did by my letter of the 29th ultimo, No. 234, your assistance in getting the above summonses served.

3. It would be quite without my province, in forwarding on such *preliminary* processes in a suit, to call into question the jurisdiction of the Court issuing such processes.

4. Exceptions to jurisdiction should, in all ordinary cases, be taken either in person or by attorney by the parties immediately affected.

5. On a "*prima facie*" view of the particular case under consideration, I am inclined to concur generally in the views expressed at para. 2 of your letter under reply, and in this I am supported by the principle enunciated in a recent ruling of the High Court of Judicature at Madras. (Referred Case No. 14 of 1865 Scotland C. J. and Holloway J.).

6. At the same time I must observe, that there *may* be circumstances connected with the *cause of action* which would give jurisdiction where ordinarily it would not exist, and it would be for the Court, to whose jurisdiction exception is taken upon the motion of the party affected, to determine as a point in the suit whether it had jurisdiction or not.

No. 4417.

MEMORANDUM.

Referred for the opinion of the Judge Advocate General.

(To be returned.)

(By Order.)

(Signed) T. C. LONGCROFT, Lieut. Col.,
Offg. Asst. Adjutant General

No. 15.

MEMORANDUM.

The Judge Advocate General has the honor to return the papers received with the Memoranda A. G., No. 4417 of 21st December 1866, and No. 20 of 3rd January 1867, with reference to summonses issued by the Madras Court of Small Causes against Lieutenant G. E. Weston and E. J. Gunthorpe of 40th Regiment N. I., and by the Principal Sudder Ameen's Court at Calicut, against Lieutenant Tremenhoe, 102nd Foot.

2. In the first case of the Madras Court of Small Causes, established by Act IX of 1850, the only jurisdiction it could possibly assume over Lieutenants Weston and Gunthorpe, the demands being within Rupees 500 each, is that

given by the 28th Section of the Act, that those Officers dwell within the local limits of its jurisdiction, fixed by Section 5, within the Town of Madras, at the time of bringing the action; or did so dwell therein at the time when the cause of action arose; or within six months before the time of bringing the action, for causes of action which arose within the same time.

3. But the Officer Commanding Malabar and Canara declares the debts were incurred by those Officers whilst residing and serving in the Cantonment of Cannanore, where they still are, and which is not within the local jurisdiction established by the Act for the Madras Court of Small Causes; and there has been no proclamation since, extending the local limits of its jurisdiction to Military Cantonments beyond the Town of Madras.

4. The summonses are dated 2nd November 1866, and set forth that the demands are for goods sold and delivered to Lieutenant Weston, between 9th December 1865 and 7th February 1866, for Rupees 196; and to Lieutenant Gunthorpe, between the 16th October 1865 and 5th March 1866, for Rupees 213, during which periods those Officers belonged, and still do, to the Madras Army.

5. The Mutiny Act for 1865, in force at the time the summonses were issued by the Madras Court of Small Causes, Section 98 enacts, that in all places in India where any body of Her Majesty's forces may be serving beyond the jurisdiction of the Courts of Request, or other Courts for enforcing small demands, established at the cities of Calcutta, Madras, or Bombay, actions of debt and all personal actions against Officers or other persons amenable to its provisions not being Soldiers, "shall be cognizable before a Court of Requests composed of Military Officers, and not elsewhere, provided the value in question shall not exceed four hundred Rupees, and that the

"defendant was a person of the above description when the cause of action arose." As both these Officers come within the above provisions in every respect, they can, therefore, only be sued for debts within that amount before Military Courts of Request, and not elsewhere.

6. This point has been so decided in a case referred for the opinion of the Advocates General of Bombay and Calcutta, and noted in the Proceedings, Madras Government, Judicial Department, 25th March 1865, a copy of which by the Order thereon, No. 463, was furnished to the Judges of the Madras Court of Small Causes for their information.

7. And it has further been decided by the High Court of Madras, in referred Case No. 14 of 1865—See Reports of that Court—that "a Court of Small Causes has no jurisdiction to try an action brought against a Military Officer in a Military Cantonment, where a Court of Requests is established," under the provisions of the Mutiny Act. "It is beyond the power of the Local Legislative Council to pass an Act in any way affecting the provisions of a Statute of the Imperial Parliament."

8. This judgment was given in the case of a Court of Small Causes held under Act XI of 1865, but it is equally applicable to the Madras Court of Small Causes, held under Act IX of 1850 and Act XXVI of 1864.

9. The general object of Section 98 of the Mutiny Act for 1865 obviously is, to prevent Officers from being taken away from their Military duties at more or less distant stations, in order to defend claims of small amount brought against them elsewhere. And it at the same time protects the creditor's civil rights and remedies against any Civilian debtor who afterwards enters the Military Service. But if the debtor is in such service when the debt is incurred, the creditor knowingly gives credit to a person who may thereafter be subject, to be sued only in a Military Court of Requests. The above is very distinctly expressed in the Proceedings, Madras Government, before named, furnished to the Judges of the Madras Court of Small Causes.

10. By the indiscriminate issue of such summonses by the Madras Court of Small Causes, against Officers serving in distant stations, not only may their Military services be lost to their Regiments, but they may be put unnecessarily to the expense of either attending at the Court, or of employing an Agent to plead non-jurisdiction; all which seems easily obviated were the Judges or Officers of the Court to call on the creditor to shew that defendant was amenable to its jurisdiction before issuing the summons, thereby also saving the plaintiff from a useless expenditure of time and money.

11. In the second case of the Principal Sudder Ameen's Court at Calicut, if it acted under Act XI of 1865, in the suit of Melekandy Chokran Cooty, against Lieutenant Tremenhoe of 102nd Regiment for Rupees 185-14-5, principal and interest due as per bill of 31st March 1863; further particulars are not stated.

12. Lieutenant Tremenhoe is permanently stationed at Cannanore with his Regiment, 102nd Fusiliers, but temporarily serving with a detachment of that Regiment at Calicut, within the local jurisdiction of the Principal Sudder Ameen's Court.

13. Presuming the suit to be one cognizable under Section 6 of the Act, the Court can only claim jurisdiction under Section 8, by the defendant at the time of the commencement of the suit dwelling within the local limits of its jurisdiction.

14. Section 12 of the Act provides that nothing in the Act shall be held to take away the jurisdiction of Military Courts of Requests; and Section 49 specially provides that nothing in the Act shall be held to affect the jurisdiction of any Court of Requests convened under the Mutiny Act, or the powers of a Commanding Officer under such Statute to assemble such Courts.

15. The provisions of the Mutiny Act as to Military Courts of Requests, and the amenability of Officers to these Courts, are set forth above in paragraph 5. Lieutenant Tremenhoe, when the summons was issued against him, was serving at a place in India, where a body of Her Majesty's forces was serving, beyond the jurisdiction of the Courts of Requests, or other Courts for enforcing small demands, established at the cities of Calcutta, Madras, or Bombay, respectively, and the demand against him was for less than Rupees 400.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
27th February 1867.*

16. In referred Case No. 14 of 1863 to the High Court, Madras, it was decided that the Act for establishing Courts of Small Causes, beyond the local limits of the jurisdiction of the Supreme Courts of Judicature, did not alter or interfere with the jurisdiction of the Military Courts of Requests constituted by the Mutiny Act.

17. In referred Case No. 14 of 1865 to the High Court, Madras, it was decided that a Court of Small Causes has no jurisdiction to try an action brought against a Military Officer in a Military Cantonment, where a Court of Requests is established. It was beyond the power of the local Legislative Council to pass an Act in any way affecting the provisions of a Statute of the Imperial Parliament.

18. At the time the summons was issued there were not sufficient Officers with the Detachment at Calicut to constitute a Court of Requests under the Mutiny Act; but others could have been there sent when required for the purpose; or, as Lieutenant Tremenheere actually was attached permanently to the force stationed at Cannanore, he could have been sued in the Military Court of Requests at that station, to which he could have been recalled for the purpose, and where, it is stated, the plaintiff was residing, and the debt for house-rent was incurred.

19. Under the above decisions of the High Court, and the facts just stated, it does not appear that the Calicut Court of Small Causes had jurisdiction in the suit.

20. In the decision of the High Court of Madras, in referred Case No. 12 of 1865, where an action was brought in the Small Cause Court of Masulipatam against a Military Officer residing there, at which the only other Military persons stationed were a Staff Officer in charge of Pensioners and two Store Serjeants, it was held that the Small Cause Court had jurisdiction to try the case, the suit not being one exclusively cognizable by a Military Court of Requests under the Mutiny Act, the defendant not being in a place where a body of forces was serving. This cannot, however, affect the case at Calicut, where a body of Troops was serving temporarily detached from the garrison of Cannanore, where Military Courts of Requests are monthly convened. This case is here mentioned, as it is the only other decision with reference to Courts of Requests under the Mutiny Act, published in the Madras High Court Reports.

21. The Officer Commanding Cannanore was informed, in reply to his reference regarding the above suits, that he could not refuse to aid the Civil power in giving effect to any process issued by a Court of Justice, and for a further explanation of the subject he is referred to Sections 14, 15, and 16 of Madras Act I of 1866. He will see that there is no heavy responsibility likely to be incurred in so doing, as the Officers of the Civil Courts are sent to carry the process into effect, on whom the responsibility for any illegality will rest, and not on the Commanding Officer of the Cantonment.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S OFFICE,

FORT SAINT GEORGE,

7th January 1867.

To the Adjutant General.

(Signed) H. PRITCHARD, Colonel,
Judge Advocate General.

From Brigadier General G. DeSAUSMAREZ, Commanding Malabar and Canara, to the Adjutant General, Head Quarters, Madras; dated Cannanore, 24th December 1866, No. 232.

Adverting to the concluding paragraph of my letter, dated the 14th instant, number and subject as per margin, I have the honor to forward,

No. 221.

Bringing to the notice of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief that summonses have been served from the Small Cause Court upon Officers, and requests instructions thereon.

for the information of His Excellency the Commander-in-Chief; copies of two summonses that have been served upon Lieutenants Gunthorpe and Weston of the 40th Regiment N. I.

2. The original summons served on Lieutenant Tremenheere is also herewith forwarded.

No. 1196.

HEAD QUARTERS, MYSORE DIVISION,
BANGALORE, 28th December 1866.

(Signed) F. P. HAINES, Major Genl.,
Commanding Mysore Division.

*Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
27th February 1867.*

No. 1.
SUMMONS.

No. 18,300 of 1866.

In the Madras Court of Small Causes.

These are to command you, George Edward Weston, Lieutenant, 40th Regiment M. N. I., residing at Cannanore, personally to appear before the Judges of the Madras Court of Small Causes, at the Court House, in the second Line North Beach, on the twentieth day of December next, at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, to answer in an action of debt brought against you by E. S. Stillwell and J. B. Chalmers, trading under the Firm of Stillwell & Co., second Line Beach, Madras, for Rupees one hundred and ninety-six, according to the under-written particulars of demand, Rupees 178-8-0 due for goods sold and delivered to you between 9th December 1865 and 7th February 1866, and Rupees 17-8-0 for interest thereon.

2. Given under the Seal of this Court, this second day of November one thousand eight hundred and sixty-six.

Debt, Rupees	196	0	0
Costs	25	12	0

(Signed) D. SILAW,
Chief Clerk.

Total .. 221 12 0 Exclusive of Subpoena and Warrant of Execution Costs.

No. 1.
SUMMONS.

No. 18,301 of 1866.

In the Madras Court of Small Causes.

These are to command you, Edward James Gunthorpe, Lieutenant, 40th Regiment M. N. I., residing at Cannanore, personally to appear before the Judges of the Madras Court of Small Causes, at the Court House, in the second Line North Beach, on the twentieth day of December next, at eleven o'clock in the forenoon, to answer in an action of debt brought against you by E. S. Stillwell and J. B. Chalmers, trading under the Firm of Stillwell & Co., second Line Beach, Madras, for Rupees two hundred and thirteen, according to the under-written particulars of demand, Rupees 193 due for goods sold and delivered to you between 16th October 1865 and 5th March 1866, and Rupees 20 for interest thereon.

2. Given under the Seal of this Court, this second day of November one thousand eight hundred and sixty-six.

Debt, Rupees	213	0	0
Costs	28	2	0

(Signed) D. SHAW,
Chief Clerk.

Total... 241 2 0 Exclusive of Subpoena and Warrant of Execution Costs.

SUMMONS.

Principal Sudder Ameens' Court at Calicut.
Small Cause, No. 283 of 1866.

Melckandy Chokran Cooty by Vakil Raman Menon.....	Plaintiff.
Lieutenant Tremenheere, Her Majesty's 102nd Regiment.....	Defendant.
To Lieutenant G. H. W. TREMENHEERE, 102nd Regiment, defendant, residing in Kacherri Amshom, Calicut Taluk.	

Whereas the above-named plaintiff has instituted a suit in this Court against you, of which the particulars are hereunder specified, you are hereby summoned to appear in this Court on the tenth day of December next, at ten o'clock in the forenoon, in person or by a Pleader of the Court, duly instructed and able to answer all material questions relating to the suit, or who shall be accompanied by some other person able to answer all such questions to answer the said plaintiff, and as the day fixed for your appearance is appointed for the final disposal of the suit you must be prepared to produce all your witnesses on that day; and you are hereby required to take notice that, in default of your appearance on the day before mentioned, the suit will be heard and deter-

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
27th February 1867.

mined in your absence; and you will bring with you, or send by your Agent, any document on which you intend to rely in support of your defence.

Dated this 23rd November 1866.

(Signed) H. M.,
Sheristadar.

(Signed) K. KRISHNA MENON,
Acting Principal Sudder Ameen.

Particulars of the Claim.

L. S.

For recovery of Rupees 185-14-5, being principal and interest due as per bill dated 31st March 1866.

MEMORANDUM.

If you pay the debt and costs into Court, you will avoid further costs.

If you admit a part only of the claim, you may, by paying into Court the amount so admitted, together with costs on that amount, avoid further costs, unless the plaintiff at the hearing shall prove a claim against you exceeding the sum paid.

If judgment be given *ex parte* in default of your appearance, your body or goods will be taken in execution, unless you pay the amount of the debts and costs into Court within one week from the day on which the judgment is given.

You may obtain summons to compel the attendance of any witnesses, or the production of any books or papers you may require for defence.

If you wish to plead a set off, you must produce at the time of appearing the particulars thereof in writing, and if your defence is the Act for the limitation of suits, or discharge under the Insolvency rules, you must appear personally or show valid cause for your non-appearance.

Bring the copy of this summons with you when you come to Court.

Do not pay the amount of any Warrant of execution to any Batta Ameen or Batta Peon, without his separating in your presence the receipt from the foot of the Warrant, and giving it to you; otherwise you will be liable to pay it again.

(Signed) H. M.,
Sheristadar.

No. 20.

MEMORANDUM.

Referred for the opinion of the Judge Advocate General.

(To be returned).

(By Order).

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
FORT SAINT GEORGE,
3rd January 1867.

(Signed) J. M. PRIMROSE, Colonel,
Adjutant General.

No. 33.

MEMORANDUM.

Referred for the consideration and orders of Government, in view to such steps being taken as may appear desirable.

(By Order).

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE,
FORT SAINT GEORGE,
10th January 1867.

(Signed) J. M. PRIMROSE, Colonel,
Adjutant General.

To the Secretary to Government, Military Department.

Referred to the Judicial Department.

FORT SAINT GEORGE,
16th January 1867.

(Signed) H. MARSHALL, Major General,
Secretary to Government, M. D.

Proceedings of the Madras Government, Judicial Department,
27th February 1867.

No. 248. ORDER THEREON, 27th February 1867, No. 314.

The Governor in Council directs that copies of the Judge Advocate General's opinion, in which the Government concur, be furnished to the Judges of the Court of Small Causes at Madras, and to the Principal Sudder Ameen at Calicut,
(True Extract).

Chief Secretary.

To the Judges of the Court of Small Causes at Madras.

„ Principal Sudder Ameen at Calicut.

„ Military Department.

Exd. J. Tulloch.

Principal Sudder Ameen at Calicut. { 1/3/67

6
Judicial Department.

PROCEEDINGS of the MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

Read the following paper
from Assistant Secy. to the Judicial Department.

Here enter 10th Jan'y 1867 No 33.

From the Secy. of the Judicial Department 1867 No 311.

The Governor in Council
directs that copies of the
Judge Advocate General's
opinion in which the
Government concur be fur-
nished to the Judges of the
Court of Small Causes at
Madras and to the Prin-
cipal Sudder Ameen at
Calcutta.

JP
WON

To the Judges of the Court of Small Causes
at Madras.

— The Sudder Ameen at Calcutta.

11/3/67

7
Judicial 1867. Department.

No. 34.

PROCEEDINGS OF GOVERNMENT.

File 580.

Dated. 27th February 1867.

27. 250.