Judicial (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 1007

Dated 13th May 1895

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

COURT HOUSE COCANADA.

Observing that when plans, &c. were called for for a combined--- the Sub-Judge and District Munsif, the probable cost of the buildg was assumed at Rs. 22,000, the charge ~~e~~ for site (some Rs. 8,050) was not allowed for the land being thought to be the property of Government, and enquiring of the High Court whether a less expensive site could not be found, as besides the considerable increased charge thereby the detailed estimate now submitted ~~sewe~~ swells the cost to some Rs. 38,150.

the

Mf

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	1880.		2-8-94.				

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	4137		1895 Lodged 4-9-95				
	4401		1895				
	5782		1895 } S.O.	153	23-1-96.		

124

~~Judicial~~ {1895.} Department.

No.

FROM

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

Dated 12th January } 1895.
Received 14"
Regd 15"

No. 50.
Enc ~~two~~ 3.

Stating that the site selected for the construction of a combined Court house for the Sub Judge and the Dt. Mf at Cocanada is a private land which will have to be acquired under Act I of 1894.

Pl. see G.O. 1580 para 3 d/ 2-8-94: which be [illegible] ref. to [illegible] 9/1

[illegible] 17/1

[illegible] 21/1

GO 1880. 28 g[illegible] +1

Refer / C 124

R/ 5-30 PM
Recd [illegible]

C.

~~Refer only~~ Order 11 March/95
R no 287

With refce to para 2 of Mr Foster's letter, the attention of the Honble the Judges might be invited to his letter d/ 21 Decr 1891 No 3108 (~~disposed of in GO d 16-1-92 No 98~~), from which it appears that the Dist. Munsiff ~~this establishment~~ was about to vacate the old Court house to occupy ~~t[illegible]~~ a rented building with effect from the 1st January 1892. ~~The Govt would be glad to be informed whether these circumstances~~ 2. The Govt. wld. be glad to be informed if it is correct in presuming that the Dist. Munsiff has subsequently returned to the old Court house

D
6-3-95

9/3/95

Copd 12/3.

The Hon the Chief Justice High Ct. with CL. } Despd 13/3/95

Every letter, whether printed or in manuscript, should be docketed and abstracted on the back; * * * * and the abstract should state clearly the purport of the letter and not merely its title subject. * * * *

Enclosures and statements also, whether sent with letters, or merely under cover, should be numbered, docketed and abstracted. The headings of statements should be written in full to prevent mistakes. (G. O., 6th April 1893, No. 289, Public.)

---

ocanada [illegible] office

No 284.

Dated 3. 12. 94.

To

The Deputy Collector
Hd. Qur. Dn.
Godavari.

Sir,

Referring to your endorsement No 407 dated 4th ultimo, on the letter from the Subordinate Judge, Cocanada, No 387 dated 26th September last, and the subsequent reminder (Endt. No 407 dated 12th idem) I beg to state that the site within the boundaries mentioned in the Sub Judge's letter, measures 10 acres 19 Cents. The statement taken from Messrs Pyda Subbarayudu and Ayyanna, the proprietors of the land, are enclosed. From which it will be seen that Subbarayudu wants a compensation of Rs 2/- per yard which comes to Rs 96,000, odd, on the whole and that Ayyanna wants the old cutcherry site of the Deputy Tahsildar's office in exchange for this land. The amount demanded by the former is ridiculously exhorbitant.

2. The site recently purchased by Messrs Hall Wilsons from Mr Tenant, late a cash Keeper of the Collector's office, adjoins the one proposed f

[illegible] eastern side. It was sold at 2 annas a yard. Both the plots are of about the same size. According to the market value of the neighbouring lands the price that can be put on the land in question does not exceed Rs 7000/-. To this amount the owners do not consent. But I think the land can be ~~required~~ acquired under the act at that cost.

3. The present cutchery site fetches, if sold by auction, nearly Rs 10000/- (i.e.) Rs 3000/- more than the value of the land in question. There are already offers up to Rs 8000 for the Cutchery site. There is every prospects of the amount rising. It cannot therefore be given in exchange

I beg to remain,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

(Signed) N. AppaRao.

Dy: Tahasildar

(True Copy)

/Signed/ G. T. Mackenzie

Ag: District Judge.

Enclosure no. 4 to Judl C. no. 124/5
(G.O. 1007 d 13/5/95)

D

No. 500.

Subordinate Court

Cocanada, 8th Dec. 18

From

M.R.Ry K. Krishna Rao Averga

Subordinate Judge

To

The District Judge
of Godavari

Sir,

With reference to District Court's Proceedings No. 1050, dated the 10th September last, I have the honour to enclose herein the letter (with two enclosures) of the Deputy Tahsildar of Cocanada, received yesterday throug the Head Quarter Deputy Collector, from which it would appear that the site which has been suggested as the best fitted for the construction of a building for the Subordinate and District Munsif's courts at this station may be valued at Rs 7,000 a that as the owners are not willing to part with it on reasonable term it may be acquired under Act I of 1894. I think that the course sugg ed by the Deputy Tahsildar may be

adop

adopted.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant
(Signed) K. Krishna Rao
Subordinate Judge

(True copy)
(Sd) G. T. Mackenzie
Ag District Judge

ecl 2 to Judl. c no 124/95. (G.O 1007 d 13th May 1895).

1

CURRENT NO 124

No. 50. High Court of Judicature,
Madras, 12th January 1895.

From
H. W. Foster Esquire,
Registrar of the High Court
of Judicature, Appellate Side,
Madras.

To
The Honorable E. Gibson,
Ag Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort Saint George.

Honorable Sir,

With reference to G. O. dated 2nd August 1894, No. 1880, Judicial Department, I am directed to state that the site selected for the construction of a combined Court-house for the Subordinate Judge and the District Munsif at Cocanada is private land the value of which is estimated at Rs. 7,000. In accordance with the orders of Government on the subject the land will, in the ordinary course, have to be acquired under Act I of 1894. Copies of the reports of the Subordinate Judge and the Deputy Tahsildar on the subject are enclosed for information and return.

2. The Court-house which was occupied by the District Munsif of Cocanada till 1892 still continues to be so occupied. The map received with the G. O. under reply is herewith returned.

I have the honor to be,
Honorable Sir,
Your most obedient servant,

Registrar.

CURRENT NO. 284

1895.

Jud Dept

Public Works Department.

G.O. 399 25 Feb 87
699: 31 3 87
2826: 13 Decr 87

G.O. 1880: 2894 miscellaneous papers
G.O. 399: 25. 2. 87
699: 31. 3. 87
~~2286~~ 2826: ~~25~~ 13. 12. 87
~~Tel~~ No. 621/95.

No. 220 C
Dated 22-1-1895
Despatched
Received 23/1
Recd 24/1

CHIEF SECRETARY
23 JAN 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Encls. 16 + 4 plans: 20

SUBJECT.

Referring for consideration papers regarding certain alterations suggested by the District Judge, Godavari, to the combined Sub Judge and District Munsiff's Court house at Cocanada.

Note

Please see C. No. 124 of 95 & connected papers put up.

26/1

Ref^ce only Cpd 31/1. No. 194 / 1-2-95

The P.W.D. is requested to state (i) whether the Estimated cost (Rs 34,800) of constructing the combined Court-house at Kumbakonam includes compensation for the site. – if so, to what amount.
(ii) whether the probability that the cost of constructing a similar building at Cocanada would be higher is merely due to differences in rates or to considerations as to the cost of the site

D
31-1

To
The P.W.D. despd 1-2-95

CURRENT No 284

No. 220 C

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

MEMORANDUM.

Dated Madras, 22nd Jany: 1895

Letter from the Superintending Engineer I circle No. 1691 G.D of 6 December 1894.

Referred to the Judicial Department for consideration.

2. The plan of the combined court house at Kumbakonam, referred to by the Superintending Engineer I circle is enclosed for inspection.

3. The total floor area including verandahs, provided in the design prepared by the Executive Engineer Godavari Eastern Division for the Cocanada courthouse is 9401 square feet, while the total area of the Kumbakonam design, including passages and verandahs is 11725 square feet. The total working space

space available in each design is Cocanada 4707 square feet and Kumbakonam 6125 square feet. The estimate now submitted amounts to Rs 30,400, while the actual cost of the building at Kumbakonam was Rs 34,800. The cost of a similar building at Cocanada will probably be higher.

Colonel R.E.
Secretary to Govt. P.W.D.

To
The Judicial Department
with papers in original
and plan of Kumbakonam
Court house.

Judicial

CURRENT NO. 621

C1-No. 284/95 + papers

189 5.

Public Works Department.

Judl D

Fort St. George
14 February 95

Office Note No 284

No. 476C
Dated 7—2—1895
Despatched
Received 9/2

As requested in Memo No 476C dated the 7th February 1895 the undersigned has the honor to return the papers received with the P.W.D. Memo No 220C dated the 22d January 95.

/ Sgd L. Davidson
for Under Secretary

SUBJECT.

Requesting to return for reference papers forwarded with memo No 220 Cd/22nd January 1895 regarding the combined Court house at Kumbakonam.

Erob
11/2

9. FEB. 1895

To The Secy to Govt.
P.W. Dept.
with P.W.C 9624 with plan
+ connected papers

desp
14/2/95

A Office note returning the papers is put up.

Eb

Court House.

CURRENT No 621

No. 476C

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

MEMORANDUM.

Dated Madras, 7 February 1895.

Advertising to its Memo No. 194 dated 1st February 1895. the Judicial Department is requested to return for reference the papers forwarded with Memo No. 220 C. dated 22d January 1895.

C H B Boulton
Under Secretary to Govt.
P.W.D.

Ex

To
The Judicial Department.

BUILDINGS AND ROADS.
CIVIL WORKS.

Govt. of (1885) Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS.

Dated April, 21st.

Recd. *Encl.*

G.O., 21st April 1885, No. 947 W.

APRIL.

Combined Court-house for the District Munsifs of Kumbakonam and Valangaman, Tanjore District

Estimate for —, sanctioned.

5
848

Court house.

21st April 1885, No. 947 W., Public Works.

GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Buildings and Roads.
Civil Works.

Read—the following papers :—

No. 1966 T.J.

Report by the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, on the estimate for constructing district munsifs' court-houses at Kumbakónam, Tanjore District, Rs. 33,640.

The plan and estimate for the combined district munsifs' court of Kumbakónam and Valangaman were called for in No. G.O. 307 W., dated 5th February 1884. The design is based on the standard plan approved of in G.O. No. 2294 W., dated 6th September 1879, with the exception of the rooms as per margin, the size and arrangement of which have been altered in consultation with the district judge, the period for which district munsifs are required to keep the records and property in their offices having been much reduced since the publication of the standard design.

Property-room from $21' \times 14'$ to $18' \times 13\frac{1}{2}'$.
Record-room from three storied of $13\frac{1}{2}' \times 13\frac{1}{2}'$ each to one story of $18' \times 13\frac{1}{2}'$.

Moreover, the district judge requested that the record-room should be accessible only through the gumastah's room; hence the arrangement of this room had to be altered. A room for vakils, $22\frac{3}{4} \times 15$, is added and the gumastah's room lengthened from 30 to 40 feet at the desire of the district judge.

2. The site has been selected by the district judge, and a compensation of Rs. 1,168, as settled by the Collector, is entered in the estimate. The soil is stated to be clay to a depth of 6 feet, and the depth of the foundation, *i.e.*, 2 feet concrete and 3 feet masonry, is considered sufficient.

3. The rates are fair and the estimate is forwarded for sanction through the district judge of Tanjore. A sum of Rs 20,000 is allotted for this building (Items Nos. 49 and 50 under class A. Works) in the budget for 1885-86.

4. The work will be completed within one and-a-half years from the date of sanction and allotment of funds.

Trichinopoly,
13th March 1885.

(Signed) H. R. MEAD, Lieut.-Col., R.E.,
Superintending Engineer, VI Circle.

From J. A. DAVIES, Esq., Acting Registrar of the High Court of Judicature at Madras, Appellate Side, to the Chief Secretary to Government, dated Madras, 20th March 1885, No. 920.

I am directed to forward, herewith, the plan (sent separately), estimate and report received from the district judge of Tanjore, with reference to G.O., dated 29th January 1884, No. 255, Judicial, for constructing a court-house for the district munsifs' courts of Kumbakónam and Valangaman, and to state that the plans appear excellent and have the approval of the High Court.

No. 754, Judicial.

Approved and transferred to the Public Works Department.

(By Order.)

31st March 1885.

(Signed) H. A. STUART,
Acting Assistant Secretary.

ORDER—dated 21st April 1885, No. 947 W., Public Works.

The estimate, amounting to Rs. 33,640, for constructing a combined court-house for the district munsifs of Kumbakónam and Valangaman in the Tanjore district, is sanctioned.

2. A sum of Rs. 10,000 has been provided for the work in the Provincial budget of 1885-86.

3. This sanction has been registered as Provincial No. 19 W. of 1885-86, and classified as Civil Buildings, Original Works.

(True Extract.)

(Signed) J. SHAW-STEWART, Colonel, R.E.,
Secretary to Govt., P.W.D.

To the Superintending Engineer, VI Circle, with nine enclosures.
" Examiner, Public Works Accounts, with duplicate abstract estimate.
" Judicial Department.

Exd. A. Grubert.
Spare Copies

Jud^l. 6/5/85 No. 1205 Mis.

Jud^l

1895. 848

Public Works Department.

Jud^l

O.N. 284/95.

No. 657 C

Dated 19—2—1895

Despatched

Received 20/2

Regd 21/2

Encs of C.N. 284
rect.
+1 mem

For orders

Please see Ref^ce
No. 184: 1.2.95

SG
28.2.95

SUBJECT.

Explaining the difference in the cost of constructing a combined court house at Kumbakonam and that of a similar building at Cocanada.

CHIEF SECRETARY
20 FEB 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

Rs/85 Go
85 Go ref^s have been communicated to Jud^e
A.S. 12/1

[illegible]

No. 657C

Government of Madras.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

MEMORANDUM.

Dated Madras, 19th February 1895.

With reference to its Memorandum, No: 194, dated 1st February 1895, the Judicial Department is informed (i) that the estimate for constructing the combined Court-house at Kombakonam included Rs: 1.168 as compensation for the site vide G. O. No: 947 W dated 21st April 1885 - copy attached -, and (ii) that the probability that the cost of constructing a similar building at Cocanada would be higher is entirely due to difference in rates. It will be observed from the estimate for the Cocanada Court-house that the compensation for the land amounts to Rs. 300 only.

2. The papers received with Office Note, No. 284, dated 14 February 1895

1895 are returned.

C. H. D. Brolen,
Under Secretary to Govt: P. W. D.

Ef. 9196

To

The Judicial Department, with P. W. O. No: 9621 and plan returned, and with a copy of G. O. 947 Wd/21-4-85.

Refce No 207/95 + papes

CURRENT NO. 2011

Judicial {1895.} Department.

No.

FROM

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

Dated 19th April } 1895.
Received

Rep 23-4-95

CHIEF SECRETARY
22 APR. 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

No. 1143
Enc n.

Intimating that the Old Court house of the District Munsif of Cocanada was vacated on 1st. May and re-occupied on 16th. September 1892 after repairs

R 2/5 - No office
written to fix papers

as
25/26/4.

ton

Ref

Please put up the Rev orders of 90 & 91 regd the acquisition of land for

Every letter, whether printed or in manuscript, should be docketed and abstracted on the back ; * * * * and the abstract should state clearly the purport of the letter and not merely its title subject. * * * *

Enclosures and statements also, whether sent with letters, or merely under cover, should be numbered, docketed and abstracted. The headings of statements should be written in full to prevent mistakes, (G. O., 8th April 1893, No. 289, Public.)

No. 1143.

High Court of Judicature,
Madras, 19th April 1895.

CURRENT No. 2011

From

D. W. G. Cowie Esquire,
Ag: Registrar of the
High Court of Judicature,
Appellate side, Madras.

To

The Honorable J. F. Price, C.S.I.,
Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort Saint George.

Honorable Sir,

With reference to G.O., dated 11th March 1895, R. No. 287, Judicial, I am directed to inform you that the old court-house of the District Munsif of Cocanada was vacated on 1st May 1892 and re-occupied on 16th September 1892 after the building had been repaired.

I have the honor to be,
Honorable Sir,
your most obedient Servant,
D. W. G. Cowie
Ag: Registrar.

Exd. N.

[G/25.]

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

C. No. 124 of 95 from the High Court (stating the cost of the site) with site plan.

C. 284. from the P.W.D., referring plans & estimates for remarks.; with memo thereon calling for explanation &
C. 621 from P.W.D. requesting return of plans & reply to the memo on C. 284.
C. 848. from P.W.D, replying to memo. & returning plans & estimates.
C. 2011. fr High Court stating that the old Court House at Cocanada was reoccupied in Sep: 9[illegible]

FOR ORDERS.

It is proposed to construct a combined building for the use of the Dist. Munsiff & the Sub: Judge at Cocanada at a cost of Rs 22,000/-

Para 2 of G: O: No 1880 of 2 Aug: 94, presumed that the site approved by the H.C was situated on Govt land - The Regr. H.C in reply to this reports that the site selected is private land covering an area of 10 acres & 19 cents, the proprietors of which claim Rs 9600/ compensation - The local authorities have however valued the land at Rs 7000/- & the H.C proposes that this site should be acquired by Govt. under Act I of 94 -

In calculating the costs of the building at 22,000/, Govt. however has not taken this extra expenditure into conside[illegible]tion - Please see U.S. note on C. No. 3628 of 9 under cover of G.O: 1880 of 2/8

Better point out all these difficulties to the H.C. & say that we think the existing arrangements had better continue, unless they can find some other & cheaper site - That now selected will certainly, it is clear, cost Rs 7000 or 8000 & may cost very much more, for if it is taken up under the Act it is impossible to say what compensation may not be awarded.

BS
7/5/95

Combined Dt. Munsiffs & Sub: Judges Court — Cocanada

(Answers)

There seems to be some misunderstanding on the part of the High Court with reference to para 3 of the above G.O.

The High Court was asked what had become of the deserted Court house which was until 1892 occupied by the Dt. Munsiff —

The High Now replies that the Court house which was occupied by the Dt. Munsiff of Cocanada till /92 continues to be so occupied —

It is therefore presumed that the house rent of Rs 35/ for the Dt. Munsiff's Court at Cocanada is no longer paid: & that the temporary repairs having been effected, the Court has moved again to its proper building.

It has been (privately) ascertained from the A.G's office that no house rent is being charged for the Dt. Munsiff's Court at Cocanada:

Officenote
This sort of information shld. be obtained either by O.M. or by telephone in future
D
31.5

The presumption is correct. Vide C No 2011/95

D
3.5.95 (On a reference made to the HS Ch.)

Please also see C No 2841/95, since received.

The second current contains the estimate originally prepared for the combined Court-houses. The amount is Rs 30,400, ~~[illegible]~~ ~~site~~.

Chk
25/1

including only the inadequate provision of Rs 300/. for the site; the actual cost being Rs 8050, — the Estimate shld be Rs 38,150

The ~~[illegible]~~ Dist. Judge (Mr Ross) has suggested certain alterations in the plan vizt.

(i) that the property, nazarat & copyists' rooms being common to both Court should be together the centre of the building, arranged so as break up the long line of buildings

(ii). that the whole design might with advantage be broken up e.g. by throwing out the judge's private rooms at the ends, & a gumasta's room at each rear

(iii) the substitution of large windows for ventilators above the roofs of the high verandahs near the judges' benches, in order that they may be properly lighted

(iv) the enlargement of the property & record rooms.

As these alterations involved a complete revision of the whole plan & estimate the Supdg. Engr. referred the matter to the Chief Engineer with the recommendation that (a) Mr Ross' suggested alterations should be carried out or (b) that in lieu thereof the combined design of the Kumbakonam Court house (intended to accommodate two district Munsiffs) should be adopted.

The P.W.D. forwards the two plans to Judicial for remarks with reference to the proposal. It is stated that the Kumbakonam Court House cost Rs 34.800, & that the cost of a similar building at Cocanada will probably be higher. The reply of the P.W.D. (C. 848) to a further reference shows that the probability is based on the difference in rates in the two districts. It appears also that in the Kumbakonam case the land acquired cost only Rs 1168, whereas the site proposed in this case will cost at least Rs 7000 + 15 × 7000/100 = Rs 8050 ~~The statement of the [illegible] that the~~. The difference in cost is Rs 8050 − 1168 = Rs 688 Adding this on to the cost of the Kumbakon Court house we get Rs 41,682. allow for the difference in rates, the al[illegible] may be nearer Rs. 50,000 than Rs. 40,000.

The conclusion is that the ~~Executive~~ Suptg Engineers second suggestion means an increase in cost of $\left\{ \text{Rs. } 41682 - (30,400 + \overset{*}{7750}) \right\} =$

= Rs. 3532, to which must be added the additional cost due to difference in rates.

The other proposal *viz.* that Mr. Ross's suggested improvements should be carried out - would *probably* not cost so much more; without an estimate it is however impossible to say ~~which was~~ what the cost of it would be, and therefore at the same time impossible to decide which of the two plans is preferable on financial grounds.

It is submitted however that Mr. Ross' proposals are for other reasons preferable to the Kumbakonam plan, as the latter is open to the first, & probably also to the third of the objections; the amount of space provided further appears to be unnecessarily large, the total working space being 6125 sq. feet in Kumbakonam against 4707 sq. feet in Cocanada. Mr. Ross' only comment on the subject of space was that the property & record rooms were too small.

To sum up,

When it was ordered in G.O. $\frac{1880}{2.8.94}$ that plans & estimates shd. be prepared Govt. was under the impression that the approximate cost would be Rs. 22,000. The present estimate making allowance for cost of land is Rs. 38,160

* correcting the undue estimate of the cost of site

The proposed erection of a building on the Kumbakonam plan will cost Rs. 41,682 *plus* an unknown addition on account of the higher rates prevailing at Cocanada. The cost of a building according to Mr. Ross' ideas has not been estimated but is probably between these two.

The present arrangements apparently are - that the Sub Court is in Simpson's Bungalow paying a rental of Rs. 75 per mensem, the Dist. Munsiff's Court being in the building which was vacated for repairs in the beginning of 1893. This will have some sale value; how much is not known.

D
4.3.95

There seems ~~very~~ is ~~little~~ no doubt that As the Dt. Munsiff's Court pays no rent a new building will cost very much more than existing arrangements; & will not prove a saving as was originally anticipated

D
~~4.3.95~~
D 3.5.95 D

Jo D
6/5/95

Combined Court House

at ~~Kumbakonam~~

Cocanada

H.M.

For orders.

Forward reply to reference on C. 284

31.1

C 7/5
23/5

[G./53]
1,000-30-3-95.

Judl. Department.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT
MADRAS

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following paper :—

G.O. of 2 August 1894 No. 1880 Judl.

C.No. 124 from the High Court of 12.1.95

C.No. 284 from the P.W.D. of 22.1.95

C.No. 626 ——— 7.2.95

C.No. 848 ——— 19.2.95

C.No. 2011 from the High Court of 19-4-95

Order. of 13th May 1895, No. 1007

When sanction was accorded for the preparation of plans & estimates for the construction of a combined Court house for the subordinate Judge & district Munsiff of Cocanada, the Govt was informed that the probable cost of constructing such a building would be some Rs. 22,000, & it was presumed that the proposed site was Govt land. At that time the Sub-Court was located in a building known as Simpson's bungalow for which a monthly rental of Rs. 75/- was being paid. The

3

Court had, but a short time before, been out of repair & in G.O. of 16.1.92 No. 310 & this Govt. sanctioned the temporary evacuation of the building & the removal of the Court to a ~~rented~~ hired bungalow rented at Rs. 35 per mensem.—

2. The total rental payable ~~by~~ for the accommodation of both Courts was thus only Rs. 110 per mensem or 6 per cent per annum on Rs. 22,000 the estimated cost of providing a combined Court house. In view of the advantages afforded by a specially constructed ~~permanent~~ new building, & the fact that ~~the~~ its construction appeared to involve a financial gain, the Govt. readily sanctioned the preparation of plans & estimates.

110
12
22000)1320(6%
132

3. The detailed estimates ~~subsequently~~ ~~received from the~~ prepared by the P.W.D. shows that the combined Court house will cost Rs. 30,400, & the estimate includes only Rs. 300/- as compensation for land. The High Court, however, while pointing out the incorrectness of the presumption (vide G.O. of 2.8.94 No. 1880) states that ~~the~~ its market-value ~~of the site~~ is Rs. 7000/- to which must be added the

that the proposed site was on Govt. land

[G./53]

,000 — 30-6-95.

21

Department.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following paper:—

15 per cent prescribed by s. 23 (2) of Act I of 1894 for compulsory acquisition. The total cost of the site will thus certainly be not less than Rs. 8050/-, & very probably much more in view of the fact that the owners claim Rs. 96,000 for it. Accepting Rs. 8050/- however as the cost of the site, the estimate must be raised to Rs. 38,150.

4. ~~In~~ On this estimate & the plan accompanying it, however, Mr. H. T. Ross the Dist. Judge ~~took~~ made the following ~~objections~~ criticisms:—

(i) that the property, Nazarat & copyists rooms being common to both Courts should be together in the centre & thus break up the long line of buildings

(ii) that the whole design might with advantage be broken up e.g. by throwing out the judges' private rooms at the ends & building a gumasta to at the rear of each end

(iii) that large windows should be substituted for the ventilators above the high verandah's & near the judges' benches, in order to give more light

(iv) that the property & record rooms required enlarging

5. Mr. Ross accordingly suggested that the estimate & plan should be revised. The revision involved being so extensive, the Supdt. Engineer referred the matter to the Chief Engineer with the recommendation that Mr. Ross' suggestions should be carried out or that, in lieu thereof, the combined design of the Kumbakonam Court house, which is intended to accommodate two District Munsiffs, should be adopted. The cost of carrying out Mr. Ross' suggestions has not been estimated but it is safe to assume that the lterations proposed will involve some increase upon the original stimate of Rs. 38,150

he cost of the Kumbakonam Court ouse was Rs. 34,800, but in that case site was purchased for Rs. 1168; aking allowance therefore for the dditional cost of the Cocanada site

---

[G./53]
1000-30-3-95.

Department.

CHIEF SECRETARIAT
MADRAS

PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following paper :—

this estimate must be raised to Rs. 41,682. Nor is this all, for the P.W.D. states that the rates in force in Godavari are higher than those of Tanjore, & this consideration shews that a court house of the Kumbakonam design would at Cocanada cost over Rs. 42,000 —

7. The Dist. Munsiff is now occupying his old Court house, the repairs to which have been completed, & the rental paid by the Sub Court for the use of Simpson's bungalow is Rs. 75 per mensem. — It is obvious therefore that, from the financial point of view, it is better to continue the existing arrangements which involve only an annual charge of Rs. 900/-, rather than to construct a building the capital cost of which would be Rs. 40,000 or Rs. 50,000

8. The Hon. the Judges of the High Court will however be requested to report whether it is not possible to find some less expensive site. Unless this can be done, the Govt. fears that the proposal to construct a combined Court house must lie over until ~~more~~ sufficient funds are available. – For this reason it is unnecessary to discuss the comparative merits of the Rambakonam design & ~~that~~ ~~the~~ that plan upon which Mr Ross made the criticisms enumerated in para. 4 of this order.

(for orders)

D
9.5.95

11/5/95

To the Hon. the C.J. with Ch.
The P.W.D. ~~Public~~ (G&O) & plans & estimates & explanations M.S.

DESPATCHED
23 MAY 95

Copied
13/5

Ud

Please see the slight alteration made by the C.S.

11/5/95

Combined Court House,
Cocanada

C.S.
(for orders)

D
13

---

en given for copying ______ en copied ______ en examined ______ en signed ______ 189 .							
AGAIN G.O., No. DATED 189 ,							
T No.							
CLOSURES TO C. No.							
ORDER OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.							
ATEMENT WITH DITTO.							
APERS NOT FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH IN ORIGINAL.							

N.B.—
A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.