

Judicial (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 2022

Dated 30 Sept. 1895

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

FEES TO PUBLIC PROSECUTOR.

Sanctioning payment to the Public Prosecutor, South Canara,
of a fee of Rs. 1,000 for assisting the Government Pleader at Madras
in an appeal case.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	5428		1895				

CURRENT No. 4280

From,

Jud^g & Supt

The District Magistrate
South Canara.



The Chief Secretary
to Government
Judicial Department.
Fort St. George.

Dated. 30th August 1895.
Received. 7th Sep 9/95

Refce on C.No. 1511/95
Majl.
Enclosure.. Nil.
Subject.

Recommending that Govern-
ment may be pleased to accord
its sanction for the payment
to Public Prosecutor, South
Canara, of a remuneration
of Rs 1000. — one thousand Rs

assisting the Public Prosecutor at Madras in
Ref on appeal case

Please put up the Supt. Note
during the S. Canara Session
Court for the same

12/9/95

C.No. 3937/95.
14888/157.95 Mis
12028/17.6.95
8828/23.4.95
861/16.4.95
672/1.4.95
568/14.3.95
291/11.2.95
1629/23.6.94 8c.

H. M.

In view

as to whether the recom-
mendation (Rs 1000) may be sanctioned.

16.9.95

A considerable bundle seems to
have been made regarding this
matter but whoever was to
blame it was not the pleader
and he is submitted should
not suffer for it. The fee
proposed though large does
not appear under the
circumstances to be excessive
20/18/95

I think the man must have
his Rs 1000.

The attention of the H.C.
should be asked to the postpone-
ments reported to have occurred
which have caused both expense
inconvenience —

19/9/95
23/9 // Circ to
H. M. for the Supt.
11/9
25 Sep
15/9/95

Reference on C. No. 1511/95
Mag.

CURRENT No. 4280

South Canara District Magis-
trate's office, Mangalore, 30th
August 1895.

From,

W. H. Welsh Esq.
District Magistrate
South Canara.

To,

The Chief Secretary
to Government,
Judicial Department,
Fort St. George,
Madras.

Sir,

With reference to this office
letter, Reference on C. No. 1511 dated
25th April last, regarding the appeals pre-
ferred to the High Court by the prisoners
in Sessions Case No. 38 of 1894, Govern-
ment having instructed me by wire
to depute the local Public Prosecutor
to assist the Government Pleader at
Madras, I requested Mr. J. M. Rama
Rao, the local Public Prosecutor, who was
then on his way to Madras to instruct
the

205530 29.4.95. J.M.

The Government Pleader in opposing the appeals. The appeals, which were posted for hearing on the 1st May last, were however not taken up on that date and, as Mr. Rama Rao found on enquiry that the appeals were not likely to come up for hearing before the reopening of the Court, he returned to Mangalore on 23rd May without being able to instruct the Public Prosecutor who went away for the Recess. On the 24th ^{May} I received a letter from the Registrar of the High Court informing me that the appeals were posted for the 5th June. I asked Mr. Rama Rao to proceed again to Madras which he did on 29th May, i.e., only 5 days subsequent to his return from that place. The appeals however were not taken up on the date fixed and under my instructions in accordance with his advice he remained at Madras, until the hearing which took place on the 17th July.

Mr. Rama Rao appears to have been
of

Govt Pleader?

of much help to the Government Pleader in the conduct of these cases, and I am informed that the Judges differ in opinion and have referred to the opinion of a third Judge.

2. It will thus be observed that Mr. Rama Rao, besides undertaking expensive journeys in inclement season, must have suffered in his private practice by his absence at Madras for about 2 months during which time he even lost the Government work in Mangalore and indeed has hardly had any private practice since the trial of Sessions Cases Nos. 33 & 34 of 1894 commenced in November 1894, which occupied a considerable part of the time of the Sessions Court here.

3. In view of the circumstances mentioned above I think Mr. Rama Rao deserves a good remuneration and I am inclined to think that a fee of Rupees 1000 will be a fair remuneration, though Government sanctioned a fee of Rupees 900 to him for

for conducting the prosecution in the
 Sessions Court (Government Order No.
 861
 26.4.95 Judicial). Practically the Rupees
 1900 would be his remuneration for six
 months work since he has earned only
 about Rupees 800 in the rest of the period
 from November 1894 to July 1895.

I have the honor therefore to recommend
 that Government may be pleased to
 accord its sanction for the payment to
 him of a remuneration of Rupees 1000.

I have the honor to be

Sir,
 Your most obedient servant,

Howelsh

Deputy Magistrate.

Ja

[G.]
 24
 500-2 7-95.

Jud. DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in proceedings:—

Again G.O., dated	18, No.
Again G.O., dated	18, No.
Current No.	of 189, dated, from
" "	" 189, " " "
" " 4280	" 189, " " "

ORDER. 30-9-95, No 2022

the proposed fee of Rs 1000/- is
 sanctioned
 the attention of the Hon^{ble} the Jst
 will be invited to the postponements
 reported to him occurred which have caused
 expense and inconvenience

pro.
 26.5.95
 24/4/95
 To D. M. South Canara (Q to)
 To A.S. (P to)
 To Hon. the Cj. with Cj A to 27/10/95

Res to Public Pros

Cs
mis (from order)

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 A A A A A A A

LETTER 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.