

Judicial (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 2027

DATED 30th Sept: 1895

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

SENTENCE OF DEATH.

Declining to interfere with the-----passed on convict No.
1899, Solliappah & Gounden, in Coimbatore Sessions case No. 60 of 1895.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

Enclosure No I

විනිසිවු මගේ පිණිස ලියා ඇති
 මේ 2 කිරි කොටස මගේ පිණිස
 ලියා ඇති පිණිස

පොදු දින 12 ක් මගේ පිණිස
 ලියා ඇති මගේ පිණිස 1899 වසර
 මගේ පිණිස ලියා ඇති මගේ
 පිණිස ලියා ඇති මගේ පිණිස
 ලියා ඇති මගේ පිණිස

පොදු දින 12 ක් මගේ පිණිස
 ලියා ඇති මගේ පිණිස 1899 වසර
 මගේ පිණිස ලියා ඇති මගේ
 පිණිස ලියා ඇති මගේ පිණිස
 ලියා ඇති මගේ පිණිස
 ලියා ඇති මගේ පිණිස
 ලියා ඇති මගේ පිණිස
 ලියා ඇති මගේ පිණිස
 ලියා ඇති මගේ පිණිස
 ලියා ඇති මගේ පිණිස
 ලියා ඇති මගේ පිණිස

පොදු දින 12 ක් මගේ පිණිස
 ලියා ඇති මගේ පිණිස 1899 වසර
 මගේ පිණිස ලියා ඇති මගේ
 පිණිස ලියා ඇති මගේ පිණිස
 ලියා ඇති මගේ පිණිස

[illegible]

১৫৫৭ খ্রিস্টাব্দে
 গুৱাহাটীতে
 ১৫৫৭ খ্রিস্টাব্দে

১৯৩৫ সাল ১২ মাস ১৫
 তারিখ। ১২ মাস ১৫
 ১৯৩৫ সাল ১২ মাস ১৫

[illegible][illegible]

E. J. A. S. K.
Superintendent.
Coimbatore Central Jail }
24th September 95. }

"Appeal for Mercy"

To

His Excellency, The Right Honorable,
The Governor in Council,
Fort Saint George.

The humble petition of convict no: 1899
Solliaffah Jandien under sentence
of death in the Coimbatore Central
Jail.

Dated 24th September 1895.

Prayer.

Prays to pardon the sentence of
death passed on him.

Ind^d
5

4517

Enclosure no 2.

To

His Excellency, The Right Honorable,
The Governor in Council,
Fort Saint George.

The humble petition of convict no: 1899 Solliaffah
Jandien under sentence of death in the Coimbatore
Central Jail.

I was sentenced to suffer death in Coimbatore
Session case no 60 of 95. I appealed to the High Court
of Madras against the sentence passed on me on the
ground that it is against law and unjust. The
Honorable Judges of the High Court confirmed the
sentence of death passed on me considering only the
prosecution evidence.

The conviction and sentence passed on me is
against law.

There are no independent witnesses in this case.
All the witnesses are related to each other and are
my enemies. The High Court did not consider
that the witnesses are related to each other and are
at enmity with me.

The evidence given by the witnesses in this
case are contradictory and cannot be believed.

I first reported the occurrence to the Erode

Terode Village Munsiff as soon as my brother's wife
was murdered by the complainants (my enemies)
and came to the spot where the murder was
committed with the Munsiff and Terode Police. The
High Court did not take into consideration this
fact. Your Excellency Council will consider
whether it is possible for me to report ^{truly} the matter
first, if I am the guilty party.

The Police did not arrest me first. After
arresting my enemies, they arrested me.

There is no enmity, as stated by the Sessions
Court that there is, between myself and the
deceased as the deceased herself has promised the land
to be let to me on lease. No motive for the murder
is established.

From the records, Your Excellency
Council will come to know that I am not
guilty. I therefore humbly pray that Your
Excellency Council will consider this case
and order my release from jail.

X Mark of Solliappah Goundan.
Council no 1899.

(Translation)

5
jud.
4
4517

Coimbatore Central Jail. ^{Superintendent}
24th September 95
LB

In the Sessions Court,
Coimbatore Division.

THE 29TH DAY OF JULY, 1895.

PRESENT:
THOMAS WEIR, Esquire,
Sessions Judge.

SESSIONS CASE NO. 60 OF 1895.

(REGISTER CASE No. 6 OF 1895,

Committed by the Stationary Sub-Magistrate, Erode,
Coimbatore District).

1899.
QUEEN EMPRESS OF INDIA *Versus* Solliappah Goundan, defended by Mr. Ven-
kataramanier, Pleader.

OFFENCE ... Murder, Section 302, I. P. C.

OPINION OF ASSESSORS (2 Brahmins.) ... Guilty.

FINDING OF JUDGE ... Concurred with the Assessors.

SENTENCE ... Death, subject to confirmation by the High
Court.

To,

D. W. G. COWIE, Esq.,

ACTING REGISTRAR,

HIGH COURT.

APPELLATE SIDE,

MADRAS.

SIR,

I have the honor to submit my Judgment (with record) in the above case
for the orders of the High Court, under Section 374 of the Code of Criminal
Procedure.

JUDGMENT.

THE accused, Solliappah Goundan, is charged with having murdered
Moottoo Pavayi, his sister-in-law, on the 19th April last.

2. The following preliminary are either not disputed or are proved.

3. The deceased, Moottoo Pavayi, was the widow of a deceased brother of the accused. Moottoo Pavayi's husband died some 20 to 30 years ago.

4. Moottoo Pavayi inherited from her husband one share in a garden called Mooniappan Kovil Thottam. The accused, Solliappah, owned another share. The remaining two shares in the garden belonged to one Ramayi (5th witness) and to the brother of the latter's husband (7th witness' evidence).

The accused had recently encumbered or alienated his share to an Asari and was therefore left without any land.

5. He (accused) was therefore extremely anxious to obtain the land of deceased for cultivation.

6. The deceased, however, was unwilling to let the accused have the land, refused to listen to the latter's persistent requests on the subject—and leased the lands to third parties.

7. On the 8th April 1895—some 10 or 11 days before the deceased's death, she executed a lease of the land for 5 years to the two Sengoda Goundans—1st and 2nd witnesses (Exhibit A in the record).

8. This lease (Exhibit A) was registered and the accused, even after the execution and registration of the lease, persisted in asking the deceased woman to let him have the land.

9. The accused alleges that the deceased woman at the last acceded to his request and agreed to let him cultivate the land.

The prosecution altogether deny that this was the case.

10. The accused admits in his statement (Exhibit E) that no one was present when the deceased finally agreed to let him have the land. His assertion is thus unsupported by any evidence, and it is, in my opinion, altogether against the probabilities arising from the antecedent circumstances.

The accused had become embarrassed in his circumstances and had lost his own land—and the deceased according to the evidence (1st witness' evidence) not unnaturally, thought that, if she allowed her needy brother-in-law to cultivate the land, she could expect no share in the produce.

11. The killing of deceased by the accused is spoken to by as many as nine witnesses (1st to 9th witnesses).

12. The effect of their evidence will now be stated.

13. The lease to 1st and 2nd witnesses (Exhibit A), as already stated, was executed and registered on 8th April.

14. On the morning of Friday, 19th April—the deceased woman accompanied by her nephew Vyapuri Goundan, 4th witness, came to 1st witness and asked why the lessees did not plough the land—as there had been rain on the previous days.

15. The 1st witness made some demur about going on with the lease on the ground principally of the objections which the accused Solliappah was making to the transaction.

16. The deceased woman apparently made light of the objections and said that she would see that 1st witness ploughed the land.

17. The 1st witness withdrew his objections and got two ploughs and 4 bullocks and started for the land along with the deceased, her nephew, Vyapuri Goundan, 4th witness—and his co-lessee—2nd witness. The 3rd witness, Chinna Goundan and the 6th witness, Vellappah Goundan went at the same time in the same direction. The 7th and 9th witnesses, Chinna Goundan and Sengoda Goundan, happened to be passing by the scene of the occurrence returning with milk from their folds. The 8th witness, Veerappah Goundan went there from a carpenter's-shop. The 5th witness—Ramayi already mentioned as being the owner of part of the field—was at the spot carrying water to her cattle.

18. When the deceased woman accompanied by her lessees and the others arrived at the *itteri* (path) outside the field, they found the accused, Solliappah engaged in blocking up, with thorns and prickly-pears, the passage in the hedge which formed the entrance to the field.

19. The deceased woman asked the accused why he was blocking up the entrance to her field. The accused replied in an abusive manner and said he would not let the deceased get into the field. The deceased woman is then said to have pulled at the thorns or prickly-pears—and thereupon the accused (who was outside the field and on the same side of the thorns as the deceased) lifted up an aruval or sickle which was in his hand and cut the deceased either on the head or neck.

The deceased woman then and there fell down and when she had fallen down the accused gave her another cut.

He is also said by some of the witnesses to have struck the deceased woman on the back with a forked-stick called a *Kavai*.

21. The witnesses, being horror-struck at what had occurred, say they ran off at once.

22. 1st and 2nd witnesses after running to their village and staying there a brief time returned to the spot and found that the deceased woman was dead.

23. They thereupon went off to the Village Magistrate of Kasipalayam (10th witness) and reported the occurrence to him and the latter at once wrote and submitted a report (Exhibit B).

24. The accused, on his part ran at once to another Village Magistrate, *viz.*, the Village Magistrate of Erode, (12th witness) who has, it is said joint jurisdiction with 10th witness over the scene of the crime.

25. The accused told his version of the occurrence to the 12th witness and the latter at once embodied it in a report (Exhibit C.) which reached the Erode Police-station as early as 10-30 A.M. on the 19th April.

The Erode Police-station, it was in evidence, was only one furlong distant from the house of the Village Magistrate, 12th witness.

26. The report made by the Kasipalayam Village Magistrate (Ex: B) did not reach the Police until 1 P.M. on 19th April.

Kasipallayam is, however, distant $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles from the Erode station.

27. In Exhibit C, the accused is recorded to have stated to the Village Magistrate of Erode—that 5 persons, viz., the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th witnesses and one Kaliappah Goundan had come to the field, where accused had gone with the deceased, Moottoo Pavayi, to plough, that the 1st witness, saying to Moottoo Pavayi ‘how did you come to plough the land that is leased to us?’ struck a blow with a stick on the neck of the said Moottoo Pavayi and that, thereupon, the 2nd witness cut her with an aruval he had—when the deceased fell down and that he—accused—being afraid, ran away, that, at that time, there were present along with him 1. Vellappah Goundan, 2. Sengoda Goundan, 3. Marappah Goundan and other persons.

28. The report of the Kasipallayam Village Magistrate (Ex: B) simply states that the 1st and 2nd witnesses came and informed the writer that, on Moottoo Pavayi’s taking them to the field for ploughing, the accused had cut Moottoo Pavayi with a bill-hook.

29. The accused’s account, it was argued for the defence, was more circumstantial than that of the 1st two prosecution witnesses.

30. On receiving the accused’s information and sending off the report (Ex: C), the Monigar of Erode (12th witness), accompanied by the Erode Police, went at once to the spot and inspected the corpse. After he, 12th witness, had reached the scene of the occurrence, the Kasipallayam Village Magistrate (10th witness) accompanied by the 1st and 2nd witnesses also came to the spot.

31. About 10 minutes afterwards, the Committing Magistrate is said to have reached the spot.

32. The latter at once began to examine the witnesses and continued doing so up to 6 P. M. or so.

33. The accused’s house was searched, but nothing was found.

34. The accused called no witnesses before the Committing Magistrate or in this Court.

35. The accused was examined by the Committing Magistrate on the day of the occurrence, viz., 19—4—95 and again prior to commitment on 17—6—95.

36. The statements then made by him are marked Exhibits E and F in the record.

37. They contain the accused’s version of what occurred, and are, as regards the principal incident, substantially to the same effect, being an amplification of the earlier statement set out in the report of the Erode Village Magistrate—Exhibit C—already noticed.

38. Both the statements, Exhibits E and F, contain a clear admission on the part of the accused of the existence of the lease to the two Sengoda Goundans, the first two witnesses, and also of the fact that the deceased had almost up to the last refused to let the accused have the land.

39. It has already been noticed that the accused admits in Exhibit E that no one was present when the deceased finally promised to let him have the land.

40. In connection with the time at which this concession is said to have been made there is a variation in the accused’s statements of some importance.

In the earlier statement (Ex. E, dated 19-4-95) the accused says the deceased promised to give the land the day before yesterday (viz., 17-4-95.)

In the later statement (Ex: F. dated 17-6-95) he says the deceased asked him to plough the land 2 or 3 days after she had leased it to the first two witnesses.

The lease, as already shown, is dated 8th April, 1895.

41. In connection with his assertion that the deceased woman finally allowed him to plough the land, the accused, after the close of the prosecution evidence, was asked the following question by the Court (under Section 342, C. P. C.)

‘Seeing that you admit that Moottoo Pavayi leased the land to the first two witnesses and that she refused to let you have it even when you begged her to do so after registration, how is the Court to believe that she afterwards consented to let you have the land?’

42. To this question the accused replied that the deceased did not at all refuse to let him have the land, but had promised to let him have it after the lease then running out had expired.

43. This final statement was altogether opposed to accused’s admissions in his earlier statements Exhibits E and F and I was altogether unable to believe it.

44. In connection with this part of the case, I have no hesitation, on the whole of the evidence, in coming to the conclusion that the accused’s assertion that the deceased woman finally agreed to let him have the land is false.

45. The lease is proved and was also admitted even by the accused in his earlier statements and the circumstances, as already shown, were such that it is altogether improbable that the deceased should, in the face of a registered lease, have, at the last moment, gone back on the lease and promised the land to her brother-in-law with whom she had been at almost life-long feud (according to the evidence) about this very land.

46. I have dwelt at some length on this point as it is, in my opinion, of great importance in appreciating the evidence in regard to the principal incident. If, as I hold to be the case, it is not true that the deceased woman allowed the accused to have the land—the main ground—of accused’s defence is shown to be baseless, while, on the other hand, the case for the prosecution is rendered highly credible.

The existence of a strong motive is established in the accused’s intense desire to have the land and by the deceased woman’s refusal to let him have it and her leasing of it to others.

As against the 1st and 2nd prosecution witnesses (on the same view) who had a clear right to the land and were supported by the deceased woman, no motive is established.

47. As regards the principal incident—viz., that of the murder—I can see no reason whatever—notwithstanding the existence of perhaps an unusual number of discrepancies to distrust the evidence that the accused was the murderer.

48. The discrepancies which may be admitted to be numerous will be found in the record.

They relate to such matters as what was said by the accused and the deceased at the time of the homicide. As to whether the accused struck first on the side of the head or on the neck, as to whether the accused struck using both hands or only one hand—as to whether the accused, besides using a sickle (aruvai), used also a forked stick (Kavai)—as to whether anything was said by deceased or not about making another opening through the hedge in the east—and as to whether the deceased woman's body when she fell down was lying with the head to the east and feet to the west or otherwise.

49. Seeing that as many as nine eye-witnesses have been called to speak to an incident, which they must all have witnessed from a somewhat different point of view, and which must naturally have struck them with horror, a considerable variation in matters of detail may reasonably be expected in their statements.

50. Moreover, in this case—granting the existence of discrepancies, there is practically no version of what occurred no explanation of how deceased met her death—other than that put forward by the prosecution witnesses. That version is spoken to by an unusually large number of eye-witnesses who were examined almost immediately after the occurrence by the Committing Magistrate and the evidence of these eye-witnesses (the existence of a strong motive being clearly established) is, in my opinion, entirely in accordance with all the probabilities arising in the circumstances of the case.

51. In saying that there is practically no other version, before the Court, of the murder than that of the prosecution, I must be understood to mean that the version given by the accused is entirely unsupported by the slightest evidence—and it cannot reasonably be believed that, if there were the slightest foundation for that version, evidence would not have been forthcoming—seeing that the incident took place at mid-day near the village-common where a large number of people were (according to the evidence) moving about, nor can it reasonably be believed that a large number of accused's fellow-villagers who are not shown to have any ill-feeling against the accused would have combined to swear away accused's life

52. As regards this point of the absence of any evidence whatever in support of accused's version of what occurred—I think it important to point out that the accused in his earliest statement, viz., that recorded in Exhibit C appears to state distinctly that there were 3 witnesses, viz., 'that there were present along with him (1) Velappa Goundan, (2) Sengoda Goundan (3) Marappa Goundan.' He, however, never called these men as witnesses at any stage of the enquiry—and, in his first statement (Exhibit E) made on 19th April, he said that, when 'the 5 persons cut Moottoo Pavayi, there was no body else present.'

About 2 annapus off, he said some women were passing to and fro and he cried out, while he was running—in general 'they have run away having killed my elder sister'. 'At the occurrence, Vellappa Goundan, Sengoda Goundan and Marappa Goundan were not present.' In his later statement (Exhibit F) dated 17th April 1895 he, however, appears to revert to the statement made in Exhibit C, except that he mentions only 2 persons—viz., Sengoda Goundan and Vellappa Goundan, who, he says, were near the Pillayar Kovil at a distance of 20 mars. These men, he says, were present and he told them what had happened.

53. If these persons were present as stated by the accused, it is significant that he has never ventured to call any of them at any stage of the enquiry.

54. The accused's account of the murder is therefore absolutely unsupported by anything in the nature of evidence and it is, in my opinion, altogether untrue and incredible.

55. Being of opinion, for the reasons stated, that the accused committed a most cruel and unprovoked murder, I find him guilty of murder—and sentence him, subject to the confirmation of the High Court, to be hanged by the neck until he is dead.

NOTE:—Accused is told to appeal to High Court in seven days.

I have the honor to be,

Sir

Your most obedient servant,

(SIGNED) T. WEIR,
Sessions Judge.

To

The Registrar of the High Court of Judicature, Appellate side, Madras
(with record).

„ District Magistrate, Coimbatore, with () spare copies.

„ Superintendent of Police, Coimbatore, with () spare copies.

„ Prisoner.

(True Copy)

Forwarded

Enclosure plus letter No. 2293

Sherisadar
23-9-95

Enclosure 1/4

E. GADSDEN
21 SEP 95

Duplicate.

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS.

Thursday, the nineteenth—day of September,
One thousand eight hundred and ninety-five.

PRESENT:—

The Honourable Sir Arthur J. G. Collins, Kt., Chief Justice
and
The Honourable Mr. Justice Parker.

Referred Trial No. 56 of 1895.

Sathappa Goundan—Prisoner. 1899

Trial referred by the Court of Session of the Coimbatore Division
for confirmation of the sentence of death passed upon the said Prisoner in Case
No. 60 of the Calendar for 1895.

CRIMINAL APPEAL No. 397 of 1895.

Appeal by the Prisoner against the said Sentence.

This case coming on for hearing, the Court delivered
the following
Judgment:— The Commission
of the offence by the accused
is testified to by no less than
nine eye-witnesses. It is pointed
out that the counter accusation

which

5
Jud
3
4517

which prisoner made against the prosecution witnesses was received some 2 or 3 hours before that made against the prisoner, but this is explained by the fact that they went to different village Magistrates and that prisoner went straight to Erode where the police station was.

We can see no reason to distrust the prosecution evidence and there is no evidence at all on the other side. The motive for the crime is obvious. The conviction and sentence must be confirmed and the appeal dismissed.

By the court.

Godhumbur
By Registrar
20-9-95 Appellate Side.

To The Superintendent, Central Jail, Coimbatore,
for information and communication to the
Prisoner. By order 22-9-95
S. Chennur

Crime.	Sentence.	Date of Sentence.	Adjudicating Court.	Present Age.	State of Health.	Conduct in Jail.	Result of the Appeal to Appellate Court.	Number of previous convictions if any and remarks.
Murder, Sec. 302 S.P.C.	Death subject to confirmation by High Court, Madras.	29th July 1895.	Sessions Judge Coimbatore.	40 years.	Indifferent.	Good.	Sentence of death confirmed on appeal by High Court, Madras.	

Coimbatore
Central Jail Office,
24th September 1895.

6,000-9-94.

Rules 701 and 714.

G. J. Jeyaraj
Superintendent of Central Jail.

C. K.

by the High Court of Judicature, Madras.

2. Copies of Judgments of the Sessions and High Courts and Nominal Roll of the prisoner are submitted.
3. The sentence of death passed upon this prisoner will not be carried into execution until a definite reply is received from Government to this petition.

I have the honor to reply

Sir,

Your most obedient servant.

G. J. Jeyaraj
Superintendent of Central Jail.
C. K.

which prisoner made against the prosecution witnesses was received some 2 or 3 hours before that made against the prisoner, but this is explained by the fact that they went to different village Magistrates and that prisoner went straight to Erode where the police station was.

We can see no reason to distrust the prosecution evidence and there is no evidence at all on the other side. The motive for the crime is obvious. The conviction and sentence must be confirmed and the appeal dismissed.

By the court.

Godhunter
By Registrar
20-9-95 Appellate Side.

To The Superintendent, Central Jail, Coimbatore,
for information and communication to the
Prisoner. By order 22-9-95
S. Chennappa

FORM No. 53.
Nominal Roll of Convict No. 1899, S. 11, Appellate Court.

Crime.	Murder, Sec. 302 S.P.C.
Sentence.	Death subject to confirmation by High Court, Madras.
Date of Sentence.	29 th July 1895.
Adjudicating Court.	Sessions Judge, Coimbatore.
Present Age.	40 years.
State of Health.	Indifferent. B. H.
Conduct in Jail.	Good.
Result of the Appeal to A. P.ellate Court.	Sentence of death confirmed on appeal by High Court, Madras.
Number of previous convictions, if any and remarks.	

Coimbatore
Central Jail Office,
24th September 1895.
Rules 701 and 714.
Superintendent of Central Jail.

5
gide.
2
4517

CURRENT No. 4517

"Appeal for Mercy"

Jud. L.

Jail (1895) Department.

From

The Superintendent, Central Jail,
Cannalore.

To

The Chief Secretary to Government,
Fort Saint George.

Dated 24th }
Despatched 24th } September 1895.
Received 25th }
Regd. — —

No. 2313

Enclosures - 5.

Subject

Submitting for orders of Government
a petition for Mercy from Convict No.
1899 Solliappah under sentence
of Death in Cannalore
Sessions Case No. 60 of 95 confirmed
by the High Court of Madras.

J
43. 200-21-5-05.

JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT.

Current Number. 4517

FOR ORDERS.

APPEAL for mercy from Convict No. 1899

Solliappah under sentence
of death in Cannalore Sessions Case
No. 60 of 1895, which sentence has been
confirmed by the High Court.

The Superintendent of the Cannalore

Jail certifies that the sentence
will not be carried out until a definite reply from
Government has been received.

25.9.95

I can see no reason to
interfere - The evidence agst.
the pet. is ample & to all ap-
pearance independent, while in
favour of the story told by him
there is no evidence at all.
It is highly improbable that a
large number of persons, none
of whom are shown to be enemies
of the Pet., should have banded
together agst. him & the proba-
bilities as to the leasing of
the land are also against him.
The petition sh^d. be dismissed.

26/9/95

This case comes when as shown
above. This has must take its
course

26/9

Japee
28 Sep

25/9/95

PETITION FOR MERCY.

VERY EMERGENT.

Hon'ble Member and Circulation

(FOR ORDERS.)

[J.
16.]
1,000-5-2-94.

Judicial Department.



PROCEEDINGS OF THE MADRAS GOVERNMENT.

READ the following letter, dated *24. Sept 95, No 457*^{23/3}, from the Superintendent of the *Central Jail at Coimbatore*, forwarding petition from Convict *No 1899 Solliappah Srinivasan* under sentence of death in *Coimbatore Session Case No. 60* of 1895, confirmed by the High Court of Judicature.

~~Read also letter, dated _____ from the Registrar of the High Court, Appellate Side, forwarding the record of the case.~~

ORDER THEREON, *dated 30 Sept* 1895, No. *2027*.

Having considered the circumstances of the case as set forth in the foregoing papers, the Right Hon'ble the Governor in Council sees no reason to interfere with the sentence of death passed on Convict *No 1899 Solliappah Srinivasan*

2. The law will take its course.

(True Extract.) (*From notes*)

20
30.9.95
Chief Secretary.

30/9/95

abstract sent to 30.

To the Superintendent of the *Central Jail, Coimbatore*
for communication to the Prisoner.
„ Inspector-General of Jails *Prison*
„ Hon'ble the Judges of the High Court, with papers returned.
The C. J. with Ck.

despatch 30/9.

File no 4655/95

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 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.