

Judicial (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

7-2  
G.O., No. 2097

Dated 10 Oct. 1895

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

PETITION.

Endorsing paragraphs II and V (7) of C. Petition Rules on---  
from Gopala Pillai, Postman of Tevaram, praying that the District  
Magistrate of Madura may be directed to enhance the punishment awarded  
in Calendar Case No. 102 of 1895 on the file of the Second class  
Magistrate of Uttamapalayam, Madura district.

# BACK PAPERS.

| G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|------|-----|-------------|-------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
|      |     |             |       |      |     |             |       |

# FURTHER PAPERS.

| G.O.       | No.  | Department. | Date. | G.O. | No. | Department. | Date. |
|------------|------|-------------|-------|------|-----|-------------|-------|
|            | 4750 |             | 1895  |      |     |             |       |
| Cm 4247/57 |      |             |       |      |     |             |       |

[ 6 ]

2,000-2-4-95.

Current No. *Indl* DEPARTMENT.

From *Leopala Pellai* Postman

*Tevaram* Resident of *Chinnamamur* and

Complainant in Calendar

Case No 102/95 on the file of the II class Magistrate

No. 7 *Attamapalayam* Madurai Dt.

Dated 18/11

Received 23/11/95

Enclosures 23/11/95

SUBJECT. *V.P.*

Praying that the District Magistrate may be directed to enhance the punishment awarded to the accused in the above case.

*10th October 1895, No 2097*

*Para II & IV of the Petition*

*9/10/95*

The petition states as follows:-

The following are the accused in Calendar Case No 102 of 95 in the Court of the 2nd class Magistrate of Attamapalayam:-

1. Marudamuttu Serrvai Agnunciff of Chinnamamur
2. Vaidalingam Pillai Namam of Do.
3. Subbapandervai Salarai of Do.
4. Kandasami Pillai inhabitant of Do.
5. Do
6. Do
7. Do
8. Do

The petitioner who is the complainant in the above case is an inhabitant of the above village and is the post man of Tevaram. In the above case the Magistrate fearing the out of fear for his well known wickedness of the accused gave only a slight punishment to the accused No 1 & 3 and released the others. In doing this he expected also the benefit of the Titad 2 from these defendants. As cases No 1 and 3 under the influence of the others obstructed the petitioner in the discharge of his functions as a postman and in their public capacities imprisoned the petitioner and



