3-7-12 BZ

Judicial (1895) Department.

ORDINARY MS.

G.O., No. 373

Dated 19th Feb. 1895.

INDEXED.

[Despatch Abstract.]

PROSECUTING INSPECTORS -- POLICE.

Approving, with remarks, the entertainment of the twenty-one Prosecuting Inspectors for whom budget provision has been made.

(a) In [illegible] Arcot and Tanjore the Spec

out of 8

BACK PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	1436-7		12-6-94				

FURTHER PAPERS.

G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.	G.O.	No.	Department.	Date.
	3087		1895	G.O. 1543 / 26-7-95			
	3205		1895	G.O. 1525 / 3-8-95			

---

ficial (1894) DEPARTMENT.

6549

Jud Dept

G.O. 1436-37-12-6-94
650-24 92 &c
887-88-7 5 91
2219-24-10-93
1018: 22-11-94 Jud

FROM
Col. C. A. Porteous,
INSPECTOR-GENERAL
OF POLICE,

To
The Chief Secy to Govt
Fort Saint George

ans G.O. of the 12-6-94

No. 7253

Dated 8th } December 1894.
Received 9
Regd 10

Encl. 2

No.

UNDER SECRETARY
10 DEC 94
PUBLIC ETC. DEPT.
SUBJECTS

Forwarding a Precis of replies received from Superintendents regarding the number of prosecuting Inspectors required and how they are proposed to be employed together with a Statement shewing the number of cases grave crimes conducted by the prosecuting agency from July 1893 to June 1894.

NR 5/12
11/12

No 19/12

Please case. NR 19/12

Copy G.O. 1307 7 Aug. 1890

Copy of 887/8 7-5-91
650 24 92

Police budget 1895-96

Police Report 43

G.O. please

15/11

For orders
19/12

June 1894 is herewith Submitted.

(a) In Arcot and Tanjore the Spec

out of 8

Stateme
took p
650 d
Distr
Prosecu
M. R.
P. Sa
M. R.
Sund

M. R. Ry. S. A. Swaminatha Sastriar Avergal B.A. & B.L. High Court Vakil	Tanjore Town Tiruvadi Vallam	21	13	7	758	..	..	8	3	
M. R. Ry. S. Ramaswami Aiyar 2nd Grade Pleader	Pattukota Arantanghi	8	5	2	390	..	..	2	..	
M. R. Ry. S. S. Ramaswami Aiyar 1st Grade Pleader	Mannargudi Tiruturapundi	11	6	3	166	..	..	3	2	
	—	93	59	23	2760	12	..	36	11	
	Total South Arcot and Tanjore	125	80	30	3146	8	..	46	14	
	Salem									
M. R. Ry. Subramania Aiyar Prosecuting Inspector	Salem	75	54	22	1645	2	..	38	14	
	Vizagapatam									
R. Ry. Raghunatha Rao from 1st July to 17th November 1893 and R. Srinivasa Rao from 26th April to 30th June 1894 Prosecuting Inspector	Vizagapatam excepting the Agency Tracts	32	30	10	625	15	4	21	8	The post was vacant from 18th Novem to 25th April 1894 for want of Inspe
	Total Salem and Vizagapatam	107	84	32	2271	1	4	59	22	
	Grand Total	232	164	62	5417	9	4	105	36	

Chief Office of the
Inspr General of Police,
Madras, 8th December 1894.

Exd.

Asstt. Inspr General of Police.

out of 8

Statement showing the number of grave cases that occurred, the number in which prosecutions took place and the number conducted by the Special Agency appointed under G. Os. Nos. 887 and 650 dated 7th May 1891 and 2nd April 1892 J.D. respectively (with the result of prosecution) in the Districts of South Arcot, Tanjore, Vizagapatam and Salem from July 1893 to June 1894.

Prosecuting officer	Jurisdiction of prosecuting officer	No. of grave or important cases which occurred within jurisdiction of prosecuting officer	Of cases shewn in Col: 3 the number prosecuted	Of cases shewn in Col: 4 number prosecuted by the Special agency	Amount including travelling allowance paid for cases prosecuted in previous column by the Special agency	Result of prosecutions		Remarks
						Of cases shown in Col: 4.	Of cases shewn in Col: 5.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
						Convicted	Convicted	
	South Arcot							
M. R. Ry. P. Sama Rao	Cuddalore Town Cuddalore Taluk Panrutty Chidambaram Taluk Mannargudy	10	8	4	150 12 "	4	1	
M. R. Ry. R. Subramania Aiyar	Virdachellam Tittagudy	3	1	"	" " "	"	"	
M. R. Ry. S. T. Parthasaradi Aiyengar	Kallakurichy Taluk Ulundoorpett Trikoilur Taluk	6	6	2	190 " "	3	1	
M. R. Ry. Sundara Aiyar	Chengam Tirnomalai Taluk Gingee Tindivam Taluk Vanur Villupuram	13	6	1	45 " "	3	1	
		32	21	7	385 12 "	10	3	
	Tanjore							
M. R. Ry. S. Ramaswami Aiyar Grade Pleader	Kumbakonam Tiruvadamarudur Mayaveram Tranquebar Shiyali	26	22	7	556 12 "	15	5	
M. R. Ry. Muthusubramania Aiyar 2nd Grade Pleader	Nannilam Negapatam Tiruvalur	27	13	4	890 " "	8	1	

Precis of Replies from District Superintendents of Police regarding Prosecuting Agency with Inspector-General's remarks.

Districts	Superintendents' replies	Inspector-General's remarks
Ganjam	Stating that 2 prosecuting Inspectors are necessary for the District until the opening of the Railway when 1 might be done away with – to deal with (1). Grave offences against person or property (2). Offences requiring circumstantial evidence and (3). Cases of appeal to the Divisional Magistrate – One division comprising of Ichapore, Somepetta, Parlakimedy, Narasannapett, Chicacole and Tekkali and the other, of the rest.	
Vizagapatam.	Recommending the appointment of 1 prosecuting Inspector with his Head Quarters at Vizagapatam – to prosecute under his orders Cases of the nature enumerated in para G of Police Order No. 12 before all Courts in the District other than the Sessions Court and those Courts situated within Agency limits – with the opinion of the Deputy Inspector General, Northern Range, that 1 Inspector will suffice.	Dacoity Highway Robbery Murder Housebreaking theft over Rs 1000 Any riot or case of specially grave nature D 8/1
Jeypore Godavari.	Informing that a prosecuting Inspector is not required at present for the District. Appending a detailed list of the proposed	

(a) [illegible] ircot o[illegible] Mayore the spec

out of 8

	proposed duties of the prosecuting – entirely in connection with released prisoners as the Cases which have to be prosecuted will not be many in number.	
Godavari	Stating that he would propose to employ the prosecuting Inspector in addition to his prosecuting work on Special work such as Anthropometrical^x measurement of prisoners, identifying old offenders &c. and that there are very few Cases (not exceeding 10 in number) in the Sessions Court which require prosecuting Inspectors to deal with them, the Cases being occasional Cases of Robbery and the larger House-breakings.	^x This is not the duty of a prosecuting Inspector – Prosecuting Inspectors are not required for Sessions Cases but for Cases before Magistrates.
Nellore	Stating that 2 prosecuting Inspectors are required for the District one at Nellore and the other at Ongole to prosecute all grave offences (such as murder, dacoity, robbery, House-breaking of Rs. 100 and over and thefts, over Rs. 200) to be judged according to the discretion of the Superintendent –	
Kurnool	Stating that 2 prosecuting Inspectors are necessary, one for the Main Range and the other for the Sub Division – to prosecute grave Crimes in their Ranges – the want of such agency being shown in the late Torture Cases, Patticondah Dacoity and	One should be enough for Kurnool.
	other Cases being acquitted: the Sessions Court –	
Bellary	Reporting that 1 prosecuting Inspector is required for the District (and suggesting that 4th Class Inspector C. Ranganatha Aiyar be appointed, if another School Inspector can be sent). The Inspector is to prosecute cases before the various Magistrates in the District –	
Anantapur	Proposing to have 2 prosecuting Inspectors for the District – one at Gooty to look after all Cases in Gooty, Tadpatry and Uravacondah where crime is generally heavy and the other at Anantapur – They have to deal with all Cases of heinous nature, Murders, dacoities, robberies &c.	One should be enough for this small District –
Cuddapah	Reporting that 2 prosecuting Inspectors are needed for the District – one at Cuddapah and the other at Madanapalli to prosecute grave Cases as directed by the Superintendent or Assistant Superintendent. The latter has also to relieve the Town and Taluk Division Inspector of the duties of the Court Inspector, the work turned out by him as Court Inspector being highly unsatisfactory and also to prosecute, when disengaged, ordinary thefts &c. as the Inspectors of the Madanapalli and Ghattoo Divisions are too much away for prosecuting purposes –	

(a) In [illegible] Arcot [illegible] Tanjore the Spec

[illegible] out of 8

North Arcot	Stating that the appointment of 2 prosecuting Inspectors is barely necessary for so large a district as North Arcot which contains about 21 Magistrates' Courts — to deal with murder, dacoity, robbery, rioting, mischief by fire, house-breaking and thefts of over Rs. 100 and other cases according to the discretion of the Superintendent. The District Magistrate concurs with him in the posting of cases - one at Vellore and the other at Chittoor as Head Quarters. They have to attend the Magistrates' Courts in turn-	
Chingleput.	Informing that a prosecuting Inspector is not in the least required.	This District should have at least one prosecuting Inspector.
South Arcot-	Reporting that 2 prosecuting Inspectors are necessary for the District - one for the Superintendent's range and the other for the Assistant Superintendent's range - to appear in the Appellate Courts in support of the Conviction of the lower Courts in Police Cases & to prosecute important Cases in the lower Courts when the Inspectors are disabled to do so and other Cases as the Superintendent or the Assistant Superintendent deems necessary-	
Tanjore	Stating that at least 2 prosecuting Inspectors are required — one at Tanjore for the Superintendent's range and the other at Negapatam for the Assistant Superintendent's range - to deal with grave Cases-	
Trichinopoly	Reporting that one prosecuting Inspector will be sufficient for the District to prosecute all grave Crimes in the several Criminal Courts of the District-	
Madura	Informing that 2 prosecuting Inspectors are required for the District - one at Madura for the Main Range and the other at Paramakudy for the Sub Division Range - to prosecute all Police Cases of Special importance before all Magistrates except the Court of Sessions-	
Tinnevelly	Stating that 2 Special prosecuting Inspectors are required for the "very litigious District" - one at Tinnevelly for the Main Range and the other at Satur for the Sub-Division and proposing to employ them in conducting the preliminary enquiry in all Sessions Cases, in supporting Convictions in all appeal Cases, in all cases in which the local police are unable to do so by C.C. P. 459 and in all burglaries which Inspectors are unable to prosecute and calling attention to	

(a) In [illegible] Arcot a[illegible] Tanjore the Spec

[illegible] out of 8

	to his letter No. 596 dated 20th June 1892-	
Salem.	Stating that the present arrangement may be continued-	
Coimbatore	Stating that there should be 2 prosecuting Inspectors for the District - one at Coimbatore for the Main Range omitting Kollegal and Talavady Divisions where Crime is light and the other at Erode for the Erode Sub Division - to prosecute generally all grave Crimes and any special cases that they might be deputed on, and stating that a prosecuting Inspector is not necessary for Nilgiris-	
Malabar.	Strongly of opinion that three prosecuting Inspectors (at least two) are necessary for the District which contains about 51 Courts exclusive of those of the Bench Magistrates and stating that any prosecuting Inspector should be 1st Class Inspector; certainly not lower than the 2nd Class, to resist all temptations towards bribery - to deal with all cases of Murder, Dacoity, Robbery, House-breaking (whenever possible), Theft, Riot or other cases rendered grave by circumstances or much involved and referring to Statistics in Crime in North Malabar - One Inspector for North Malabar exclusively and the other for the rest - and if there be two for the latter, one at Palghat and other at Malapuram-	Two prosecuting Inspectors should be enough for this District: One for North Malabar and the other for South Malabar.
South Canara.	Reporting with reference to the Monsoon which renders travelling difficult, that 3 prosecuting Inspectors are necessary for the District where, although Crime is light as compared with other Districts, there is neither Railway nor any other means of rapid transit - one for Kundapur, Udipi and Karkal, another for Cassergode, Neeleshwar and Puttur and the third for the rest - to prosecute all cases investigated by the Police.	1 prosecuting Inspector is sufficient for this small District-
Kistna	Stating that 4 prosecuting Inspectors are required to conduct all grave Crimes in the 20 Magisterial Courts; if thefts, under Rs. 100 are excluded, three would be sufficient; two would barely suffice, if all thefts, below Rs. 500 are excluded - and in case two only are sanctioned, they should be stationed - one at Bezwada and the other at Narasarowpeta; if three are sanctioned, the third at Masulipatam.	
Chief office of the Inspr General of Police Madras, 8th December 1894	Asstt. Inspector-General of Police	

(a) In Arcot and Tanjore the Spec

out of 8

No. — 1,000 — 10-94.
49

Account DEPARTMENT.

CHIEF OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,

No. 7253 Madras, 8th December 1894.

FROM

Colonel C. A. Porteous,

INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,

TO

THE Chief Secretary
to Government
Fort Saint George.

SIR,

Enclosures. two.

I have the honor to state that on receipt of G.Os No. 1436 and 1437 dated 12th June 1894 J. D., a Circular Memorandum was issued calling upon the Superintendents to report what number of Inspectors would be required for prosecuting Police cases and how they proposed to employ them.

A precis of replies received from District Officers is herewith attached.

The majority of Superintendents apply for 2 Inspectors for each District.

2. The number asked for by each and the number proposed by me is shown in the Subjoined

[illegible] is herewith submitted.

(a) In [illegible] Arcot and Tanjore the Spec

[illegible] out of 8

Subjoined list.

Name of District.	Number of prosecuting Inspectors which Superintendent Considers necessary	Number of prosecuting Inspectors which Inspector General considers necessary	Remarks.
Northern Range.			
Ganjam	2	2	
Vizagapatam	1	1	
Jeypore	Nil	Nil	
Godavari	1	1	
Kistna	3	2	
Central Range			
Nellore	2	2	
Kurnool	2	1	
Bellary	1	1	
Anantapur	2	1	
Cuddapah	2	2	
North Arcot	2	2	
Chingleput	Nil	1	
South Arcot.	2	2	
Southern Range			
Tanjore	2	2	
Trichinopoly	1	1	
Madura	2	2	
Tinnevelly	2	2	
Salem	1	1	
Coimbatore	2	2	
Malabar	2	2	
South Canara	3	1	
Total	35	31	

3. Almost all Superintendents propose to employ these Inspectors.—

i For prosecuting grave cases such as murder, dacoity, rioting, house-breaking and theft of over Rupees 100.—

ii For supporting convictions in all appeal cases.—

iii In all cases in which the local Police are debarred from conducting prosecutions under Section 495 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.—

4. The Superintendent of Police, Godavari recommends that the prosecuting Inspector be employed on the following duties.—

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

i He should take over anthropometrical wor

ii He should attend the Jail for the identifica of prisoners.—

iii He should prepare Jail lists and report his diary the prisoners released and the destination.—

iv He should report, as far as possible, the rou the released prisoners take and the d their departure.—

v He should inform Town, Taluk and Rail heads at Rajahmundry the above detail regarding released prisoners and Communicate with the Inspectors Concern

vi He should take over the Wandering Gang Registers, Foreigners Registers and be responsible for reports to the Assistant with the Government.—

vii He should practically be at the head of the Intelligence Department as above noted.—

viii In his absence, when prosecuting case the School Inspector can take over hi duties.—

Note— These are not the duties of a prosecuting Inspector. In this large and important District there is ample work for two prosecuting Inspectors.—

[illegible]

5. The Statement called for by Government showing the number of grave cases conduc by the prosecuting agency from July 1893 June 1894 is herewith submitted.—

(a) In [illegible] Arcot a[illegible] Tanjore the Spec

out of 8

cases prosecuted between July 1893 and June 1894, and in 14 Cases Convictions were obtained.

(b) In Salem and Vizagapatam Districts the Special prosecuting Inspectors of Police were employed in 32 out of 84 Cases prosecuted and obtained 22 Convictions.

(c) The Results of prosecutions by the different Classes of agency are shown below:—

46.6 per cent. Convicted of Cases prosecuted by pleaders

68.75 " Convicted of Cases prosecuted by Special (prosecuting) Inspectors of Police.

67.6 " Convicted of Cases prosecuted by ordinary Police.

(d) For the 30 cases prosecuted by pleaders in South Arcot and Tanjore, the fees and Travelling allowance paid amounted to Rupees 3147-"-", the Cost of each case was Rupees 105-"-"

(e) In Salem and Vizagapatam, the Inspectors prosecuted 32 cases and the Sanctioned pay and horse and travelling allowances paid was Rupees 2271-"-" or nearly Rupees 71-"-" per case.

6. The following Inspectors are recommended for the post of Prosecuting Inspectors in the Districts of Godavari, Tanjore, and South Arcot.

Arcot.

Name	District in which employed	District for which recommended as prosecuting Inspector.	Remarks.
M.R.Ry. T. Madhava Rao	South Arcot	South Arcot	On furlough for 6 months from 21st August 1894
" V. Ramachendra Aiyar B.A. B.L	Trichinopoly	South Arcot	To act-Vice T. Madhava Rao on leave.
" A. Jagannatha Pillai	Tanjore	Tanjore	
" P.V. Subba Rao B.A.	Godavari	Godavari	

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your Most Obedt Servant,

Chas. A. Porteous Colon

Inspector General of Police.

Va

[G.]

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

[5]
500—20-6-94.

DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings :—

Again G.O., dated 18 , No.

Again G.O., dated 18 , No.

Current No. of 18 , dated from

Judicial 112/21-1-95

Current No. 6549 of 1894, dated 8th December from the I.G. of Police

Refce Only

Copied 19/1

The I.G. is requested to state in detail what provision has been made in the Police budget for 1895-96 with reference to G.O. of 14th June 1894, No 1436 Jl & his letter no 7253 of 8 Dect 1894

(From orders)

19.1

I.G. Police

Copied 19/1

To

The I.G. of Police. — Despd 21/1/95

Reference ong

B.S. [G./94] Judicial DEPARTMENT.

No. 0/49 1,000—10-94.

44

DEPARTMENT.

No. 466

CHIEF OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,
Madras, 31 January 1895.

FROM
M. Hammick Esq. I.C.S.
INSPECTOR-GENERAL OF POLICE,

TO
THE Chief Secretary
to Government
Fort St. George.

SIR,

Enclosures.

P.M. P.A.
9. 70/- – 1470 or 17640
Hds. @ 15/- – 315 or 3780
Total Rs. 21420.

With reference to Memo No. 112, dated 21st January 1895, from the Under Secretary to Government, J.D., calling for certain information regarding the agency for the prosecution of offenders in magisterial courts, I have the honor to state that agreeably to the directions contained in G.O., No. 1436, dated 12th June 1894, J.D., provision was made in my Budget Estimate for 1895-96 for 21 Inspectors 4th class. This number includes the four Prosecuting Inspectors sanctioned in G.O. No. 884 J.D., dated 7th May 1891 and provides one Inspector for each District.

2. My letter No. 4253, dated 8th Decemb
94 was submitted to Governmen

subsequent to the Budget Estimate, the additional number of Prosecuting Inspectors herein recommended could not therefore be included.

If my proposals are approved of it will be necessary to make provision for 10 more 4th class Inspectors costing Rs 10,200 per annum.

Pay 700 or 8400
Horse allce. 150 or 1800.
Rs 10200.

I have the honor to be,
Sir
Your most obedt. Servt.
A. Hammick
Inspector General of Police.

Jud. (1895) DEPARTMENT. 444

~~Eccl~~ Refce No 112/95 & papers

Jud. D
C. No. 6579/94
& papers.

FROM

M. Hammick Esq. I.C.S.

INSPECTOR-GENERAL

OF POLICE,

Orig. of Police Budget for 1895-96

TO

The Chief Secretary
to Government
Fort St. George.

No. 466

Dated 31 } January 1895
Received 1/2 }

No.

CHIEF SECRETARY
-1. FEB. 1895
GOVERNMENT OF MADRAS

SUBJECT.

Reporting with reference to G.O. No. 112 dated 21-1-95 J.D. that agreeably to directions contained in G.O. No. 1436 d 12.6.94, J.D. provision was made in this Office Budget Estimate for 1895-96 for 21 Inspectors 4th class.

5.3.
2/2

For orders

[G/24]

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

[G/26]
—6-8-94.

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

C. No. ~~6549/94~~

6549 of 1894 from the I.G. Police
Ext. Refce. 112/21.1.95 hereon
& Current 444 from the I.G. in reply hereto.

FOR ORDERS.

The I.G. of Police furnishes the informn called for in G.O. d 12 June 1894 No. 1436 J.D. That G.O. only contemplated the appointment of one prosecuting Inspector for each District i.e. 20* in all. Col. Porteous now asks for the appointment of 31, a second prosecuting inspector being in his opinion necessary in the districts of Ganjam, Kistna, Nellore, Cuddapah, North & South Arcot, Tanjore, Madura, Tinnevelly, Coimbatore & Malabar.

* Nilgiris being included in Coimbatore.

2 He was requested to make provision in his budget for 95-96, but it is not clear from the Budget order (G.O. d 22 Novr 1894 No. 1018 Fin.) what provision he has made, & the Financial Dept cannot say. There is an increase of 2-3rd class & 19-4th class inspectors - but this is counterbalanced by a decrease of 6 first class & 6 second class inspectors, besides which it is not known whether the additional inspectors provided for are the new prosecuting inspectors. However this may be it may be regarded tolerably certain that the present for 1895-96 does not provide for the

See Current 444. later on. for the information
D
2/2

rosecuting inspectors now proposed ther with their travelling allowance tingencies &c. In Salem & Vizagapatam prosecuting inspectors cost Rs 2271 e year – July 93 to June 94 – At this rate would cost some Rs 35,200 per annum.

The results of the prosecutions in the year ending 30 June 1894 shew only a fractional superiority in the case of prosecutions by these Inspectors as compared with charges prosecuted by the ordinary police agency – 68.75 per cent of convictions as against 67.6 – but no doubt it may be said that the prosecuting inspectors were only employed in specially difficult cases; their work compares very favourably with that of the prosecuting Vakils who only secured convictions in ~~the~~ Dx 46.6% of the cases undertaken.

4. Col. Porteous does not definitely state that "arrangements he proposes to make "in each district with the object of providing "work for the Inspector when not employed "in prosecuting cases". Apparently he accepts the recommendation made by the majority of the Supdts., i.e. that they should be employed

(i) For prosecuting grave cases such as murder, dacoity, rioting, housebreaking & theft above Rs 100

(ii) For supporting convictions in all appeal cases.

(iii) In all cases in which the local Police are debarred from conducting prosecutions by s 495 Cr. P.C. i.e. by reason of their having investigated the cases in question

Further ~~states~~ recapitulates the recommendations

Special Prosecuting Agency

FOR ORDERS.

H M & circ

and were moreover only new to the work HH

[G./24]

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

DEPARTMENT.

No.

From

Dated 189 .

FOR ORDERS.

Yes – But we may, I think, leave it to Mr. Hammick to see that these inspectors have enough to do – HH

of the Godavari Superintendent as to the employment of these men, but nowhere can be found specific recommendations made by Col Porteous himself. The Govt. order has thus not been fully answered.

5. The I.G.'s letter concludes with a recommendation to appoint four individuals as prosecuting inspectors in South Arcot (2), Tanjore & Godavari. There is at present only one man in South Arcot, & one each in Salem Tanjore & Godavari, the appointments being temporary, lasting only till June 1895.

D–
16 Jan.

Before circ. ask the I.G. to say with ref. to his proposals & to G.O. 1436/16.6.94 what provision he has made in his budget for this additional staff –

18/1

Read Current 444 also.

Note. dy 4.2.94

The I.G.'s reply to the reference directed by C.S. shews that these proposals if sanctioned will necessitate an additional budget provision of Rs 10,200 on account of pay & horse allowance. This is exclusive of the provision already made for 21 inspectors viz. Rs ~~30,78~~ 21,42

Special Prosecuting Agency

The total cost of these measures will be Rs. 31,620 exclusive of travelling allowance & contingencies

D
4.2

This is a luxury which I submit that Govt. cannot in the present state of its finances afford. There is much of far greater importance ~~[illegible]~~ than this to be done.

I submit that although, if Govt. had plenty of money, this experiment would be a desirable one to carry out - it ~~[illegible]~~ is at present quite out of the question. The ~~present~~ establishment now employed may be done away with at the expiry of the period for which they were sanctioned (up to June 1895)

6/2/95

I should say the [illegible] "Let him have his 21 men"

11/2/95

I quite agree. I believe in this work, and if well looked after these men by careful handling of police cases will do much to improve the statistics of convictions - to say nothing of the excellent training they will get, wh. shd. qualify them for magisterial work eventually. I am sorry we have not got the money for the other men asked for especially in Godavari

W
13 Feb.

H. M. & Circ.
(For orders)

Judicial DEPARTMENT.

Papers to be read in Proceedings :—

Again G.O., dated 18 , No.

Again G.O., dated 12 June 1894, No. 1436 Jud.

Current No. 6549 of 1894, dated 8 Decr. from the I.G. Police

Current No. 444 of 1895, dated 31 January from the I.G. Police

Order 19 Feby. '95 No. 373

The Govt. regrets that it is for financial reasons impossible to sanction the I.G.'s proposals in their entirety. Entertainment of the twenty one prosecuting inspectors for whom budget provision has been made will however be approved. This will allow one for each district, ~~but the I.G. will be at liberty to employ the inspector~~ ~~proposed~~ ~~sanctioned for the Nilgiris in the Godavari, or any other dist which may be in greater need of his services~~

(from orders)

D
16.2.95

18/2/95

19/2

The I.G. of Police
The Acctt. General with S.C. G.O. 1436/94 Jud.
" Regr. High Court

20/2
desptd 21/2/95
desptd 30/10/95

Note for C.S. I have struck out the last sentence about the Nilgiris as the I.G. has not proposed to employ any inspector in the Nilgiris. It seems hardly necessary to send the papers in circulation again on this account.

Prosecuting Inspectors, Police

C.S.

(from orders)

---

pying ______
copi ______
xamined ______
sig ______

} 189 .

AGAIN G.O., No. 189 , DATED

RENT No.							
CLOSURES TO C. No.							
RDES OF GOVERNMENT	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
TES OF GOVERNMENT.							
EMENT 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.