

✓
Confidential No. 6
1892.

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

G.O., DATED 7-1-92.

No. 33.

Series. *Mis*

Confidential.

st copy sent to Press.

turned for signature.

DESPATCHED

spatched

7 JAN 92

IN M.S.

[Despatch Abstract.]

Police Recording letter from
the I. G. of - bringing to notice
the treatment of the - by
Mr. Tate, Joint Magistrate
of South Arcot.

READ AGAIN ORDER OF GOVERNMENT, DATED
189 , No.

BACK PAPER, No.

OF 189

FURTHER PAPER, No.

OF 189

ENCLOSURES.

Spare copies.

Struck

Issued

CURRENT No.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

ORDER, &c., OF GOVERNMENT- A.

PAPERS KEPT OUT OF FILE FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL
(not paged).

NUMBER OF COPIES
REQUIRED. { Order complete.
Letter only.
Order complete with Letter.

N.B.—

A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.
R = Print, but not for monthly volume.

No. 6731

CURRENT NO. 52
CHIEF OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,
Kurnool
Madras, 24 November 1891.

FROM

Colonel L. A. Porten

INSPECTOR GENERAL OF POLICE,

TO

THE

Chief Secretary

to Government

Fort Saint George

SIR,

Enclosures 5

I have the honor to forward, for such
notice as the Government considers
necessary, a report (with enclosures) from
the Superintendent of Police, South Arcot
setting forth the harsh treatment experienced
by his Police at the hands of Mr. Sale
Joint Magistrate of that District—

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Yours most obedt. Servt.

W. H. Porten Colonel

Inspector General of Police

mk

FROM

Col C. A. Perkins

INSPECTOR GENERAL

OF POLICE.

No.

Dated

Received

November 1891.

No.

26 NOV 91
SUBJECT: [illegible]

I enclose a report with
enclosures from the Subot
of P. H. C., South Arcot,
bringing to notice the ^{harsh} treat-
ment experienced by ^{his} Police
at the hands of Mr. Sate,
J. Magistrate of that
District—

In view

The judgments of the original & appellate Courts in the case in which harayanaswami hainar was fined Rs. 200 for ^{in contempt of the Court} ~~in contempt of the Court~~ ^(Union Govt. judgment says in writing not in fact) ~~for~~ ^{for} ~~the~~ have not been submitted nor has the judgment of the original Court in the case in which the Inspector's wife was fined Rs. 200 for refusing to answer a question. If Huns consider it necessary they will be sent for.

Mr. Tate appears to have asked in
a business letter wanting in judgment
if Mr. Galt intended to take any
notice of the matter Mr. T. should
be submitted be called upon
to offer such explanation as he
may have. 29 Dec -

I am not clear that it is necessary
that Gov^t should interfere at all.
Even the Engl^l admits that the trading
of the poles was altogether unexped-
ient in connection with the
law, and Mr. Latie's sentences in this
certainly were proportionate. Hence
this even points out
how del. uside; I think I would
simply send the papers.

~~24.8~~ 17/12/91 u.d.

Co. order 7 Janry 92 N^o 32

Recorded

(Emoryus)

15/12
 Lt. J. G. P. J. J.
 (with 5 (five) enclosures)
 20/12

returned 73014540