

Judicial (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 1834

Dated 3rd Sept. 1895

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

PLEADERS' FEES.

Approving the recommendation of the District Magistrate of Malabar that a fee of Rs. 140 be sanctioned to M.R.RY V. Vengu Iyer, Pleader, Palghat, for conducting the prosecution of a forgery case on behalf of Government.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Palghat 12th June 1895

From, m Rhy V. Vengur Jee
Pleadu Palghat

To, J. Murphy Esquire
Head assistant magistrate
Palghat

Sir,

I beg to inform you that I was engaged by the Head assistant magistrate Mr. Francis under the sanction of the District Magistrate to conduct the prosecution in the case of Resima vs Sivaramanunni and others (a case of forgery and false personation) pending before the Stationary magistrate Palghat and that it was then agreed that I should be paid Rs 20 per diem.

The principal offenders Sivaramanunni and Dhason are still abroad, the Police have not succeeded in arresting them. Some of the accused were arrested and after trial were discharged. I have examined witnesses for prosecution and also filed 9 documents in evidence. The case has been pending for nearly a year and I see no chance of the principal offenders being arrested though their properties have been under attachment for 8 months.

I therefore request you will be pleased to pay me my fees Rs 140 for the seven days appearance I made before the Stationary magistrate Palghat. Herewith is submitted a statement showing the dates on which I appeared and the work done.

I have re
(Enclosed) m Rhy V. Vengur Jee

J. K. K. K.

for District master

Rs 21.8

Statement of work done with dates

Date of appearance.

work done.

- 16th July 1894 — Case adjourned as the Police represented the principal offenders were not arrested
- 8th August 1894 — Examined the Adhigam of the amsam
- 13th August 1894 — Examined prosecution witnesses nos. 1, 2, 3 & 4
- 17th August 1894 — Examined the prosecution 1st witness again and filed documents
- 20th August 1894 — Examined prosecution 5th & 6th witnesses.
- 18th September 1894 — Examined one of the accused who appeared for the first time on this date before the Court
- 22nd April 1895 — Resisted the claim to the properties attached preferred by the relations of the principal offenders. Appearance was made in obedience to a notice issued to me by the Stationary Magistrate

W. V. Vengur Rao

(True Copy)

J. K. Adappa

For District Magistrate

Rs.
21-8

5th
Jus
2

4033

CURRENT No. 4033.

May 1894 No. 3008
Mag

Malabar District Magistrate's office
Calicut - 20th August 1895.

From,

H. Moberly Esq.
Mag. District Magistrate
Malabar.

To,

The Chief Secretary
to Government, Judicial Department
Coimbatore.

Sir,

On the 28th May 1894, one
Arumachalam Chetty of Elapully
amsam, Palghat Taluk, lodged a
complaint before the Stationary
Magistrate, Palghat, charging 5
individuals with forgery of a
valuable security and false personation.

The Station House officer, Chullimida,
to whom the complaint was referred
for investigation, laid a formal
charge on the 8th June charging
the 1st accused with offences under
Sections 467 and 468 I.P.C., the 2nd under
Sections 419 and 468, the 3rd and 4th

under

5
Tud
3
4033.

under Sections 193 and 114, and the 5th accused under Sections 193 and 471. Warrants were issued for their arrest and one of the accused was arrested and produced.

2. The Sub Magistrate reported to the Head Assistant Magistrate that the Complainant was not in a position to engage the services of a competent pleader to prosecute the case and suggested the appointment of a prosecutor on behalf of Government. The accused were reported to be rich and influential people.

3. The Head Assistant Magistrate, Mr. Francis, referred the matter for orders. Mr. Bradley requested the Head Assistant Magistrate to appoint a vakil to prosecute, settling his fees beforehand.

4. Mr. R. V. Vengalil, 15th Grade Pleader, Palghat, was accordingly asked to conduct the prosecution and from the enclosed D.O. of Mr. Francis, it

would

would appear that he was offered a fee of Rs 20 per diem. The pleader put in 7 appearances, examined 6 witnesses and filed 9 exhibits. Copy of his letter showing the work done by him in the case is submitted.

5. I have the honor therefore to recommend that sanction may be accorded for payment of a fee of Rs 140 at Rs 20 a day.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

your most obedient servant.

Quaint

Aq. District Magistrate

Sh.
Re
21-8

Judicial Dept.

CURRENT No. 4033

From

The District Magistrate

CHIEF SECRETARY
MALABAR
23. AUG. 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

To the Chief Secretary
to Govt. Ind. Dept.
at Calcutta

Revenue 3008

Dated. 20th August 1895

Despatched 21- 8- 95

Rd - 23- 8- 95

Encl - 3

Subject.

Fee of Rs 140.

Requesting that a fee
of _____ may be sanctioned
to Mr. Dengu Iyer Pleader.
Rs 140
Pacehat for conducting
the prosecution of a forged
case on behalf of
Government.

27/8/95
The D. Magistrate's recommendation
is approved.

27/8/95
The D. Magistrate's recommendation
is approved.

To the D. Magistrate, Malabar (Pro)

Aut. Secy (Pro) 27/8/95

Note

The Pleader put in 7 appearances,
examined 6 witnesses & filed 9
submissions. on the first day (i.e. on
the 11th inst) he did nothing beyond
putting in his appearance as the
case was adjourned on the re-
presentation of the Office that
the principal offenders were
not arrested. But from the D.O.
of Mr. Francis it would appear
that the agreement stipulation
was that the Pleader should
be paid Rs 20 for every appearan-
ce whether any work was
turned out or not. In these circum-
stances the Pleader seems to be
entitled to the fee recommended
by the D. Magistrate.

I am of the opinion that the
terms of the regulations
include cost of attending the
court 27/8/95

When given for copying _____
When copied _____
When examined _____
When signed _____

189

READ AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATED

CURRENT No.

ENCLOSURES TO C. No.

ORDER OF GOVERNMENT

LETTER OF GOVERNMENT.

STATEMENT WITH DUTTO.

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

N.B.-

A = Copy in full.
B = Not to be copied.
F = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.