

Judicial (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 2207

Dated 31st Oct. 1895.

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

PETITION.

Endorsing paragraph II C. petition rules, on----from Maddula Rangasayi, a merchant of Ellore, requesting that ^{the} records connected with his case may be called for and that the Agent be directed to review his decision.

BACK PAPERS.

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

FURTHER PAPERS.

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

[G
9]
1000-12-8-95.

C. P. M...

Current No. 4927
Jus DEPARTMENT.

From
Madam Rangasayi
A Merchant of
Erum

No.

Dated 15-10-25
Received 17-10-25
Regd 19-10-25
Enclosures

SUBJECT.

Regd that the records
connected with his case
may be called for that
the agent be directed
to review his decision

Order 31st Oct 1925 No 2207
Min
Para. DC. R. Rules.

To the Secy. Govt. of Madras
Para. 2. Clk. 2/11
20 x 55
20 x 55
20 x 55
2/11

name
re-
calli
in
ya who
mother
ded
nd

CURRENT No.

4927



To.

His Excellency

The Governor in Council

Fort Saint George

Petition under the Godavari Agency Rules.

The humble petition of
Maddula Rungasayi a
merchant residing in
Ellore and defendant
in O.S. 7 of 1893 on the file
of the Special Assistant
Agent Godavari

Respectfully sheweth.

1. That the above suit was filed against the petitioner by one Kalluri Prankayya of Polavaram for Rs 507-7-9 on a pro-note dated the 26th February 1890 executed by the petitioner in favor of one Palivela Raghavayya who endorsed the same to the plaintiff.
2. That the pro-note sued on was executed by the Defendant at Kondapalle a village in the Vizian's Dominions in favor of the said Palivela Raghavayya who was a resident of Rutturamkotta another village in the Vizian's Territory.
3. That the petitioner never resided

or worked for gain within the jurisdiction
of the Godavari Agency Civil Courts.

4. That the Special Assistant Agent of
Godavari had no jurisdiction to try the
suit.

5. That the petitioner put in a statement
objecting to the jurisdiction of the Court
and pleading that the plaintiff had
omitted to give credit for sums received
by the original payee of the pro-note
that the plaintiff had wrongly claim-
ed interest and that the undivided brothers
of the defendant should have been joined
as defendants.

6. That the Special Assistant Agent
framed the issues and adjourned the case
for the attendance of plaintiff's witnesses
which he was not able to secure for about
two years as they were residents of the
Nizams Territories.

7. That the Special Assistant Agent
at last fixed the date of hearing for the
20th of January 1895 at Koonawaram
a place 80 miles from Ellore where the
petitioner lives and that the way between
Ellore and Koonawaram lies through
jungle track infested with wild beasts
and is not easily passable occupying a
weeks journey.

8. That the 20th of January 1895 being a Sunday the petitioner's Vakil posted a petition to the Special Assistant Agent on the 17th of January praying to post the Case some day in March and send him a timely intimation to Ellore to enable him to secure the attendance of his witnesses on such adjourned day of hearing

9. That the Special Assistant Agent tried the Case ex parte on the 21st of January 1895 the Monday following the original date of hearing and decreed the plaintiff's suit

10. That the petitioner appealed to the Government Agent Godavari who by his proceedings of the 8th of June 1895 No. 80 Confirmed the decree of the Special Agency Assistant holding that the Special Assistant was right in proceeding to try the Case on a day other than that originally fixed and that the objections of the petitioner to the suit were satisfactorily met by the Special Assistant Agent in the ex parte judgment delivered behind the petitioner's back

11. That the petitioner again appealed to the Agent to reconsider his order of the 8th of June but the petitioner's application was rejected by the proceedings

of the Agent dated 25th of July 1895
and the Petitioner was referred to the High
Court.

12. The petitioner therefore humbly prays
that the records of the Case may be called
for and the Agent be directed to review
his decision and that the Costs of these
proceedings may be ordered to be paid
to the petitioner

15/10/95

W. J. O'Connell
J. O'Connell

part?

[Faint, illegible handwritten text, likely bleed-through from the reverse side.]

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

189

ALH AGAIN G.O., No.
189

DATE

PRESENT No.

ATTACHES TO C. No.

OF GOVERNMENT

A A A A A A A

OF GOVERNMENT.

WITH DITTO.

FILED UP, BEING MEANT FOR DESPATCH
ORIGINAL.

A = Copy in full.
B = Copy to be copied.
P = Copy abstract only.
Q = Copy heading only.