

16736/24/79

B/12/24 RH

2306/R1/59

22.1.20.

Go 617 Bui 12.3.1888.

Recd 12/12/78

13/74 13314 RH
RR

CON FDL-610

Seet. I (1)-L-10,006-7-10-70.

- (1) Number of pages 18
(2) Date of repair _____
(3) Initials of the Referencer _____

TAMIL NADU ARCHIVES

GOVERNMENT OF TAMIL NADU

JUDL DEPARTMENT

CON FDL-610

G.O. No.
B.P. No.

617

Press
Mis.

Dated

12-3-1888 187.

Not to be folded or roughly handled

BS

617
Revenue Board Office...
Land Revenue,
dated 24th February 1900.

From

J. H. Garsin Esquire C.S.I.

2nd Division, Board of Revenue.

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Judicial Department.

Sir,

I have the honor to enclose the bill of costs, as between attorney and client, presented to me only two days ago, by my solicitors, Messrs Barclay and Morgan, in connection with the suit for alleged defamation filed against me by P. Kobasami Dewan of Madura and to request that the amount Rs 129-12-0 may be ordered to be paid to me, as I have settled the account myself.

2. The Government will, no doubt, remember that when the suit was called on for hearing an absurd application was made to adjourn it for 6 months, which was at once refused and that then the suit was dismissed with costs without my having to appear at all. The whole of costs, as between party and party, have, I understand, been levied from the plaintiff.

The costs were the
costs of my
giving to the

plaintiff. but the bill now submitted is for those
costs which my solicitors inform me they could not
yet allow on taxation.

3. I should have applied to Government to defend
the suit at the public cost from the very beginning,
seeing that the act which constituted the alleged
defamation was done by me in my public capacity
as a Member of the Council of Wardens and Con-
jointly with my Colleague, the Honorable Mr
Mr. Whitelocke, had it not been that my solicitors
strongly urged me not to do so, because they feared
that if the case came on for hearing and it was
elicited that the case was being defended by Government,
it would only give occasion to Mr. Eardley Norton,
Plaintiff's Counsel, to say that the Government
were making a personal matter of it and to throw dirt
at the Government. I wish that this will be no
bar to the costs being now paid by Government.

I have the honor to be

Sir,

Your Obedient Servant.

J. H. G. G. G.

2nd Decr. 1841. B. G. G. G.

617

2

617

Timing of 20 July 1887

Confidential

Judicial (1888) Department.

C No 976

For order.

see
29/2. H.C.
1 Mar

The Chief Secretary
to Government
Judicial Department.

10/24th February 1888.

The matter does not at all turn on the proceedings of the 20th July when the suit was dismissed, but on the nature of the suit. It may be correct that the claim may be considered now upon the same footing as one made at the outset that the suit is one in which the defendant has to pay costs, but in either case Mr. Farwell has to satisfy us that this was such a suit. All he says is that "the act which constituted the alleged defamation was done by him in his public capacity and jointly with his colleagues". Without a full copy of the pleadings we cannot say how this was, my impression was that Mr. Farwell's private opinion was more or less mixed up.

P.H.
2 March

Requesting sanction of Govt
for payment of costs incurred by
J. H. Garshi Esq. C.S.D. in
connection with the suit for alleged
defamation filed by P. K. Vasani
Jnan of Madras.

Over

To H.C. 1/3/88

By 3/3/88

My dear Garstin,
With reference to your confidential letter dated 27. Febr 88, I am to say that the Govt. desire to see the Pleadings in the case, and to request that you will forward a copy of the Plaintiff's answer, as you doubtless have by you, for perusal.

Yours sincerely

J.E.

sep
5/3

J. H. Garstin Esq. C.S. J. Secy
5/3/88

Revenue Board Office,
(Land Revenue),
MADRAS.

6/3 1888

My dear Mr. Ker.

Yr. S. O. of

Yesterday.

I have not a copy of the Plaintiff's answer by me. I have written to my Solicitor to let me see their copies & will forward them on receipt of your drawing.
J. H. Garstin

617
6
Revenue Board Office,
(Land Revenue),
MADRAS,

6/3 1880.

CHIEF SECRETARY
6 MAR 88
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

My dear Mr. K.

Herewith I
send the originals of the
pleas & move the
Court from my solicitor.
Will you kindly return
them to me as soon as

you can
Yours sincerely
J. H. Gault

[9]

DEPARTMENT

D.O. 46.

From

J. H. Garstin Esq. C.S. 2.

San Francisco
Rt. Hon. Mr. Justice

Submitted to H.M. with reference to his
Note dated 9th March.

sep H.C.
6/3 7 Mar.

Mr. G. Garstin Esq.

Mr.

9/12/98, li. 617

This is perhaps a somewhat
doubtful matter but the
sum demanded is small - in
view of what Mr. Garstin states
at the end of his former letter
we may I think accept the
liability limited to Rs. 129/12/-
sanction payment acc^y

From order. P.H.
sep 8 Mar

100 10 Mar
12 Mar.

Return to Mr. G.

J. H. Garstin Esq. C.S. 2.

into papers

7/3 R 8/3 Mr. Garstin Esq. 7/3/98

No.

Dated 6th

Received 6th

} March 1898

Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Forwarding plaint &

Answers in his case.

I
13/3

[7]

ORDINARY, MS.

<i>Full</i>	DEPARTMENT.
G.O., DATED <i>12 March 1889</i>	
No. <i>617</i>	

When given for copying *12/3*

[Despatch Abstract.]

*Mr. Garstin - Costs in the
deformation unit brought against
him of Kolarismani Term. Sanat*

Confidential

(9 Shubs)

P. 10. 15. 8