

CONFIDENTIAL.

[G.]
[11.]
200-7-9-96.

Judicial(1895) Department.

ORDINARY *Mis*

G.O., No. 2440

Confidential No 175

DATED 26-11-95

[Despatch Abstract.]

Mr. W. C. Holmes. J. C. S.

Informing — that no formal inquiry at which his presence will be required will take place as regards his efficiency for judicial work and that orders on his case will be communicated to him as soon as they are passed.

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	168	Cau	1895				

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.

CURRENT NO 54

District Court,
South Canara, 15th November 1895.

FROM

W. C. Holmes Esquire, B. A., I. C. S.,

District and Sessions Judge,

South Canara.

To

The Chief Secretary to the

Government of Madras.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of the proceedings of Government No. 2231 Judicial dated 4th Instant (with its enclosures) calling for any explanation or remarks I may wish to offer on the letter of the Acting Registrar of the High Court to you dated 14th Ultimo No. 2878.

2. The Honourable Judges of the High Court suggest that it would be advisable to employ me after my return from furlough in some Department other than the Judicial. I greatly regret that the Honourable Judges wish that I should leave the Judicial Department. The work of the Judicial Department is work in which I take, and have, for many years, taken the deepest interest. Before I came to India I joined one of the Inns of Court and have kept all my terms except one—some before I came to India and some during my last furlough—I have passed the necessary examinations and hope to be called to the bar on the first occasion I am in London. Ever since I came to India, I have looked forward to being a District Judge, and since I was first appointed to such a post between 5 and 6 years ago I have found the work to be exactly the work I could most wish to do. It is work that gives me the keenest pleasure, and is to me work the mere performance of which is its chief reward. Such being my love (for the expression is not too strong) for the work I am now employed on, it will be understood how keenly I feel the suggestion of the High Court that I should not return to it.

3. If I were myself aware of any inaptitude for dealing with judicial work I should not hesitate to admit it. I sometimes, it is true, have found the work that came before me exceedingly difficult, but I do not attribute that to any inaptitude on my part in dealing with the work, but to the difficult nature of the work itself. I think the real reason for cases sometimes seeming so difficult to me is that I go so thoroughly into them that difficulties present themselves that would not be otherwise apparent.

How I did my judicial work during the 4½ years I have been in this Court can, to a certain extent, be inferred from the statistics showing the number of appealable cases I decided, the decrees which were appealed against, and the result of the appeals.

Out of 82 regular suits disposed of by me appeals were presented in 5 cases. In 3 appeals my decisions were confirmed, and 2 appeals are still pending in the High Court. The suits no doubt were in the majority of cases simple. But that there should have been so few appeals from my decisions and that those few should have been so far unsuccessful shows, I submit, that my work was satisfactorily done.

I now turn to Civil Miscellaneous Appeals. I find that in these cases I gave, since I came to this Court, 88 appealable decisions. Against 21 of my decisions appeals were preferred. The 21 appeals that were preferred resulted in my decisions being confirmed in 16 cases, reversed in 4 and remanded in 1. These Miscellaneous Civil Appeals were often very complicated and difficult, and that out of 21 appeals disposed of only 4 should have been reversed and 1 remanded is a result which I think is not unsatisfactory.

The most important civil judicial work in the Court is the disposal of Regular Appeals. Of Regular Appeals, I find that since I came to Mangalore I disposed of 637 against which a Second Appeal lay. Second Appeals were presented up to this time so far as we know in this office against 181 of those 637 decisions. Out of 151 appeals already decided my decisions were upheld in 117. In 13 cases (4 of which were connected) the decrees were modified. In 10 they were reversed; and in 11 the suits were remanded.

The regular appeals that come up for disposal in this district are generally difficult. This I believe is the general opinion among persons in a position to judge, and it is borne out by the number of decisions from cases from this district that appear in the law reports. This being so, considering that in nearly 72 per cent. of such decisions of mine no 2nd appeal at all was preferred, and that out of 151 cases disposed of I was found right in 117, and my decisions only reversed, varied, or remanded in 34, I think the figures show that my work was satisfactory. Assuming that in the 30 cases still pending before the High Court a proportionate number of my decisions will be confirmed, the result will be that out of 637 Regular Appeals against which a 2nd appeal lay disposed of by me 93.7 per cent. will have been either accepted by the parties or confirmed by the High Court and only in 6.3 per cent. will any alteration in my decisions have been made.

I find that I passed 808 orders on Miscellaneous Petitions that were liable to appeal. Four orders were appealed against; one was confirmed, two were compromised in the High Court; and in one case there was a remand.

There were about 1,500 judgments and orders of mine which, though not open to appeal, were subject to revision by the High Court. Only six revision applications were presented, and in all cases my judgments or orders were supported.

I do not think the figures I have given can be held to show an inaptitude for judicial work. The number of my judgments and orders that have been interfered with by the High Court, either in appeal or by way of revision, is only a small fraction

of the total, and it must be remembered that the work of this Court is often difficult and complicated, that at first I was new to the peculiar customs of the West Coast, and that when I first joined the Court, owing to the work of the Court being heavily in arrears, I had to work at high pressure. Civil Appeals (Regular and Miscellaneous) form the chief part of the civil work of the Court. Shortly after I joined the Court, I find that on the file of the District Court and Sub-Court (in this matter the work of the two Courts must be taken together) there were 526 Civil Appeals pending. That is to say, there was considerably over a year's work in arrears. On the first day of this year, the number was 194. This result was greatly due to the excellent work done by my Sub-Judge Mr. O. Chendu Menon, but I contributed to the result by disposing of 971 Civil Appeals in the time. I may also be pardoned if I state that the way I got through the work was by commencing almost daily at 7 O'clock in the morning and continuing with short intervals for dressing and meals till 5 and sometimes 6 in the evening. Since the beginning of the year the number of appeals pending has risen by about one hundred. This is due to heavy Sessions work, to my ill health, and to Mr. Chendu Menon's illness.

I think I am entitled to submit that the figures I have given show that I had a thorough knowledge of the facts of the various cases that came before me and that I applied to them sound principles of law.

I find that 122 Sessions Cases were disposed of by me since I came to Mangalore. Out of these, in 71 there were convictions, in 37 acquittals, and 14 were withdrawn. In one case I disagreed with the verdict of the Jury who found the accused guilty and on a reference by me the High Court set him at liberty. Out of the 71 cases in which there were convictions in 42 cases there were appeals of which the result is known in this office. 26 of the appeals were dismissed. In 8 the sentence was varied, in 7 the decision reversed wholly and in 1 as to some appellants. The High Court in revision enhanced the sentence in 4 cases, and released the prisoner in 1. Of the 37 acquittals 1 was appealed against and another was taken up by the High Court *suo motu*, and in both cases a retrial was ordered. One appeal against an order allowing a withdrawal was dismissed.

The following table will show how the work I did compared with the general work of the Sessions Courts of the Presidency for the last 3 years of which I have the figures.

	Average for the Presidency.			My work for 4½ years.
	1891.	1892.	1893.	
Confirmed . . .	62	58	71.4	62
Varied	21.6	17.4	16.	19
Reversed . . .	12.16	18.8	9.5	16.7
Reversed and re- manded }	1.6	.8	1.7	..
Confirmed as re- gards some appellants }	.9	5.	1.4	2.3
Total . .	<u>99.7</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>	<u>100</u>

I think these figures show that my Sessions work is not far from the average for the presidency. What I am absolutely positive of is this, that my decision in each case was arrived at after a deep and thorough examination of all the facts of the case, after a patient hearing of both sides, and after very careful thought and consideration. Others may differ from the opinions I formed, but I think it must be allowed that I had unusual opportunities of forming my opinions, and considering the amount of labor and thought I bestowed on the cases that came before me, I think my opinions are entitled to great weight. I may be allowed to add that deficiencies in criminal work in this country are in my opinion greatly due to grave defects in our rules of procedure.

4. With regard to the specific instances in which the High Court were dissatisfied with my work, and which they brought to the notice of Government, they are, if I understand them correctly:—

1. that two cases were unnecessarily protracted, and,
2. that irrelevant matter was admitted in evidence in them.

5. With regard to the first of these, the principal reason the cases took so long was that they were very important, and, in my opinion, equally difficult, and an exhaustive and thorough investigation of the facts was necessary. The cases followed one another, and they unfortunately began at a time of the year when they could be grappled with with the least amount of vigor. In this district owing to the recess being generally taken rather early, on account of communication being cut off in the monsoon, there is a long stretch of seven months' continuous work between the opening of the Court after the recess and the Xmas holidays. I can speak from five years' experience of those long stretches of work, and I know how exhausted one gets towards the close of them. It was towards the end of this stretch of work last year that these heavy cases began, and as I said it was at a time when they could be grappled with with the least amount of vigor. The defence was conducted by Rau Bahadur N. Shiva Rau the leader of the local bar in South Canara. Mr. Shiva Rau is a Vakil of long experience, and of great ability. His ability is equalled by a deliberateness and a tendency to make exhaustive and minute examinations of facts that lead to the cases he is engaged in often being protracted. There were some special reasons for Case No. 33 of 1894 occupying the time it did. One was that at the early part of the trial, one of my children was born, and that event and the subsequent state of my wife's health necessitated my being absent from Court for a considerable number of hours that would otherwise have been devoted to the case. If I recollect rightly the case was also delayed owing to the unavoidable absence of some of the assessors on some days, but I cannot speak positively about that now from memory, and I have not got the records. Case 38 of 1894 was most protracted, and I unfortunately suffered seriously in my health in consequence; but I do not think I could have prevented it. I sent an explanation to the High Court for the delay, and with reference to other matters connected with the case, and I hoped I had satisfactorily

explained all that the High Court had complained of. I beg to append a copy of my letter. I am informed on good authority, though I have not been able to verify the statement, that there have been instances in this Court of cases occupying as long or nearly as long as Case No. 38 of 1894 did, in the time of Mr. J. G. Thompson, in the time of Mr. Walhouse, in the time of Mr. Best, and in the time of Mr. Tate. I am also informed, on good authority, that even in a Civil Case in this Court (*Coelho vs. Coelho*) one witness was examined at great length—for 15 days. These facts show that protracted trials in South Canara are not unusual.

I have had a statement prepared in the Office of my Court showing the number of Sessions at which I presided since I came to Mangalore, the No. of cases for hearing and the No. of days occupied by each Sessions. I find that 122 cases were decided on an average of 2.1 days for each case, and on an average of 6.5 days for each Sessions. Considering that a large proportion of the cases that occur in this District are complicated and difficult, I do not think that these figures show that there was any undue delay in disposing of the cases that came before me. I have ascertained that Mr. W. J. Tate, during the 2 years he was Judge here, took, on an average, 2.9 days over each Sessions Case, and 7.9 days over each Sessions, and that Mr. J. W. Best in the last two years that he was here (the only period for which I have the figures) took on an average 1.7 days over each Sessions Case, and 5.9 days over each Sessions.

6. With regard to the second point it will be apparent that it is impossible that I can deal with it unless I know exactly the evidence that was considered irrelevant. I can say this that I have never known Mr. Shiva Rau ask a question without a definite object. I entirely acquit him of intentionally introducing irrelevant matter. He is a man of the world with a great deal to do, and no time to waste. He no doubt often adopts a very roundabout way of getting out of a witness what he wants, but, as he has more than once explained in Court, if he puts a question directly to a hostile witness, the witness is certain to see the object of the question and to frame his answer accordingly, so he adopts a method of wheedling what he wants out of witnesses. The method is very clever and generally successful, but slow and tedious. I think that this will explain a good deal of what at first sight would appear irrelevant matter. But it is, as I said impossible for me, except in a general way, to deal with the subject unless I know specifically what is considered irrelevant. It must be remembered that it is a very much more easy matter to decide on relevancy or the contrary after a case is finished, than on the spur of the moment when the question is put. It must also be remembered that a fact may appear irrelevant standing by itself, but when taken in conjunction with other facts, it would be found perfectly relevant, and to understand the relevancy of any particular fact, it is often necessary to have an extremely minute knowledge of a number of other facts connected with the case, and I do not think, I am saying anything disrespectful to any Appellate Court if I say that in a long and complicated case an Appellate Court often cannot have the necessary knowledge unless its attention were particularly directed to the special combination of facts in question. It also often happens that a lawyer

brings out one fact and fails to elicit the rest of the combination of facts which would make that one fact relevant, and that one fact standing alone would appear and indeed would be irrelevant, but it would be nevertheless illegal to prevent its being put on the record. I do not think I can say much more about the charge of admitting irrelevant matter. A minute acquaintance with the facts of the case would be necessary before such a charge could be shown to be unfounded, and I think it would be almost practically impossible in any case to deal with such a charge on paper. Whether a fact is relevant or not would be to a great extent a matter for argument, and the argument on each particular item of alleged irrelevant matter might not be very short when the question whether a Judge is to hold office or not is at stake. All I can say now is that I do not admit I was wrong, and that I am prepared to meet if called upon, and if I find I can, any specific charges that may be brought against me.

7. Possibly it would not be practicable to hold an enquiry, and an enquiry to be of the least value to me would require to be thorough. For over 12 months, I have not been in my usual health. I received a great shock at the time of Mr. Levy's death, which for some days completely unnerved me, and since then I have had a great domestic affliction in the death of one of my children; I have recently felt the strain of work very much and I have had to apply for furlough at an unsuitable time of the year. An enquiry would entail on me a great strain, and might not impossibly, if held now, render me unsuited for Judicial or any kind of work. On the other hand unless I could satisfy the High Court and Government that my work has been satisfactory, I should be serving in India, if I returned, under the great disadvantage of not possessing the confidence of my superiors. Under these circumstances, unless my present explanation is accepted as satisfactory, I feel that it is better for me to respectfully and humbly beg that I may be granted a pension proportionate to my length of actual service in India, and that I may be allowed to resign the Service.

8. My passage was taken some time ago for Marseilles by the P. & O. S. S. "Caledonia" leaving Bombay on the 14th December, and I should be greatly obliged by your informing me as soon as possible by wire, whether I should cancel my passage and remain in India or whether I can proceed to Europe. Should Government or the High Court wish that I should give any personal explanation I shall be glad to go to Madras to give it.

9. I return the enclosures of the proceedings under reply, and I am leaving in the Office of this Court statements showing how the figures given in this letter were arrived at, so that, if necessary, my figures can be verified.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant,

W. B. Holmes

District and Sessions Judge.

The High Court passed no order on this explanation but addressed Govt. on the subject in its letter in G.O. 2231 24.11.95 (vide para 2. of Court. No. 1263.)

(COPY)

No. 963.

*Sessions Court, South Canara,
Mangalore,
25th September 1895.*

FROM

The Sessions Judge,
South Canara.

To

The Registrar of the
High Court of Judicature,
Appellate Side,
Madras.

Sir,

** This is frogs. about
3. case 38. in 90.
1231 J.
A. 11. 95*

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the High Court Proceedings, No. 1812, dated 16th instant, and to say that there are some matters which I would respectfully wish to lay before the Honourable Judges of the High Court.

2. With regard to the 2nd paragraph of the Proceedings, I can assure their Lordships that there was not a single adjournment given in the case, that could have been avoided. The case began on Wednesday, the 12th December and was continued from day to day till Thursday, the 20th December. It was not taken up on Friday the 21st December as that was the last day before the holidays and the last working day of the year, and there was a good deal of other work that required to be attended to. From Saturday, the 22nd December to Saturday the 5th January, the Court was closed on account of public holidays and the case was taken up on the reopening of the Court on Monday, the 7th January, and was continued from day to day till Friday the 11th January. Saturday the 12th January was a general public holiday on account of Pongul, and Monday the 14th January was a general Hindu holiday authorized by the Rules of Practice, page 78 and since by G. O. No. 126, Public, dated 19th February 1895, and it was impossible to take the case on those days as two of the Assessors and the defence Vakils and indeed almost every one engaged in the case were Hindus. The case was, therefore, adjourned to Tuesday the 15th January, and from that day the case continued from day to day to Friday the 18th January. The 19th was a public holiday. The case was taken up the next Court day, namely, Monday the 21st January, and was continued from day to day for 11 days till Friday, the 1st February. On Saturday, the 2nd February one of the Assessors was unable to attend as it was an important local holiday for Hindus of the class to which he belonged. The case was taken up on

Monday, the 4th February, and continued from day to day for 10 days till Friday the 15th February. Saturday, the 16th February, was a public holiday. The case was taken up on Monday, the 18th February and continued from day to day till the 22nd February. The 23rd was an authorized Hindu Holiday (Shivarathri) and the case was not taken up. The case was taken up again on Monday the 25th, and on Tuesday the 26th. On Wednesday the case could not be taken up as it was a holiday for Mahomedans, and one of the Assessors, who was a Mahomedan, could not attend. The case was taken up on Thursday the 28th and continued from day to day till the 2nd March, when the Assessors gave their opinion.

The following statement will show in a tabular form the number of working days in each week from the date of the commencement of the trial till the 2nd March, the number of days on which the case was taken up, and the reason for the case not being taken up, when it was not taken up on every working day in each week:—

No. of the week.	Actual working days.	No. of days in which the case was taken up.	REMARKS.
1st	4	4	
2nd	5	4	The last working day of the year had to be devoted to other work.
3rd	5	5	
4th	5	4	One day was a Hindu Holiday.
5th	6	6	
6th	6	5	One day was a Hindu Holiday.
7th	6	6	
8th	5	5	
9th	6	5	One day was a Hindu Holiday.
10th	6	5	One day was an authorized Mahomedan Holiday and Mahomedan Assessor could not come.

I have to explain that on Fridays, the Mahomedan Assessor could not come till half past one or two, and on Fridays the case was not commenced till that hour. On other days the case began generally at half past ten, and continued till five or six in the evening, except on one day when the case stopped at 2 P. M.

I think that the Honourable Judges will be satisfied with my explanation, and will acquit me of having granted unnecessary adjournments.

3. With regard to the 3rd paragraph of the High Court Proceedings, I would respectfully bring to the notice of the Honourable Judges that the case in question was one in which every fact that could possibly be brought out in evidence was minutely gone into. I may have of course inadvertently let in inadmissible evidence, but in a

complex case it is very difficult often to draw the line between admissibility and inadmissibility. I have frequently in my experience found that matter that I first thought inadmissible subsequently turned out to be relevant. As to the concluding remark in the paragraph, I would beg to represent that it may be remembered that the subject of evidence is one to which I have for over 20 years given more or less constant attention.

4. In the 4th paragraph of the Proceedings, the High Court comment on the examination touching trivial matters being recorded in the form of question and answer. With regard to this, I beg to say that I found it absolutely necessary to adopt this form of question and answer in recording the evidence in the case of almost all the examination by the Pleader for the 1st and 2nd Defendants. The questions put were generally so involved or so long and so indeterminate that it was necessary to have the question definitely settled before the Translator was allowed to put it. If I had not adopted this procedure, the record of the evidence would have been vague and most misleading. The procedure was, of course, quite unusual, but the circumstances were also exceptional.

5. I respectfully beg to explain with reference to the 1st sentence of paragraph 5, that the reason I did not remonstrate against the unusual procedure adopted was that the point the Pleader for the 1st and 2nd Defendants wanted to bring out was of such moment that although I did not approve of his method, I did not think I should have been justified in interfering. Mr. Shiva Rao wanted to shew that the boy was not gagged in such a way that he could not have cried out. If he could have established that point, the prosecution case would have been hopelessly damaged, and I did not think, I should have been justified in preventing him adopting his own method of trying to establish his point.

With regard to the 2nd sentence of the 5th paragraph, I beg the Honourable Judges will remember that the case was most obstinately contested. I submit that I was bound to listen to the arguments as to the relevancy or otherwise of every question objected to. I submit I had no other alternative.

No doubt, Mr. Shiva Rao's arguments were exceedingly long, and they were equally involved, and difficult to follow, but in an important case in which the lives of his two clients were at stake I did not think it right to interfere.

With regard to the last sentence of the 5th paragraph, I have formed the opinion, and I hope there will soon be a ruling of the High Court on the point, that according to the Code of Criminal Procedure, the prosecution cannot examine at a Sessions trial any person as a witness, if objection is taken by the accused, unless the person has been examined by the Committing Magistrate. I had consequently in the case in question to examine as Court witnesses no less than seven persons whose evidence should, in my opinion, have been taken by the Committing Magistrate. In examining Court witnesses the procedure I have always followed is to examine them myself, then to let the Public Prosecutor put questions, and then allow the Defence Vakils to question the witness. I respectfully submit that this is the correct procedure.

6. I trust that with this explanation before them the Honourable Judges will be able to take a different view of the way I conducted the case. The case was one in which I considered, I think, rightly, that the slightest want of patience on my part would have most materially and probably hopelessly prejudiced the prosecution.

I have etc.

(Signed) W. C. Holmes,
Sessions Judge.

CURRENT NO. 5459.

Judicial Dept.

From

W. C. Holmes Esquire,

District and Sessions Judge,

South Canara.



Of: 15 }
Of: 18 } Nov 1895.

To

Encls: 3 papers n/s
+ 6 S.C.
The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Madras.

Submitting—with enclosure—explanation
and remarks called for in G. O. Judicial No. 2231,
dated 4th November 1895.

To await the return of the above G.O.
now in circ with another current.

G.
25
300-5-10-95

Tell

DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 5459.

FOR ORDERS.

Pending H.M.'s orders upon the
question raised in ^{note in} the linked file as to
whether the High Court's judgment in
the appeal against Mr. Holmes' judg-
ment in S.C. 33 of 1894 & the
Govt. Pleaders' remarks as to the
value of the evidence of the 16th witness
was recorded should be sent to
Mr. Holmes for explanation, in addition
to the Trags. of the High Court in
the same matter already sent in
G.O. 2231
4.11.95. Public, no note is
put up on this explanation as an
explanation. For if H.M.'s orders
are that the papers in question be
still go to Mr. Holmes the explanation
that will be submitted upon them, &
the present explanation will have to
be dealt with together.

2. Para 7. of the explanation

W. L. C. Holmes, ICS.

[G.]
24.

20-5-10-05.

Indol

DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated	189	, No.
Again G.O., dated	189	, No.
Current No. 5459	of 1895, dated	, from
" "	" 189	, "
" "	" 189	, "

Print A

26 P

ORDER. : 26 Nov: 1895, No. 2440.

With reference to paras 7 and 8 of his explanation Mr. Holmes will be informed that no formal enquiry at which his presence will be required will take place in respect to this matter. There is therefore no ^{necessity} ~~reason~~ which requires to ~~delay~~ cancel the passage which he has taken to Encke or to defer taking leave. The orders of Govt. upon the present matter, & upon his ~~pro~~ ~~cedure~~ conduct of certain other cases which have recently come before Govt, & regarding which a reference ^{made} ~~will~~ ^{orders} will shortly be ~~made~~ ^{made} to him, will be communicated to Mr. Holmes as soon as they are passed, being sent if ~~he~~ he has by that time

I think it will suffice to say this. I don't think it is necessary to say anything FOR ORDERS. at present about his retiring ~~minor pension.~~ ~~minor pension.~~ ~~minor pension.~~

H. E. THE GOVERNOR.

THE HON'BLE MR. H. W. BLISS, C.I.E.

THE HON'BLE MR. J. GROSE.

I think it will be necessary, not only to ask the H.C. about this, but also to write their remarks on Mr. H's letter to Govt. -

Let H.E. see this after first telling Mrs H. that he can go home & as above.

23/11/95

90 2440 - 26/11/95

appears however to call for early orders, & also para 8.

It is submitted that Mr. Holmes may be told that no formal enquiry at which his presence will be required will take place: that he can go home as he proposes: & that the orders of Govt. on this matter will be communicated to him. He can then make up his mind whether to resign on proportionate pension or not.

3. The explanation is not ready for disposal yet, as there is no copy of the H.C.'s judgment in S.C. appeal in S.C. 38 in the office, & this will have to be procured, & it is also submitted that the H.C. might be asked (on the C.S. Devis officially) what orders were passed by the H.C. on the explanation sent to it by Mr. Holmes. The H.C. appears to have sent him its proceedings on S.C. 38, but not that on S.C. 33.

The explanation is a very wordy affair.

21/11/95

Left India to his address in
Europe
ord
11/12/95 (from ordno)

20/11/95

W.C. Holmes & Co.

W.C. Holmes & Co. (S) Despatch
26/11

CS
(from ordno)

First copy sent to Press.

Returned for Signature.

Despatched.

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

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

Spare Copies.

Struck
Issued

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

Total ..

In hand ..

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO

PAPERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
IN ORIGINAL.

N.L.—
A = Print in full.
B = Not to be printed.
P = Print abstract only.
Q = Print heading only.

CONFIDENTIAL.

பொ. ப. புது ஏண். 24

- துண்டு

குறியிட்டவர் பொறுப்பிலிருக்கும் பதிவுக் கட்டிடத்தின்மீதும் எடுக்கப்பட்ட தாள்.

அச்ச
பல்வகை
ஸாலாயம்

எண் _____, தேதி _____

- 198

[illegible]

G. O. No. 770

29.3.94

$$2 \overline{) 2530}$$

6.12.95

Taken for 4-7 M-D

9472

June