

Judicial (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 1278

Dated 15th June 1895

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

KIDNAPPING.

Approving, with remarks, the action taken by the District Magistrate of Tanjore for securing the attendance of a woman named Mottai at Penang said to have been kidnapped from British India.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	2087		1896				

note for Co.

I have added a line to the note to make it clear that the G.O. quoted is only an analogous case, an offender & not a witness being concerned in it
 14/6/96

Seen. This makes
 14/6/96

Tanjore District Magistrate's
 office. Camp Kumbakonam,
 3rd June 1895.

Refonc. No. 203
 mag.

From. Robert B. Clegg Esq
 A.D. Magistrate
 Tanjore.

To. The Honourable Mr. J. T. Rice.
 Chief Secretary to Govt.
 Judicial Dept.
 Madras

Sir,

A certain Karuppan of Puduvar,
 Mayavaram Taluk, complained
 before the Stationary 2nd class
 magistrate, Mayavaram, that
 his wife Mottai was enticed
 away by one Muthu Karuppan
 of the same village and sold
 at Penang. The 2nd class magistrate
 who made a preliminary enquiry

into the case, discharged the accused
Muthu Karuppan under sec. 209
C. P. C for want of evidence. The
Sessions Judge, in ordering, in
the exercise of his powers of revision,
further enquiry into the case,
observed that the case demands
a most searching enquiry by
the Straits Settlements' Police to
ascertain if the woman was
sold as alleged by her in a
letter to a relative of hers. Thereon
the Sub Magistrate was directed
to furnish a description of the
woman Mottai, and an abstract
of the evidence recorded, with
any further information he
could collect.

2. From a letter of the Penang

Police Superintendent to the Superin-
tendent of Police, Tanjore, it
appeared that the Police of the
Straits Settlements had subse-
quently, got some information
in the matter, traced out the
woman Mottai and detained
her and her child pending
identification. The description
of the woman given by the
Sub Magistrate was, on a
comparison with that furnished
by the Penang Police, found
to agree, and it seemed certain
that the woman under detention
of the Penang Police was the
same as the one alleged to have
been Kidnapped from British
India.

3. Thereon the Straits Settlements Government was addressed to send her under Police escort for production before me in view to the offender Muthukaruppan being again brought to justice. That Government has now intimated to me that I should proceed under Sec: 15 of the Fugitive offenders Act, 1881, viz, forward a summons for service on her, and has remarked that in any future case of the kind, the application should be forwarded through the Madras Government. To avoid delay, I have sent a constable-No 866 Marutha-muthu Pillai of Mayavaram Station-with a letter to the

44th 45th ne
e by
4.

+ vide para. 2 of
80 of 26 Jan. 85, No.
205 Judl.

Colonial Secretary, and a summons in duplicate for service on the woman and have provided him with the necessary funds for bringing the woman here. 4. I request that my action may be approved.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obt. servant,

Robert B. B. B.
C. J. District Magistrate
3/6/85
Jm
Lm

Judicial Dept.
CURRENT NO. 2743

From
Theas Dist maste
Tanjore

CHIEF SECRETARY
5 JUN. 1895
The Chief Secretary
to Govt. J. S. Madras

3 June 1895
Ref: on C No 203
mael
En: int
Subject

Reporting the action
taken for securing
the attendance of a
woman named Mottai
now at Penang said to have
been kidnapped from
British India.

10.163/4: 23 Jan 94 SE
10.2275/6: 10.12.92 mialah
1867: 6 Oct 92 SE
821: 284.91 mis
2909: 21 Dec 87 SE
436: 14 Feb 85 SE
205/6: 26 Jan 85 SE
3146/7: 2 Dec 84 SE

For order.

As to whether the action may be
approved? The correct procedure seems to call for
the necessary papers + make a formal appl.
for revision as was done in the case dealt with
in G.O. of 26 Jan. 1885, No. 205/6 Tull, but
in this case the Govt. of the Straits
Settlement appears to have condoned
the procedure adopted by the Dist.
Maste. It will therefore probably suf.
free to see
Order d/15 June 1895
mis Approved 13/6/95
2. In future cases, the Dist. Maste
should follow the procedure prescribed
in G.O. of 26.1.85 No. 205/6 in the
case of warrants issued against offenders
12.8.85 12/6/95

* There was no tradition required in
this case but the summons should
have been sent through the
To the Govt. J. S. Madras
Tanjore - 22 JUN 1895 12/6/95
I suppose this is right. But
I haven't a copy of the Statute
to refer to
12/6/95

When given for copying
When copied
When examined
When signed

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO G. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTERS OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DITTO.

PAPERS 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.