

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

1894. 6900
 By Dy Magistrate
 South Arcot

No. 1614/1894
 Reward for apprehending an
 offender

To The Chief Secretary
 to Government
 Sd/- Department
 Madras

In order
 May the Dms. proposals be
 Sanctioned? For Approval
 Order

Dated 22nd
 Dec 28th } December 1894

The Dist Mag's attention will be
 drawn to para 1(i) of G.O. of 18 Sept.
 1889 No. 1614. He has power to grant
 the rewards proposed himself.
 to you.



Ref No. 3140

Enc: one

No 2456: 24 Nov. 93.
 2404 18 Nov 93
 2439
 Requesting Government to the payment
 of Rs 100 as reward to Sundara
 App. Ramasami Iyer and
 Raghunatha Iyer of Komaramangalam
 Cuddalore Taluk for
 meritorious conduct in the
 arrest of a desperate burglar
 of Kallar caste.

10/11

one or 2 more pieces

10/11

District Magistrate's office
Cuddalore 22nd December
1894

South Arcot

From

A. E. Cartwright Esq. Esq.

District Magistrate

South Arcot

To

The Chief Secretary to Government
Judicial Department
Madras.

This applies to cases
where injuries have
been caused in

Under Para 5 of Government

Order dated 18th September 1889 No 1614,

Judicial, I have the honor to request
the sanction of the Government to the
payment of Rs 100 as reward to Sundara
Aiyar, Ramasami Aiyar and Raghunatha
Aiyar, all of Koniamangalam in the
Cuddalore Taluq. for meritorious
conduct in the arrest of a determined
and desperate burglar of the Kallan
Caste. I enclose for perusal and
return a printed copy of the Sessions
Court's judgment in the case in para
3 of which the intrepid conduct of the
above

above persons and especially of Sundara Aiyar is clearly detailed. The Government will, I have little doubt, agree with me in thinking that the conduct of these men deserves recognition in order to operate as an incentive to others to act likewise under similar circumstances. In this country there is far too little pluck of this kind.

2 The Superintendent of Police recommends that the above amount may be distributed as follows:-

- 1 Sundara Aiyar Rs 60.
- 2 Ramasami Aiyar } each
- 3 Raghunatha Aiyar } Rs 20.

and I approve of his recommendation. The men prefer the reward to take the form of medals and the necessary arrangements for making the medals will be made as soon as Government favours me with its sanction.

I have the honour to be
 Sir
 Your most obedient servant
 M. S. S. S.
 For a District Magistrate

to be placed on his title
 in the name of Rs.

Current No 16900
 of 22 Dec 1894 from the
 Dist. Mag. South Arcot.

I may have thought that para 5 of the G.O. of 1889 might as well be cancelled. If D.M.s can't be trusted not to give rewards when excessive violence is used against criminals, what is the use of them? The rewards now proposed are sanctioned.

M.S.
 25/1/95

CP

Order 31st Jan'y 195 No 200
 Sanctioned with the remark that para 5 of G.O. of 18 Sept 1889 No 1614 Jd. applies to cases in which the offender is a gang robber or other offenders concerned with the robbery or other offences in which the offender has been concerned. The Dist. Mag. has not been applied to (from order) 29/1/95

The D.M., South Arcot, has been directed to issue a notice to the effect that the general question of cancelling para 5 will be taken up at the next meeting of the Council. Mr. Hatterworth is now revising the rules, & the general question of cancelling para 5 will be taken up at the next meeting of the Council. 28-1

To orders. This is an application for the sanction of Govt. to the disbursement of rewards aggregating Rs 100 to three ryots who arrested a determined housebreaker who was within the power of sanction granted to the Dist. Mag. by para 5 of G.O. of 18 Sept 1889 No 1614 Jd., but application has been made to Govt. under para 5 of that order on the ground that these ryots suffered bodily injury in repelling the attack of the man arrested. That paragraph is based on G.O. of 23 August 1862 No 1380 Jd. which runs "xxx no rewards to any amount should be granted without application to Govt. when loss of life or bodily injury has resulted from resistance made by others than the paid police against the attacks of gang robbers & on similar occasions." The original of that order does not throw any light on the reason why this rule was made. In the absence of any written record one is reduced to conjecture the most reasonable conjecture appears to be that it was intended to provide a reference to Govt. in cases where the person arrested or beaten off was seriously injured, not where the persons effecting the arrest received injuries. The object of the reference would be to secure that Dist. Mag. granted rewards where an unnecessary amount of violence was used by an offender.

22.1
The reading of the P.O. suggests that
that Davidson is undoubtedly correct
in this - & that case is better placed

(For orders)

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